

100 BIBLE VERSES 1
MORMONS 2
MISUNDERSTAND 3

Bill Grover 4

NEW HARBOR PRESS 5

RAPID CITY, SD 6

Copyright © 2021 by Bill Grover 7

1 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distrib-
2 uted or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying,
3 recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior
4 written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations
5 embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permit-
6 ted by copyright law. For permission requests, write to the publisher, ad-
7 dressed "Attention: Permissions Coordinator," at the address below.

8 Grover/New Harbor Press
9 1601 Mt. Rushmore Road, Ste 3288
10 Rapid City, SD 57701
11 www.NewHarborPress.com

12 **Ordering Information:**

13 Quantity sales. Special discounts are available on quantity purchases by
14 corporations, associations, and others. For details, contact the "Special Sales
15 Department" at the address above.

16 100 Bible Verses Mormons Misunderstand / Bill Grover. -- 1st ed.
17 ISBN 978-1-63357-399-4

18 All Scripture quotations are taken from the New King James Version®.
19 Copyright 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights
20 reserved.

CONTENTS

1

Introduction.....	1	2
Chapter 1: God and Christ in the Old Testament.....	9	3
Chapter 2: God and Christ in the New Testament	33	4
Chapter 3: Man and Salvation in the Old Testament.....	71	5
Chapter 4: Man and Salvation in the New Testament.....	87	6

INTRODUCTION

1

I define evangelicals as those who, among other beliefs, af- 2
firm the full inspiration and supreme authority of the Bible 3
over faith and conduct, that the one God subsists in three of 4
what we call “Persons” who do not exist by side but instead 5
comprise only one Being as They form a unity in essence, that 6
Christ who is one in Person yet exists in two distinct natures 7
each with its own intelligence, and experiences, one of His 8
natures being the unchangeable, omnipotent deity and the 9
other nature being the mutable and weak humanity, and that 10
in His lesser nature, by His suffering and resurrection, Jesus 11
redeemed both those in the previous Old Testament age who 12
exercised faith in the God of Israel and in the present New 13
Testament age who believe in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. 14

I think that I will be able to demonstrate in the ensuing pag- 15
es that these beliefs, in general, are not those of Mormonism’s 16
apologists and theologians. Therefore, Mormons are not evan- 17
gelicals. (Nor do they claim to be!) It is also true that they reject 18
the ancient creeds of the early church as the Nicene and the 19
Chalcedonian. But whether practicing Mormons are saved or 20
not, I will not venture to judge. Further, one should admit that 21
despite the many nefarious, and even at times ridiculous doc- 22
trines, from a biblical standpoint in my opinion, Mormons do 23
use the Bible, even occasionally with substantial argumenta- 24
tion, to supplement their modern “revelation” in order to vali- 25
date their beliefs. That no doubt deceives many into becoming 26

1 Mormons. And, it is that biblical usage, of course, which is the
2 subject matter of this present writing.

3 This book uses a number of Mormon primary sources to
4 describe LDS tenets. These sources include:

5 * Richard R. Hopkins in *Biblical Mormonism* (Bountiful
6 Utah: Horizon, 1994) who attempts to remove his faith from
7 being classified as a cult. Hopkins attempts to use biblical ex-
8 egesis (i.e., draw out meaning) to defend his religion.

9 * Daniel H. Ludlow edited *Jesus Christ and His Gospel*
10 (Salt Lake: Deseret, 1992) which consists of elaborations by
11 various contributors on selections from the *Encyclopedia of*
12 *Mormonism*.

13 * Bruce R. McConkie authored the three volume *Doctrinal*
14 *New Testament Commentary* (Salt Lake: Bookcraft, 1965)
15 which interprets the New Testament according to Mormon
16 convictions.

17 * Mc Conkie also wrote *Mormon Doctrine* (Salt Lake:
18 Bookcraft,1979) which comments, in alphabetical order, on a
19 great number of LDS beliefs.

20 * Robert L. Millet's *A Different Jesus?* (Grand Rapids:
21 Eerdmans, 2005) is an effort to demonstrate that Mormons
22 should be understood as being Christians because of what
23 they believe about Christ.

24 * Millet also is co-author (with Gerald R. Mc Dermott) of
25 *Claiming Christ* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2007) which is
26 said to be an evangelical/ LDS debate on the Person and work
27 of Christ.

28 * Millet further is one of the editors of *LDS Beliefs: A*
29 *Doctrinal Reference* (Salt Lake: Deseret,2011) which in nearly
30 700 pages explains Mormon tenets.

* The volume Gospel Principles (Salt Lake: published by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter -Day Saints, 1997) has no author(s) listed, but it is a discussion of 47 Mormon doctrines.

* David J. Ridges in *Mormon Beliefs and Doctrines Made Easier* (Springfield, Utah: CFI, 2007) wrote to assist “members of the Church” to understand better over 1300 topics related to LDS theology.

Roberts in *Mormon Doctrine of Deity* (Bountiful, Utah: Horizon, 1982 3rd printing) consists of three chapters in dialogue with one C. van der Donckt about the divine nature and other chapters on several more topics.

* Stephen E. Robinson wrote *Are Mormons Christian?* (Salt Lake: Bookcraft, 1991) to inform the faithful “Saints” of how to respond informatively to the claim that Mormons are not Christians.

* Robinson also co-authored (with Craig L. Blomberg) *How Wide the Divide* (Downer’s Grove: Intervarsity, 1997) which is a doctrinal dialogue between a Mormon and an evangelical.

* Joseph F. Smith, the sixth LDS president and the nephew of Joseph Smith wrote *The Way to Perfection* which was printed in its eleventh edition in 1956. The book covers both genealogical and doctrinal issues.

* James E. Talmage authored *Jesus the Christ* (Salt Lake: Deseret, 1915); this is an exposition on the life of Jesus.

* Talmage also penned *A Study of the Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake: published by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter- Day Saints, 1961, the 42nd. English edition) which addresses the principal doctrines of the Mormon faith.

NOTE : References to these Mormon writers will be indicated in the text by their underlined names and page numbers

1 but a few other Mormon s alluded to and non- Mormons as
2 well will usually be listed at the end of chapters in endnotes.

3 Part of the LDS position on the authority of the Bible is
4 summarized in 2 Nephi 29:10, “Wherefore, because that ye
5 have a Bible ye need not suppose that it contains all my words;
6 neither need ye suppose that I have not caused more to be
7 written.” So, accordingly, given this “inspired” proclamation
8 Mormons also consider the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine
9 and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price to be the word
10 of God in addition to the Bible. However, despite Robinson’s
11 (How Wide, 17) claim that Mormons accept the King James
12 Version of the Bible as “the inspired word of God,” that claim
13 is depleted of force by the “Prophet” Joseph Smith asserting
14 that “many important points touching the salvation of men
15 had been taken out of the Bible, or lost before it was compiled.”
16 (Millet, Beliefs, 68). With equal disdain for the Bible’s author-
17 ity, Joseph F. Smith (Perfection, 29) avers:

18 This doctrine (i.e., of pre-existence) is to be
19 found in the Bible, but, in the present mutilated
20 form in which this doctrine comes through to
21 us through that volume, it is difficult for those
22 who have not been enlightened by other rev-
23 elation to comprehend it.

24 In stark contrast to the LDS position, evangelicals believe
25 the Bible, in its autographa (i.e., the original writings), to be
26 verbally inspired (1 Corinthians 2:13; 2 Peter 1:21, 22) even to
27 the extent of the tenses of verbs (Matthew 22: 32; Galatians
28 3:16) and smallest parts of words (Matthew 5:17, 18). We also

hold that the Bible is authoritative (2 Timothy 3:16) even over 1
 supposed prophets like Smith (1 Corinthians 14:37). Still, one 2
 might ask, “but how can it be known, for example, what the 3
 apostle Paul wrote in his letters two thousand years ago?” 4
 Well, if you are a Mormon, you can rely on Joseph Smith’s 5
 “Inspired Version” (Independence, Mo.: Herald Publishing 6
 House, 1970) --which adds many whole verses to the Bible and 7
 mistranslates the original texts-- to supposedly inform you of 8
 what the authors of Scripture actually wrote, but it is claimed 9
 by the LDS that Smith’s version assures the faithful “Saints” 10
 what words in the Bible are authentic. 11

On the other hand, one should be aware that Protestant 12
 scholars as Bruce Metzger in his *A Textual Commentary on* 13
the New Testament (Stuttgart, Germany: UBS, 1995) have re- 14
 searched the earliest Greek copies of the New Testament, the 15
 first translations of it, and citations from it in the church fathers 16
 of the first several centuries to determine the words of the 17
 authors of the New Testament. See also Comfort and Barrett, 18
The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts 19
 (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House 2001) which allows the reader 20
 to see the earliest extant text in the original Greek language. 21

The Bible, itself, of course, insists that it is true. “The 22
 entirety of your word is truth.” (Psalm 119:160). “Sanctify them 23
 by your truth. Your word is truth.” (John 17:17). “We spoke all 24
 things to you in truth” (2 Corinthians 7:14) So, Christian beliefs 25
 should be in accordance with the Bible. We should be “rightly 26
 dividing the word of truth.” (2 Timothy 2:15). 27

While other topics in Mormon interpretation of the Bible 28
 will be covered, there are a number of recurring themes in 29
 this interaction with LDS literature. These beliefs are denied 30

1 by evangelicals: (1) The tenet that there is more than one God
2 permeates much LDS theology. Mormon apologists energeti-
3 cally and defensively teach the plurality of God. (2) God the
4 Father (who also has a Father) is a glorified Man and so is
5 spatial not omnipresent. (3) Among the divine Beings is our
6 Heavenly Mother who cooperates with God the Father by al-
7 lowing Him to sire through Her “spirit children” (including the
8 pre-mortal Jehovah) which spirits, thereafter, will yearn to
9 obtain bodies. (4) The “Trinity” (Godhead) is composed of three
10 separate Beings. These are the Father who is *Elohim* , the Son
11 who is *Jehovah*, and the Holy Ghost (who while not having a
12 body is yet a man). Of these, the Father is the supreme deity.
13 (5) Through exaltation some men can become Gods having the
14 same glory and powers of God. (6) In order to become divine,
15 men must obtain the office of the Melchizedek priesthood and
16 be married for eternity. It is the latter qualification which al-
17 lows men, as Gods, to sire their own “spirit children” and cre-
18 ate other worlds for them to populate, for divinity is, in part
19 at least, achieved by doing that. (7) Predestination is based on
20 one being good in his or her pre-mortal life in which we all
21 lived as “spirit children” in heavenly families and obeyed or
22 did not obey the Gospel. (8) The Gospel is being preached to the
23 dead now (and was before) and proxy baptism for salvation is
24 done for them in Mormon temples. (9) Christ has but one na-
25 ture, so His body is divine. (10) All men are redeemed, except
26 a very few reprobates, and the redeemed will live eternally
27 in one of the three glorious heavenly kingdoms depending on
28 how they obey the Mormon principles. (11) In the Bible there
29 are many references to the Mormon “restoration.”

100 BIBLE VERSES MISUNDERSTOOD BY MORMONS

Included in this effort are 140 review questions, seven after every five biblical verses, to cement understanding where helpful.

1
2
3

GOD AND CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

2

3

(1). Genesis 1:1. “In the beginning God (not Gods) created the heavens and the earth.”

4

5

If you told a good Mormon that his book of 1 Nephi was wrongly translated when it reads that Nephi was “born of goodly parents” (1 Nephi 1:1), the Mormon would likely roll his eyes thinking that you really are not a very bright person because, after all, that book is distinctly a Mormon treasure, and who, better than a Mormon (Smith, the, “Prophet,” himself) should translate the “golden plates”? Who are you to tell the Mormons that 1 Nephi is incorrectly translated? So, who do you suppose is better at translating Genesis 1:1? Is it the ancient Jews who had Hebrew as their own language or the modern Mormons who read only English? The obvious answer is the Jews. But the Jews, for example, in the midrash *Bereishit Rabbah* (300-500 C.E.) translated *Elohim* all throughout Genesis 1 as “God” not “Gods.” Again, when the Jews translated the Old Testament into Greek (the Septuagint) a few centuries before Christ, they rendered it by the singular *theos* not in the plural *theoi*.¹ Yet again when the author of Hebrews in

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 1:9 cites from the Hebrew language of Psalm 46:6, he does not
2 translate *Elohim* “Gods” but God (*theos* not *theoi*).

3 Still, Roberts, 139 regarding of Genesis 1:1 asserts,

4 It is a matter of common knowledge that the
5 word in the first chapter of our English version
6 of the Bible, in the Hebrew is *Elohim* - plural
7 of *Eloah*- and should be rendered “Gods”-so as
8 to read “In the beginning the Gods created the
9 heavens and the earth.

10 And, what could be Roberts’s motivation to insist on such
11 given that it is contrary both to highly qualified Jewish and
12 inspired New Testament practice? Of course, it is that Article
13 1 of their religion is understood as requiring that the Godhead
14 is three different Beings (Talmage, Articles, 40, 41). So, Roberts
15 must search for biblical evidences to verify that belief.

16 But, were Roberts in error, what could be the real purpose of
17 Genesis chapter one, in every case, pairing the plural *Elohim* as
18 a subject with a with a singular verb? Why use the plural form
19 of a noun with a singular verb? For that answer one may in-
20 quire of Terence Fretheim, Th.D. who teaches Hebrew and Old
21 Testament literature. He opines that the “plural has reference
22 to intensification or absolutization or exclusivity.”² Likewise,
23 another Hebrew expert, Brown, attributes the plural usage to
24 the effort of reflecting the divine “majesty and power.”³ Thus ,
25 it can should seen by one not submerged in the Mormon faith
26 that the plural form of the Hebrew for God in Genesis 1:1 is not
27 requiring us to believe that a plurality of divine Beings exist. It
28 is saying how great the one and only God is.

(2). Genesis 1:26. “Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image.” 1
2

We should recall that God the Father, in LDS theology, is a glorified man. As such, one might envision Him to possess all of the constituent parts of a physical, masculine human being. But a man does not have a womb! So, how could God the Father birth what Mormons call heavenly “spirit children”? Millett, Beliefs, 441 has our answer! 3
4
5
6
7
8

The existence of a female counter part to our Father in heaven is suggested in the scriptural narrative of the Creation: And God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness...’ 9
10
11
12

So, behold, Millet has just evidenced the plurality of divine Persons by showing that there must be both a male God and a female God because Genesis 1:26 says “us.” How else could our spirits be born in heaven without a Mother God? Well, why should Gods not be female too? After all, other religions have goddesses so why shouldn’t Christianity? Shall we not recall that Hera was the consort of Zeus, Demeter was the goddess of corn, that Artemis was the goddess of passage, and that Aphrodite was the goddess of sex? And the gods did birth through sex so why should not the Christian Gods do that as well? Recall that in the Mormon mind exaltation, that is, when humans become Gods, results from birthing multitudes of spirit children with one’s wife (or wives) for eternity. 13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

But wait, the evangelical can counter, “where is our divine Mother ever mentioned in the Bible? “Where did Moses write of Her? Oh, he did not. Well, where does Isaiah, Jeremiah or 26
27
28

1 any of the prophets depict Her? Oh, they do not. Okay, where
2 did our Lord Jesus ever allude to His heavenly Mother? What?
3 He didn't? He didn't speak of His divine Mother even once af-
4 ter talking so very often about His divine Father? That seems
5 very neglectful! I know, leave it up to Paul whose deeds and
6 words constitute more than half of the Book of Acts and who
7 wrote thirteen letters in our New Testament informing us of
8 so very many different doctrines. Where does Paul ever teach
9 that there is a female God? He does not. Are we seeing any
10 pattern here?

11 Furthermore, why doesn't the Bible urge us to worship the
12 Mother God if there is such a one? Oh, Orson Pratt, appointed
13 by Brigham Young in 1852 to write on Mormon beliefs has our
14 answer: We should not worship the Mother of our spirits be-
15 cause "the Father of our spirits is the head of His household,
16 and His wives (note plural) are required to yield the most per-
17 fect obedience... ."4 That the Father must have more than one
18 wife is, of course, suggested by Brigham Young's statement
19 that, "the reason why the doctrine of the plurality of wives
20 was revealed (is) that the noble spirits which are awaiting for
21 tabernacles (bodies) might be brought forth."⁵ As we are to be
22 like our heavenly Father, and we need more than one wife to
23 do our "job," says Young, it follows that God the Father needs
24 more than one wife too to do His "job." Simple logic!

25 But despite all of that, more seriously, why would God in
26 Genesis 1:26 say, "let us make man?" Who is included in the
27 "us"? Jewish wisdom in Bereishit Rabbah suggests that God
28 was consulting all of creation. And, the Babylonian Talmud re-
29 ports that angels were questioning that man should be creat-
30 ed. ⁶ Yet one who rejects the teaching that God the Father has

a heavenly wife, since, after all, She nowhere is mentioned in the Bible, which omission troubles not the inventive Mormon theology one whit, might also question why God would ask creation, even angels, for their input in deciding about creating man.

I find it surprising even given the LDS obsession with making “spirit children” in heaven and bodies for them on earth that Mormons invent a female God to account for the plural pronoun (us) instead of seeing the involvement of the eternal Son of God as co-creator with God the Father. After all, John stipulates that the Son was active in creation (John 1:3) as does Paul (Colossians 1:16b) as does the author of Hebrews (1:2). Furthermore, the “Persons” of the Father and the God Son communicate (John 12:27, 28; Hebrews 1:9). So, why not understand that the Father in Genesis 1:26 includes the Son in the “us”?

But, what else should one expect from the Mormon theological system which fabricates the birthing of pre-existence of “spirit children” and that God is a “big” man other than there must be a “big” woman too? Children must have mothers, right? And being a mother requires a man, right? But note, lest one take our being created in God’s image to refer to our being in a body, and thus concluding that God must be physical, observe that Ephesians 4:24 indicates that our being “created according to God” refers to one’s “righteousness and holiness” not to one’s physique (compare Colossians 3:10).

(3.) Genesis 11:5. “But the LORD came down to see the city and the tower which the sons of men had built.”

1 Let's not be too critical of the Samaritan woman who
2 thought that God should be worshipped on one particular
3 mountain in Samaria (John 4:20). After all that God must be
4 in one physical location can be inferred, wrongly of course, by
5 references to the physical nature of the Deity throughout the
6 Old Testament. God surely must have eyes because Zechariah
7 says, "He who touches you touches the apple of His eye" (2:8).
8 God surely must have ears as the Psalmist pleads, "bow down
9 Thy ear to me" (31:2) So should we not envision God needing
10 to bend far over in order to hear David? Could God actually
11 not hear very well? And, we must believe that God has really,
12 really big feet because Isaiah informs that the earth is God's
13 footstool (66:1). But, might this not rather mean that God is in
14 charge?

15 Oh no, we must take every divine utterance literally! How
16 could God be a man unless He has feet? How could He walk
17 in Eden (Genesis 3:8) without feet? Of course, God also has
18 wings and feathers (Psalm 91:4); is that literal too? Besides, His
19 body is required to perform other of God's actions. He shoots
20 arrows (Deuteronomy 32:23). Arrows? Why not automatic ri-
21 fles? And, He rides in chariots (Jeremiah 4:13). Chariots? Why
22 not in pickup trucks? Oh, because God through Jeremiah and
23 Moses was informing of Himself in anthropomorphic syntax
24 to illustrate the activities of God to the ancient, not theologi-
25 cally mature Jews.

26 So, those like the confused Samaritan woman need correc-
27 tion. And, Christ gives this: "God is Spirit" (John 4:24). And our
28 Lord implied that God is everywhere. So, God's presence is not
29 confined to one locale. One can worship Him in Samaria and,
30 at the same time another can worship Him in Judea. Yes, God

is there in both places, and everywhere else, at the same time: 1
 “For where two or three are gathered together in My name, I 2
am there in the midst of them.” (Matthew 18:20). He is there 3
 not just His influence. 4

So, when Talmage, Articles, 43 asserts that Moses in Genesis 5
 11:5 is evidencing that God “cannot be in more than one place 6
 at a time,” he is turning what Moses wrote in obvious anthro- 7
 pomorphic terms (like God shooting arrows and God riding 8
 in chariots) into a literal theological description of the nature 9
 of God. But, if God is not everywhere at once, then how can 10
 Christ truly say that He is with His people wherever they go 11
 (Matthew 28:20)? If He is not everywhere, then how can He 12
 fill Heaven and earth (Ephesians 4:10)? This, of course, is in His 13
 divine nature. Mormons believe that God the Father is a man 14
 so He is spatial, but how is He limited in space when He dwells 15
 in all believers (1 John 3:24)? 16

But, again on Genesis 11:5, if we think that God was required 17
 to “come down” to inspect the city and the tower, how do we 18
 harmonize that belief with what elsewhere is said about the 19
 divine knowledge? God “knows all things” (1 John 3:20); He is 20
 “perfect in knowledge” (Job 37:16). How can we, then, believe 21
 that God “must come down” in order to view what was occur- 22
 ring on earth? Does God flitter around creation first here then 23
 there so that He can keep track of what is happening “below” 24
 Him? Once again, we catch Mormons building literal theology 25
 on what clearly are anthropomorphic expressions. 26

But none of this is meant to say that God cannot make an 27
 appearance in a locality looking like a man. I am just saying 28
 that He in His nature is not a man or spatially limited like a 29
 man. 30

1 (4). Numbers 16:22. "Then they fell on their face, and said, 'O
2 God, the God of the spirits of all flesh.' "

3 This text is used by Ludlow, 438 to evidence that "hu-
4 man spirits are the literal offspring of perfected, exalted par-
5 ents, a Father and A MOTHER IN HEAVEN." These offspring,
6 "lived as personal, individual spirit children with God in a
7 PREMORTAL Life before they were born into physical bodies."
8 (his caps). This is Mormon 101 "stuff" as their sacred texts re-
9 quire it. "The Book of Abraham" (3:18, 22) enforces the second
10 half of Ludlow's teaching, and the first part can be deduced by
11 the Mormon view that husbands and wives becoming divine,
12 "heavenly parents" just as D&C 132:19, 20 informs: "a continu-
13 ation of the seeds forever and ever. Then they shall become
14 gods." If God is like men, then men can be like God!

15 But, where is any of this human begetting of innumerable
16 pre-mortal spirit children explicitly taught in the Bible? And
17 must being the "God of spirits" instead of being a reference to
18 the creation of spirits in time in the womb (Job 31:15; Isaiah
19 44:2) mean that the Father inseminates His heavenly Spouse
20 (or Spouses)-- in the eternal past in some heavenly manner of
21 course-- who then births billions and billions of spirits? That
22 must require of Her a great deal of effort, but perhaps She too
23 is omnipotent like Her Husband? Instead of striving to rightly
24 divide the Word of Truth our Mormon friends instead labor in
25 the unbiblical fields of "modern revelation" and then attempt
26 to make the Bible somehow match the misguided tenets prop-
27 agated by their supposed "prophets."

(5). Numbers 23:19. "God is not a man that He should lie, nor the son of man that He should repent." 1
2

The boldness by which Mormons eviscerate the Scripture is not limited to reading into the Bible what is not there; it even includes changing what is there into what is not there. If one were to say that he is 60 years old, and I then say, "Oh, you're under 40 then," I am either a bit mathematically challenged or I am being factitious or I am just making a silly joke. But this verse is not doing such. Even within the context of the clauses above quoted is the affirmation that God will not misrepresent the facts. "Has He said and will not do? Or has He spoken and He will make not it good?" In other words, the inspired text is here being very literal and very precise when it stipulates that "God is not a man." It is saying what is true about God. We should take such affirmations seriously. For example, if our Lord Jesus says, "You shall worship the Lord your God (note not Gods), and Him (note "Him" not "Them") only shall you serve (Matthew 4:10), who am I to say that what Christ really meant is that we have many Gods and many Lords -- or at least Three of such (in the LDS Godhead). 3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

So, when Roberts, 93 hypothesizes that the Bible saying "God is not a man" really means "man as he is now," not what man will be (an exalted God?) in the future, Roberts is turning what is there in the Bible into what is not there. Why is he doing that? He is motivated to drive out understandings of the Bible which contradict the Mormon teaching that God is an exalted man and that man may become exalted just as God. Now, I'm sure that Roberts will feel that I am taking liberties were I to say that when his "prophet" imagined that, "God was 21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

BILL GROVER

1 once as we are now, and is an exalted man”⁷ what Smith really
2 meant was that God never was as we are. Yet, Roberts feels
3 that he is free to add phrases to the meaning of the Bible (“as
4 he is now”) in order to make what the Word of God clearly
5 refutes into what affirms.

Review Questions on 1-5 1

1. What Mormon teaching does Matthew 18:20 refute? 2
2. What might the reason be that Genesis 1:26 says “us”? 3
3. How did Jews translate the plural *Elohim*? 4
4. Why do Mormons believe there is a female God? 5

- 5. How does God’s knowledge relate to His omnipresence? 1
- 6. What Mormon teaching does Ephesians 4:24 refute? 2
- 7. Why would the plural form for “God” in Genesis be used with a singular verb? 3
4

(6). Deuteronomy 6:4. “Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD in one.” 5
6

The noun “LORD” is a rendition of the Hebrew *Yahweh*. 7
This is from the tetragrammaton YHWH which likely relates 8
to the Hebrew verb *hāya* meaning “to be.” “Jehovah” is an an- 9
glicized equivalent of this Hebrew personal name of God. 10

Now what this verse says is that Jehovah is God (Elohim) 11
and God is Jehovah. One Being not two. This is tirelessly re- 12
peated throughout the Old Testament, for example: 13

Genesis 2:4: The LORD God made the earth.	Judges 3:7: The LORD their God
Exodus 20:2; I am the LORD your God.	1 Samuel 7:8: The LORD our God
Leviticus 26:13 I am the LORD your God	2 Samuel 5:10: The LORD God of hosts.
Numbers 22:18: The LORD my God.	1 Kings 18:21: If the LORD be God.
Deuteronomy 4:35: The LORD He is God.	2 Kings 18:22: The LORD our God.

14

15 Joshua 14:9: The LORD my God.	and so on.....and so on..... 1
----------------------------------	--------------------------------

16 So, how can Mormons find more than one God in 2
 17 Deuteronomy 6:4? Simple, the text is not saying that God is one; 3
 18 it is saying that Jehovah is one (Hopkins, 69). Elohim is another. 4
 19 Jehovah refers to “the pre mortal Jesus Christ” (Ridges,146.) 5
 20 Elohim (God) is God the Father, the Parent of Jehovah (Ridges 6
 21 84). Therefore, a Mormon can reason: “There are at least two 7
 22 Gods.” This despite the evidence in the above texts which clear- 8
 23 ly say that the two (Elohim and Jehovah) are One! Now later 9
 24 we will have other occasions to note such verses, but for now 10
 25 witness that in the Bible Jehovah (the LORD) insists that HE is 11
 26 the only God (Elohim). “Thus says the LORD... Besides Me there 12
 27 is no God.” (Isaiah 44:6). “There is no God besides Me.” (Isaiah 13
 28 45:5). “There is no God besides Me.” (Isaiah 45:21). Therefore, 14
 29 Deuteronomy is teaching us the unity of God. There is only 15
 30 one God. Not two. Not three. Not many! 16

31 (7). 1 Samuel 2:10. “The LORD (i.e., Jehovah) will judge the ends 17
 32 of the earth.” 18

33 Both evangelicals and Mormons teach that there will be 19
 34 a Day of Judgement. Jesus referred to the Day of Judgment 20
 35 (Mark 6:7). Peter says that too, “The Day of Judgement” (2 Peter 21
 36 3:7). So does John, “The Day of Judgment” (1 John 4:17). So does 22
 37 Jude, “Judgment of the great Day” (Jude 6). And, we should be- 23
 38 come prepared for that by accepting Jesus Christ as Savior and 24
 39 as Lord of our lives. 25

40 And, yes, in the coming of Christ, we find the One who 26
 41 will function as judge on that Day. The Lord Jesus will judge 27

1 the living and the dead in His second coming (2 Timothy 4:1;
2 Acts 10:42). Hopkins is over stating his case, though, when he
3 tries to prove that only Jesus, not the Father, is *Jehovah*. His
4 logic is: Premise, it is Jehovah who will judge men: “The LORD
5 (*Jehovah*) will judge the ends of the earth” (1 Samuel 2:10).
6 Premise, John 5:22 says that “The Father judges no one, but
7 has committed all judgment to the Son.” Conclusion, so, only
8 the Son is Jehovah. Simple! Or is it?

9 First note that *Elohim* (who is the Father in Mormon lin-
10 go) also judges: “O our *Elohim* will You not judge them? (2
11 Chronicles 20:12). “But *Elohim* is the judge” (Psalm 75:7) “*Elohim*
12 Himself is the Judge” (Psalm 50:6). “*Elohim* shall judge the righ-
13 teous and the wicked” (Ecclesiastes 3:6). “Arise O *Elohim* and
14 judge the earth” (Psalm 82:8). So, one can just as strongly argue
15 that only Christ, not the Father, is *Elohim* because John 5:22
16 states that Christ is the judge and *Elohim* is said to judge. The
17 Mormon counter is that sometimes the Son is called *Elohim* too
18 (Millet Beliefs, 180). How cleverly convenient! *Elohim* means
19 the Father, or else when it doesn’t, Mormons surely will let us
20 know in order to support their teachings. Isn’t it peachy to be
21 right no matter what you say?

22 But second, observe Romans 2:17: “God will judge the se-
23 crets of men by Jesus Christ.” The Father, I assume the referent
24 of “God” in 2:17, is judging through Christ. Just as in all other
25 activities of Jesus, the Father works through the Son. We even
26 see that in the creative act in the Son’s pre-existent, divine na-
27 ture as the Logos (John 1:3; Hebrew1:2). And, in His incarna-
28 tion, in His (I think) human nature, Jesus’ words and works can
29 be said to be the Father’s, “I am in the Father and the Father in
30 Me...the Father who dwells in Me does the works (John 14:10).

But what does 14:10 imply? It implies that the Father is Spirit not flesh for one physical body cannot be in another body. The indwelling of the Son by the Father is evidence that the Father is not a man. How does one man live in another man? He cannot. But why does Hopkins work so strenuously to separate the works of *Jehovah* from the activities of *Elohim*? Why else than to substantiate the Mormon belief in multiple Gods. But, in that effort he fails.

(8). Psalm 82:1. "God (Elohim) stands in the congregation of the mighty; He judges among the gods (*Elohim*)."

Let's spend a moment reviewing the powers and characteristics of God from what I think is a biblical perspective. God is eternal (Psalm 102:27; 1 Timothy 6:16), unchangeable (Psalm 102:27; Malachi 3:6), everywhere at once (Psalm 139:7; Jeremiah 23:13), all knowing (Psalm 147:4; Matthew 10:30), all powerful (Genesis 18:14; Ephesians 1:19), and, He is in control (Isaiah 46:10; Ephesians 1:11). These are the necessary qualities that differentiate what makes God true "God" from that which is not God. So, how many individuals in the Bible possess these qualities? Obviously, the Father does. But, so does the Son as, for example, the Son is omnipotent (Revelation 1:8). Therefore, the Son is God (John 20:28). But the Holy Spirit also has divine qualities, for example, He is omniscient (1 Corinthians 2:10). So, He also is God (Acts 5:3,4).

But how many others in existence are said in Scripture to have these attributes? There are none. So, why, then, are some others called "gods" in the Bible? The devil is called a god because of his limited influence among unbelievers (2

1 Corinthians 4:4) which the real God permits for now. And
2 Moses became as God in a limited manner because of Moses'
3 divinely determined relationship to his brother (Exodus 4:16).
4 Likewise, *elohim* can refer to rulers and judges because they
5 reflect divine majesty and power which has its Source in the
6 one true God : "Then his master shall bring him to the judges
7 (i.e. the *elohim*-Exodus 21:6). But these judges obviously were
8 not omniscient or omnipotent. They did not possess the pow-
9 ers of God.

10 Therefore, when Roberts, 158 contends that Psalm 82:1 is
11 evidence that there are many Gods, he confuses those that
12 act with divine enabling with the One who enables. But why
13 would Mormons desire so much to prove that there are many
14 Gods? Well, If there were not, how could the inerrant prophet
15 rightly declare, "You have got to learn how to be Gods your-
16 selves"!⁹ Now, lest we suppose that what the Mormons mean
17 by men becoming Gods is simply like the Hebrew judges acting
18 in the name of God, note the teaching of McConkie, Mormon
19 Doctrine, 321 who explains that the exaltation of saints means
20 to actually possess the attributes of God and to actually do
21 what He does.

22 (9). Psalm 89:27. "Also I will make him my firstborn"

23 Ludlow, 264, understanding this verse to reference Christ,
24 connects the text to those in the New Testament as Colossians
25 1:15 and supposes this verse to be a reference to Christ being
26 the "first born spirit child of Jehovah." And, it cannot be ar-
27 gued that the most often meaning of that compound noun
28 is the first child of parents. But (1) "first born" in Colossians

indicates pre-eminence not birth. Look at the context: He has pre-eminence because He creator. He is before all things. He is the Head of the Church. By Him all things consist. All things were created for Him. Christ is the first born from the dead. Paul is not talking about Christ as “spirit child” in heaven; Paul is describing the greatness of Christ. And (2) Neither Psalm 89 nor Colossians 1:15 nor any other Biblical text says that Christ was a “spirit child” in heaven. So, what really is the proof of that in Mormon belief? Their inspired prophet claimed that Christ revealed this about Himself, “Verily I say to you, I was in the beginning with the Father and was the first born.” Smith said Christ was “the first begotten in the spirit.” (Ludlow, 264) So, good Mormons are required to believe it regardless of the context of Colossians 1:15.

(10). Psalm 139:7,8. “If I ascend into Heaven, You are there. If I make my bed in hell, behold you are there.”

As already noted, Mormons reject the omnipresence of God. If God is a man, He cannot be everywhere present at the same time. But how can a text as this one then be explained? Is it not suggesting that where ever one goes, God is there? So, God must be everywhere, right? Wrong, says Hopkins, 58. The meaning of the text, this Mormon explains, heh, heh, is that God travels “to any spot instantaneously”!

Picture that in your mind. In Asia a believing parent calls on God for immediate healing as her child is near death. So, God rushes over there. But in the same instant in Canada a boat capsizes and those drowning pray the Lord to save them. So, God rushes over there. Multiple that by thousands, millions of

1 times. Imagine God racing around the universe to perform His
2 works. Of course, God is an omnipotent man so He does not
3 get weary from all this travel. He is like Superman of Marvel
4 comics tirelessly flying around the universe.

5 The Mormon may answer that it is not God's presence that
6 is everywhere but His influence. Yet, be reminded that in #3
7 above Mormons argue that as God "went down," it must be His
8 presence, on that occasion, they think, which moves about.
9 But the presence of God is not in one place for Revelation 21:3
10 stipulates that God Himself "will dwell" with His people not
11 merely His influence. Yet, God's people are everywhere not
12 in one place. Or, praise Jesus, recall our Lord's promise: "For
13 where two are three are assembled in My name, I (not just my
14 influence) am there among them (Matthew 18:20).

Review Questions on 6-10	1
1. How does the context of Colossians 1:15 indicate the meaning of “first born”?	2 3
2. What Mormon teaching does Psalm 82:8 refute?	4
3. How does John 14:10 indicate that God is not a spatial Man?	5 6
4. What Mormon doctrine does Deuteronomy 6:4 refute?	7
5. How do Mormons explain Psalm 139:7, 8?	8
6. What is included in the Mormon doctrine of humans becoming Gods?	9 10
7. How does Isaiah 44:6 show Mormonism to be wrong?	11

1 (11). Isaiah 9:6. And His name will be called Wonderful,
2 Counselor, Mighty God.”

3 In Mormon theology, the Father (*Elohim*) is the supreme
4 God (Ridges, 121). Since there are different Gods, different
5 ranks can exist among them- or so Mormons think. To grasp
6 what Hopkins, 93 claims-- that the Father exalted the Son into
7 Godhood-- one needs to remember that in Mormon theol-
8 ogy first the Father sired the pre mortal Son with the assis-
9 tance of a Mother God, of course. Christ then, growing up in
10 heaven amongst, eventually, innumerable brethren, became
11 Jehovah by being superior to all the others. But second, in His
12 incarnation Christ was reduced from deity to manhood. Then,
13 third, after Jesus’ obedience and resurrection, He is exalted by
14 the Father (Philippians 2:9) and then was reinstated back to
15 divinity.

16 Evangelicals, of course, can rather see the Incarnation not
17 as a change in Jesus’ divinity but as an addition of humanity
18 to His Person. Christ exists in two natures. So, we could be-
19 lieve that it is Christ’s humanity that was exalted and that ex-
20 altation did not result in that humanity becoming divine.

21 But then what shall we say of Isaiah 9:6 which Hopkins
22 asserts means Christ “was raised ...to the position (by the
23 Father?) of Mighty God.” God makes Gods!? Well, that fits with
24 the Mormon doctrine of deification, right? But let’s note two
25 Christological teachings by the author of Hebrews which are
26 amplified by Paul in Philippians 2.

27 1. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever
28 (Hebrews 13:8). But obviously, this must refer to Christ’s divine
29 nature; that nature does not change (Psalm 102:27; Malachi 3:6;

Hebrews 1:12; James 1:17). So, as God, Christ cannot be further raised; God ever remains the same!

2. But to Christ's Person was added a second nature which is fully human (Hebrews 2:14, 17); that new nature does not constitute a change in Christ as God, since God cannot change. Nothing is said about Christ giving up His divinity or its powers. But, that second, added human of Christ changes (Luke 2:52). The verb in Philippians 2:7 sometimes translated "emptied" has no object. Paul elaborates: (1) Christ exists continually (present tense -not existed) in God's nature (2:6). That is one nature. Then, another nature was added (2:7). One plus one is two. Then, in the added second nature He was obedient (2:8).

Then Paul says that Christ, in His present condition of having a human nature, God exalted Him (Philippians 2:7-9). God did not exalt God. A man was not changed into God. Philippians 2:9 does not say that Christ's human nature was transformed into divinity. It says that the human nature was honored. Why? Because Christ was obedient. Which nature was obedient? His humanity! Read verse 8: "And being found in the appearance of a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient." Hopkins' proof text does not say that the Father made Jesus God; it says Jesus will be called God (Titus 2:13; Hebrews 1:8) because He, in His divine nature (Philippians 2:6), is God.

(12). Jeremiah 23:23, 24. "Am I a God at hand says the LORD and not a God afar off? Do I not fill heaven and earth?"

Does the text not prove that God is omnipresent, is everywhere? Oh no, answers Hopkins, 58. It's "His glory, influence,

1 and power” that fills the universe; it is not His Person. It can-
2 not be His Person that is everywhere because God is a man
3 and a man is spatially confined to one place. But is that the
4 way the Old Testament uses the word *mala* (fill)? “Fill their
5 sacks with corn” (Genesis 32:25). Does that mean the sacks will
6 be filled with the corn’s influence? Observe: “Ye shall eat your
7 fill” (Leviticus 25:19). “Fill our houses with spoil” (Proverbs
8 1:13). Note its use elsewhere in even in Jeremiah: 33:5; 51:14.
9 In all of these cases it is not the influence of a thing that fills
10 something, it is the thing itself. A Mormon cannot accept that
11 God, Himself, fills the universe because the Mormon’s iner-
12 rant “prophet” insists that God is fleshly, “an exalted Man.”¹⁰

13 (13). Malachi 2:10: “Have we not all one Father? Has not one
14 God created us?”

15 We should recall the LDS teaching of our pre-mortal state.
16 We all were born in heaven as “spirit children” and lived in a
17 society where we obeyed or did not obey the Gospel.¹¹ Now
18 that includes the pre-existent Christ and angels as well be-
19 cause angels are men.¹² So, we are all brethren being sired by
20 God the Father and His Wife or Wives. “But, wait a minute Bill,”
21 you may ask, “since the devil is a fallen angel and angels are
22 men and all man are brethren having one Father, that means
23 Satan is our brother and the brother of Christ?!” Correct.

24 As [Hopkins_100-103](#) explains, Malachi 2:10 means God
25 is the Father of all men. And Satan is God’s son (Job 1:6).
26 Therefore, Satan is the “brother of Christ” and “of all men.” But
27 where does the Bible affirm that angels are men? It does not.
28 Yes, some disciples may have supposed Peter to be an angel

(Acts 12:15), but that is not the equivalent of the inspired text 1
teaching us that men are angels. Saying what people think is 2
not saying what people think is correct. But if angels are not 3
men, then Satan is not our brother. And where does the Bible 4
anywhere say that God birthed Satan as brother to Christ"? It 5
does not. But as already shown, to Mormons it does not matter 6
much what the Bible does not say; their teachings instead are 7
much based on the sayings of their infallible prophets. 8

Malachi 2:10 is saying that Jewish priests are the same as 9
all Israel because God created them both. God is the Father 10
of Israel not because He birthed the Jews as heavenly "spirit 11
children," but because He chose Israel out all the nations on 12
the earth (Deuteronomy 7:6). Malachi does not say anything 13
about a pre-mortal status of man. The buttresses of Mormon 14
theology are unwarranted conjecture on the meaning of the 15
Bible and their modern revelation. 16

END NOTES FOR CHAPTER 1

1

2

1. Lancelot C.L. Brenton. *The Septuagint With Apocrypha*. (Peabody, Mass. 1998), 1. Transliterated it reads, “ En archē epoiēsen ho theos... ”

3

4

5

2. Terence E. Fretheim. “Elohim” in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, vol 1 , Willem A. Gemeren, rd. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 405.

6

7

8

3. Francis Brown. *The New Brown- Driver- Briggs- Genensius Hebrew and English lexicon* (Peabody, Mass. :Hendrickson, 1979), 43.

9

10

11

12

4. Orson Pratt. *The Seer*. (U.S.A.: Eborn Books, 2009), 159.

13

14

15

5. Brigham Young. *Discourses*. selected and arranged by John A. Widtsoe. (Salt Lake: Deseret, 1941), 4.56 (p. 197).

16

17

6. www.Judaism.stackexchange.com/questions. (accessed 2-20-21) .

18

7. Joseph Smith. *King Follett Discourse*.

19

8. Brown, *Lexicon*, 43.

20

9. Follett Discourse.

21

10. *Ibid*.

22

11. Millet, *Beliefs* 498-501.

23

12. *Ibid.*, 36.

GOD AND CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

2

3

(14). Matthew 1:20. “For that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit.”

4

5

The Mormons are not adverse to changing the wording of the Bible to fit their theology. The most extensive example of this is their prophet Joseph Smith’s “Inspired Translation” of the Bible¹ which modifies Scriptural verses in ways that cannot be found in any recognized translations of the original languages (they are all wrong and only the “prophet” has it right) and even which adds whole new verses to the biblical text. But Smith must have been off his regimen in altering the Bible to reflect Mormon teachings when he came to this text as it can readily be understood as being in contradiction to Mormon theology.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Of course, in the evangelical view of there being only one God, the activity of the Holy Spirit when conceiving in Mary our Lord Jesus is not different than saying that Mary’s divinely made pregnancy was accomplished by the Father-not of course by sexual intercourse as we deny the Father is flesh. But, what the Spirit does is the Father doing it, evangelicals can

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 say, because we believe in only one God. And, God is Spirit. But,
2 in contrast, McConkie, Mormon Doctrine, 547 teaches, “Christ
3 was begotten by an immortal Father in the same way that
4 mortal men are begotten by mortal fathers.” (my emphasis)

5 As McConkie elsewhere, Doctrinal NT 1:56 does not believe
6 in one God, instead teaching that the Holy Spirit is a differ-
7 ent Being than the Father, he must require Matthew 1:20 to be
8 revamped by saying that the verse is not properly translated.
9 Christ is the Son of the Father, not the Son of the Holy Spirit.
10 Therefore, it should be rendered, “she was found with child
11 by the power of the Holy Ghost.” What does this mean? “Mary
12 was carried away in the Spirit” McConkie says.

13 Of course, the word “power” is not in the verse. So, what
14 was the result of Mary being “carried away”? The esteemed
15 (by Smith) teacher of Mormon doctrine Orson Pratt² has the
16 answer. God the Father and Mary “were associated together
17 in the capacity of a Husband and Wife.” God, who is a man,
18 remember, acted “in the capacity of a husband, and beget a
19 Son.” God may have given Mary back to Joseph, Pratt says, or
20 instead He may have “intended after the resurrection to again
21 take her as one of his own wives to raise up innumerable, im-
22 mortal spirits in eternity.”² My, my, just think, were that the
23 case, then many in that day could be “spirit children” of Mary
24 too like Jesus is!

25 (15). Matthew 3:16: “When He had been baptized, Jesus came
26 up immediately from the water.”

27 But why did Jesus submit to baptism? McConkie, Doctrinal
28 NT, 123 explains: “He had to be baptized to gain admission to

the celestial kingdom.” As McConkie, in *Mormon Doctrine* 73, 1
also expounds, “Baptism is the gate to the celestial kingdom.” 2
So, obviously, that is why Christ must be baptized. How else 3
could He get into heaven? It rather seems wise to see a pos- 4
sible reason for the sinless One (1 Peter 2:22) to be exemplify- 5
ing by His baptism that God’s ordinance is decreed for those 6
repenting: “Repent, and let everyone of you be baptized “(Acts 7
2:38). But our Savior is nowhere said to need to do anything to 8
enter the door of heaven as He, Himself, is that door: “I am the 9
door. If anyone enters by Me, he will be saved (John 10:9). 10

1

Review Questions for 11-15

2

1. How do Mormons interpret Jeremiah 23:23, 24?

3

2. What Mormon doctrine about Christ do Psalm 102:27
4 and Hebrews 1:12 refute?

5

3. Why do Mormons wish to interpret Matthew 1:20 as
6 they do?

7

4. Why was Jesus baptized according to Mormonism?

8

5. How do Mormons say Christ originally came into
9 existence?

10

6. Who was Mary's first husband according to
11 Mormonism?

12

7. How does the Hebrew word *mala* refute a Mormon
13 teaching?

(16). Mark 13:32: "But of that day and hour no one knows not the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father." 1
2

To an evangelical --unless he is not well learned Christologically or has become influenced by functional kenoticism (which teaches that when incarnating the divine Son temporally lost the use of some divine powers), this verse is thought to be attributable only to the human nature of Christ. We think that in His divinity our Lord ever is omniscient, but in His humanity He is not. That is because we see that Paul teaches that Christ exists in two natures: the nature of God and the nature of a bond servant (Philippians 2:6,7). And, in that second nature, Christ learned and thus was not omniscient (Luke 2:52; Hebrews 5:8). Yet, in His divinity, Christ knows all (John 16:30; 21:17). Mormon Christology struggles with Mark 13:32 because they deny Christ exists in two natures. Why would He exist in two natures they think, since God and are the same nature. 3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

So, in contrast from the evangelical, to the Mormon mind, the humanity of Christ is God. Why should His humanity not be divine since God the Father is a man? Like Roberts 15, 268 explains, the baptism of Jesus shows that that there are three Gods. (i.e., Jesus' body itself is God and so God was crucified, they think). Evangelicals instead can believe that only Christ's human nature was baptized and died. So, we need not be perplexed by Mark 13:32; we can believe His ignorance of the time of His return is a condition of His humanity only. 18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

But Mormons who fail to see in Christ both a divine and a human intelligence may feel that Christ, who is a God cannot not know everything. Christ's body is God, so His brain is God, 27
28
29

1 and a divine brain must know all!? So, McConkie, Doctrinal
2 NT 1:667 feels constrained to insist that this verse, Mark 13:32,
3 should be deleted just as his inerrant prophet has done in his
4 “Inspired Version.” This Mormon apostle, and his “prophet-
5 master” remarkably, want to remove whole verses from the
6 Bible when Scripture does not fit their doctrine.

7 (17). Luke 3:22: “And the Holy Spirit descended in bodily form
8 like a dove upon Him, and a voice came from heaven which
9 said, ‘You are My beloved Son.’”

10 This verse, of course, is a prime opportunity for Hopkins,
11 69 to find three Gods in the Bible: (1) the voice from heaven,
12 (2) the Holy Spirit descending, and (3) the Son being baptized.
13 In the Mormon mind seemingly, God cannot do three things
14 at once! But, what if the Holy Spirit is the same in Being as
15 God the Father? Note first 2 Corinthians 6:16-18: (1) Believers
16 are the temples of God; (2) Paul reminds us that in Leviticus
17 *Elohim* God says He will dwell in us; (3) and will be our Father;
18 (4) But in 1 Corinthians 3:16 *Elohim* God dwelling in us is the
19 Holy Spirit! Am I saying that the Father and the Spirit are one
20 in “Person”? No, but they are one in Being. They are not two
21 Gods but one and same God. What the Spirit does also can be
22 the Father’s doing and vice versa. I am saying that the Voice
23 and the Dove are one Being.

24 Second, Christ being baptized in this text need not refer
25 to Christ in His divinity as God since in Luke 2:52 Christ in-
26 creases in wisdom and in 4:2 (as “Son” 4:3), He was tempted.
27 But God knows everything (Romans 11:33), and God cannot be
28 tempted (James 1:13). Further, the experiences of the “Son,” in

my opinion, often are pertaining only to His humanity (Mark 13:32; John 8:28; Acts 3:26; Romans 5:10). 1
2

(18). Luke 24:39: "Behold My hands and feet, that it is I Myself. Handle Me and see, for a spirit does not have flesh and bones as you see I have." 3
4
5

Robinson, 81 opines that this text provides him with an opportunity to impress his readers with his ummm..persuasive (?) logic. He says, "the logic is not difficult." Premise: Jesus is God. Premise: Jesus has a body of flesh and bones. Conclusion: Therefore, God has a body of flesh and bones! 6
7
8
9
10

It seems to have escaped Robinson's notice that Christ's body was an addition to His Person (Hebrews 2: 14). In His Person, Christ already was God. His flesh and bones did not make Him like God, they made Him like man, "He had to be made like His brethren"- not like God (Hebrews 2:17). He already was like God because He was God (Hebrews 1:8). It wasn't His body that made Him like God. He was, in His Person, in His bodiless nature, unchangeable (Hebrews 1:12). He who is in God's nature (Philippians 2:6) added to His Person a different nature of humanity (Philippians 2:7). That addition was not a modification of the deity which cannot change (Malachi 3:6). In His human nature He could die; in His divine, He could not. Robinson's logic is dashed to pieces against the explicit teachings of the Bible. 11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

(19). John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." 25
26

1 Even among this hundred long, collected plethora of LDS
2 hermeneutical gymnastics, Hopkins', 63 interpretation of this
3 verse which is put under the bold heading "The Creation of
4 God the Son" challenges one to elicit any exegetical virtue
5 at all in the Mormon understanding of the Scriptures. Be re-
6 minded that the Bible declares that Christ, Himself, is eternal:
7 "He is before all things" (Colossians 1:17); "I am the alpha and
8 the omega" (Revelation 21:6).

9 Yet, in the phrase "In the beginning was the Word,"
10 Robinson sees it that "The first thing God did in creating the
11 heavens and the earth was to create or form the Word." This is
12 a remarkably inane exposition since the text clearly does not
13 say that. Yet, the Mormon doctrine of Christ is that He was
14 *Elohim's* first "spirit child," and so as an individual, Christ had
15 a beginning. But the context of John 1:1 rather stipulates that
16 Christ made all things (1:3). So does Paul say that (Colossians
17 1:17). Even when the Bible emphatically asserts the opposite
18 ("all things"), Mormons attempt to draw out of it their fuddled
19 teachings.

20 Now Hopkins qualifies his position by stipulating that
21 Bible believing evangelicals are ignorant that Christ existed
22 as an "intelligence" before creation. So, Christ like all men,
23 as Hopkins' inerrant prophet in D&C 93: 29 blathers without
24 biblical proof, eternally existed as an "intelligence." Yet, as
25 Ridges, 143 explains, "we know nothing about this aspect of
26 our premortal existence." And, why, as Hopkins declares, are
27 evangelicals "ignorant" about these "intelligences"? It is be-
28 cause the doctrine is nowhere taught in the Bible. Mormons
29 make "stuff" up, and the biblically uneducated Mormons eat
30 the "stuff" up.

(20). John 1:14: “And the Word became flesh.”

1

Evangelicals unlike the Mormons believe that Christ after the Incarnation has two sets of capabilities. Each nature in Christ has its own set. That is why, as above said, most of us believe that Mark 13:32 refers only to Jesus’ humanity. We think in His humanity Christ is not omniscient but, in His deity, He is. So, the human nature of Jesus is not just physical. It has its own set of knowledge.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

But Ridges, 142 understands John 1:14 to say that all Christ received in His Incarnation was a body. Yet, the Greek word *sarx* in the New Testament often alludes to the whole of a human being (John 17:2; Romans 3:20; Galatians 1:16). And, Christ’s humanity consists not just in a physical body but includes a human soul and or spirit as well (John 12:27; John 13:21). If the Word becoming “flesh” does not include a human mind, then how could the Word become “like His brethren” (Hebrews 2:17)?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Review Questions for 16-20

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
1. Explain James 1:13 if Christ in Luke 4:2 was tempted.
 2. How does Philippians 2:7 explain how Christ could die if He is God.
 3. Define the Greek word *sarx* used in John 1:14.
 4. What does functional kenoticism teach, and why does this writer reject it?
 5. What does Hebrews 2:15 suggest about Jesus' human nature?
 6. How does Revelation 21:6 refute Mormon teaching?
 7. How can Mark 13:32 be harmonized with John 16:30?

(21). John 3:16: "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." 1
2

In Mormonism, the phrase "only begotten" when applied 3
to Christ refers only to Jesus' birth from Mary. "Christ is the 4
"Only Begotten Son of God in the flesh...with Mary as His 5
Mother...(and) ...God as His physical Father" Millet, Beliefs, 6
459. But an issue which Mormons are apparently not willing 7
to acknowledge is that the Greek *monogenēs* translated "only 8
begotten" in the King James version perhaps does not refer to 9
a birthing at all but rather to the uniqueness of Jesus' sonship. 10

What's the difference? Perhaps John 3:16 (along with 1:14, 11
18; 3:18: and 1 John 4:9) is not saying that Jesus became God's 12
Son by being born of Mary. This is not a denial that Jesus is 13
God's Son; it only is questioning that those five texts in John 14
are saying that He became God's Son by being born of Mary. 15
Evangelicals differ on this, but to me, the Septuagint (a Greek 16
translation of the Hebrew Old Testament of around 250 B.C.) 17
and Luke suggest that *monogenēs* is better understood as indi- 18
cating not that someone is born, after all, we all are born, but 19
that someone is one of a kind. 20

Let's note how these sources use *monogenēs*. The Septuagint 21
became the Bible of the apostolic church and is frequently 22
quoted in the New Testament. But a survey of texts in it as 23
Judges 11:34, Psalm 22:20, 24:16, and 34:17 suggest that the 24
adjective in question means "unique" not begotten. Note in 25
Judges 11, "she was his only (*monogenēs*) child." The point is 26
not that she was "begotten." She was one of a kind being his 27
only child. As for Luke, observe the usage in 7:12, 8:42, and 28
9:38. For example, 9:38, "Teacher, I implore you look on my son, 29

1 for he is my only (*monogenēs*) child.” The father is not say-
2 ing that his son was born but that the son is unique being His
3 “only child.” So, what John in five places is saying may be that
4 Christ is God’s Son in a very unique way; He is one of a kind.

5 However, my real gripe regarding the Mormon interpreta-
6 tion is not over the issue above. It is with McConkie, Mormon
7 Doctrine, 547. In regard to John 3:16 he asserts “Christ was
8 begotten by an immortal Father in the same way that mor-
9 tal men are begotten by mortal fathers” (my emphasis). In 14
10 above I refer to Pratt as well who implies that Mary had sex
11 with God the Father. Yes, this is quite consistent with the LDS
12 belief that God is a big man, but in my view, it is blasphemy.

13 (22). John 4:24: “God is Spirit.”

14 I in 16 above show one example of how Mormons change
15 the Bible to suit their teachings. Here is another. McConkie
16 Doctrinal NT 1:153 insists “Jesus never, never, never said ‘God
17 is a Spirit,’ but rather that God had promised His Spirit unto
18 those who worship Him in Spirit and in truth.” But, wait a min-
19 ute. The Greek syntax which is unchallenged in copies of the
20 original, reads: *pneuma ho theos*. Having the clause begin with
21 “Spirit” would seem to be emphatically emphasizing what God
22 is. So, what is McConkie’s proof that in this verse Christ is not
23 saying what the NKJV says God is? We should remember that
24 Papyrus 66 is the earliest extant Greek copy of John and is dat-
25 ed around 150.³ It reads: “God is Spirit.” Why would a Christian
26 transcriber working a mere 50 years or so after the apostle
27 wrote get the verse wrong, but McConkie nearly 1900 years
28 after John get it right?

So, what is McConkie's convincing proof that Jesus "never, never, never" said what the NKJV says He said? Oh yes, it is McConkie's inerrant prophet who dictated an "inspired version" of John 4:24 (there 4:26) which does not read "God is a Spirit" but instead translates "God promised His Spirit." But the word "promise" is "never, never, never" there! All the early Greek copies of John, all the early translations of John, all the citations of John in the early church must bow down, must be corrected, must stand in awe of the superlative rendition of this text by the Greek illiterate founder of Mormonism. What crockery!

(23). Jo 5:19: "Most assuredly, I say to you the Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He sees the Father do; for whatever He does, the Son also does in like manner."

The reader will please note the tense of the verbs "sees" and "does" not "saw or "did." Our Lord is speaking of occurrences which happened in His present time. It was then that Jesus was seeing the Father's works. So how is it rightly expounded by Hopkins¹¹⁶ that the Father was doing things in "some unknown time in the eternal past"? How? By Hopkins swallowing whole his "inspired prophet's" delusional ravings that "God himself was once as we are."⁴ The Father likely faced the very same challenges before that His Son did then!

So, Hopkins incredulously surmises that God the Father, "who may have had His own Father in Heaven," by the way, was sent (by His Father?) to another world and did there what Jesus did on this world. Jesus is copying the somehow recorded long past "adventures" of His Father on that other world. As

1 said, the verbs in the verse belie Hopkins ummm...imaginative
2 exegesis, and nowhere does the Bible say that the Father went
3 to another world (or has His own Father) and there was obe-
4 dient to a higher authority unto death. It is utter drivel. And,
5 Hopkins informing that “many early Mormon leaders” have
6 held this interpretation demonstrates the witlessness of much
7 of Mormon hermeneutics.

8 **(24).** John 5:23: “that all should honor the Son.”

9 The context of 5:23 indicates that that honor should be giv-
10 en the Son because the Son is taught by the Father, judges, and
11 gives life. These things happen in Christ’s incarnate existence.
12 Again, the verbs’ in the context “sees” (19) and “shows” (20),
13 witness to that. The verse is not referencing Jesus’ pre mortal
14 state. But ignoring the context, McConkie, Doctrinal NT 1:190
15 instead veers sharply away from it and expounds that Christ
16 in His “pre- existent sphere, attained that intelligence and
17 power which made Him a god”!

18 But the Bible nowhere says that Christ attained “Godhood.”
19 So, why would a Mormon teach that Christ at first was not a
20 God but then became a God? Why else than to abide by his
21 number two inerrant prophet Brigham Young who imagined
22 that God progresses eternally and that we men (which in-
23 cludes Christ) had better strive to become God .⁵ God is a man
24 and men become Gods. That’s a catchy slogan it has a ring to it.
25 It’s music to a Mormon’s ear.

26 **(25).** John 6:46: “Not that anyone has seen the Father, except
27 He who is from God; He has seen the Father.”

“Aha,” I can picture Hopkins 82 gratefully exclaiming, 1
“here’s my chance to prove once and for all that we can see 2
God and so He a physical Being. The verse plainly says that 3
those (we Saints) have seen God.” But, wait a minute, who is 4
“He who is from God”? It is that One, only, who has seen God. 5
Well, whom is the passage talking about? Is it believers or 6
Christ? The Subject of the section is Jesus. The context shows 7
that. He is the bread 6:41. He raises the dead 6:44. To Him be- 8
lievers come 6:45. In Him we must believe 6:47. The Subject of 9
6:46 who is the only one who has seen the Father, therefore, 10
is Christ not Christians. After all Jesus in 6:42 says He came 11
down from Heaven. That indicates that He is the One from 12
God.” Note 7:29: “I am from Him” and “I came forth from the 13
Father.” (16:28). The One who sees the Father is Christ. 14

Review Questions for 21-25

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
1. Why and how did Joseph Smith change John 4:24?
 2. How do the tenses of the verbs in John5:19 show that the Mormon interpretation of this verse is incorrect?
 3. How do Mormons misunderstand John 6:46?
 4. What are two views on the Greek term *monogenēs*?
 5. How does Mormonism teaching that Christ “attained” Godhood relate to its doctrine of man’s future?
 6. What is papyrus 66 and how does it contradict Mormonism?
 7. How do the Septuagint and Luke demonstrate the meaning of *monogenēs*?

The subject of the next three verses is three LDS objections to God's unity of substance. In the evangelical opinion the "Persons" of God are not separate in nature. Instead, they are one in essence. Each "Person" is believed to be an eternal, personal subsistence in the one Being. We arrive at this conclusion because we see the Bible as teaching that there is only One God, that is, only One almighty, only One all knowing, and only One who is everywhere present at the same time. Yet three are identified as being God. So, they are Three in One. Evangelicals admit that this concept has no equivalent in our material realm. But we deny that God must be explained by human experience, and we reject the Mormon persuasion that there are three separate Beings in the Godhead.

The evangelical position is alluded in Hopkins' book mentioned below as being "Nicene." That is correct. This is a reference to the Nicene Creed of 381 A.D. which states that the Son is "of one substance with the Father (*homoousion tō patri*) ." Of course, to evangelicals, our agreement with the framers of Nicaea is due our believing that their conclusion is consistent with the teachings of the Scriptures.

(26.) John 10:30: "I and My Father are one." 21

The Mormon misunderstanding here is over what is the evangelical interpretation. Hopkins 86 sets up a straw man by claiming that evangelicals (an unqualified description) teach that this verse proves that the Son and the Father are one in essence. Yes, Hopkins names one evangelical who teaches that to be the meaning of that verse. And, I know others who do. But Hopkins has not researched the evangelical opinion 28

1 on 10:30 very well for many of us do not claim that this text
2 proves a unity of essence between the Father and the divine
3 Son.

4 Of course, Hopkins is at a disadvantage when it comes to
5 summarizing evangelical views because unlike Mormons, we
6 do not have to conform in our understanding of biblical texts
7 in order to align our views with the decrees of “inspired” LDS
8 prophets. So, the evangelical theologian Wayne Grudem in his
9 systematic theology says that John 10:30 means that “Jesus
10 will accomplish all that the Father has given Him to do”⁶ not
11 that the verse means a unity of substance. And, the evan-
12 gelical expositor F.F. Bruce states that the text means that the
13 Father and the Son have one mind and purpose.⁷ Even Calvin
14 denied that the text evinces a unity of essence.⁸ Evangelicals
15 do not hang their *homoousion* doctrine on this one verse.

16 (27). John 14:10: “Do you not believe that I am in the Father,
17 and the Father in Me? The words that I speak to you I do not
18 speak on My own authority; but the Father who dwells in Me
19 does the works.”

20 Millett Claiming Christ, 81 avers that the Father and the
21 Son inhering in each other is no more than the equivalent of
22 the Bible teaching that Christians are “in Christ.” But, Millett
23 continues, this means being surrendered to Christ and living
24 in union with Him not being one in essence with Him.

25 Evangelicals believe that Christ is both God and man. His
26 manhood is different from His Godhood. How His manhood
27 relates to the Father is not, I think, how His divinity relates
28 to the Father. With some exceptions among us, typically we

envision that the one Person of Christ acts and experiences 1
 distinctly through each nature. What is true of His deity is not 2
 necessarily true of His humanity. In His deity He is the eternal 3
 creator but, in His humanity, rather, He is not eternal and is 4
 born in time. Evangelicals, therefore, are not saying that Jesus' 5
 humanity is one in essence with the Father. So, the task falls 6
 on us to decide whether a particular biblical text alludes to 7
 Christ as man, Christ as God or even perhaps to Christ as both 8
 God and man. Mormons do not have this dilemma as they per- 9
 ceive that man and God are the same race. 10

Yes, in John 14:10 the disciples could have understood 11
 Jesus' meaning to be that the Father is in our Lord's human- 12
 ity. After all, the disciples had observed Jesus experiencing as 13
 a man by sleeping, walking, wearying, praying and even not 14
 knowing somethings. And, were that the case, could it not be 15
 that Jesus by saying that the Father is in Him simply means 16
 that He is in unity with the Father's goals etc. But I think the 17
 text must imply even more. 18

The context does not appear to reinforce the understand- 19
 ing that Jesus by saying that the Father is in Him merely 20
 means that He and the Father are one in purpose. Any man 21
 or women can be in agreement with God's purposes. So, why 22
 would Philip say "show us the Father" if all that he meant was 23
 "show us how you have the same goals as the Father"? Philip 24
 had already repeatedly witnessed that! And, if only a union of 25
 objectives were Jesus' meaning, then, why does He claim that 26
 the Father is in Him if by that He simply meant that He, like 27
 so many millions of others, does God's will? No, I think it must 28
 mean more than that. 29

1 Millet claims that all Jesus meant was that that He is in the
2 Father and the Father is in Him just as believers are “in Christ.”
3 That position both (1) is not implying an essential unity be-
4 tween the Son and the Father, and (2) is observing that believ-
5 ers do not obviously live literally in body or soul in Christ’s
6 Person. Rather, they live in harmony with Him.

7 Yet the unity of God the Son and God the Father derives
8 from there being only one God. They possess equal powers.
9 The Father creates and so does the Son. The Father saves and
10 so does the Son. The Father sends the Spirit and so does the
11 Son. A unity of works argues for a unity of being. But man
12 does not create worlds (according to the Bible, that is) or save.
13 What God can do men cannot. So, where is the logic in say-
14 ing that “in” when applied to men being “in” Christ must be
15 equivalent, having the same meaning, as the Father being “in”
16 Christ? As Mormons are wont to do, Millet confuses man’s
17 capabilities with God’s. I think the Father lives as sovereign
18 only in our Lord’s humanity as Jesus in His deity is equal to
19 God (John 5:18; Philippians 2:6). In becoming Man, Christ in
20 His humanity alone, in my opinion, had submitted Himself to
21 the Father’s directions. “And being found in the appearance
22 as a man, He (then) humbled Himself and became obedient.”
23 (Philippians2:8).

24 (28.) John 17:11: “That they may be one as we are.”

25 Talmadge, Articles, 40 is convinced that here is indisput-
26 able proof that the Son and the Father are not one in essence
27 because disciples are said to be “one” yet they are separate in-
28 dividuals. But the unity of the disciples, Talmadge thinks, is

said to be just as the unity between The Son and the Father: 1
 “as we are”! But must one relationship of unity be just as an- 2
 other? Can I not say that the unity between believers is dif- 3
 ferent than the unity which exists between the “Persons” in 4
 God? Must “as we are” indicate the exact kind of unity or could 5
 it not instead merely mean the fact of unity. 6

Are there differences between the unity of believers and 7
 the unity of the divine Persons? The first occurs in time, but 8
 the second is eternal (John 17:5b). In the first, one is not dwell- 9
 ing in the other, but in the second They are (John 14:10). In the 10
 first they do not glorify each other, but in the second They do 11
 (John 17:4, 5). The second is caused by their own common na- 12
 ture (John 1:1; Hebrews 1:8), but the first is caused by One not 13
 of the same nature. “Father (You) keep then” (John 17:11). 14

Yes, I know the final proposition will not set well with a 15
 person who imagines himself to be in embryo as God the 16
 Father, Himself. God in training as it were. But that is not my 17
 supposition. So, what I think the examples cited here evidence 18
 is that the unity of believers is different from the unity be- 19
 tween the Son and the Father. It cannot be convincingly ar- 20
 gued, therefore that “as we are” in John 17:11 NKJV indicates 21
 that the unity existing between believers and the unity exist- 22
 ing between the divine Persons are the same. Talmadge’s ar- 23
 gument is a failure. 24

(29.) John 20:17: “I am ascending to My Father and your Father, 25
 and to My God and your God.” 26

What are the effects on a believer having God as one’s 27
 Father? Does Paul not tell us in Colossians 3:10, “renewed 28

1 knowledge according to the image of Him who created him”?
2 Being God’s child means knowing God. How are God’s children
3 like Him? We act like Him (Matthew 5:9; Luke 6:35); “Therefore
4 be imitators of God as dear children” (Ephesians 5:1). Being chil-
5 dren of God, therefore, does not relate to our having the same
6 nature as God but to our becoming acquainted with Him and
7 acting like He wishes us to acts. But why discuss this matter?
8 It is because Hopkins, 55 imagines that “If God is the Father of
9 humans...then God too must be human.” That is what Hopkins
10 elicits from John 20:17! “Sons and fathers are always the same
11 race,” he argues. But the Fatherhood of God must be attributed
12 to His creating man. And, that creation does not require God
13 to be human. Yes, God created humans in His image, but that
14 image concerns the capacity of knowing God not being God:
15 “and have put on the new man who is renewed in knowledge
16 according to the image of Him who created him” (Colossians
17 3:10). my emphasis.

18 (30) Acts 7: 56: “Look I see the heavens opened and the Son of
19 Man standing at the right hand of God.”

20 Hopkins, 82 believes that as God has a right hand, He,
21 therefore, has the entire body of a man. This Mormon has not
22 done his research for being at God’s right hand is not descrip-
23 tive of God but denotes that one has a place of power and or
24 authority. Thus, in Acts 2:34 of Christ, we read, “Therefore be-
25 ing exalted to the right hand of God.” Also, Hebrews 1:13, “Sit at
26 My right hand Till I make Your enemies your footstool.” Both
27 “footstool” and “righthand” are anthropomorphisms.

Review Questions for 26-30	1
1. What are likely two different meanings of “as we are one” in John 17:21?	2 3
2. Why should it be doubted that John14:10 merely means that Christ shared His Father’s goals?	4 5
3. What do most evangelicals believe in regard to Christ’s two natures and His actions?	6 7
4. What does Colossians 3:10 tell us about our being in God’s image?	8 9
5. Explain what being “at God’s right hand” means.	10
6. How do Mormons misunderstand evangelical views on John 10:30?	11 12
7. ow do Mormons misunderstand John 20:17?	13

1 (31.) 1 Corinthians 3:16: “Do you not know that you are the
2 temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you?”

3 One could become confused by the apparent disagreement
4 between two LDS sources. Ludlow, 231 teaches that only in a
5 “figurative” sense can the Holy Ghost dwell in the hearts of
6 saints. The Spirit is spatially limited. But Millet, 457 says that
7 God is omnipresent by His Spirit. Yet, there is no contradiction
8 as Millet qualifies that statement to mean “the Light of Christ”
9 is everywhere at once. The “Light of Christ” is a “power” or an
10 “influence” by which a corporeal Being, God, can be omnipres-
11 ent Millet, 392, 393.

12 But would the inspired Jew, Paul, be speaking “figurative-
13 ly” in describing the omnipresent capacity of the Spirit? Why
14 would we suppose this since in his tradition Psalm 139:7 has
15 taught him, “Where can I go from your Spirit Or where can I
16 flee from your presence”? Let’s note that the Psalm is not talk-
17 ing of the divine “influence” or “power” but the divine pres-
18 ence. Likewise, Paul in Romans 8:9 speaks to believers in the
19 words “the Spirit of God dwells in you.” Paul emphatically re-
20 peats it, “His Spirit who dwells in you” (8:11). In another let-
21 ter the inspired apostle writes, “your body is the temple of the
22 Holy Spirit who is in you” (1 Corinthians 6:19). But Paul is in
23 agreement here with his divine Lord’s promise: “The Spirit of
24 Truth...will be in you” (John 14:17). Why would Mormons wish
25 to limit the divine indwelling to a mere influence? Because
26 God must be spatial since humans are spatial, and God is hu-
27 man. Again, LDS dogma trumps the Bible.

(32). 1 Corinthians 8:5: "(as there are many gods and many lords)." 1
2

Of this text Hopkins, 117 opines, "This positive indication of the actual existence of many gods and many lords cannot be ignored the way Evangelicals do." But speaking of ignoring things, Hopkins has paid no attention to verse 4 speaking of "idols" and verse 5 saying "so called gods." If Paul is alluding to actual living deities, then why does he call them "idols" and so "called"? 3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Hopkins thinks that the apostle by saying "for us there is one God" (8:6) shows that Paul is admitting the existence of other gods. Only One for us, but many for others?! But, again recall Paul's theological heritage: "Thus says the LORD...besides Me there is no God" (Isaiah 44:6); "Thus says the LORD... there is no God besides Me" (Isaiah 45:1, 5) "I am God, and there is no other" (Isaiah 46:9). Hopkins emulates his number two "inerrant" prophet and president who confesses, "How many Gods there are I do not know."⁹ That despite the genuinely inspired Paul teaching "There is one God" (1 Timothy 2:5). But, away with the Bible, the Mormon prophets reign. 10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

(33). 1 Corinthians 15:28: "Now when all things are made subject to Him, then the Son Himself will be subject to Him." 21
22

I should remark that in the last 40 or so years, there has arisen within evangelical Christology the opinion of many that God the Son while equal in essence with the Father is eternally relationally subordinate to the Father. And these cite this text as evidence.¹⁰ I do not adhere to that doctrine. 23
24
25
26
27

1 And so, I think that Hopkins, 94 errs when he writes,
2 based on this text, “The Son will always be in subjection to
3 the Father.” Of course, the Mormons cannot countenance the
4 position that “Son” in this text could have reference to Jesus’
5 human nature only and not His divine nature. They cannot
6 because in the Mormon mind God and man are the same in
7 being, the same race. So, Christ exists in only one nature, they
8 think. But recall that Jesus who is the Son naps in a boat (Mark
9 4:38), learns (Luke 2:52) and wearies on a journey (John 4:6). I,
10 instead, don’t think that God snoozes or increases in knowl-
11 edge or gets tired. So, I see it that Jesus has a humanity which
12 is not His divinity. But the same Jesus has all knowledge (John
13 16:30; 21:17) and has all power (Revelation 1:8); therefore, Jesus
14 has a divine nature as well.

15 And, which of these natures does the apostle mean when
16 he says, “the Son will be subjected”? Well, let’s look at the con-
17 text. Verse 21 (“By Man came the resurrection from the dead”);
18 Christ is spoken of as a man. That suggests that Paul’s refer-
19 ent is Jesus’ humanity. And, furthermore, Christ is repeatedly
20 said to share the Father’s throne (Revelation 3:21; 12:5; and
21 22:3)! How does He share the throne if He subjects Himself
22 to the Father? Peter says the Kingdom of Christ is forever (2
23 Peter 1:11). How is it forever if the Son subjects Himself to the
24 Father? In my view 1Corinthians 15:28 speaks of the Son as
25 man not as God. As God, as Jehovah, He reigns (Psalm 99:1).

26 **(34).** Galatians 3:28: “For you are all one in Christ.”

27 Robinson, How Wide, 130 argues that as believers can be
28 one in Christ but remain separate individuals, the oneness

existing between the Persons in God cannot be an “ontological essence.” Recall that the evangelical doctrine is that while there are three personal distinctions in God, God is numerically only one Being. The only way Mormons can deny the unity of essence between the Persons in the Trinity is by asserting the existence of multiple divine beings. If there is only one God, then God is one. Mormon careless exegesis is the route by which Mormons arrive at their interpretations.

Were one to think that I am being overly harsh in my evaluation of Mormon exposition, note Paul’s text. Jew vs Greeks; slaves vs. free; men vs women. These are different. That they are “one” is not remotely denying their differences. Their unity is that they belong to Christ (5:29). But, as for the unity between the Son as God and God the Father, the same Paul says the Son exists in the divine nature-not divine natures (Philippians 2:6). Again, not natures! God has only one divine nature, and the Son shares that one nature. Philippians 2:6 just said that. Therefore, the unity between the Father and the divine Son is, indeed an ontological one. And, as God has only one nature, there is only one God.

(35). Philippians 2:7: “But made Himself of no reputation, taking the form of a bond servant, and coming in the likeness of men.”

And, also in reference to Philippians 2, Millet, Claiming 79, asserts that “emptied Himself” 2:7 (as in the New American Standard) means Christ “emptied Himself of His Godhood.” But this interpretation is unacceptable first because the verb “emptied” has no object. The verse does not say that the Son

BILL GROVER

1 gave up anything pertaining to His deity. Instead ,2:6 is ex-
2 plained in 2:7, “taking the form of a bond servant, and coming
3 in the likeness of men.” The emptying was accomplished by
4 an adding a new nature to His Person not changing His divin-
5 ity into humanity. We know that in becoming man, Christ
6 did not cease in in His Godhood because the tense of being in
7 the form of God is present; that is, He did not lose that form.
8 Besides, even in His incarnate state, He still is God: “My Lord
9 and my God” (John 20:28)! Christ at no time lost His divinity or,
10 in my estimation, the powers of that deity.

Review Questions for 31-35	1
1. In Mormonism how is “The Light of Christ” defined, and how does that qualify their understanding of the Spirit indwelling believers?	2 3 4
2. How does the context of 1 Corinthians 15:28 seem to disprove the eternal role subordination of God the Son?	5 6
3. How does Romans 8:11 contradict Mormon belief?	7
4. What shows that Christ did not empty Himself of deity in becoming Man?	8 9
5. Why does 1 Corinthians 8:5 not evidence that there are many Gods?	10 11
6. How does Philippians 2:6 show that God is one in Being?	12
7. Why would Mormons misrepresent the meaning of 1 Corinthians 6:19?	13 14

1 (36). Philippians 2:8: He humbled Himself and became
2 obedient.

3 It was suggested in 23 that Mormons hold that the Father
4 progressed into Godhood by obeying His own Father. The
5 “inspired” prophet, Joseph Smith, who, of course, must be be-
6 lieved and obeyed, implied that in his *Follett Discourse*: “God
7 Himself was once as we are.” So, if the Father did that, then,
8 McConkie, *Doctrinal NT* 2:496 commenting on this text, must
9 reason the Son, is required to do that as well. McConkie asserts
10 that Christ “had to work out His own salvation.” But our Lord’s
11 work on earth is nowhere said to have been for Himself but
12 was instead for us. “For even the Son of Man did not come to
13 be served but to serve, and give His life a ransom for many”
14 (Mark 10:45). “Who gave Himself a ransom for all” (1 Timothy
15 2:6).

16 Yet, why would any Mormon believe that Jesus was re-
17 quired to reach Godhood by obedience? Why else but to but-
18 tress up the Mormon conviction that man by obedience can
19 attain deity? But, obedience to whom? Obey God. But how do
20 we know what God is commanding? The LDS answer is that to
21 reach “exaltation” the Mormon must listen to and obey the in-
22 spired words of the prophet of the Lord, and that prophet is the
23 “President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints”
24 (Gospel Principles, 48, 304). Being in God’s presence in heaven,
25 an effect of exaltation (Ludlow, 159), is only for those who obey
26 Mormon leadership on earth. The Mormon requirement puts
27 the papal claim of authority to shame by comparison.

(37). Hebrews 1:3: "Who being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person." 1
2

Of this text Roberts, 85 asserts, "The truth that God in form is like man is further emphasized by the fact that Jesus is declared to have been in the express image of His Father's Person." 3
4
5
But, I think a fundamental error in Mormon Christology is 6
7
that they cannot see that the Son of God in His humanity is 8
9
man but in His deity is God. That God is not flesh is evidenced 10
11
by Christ -- the eternal Word who is God- requiring the addition 12
13
of a body in order to be human: "And the Word became 14
15
flesh" (John 1:14). 16
17

This doctrine is clearly taught by the author of Hebrews as well, He who is God (1:8) had to be made like us (2:14). That is, 12
13
He was not before His Incarnation like us! Roberts' is unable 14
15
to differentiate between Christ's divine nature in which our 16
17
Lord is "the brightness" of God's glory and the image of the 18
19
Father's Person from Christ's human nature which is "in the 20
21
likeness of men" (Philippians 2:7b). That inability is an effect of 22
23
the Mormon tenet that God is a man. 24
25

(38). Colossians 1:15: "He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation." 20
21

Of this verse McConkie, Doctrinal NT 3:25 tells his readers 22
23
that Christ "is our Elder Brother, the first of the spirit children 24
25
born to His exalted Parent...in that spirit sphere He advanced 26
27
and progressed until He became like unto God (Abraham 3:24) 28
29
in power and intelligence." McConkie offers no biblical justifications for his errant doctrines. And, how could he since the Bible says nothing about our Lord being a "spirit child" in 30
31

1 heaven or first not being like God but later becoming like God.
2 It rather is that the Bible teaches that Christ is God from the
3 beginning (John 1:1) and that He does not change (Hebrews
4 1:12). Mormon teachings about Jesus are in direct conflict with
5 the teachings of Scripture.

6 Furthermore, in Colossians 1:15 “Firstborn” (*prōtotokos*)
7 indicates a rank not origin. As elsewhere said, the adjective
8 refers to our Lord’s pre-eminence over creation by stipulating
9 that for Christ “all things were created” (1:16), and He is “be-
10 fore all thing (1:17), and He is the Head of the Church (1:18).
11 Therefore, He has “preeminence”, Paul, himself, states (1:18).
12 But Mormons derive no pleasure from what Paul teaches
13 when it contradicts their deceptive and delusional doctrines.

14 (39). Hebrews 12:9: “Shall we not much more readily be in sub-
15 jection to the Father of spirits and live?”

16 Of this text Ludlow, 438,439 opines that the Father and
17 MOTHER IN HEAVEN (his caps) bore all “spirit children” as liv-
18 ing beings in a pre- mortal life where the offspring “received
19 their first lessons in the Gospel,” and who were later born in
20 physical bodies. That is, men were created as living individu-
21 als in heaven before coming to earth. We should see here that
22 Mormon doctrine is allowed to run rampant over the teach-
23 ings of the Bible.

24 For Scripture most clearly instead stipulates that Adam be-
25 came a living being on earth not in heaven: “And the LORD
26 God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into
27 his nostrils the beath of life; and man became a living being”
28 (Genesis 2:7). While the Bible speaks not at all of a Mother in

heaven who birthed us or our learning the Gospel in a pre- 1
 mortal existence, such omissions dissuade not the LDS' inven- 2
 tive theology from redesigning man in Mormonism's own 3
 image. In doing theology, the Mormon way is not to elicit doc- 4
 trine out of the Bible but to attempt to put into the Bible what 5
 is not there. 6

(40). Hebrews 13:8: "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, 7
 and forever." 8

It just does not seem bothersome to Mormon "experts" to 9
 teach the exact opposite of what the Bible plainly declares. The 10
 writer of Hebrews explains, himself, his meaning in 1:10-12, 11
 "You LORD, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth. 12
 And the heavens are the work of your hands...And they will 13
 be changed. But you are the same." Just how more definitely 14
 could Hebrews clarify the immutability of the divinity of the 15
 Son who created the universe than by saying in regard to Him 16
 that while the universe changes, His deity does not. 17

The Subject of Hebrews 13:8 is Christ's divine nature in 18
 which He created the universe. This nature is distinct from 19
 the humanity noted in Hebrews 2:14, 17 as that humanity 20
 changes (Luke 2:52). But the divine nature, the Bible states, 21
 does not change. 22

Yet, McConkie Doctrinal NT 3:238, 239 bloviates that the 23
 writer of Hebrews means that Christ while yet in the spirit 24
 "progressed and advanced until He became like His Father." 25
 But where does the Bible teach that? Christ's unchangeable- 26
 ness, McConkie hypothesizes, means, "from one pre- existence 27
 to another His laws are the same." The Bible does not define 28

BILL GROVER

1 the divine immutability in that manner either. But why would
2 Mormons wish to deny the plain teaching of the Bible that
3 God does not change (Psalm102:27; Malachi 3:6; James 1:17)?
4 They must abide by their prophet, Brigham Young's dictum
5 that "The God I serve is progressing eternally." Prophets of the
6 LDS rule over the Bible, you see, and they "have the right of
7 revelation for the entire Church." Therefore, we must follow
8 their "inspired teachings completely" (Gospel Principles, 48,
9 49).

Review Questions for 36-40	1
1. How does the context of Colossians 1:15 demonstrate that <i>prōtotokos</i> refers to rank not origin?	2 3
2. How does Genesis 2:7 disprove Mormon doctrine?	4
3. What humans must Mormons obey in order to become Gods?	5 6
4. Which Mormon teaching does Mark 10:45 refute?	7
5. According to Mormonism how did the Father become God?	8 9
6. Explain the Mormon understanding of Hebrews 13:8.	10
7. How does John 1:14 indicated that God is not flesh?	11

1 (41.) Revelation 3:14: "These things says the Amen, the Faithful
2 and True Witness, the Beginning of the creation of God."

3 Hopkins, 66 instructs his readers that this text proves that
4 birthing Christ as a "spirit child" was the first creative act of
5 God. Christ is the firstborn. However, Hopkins does not pro-
6 vide the biblical proof that Christ ever was a child in heaven.
7 It rather is that the "beginning" of creation was by the Son
8 not of the Son, "For by Him all things were created that are in
9 heaven" (Colossians 1:16). If the Son created all things in heav-
10 en, then how is He created in heaven?

11 The word "beginning" (*archē*) in Revelation 3:14 refers
12 not to the origin of Christ but to His preeminence. Yes, in
13 Colossians Christ is called "first born" over all creation. But
14 look at the context. He also is "the beginning the first born"
15 from the dead." Why? So that "He might have the preemi-
16 nence" (1:18) not because He is created. "First born" refers not
17 to being the first in origin but to being the first in rank.

18 (42.) Revelation 7:10: "Salvation belongs to our God who sits on
19 the throne, and to the Lamb."

20 Mormon theology labors at two poles. One is the effort to
21 make man like God; the other is to make God like man. But
22 how can God be like man if He is everywhere at the same
23 time? He cannot. So, Mormons work hard to find texts which
24 confine God to one place. And Hopkins, 58 believes that he has
25 achieved this in Revelation 7:10: God sits on a throne, ergo, He
26 must be in only one place at a time.

27 But might it not rather be that by "throne" is meant having
28 "a position of authority and power" not something on which

one actually sits. After all, God's throne is heaven: "But I say 1
to you, do not swear at all: neither by heaven, for it is God's 2
throne" (Matthew 5:34). Should we imagine that God sits on 3
heaven and thus He is proven to be spatial? Or consider Isaiah 4
66:1, "Heaven is My throne and earth is My footstool." So, must 5
it be believed that this text is literally saying that God rests 6
His feet on the earth so thus it is proven that God has feet? 7
Is God's greatness --not His massive physical characteristics-- 8
the prophet's point? Or consider Revelation 3:21, "To him who 9
overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne." So, if 10
thousands or millions or billions "overcome," they all will sit 11
on just one throne? My! That would be a very large throne! 12
Does it not instead mean that they become rulers? No, I think 13
that God sitting on a throne does not mean He has a body; it 14
means He rules in power. 15

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

1. Joseph Smith. *New Translation of the Bible*. (Independence, Mo.: Herald House, 1970).
2. Orson Pratt. *The Seer*. (U.S.A.: Eborn Books, 1970), 158.
3. Comfort and Barrett. *The Text of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts*, 376, 378.
4. Smith. *Follett Discourse*.
5. Young. *Discourses*, 7:238; 9:243.
6. Wayne Grudem. *Systematic Theology*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 242.
7. F.F. Bruce. *The Gospel of John*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 233.
8. Herman Ridderbos. *The Gospel of John*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 371.
9. Young. *Discourses*, 7:333.
10. For example, John V. Dahms. "The Subordination of the Son" in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37.3 (September 1994), 365-379.
11. Young. *Discourses*, 11:286.

MAN AND SALVATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

2

3

(43). Genesis 2:24: “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.”

4

5

6

Hopkins, 114 believes that this verse supports the LDS teaching that marriage was intended by God to be eternal. Marriage for eternity permeates the Mormon doctrine of man. Such a marriage is “required to enter the highest degree of celestial glory” (Millet, Beliefs 408). “Celestial marriage is the gate to an exaltation in the highest heaven within the celestial world” (McConkie, Mormon Doctrine 118).

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

But, let’s consider some arguments against this: First note that while the New Testament teaches that marriage is honorable (Hebrews13:4), nowhere is it said that marriage relates to salvation in any manner, shape or form. If eternal marriage is required for the highest exaltation, why is it not mentioned? Again, Mormons enthusiastically add to the teachings of Scripture. Second, Paul discusses remarriage in 1 Corinthians 7:8,9, but the prospect of marriage for eternity is not a part of the apostle’s teaching. Why does Paul discuss remarriage

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 if marriage for eternity is required for the fullness of glory in
2 the afterlife? Why does the inspired Paul nowhere even men-
3 tion “celestial marriage” if that is a condition for the highest
4 status in “exaltation”?

5 Then, observe that in 1 Corinthians 7:26 Paul can suggest
6 that at least for that time people should not marry. So, these
7 are giving up “exaltation” by remaining celibate? Why doesn’t
8 Paul warn them of that undesirable effect if they do not mar-
9 ry? Finally, he even says that that abstinence from sex in mar-
10 riage could be a divine gift, and that he, himself, possesses that
11 gift! (1 Corinthians 7:7). Does that sound like one who believed
12 that marriage relates to heavenly rewards? The Mormon doc-
13 trine of marriage simply does not equate with biblical teach-
14 ing. But like so many Mormon beliefs, even if the Bible does
15 not express a tenet, that does not curtail the Mormons from
16 teaching it.

17 But why would Mormons find such a doctrine beneficial to
18 the promotion of their faith? They insist that by the LDS “res-
19 toration of the Gospel, eternal marriage has been restored to
20 the earth” (Gospel Principles, 241. But nowhere in the Gospel
21 of the New Testament is found such a teaching. So, how is it
22 a restoration? Therefore, what is the Mormon motivation to
23 emphasize it? Gospel Principles, 242 provides the answer.
24 Marriage for eternity can only be done in a Mormon temple by
25 a Mormon priest. How better to build up church membership
26 than to teach that the highest heaven can only be obtained by
27 submission to Mormon priests and Mormon ordinances? But
28 where does the New Testament ever hint that those Jews and
29 Gentiles believers in the first century were instructed by the
30 apostles to be married in temples by priests?

(44). Genesis 3:22: "Then, the LORD said, 'Behold , the man is
become like one of Us, to know good and evil.' "

In accordance with Mormonism tenets, Ludlow, 205 claims men can achieve "godhood" which "denotes...having all divine attributes and doing as God does and being as God is." Ludlow avers that Genesis 3:22 means "perfected mortals become gods." It seems that Mormons are unable to read a verse clear through. For the phrase "become like one of us" is clearly qualified by the phrase "to know good and evil." That qualification removes from the text any notion that men "become gods" or have "all divine attributes." Only one quality of God is said to be the result of the Fall, and it is not becoming divine. Knowing good and evil did not make Adam and Eve gods.

(45). Genesis 4:11: "And Cain said to the LORD, 'My punishment is more than I can bear.' "

I do not relish giving a direct quotation from a Mormon president which is filled with such racism. But it exemplifies the Mormon predilection to add their nefarious beliefs to the teachings of the Bible. Cain, of course, killed his brother Abel (Genesis 4:8). And consequently, God punished Cain and put a mark on his forehead. What was that mark? Joseph Fielding Smith, 101, 107 explains: "Cain became the father of an inferior race...Millions of souls have come into this world cursed with a black skin. These are the descendants of Cain ...the mark placed on Cain, and which his posterity inherited was the black skin." (See also the Mormon scripture of Moses 7:8). This grievous and unbiblical Mormon doctrine was promoted by none other than Brigham Young, himself: "The Negro-The

BILL GROVER

1 seed of Ham, which is the seed of Cain descending through
2 Ham, will, according to the curse put upon him, serve his
3 brethren, and be a “servant of servants” to his fellow crea-
4 tures.”¹ I feel the need to apologize that any organization rep-
5 resenting itself to be Christian slurs any person based on race.
6 As Peter learned, “God shows no partiality. But in every nation
7 whoever fears Him and works righteousness is accepted by
8 Him (Acts1:34, 35).

9 In the late 1970s blacks were for the first time accepted into
10 the Mormon priesthood. That was said to done by a modern
11 revelation. Had Mormons adhered to the Bible, they would
12 have found no evidence in the first place to judge blacks of
13 being unfavored by God or in any way inferior. By the way,
14 the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter- Day Saints
15 rejects this LDS doctrine so adamantly taught by Young and
16 JF Smith.²

Review Questions for 41-45	1
1. How does Paul indicate that he does not believe in marriage for eternity?	2 3
2. At what two “poles” do Mormons labor?	4
3. What have Mormons wrongly taught about the black “race”?	5 6
4. Why is the Mormon understanding of Revelation 3:4 incorrect?	7 8
5. What do Mormons believe is the “gate to exaltation”?	9
6. What in Genesis 3:22 shows that humans do not become Gods?	10 11
7. In what way does Revelation 3:21 indicate that Mormons misunderstand Revelation 7:10?	12 13

1 (46). 1 Kings 11:41: "Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, all that
2 he did, and his wisdom, are they not written in the book of the
3 acts of Solomon?"

4 There's more. Ridges, 193 lists the books of the Wars of the
5 Lord, Jasher, Acts of Solomon, Samuel the Seer, Gad the Seer
6 ,Nathan the Prophet, prophecy of Ahijah, visions of Iddo, and
7 several others which are mentioned in the Bible but are not
8 included in the Bible. So, what does this prove? Well, the New
9 Testament has about 250 direct quotations plus about 1000
10 indirect or partial quotations from Old Testament books. OK,
11 how many times is Iddo quoted? Ten times? No! Five? No! One
12 time? No. How many for Nathan? None! How many for Gad?
13 None! How many for Jasher? None! Are we getting the pic-
14 ture? Are we to believe that If God wanted His Church to be-
15 come aware of the contents of such books that He would not
16 make them available to the writers of the New Testament?

17 Just because an Old Testament Book mentions another
18 book, that is no proof that the book mentioned should be in
19 the Bible. So, when Ridges argues that because the Bible men-
20 tions such "lost books" that proves the Bible not complete and,
21 therefore, "there is a need for a continuing revelation from
22 God," Ridges has jumped the track in his logic. The measure of
23 what information is needed for believers is to be found in the
24 New Testament not in Mormon hypotheses. That no further
25 revelation is needed is proven by our Lord's promise to His
26 apostles that they would be guided into all truth (John 16:13).
27 And the complete truth given them is communicated to us in
28 their writings in the New Testament not in "modern revela-
29 tion." It is just as Jude 3 informs: the Faith has already been

delivered once for all time. And Paul in discipling Timothy 1
 states that one can be fully equipped by Scripture without re- 2
 course to “lost books” (2 Timothy 3:16, 17). 3

(47). Job 1:6: “Now there was a day when the sons of God came 4
 to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan also came 5
 among them.” 6

The Mormon practice of embellishing the Bible is distinctly 7
 seen in Hopkins, 103 concluding that Satan is our brother. To 8
 put Hopkins in deductive format, by what logic does he arrive 9
 at that position? Premise: “sons of God” refers to the Father 10
 birthing all men in heaven (and angels are men, Mormons 11
 think-see comments on Acts 12:14). Premise: All men are 12
 “spirit brothers.” Conclusion: Therefore we, and Christ, have 13
 Satan as our brother. Hopkins declares this to be “pure biblical 14
 doctrine”! 15

But as we all likely know, a conclusion is only valid if both 16
 premises are true. However, it is easily arguable that the first 17
 premise is not biblically true. Yes, it may be true in Mormon 18
 theology, but Hopkins entitled his book “Biblical Mormonism” 19
 so the onus is upon him to substantiate his assertion by the 20
 Bible. But his references in his book to Jeremiah 1:5 on pages 21
 100, 101 evidence only God’s prescience not man’s pre-exis- 22
 tence. But further, men become children of God by rebirth 23
 (John 32:3) and/or adoption (Galatians 4:5), and as the Bible is 24
 silent on man (including Satan) being pre-existent, growing up 25
 in heavenly families, and learning the Gospel in heaven, we 26
 should see Hopkins’ argument to be fatally flawed. 27

1 (48). Job 38:4: "Where were you when I laid the foundation of
2 the earth?"

3 Since God asked Job where was he when the earth was cre-
4 ated, Hopkins, 105 takes that as proof that Job must have been
5 somewhere. Job was in heaven as a "spirit child, of course.
6 Yet, can we not note that God does not say, "You were pres-
7 ent at creation." How could the pre-existence of man be the
8 Scripture's topic here since 38:21 implies that Job was not born
9 in eternity and that the number of his days are not great? No,
10 instead 38:4 begins a listing of questions which can only be
11 answered in the negative: "Have you commanded the morn-
12 ing?" No! "Have you comprehended the breadth of the earth?"
13 No! "Have the gates of death been revealed to you?" No! "Were
14 you present at creation?" No!

15 Doctrines important to the Christian faith are clearly
16 taught in the Bible. Is Christ God? (John 1:1 and others). Does
17 Christ save? (1 Timothy 1:15 and others). Is salvation by faith?
18 (Ephesians 2:8 and others). Major tenets of Scripture are dis-
19 tinctly taught without the need for embellishment or un-
20 needed inference. So, where does human life begin accord-
21 ing to Scripture? "He who made me in the womb" (Job 31:15).
22 "He who formed you from the womb" (Isaiah 44:24). "He was
23 conceived in the womb" (Luke 2:21). Human life did not begin
24 as heavenly "spirit children," but, as the Psalmist says, "You
25 formed my inward parts; you covered me in my mother's
26 womb" (149:13).

27 (49). Isaiah 29:18: "Therefore the Lord will wait, that He may be
28 gracious unto you."

Of this text Ridges, 40 asserts, this verse, “prophesies the good that will come to the honest of heart when they read the Book of Mormon.” But why should the book of Mormon be thought to be the prophet’s subject? Why should the verse not instead refer to the Gospel in the New Testament? Ridges does not provide any argument for his claim.

(50). Jeremiah 1:5: “Before I formed you in the womb; before you were born, I sanctified you: I ordained you a prophet to the nations.”

The “scriptures” besides the Bible which Mormons deem to be inspired include the book of Abraham. In 3:22, 23 of that book God tells Abraham that there were “intelligences” (in LDS doctrine, these intelligences became “spirit children” who then assumed bodies). Some of these intelligences were more noble, and these special ones, like Abraham, were chosen to be great when enfleshed. So, it is not surprising that Mormons involve themselves with the task of digging into the Bible to find verses texts to collaborate the tenets of their other holy texts. And, Talmage, 189 thinks that he has found one in Jeremiah 1:5. Talmage avers, “This is one of the many scriptural proofs that the spirits of mankind existed prior to their earthly probation.”

It is? But the text, itself, does not talk about Jeremiah being a pre-existing intelligence. It does not say he was a heavenly “spirit child”! It does not say that Jeremiah was more noble than others when he was in heaven. All of that is unwarranted, un-biblical embellishment. What it does say is that God ordained Jeremiah to be a prophet before Jeremiah was born. All that is

BILL GROVER

1 required for that is the foreknowledge of God which is clearly
2 taught in texts as Isaiah 46:9, 10, "I am God and there is none
3 like Me, Declaring the end from the beginning." Furthermore,
4 God's decree is based on the divine will (Ephesians1:5, 11) not
5 on human merit. Anything else suggests that if we are "noble"
6 it is by our own goodness not by divine grace.

Review Questions for 46-50	1
1. What suggests that the Mormon understanding of Jeremiah 1:5 is wrong?	2 3
2. Why does Job 38:4 not evidence Job's pre-existence?	4
3. How does John 16:13 indicate that modern revelation is unneeded?	5 6
4. How do Job 31:15 and Isaiah 44:24 refute Mormon teaching?	7 8
5. If Iddo and Jasher are not alluded to in the New Testament, what does that indicate?	9 10
6. According to Mormonism, why did Abraham become great on earth?	11 12
7. Explain the Mormon understanding of Satan.	13

1 (51). Ezekiel 37:16: "Then take another stick and write on it the
2 stick of Joseph."

3 On this verse we find Ridges, 40, 316 making another un-
4 substantiated claim of how the Old Testament foretells the ad-
5 vent of Mormonism. He asserts, "Ezekiel 37:15-20 prophesies
6 that the Book of Mormon will someday join forces with the
7 Bible in bearing witness of the Lord's work." As in #48, Ridges
8 offers no argument for his view. The compulsion for Mormon
9 writers to find biblical references to their "restoration" in
10 Scriptures-- which texts are in fact utterly distant from that
11 objective-- is perhaps supremely evident in Ridges' kidnap-
12 ping Ezekiel's prediction of a unification of the tribes of Israel
13 and applying it instead to Mormonism modern scriptures.

14 (52). Daniel 2:44: "And in the days of these kings the God of
15 heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed;
16 and the kingdom shall not be left to other people; it shall break
17 into pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand
18 forever."

19 We have already witnessed incredible, from an exegetical
20 point of view, examples of LDS writers taking verses out of con-
21 text. But McConkie, Mormon Doctrine, 137 deserves a special
22 pinocchio award for contending that the kingdom which God
23 will set up refers to God's decree that the Mormon restoration
24 begun in 1829 will ultimately and finally triumph. It is rather
25 that the Kingdom which belongs to Christ (Ephesians 5:5), be-
26 gan in the apostolic age (Colossians 1:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:12)
27 and has no end (2 Peter 1:11). The kingdom is not Mormonism.

(53). Daniel 7:9: “And the Ancient of Days was seated.” 1

Roberts,²⁴⁴ informs his readers that the Ancient of Days 2
is Adam who “as the father of the human family presides over 3
the spirits of all men.” But Adam, Roberts says, “delivers up his 4
stewardship to Christ.” Since the context of Daniel 7 regarding 5
the Ancient of Days states He is seated on a throne and that 6
“a thousand thousands ministered to Him” one might observe 7
that Roberts is dangerously close to saying that Adam is God! 8
And God, not Adam, is of course, Daniel’s Subject. And indeed, 9
if you read Roberts further, you will find him saying, of Adam 10
“it is of no matter whether we consider him our God” (263). 11
What? It is of no matter who we believe is God?? 12

But how could this writer feel that he would receive ap- 13
probation from the Mormon establishment by even hinting 14
at the approval of such heresy? Well, it is because the sec- 15
ond president of Latter-Day Saints, Brigham Young, himself, 16
insists that, “Adam is our Father and God. He is the only God 17
with whom we have to do.”³ Today, Mormons are actively at- 18
tempting to cover up President Young’s heresy by claiming 19
the “prophet” simply is being misunderstood. (Ridges, 6). Cover 20
it up they must for their doctrine is that “The Lord will never 21
allow the President of the Church to leads us astray” (Gospel 22
Principles, 50). 23

(54). Amos 3:7: “Surely the LORD God does nothing, Unless He 24
reveals His secret to the prophets.” 25

Millet, Getting at the Truth, 105 in saying that Amos should 26
be interpreted as meaning “If God is going to make anything 27
known to His covenant people or to the world, He will do so 28

1 through His living prophets" (my emphasis) has chosen to dis-
2 regard the New Testament descriptions of the functions of
3 prophets. What we see in the work of Mormon prophets is
4 the inventing of beliefs including the need of temples, priests,
5 presidents, celestial marriages, distinguishing *Elohim* from
6 *Jehovah*, men existing as pre-mortal "intelligences," a Mother
7 God and so forth.

8 But such theological innovating was not the work of New
9 Testament prophets. Instead, they foretold very earthly mat-
10 ters as a famine (Acts 11:28) or Paul's arrest (Acts 21:11). They
11 also exhorted believers (Acts 15:32). But creating doctrine was
12 not their function. And their authority over the church was
13 very limited as their prophesying was subject to judgment by
14 others (1 Corinthians 14:29).

15 But Mormonism has elevated the role of modern prophets
16 to making doctrinal decisions for believers, and that is not sup-
17 ported in the New Testament. Yes, I know it is imagined that
18 Joseph Smith knew "more than all the world put together,"⁴ and
19 that true prophets must "be members of the Church of Jesus
20 Christ of Latter -Day Saints" (McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*,
21 608). But such incredulous self- aggrandizement should not be
22 an expected trait for anyone or any church striving to "serve
23 the Lord with humility" (Acts 20:19). The LDS position on "liv-
24 ing prophets" is clearly not supported by the teachings of the
25 apostles.

END NOTES FOR CHAPTER 3

1

1. Brigham Young. *Discourses*, 2:184. 2
2. Russell F. Ralston. *Fundamental Differences*. 230-234. 3
3. *Millennial Star*. 17:195; Brigham Young, *Journal of Discourses* 1:50. 4
5
4. *King Follett Discourse*. 6

MAN AND SALVATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

2

3

(55). Matthew 5:48: “Therefore you shall be perfect, just as your Father in heaven is perfect.”

4

5

Ludlow, 205 imagines that this verse means, “resurrected and perfected mortals become gods.” But the passage is not talking about man’s exaltation. It is talking about morality. It is not saying that mortals don the powers of God as omniscience and omnipotence; it speaks only of not reconciling, not lust-ing, not divorcing, not being unloving and so forth. `Ludlow provides us with an example of the Mormon predilection of trampling over the contexts of verses to force conclusions far and away from what the Bible is actually saying.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

But let’s not suppose that the Mormon tenet of man’s deification can be contained by the addition of only moral qualities to exalted human beings for it is far more than this. McConkie, Mormon Doctrine 321 explains that humans can “possess the attributes and enjoy the perfections which the Father has.” They can, in other words, “do what He does, have the powers resident in Him.” But why should McConkie write in such glowing terms of man’s possible future acquisition? It

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

BILL GROVER

1 is because his inspired prophet declared, you will “inherit the
2 same power, the same glory, the same exaltation until you ar-
3 rive at the station of a God and ascend the throne of eternal
4 power.”¹ Mormon theologians must obey the precepts of their
5 inerrant prophets for has not Smith said of himself that his
6 duty is, “to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto
7 Moses” (D&C 107:91). And, who should argue with a modern
8 Moses?

Review Questions for 51-55	1
1. Who is the Ancient of Days according to Mormonism?	2
2. How does the context of Daniel 7:9 refute Mormon teaching?	3 4
3. How does the New Testament refute Mormon understanding of Amos 3:7?	5 6
4. Why do Colossians 1:13 and 1 Thessalonians 2:12 show the Mormon understanding of Daniel 2:44 to be incorrect?	7 8 9
5. How do Mormons interpret Ezekiel 37:6?	10
6. What did Brigham Young teach about Adam?	11
7. In Mormon theology, what powers do humans get when becoming Gods?	12 13

1 (56). Matthew 7:21. "Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,'
2 shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of
3 My Father in heaven."

4 But what must be included in doing the will of the Father?
5 McConkie, New Testament Commentary 1:254 has our an-
6 swer. And woe to all of us outside of the Mormon restoration,
7 for we are prevented from doing the Father's will since do-
8 ing such requires one to believe, as McConkie opines, "in the
9 prophets sent by Christ to reveal His truths, Joseph Smith be-
10 ing the greatest of these in this dispensation."

11 So, if the "greatest" prophet says men become gods having
12 all power becoming equal to God (D&C 76: 95; 132:20), we must
13 just believe it whether the Bible teaches that or not. If the
14 "greatest" prophet asserts that Christ did not at first have the
15 divine fullness (D&C 93:13,14), we must just believe it wheth-
16 er the Bible informs us of that or not. And when Smith, "the
17 greatest prophet" says that God wants him to have more than
18 one wife (D&C 132:52), we just must believe that is God's will
19 despite the genuinely inspired Paul's rule that church leaders
20 must have only one wife: "the husband of one wife" (1 Timothy
21 3:2). Smith, you see, has more even authority than Paul.

22 The Mormon adoration for their infallible prophet is noted
23 in a hymn sung about him in Gospel Principles, 358, 359:

24 Praise to the man who communed with Je-
25 hovah! Jesus anointed that prophet and seer.
26 Blessed to open the last dispensation,
27 kings shall extol him, and nations revere.
28 Hail to the prophet ascended to heaven.

Traitors and tyrants now fight him in vain. 1
 Mingling with Gods he can plan for his brethren. 2
 Death cannot conquer the hero again. 3

(57). Matthew 16:18: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." 4
 5

What was our Lord's meaning? Is it not explained in the following verse? "And I will give you the keys of the Kingdom." 6
 I take this to mean Peter's prominence in proclaiming the 7
 Gospel (Acts 2:14; 10:34 f.). Those accepting the Gospel (Acts 8
 2:47), constitute the Church, which will be victorious over the 9
 "gates of hell" (*Gehenna*). Gates are that by which individuals 10
 enter hell; believers avoid these gates by accepting the Gospel. 11
 In this manner, hell does not prevail over the Church. 12
 13

But what of those already in hell? Does the Gospel affect 14
 them? Ludlow, 229 believes it does. He surmises that, "God's 15
 priesthood power will penetrate hell and redeem the repentant 16
 spirits there." This, of course, agrees with the Mormon 17
 doctrine discussed in several texts below. However, this view 18
 neither seems consistent with our Lord's teaching in Mark 19
 9:46, 48 which is that those in hell are eternally punished 20
 nor with Revelation 21:8 which does not allude to a reprieve 21
 for those confined in hell if they respond appropriately to a 22
 Gospel presentation in their afterlife. 23

(58). Matthew 16:19: "And I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." 24
 25
 26
 27

1 As seen above, this passage has Peter as its subject. In
2 Greek, the “to you” is singular in number. It does not say “to
3 you and also to all future LDS presidents.” Our Lord’s words
4 are addressed to only Peter. Consequently, anyone but a de-
5 vout Mormon likely will be surprised to read in Millet, Beliefs,
6 363 that, “The president of the Church holds and exercises all
7 of the keys of the kingdom” just as Peter did. Here Mormons
8 have abducted the Bible’s clear and quite limited applica-
9 tion to Peter and without any warrant applied it to Mormon
10 presidents.

11 The president of the church, in Mormon thought, has un-
12 equaled power. He is the earthly head of the kingdom. Only
13 he can exercise the keys of the kingdom in their fullness. Only
14 by his authority are ordinances required and teaching is done.
15 He is the mouthpiece of God on earth! (McConkie, Mormon
16 Doctrine 592, 592). Can we not see that such a doctrine is un-
17 biblical? Where in the lists of New Testament church offices,
18 as in Ephesians 4:7-12, is a “president” ever even listed? Where
19 in the New Testament does any prophet or apostle say that
20 he is the head of the kingdom or that Gospel ordinances must
21 be approved by him? The utter theological conceit of Mormon
22 writers is gagging.

23 (59). Matthew 19:6: “So then they are no longer two but one
24 flesh. Therefore, what God has joined together let not man
25 separate.”

26 Hopkins, 114 informs that Christ must here be alluding to
27 eternal marriage. Why would Jesus say “let not man separate”
28 them if God would allow them to be separated by death? Gospel

Principles, 242 outlines “The Benefits of Eternal Marriage: (1) 1
by that we can live in the celestial kingdom (2) we can become 2
exalted as God, (3) we can in a future time increase our family 3
by having spirit children.” 4

But I find it interesting that neither Hopkins nor Gospel 5
Principles interacts with Romans 7:3: “if her husband dies, she 6
is free from that law (of being bound to her husband) she is 7
no adulteress though she has married another man.” (See also 8
1 Corinthians 7:39). How could a couple be eternally married 9
if when one dies, the other remarries? Why does Paul not 10
add, “Of course if their marriage is celestial, then she must not 11
remarry”? 12

Why does Paul, or Jesus, or Peter or any other biblical writ- 13
er not address marriage for eternity if it is so very vital to our 14
after-life? Just think how many more heavenly “spirit chil- 15
dren” Christians could bear in their post mortal existence if 16
only the biblical authors had done their job of educating of us 17
more thoroughly about the benefits of celestial marriage. Just 18
think of all those “spirit children” who will go unborn since no 19
biblical writer ever informed us about eternal marriage. 20

(60). Matthew 24:14: “And this gospel of the kingdom will be 21
preached in all the world as a witness to all the nations and 22
then the end will come.” 23

Hold onto your hats for here comes another windy 24
Mormon claim. McConkie, Doctrinal NT 1:649,650 reveals to 25
us that “Jesus is here announcing the restoration of the gos- 26
pel in the last days.” The foppish, self-centered hermeneutics 27
of Mormon writers here again is revealed. They make the 28

BILL GROVER

1 LDS “restoration” (beginning I suppose in 1820 when the di-
2 vine Persons appeared to Joseph Smith) the enduring subject
3 of biblical prediction. So, what were those faithful servants
4 of God doing in their evangelical and missionary endeavors
5 from the first to the nineteenth century, before the supposed
6 revelation to Smith and the establishment of his “restoration”?

Review Questions for 55-60	1
1. How many biblical writers teach marriage for eternity?	2
2. What Mormon teaching does Ephesians 4:7-12 refute?	3
3. Give your opinion on the hymn to Joseph Smith.	4
4. How do Mormons misinterpret Matthew 24:14?	5
5. What shows that the Mormon understand of Matthew 16:19 is incorrect?	6 7
6. Whom do Mormons believe is “the greatest prophet” of this dispensation?	8 9
7. What Mormon teaching does Mark 9:46, 48 refute?	10

1 (61). Mark 16:16: "He who believes and is baptized will be saved;
2 but he who does not believe will be condemned."

3 Talmage, Articles of Faith,⁹⁵ informs that this verse states
4 that salvation is based on obedience. It needs to be mentioned
5 that there are many evangelicals who teach a doctrine often
6 called "Lordship Salvation" which has been understood as
7 meaning that a believer must be obedient to God in order to be
8 saved.² But, an evaluation of that doctrine is beyond the scope
9 of this book's purpose. Instead, let's look at the Mormon use of
10 Mark 16:16 to evidence their teaching that salvation is based
11 on obedience, more particularly on being baptized.

12 The reader will recall that we do not have the original of
13 Mark. What we do have is early copies of it in Greek, ancient
14 translations, and references to it in the church fathers. We
15 utilize these sources to guide us in determining the correct
16 text of Mark. But it is questionable that verses 9 through 20 of
17 Mark 16 were included in the original. The oldest uncial Greek
18 copies omit these verses as do many other copies and ancient
19 translations. The church fathers Clement of Alexandria and
20 Origin show no knowledge of the longer ending of Mark.
21 Furthermore, the style and vocabulary of verse 9-20 differ
22 from the rest of the Book. The longer ending, for example, in-
23 cludes a number of words not found elsewhere in Mark.

24 These data would seem to suggest that we should not con-
25 struct major doctrines as how is one saved on Mark 16:16. Of
26 course, we do want to build our theology on the Bible. But,
27 by the "Bible" I mean the original writings which should be
28 determined by textual research made available to us by the ef-
29 forts of non-Mormon believers like Bruce Metzger.³ Mormons

in refusing to avail themselves of such efforts are basing, in 1
 this case, vital doctrines on a text which may not be origi- 2
 nal. Mormons further hide that questionable practice to their 3
 faithful. 4

(62). Luke 24:39: “Behold My hand and My feet, that it is I 5
 Myself. Handle Me and see, for a spirit does not have flesh and 6
 bones as you see I have.” 7

The Mormon obsession with post-mortal sex is possibly 8
 never more evident than in the Hopkins,¹¹³ comment on 9
 Luke 24:39. For while you and I may revere this verse’s point 10
 as being the reality of Jesus’ bodily resurrection, that will not 11
 suffice the Mormon exegete. No, we must elicit from this text 12
 a fundamental principle of our becoming heavenly parents 13
 who birth untold “spirit children.” And so, Hopkins declares, 14
 “Christ appeared to His apostles in the exact form He had dur- 15
 ing His mortal life. If men are thus raised in the exact bodily 16
 form they enjoyed during this life, why should theologians 17
 expect resurrected beings to be sterile?” Hopkins is saying that 18
 Jesus was still able to experience heavenly sex after His res- 19
 urrection. Perhaps keeping in mind the apostle Orson Pratt’s 20
 unbiblical claim that Jesus had at least three wives,⁴ Hopkins 21
 diverts Jesus’ resurrection toward evidencing the Mormon 22
 persuasion that resurrected persons have sex in heaven and 23
 that “human spirits are the literal off spring of perfected, ex- 24
 alted parents” and that while in heaven we accepted or reject- 25
 ed the Father’s plan for salvation (Ludlow, 84, 438). 26

But look at the Bible. Where does it say that post mortal 27
 humans have sex in heaven? Where does it say that “spirit 28

1 children” are birthed by those sexual escapades? Where does
2 it say that these “spirit children” responded to the Father’s plan
3 for their salvation? There are no places where such teachings
4 are taught in the Bible. Once again, Mormons are caught man-
5 ufacturing their own doctrines by not confining their theol-
6 ogy to biblical teaching.

7 (63). John 9:2: “And His disciples asked Him, saying, ‘Rabbi who
8 sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?’ ”

9 Of this text Talmage, Jesus the Christ, 413 bloviates that
10 the disciples believed in pre-existence. He expounds, “The dis-
11 ciples’ question implied their belief in a state of moral agency
12 and choice antedating mortality; else, how could they have
13 thought of the man having sinned so as to bring upon himself
14 congenital blindness? The disciples evidently had been taught
15 the great truth of an ante-mortal existence.” (my emphasis)

16 But how can my comment that Talmage’s exposition is
17 bloviation be just? Well for several reasons: First, what the
18 disciples might have believed at that time is not necessarily
19 biblical doctrine. Afterall, we can observe their errors pertain-
20 ing to the kingdom (Matthew 21-24), in Jesus talking with the
21 woman of Samaria (John 4:27), and even regarding whether
22 the Lord should die to redeem believers (Matthew 16:22). The
23 disciples at times neither grasped Jesus’ meanings (Mark 7:17,
24 18) nor understood His Person (John 14:9). So, to base our doc-
25 trine on what the disciples may have believed before their
26 being baptized with the Holy Spirit and receiving the knowl-
27 edge of “all truth” (John 14:17; 16:13; Acts 1:5) is not conclusive

evidence that their opinions before that experience concurred with Scripture.

Second, Talmage is incorrect in maintaining that there was no other possibility in accounting for the man's blindness except for his pre-mortal experience. God is quite aware from eternity of our deeds and conditions on earth. God declares the end from the beginning (Isaiah 46:9), and He had decided before our births what we will do. He "works all things according to the council of His will" (Ephesians 1:11); He does whatever pleases Him (Isaiah 46:10). The man's blindness may well have had its origin in the divine decree.

Third, Talmage's interpretation of the text is a non sequitur in that our Lord teaches that the man's blindness was not caused by anyone's sin. It occurred so that "the works of God should be revealed in him." What a lesson for us this can be! Do we feel it unfair that we have a failing heart, or have lost a loved one, or have had misfortune heaped upon us? Let's be grateful on this one count: our "thorn" may be the occasion for our Father to demonstrate His strength in us (2 Corinthians 12:7-9). What a great opportunity to be a subject through which God demonstrates His power.

(64). John 10:16: "And other sheep have I that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they will hear My voice; and there will be one flock and one shepherd."

A recurring theme in the Pauline epistles is the unity of the Jewish and Gentile believers in their faith in Christ. For example, Gentiles are grafted into the same olive tree as the Jews (Romans 11:17), are blessed as was Abraham (Galatians 3:14),

1 and are along with Jews “one new man” in Christ (Ephesians
2 2:14). So, given Scriptures as these whom should we think was
3 Jesus’ referent? Was it not the Gentiles?

4 Oh no that will not do. I know whom it must be. It is people
5 in America who are the other sheep to whom Christ witnessed
6 after His resurrection Ridges_40. But wait, where in the Bible
7 does it say that Christ appeared or would appear in America?
8 But that is no problem for 3 Nephi fixes that small omission by
9 describing how Jesus visited America descending in a white
10 robe telling them that He died for sin and inviting them to
11 thrust their hands into His wounded side. Therefore, we must
12 interpret the Gospel of John by Mormon modern scriptures.
13 The Bible is insufficient; we must rely on LDS sacred texts to
14 understand it!

15 (65). John 10:34: “Jesus answered them, ‘Is it not written in
16 your law, I said you are gods?’ ”

17 Hopkins_109, 110 argues that evangelicals are mistaken
18 in saying that the judges in Israel were called “gods” merely
19 because they represented the divine authority. No, Jesus is
20 instead saying here that these men actually were gods. Our
21 Lord’s referent is Psalm 82:

22 (82:1) God stands in the congregation of the mighty; He
23 judges among the gods. (82:2) How long will you judge un-
24 justly, and show partiality to the wicked?... (82:5) They do not
25 know, nor do they understand.. (82:6) I said you are gods, and
26 all of you are children of the most high. But you shall die like
27 men.

But please recall the LDS teaching of the time and nature 1
of deification. “Godhood is to have the character, possess the 2
attributes, and enjoy the perfections which the Father has” 3
(McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, 321), and Godhood is a state 4
enjoyed by “resurrected and perfected” mortals (Ludlow, 205). 5

Now, let’s apply these data to those humans in Psalm 82. 6
Well, these judges judged unjustly and did not understand. So, 7
how could it be thought that they possessed the perfections 8
and attributes of God? Further, they were not resurrected be- 9
cause they had not even yet died. In other words, these judges 10
cannot fit the Mormon tenet of when and how men become 11
gods and what being gods includes. So, our Lord calling them 12
“gods” must be limited to their acting as God’s representatives 13
as judges, a function which they did poorly. John 10:34, there- 14
fore, is no evidence for the Mormon doctrine of men becom- 15
ing gods. 16

1 Review Questions for 61-65

- 2 1. In Mormonism who enjoys Godhood?
- 3 2. What shows that the Mormon understanding of John
4 10:16 is incorrect?
- 5 3. Explain John 9:2.
- 6 4. What indicates that Mark 16:16 may not be original?
- 7 5. Why do Mormons think Luke 24:30 supports sex in
8 heaven?
- 9 6. What shows that Judges in Israel while called “gods”
10 were not divine?
- 11 7. What demonstrates that Jesus’ disciples made mistakes
12 and how does that fact relate to John 9:2?

(66). John 16:13: “When He the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth.”

McConkie, Doctrinal NT 1:754, 755 opines that this text means that modern saints can be assured “that the Book of Mormon is true” and “may know the truth of all things.” Once again, Mormons are found ignoring the context of a verse and misapplying it. Who is the referent of “you” to whom the promise is made? It does not say that believers in general will be guided into all truth. It does not say that those in the Mormon “restoration” will be guided into all truth.

Let’s examine the context to see the participants in this exchange. The disciples of Christ at that time are the only participants besides our Lord as 16:4, 17, 18, 19, 29 and so forth indicate. It is the doctrines of first century apostles which is to be followed (Acts 2:42; 2 Timothy 1:13; Jude 17). It is those apostles whose names will be on the “great city” (Revelation 21:14). The goal of the Mormons attributing John 16:14 to the “saints” of modern times is to endow Mormonism with an infallibility which only is due to the writers of the Bible. The Mormon swing at Mormon inerrancy is a complete miss.

(67). Acts 3:21: “whom heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began.”

The revolting Mormon appetite to find biblical references to Mormonism regurgitates itself in Ridges, 195 claim that Peter here is alluding to Joseph Smith’s restoring “the true church of Jesus Christ again to the earth.” How can this be since Peter states that this restoration has been spoken of

1 since the world began? Is Ridges presuming that the proph-
2 ets of God have since the beginning spoken of Joseph Smith's
3 work? Where does that occur?

4 Oh, I forgot that Genesis 50:30, 33 plainly informs that "A
5 seer I will raise up...and his name will be called Joseph and it
6 will be after the name of his father." And Joseph Smith's father
7 name was, of course, Joseph! Wait a minute, you say, Genesis
8 50 has only 26 verses. No, you are mistaken for the inerrant
9 Joseph Smith's "Inspired Version"⁵ has both verses 30 and 36
10 and more. But why must I believe Genesis 50 originally had
11 these? Because the seer Joseph Smith says it did. But how do I
12 know he is a seer? Because verses 30 and 36 in Genesis 50 says
13 he is! It is simple Mormon logic, n'est-ce pas?

14 (68). Acts 8:18, 19: "And when Simon saw that through the lay-
15 ing on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given, he of-
16 fered them money, saying, 'Give me this power also, that any-
17 one on whom I lay hands may receive the Spirit.'"

18 Gospel Principles, 82 tells its readers that Simon was trying
19 to buy the priesthood. Now, we can recall that Mormonism
20 teaches that there are two degrees of priesthood, but the lay-
21 ing on of hands can be performed only by members of the
22 greater Melchizedek priesthood (Ludlow, 336); at the time of
23 the event in Acts 8, Mormons claim, the Melchizedek priest-
24 hood and its keys were only held by the chief apostles, Peter,
25 James, and John. After centuries of apostasy, these three,
26 Mormons claim, restored to their most deserving prophet
27 Joseph Smith that priesthood (Millet, Beliefs 442), and now
28 other Mormons can enjoy the powers of the priesthood.. But

in Mormon doctrine, only men can become Mormon priests 1
 (Ridges, 252; Gospel Principles, 81. 2

It is quite true that Christians are referred to in the New 3
 Testament as priests: (for example, 1 Peter 2:5,9). But note: (1) To 4
 whom was Peter in his first letter (1:1,2) addressing? It was to 5
 “pilgrims of the dispersion” to the “elect.” Does that not include 6
 women? (2) Peter says nothing about two degrees of priest- 7
 hood (Aaronic and Melchizedek). (3) the Bible nowhere says 8
 that only three persons only were at any time the only mem- 9
 bers of the greater priesthood. (4) In fact, the New Testament 10
 does not call any follower of Christ a Melchizedek priest (or, 11
 for that matter, an Aaronic priest either). These are reasons for 12
 me to doubt the story that three apostles appeared to Joseph 13
 Smith and conferred on him the priesthood. Mormonism’s 14
 fables are its foundation. 15

(69). Acts 17:29: “Therefore, since we are the offspring of God.” 16

Concerning this very verse, Ridges, 88 remarkably 17
 comments, 18

Those who live worthy to become gods (D&C 19
 132:20) will live as husbands and wives eter- 20
 nally and will have the blessing of eternal in- 21
 crease, in other words, of having an unlimited 22
 number of spirit children...As gods, they will 23
 create worlds for their spirit children. 24

It will be observed that Ridges bases his interpretation 25
 on what his “inspired” prophet expounded in Doctrines and 26
 Covenants and not on any teaching in the Bible. Acts 17:29 27

1 does not refer to God birthing our spirits in heaven with the
2 compliance of His wife or wives because the context (verse 26,
3 28) plainly indicates that Paul's referent is men on earth not
4 "spirit children" in heaven.

5 Further, there is no exegetical justification to connect Acts
6 17:29 with the Mormon doctrine of eternal marriage, men
7 becoming gods, birthing heavenly spirit children, or creat-
8 ing worlds for these children to inhabit. Can the reader not
9 without feeling it humorous imagine worlds being created for
10 "spirit children" who will then create more worlds for their
11 "spirit children" and so on and so on? But, in reality, we should
12 not see humor in the Mormon doctrines since so many are de-
13 ceived by it. But why wouldn't they? Who would not want to
14 become a god? But only good Mormons are deified.

15 (70). Romans 3:24: "Being justified freely by His grace through
16 the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

17 Let's note the inspired Paul's teaching that we are justified
18 by grace through faith:

19 Romans 3:24, "Being justified freely by His grace." Romans
20 5:1, "Being justified by grace." Galatians 2:16, "Justified by faith
21 in Christ." Galatians 3:24, "justified by faith." Titus 3:7, "justi-
22 fied by His grace."

23 And, "by grace through faith" excludes from the Pauline
24 doctrine of salvation the role of works in acquiring justifica-
25 tion: "But to him who does not work but believes on Him who
26 justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness"
27 (Romans 4:5- my emphasis) Of course, we should not say that

one can be saved and go unchanged in his conduct; having
faith changes people.

But, one has cause to wonder at McConkie, Doctrinal NT
2:230 asserting that,

All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations,
oaths, vows, performances, connections, asso-
ciations, or expectations (D&C 132:7) in which
men must abide to be saved and exalted, must
be entered into and performed in righteous-
ness so that the Holy Spirit can justify the can-
didate for salvation.

This Mormon teaching that we are justified by works is
disproven by Paul, the apostle's, own writings. But why would
Mormon leaders wish to indoctrinate their believers that they
must be faithful in all their commitments as good Mormons
to be saved? Why else than to require that Mormon converts
must obey the Mormon leaders completely, Gospel Principles,
49, and so that life of obedience to Mormonism, not by faith in
God's grace, earns justification.

Review Questions for 66-70

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

1. Where does the New Testament teach that men become Melchizedek priests?
2. How do Mormons misunderstand John 16:13?
3. Where are Genesis 50:30, 33 found and what do they teach?
4. What Mormon teaching does the context of Acts 17:29 refute?
5. What indicates that Mormons misunderstand John 16:13?
6. How do Mormons interpret Acts 3:21?
7. According to Paul how are we justified?

(71). Romans 5:19: “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.”

Ludlow 372 opines that this text means that men “will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam’s transgression.” But some may see this as only half right. Certainly, men will be punished for their own sin, but why are men sinners in the first place? How did they get to be that way? Psalm 51:5 suggests that we are sinners from birth. “Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me.” Why is that? Paul’s answer is all people are made sinners “by one man’s disobedience.” “In Adam all die.” (1 Corinthians 15:22). And, sin in us is extensive, “we are “by nature children of wrath” (Ephesians 2:3).

The apostolic motive for noting the unhappy results of Adam’s fall on his posterity is to embrace the glorious effect of Christ’s resurrected salvific accomplishment, “in Christ shall all be made alive” (1 Corinthians 15:22). To underestimate the results of Adam’s fall on us is to deemphasize the power of salvation in Jesus. We magnify our Lord Jesus by confessing the marvelous work He has done for and in us.

(72). Romans 8:17: “And if children, then heirs—heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, if indeed we suffer with Him, that we also may be glorified together.”

Ludlow 226 avers that this text means “all humans are spirit sons and daughters of God, with the potential of inheriting all that the Father has (D&C 84:33-38).” I note that Ludlow must refer to his “inspired” seer to justify his interpretation. His adored prophet asserts, “He that receiveth my Father

1 receiveth my Father's kingdom; therefore, all that My Father
2 hath shall be given him" (D&C 84:38). This, of course, is very
3 much in line with Smith's proclamation to Mormons "you
4 have got to learn how to be Gods yourself."⁶ If one possesses all
5 that the Father has, then that one surely is a God.

6 But what does Paul mean by being an "heir"? Are there any
7 clues in the context? Does the context say we will become om-
8 nipotent or omniscient? Ummm, no! Does it say we will own
9 the cattle on a thousand hills? Ummm no! Does it say that we
10 will rule over princes and kings? Ummm no! Well, what does
11 the context say in regard to our being heirs? It only says we are
12 "eagerly awaiting for the adoption (which is) the redemption
13 of our body" (8:23). How can one get out of that very qualified
14 explanation of being heirs that Paul alludes to our possess-
15 ing all that God has? One cannot unless he subjects himself to
16 the words of Joe Smith as the authoritative, never to be ques-
17 tioned, interpreter of the Bible. And that demonstrates the
18 error in Mormon expositions. Mormon exegesis of the Bible
19 consists first learning how Smith interpreted a verse and then
20 doing likewise.

21 **(73).** Romans 8:29; "For whom He foreknew, He also pre-des-
22 tined to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might
23 be the first born among many brethren."

24 And what is the manner by which God has this foreknowl-
25 edge? Is it not because He is in control of the future? "I ap-
26 pointed ...the things that are coming and shall come." Isaiah
27 44:7) "the purpose of Him who works all things after the coun-
28 cil of His own will (Ephesians 1:11). Please note that the divine

“foreknowledge” should not be understood as just being aware 1
of what events will happen, it means as well, causing those 2
events. This is evidenced by texts as Acts 2:23, 3

Him being delivered by the determined pur- 4
pose and foreknowledge of God, you have tak- 5
en by lawless hands, have crucified, and put to 6
death. (my emphasis) 7

Please take notice that this text does not say that those cru- 8
cifying Christ were known by God as “spirit children” in their 9
pre-mortal state as evil doers in heaven and by that knowl- 10
edge God foreknew the bad acts which they would do after 11
donning bodies. Neither does Romans 8:29 suggest that God 12
knew the elect as well behaved “spirit children” in heaven and 13
so, therefore, predestined them for salvation. Can we not see 14
that these texts contain no proof of the Mormon doctrine of 15
man’s pre-existence? 16

Now, regarding divine foreknowledge Hopkins, 104 17
blathers, 18

During man’s pre-existence, God was able to 19
observe each individual and their choices. He 20
became completely and perfectly acquainted 21
with each personality so that He “foreknew” 22
the choices that they would make on earth. 23

What we see in Hopkins’ exposition is the Mormon ef- 24
fort to place LDS teaching into the Bible that is not there. 25
Neither Romans 8:29 nor any other biblical text states that 26
God watched our behavior as pre-mortal “spirit children” and 27

1 by keeping track of our heavenly behavior became enabled
2 to foreknow our choices and activities on earth. The Mormon
3 doctrine is pure hogwash. But, perhaps, I am unjustly criticiz-
4 ing Hopkins since his explanation perfectly fits with his “in-
5 spired” prophet’s babblings that “Man also was in the begin-
6 ning with God” (D&C 93:29). Who should blame a Mormon for
7 inserting his prophet’s teachings into biblical texts which do
8 not in actuality support the “prophet’s” pronouncements? If
9 Hopkins did not, how could he remain a Mormon?

10 (74). Romans 9:13: “As it is written, ‘Jacob have I loved, but Esau
11 I have hated.’”

12 The Mormon aversion to God’s predestination, which is a
13 doctrine in Scripture based only on the divine prerogative, is
14 again shown in McConkie, Doctrinal NT 2:277 saying of this
15 verse,

16 God chose Jacob over Esau while the two were
17 yet in Rebecca’s womb and before either, as far
18 as works of this life are concerned, had earned
19 any preferential status. Why? It is a pure mat-
20 ter of pre-existence. Jacob was coming into the
21 world with greater spiritual capacity than Esau.

22 But does this interpretation fit Paul’s explanation in the
23 passage? How could it when verses 11 and 16 teach that elec-
24 tion is not based on works but on divine mercy? Mormonism
25 wishes us to believe that our election is due to our good choic-
26 es made in our pre-existence. But the apostle denies that by
27 insisting that our election is based on divine grace not on our

works. Note further what I now am is not due to what I formerly was in my pre-existence but because God “made me like this” (verse 20). 1
2
3

(75). Romans 12:1: “I beseech you therefore brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy acceptable to God which is your reasonable service” (my emphasis). 4
5
6
7

The incredibly self-centered interpretations of the Bible to support Mormon principles exudes through Gospel Principles, 173 application of this verse to Mormon converts. Does Romans 12:1 mean present your brain to God think holy thoughts? Oh no. Does it mean present your voice to God to speak praises of Him? Oh no. Does it mean to present your time and energy to labor in the vineyards of the Divine? Oh no. What Romans 12:1 means “is to be willing to give everything we have for the Church of the Latter-Day Saints (my emphasis). Leave it to the Mormon writers to confuse what is due only to God with what must be given to the Mormon establishment. 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Review Questions for 71-75

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
1. Define our adoption in Romans 8:23.
 2. What does Acts 2:23 tell us about God's foreknowledge?
 3. Why is every human a sinner?
 4. Explain how Mormon exegesis is done.
 5. Why is the Mormon interpretation of Romans 9:13 incorrect?
 6. Explain the meaning of "heir" in Romans 8:17, and how Mormons misunderstand this verse.
 7. What should good Mormons be willing to do according to LDS teaching on Romans 12:1?

(76). 1 Corinthians 6:19 “Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is within you.”

And who or what is God’s Spirit? In remarking on the nature of our salvation I see the need to define God for it is He who saves us which salvation includes His indwelling. It is manifest that Mormons wish us to believe that the “Persons” in the Godhead are not three subsistences united in one Being. Instead, They are separate Beings with a common purpose. And, one of these Beings indwells each believer according to this verse. But, exactly who is the Holy Spirit if He is a separate Being from the Father and the Son?

Ludlow, 231 provides the answer: “The Holy Ghost is a spirit man, a spirit son of GOD THE FATHER” (his caps). The Holy Spirit is a man? Well, why not since the Father and Son also are men. But there seems to be a couple of problems with Ludlow’s thesis. First, if the Holy Ghost is a man, then how does one man indwell millions of Christians simultaneously since as 3 and others above show the Mormon position that God is spatial not everywhere at once. And second, where does the Bible ever say that the Spirit is the Father’s child? It doesn’t! Ludlow’s teaching is yet another example of Mormon fabrication of doctrines not in Scripture.

(77). 1 Corinthians 15:22: “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive.”

Mormons teach that all men have become immortal because of Christ’s atoning work. But, immortality is not eternal life. The former, Ludlow, 242-244 teaches, merely means living forever, but the latter means living in a resurrected condition

1 in God's presence and becoming like God. Immortality, Ludlow
2 continues, is a free gift of grace, but eternal life is "predicated
3 upon obedience to the fullness of Gospel law and ordinances
4 (D&C 29:43, 44; 130:21,22).

5 These sentiments are unbiblical. Eternal life is a gift
6 (Romans 6:23), it is not earned. Whoever believes in the Son
7 (not whoever keeps Mormon ordinances) has eternal life
8 (John 3:15). He who has the Son has eternal life (1 John 5:11,
9 12). The Mormon distinction between immortality and eter-
10 nal life while supported by the LDS tenet of three kingdoms
11 in the after- life and the Mormon tactic of offering exaltation
12 to those in the third kingdom who were obedient to Mormon
13 principles and practices is far from the Doctrine of "by grace
14 through faith" so often taught in the New Testament.

15 **(78).** 1 Corinthians 15:29: "Otherwise, what will they do who
16 are baptized for the dead, if the dead do not rise at all? Why
17 then are they baptized for the dead?"

18 Millet, *Claiming Christ*, 199, 200 reminds his readers that
19 his "inerrant" prophet, Joseph Smith declared that those who
20 have not heard the Gospel in this life must hear it in the next
21 life in order to be judged, but that upon their accepting the
22 Gospel in the afterlife, someone in this life must be baptized
23 in water for them. Millett alludes to 1 Corinthians 15:29 as evi-
24 dence for his doctrine.

25 However, let's consider several counters to this interpreta-
26 tion. First, given that untold millions have died without hear-
27 ing the Gospel and so have not been baptized, and if baptism
28 by the living could be done efficiently for the dead, would

one not reason that the Bible would be full of references to 1
 this practice? Why is there but a single reference to it if the 2
 doctrine is so important as to make it a temple rite? There are 3
 many references to water baptism in the New Testament. Why 4
 do none of these mention baptism for the dead? Why is there 5
 no command to the baptizand, “now that you are baptized go 6
 on and be baptized repeatedly for the dead”? Second, observe 7
 that Paul does not say that he or the Corinthians baptized for 8
 the dead. Instead, a non-identified “they” do. Third, the phrase 9
 “for the dead” may not mean “on behalf of the dead.” Perhaps it 10
 means being baptized so as to be reunited with one’s beloved 11
 dead. 12

(79). 1 Corinthians 15:40: “There are also celestial bodies and 13
 terrestrial bodies; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the 14
 glory of the terrestrial is another.” 15

I have already suggested that the Mormon exposition of 16
 the Bible is much based not on sound hermeneutical princi- 17
 ples but instead on making sure that Mormon interpretation 18
 of Scriptures coincides with the “inspired” prophet, Joseph 19
 Smith, opinions on the meaning of biblical texts. This prac- 20
 tice is quite evident in McConkie, Doctrinal NT 2:398-400. For 21
 instead of examining the context for clues to understanding 22
 Paul, McConkie instead chooses to directly quotes two pages 23
 of Joe Smith’s expounding that the apostle’s referent is de- 24
 grees of glory enjoyed in the afterlife. But the very next verse 25
 (15:41) shows that by “celestial” bodies Paul refers to the moon 26
 and the stars not to heavenly kingdoms. 27

1 (80). Ephesians 1:4: "Just as He chose us in Him before the
2 foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without
3 blame before Him in love."

4 Hopkins, 104 instructs his readers that this verse means
5 that in our pre-mortal state as "spirit children," God was able
6 to observe our choices and on that basis He predestinated us.
7 Hopkins is desirous to uphold the LDS doctrine of man's "free
8 agency", this is, that our choices are only our own and are not
9 under the control of outside forces. So, predestination only
10 based on God's choice as understood by many Protestants, is
11 a false doctrine (McConkie, Mormon Doctrine, 28). However,
12 pay close attention to the context of this verse. God's will is
13 alluded to in 1:5 as the basis of predestination. God's purpose
14 is the basis of predestination in 1:11. "God," it says, "works all
15 things according to the counsel of His will." Where is man's
16 free agency" here referenced? It is not!

17 To compound the argument against the Mormon doctrine
18 of "free agency" observe that it is not man's will but God's will
19 which is the cause of our being chosen. God chose Israel first,
20 Israel did not choose God first (Deuteronomy 7:6). Christ chose
21 the 12 first, they did not choose Him first (John 15:16). And
22 God first chooses men for salvation (2 Thessalonians 2:13), we
23 did not choose Him first! We love God because He first loved
24 us! (1 John 4:19). The Mormon interpretation of Ephesians 1:4
25 is not biblical.

Review Questions for 75-80	1
1. How does Ephesians 1:11 contradict the Mormon interpretation of Ephesians 1:4?	2 3
2. Explain the difference between immortality and eternal life in Mormonism and how is each said to be acquired?	4 5
3. What is the Holy Spirit (Ghost) according to Mormon doctrine and what biblical doctrine refutes that?	6 7
4. Which Mormon teaching does 2 Thessalonians 2:13 refute?	8 9
5. In Mormonism what does “free agency” mean, and how does Deuteronomy 7:6 contradict that belief?	10 11
6. How does one obtain eternal life according to Mormonism?	12 13
7. Why does Romans 6:23 contradict a Mormon teaching?	14

1 (81). Ephesians 3:15: "From whom the whole family in heaven
2 and earth is named."

3 Smith, *The Way to Perfection* 256 imagines that this verse
4 proves that there are family organizations in heaven. The
5 strong urge to find in the smallest phrases in the Bible support
6 for vast series of Mormon doctrines whether they are there or
7 not is here demonstrated. The Father has the human family
8 named after Him because He is their Creator and Redeemer.
9 The text is not evidence for family units in heaven but for
10 some members of the human family being in heaven and oth-
11 er members being yet on earth.

12 (82). Philippians 3:21: "Who will transform our lowly body
13 that it might be conformed to His glorious body."

14 This is another text which is understood by Mormon writ-
15 ers to be an evidence of the deification of men. Millet, *Getting*
16 *at the Truth*, 114, 115 opines that this verse means, as his in-
17 errant prophet claimed, men "become like God." While Millet
18 tones down the boldness of that tenet by asking whether
19 exalted men receive all of the divine powers or not, other
20 Mormons are not so shy about what they include in human
21 deification.

22 I can illustrate that in several Mormon writings. Ludlow,
23 *159* explains that exaltation means "receiving power to do
24 what God does." According to Millet, *LDS Beliefs*, 199 exaltation
25 results in "having all things subject to them." And, McConkie,
26 *Mormon Doctrine* 257 insists that an exalted person, has "all
27 power in heaven and earth (D7c 76:50-60; 93:1-40)." But where
28 are such promises of grandeur given in texts as Luke 23:43,

John 14:3, or 1 Peter 1:4? The Mormon doctrine of exaltation has no support in the Bible. 1
2

(83). 1 Timothy 2:6: "Who gave Himself a ransom for all." 3

Talmage, Articles of Faith, 477 explains the Mormon view on redemption in Christ: 4
5

We believe that through the sufferings, death, 6
and atonement of Jesus Christ all mankind 7
without one exception. are to be completely and 8
fully redeemed, both in body and in spirit from 9
the endless banishment and curse to which 10
they were assigned by Adam's transgression.; 11
and that this universal salvation and redemp- 12
tion of the whole human family from the end- 13
less penalty of original sin is effected without 14
any conditions whatever on their part; that is, 15
they are not required to repent or believe. 16

However, one need not research far in the Bible to find 17
Scriptures to contradict this Mormon persuasion: Acts 16:29, 18
30, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved? Believe on the Lord Jesus 19
Christ and you will be saved. Romans 10:9, "If you confess 20
with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart 21
that God has raised Him from the dead, you will be saved." 22
Ephesians 2:8, "By grace you have been saved through faith." 23
The Mormon teachings of universal salvation and salvation 24
without belief in Christ, like so many others, are unbiblical. 25

1 (84). 1 Timothy 3:2: “A bishop must be blameless, the husband
2 of one wife.”

3 McConkie, Doctrinal NT 3:81 remarks that it is fine for
4 certain special persons to have plural marriage in the new
5 and everlasting covenant. But why would McConkie, in di-
6 rect contradiction to Paul’s requirement, say that it is OK for
7 church leaders to have multiple wives? He must teach that be-
8 cause his inerrant, though lustful, prophet claimed that God
9 wanted him to have more wives than just Emma. D&C 132:52,
10 “And let My handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that
11 have been given unto My servant Joseph.” Smith uses God like
12 a puppet. God says what Smith tells Him to say! God doesn’t
13 speak through Smith; Smith speaks through God.

14 (85). Titus 1:2: “in hope of eternal life which God, who cannot
15 lie, promised before time began.”

16 As the text says that God’s promise was before time began,
17 Ludlow, 439 teaches “In the premortal state, spirits received
18 their first lessons in the gospel and the work of God that they
19 would do on the earth. But that opinion is belied by the ex-
20 periences of believers who are said to be taught on earth not
21 in heaven: (Acts 11:26; Colossians 2:7; 2 Thessalonians 2:15).
22 Nowhere does the Bible say that we were taught in pre-mor-
23 tality in heaven.

Review Questions for 81-85	1
1. How did Smith use God as a puppet?	2
2. What Mormon teaching might Colossians 2:7 refute?	3
3. Explain why Ephesians 3:15 does not prove there are families in heaven.	4 5
4. Who was Emma, and what supposedly did God tell her to do?	6 7
5. What is included in man's deification according to Mormonism?	8 9
6. How does Acts 16:30 refute a Mormon doctrine?	10
7. Who is redeemed according to Mormonism?	11

1 (86). Hebrews 7:17: "For He testifies: You are a priest forever
2 according to the order of Melchizedek."

3 MConkie, Doctrinal NT 3: 171 supposes that this text proves
4 that Mormon men can acquire the Melchizedek priesthood
5 and by that acquisition "confer the gift of the Holy Ghost" and
6 enable persons to marry for eternity. This Mormon doctrine
7 runs counter to the meaning of this verse as shown by cross
8 references to it.

9 Who is the only one identified as being a Melchizedek
10 priest in this text? Plainly it is not Mormon men. The verse
11 is a quotation of Psalm 110:1, 4 which limits that priesthood
12 to "my Lord"! Furthermore, look at Hebrews 5:6, "You are My
13 Son...a priest forever According to the order of Melchizedek."
14 Mormons have claimed a status which is only due to our Lord,
15 Jesus Christ. Well, why not. If men too are Gods, they must be
16 equal to Christ in every way, right?

17 (87). Hebrews 11:40: "God having provided something better
18 for us, that they should not be made perfect apart from us."

19 McConkie, Doctrinal NT 3:220, in keeping with the LDS te-
20 nets of eternal marriage and the bearing of heavenly "spirit
21 children," interprets the "they" as one's own family. He writes
22 of this verse,

23 Salvation, which is eternal life, consists of the
24 continuation of the family unit in the high-
25 est heaven of the celestial world (D&C 131:1-4;
26 132:1-32). In that blessed realm a perfect patri-
27 archal order will exist with Adam as its head.

It frankly is astonishing how many unbiblical falsehoods 1
 Mormons can insert into a single verse. Neither the context 2
 of Hebrews 11:40 nor the verse itself has references to one's 3
 family in heaven. Neither does it say there is a highest heaven 4
 in the celestial world. Neither does it say that Adam has the 5
 status of being the head of humanity in heaven. So, how does 6
 McConkie arrive at his conclusions? Simple, he references 1 ½ 7
 pages written by his inspired "Prophet" Joe Smith as evidence 8
 for his teaching. We must interpret the Bible just as Joe did 9
 remember. 10

(88). Hebrews 12:23: "To the general assembly and the church 11
 of the first born who are registered in heaven." 12

McConkie, Doctrinal NT 3:230 continues his adulation of 13
 the "Prophet's" inerrant exposition in this verse by alluding to 14
 D&C chapters 76; 77; 78; and, 88. Who constitutes "the church 15
 of the first born"? Is it Catholics? Nope! Is it Protestants? Nope! 16
 Well, is it all Christians, then? Nope! Get ready for another 17
 Mormon delusion: The church of the first born is "Members of 18
 the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints" who devote 19
 themselves to righteousness. But, does the author of Hebrews 20
 say that? No but McConkie's prophet did and that is what re- 21
 ally counts to a Mormon. 22

(89). 1 Peter 1:2: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God 23
 the Father." 24

McConkie, Doctrinal NT 2:268, 269 infuses into verse the 25
 Mormon opining on predestination. God, McConkie says, does 26
 not from all eternity order "whatever comes to pass, having 27

1 especial and particular reference to salvation.” Well, then
2 what determines how men act in this life? McConkie explains
3 that our natures and actions in pre-mortality as “spirit chil-
4 dren” are what motivates God’s election:

5 The Lord foreordained chosen spirit children
6 in pre-existence (He) simply designated certain
7 individuals to perform missions which the Lord
8 in His wisdom knew they had the talents and
9 capacities to do...The mightiest and greatest
10 spirits were foreordained to stand as prophets
11 and spiritual leaders.

12 So, we are ordained what we are to be in this existence
13 because of what we were in our pre-existence? Scriptures
14 as Isaiah 46:10, “I will do all My pleasure” and Ephesians
15 1:11, “Him who works all things after the counsel of His will”
16 which do not mention our pre-existence at all go unnoticed
17 by McConkie here in his zeal to propagate Mormon error. The
18 Bible knows nothing of our preexistence as “spirit children”
19 where we were more or less mighty than our peers. Observe
20 that Job 31:25 teaches that we started life in the womb not in
21 heaven.

22 (90). 1 Peter 3:19: “By whom He also went and preached to the
23 spirits in prison.”

24 McConkie, Doctrinal NT 3:308-312 quotes pages from his
25 most eloquent Joe the “prophet” in order to substantiate his
26 view that this verse means that after Christ’s death Jesus
27 preached to spirits in heaven to redeem the dead. However,

let's interact critically with that opinion. First the word translated "preach" (*kērussō*) in this verse does not necessarily mean a Gospel presentation. In Mark 7:36 the verb is used in regard to informing others of Christ healing a man's deafness. In Revelation 5:2 it relates to opening seals. The common word for preaching the gospel rather is *euongelizō*. Further, 2 Peter 2:4 suggests that those in "prison" are angels. Of course, to defend their position, Mormons claim angels are in fact men.

Review Questions for 86-90

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
1. What Mormon doctrine does Ephesians 1:5 refute?
 2. According to Mormonism who is the head of the human family in heaven?
 3. What shows that *kērussō* may not mean preaching the gospel?
 4. How do Mormons misapply Hebrews 7:17?
 5. What Mormon teaching does Job 31:25 refute?
 6. According to Mormonism why are some ordained to be spiritual leaders?
 7. Who is the “Church of the First Born” according to Mormon doctrine?

(91). 1 Peter 3:20: “who formerly were disobedient, when once the Divine suffering waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was being prepared, in which a few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water.”

In his comments on those living in Noah’s day, McConkie, Doctrinal NTT 3:312 explains,

These particular spirits, the souls of those who lived in Noah’s day were taught the gospel during their mortal probation. ...Hence, even assuming they accept the truth in the spirit world, the highest inheritance available to them is the terrestrial kingdom; they are forever barred from that eternal life found only in the celestial kingdom of heaven. This limitation on the doctrine of the salvation of the dead was revealed to Joseph Smith in the vision of the degrees of glory.

Doctrines not found in the Bible come gushing out of the minds of Mormon writers like broken water faucets. Yes, men were corrupt in the time of Moses, but where does Scripture teach that men in Noah’s day were taught the gospel? Where is Jesus’ sacrificial death and resurrection found in Genesis 8 or even His name? Where does it say that men living in Noah’s time accepted the gospel or did not afterwards in the spirit world? And why should one base his beliefs on Joe Smith’s supposed vision from God instead of what the Bible actually teaches?

1 (92). 1 Peter 4:6: "For this reason the gospel was also preached
2 to those who are dead, that they might be judged according to
3 men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."

4 Millet, *Claiming Christ*, 198 explains that this verse should
5 be understood as meaning that Jesus preached the Gospel to
6 those in a post mortal spirit world, the spirits in prison who
7 had been wicked in the days of Noah. However, this verse
8 need be not saying that the gospel is preached to those now
9 dead; it rather can be understood that deceased persons had
10 the Gospel preached to them before they died. What evidenc-
11 es this interpretation? Scriptures like Matthew 24:14, "And
12 this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in all the world as
13 a witness to all the nations, and then the end will come." The
14 preaching occurs in the world not in the after-life.

15 (93). 2 Peter 1:4: "by which have been given to us exceedingly
16 great and precious promises, that through these you might be
17 partakers of the divine nature."

18 Robinson, *How Wide*, 81 asks, "What could it possibly mean
19 'to partake of the divine nature' if the divine nature is not ex-
20 tended to us and does not become part of us?" But Robinson
21 in asking his question has not checked the context for clues as
22 to the meaning of 1:4. For 1:3 stipulates that God's power pro-
23 vides us with all things pertaining to life and godliness. And,
24 1:5-7 informs that we should add godliness and self-control
25 and kindness to our faith. But how are we made in God's na-
26 ture if by that added nature, we simply are empowered to be
27 godly and not transformed into being gods? And if we need to
28 add godliness to our faith, how can we be thought to possess

in the actual substance of the nature of God? The solution is to understand our being “partakers of the divine nature” as God supplying His power for us to be godly not making us God.

(94). 2 Peter 1:10: “Therefore, brethren be even more diligent to make your call and election sure, for if you do these things you will never stumble.”

But what must we do to make our call and election sure? Ludlow, 55 provides us with that answer. We “must receive the ordinances of the gospel including the temple ordinances.” Temple ordinances were revealed to Adam and Eve in Eden according to the so-called book of Abraham and in the temples of Mormonism accelerated learning occurs and the living are linked to the dead. Millet, 615 suggests that “it may be that the temple endowment and the other temple ordinances form the strongest available evidence of the divine inspiration of the Prophet Joseph Smith.”

Ummm, but let’s recall that the New Testament nowhere refers to Christian temples except our bodies being God’s temples. Also, the Bible says nothing about temples being revealed to Adam and Eve. Nor does the Bible have any reference to the book of Abraham. And finally, where is solid evidence that the living are linked with the dead in Mormon temples? If that unproven claim is “the strongest available evidence” that Joe the “prophet” is inspired, then Mormons should seriously reconsider their beliefs.

(95). 1 John 4:12: “No man has seen God at anytime.”

1 McConkie, Doctrinal NT 3:398 avers that this verse is in-
2 correctly translated. It should read, “No man hath seen God at
3 anytime except them that believe.” Now why does McConkie
4 aver that? It is because his inspired “prophet,” Joe Smith, has
5 translated it in that manner in Smith’s “Inspired Version of the
6 Holy Scriptures.”⁵ As we’ve before asked in regard to another
7 text (#22 above), where in the earliest copies of this verse
8 or the ancient translations of it or in the citations of it in the
9 church fathers do the words, “except them that believe” ap-
10 pear. So, why should anyone accept Joe’s addition to the Bible
11 which have the motive of substantiating Joe’s visions of God?
12 Oh, I forgot, we must accept Joe’s vision because Joe’s transla-
13 tion of 1 John 4:12 states that men can see God. And we must
14 believe that 1 John 4:12 says men can see God because Joe saw
15 God. Simple logic if one is a Mormon!

Review Questions for 91-95	1
1. Explain the meaning of 2 Peter 1:4.	2
2. Where does the New Testament refer to Christian temples as places of worship?	3 4
3. Why is the Mormons interpretation of 1 Peter 3:20 obviously incorrect?	5 6
4. What demonstrates that Joe's translation of 1 John 4:12 is wrong?	7 8
5. What does the so-called book of Abraham teach about Adam and Eve?	9 10
6. What is said to be the strongest evidence that Joe "the prophet" was inspired, and why is that not convincing?	11 12
7. Why does 1 Peter 4:6 not prove that persons in the post-mortal world hear the gospel?	13 14

1 (96). Jude 6: "And the angels who did not keep their proper do-
2 main, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting
3 chains under darkness for the judgement of the great day."

4 Ludlow, 435 explains,

5 The pre-earth life of spirits is called "their first
6 estate in Jude 1:6" (Jude of course only has one
7 chapter!). Latter-Day Saints believe that through
8 the process of BIRTH, the spirit children of God
9 who kept their FIRST ESTATE (premortal) enter
10 into their second estate by receiving a PHYSI-
11 CAL BODY with additional opportunities for
12 experience and development. (his caps)

13 Here is how Mormon interpretation works: Jude 6 states
14 these individuals to be "angels." So, how can Mormons think
15 they are humans? By teaching that "angels are not, as tradi-
16 tional Christians aver, special creations of God. Rather, they
17 are human beings." (Millet, LDS Beliefs, 36). Thus Mormons at-
18 tempt to prove man's pre-existence by misinterpreting Jude 6.
19 But wait, where does the Bible teach angels are men? Millet
20 shows us no biblical proof but instead alludes to D&C 129:1 and
21 other Mormon "scripture." Jude 6 is used as evidence for the
22 LDS tenet of man's premortal existence. But since the verse
23 refers to angels not humans, Mormons must invent the doc-
24 trine that angels are humans. To evidence one invented tenet,
25 Mormons invent yet another one! Mormonism is a series of
26 numerous, feckless, and, unbiblical teachings!

27

(97). Revelation 1:6: “to His God and Father.” 1

McConkie, Doctrinal NT 3:436 reminds his readers that 2
 Joe Smith revealed “with great power” that “there was a God 3
 above the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” McConkie cites his 4
 esteemed prophet Joe as saying “God the Father had a Father, 5
 you may suppose that He had a Father also...I despise the idea 6
 of being scared to death at such a doctrine, for the Bible is full 7
 of it.” Is the Bible full of the doctrine that God the Father had 8
 a Father? Where? It is rather that the Bible teaches that there 9
 is only one God: “Besides Me there is no God” (Isaiah 44:6). The 10
 Mormons teach doctrines which are in direct opposition to the 11
 teachings of the Bible and suppose that clothing them with 12
 Smith’s empty erudition renders these fabricated doctrines 13
 biblical. This text instead provides no hint of the existence of 14
 any grandfather Gods! 15

(98). Revelation 7:4: “One Hundred and forty-four thousand of 16
 all the tribes of Israel” 17

Mormon self-importance is exhausting. McConkie, 18
 Doctrinal NT 3:494 fanciful remark on this text is that 19

The keys and power to restore the Ten Tribes 20
 (of Israel lost in the dispersion) to their former 21
 high status in Israel and to lead them from their 22
 unknown places of lodgement ...were given by 23
 Moses to Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery on 24
 April 3, 1836. 25

1 This assertion is utter nonsense! Where is the proof that
2 Moses gave Joe anything? This is yet another example of
3 Mormons basing their teachings on fairy tails.

4 (99). Revelation 12:7: "And war broke out in heaven: Michael
5 and his angels fought with the dragon."

6 And, who is Michael? Why as Ridges, 188 asserts, "Michael
7 is another name for Adam...Michael (Adam) is immediately
8 under Jesus Christ in the hierarchy of authority over this
9 earth." As if they were in hypnotic trances Mormons mouth
10 out their unbiblical teachings. If my evaluation seems harsh,
11 then please show me where the Bible says that Adam is
12 Michael or that Adam has any authority over the earth. Let
13 the Mormon understanding of Revelation 12:7 stand as the
14 failed test of Mormon interpretation.

15 (100). Revelation 20:13: "Death and Hades delivered up the
16 dead who were with them. And they were judged, each one
17 according to his works."

18 Ludlow, 229 remarks,

19 "Many of these spirits will enter into the TELES-
20 TIAL KINGDOM in their resurrected state...
21 Many have been and many more will yet be,
22 delivered from hell through hearing, repent-
23 ing, and obeying the gospel of Jesus Christ in
24 the spirit world after the death of the body."

You may recall that according to Mormonism the telestial kingdom is reserved for such as murderers who did not repent in mortality. These will be cleansed in a post mortal spirit world before the resurrection. Ludlow, 452.

It would be challenging to compile a list of all the Mormon misinterpretations and false doctrines for just about every verse covered in these 100 is chocked full of Mormon hermeneutical errors. Even regarding Ludlow's comments on Revelation 20:13, where does the Bible say that unbelievers go to a "telestial kingdom"? It rather states that those not believing in Christ are condemned (2 Thessalonians 2:12). Unbelievers are condemned already (John 3:18). The Bible teaches nothing about second chances for those who die in unbelief. Nor does it say that there is a telestial kingdom.

Review Question for 96-100

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

1. Why would Mormons teach that angels are human beings?
2. Who do Mormons say is Michael the Arch Angel?
3. What Mormon teaching does John 3:18 refute?
4. How does Isaiah 44:6 disprove Mormon belief about God the Father?
5. Who inhabits the telestial kingdom according to Mormonism?
6. What is man's "first estate" according to Mormonism?
7. Who was given the power to restore the ten lost tribe of Israel in Mormon belief?

END NOTES FOR CHAPTER 4

1. Joseph Smith, *King Follett Discourse*. 1
2. See discussion in Wayne Grudem. *Systematic Theology* 2
(1994), 714, 715. 3
3. Bruce Metzger. *A Textual Commentary of the New* 4
Testament. 5
6
4. Orson Pratt. *The Seer*. (U.S.A: Eborn Books, 2009), 159. 7
5. Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible 8
(Independence, Mo.: Herald Publishing House, 1970), 9
115, 116. 10
6. King Follet Discourse. 11
7. Smith's "New Translation," 512, 12