



Type: Book Chapter

---

## "... There Can Be No More Bible."

Author(s): Hugh Nibley

Source: *Since Cumorah*, 2nd ed.

Published: Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, UT: Foundation for  
Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1988

Page(s): 3–19

---



The Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) existed as a California non-profit corporation from 1979 until about 2006, when it was allowed to go into involuntary liquidation, at which time copyrights held by FARMS and its authors and/or editors reverted or may have reverted back to their original author and/or editors. This chapter is archived by permission of Deseret Book.

# 1

“ . . . There Can Be  
No More Bible.”

## **Clutching at Straws: The Classic Charges against the Book of Mormon**

The first line of defense against the Book of Mormon, a barricade thrown up even before it had come from the printer, was the charge that since the Bible is the absolute, letter-perfect, flawless, and final Word of God, to designate any other writing as holy scripture could only be the height of blasphemy. It was an easy thing, however, for Orson Pratt and others “to expose this popular, though fatal error, invented by priestcraft in the early ages of the apostasy, and transferred to succeeding generations.”<sup>1</sup> We need not repeat here the oft-published evidence that the writers of scripture have always thought of the setting forth of the word of God for men as an open-ended affair in which God is free to speak whenever he chooses, regardless of how reluctant men may be to allow him that privilege, since the proposition is readily conceded by leading Christian scholars today.<sup>2</sup>

The second mortal offense of the Book of Mormon was the admission on the title page that this record, translated “by the gift of God,” might possibly contain mistakes. Mistakes? In a book revealed by the power of God? Another blasphemous conception. Yet today Bible scholars accept this proposition as readily as they do the first, and labor day and night to come up with a more correct text of the

Holy Bible than any at present available. The idea that a book can contain many things that are true and of God and at the same time many things that are false and of men was one that Catholics and Protestants alike found perfectly unthinkable in the days of Joseph Smith, though most students of the Bible accept it today. And once the possibility of human error is conceded, why should the idea of corrected editions of the Book of Mormon be offensive? Revised and improved editions of the Bible are constantly coming from the press, and the Mormons have never believed in an infallible book or an infallible anything in which men have had a hand. God allows fallible humans to be co-workers with him on the road to a far-distant perfection, but he expects them to make lots of mistakes along the way.

Why, then, have the critics been scandalized and delighted to discover that the second edition of the Book of Mormon corrected many mistakes in the first? For years this writer used only the first edition in his classes, and it is still by far the best. It is full of mistakes, but they are obvious ones. According to the printer, J.H. Gilbert, Joseph Smith told him to leave the grammar unaltered, since "the Old Testament is ungrammatical."<sup>3</sup> As we shall see, recent studies of the Old Testament prophets show that they often mix up their persons, numbers, and tenses in impassioned discourse, just as Abinadi does in the first edition of the Book of Mormon, pages 182-83. On the other hand, the prophet gave Gilbert a free hand with punctuation and spelling: "The manuscript," says the printer, "was one solid paragraph, without a punctuation mark, from beginning to end."<sup>4</sup> Imagine six hundred pages of that! How is it to be explained except on the assumption that the text was actually dictated word for word by one uneducated man to another? It was no ruse or trick, since nobody but the printer ever mentioned it, and he was authorized to correct the manuscript where he thought necessary. The manuscript used by the printer is now available, and it shows that Mr.

Gilbert did take liberties with the text. Are we to believe that Joseph Smith is responsible when we read in the first edition on page 69 five lines from the bottom, "For my soul deliteth in the Scriptures" and just two lines below that, "Behold my soul delighteth in the Scriptures"? Since by his own admission the printer was authorized to correct the spelling, isn't he to blame for putting in the fifth line from the bottom of page 180: "Lamoni rehearst unto him" and on the bottom line "now when Lamoni had rehearsed unto him." Or who is accountable for the "peeple" on page 127, after the word had been spelled properly a hundred times? If the printer was correcting Oliver Cowdery's spelling he should have corrected these mistakes; if not, Cowdery himself had obviously slipped up and any editor was not only free to correct the slip but bound to. Whether the printer chooses to use or omit a hyphen or a comma is a matter of punctuation and entirely up to him. "There were some printing errors," Joseph Smith wrote, and people still throw up their hands in horror, as if there are not printing errors to be found in almost any edition of the Bible.

An occasional printing error in a Bible disturbs no one, both because it is to be expected and is easy to correct. Changes in wording to clarify the English also cause little offense. "A-going" and "a-journey" (Book of Mormon, first edition, page 249) were perfectly accepted usage in Joseph Smith's time and place, but not anymore: consequently we change them in today's editions lest they confuse the young, though to this writer "a-going" and "a-journey" have a nice swing and color—his grandmother always spoke that way. In your English Bible you will find many words in italics; these are all words *not* found in the original, and they vary from edition to edition: they are put there by the various translators in attempt to convey as clearly as possible what they thought the original writers had in mind. Thus you will find in the very second verse of your King James Bible the word "was" in italics—because in the

Hebrew texts the word “was” is simply not there, but to make good *English* it *has* to be put in. If men can take such liberties with the Bible, while holding it to be an infallible book, why should we not be allowed the same freedom with the Book of Mormon, which nobody claims to be infallible?

If one examines the long list of changes in various editions of the Book of Mormon one will find not a single one that alters the meaning of any passage. In two places, it is true, Joseph Smith added words in the second edition: they should be in italics to show that they are there by way of explaining the text, *not* changing it. In the first edition Mary is referred to as “the mother of God, after the manner of the flesh” (1 Nephi 11:18); the insertion in later editions of “*the Son of God*” is simply put in to make it clear that the second person of the godhead is meant, and thereby avoid confusion, since during the theological controversies of the early Middle Ages the expression “mother of God” took on a special connotation which it still has for many Christians.

Three verses later (1 Nephi 11:21), the declaration of the angels, “Behold the Lamb of God, yea, even the Eternal Father!” has been augmented in later editions to “even the Son of the Eternal Father!” to avoid confusion: in this passage the Eternal Father is possibly in apposition not to “Lamb” but to “God” – he is the Lamb of God-the-Eternal-Father. But that might not be obvious to most readers, and so to avoid trouble, and without in the least changing the meaning of the text, the Lamb of God is made equivalent to the Son of the Eternal Father. Both ideas are quite correct, and there is no conflict between them. In the same way, the second edition adds the words “or . . . waters of baptism” to the term “waters of Judah” in the first edition (1 Nephi 20:1) by way of clarifying – not changing – what the writer had in mind.<sup>5</sup>

Sometimes the editors of later editions of the Book of

Mormon have made "corrections" that were better left unmade. Thus one officious editor in his attempt to visualize and rationalize a practical system of ventilation for the Jaredite barges omitted a number of significant words that appear in the first edition which if carefully analyzed seem to give a far better plan for air-conditioning than that found in Ether 2:17–20 of our present editions.<sup>6</sup> And was it necessary to change the name of Benjamin (in the first edition) to Mosiah in later editions of Ether 4:1? Probably not, for though it is certain that Mosiah kept the records in question, it is by no means certain that his father, Benjamin, did not also have a share in keeping them. It was Benjamin who displayed the zeal of a life-long book lover in the keeping and studying of records; and after he handed over the throne to his son Mosiah he lived on and may well have spent many days among his beloved records. And among these records could have been the Jaredite plates, which were brought to Zarahemla early in the reign of Mosiah, when his father could still have been living (Mosiah 8:9–15).

The first edition of the Book of Mormon, though the most readable, is not the standard version today. That is because it is hard to use, with its long chapters and lack of numbered verses, and the grammar is sometimes disturbing to us. Disturbing, but never misleading—that is the point. Much of the New Testament is in barbaric Greek, and the ancient pagans often jeered at the illiteracy and bad grammar of the Disciples; yet in our English Bible *their* grammar is meticulously correct. Is that an indication of skulduggery? No more than the poor grammar of the ancient Apostles was proof that they were not inspired. If anything, Joseph Smith's poor grammar serves the purpose of proving, as did theirs, that the inspired words of the prophets were no product of the schools or the invention of cunning and clever men.

The Book of Mormon claims to be written in "words of

plainness": its meaning is always clear. Joseph Smith at the end of his life proclaimed it the most correct book on earth. Most correct in what sense? The text of *Tom Sawyer* is far better attended than that of the Bible, but does one conclude from that that *Tom Sawyer* is a more "correct" book? What is a "correct" book? One with properly cut margins, appropriate binding, a useful index, accurately numbered pages? Not at all; these are mere mechanical details, as are also punctuation, spelling, and even grammar – those matters about which the critics of the Book of Mormon have made such a to-do. Perhaps only a book of science can be really correct in the sense of conveying perfectly accurate information: only here we must remember Karl Popper's warning: "Every scientific statement must remain *tentative forever*." So what is a correct scientific statement today may not be correct tomorrow. The most correct book in the world is the one that will be found to contain the fewest untrue statements after all the books in the world have been checked and compared. Of course no one can know today which book that will be, unless one knows it by revelation. But such a statement made about the Book of Mormon by its translator invites the most searching examination. To such an examination we intend to contribute.

To shore up the weakness of the total-Bible argument, opponents of the Book of Mormon have always depended heavily on vigorous declamations against the character of Joseph Smith. The accepted procedure has been to argue that since Smith was a rascal the Book of Mormon *must* be a fraud, while resting the proof of his rascality squarely on the fact that he produced the Book of Mormon.

Today we can no longer view the issues from the vantage-point of those friends and enemies of Joseph Smith, both of whom could claim to have known him personally and intimately. We can indeed examine the credentials of the various character witnesses, as we attempt to do in *The Myth Makers*, but the whole question of Joseph Smith's

character has become academic. On the other hand, we now enjoy certain advantages in testing the Book of Mormon which were denied to earlier generations. The whole discussion has shifted ground completely, though critics of the Book of Mormon are still desperately determined to keep it in the old grooves. How drastically things have changed can be illustrated by comparing the position taken by the clergy one hundred years ago with the position they take on the same issues today. At that time they argued that the Book of Mormon could not be true because its existence refuted the most basic tenets of the Christian faith. Today, those particular tenets are all being revised as the churches begin to teach the very things that so outraged them coming from the Mormons.

Let us look in on a public discussion which was edifying the summer crowds at Boulogne-sur-Mer in a warm July of the year 1850. The ministers of three leading denominations had sent to Elder John Taylor and his three companions laboring in the city a "respectful public challenge, to meet us in open and public debate,"<sup>8</sup> wherein they intended to demonstrate (1) that Joseph Smith was a "blasphemous and daring imposter," (2) that the Book of Mormon was a "stupid and ignorant farrago of nonsense," and (3) that the pretended divine calling of the Elders themselves was a fraud. Three more ministers acted as referees. The prosecution rested their case on the writings of the Reverend Henry Caswall, Professor Turner, and John C. Bennett. This put Elder Taylor at a peculiar advantage, since he was not only intimately acquainted with Joseph Smith, but had also known Caswall and Bennett personally, while his opponents had never set eyes on any of them.

"Concerning Mr. Caswall," said Elder Taylor, "I was at Nauvoo during the time of his visit. He came for the purpose of looking for evil. . . . I saw Mr. Caswall in the printing office at Nauvoo." Here is news indeed; in examining Caswall's story some years ago, we were unable



to find a witness to his visit, but here we have one. We even have a report of the Psalter episode: "He had with him an old manuscript and professed to be anxious to know what it was. I looked at it and told him that I believed it was a Greek manuscript. In his book he states that it was a Greek Psalter; but that none of the Mormons told him what it was. Herein is falsehood, for I told him." It is significant that in a later version of his story, published sometime after this discussion, Caswall changed his story and had Joseph Smith, who in his first version said, "That ain't Greek," say "some of it is Greek." We showed in our study that there was indeed something very suspicious about Caswall's Psalter-story in which we detected a rather obvious trap to catch Joseph Smith, a trap that never worked, though the Reverend Caswall made devious and toilsome efforts to prove that it did.<sup>9</sup> And now we have interesting confirmation of our trap theory.

It was the third night of the great discussion. The ministers, who had put much store by Caswall's testimony, that night brought with them a manuscript to test *Taylor's* knowledge of Greek. That was irrelevant, of course, since Elder Taylor's claim was not that he had proven the Caswall manuscript to be Greek or that his identification was correct, but only that he had said he thought it was Greek. However, the reverend gentlemen put three sentences in strange writings before Taylor and asked him to tell them which of the three was Greek:

*Elder Taylor.* — This, I think; (pointing to the first).

*Mr. Cleeve.* — There is not a letter of Greek in it; it is a verse of Japanese (Laughter and confusion).

*Elder Taylor.* — That certainly has the appearance of Greek.

*Mr. Groves* [another minister, not one of the three]. — I declare it is much more like Hebrew. . . .

A *Gentleman* in the meeting. — Let me see it. I am a graduate of Oxford, and I declare that there are Greek

characters in it, and that any person not familiar with the language could easily mistake it for Greek. — (Cries: "It is all a trick! shame!" and much confusion). . . .

Second *Gentleman*. — It is written to imitate Greek, and is evidently done so with an intention to deceive.

*Mr. Cleeve*. — There is not a letter of Greek in it.

First *Gentleman*. — I declare there is, sir, and I will not be contradicted. — (Confusion.)<sup>10</sup>

To such desperate measures would men of the cloth resort to discredit the Book of Mormon. Here we have a plain enough demonstration of the sort of thing Caswall was up to. If the discussion resulted in nothing else, it did conclude with clear statements by both sides of the positions they took. The contrasting viewpoints were thus summed up by Elder Taylor:

Now have they Apostles? No. They ridicule the idea of them. Have they Prophets? No. They tell us there is to be no more prophecy. Have they evangelists, pastors, and teachers, inspired men? No. They don't believe in inspiration, and tell us that the cause of inspiration has ceased. Do they speak in tongues? No. You have heard it turned into ridicule time and again [during the discussion]. Do they have prophets among them who prophesy? No. This they call a delusion. If any are sick, do they do as St. James says, "send for the elders of the church that they may pray for them, and anoint them with oil in the name of the Lord?" No.<sup>11</sup>

In their rebuttals the ministers confirmed all these points, with the referees joining in on their side. But what would their positions on these issues be today? Hesitant — if they kept up with the times.

### **Aggiornamento — the Churches Give Ground**

*Aggiornamento* is a word favored by Pope Paul VI, and he translates it as "up-dating." A new conception of the church, and especially of its spiritual gifts, is now running

hand in hand with a new concept of the scriptures, and that in turn throws the door wide open to a new look at Mormonism and the Book of Mormon. What has brought this strange state of affairs to pass? It has been the discovery of ancient records, long forgotten by men, but brought to light in the years since Cumorah, and especially in our own generation, to make the Cumorah story appear less and less fantastic and more and more probable as the years go by and the documents accumulate. The compelling power of ancient voices speaking anew from the dust since Cumorah and especially since Qumran is today driving the whole Christian world along strange paths. "No one can deny," writes a Methodist scholar with strong Catholic leanings, "that something remarkable is going on in the formerly 'unchanging' Roman Catholic Church."<sup>12</sup> Nothing less than a thorough-going revamping of doctrines and ordinances is indicated. Restoration and revelation, forbidden words but a decade or so ago, have become the watchwords of a "renewed" Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant.

What is responsible for this astonishing revolution? A Protestant and a Catholic scholar, co-authoring a new book on the liturgical movement, have shown that the initial impulse and continuing pressure behind the movement has been the progressive discovery of increasingly ancient documents opening up step by step new and strange vistas of an ancient church totally unlike anything that conventional Christianity had imagined.

R.P. Marshall, the Protestant minister, begins by noting that the Protestants have been guilty of a systematic neglect of rites and ordinances; indeed, "only in recent years has worship been seriously considered by Protestants as a field for study."<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, the Catholic writer M.J. Taylor, S.J. notes that the rites of the Roman Church have long since become all but meaningless for the people: "Men seem unable to leave well enough alone. They want to add to what tradition has given them;" such additions "made

for a sense of spectacle. . . . In the liturgies where bishops and the popes were celebrants the chants became almost symphonic. . . . The people, unable to participate in the musical supports to these rites, surrendered their role to the choir."<sup>14</sup> That is, both Catholic and Protestant authorities admit that their churches are today far removed from the original rites of the church, a return to which is the purpose of the so-called liturgical movement, "a practical effort . . . to renew the lives of all the faithful here and now through a revived liturgy."<sup>15</sup> And this is where the voices from the dust come in, for the movement began with those "patristic and liturgical studies" which sought the true nature of the liturgy in the oldest available documents.<sup>16</sup>

Dom Gueranger (1805–1875) of the monastery of Solesmes started the movement, but though he "thought it necessary to go back to the past, . . . he lacked the historical documents"<sup>17</sup> necessary to take him far enough. Hence, "his renewal went back to a time when the Roman liturgy was not at its best."<sup>18</sup>

The greatest advance was made in Germany at the Monastery of Maria Laach, which "made an immeasurable contribution to the liturgical movement in its scholarly liturgical studies" and "produced . . . ample historical justification for . . . reform."<sup>19</sup> In short, the unearthing of old documents or "historical studies (doctrinal, liturgical, and pastoral) made it quite clear that our present liturgy was not in the best of health;" without such documents none would have suspected the need of going "back to the earlier traditions, . . . a return to tradition to overcome defects of the present."<sup>20</sup> The same need is now felt by many Protestants, and for them too, "the liturgical movement has sought the aid of history and theology in the study of the rites. . . . Catholics and Protestants," Marshall concludes, "must recover what they have lost, and one cannot cast blame on the other."<sup>21</sup>

As everyone knows, the world was mightily offended

by the assertion of the Latter-day Saints that the Christians had lost many of the ancient rites and ordinances and was scandalized and amused by their preoccupation with rites and ordinances that they considered essential to salvation.

Today the Christian world both admits serious losses and seeks to fill the gap by going back to long-forgotten writings, the oldest and most important of which have come forth literally from the dust in our own time. This astonishing turn of things can be illustrated by utterances, characteristically frank and scholarly, of Pope Paul VI. "Now everything is new, surprising, changed," he writes of the liturgy; "even the ringing of the bells at the Sanctus has been done away with."<sup>22</sup> *Everything* new and changed! That is surprising indeed, but there is a reason: "We are concerned," wrote the pope in his First Encyclical, "to restore to the Church that ideal of perfection and beauty that corresponds to its original image . . . [and have] the desire of renewing the whole structure of the church."<sup>23</sup>

When Mormons have spoken of a restoration of the gospel, the Christians have been quick to take offense and demand in outraged tones, "Restoration? When was it ever lost?" But now no less a person than the Pope of Rome declares that there must be restoration affecting "the whole structure of the Church"! He speaks of "the great spiritual renewal which the Second Vatican Council hopes to promote" and champions "the Church's heroic and impatient struggle for renewal: the struggle to correct those flaws introduced by its members."<sup>24</sup> The church "today . . . is examining herself and formulating the things which Christ, her founder, thought and willed concerning her. . . . The church must now define her own nature. . . . In this way the church will complete the doctrinal work which the First Vatican Council intended to enunciate."<sup>25</sup>

To one familiar with the Catholic polemic of bygone years with its pounding emphasis on the great, monolithic, unchanging, universal, victorious church, all this sounds

very new, surprising, and changed indeed. Isn't it rather late in the day to try to decide what the church is all about? There must be some good reason for such a drastic and abrupt change of viewpoint, and the cause is not far to seek—new discoveries of old documents are confronting the world with an image of the early church that is totally different from all former imaginings, but an image to which the present Christian world must somehow manage to adjust. That is not the whole story, but as in the liturgical movement in general, it is undoubtedly the prime mover.

The voice of Qumran seems to echo in the terms by which the present pope and the council choose to designate the church: "The People of God," "The New Israel," elicit the image of Israel in the desert, the small band of faithful saints that "sometimes looks like a small flock."<sup>26</sup> "The church has turned a corner," writes the editor of the *Catholic World*; "today we belong to a church which has defined itself as the people of God. . . . We live in an age of renewed attention to the charismatic gifts of Holy Spirit bestowed on every baptized person with the 'right and duty' to use these gifts for the building up of the Body of Christ."<sup>27</sup>

Eduard Meyer noted long ago that one of the unique aspects of Mormonism, setting it off completely from all other religions, was the idea of a continuation of the charismatic gifts as shared by all members.<sup>28</sup> The "right and duty" in our quotation refers to the new Catholic policy of "every member a missionary": "It pleases Us that the test [of the Council schema] constantly demands that the entire church be missionary, and also that each member of the faithful, insofar as possible, become in spirit and in works a missionary."<sup>29</sup>

There is much talk now in both Protestant and Catholic journals of revelation and inspiration—need we remind the reader that from the beginning its claim to continuing revelation was considered to be the most obnoxious and dangerous aspect of Mormonism?<sup>30</sup> Father Latourelle notes that

the Second Vatican Council is the very first time a council of the church has ever methodically considered the basic foundations of revelation, tradition, and inspiration.<sup>31</sup> And now we are told that "when either the Roman Pontiff or the body of bishops in conjunction with him defines a proposition, they propound it in connection with revelation," so that "all are bound to abide by, and conform to, this Revelation."<sup>32</sup> Infallibility, we are told, "is coextensive with the deposit of divine Revelation," i.e., the words of the Bible as "propounded with the assistance of the Holy Spirit."

Reversing the argument of Tertullian, the Pope proves the presence of the Holy Spirit by the existence of the church, instead of *vice versa*: "But if the Church is here, then the Holy Spirit is also here, the Paraclete," so that "the Church can never fail to give assent to these definitions because of the activity of the Holy Spirit."<sup>33</sup> The cornerstone of authority is now revelation and the Holy Spirit. But it was not always so. Whatever became of Scholastic Philosophy, the proudest and greatest achievement of the Roman Church, which up until now has been officially designated as the one proper key to revelation, i.e., to the deposit of the scriptures?<sup>34</sup> Now revelation itself is something more than the word of God in the Bible, official statements are now to be considered as made somehow "in connection with revelation." Today scholasticism is out and indirect revelation is cautiously taking over. The Pope even refers to his predecessor, Pius XII, clearly but with careful indirection, as a prophet, one who spoke in "solemn tones like the voice of the Prophet of God and the Father of the world."<sup>35</sup>

The role of new documentary discoveries in bringing these strange changes about is evident from a number of papal utterances. "The Pope recognizes that recent explorations, methods, diggings, texts, inscriptions, papyri, codexes, ruins, etc., have *entirely changed* the problems of

Biblical exegesis in the last fifty years," and he calls for intensified search for the original texts, and a new scientific Catholic method of exegesis.<sup>36</sup> Noting that "even such illustrious commentators as St. Jerome sometimes had relatively little success in explaining more difficult questions" of scripture, the Pope suggests "General Guidelines for the Exegete," requiring "appropriate use of the new exegetical techniques, particularly those advocated by the historical method taken as a whole, . . . relying on the help of textual criticism, literary criticism, and linguistic knowledge;" he emphasizes the importance of "the sound findings of recent investigations," and allows that "the Catholic exegete can and should be free to exercise his own perspicacity and intelligence. Only in this way will each person . . . contribute to the continuing progress of sacred doctrine."<sup>37</sup>

Though this apparent freedom of investigation is actually to be under the strict surveillance of the "living magisterium" of the church and "subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the Ordinaries,"<sup>38</sup> still it is the scholars with their "diggings, texts, inscriptions," etc., who furnish the information necessary to decide what the teachings and rites of the church should be.

It is astonishing how many of the changes that are taking place in Catholic and Protestant doctrines and ordinances are in the direction of those very things that have always brought persecution and derision on the heads of the Latter-day Saints in the past. This may be shown by a glance at the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, published by the Second Vatican Council on November 25, 1965.<sup>39</sup> The first section is headed "The Father's Plan" and speaks of the gospel in terms of a plan going back to the pre-existence. The second chapter is entitled "The People of God," and in the section headed "A Chosen People" presents us with that new image of the church so startlingly different from the one that has been diligently cultivated since the Fathers of the fourth century, as it shows us "the new Israel, jour-



neying in the present world, . . . moving forward through temptations and trials."

The next section is headed "A Priestly People," and teaches that "the common priesthood of the faithful" is "in its own distinctive way a participation in the one priesthood of Christ." The next section announces that all must through the sacraments (ordinances) be "reborn as sons of God." Next we learn that "the Holy People of God also share in Christ's prophetic office by bearing living witness to Him." This calls (in the next section) for the gifts of the Spirit, which should be widely enjoyed in the church. The next section calls upon all to be missionaries.

Chapter VII has a title that would have shocked any church historian a few years back,<sup>40</sup> when church and eschatology were held to be diametrically opposed to each other: "The Eschatological Character of the Wayfaring Church and its Union with the Heavenly Church." It was just this sort of talk that St. Augustine and his contemporaries effectively put an end to; for him and his scholastic successors (who hardly receive any notice at all in the new order of things), the church on earth *was* the eschatological and heavenly church.<sup>41</sup> But now it is a different story as we are whisked off to Qumran to see a little band of "saints," scorned and rejected by the world, living in expectation of the coming Lord at the end of the times: "The final age of the world has already come upon us," the chapter begins, informing us that "until the appearance of new heavens and a new earth in which justice dwells, the wayfaring church . . . wears the ephemeral look of this world."

So now the universal church, militant and triumphant, established once for all to remain (according to the formula of the former Vatican Council) "firm and steadfast until the end of the world," has taken on "the ephemeral look of this world"! Nay, for all its resounding claims "the catholicity of the Church is always enormously deficient."<sup>42</sup>

The Christian world cannot be wholly unaware of mov-

ing in the direction of things that they mocked and derided when voices first spoke from Cumorah. One indication of this is the observation of one of the foremost Catholic authorities on the Dead Sea Scrolls, in one of the first and best books ever to appear on the subject, that the correct title for the community at Qumran should be Latter-day Saints, but that the title could not be used because unfortunately it had been preempted by a "so-called Christian sect."<sup>43</sup>

While Roman Catholics today concede that changes are being made and have been made in the past in the rites, customs, and administration of their church, some of them have taken pains to point out to this writer that the really important part of the heritage, the *doctrine* of the church, has remained unchanged, fixed in the inalterable formulas of the creeds. But this is a misunderstanding. The great councils of the church, including all the early ecumenical councils, were held primarily to discuss and decide on matters of doctrine; if the words of the creeds have remained unchanged, the interpretation of those words has been a theme of endless controversy that still goes on.<sup>44</sup> It is understandable that the Catholic clergy, where they can, take the position of Bousset that their church has never changed its fundamental doctrines; yet as Owen Chadwick has shown, the greatest changes in that church in modern as in ancient times have been doctrinal ones.<sup>45</sup>