

King as token of God's covenant with Israel, LeGrand Baker

Their relationship with God was a covenant relationship,¹ and the king was the living token of that covenant.²

What is more, it is clear from the outset that the king is both dependent upon and responsible to Yahweh for the right exercise of his power; for his subjects, whatever their status in society, are one and all Yahweh's people.³

In our time, most people have never encountered a king who is a ruling monarch, except in a book, or in the movies, or on television. For them the word "king" evokes an image that tends to focus on one of two ends of an imaginary spectrum. Either it is wicked king John who fought brave Robin Hood, or a modern constitutional monarch whom some think of as more decorative than useful. But in ancient Israel a king was something quite different from anything anywhere along that imaginary spectrum. A king who was the ruling monarch of Israel, was, first of all, a representative of God, as such he was a son of God. He was not the "head of state," he was the state personified.^{4 5} His decrees were the only legislation; his power was the only executive authority; his wisdom was that of the chief judge; and he was the nation's highest of high priests.⁶

1 Psalms 89:27-30. Stephen D. Ricks, "The Treaty/Covenant Pattern in King Benjamin's Address (Mosiah 1-6)," *BYU Studies*, 24:2, 1984, p. 151-162.

2 Sigmund Mowinckel, translated by A.P. Thomas, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2 Vols., Abingdon, Nashville, 1962, vol. 1, p. 50-61.

3 Aubrey R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 1967, p. 8.

4 Carlo Zaccagnini, "Sacred and Human Components in Ancient Near Eastern Law," in *History of Religions* (33:3, February 1994), 265-286.

5 For a discussion of the Israelite government of the Old Testament see, Stuart A. Cohen, "Kings, Priests, and Prophets, Patterns of Constitutional Discourse and Constitutional Conflict in Ancient Israel," in Zvi Gitelman, *The Quest for Utopia, Jewish Political Ideas and Institutions through the Ages* (Armonk, New York, M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1992), 17-40.

6 "The Davidic dynasty acted as the true heirs of the ancient king of Jerusalem, Melchizedek, at once priest and king." Sigmund Mowinckel, *He that Cometh* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), 75. Writing of the king as the nation's religious leader, Mowinckel observed, "This transition becomes still more easily comprehensible if, as certain things indicate, David's new priest in Jerusalem, Zadok, was descended from the ancient race of priest kings, of whom Melchizedek was a representative. David and his successors were professedly 'priests' after the order of Melchizedek ('for the sake of Melchizedek'), as we hear in Ps. 110." Sigmund Mowinckel, translated by A.P. Thomas, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 2 Vols. (Nashville, Abingdon, 1962), vol. 1:133.

Nelson also understands the rise of Zadok to have something behind it other than right by descent of birth. He writes, "Beneath the surface of the OT remain traces of competition among rival priestly families, but the Deuteronomistic History (Dtr) demonstrates little partisan interest in these controversies. For example, Dtr makes no effort to produce complete genealogies for either the Elides or the Zadokites. The 'father' of Eli's house remains mysteriously unspecified in 1 Sam. ii 27. The genealogy offered for Zadok is notoriously problematic (2 Sam. viii 17). Moreover, in spite of this ostensible concern with the 'faithful priest' Zadok (1 Sam. ii 35), Dtr fails to provide genealogical links between him and later Jerusalem priests." "Whatever the facts about Zadok's lineage, Dtr would simply have taken his Levitical descent for granted, and in this he may actually have been correct...Zadok replaces the Aaronic Abiathar without Dtr feeling any need to provide him with an Aaronic genealogy." Richard D. Nelson, "The Role of the Priesthood in the Deuteronomistic History," in *Congress Volume, Leuven, 1989* (Leiden, E.J. Brill for the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, 1989), 132, 135.

Oooooooooooooo

LLB = Kingship in 2 Ne. 5:16-34

2 Nephi, chapter 5:16-34

In the fifth chapter of Second Nephi we have the of the ancient Israelite New Year's enthronement festival. They are not there, because describing the festival was not Nephi's purpose, but the festival is the context from which he is writing, and that context simply reveals itself in what he writes.

v. 16 And I, Nephi, did build a temple; and I did construct it after the manner of the temple of Solomon save it were not built of so many precious things; for they were not to be found upon the land, wherefore, it could not be built like unto Solomon's temple. But the manner of the construction was like unto the temple of Solomon; and the workmanship thereof was exceedingly fine.

In the ancient Near East, kings built temples. Indeed, the building of a new temple was a necessary beginning to a new dynasty. Nephi does not say "we built a temple," he says "I, Nephi, did build a temple." In so saying he is assuming the prerogative and responsibility of an anointed king.

The temple, he says, is built after the pattern and manner of construction of Solomon's temple, except it was not built of so many precious things. But he has just told us in the preceding verse,

And I did teach my people to build buildings, and to work in all manner of wood, and of iron, and of copper, and of brass, and of steel, and of gold, and of silver, and of precious ores, which were in great abundance.

So the precious things the temple lacked, was not the gold which adorned the interior of the temple and covered the cherubim throne in the Holy of Holies, nor was it the gold and silver implements which were used in the temple service. So it must have been the material from which the temple itself was constructed. Our Bible, and one may presume the Brass Plates also, gives a detailed account of the construction of Solomon's temple. It says

And the king commanded, and they brought great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones, to lay the foundation of the house. And Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders did hew them, and the stonesquarers: so they prepared timber and stones to build the house. (2 Kings 5: 17-18)

Such a labor would have been beyond the ability of Nephi and his colony. The stone like that which Solomon used was not available either because it did not exist there, or because it was in the mountain and could not be gotten out. The giant cedars of Lebanon which Solomon imported to construct his temple, simply did not grow where Nephi was. So the Nephite temple was probably built of wood, rather than stone. That bothers Nephi, but he is still very proud of the result.

The dimensions of the temple of Solomon are given in the scriptures, so Nephi and his builders could have followed those with some accuracy. Notwithstanding those details, in our day, the description in the Bible is not sufficient for one to know what the temple looked like. But for Nephi and his people that would not have been a problem. They had been in Jerusalem and seen the original.

The most sacred part of the temple was the Holy of Holies with the throne of God at its back wall. The throne had winged cherubim on each side. Their wings reached either side and to the top of the room, which was about 16 feet high.

Temples in the ancient Near East were dedicated during the New Year's festival. In Palestine this occurred in the fall of the year, in October or November. During that time the Feast of Tabernacles was culminated by the enthronement of the king. Mormon scholars have shown that King Benjamin's address and the enthronement of his son Mosiah took place during such a festival.

It is entirely expectable that at the conclusion of the temple construction and in connection with its dedication, the question would arise about whether Nephi would accept the title of king. Nephi rejected the title, but rejoiced in the fact that it was offered to him. Before the offer was made he had served as though he were king.

v. 18 And it came to pass that they would that I should be their king. But I, Nephi, was desirous that they should have no king; nevertheless, I did for them according to that which was in my power.

v. 19 And behold, the words of the Lord had been fulfilled unto my brethren, which he spake concerning them, that I should be their ruler and their teacher. Wherefore, I had been their ruler and their teacher, according to the commandments of the Lord, until the time they sought to take away my life.

In ancient Israel the king had three main functions. First, he was commander in chief of the armies, and responsible for all international relations. Second, he was judge of the people, functioning much the way Americans think of the Supreme Court. That is, he was the court of last appeal. Third, he was something like the president of the church. The priests and Levites took care of the routine matters of daily sacrifice and services, but on special occasions the king could conduct and perform sacrifices. He could use the Urim and Thummim, and he could go into the Holy of Holies and speak with God. Near the conclusion of the Feast of Tabernacles he gave a lecture on the nature and power of the Law of Moses, and thus was the chief teacher, as well as the chief priest and prophet.

and after he rejected the crown, he continued to do so for a short time.

v. 26 And it came to pass that I, Nephi, did consecrate Jacob and Joseph, that they should be priests and teachers over the land of my people.

v. 27 And it came to pass that we lived after the manner of happiness.

v. 28 And thirty years had passed away from the time we left Jerusalem.

v. 29 And I, Nephi, had kept the records upon my plates, which I had made, of my people thus far.

v. 30 And it came to pass that the Lord God said unto me: Make other plates; and thou shalt engraven many things upon them which are good in my sight, for the profit of thy people.

v. 31 Wherefore, I, Nephi, to be obedient to the commandments of the Lord, went and made these plates upon which I have engraven these things.

v. 32 And I engraved that which is pleasing unto God. And if my people are pleased with the things of God they will be pleased with mine engravings which are upon these plates.

v. 33 And if my people desire to know the more particular part of the history of my people they must search mine other plates.

v. 34 And it sufficeth me to say that forty years had passed away, and we had already had wars and contentions with our brethren.

Ooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo

Kingship – legitimacy, letter to Jonathan Cannon

7071 University Station
Provo, Utah 84602
14 November, 1997

Elder Jonathan Cannon
Via Gavinana 17
21052 Busto Arsizio (VA) Italy

Dear Jonathan,

Your mother is kind enough to send me copies of some of your letters. I enjoy being able to share some of the experiences of your mission with them.

I am delighted at how much you enjoy your mission and love the people whom the Lord has asked you to serve. I suspect one of the richest blessings of being a missionary is that it comes closer to teaching you what it means to live the law of consecration than any other experience you will have for a long time. In the mission field you may give, and give, and give, with no possible hope of being given to in return. You have nothing to earn, no profit to make, not even a gift you can expect in exchange for what you give. You may love others and learn that their letting you love them is a great blessing to you. If they learn to love you in return that is another, and different blessing, but even that you cannot expect. So you go about giving everything you have and everything you are to others for no better reward than to see them happy. That, you will ultimately learn, is the most important thing in life (this one, the last one, or the one to come), and the training you now receive for that is the best possible training.

Some time ago I received a letter from a friend who is also on a mission. He asked me some good questions. I don't know that my answers were as good as his questions, but I thought you might like to think about the questions, if not the answers. My response to Michael reads:

I have been too long responding to your letter. At first I didn't answer it because I wasn't sure how, after that I got lazy. I apologize for that.

It's been long enough that you probably don't remember what you wrote, so I'll remind you.

I have a question. It has to do with the priesthood. In the beginning of the book of Alma, Alma goes to preach the gospel. Many times it says that Alma went to preach "according to the holy order of God." (Alma 8:4, for example) This means his work was very closely connected with the priesthood. I know the priesthood, with respect to missionary work, is more than just permission to teach the gospel and administer the ordinances. It's more than giving blessings of health. So my question is, What exactly is the connection between the priesthood and missionary work, and how can my priesthood help me be a better missionary (baptize more families)?

It's that last question I tizzied about -- and still don't know how to answer. I'll try the others though.

Even though Alma did not have the title of king, he was functioning as both king and priest. In ancient Israel, before Lehi left Jerusalem and the Jews were taken to Babylon, the king was (Some kings were apostate, so for them this is true in theory rather than in fact) not only the head of state, he was also the chief prophet and High Priest. After the Babylonian captivity, when the Jews had no king, the High Priest took over the chief religious duties. But before that, the Psalms suggest, the early kings had the Melchizedek Priesthood. David used the Urim and Thummim just as he would had he been the prophet. Hezekiah received a letter from the Assyrian king, took it into the Holy of Holies, laid it on the throne of God and essentially said, "Here read this. Now tell me what I supposed to do to keep the Assyrians out of Jerusalem."

The king's enthronement anointing was the same ordinance by which he was adopted as a son of Jehovah. As his son, he could sit on the throne of God, act in Jehovah's place in matters of state, and especially in judging the people. He alone was the Supreme Court, and his primary duty in times of peace was to "judge righteous judgement."

So Alma, having given the administrative responsibilities of kingship (including civil and criminal judge) to the Chief Judge, but retaining the ecclesiastical powers of kingship (prophet, High Priest, and judge in religious matters) set out to exercise his authority, as it was his obligation to do. What we find in his sermons is the his defining the law by which the people will be judged. He says if he does not make this clear to them, then the consequences of their sins will be upon him, but after they are warned, then he and God can judge them according to the law they have been taught. Thus Alma rules (judges - makes a ruling) the church as president (king: giver of law, judge, prophet and High Priest). His right to do so rests on his sonship — being a rightful heir to God.

The king's legitimacy rested on five propositions, all of which were demonstrated in an eight day endowment session which he and all the people shared once each year during the New Year's festival. It was a given that he knew the scriptures and the Law of Moses, for he was the personification of the Law.

Those requirements for legitimacy were these: 1) He had to have been called by God at the Council in Heaven. 2) He had to have the correct genealogy (yours is demonstrated when you received your Patriarchal Blessing). 3) He was anointed to become king and given a new name. 4) He had to be shown to be acceptable to God. 5) He had to receive the necessary ordinances (washing, anointing, clothing, crowning) in the temple.

That is how, why, and by what authority "Alma went to preach 'according to the holy order of God.'" The question of how you use your priesthood to be a missionary is a somewhat different matter. The chief differences are 1) that you are not the President of the Church and 2) the people you are talking to are not already members of the church. But there are also a great many similarities:

The requirements of legitimacy (except those associated with his final anointing and crowning) you have met. You are not *thee* Prophet, but you have the Gift of the Holy Ghost and are obligated to speak as it instructs, and to whom it instructs. The people you are to teach are not already members of the church, so do not have the burden of having already made covenants *in this life*. But neither you nor they know what covenants they made before they came here, or what covenants you made in association with theirs. That means both you and they are walking in the dark — but you, and they when they listen, have the Holy Ghost which functions as a light in the darkness. You may know those to whom you must speak even if they do not know you. Whether they listen when you speak is not your responsibility. That you be at the right place and say the right thing is your responsibility. The Holy Ghost will take care of that. All you have to do is listen and obey.

Paul's promise (Ephesians 1) that God has enough power to help you keep those covenants, is

sufficient to ensure your success, unless you choose not to succeed. So it is really true that all you have to do is listen and obey. If you do that, the priesthood power which gives you the authority to teach will also be sufficient to assure you the power to teach. In a somewhat related vein, I wrote a note to put in last week's Book of Mormon project. I'll add it in case it has any value.

[1 Ne. 17:7, 27 Oct 97, LeGrand Baker,]

...after I, Nephi, had been in the land of Bountiful for the space of many days, the voice of the Lord came unto me saying: Arise, and get thee into the mountain. And it came to pass that I arose and went up into the mountain, and cried unto the Lord.

There is much one can learn from that seemingly incidental part of Nephi's story. Its importance is emphasized by its being repeated over and over again throughout the scriptures and sacred history.

The Brother of Jared was told to come to the mountain. Jesus took Peter, James and John to the Mount of Transfiguration to receive their endowments. Elijah went to the mountain of God on his own, but expected to find God there when he arrived. Nephi went to his backyard and climbed on his private tower (which turned out not to be so private as he had anticipated). Enoch told his family he was going to go to bed and have a vision. They were not to come into the room until it was over. Joseph Smith went into a grove; he does not say the Spirit instructed him to do so; only that he had given some thought to where he should go to pray. The night Moroni came, he waited until the family had all gone to sleep, then knelt beside his bed, fully expecting to receive a revelation. Joseph F. Smith "sat in my room pondering over the scriptures" when he received the vision of the redemption of the dead which is section 138.

The places are different. Not everyone has immediate access to the quietude of a mountain. But that, as far as I can tell, is not the point. The point is this: When the Spirit says "stop what you are doing and go for a walk," or "go to your room," or "sit quietly and listen." Then one should obey.

We take the sacrament weekly as a token of the covenant that we will do our part to have the Spirit always be with us, but we sometimes get too busy to listen when he is there. That is like walking in the mountains with a friend--and ceaselessly talking about a football game or about politics all the way going and coming--and never really having been with the friend in the mountain at all.

We often get on our knees and expect the Lord to answer our questions just then, while we are taking the minute to talk to him. We grunt and groan inside, trying to get as "spiritual" as we can for the experience. Nothing happens and we go away disappointed.

Or else we let our own enthusiasm get in the way of our listening and go away convinced that the Lord shares that enthusiasm and that he approves of whatever it was we tried to convince him to sanction. (Then when it doesn't turn out, we respond incredulously, "But I prayed!")

Or else we kneel down with our hearts so full of sorrow, or disappointment, or fear that those feelings take up all the space in our soul; and we go away thinking that we have had "a stupor of thought" so that must be God's answer.

Prayer is this: Forever walking in a mountain with a friend. Stopping sometimes, together, to admire a columbine. Sometimes being so caught up in the urgent majesty of it all that one doesn't remember his friend is even there, but without an empty place within--because one knows he IS and that he is there. Sometimes stopping to talk together--listening and talking, talking and listening. Sometimes just needing to talk and talk and know that you are being listened to. Sometimes filling one's mind by listening to what he has to say. Sometimes filling ones' whole soul by just knowing that you are together.

Our world tends to crowd out such prayer, and I suppose, since we live here, that must be so. But when the time comes when the Spirit whispers, "Arise, and get thee into the mountain," it is time to go, and visit with a friend.

My love always,

LeGrand

7071 University Station
Provo, Utah 84602
14 November, 1997

Elder Andrew Cannon
8500 Papa,
Varga Utca 12
Hungary

Dear Andrew,

Your mother is kind enough to send me copies of some of your letters. I enjoy being able to share some of the experiences of your mission with them.

I am delighted at how much you enjoy your mission and love the people whom the Lord has asked you to serve. I suspect one of the richest blessings of being a missionary is that it comes closer to teaching you what it means to live the law of consecration than any other experience you will have for a long time. In the mission field you may give, and give, and give, with no possible hope of being given to in return. You have nothing to earn, no profit to make, not even a gift you can expect in exchange for what you give. You may love others and learn that their letting you love them is a great blessing to you. If they learn to love you in return that is another, and different blessing, but even that you cannot expect. So you go about giving everything you have and everything you are to others for no better reward than to see them happy. That, you will ultimately learn, is the most important thing in life (this one, the last one, or the one to come), and the training you now receive for that is the best possible training.

Some time ago I received a letter from a friend who is also on a mission. He asked me some good questions. I don't know that my answers were as good as his questions, but I thought you might like to think about the questions, if not the answers. My response to Michael reads: I have been too long responding to your letter. At first I didn't answer it because I wasn't sure how, after that I got lazy. I apologize for that.

It's been long enough that you probably don't remember what you wrote, so I'll remind you.

I have a question. It has to do with the priesthood. In the beginning of the book of Alma, Alma goes to preach the gospel. Many times it says that Alma went to preach "according to the holy order of God." (Alma 8:4, for example) This means his work was very closely connected with the priesthood. I know the priesthood, with respect to missionary work, is more than just permission to teach the gospel and administer the ordinances. It's more than giving blessings of health. So my question is, What exactly is the connection between the priesthood and missionary work, and how can my priesthood help me be a better missionary (baptize more families)?

It's that last question I tizzied about -- and still don't know how to answer. I'll try the others though.

Even though Alma did not have the title of king, he was functioning as both king and priest. In ancient Israel, before Lehi left Jerusalem and the Jews were taken to Babylon, the king was (Some kings were apostate, so for them this is true in theory rather than in fact) not only the head of state, he was also the chief prophet and High Priest. After the Babylonian captivity, when the Jews had no king, the High Priest took over the chief religious duties. But before that, the Psalms suggest, the early kings had the Melchizedek Priesthood. David used the Urim and Thummim just as he would had he been the prophet. Hezekiah received a letter from the Assyrian king, took it into the Holy of Holies, laid it on the throne of God and essentially said, "Here read this. Now tell me what I supposed to do to keep the Assyrians out of Jerusalem."

The king's enthronement anointing was the same ordinance by which he was adopted as a son of Jehovah. As his son, he could sit on the throne of God, act in Jehovah's place in matters of state, and especially in judging the people. He alone was the Supreme Court, and his primary duty in times of peace was to "judge righteous judgement."

So Alma, having given the administrative responsibilities of kingship (including civil and criminal judge) to the Chief Judge, but retaining the ecclesiastical powers of kingship (prophet, High Priest, and judge in religious matters) set out to exercise his authority, as it was his obligation to do. What we find in his sermons is the his defining the law by which the people will be judged. He says if he does not make this clear to them, then the consequences of their sins will be upon him, but after they are warned, then he and God can judge them according to the law they have been taught. Thus Alma rules (judges - makes a ruling) the church as president (king: giver of law, judge, prophet and High Priest). His right to do so rests on his sonship — being a rightful heir to God.

The king's legitimacy rested on five propositions, all of which were demonstrated in an eight day endowment session which he and all the people shared once each year during the New Year's festival. It was a given that he knew the scriptures and the Law of Moses, for he was the personification of the Law.

Those requirements for legitimacy were these: 1) He had to have been called by God at the Council in Heaven. 2) He had to have the correct genealogy (yours is demonstrated when you received your Patriarchal Blessing). 3) He was anointed to become king and given a new name. 4) He had to be shown to be acceptable to God. 5) He had to receive the necessary ordinances (washing, anointing, clothing, crowning) in the temple.

That is how, why, and by what authority "Alma went to preach 'according to the holy order of God.'" The question of how you use your priesthood to be a missionary is a somewhat different matter. The chief differences are 1) that you are not the President of the Church and 2) the people you are talking to are not already members of the church. But there are also a great many similarities:

The requirements of legitimacy (except those associated with his final anointing and crowning) you have met. You are not *thee* Prophet, but you have the Gift of the Holy Ghost and are obligated to speak as it instructs, and to whom it instructs. The people you are to teach are not already members of the church, so do not have the burden of having already made covenants *in*

this life. But neither you nor they know what covenants they made before they came here, or what covenants you made in association with theirs. That means both you and they are walking in the dark — but you, and they when they listen, have the Holy Ghost which functions as a light in the darkness. You may know those to whom you must speak even if they do not know you. Whether they listen when you speak is not your responsibility. That you be at the right place and say the right thing is your responsibility. The Holy Ghost will take care of that. All you have to do is listen and obey.

Paul's promise (Ephesians 1) that God has enough power to help you keep those covenants, is sufficient to ensure your success, unless you choose not to succeed. So it is really true that all you have to do is listen and obey. If you do that, the priesthood power which gives you the authority to teach will also be sufficient to assure you the power to teach. In a somewhat related vein, I wrote a note to put in last week's Book of Mormon project. I'll add it in case it has any value.

[1 Ne. 17:7, 27 Oct 97, LeGrand Baker,]

...after I, Nephi, had been in the land of Bountiful for the space of many days, the voice of the Lord came unto me saying: Arise, and get thee into the mountain. And it came to pass that I arose and went up into the mountain, and cried unto the Lord.

There is much one can learn from that seemingly incidental part of Nephi's story. Its importance is emphasized by its being repeated over and over again throughout the scriptures and sacred history.

The Brother of Jared was told to come to the mountain. Jesus took Peter, James and John to the Mount of Transfiguration to receive their endowments. Elijah went to the mountain of God on his own, but expected to find God there when he arrived. Nephi went to his back yard and climbed on his private tower (which turned out not to be so private as he had anticipated). Enoch told his family he was going to go to bed and have a vision. They were not to come into the room until it was over. Joseph Smith went into a grove; he does not say the Spirit instructed him to do so; only that he had given some thought to where he should go to pray. The night Moroni came, he waited until the family had all gone to sleep, then knelt beside his bed, fully expecting to receive a revelation. Joseph F. Smith "sat in my room pondering over the scriptures" when he received the vision of the redemption of the dead which is section 138.

The places are different. Not everyone has immediate access to the quietude of a mountain. But that, as far as I can tell, is not the point. The point is this: When the Spirit says "stop what you are doing and

go for a walk," or "go to your room," or "sit quietly and listen." Then one should obey.

We take the sacrament weekly as a token of the covenant that we will do our part to have the Spirit always be with us, but we sometimes get too busy to listen when he is there. That is like walking in the mountains with a friend--and ceaselessly talking about a football game or about politics all the way going and coming--and never really having been with the friend in the mountain at all.

We often get on our knees and expect the Lord to answer our questions just then, while we are taking the minute to talk to him. We grunt and groan inside, trying to get as "spiritual" as we can for the experience. Nothing happens and we go away disappointed.

Or else we let our own enthusiasm get in the way of our listening and go away convinced that the Lord shares that enthusiasm and that he approves of whatever it was we tried to convince him to sanction. (Then when it doesn't turn out, we respond incredulously, "But I prayed!")

Or else we kneel down with our hearts so full of sorrow, or disappointment, or fear that those feelings take up all the space in our soul; and we go away thinking that we have had "a stupor of thought" so that must be God's answer.

Prayer is this: Forever walking in a mountain with a friend. Stopping sometimes, together, to admire a columbine. Sometimes being so caught up in the urgent majesty of it all that one doesn't remember his friend is even there, but without an empty place within--because one knows he IS and that he is there. Sometimes stopping to talk together--listening and talking, talking and listening. Sometimes just needing to talk and talk and know that you are being listened to. Sometimes filling one's mind by listening to what he has to say. Sometimes filling one's whole soul by just knowing that you are together.

Our world tends to crowd out such prayer, and I suppose, since we live here, that must be so. But when the time comes when the Spirit whispers, "Arise, and get thee into the mountain," it is time to go, and visit with a friend.

My love always,

LeGrand

7071 University Station
Provo, Utah 84602
14 November, 1997

Elder Michael Willis
Chili Santiago West Mission
50 East North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84150

Dear Michael,

Thank you for your letter. I enjoy being able to share some of the experiences of your mission with them.

I am delighted at how much you enjoy your mission and love the people whom the Lord has asked you to serve. I suspect one of the richest blessings of being a missionary is that it comes closer to teaching you what it means to live the law of consecration than any other experience you will have for a long time. In the mission field you may give, and give, and give, with no possible hope of being given to in return. You have nothing to earn, no profit to make, not even a gift you can expect in exchange for what you give. You may love others and learn that their letting you love them is a great blessing to you. If they learn to love you in return that is another, and different blessing, but even that you cannot expect. So you go about giving everything you have and everything you are to others for no better reward than to see them happy. That, you will ultimately learn, is the most important thing in life (this one, the last one, or the one to come), and the training you now receive for that is the best possible training.

You asked a question in you letter which I blame in part for my not responding sooner. It is a very good question, only I'm not at all sure I have an equally good answer. I tizzied about it for a while, then got lazy. I apologize for not answering sooner. I suspect you do not even remember the question now, so I'll quote from your letter:

I have a question. It has to do with the priesthood. In the beginning of the book of Alma, Alma goes to preach the gospel. Many times it says that Alma went to preach "according to the holy order of God." (Alma 8:4, for example" This means his work was very closely connected with the priesthood. I know the priesthood, with respect to missionary work, is more than just permission to teach the gospel and administer the ordinances. It's more than giving blessings of health. So my question is, What exactly is the connection between the priesthood and missionary work, and how can my priesthood help me be a better missionary (baptize more families)?

It's that last question I tizzied about -- and still don't know how to answer. I'll try the others though.

Even though Alma did not have the title of king, he was functioning as both king and priest. In ancient Israel, before Lehi left Jerusalem and the Jews were taken to Babylon, the king was (Some kings were apostate, so for them this is true in theory rather than in fact) not only the head

of state, he was also the chief prophet and High Priest. After the Babylonian captivity, when the Jews had no king, the High Priest took over the chief religious duties. But before that, the Psalms suggest, the early kings had the Melchizedek Priesthood. David used the Urim and Thummim just as he would had he been the prophet. Hezekiah received a letter from the Assyrian king, took it into the Holy of Holies, laid it on the throne of God and essentially said, “Here read this. Now tell me what I supposed to do to keep the Assyrians out of Jerusalem.”

The king’s enthronement anointing was the same ordinance by which he was adopted as a son of Jehovah. As his son, he could sit on the throne of God, act in Jehovah’s place in matters of state, and especially in judging the people. He alone was the Supreme Court, and his primary duty in times of peace was to “judge righteous judgement.”

So Alma, having given the administrative responsibilities of kingship (including civil and criminal judge) to the Chief Judge, but retaining the ecclesiastical powers of kingship (prophet, High Priest, and judge in religious matters) set out to exercise his authority, as it was his obligation to do. What we find in his sermons is the his defining the law by which the people will be judged. He says if he does not make this clear to them, then the consequences of their sins will be upon him, but after they are warned, then he and God can judge them according to the law they have been taught. Thus Alma rules (judges - makes a ruling) the church as president (king: giver of law, judge, prophet and High Priest). His right to do so rests on his sonship — being a rightful heir to God.

The king’s legitimacy rested on five propositions, all of which were demonstrated in an eight day endowment session which he and all the people shared once each year during the New Year’s festival. It was a given that he knew the scriptures and the Law of Moses, for he was the personification of the Law.

Those requirements for legitimacy were these: 1) He had to have been called by God at the Council in Heaven. 2) He had to have the correct genealogy (yours is demonstrated when you received your Patriarchal Blessing). 3) He was anointed to become king and given a new name. 4) He had to be shown to be acceptable to God. 5) He had to receive the necessary ordinances (washing, anointing, clothing, crowning) in the temple.

That is how, why, and by what authority “Alma went to preach ‘according to the holy order of God.’” The question of how you use your priesthood to be a missionary is a somewhat different matter. The chief differences are 1) that you are not the President of the Church and 2) the people you are talking to are not already members of the church. But there are also a great many similarities:

The requirements of legitimacy (except those associated with his final anointing and crowning) you have met. You are not *thee* Prophet, but you have the Gift of the Holy Ghost and are obligated to speak as it instructs, and to whom it instructs. The people you are to teach are not already members of the church, so do not have the burden of having already made covenants *in this life*. But neither you nor they know what covenants they made before they came here, or what covenants you made in association with theirs. That means both you and they are walking in the dark — but you, and they when they listen, have the Holy Ghost which functions as a light

in the darkness. You may know those to whom you must speak even if they do not know you. Whether they listen when you speak is not your responsibility. That you be at the right place and say the right thing is your responsibility. The Holy Ghost will take care of that. All you have to do is listen and obey.

Paul's promise (Ephesians 1) that God has enough power to help you keep those covenants, is sufficient to ensure your success, unless you choose not to succeed. So it is really true that all you have to do is listen and obey. If you do that, the priesthood power which gives you the authority to teach will also be sufficient to assure you the power to teach.

In a somewhat related vein, I wrote a note to put in last week's Book of Mormon project. I'll add it in case it has any value.

[1 Ne. 17:7, 27 Oct 97, LeGrand Baker,]

...after I, Nephi, had been in the land of Bountiful for the space of many days, the voice of the Lord came unto me saying: Arise, and get thee into the mountain. And it came to pass that I arose and went up into the mountain, and cried unto the Lord.

There is much one can learn from that seemingly incidental part of Nephi's story. Its importance is emphasized by its being repeated over and over again throughout the scriptures and sacred history.

The Brother of Jared was told to come to the mountain. Jesus took Peter, James and John to the Mount of Transfiguration to receive their endowments.

Elijah went to the mountain of God on his own, but expected to find God there when he arrived. Nephi went to his back yard and climbed on his private tower (which turned out not to be so private as he had anticipated). Enoch told his family he was going to go to bed and have a vision. They were not to come into the room until it was over. Joseph Smith went into a grove; he does not say the Spirit instructed him to do so; only that he had given some thought to where he should go to pray. The night Moroni came, he waited until the family had all gone to sleep, then knelt beside his bed, fully expecting to receive a revelation. Joseph F. Smith "sat in my room pondering over the scriptures" when he received the vision of the redemption of the dead which is section 138.

The places are different. Not everyone has immediate access to the quietude of a mountain. But that, as far as I can tell, is not the point. The point is this: When the Spirit says "stop what you are doing and go for a walk," or "go to your room," or "sit quietly and listen." Then one should obey.

We take the sacrament weekly as a token of the covenant that we will do our part to have the Spirit always be with us, but we sometimes get too busy to listen when he is there. That is like walking in the mountains with a friend--and ceaselessly talking about a football game or about politics all the way going and coming--and never really having been with the friend in the mountain at all.

We often get on our knees and expect the Lord to answer our questions just then, while we are taking the minute to talk to him. We grunt and groan inside, trying to get as "spiritual" as we can for the experience. Nothing happens and we go away disappointed.

Or else we let our own enthusiasm get in the way of our listening and go away convinced that the Lord shares that enthusiasm and that he approves of whatever it was we tried to convince him to sanction. (Then when it doesn't turn out, we respond incredulously, "But I prayed!")

Or else we kneel down with our hearts so full of sorrow, or disappointment, or fear that those feelings take up all the space in our soul; and we go away thinking that we have had "a stupor of thought" so that must be God's answer.

Prayer is this: Forever walking in a mountain with a friend. Stopping sometimes, together, to admire a columbine. Sometimes being so caught up in the urgent majesty of it all that one doesn't remember his friend is even there, but without an empty place within--because one knows he IS and that he is there. Sometimes stopping to talk together--listening and talking, talking and listening. Sometimes just needing to talk and talk and know that you are being listened to. Sometimes filling one's mind by listening to what he has to say. Sometimes filling ones' whole soul by just knowing that you are together.

Our world tends to crowd out such prayer, and I suppose, since we live here, that must be so. But when the time comes when the Spirit whispers, "Arise, and get thee into the mountain," it is time to go, and visit with a friend.

My love always,

LeGrand