DRAFT

Tracing Ancient Threads in the Book of Moses
2020 Interpreter Foundation Conference
September 18-19, 2020

The Book of Moses as a Pre-Augustinian Text: A New Look at the Pelagian Crisis

Terryl L. Givens

Coming from a tradition which for almost two centuries has labored under the pejorative label of heretics, Latter-day Saints should be especially attuned to the historical formation of such categories, and to revolutions in recent scholarship over the meaning and validity of such labels as they are deployed in Christian historiography. I want to situate the Book of Moses in the midst of such developments, since they give us powerful new grounds for seeing the text as both authentically Christian in its themes and pre-Augustinian in its doctrine.

Walter Bauer, in his classic study of Orthodoxy and Heresy, made the argument that "orthodoxy" is just the heresy that won out. According to this view, we have a number of competing factions in early Christianity, and the winner writes the narrative.[1] More recent scholars have challenged that interpretation. Alister McGrath, in his recent study on the topic, argues something close to the opposite; "Heresy is best seen as a form of Christian belief that…ends up subverting, destabilizing, or even destroying the core of Christian faith."[2]

This definition strikes me as consummate question-begging, and ignores rather than refutes Bauer's position. Such conceptions, which dominate the writing of Christian history, have an implicit providentialist bias. They presuppose that where Christianity arrived, in general terms, is where God intended, so orthodoxy becomes synonymous with whatever precedes the end result. Anything that is seen, *retrospectively*, to challenge that normative strain is adjudged heresy. But the core of Christian faith is precisely what is being contested in the formative fourth century of Christian development in particular.

Although Paul is generally credited as the author of Christianity understood as a system of thought, it is actually Augustine who first erects an interconnected set of precepts into a tightly organized system that serves as the foundation of Christian development for the next 1600 years. As B. R. Rees notes, as the 4th century ends, "in the Western Church" there does not even exist a "coherent body of doctrine tried, tested, and refined in the furnace of controversy."[3] Disputes over homoiousios (of similar substance) or homoousios (of the same substance) in that century, like the meaning of the eucharist in the 16th, are quite clearly debates between advocates of competing interpretations of a sparse New Testament record, not occasions where a "core" of biblical truth is under assault by theological barbarians.

So I want to look at several simultaneous or near simultaneous developments that do not cause Augustine to *defend* the core of Christian faith, but to *create* a new core of Christian faith—in two instances by actually abandoning what were arguably core tenets of early Christian thought—premortal life and moral agency. In order to make all his pieces fit together, Augustine only at this juncture elaborates a systematic structure that will *become* Christian orthodoxy. Again to quote Rees, "What Augustine did was to build original sin and its transmission, infant baptism, grace and predestination into a coherent theological system, while carrying the first and the last of these to extremes hitherto inconceivable."[4]

I want to revisit the context out of which this new system emerges for a few reasons. First, because by doing so the pre-Augustinian theological world is revealed as demonstrably consonant—to a remarkable degree—with the theological foundations laid out in the Book of Moses. While this does not establish the provenance of that book of scripture as authentically ancient, the comparison does establish that at the early date of late 1830, Joseph Smith produces

a text that is consistent in its radical reconstruction of Christian theology along the lines of its pre-Augustinian complexion.

And second, I want to merely note that the doctrines it expounds are demonstrably consonant with contemporary theological developments and reconsiderations of the Christian past. This project of elucidating the gospel of Moses comes at a remarkable moment in modern Christian history. A growing chorus of scholars are lamenting what I call the Augustinian triumph. In one typical formulation, the twin condemnation of Pelagius and Origen, writes Elizabeth Clark, ensured the supremacy "of a Christian theology whose central concerns were human sinfulness, not human potentiality; divine determination, not human freedom and responsibility; God's mystery, not God's justice. *Christianity was perhaps poorer for their suppression* (my emphasis)."[5]

The chain of events leading to the greatest doctrinal reconstruction in Christian history begins in the early fifth century. As B .R. Rees writes, citing Irenaeus by way of illustration, "The emphasis [with him] is not on a Fall in the past but upon growth in the future." The imitatio Christi takes central stage.[6] Abruptly, in the early fifth century, Adam, the Tree, and the fruit thereof become the obsessive concern of Augustine and the subsequent tradition.

The upheavals begin in Carthage, North Africa, when in 411 Caelestius—a figure about whom little is known—it put on trial for heresy. The charge was that he denied the still emerging doctrine of original sin. According to transcripts of the trial, he had written that "at their births, infants are in that state [of innocence] which Adam was before his transgression." He is asked if he is denying that "the guilt of the [original] transgression" in inherited at birth, and he affirms that he is. Significantly, he points out that at this time, "many within the Catholic Church argue

against it and some others defend it, inasmuch as it is open to discussion and not a matter of heresy."[7]

In spite of no orthodoxy on the subject, Carthage is within the sphere of Augustine's influence and Caelestius is summarily anathematized. Further proof that this verdict is a reflection of Augustine's influence and no settled consensus is that fact that six years later (417), Caelestius appealed to Pope Zosimus, affirming in writing that he maintained "original sin binds no single infant…. Sin is not born with a man," and if infants are baptized, the purpose of the sacrament is not to counter any implied transmission of sin from parent to child.[8] Zosimus clears Caelestius of the taint of heresy. But Caelestius's teacher Pelagius is similarly summoned, in 415, to a conventum in Jerusalem then to a synod in Jerusalem where he is required to answer a series of charges concerning his teachings on original sin and free will. He is exonerated. The historical circumstances lend legitimacy to Pelagius's own claim that, in Henry Chadwick's words, Pelagius was "a traditionalist, defending the true faith against the innovations of Augustine."[9] It is generally recognized among scholars that just as Origenism was a construct only tangentially related to Origen's original teachings, so did Augustine erect Pelagius into a bogeyman that lent greater credibility to his own effort to depict himself as the defender of orthodoxy against dangerous innovations—when the opposite was closer to the truth. Ali Bonner, for example, argues in a recent study that "Pelagius did not invent anything," while "Augustine and his allies installed as orthodoxy a much more novel Augustinian" gospel.[10] Further evidence this is really the case is noted by Rees. When monks not only in far away Marseilles but even in Roman Africa read Augustine on original sin and free will, "they were deeply shocked."[11] He was not expounding orthodoxy: he was creating it. Dennis Groh agrees: "Many people beside the Pelagians smelled something very new in [Augustine's] interpretation

of St. Paul…. But his continuous tracts against the Pelagians carried the day and convinced the Church that this was what it had always taught."[12]

Augustine makes it his life's mission to extirpate utterly the teachings of Caelestius and the larger body of teachings of his mentor Pelagius. The task consumes him, and elicits a huge corpus of works dedicated to that objective. In 418, the battle is largely over. Augustine succeeds in securing the triple condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius by Emperor Honorius, another council in Carthage, and a persuaded Pope Zosimus.

In what follows I will briefly review the doctrinal assertions clearly made in the Book of Moses that were lost under the direct or indirect influence of Augustine. In each case, I will identify the Restoration scripture that enunciates a key doctrine, and then provide a brief explication of its 4th century defender as well as its demise at Augustine's hands.

1. Sin and Baptism

"The Son of God hath atoned for original guilt, wherein the sins of the parents cannot be answered upon the heads of the children, for they are whole from the foundation of the world" (Moses 6:54).

Critics of the Book of Mormon have alleged that doctrines in that scripture are suspiciously relevant to nineteenth-century debates. That may be true. But in the case of the Book of Moses, we find a constellation of doctrines even more germane to the controversies of the late fourth and early fifth century. In this regard, original sin and the baptism of infants were the two explosive issues that precipitated the Pelagian controversies of that era. According to

Stuart Squires, "the baptism of infants, … became the primary battlefield on which the fight over original sin, as well as the meaning of baptism, were fought."[13]

We saw above how Caelestius roiled those waters with his challenge to the Augustinian view of child baptism as a counter to inherited original guilt. Both Caelestius and Pelagius accepted infant baptism—unenthusiastically—for the same reasons that Luther and the Reformers did. Diarmaid MacCulloch notes that both Calvin and Luther could not defend the practice based on scripture, but were being "forced back unhappily towards saying that there were some things in the life of the Church that had been proved by their long usage."[14] In other words, they were willing to compromise their biblicism rather than be tarred with the radical Anabaptist brush. Similarly, Pelagius and his cohorts found ample reason to reject the *rationale* for infant baptism, which was new, but stopped short of dismissing the *practice,* because it was too deeply entrenched by now.

Of course, in the absence of original sin, Pelagius's rationale for infant baptism disintegrated. His problem was not his unorthodoxy—but his failure to throw the baby out with the baptism water. In other words, if he had been willing to deny original sin *and* the baptism of infants, his theology would have been fully self-consistent. As it was, his half-way position was incapable of sustaining the assaults of the Augustinian contingent. Doubly unfortunate, insofar as the need to rethink baptism almost took him to an early Christian emphasis in harmony with Restoration teachings. The effects of baptism, Pelagius rightly wrote, are that the baptized "become adopted sons and daughters of God."[15] In the primitive Church, remember, converts were often baptized in large groups at Easter, since the significance of both was birth to a

new life.[16] Notice that in LDS thought, children under eight are incapable of sin, and yet eight-year olds are baptised. This practice illustrates the principal significance of the ordinance as an ordinance of adoption, as does the covenantal language of taking a new name upon us. This covenantal language, in the Book of Mormon especially, is explicitly associated with what Noel Reynolds calls baptism's "witnessing function."[17]

It has been noted that Moses 6:55, with its reference to children "conceived in sin" evokes shades of original sin. However, the clear assertion that children are "whole from the foundation of the world" suggests only one possible meaning of that phrase: children are born into a world, into a hostile environment, where sin's fruits—"the bitter"—are everywhere in evidence.

2. Agency

"In the day I created them; and in the Garden of Eden, gave I unto man his agency" (Moses 7:32).

Scholars have long noted what some call the Restoration's "almost obsessive … concern for free moral agency."[18] Arminianism was already gaining strength in Joseph Smith's America, but the Book of Moses added a kind of double etiology—origin story—behind this gift. First, the Latter-day Saint cosmology puts the contest over human agency at the very beginning of the creation story. Even before the earth is formed, the Father's plan is challenged by Lucifer's project to "destroy the agency of man" (Moses 4:3). A few chapters later, we read that

"The Lord said unto Enoch: Behold these thy brethren; they are the workmanship of mine own hands and I gave unto them their knowledge, in the day I created them; and in the Garden of Eden, gave I unto man his agency" (Moses 7:32). Many Saints reading this passage wonder how individuals possessed of agency in the preexistence can be awarded it in the Garden. In fact, Joseph revised that verse to read, "in the Garden of Eden man had agency."[19] In any case, God did prepare the conditions in the Garden in terms of oppositions from which man could freely choose, quickening that gift of agency as we experience it in this mortal life. As Lehi will elaborate, "man could not act for himself save it should be that he was enticed by the one or the other" (2 Ne. 2:16).

Pelagius frames the principle this way: "*Posse* ["to be able" in Latin] is the ability to choose either good actions or evil actions. As we are not burdened by original sin, our ability is not hampered in any way. This *posse* is entirely a gift from God."[20] According to his biographer, Pelagius believed and taught that this human will "was itself a form of interior grace," the grace essential to salvation.[21] Elaine Pagels goes so far as to say, "Christian converts of the first three centuries…regarded the proclamation of αὐτεξουσία—the moral freedom to rule oneself—as virtually synonymous with 'the gospel.' Yet with Augustine, … the message changed."[22]

Augustine had at one time been a fervent defender of free will. Indeed, the early Augustine wrote a work titled De Libero Arbitrio (The Freedom of the Will). Although some scholars try to harmonize his positions there with his later insistence on predestination, Augustine himself acknowledged he made a paradigm shift when he said, "I, indeed, labored in defense of the free choice of the human will; but," he says tellingly (and "with a shudder," writes Robert O'Connell), "the grace of God conquered."[23]

And so, in Augustine's De praedestinatione sanctorum he writes that "the grace given by God does not simply allow one to believe, but that it makes one believe."[24] In that logic, as subsequent authorities like Fulgentius wrote, predestination "was the only reasonable conclusion to the Christian doctrine of salvation by grace."[25]

Preexistence

God "called upon our father Adam by his own voice, saying: I am God; I made the world, and men before they were in the flesh" (Moses 6:51).

It hardly seems the basis for a Restoration doctrine of preexistence; however, the evidence suggests this was a pivotal seed that immediately bore rich fruit. These Enoch texts were not published until 1833, but it is clear that they were circulating earlier and had profound impact, as two documents illustrate. In the first, dated March 1832 and titled "A Sample of pure language," the name of God is given as Awman, or "the being which made all things in its parts"; and the "children of men" are said to be "the greatest parts of Awman."[26] The phrasing might not of itself have suggested a premortal genealogy; together with a second revelation, however, the text points quite clearly to a conception of human spirits as emanating from God, with the teaching traceable to Enoch.

Little is known of the context in which this second revelation, dated 27 February 1833, was pronounced. An undated broadside of a poetic rendering of the revelation indicates that the original revelation was "sung in tongues by Elder D. W. Patton . . . and interpreted by Elder S[idney] Rigdon."[27] Recorded in the hand of Frederick G. Williams, this translation of an instance of "tongue- singing" is clearly based on the 1830 prophecy of Enoch. For in this song, Enoch, as in Smith's version, "saw the begining the ending of man he saw the time when Adam

his father was made and he saw that he was in eternity before a grain of dust in the balance was weighed he saw that he emenated and came down from God."[28] The cross- fertilization of the Awman revelation and the Enoch hymn emerged when an anonymous writer, perhaps W. W. Phelps, published in the church paper a poetic celebration of preexistence in May 1833, bearing clear phrasing from these two sources (emphasis added):

Before the mountains rais'd their heads
Or the small dust of balance weigh'd,
With God he [Enoch] saw his race began
And from him emanated man,
And with him did in glory dwell
Before there was an earth or hell.[29]

Tellingly, Smith unambiguously affirmed the eternal preexistence of human spirits early this same month, declaring that "man was also in the beginning with God. Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be" (D&C 93:29). Yet Phelps published his poetic declaration borrowing its language not from the definitive revelation of Smith but from the hymn of Enoch, showing the infiltration of the Enoch text into LDS culture in these earliest years.

In the early fifth century, sadly, free will is not the only casualty of Augustine's theory of Grace. So, too, is the early Christian belief in mortal preexistence. The logic runs this way: The early Augustine felt perfectly safe in arguing that "evil deeds . . . would not be punished justly if

they were not performed voluntarily." That, of course, was to imply a powerful argument for preexistence, because life seems self-evidently unfair and if we don't choose the circumstances of our birth, they must be tied to premortal conditions. And so Origen had argued that only a preexistent life could explain the variations of blessedness and—more commonly—misery, associated with this mortal life. The details may have been wrong, but Origen and the young Augustine alike sensed that *something* must have transpired before birth to make greater sense out of God's justice.

Preexistence had been espoused by several church fathers because it addressed not only the justice of God, but the mystery of human embodiment and suffering, the sensitivity of the soul to spiritual truth, and the quest for what seemed a dimly remembered happiness that is sensed but not known in or from this world. Origen is the best-known proponent of the view, but it was a familiar carry-over from Jewish thought, was familiar to the Essenes, was found in the Gospel of Thomas, the Apocalypse of Adam, the Exegesis on the Soul, and expressed by Clement of Rome, Clement of Alexandria, Evagrius, Didymus the Blind, Synesius of Cyrene, and others. By the late fourth century, a general state of uncertainty regarding the doctrine prevails. As Augustine describes the options he is contending with:

> There are four views about souls: (1) they come into being by propagation [traducianism]; (2) they are created individually for each person who is born [creationism]; (3) they already exist somewhere and are sent by God into the bodies of those who are born ["sent" preexistence]; (4) they sink into bodies by their own choice ["fallen" preexistence, Origen's idea].[30]

Three reasons explain why at this point, Augustine is still committed to the doctrine of preexistence. Reason one: Augustine finds that preexistence aptly accounts for our search for happiness. We cannot search for what we have never known. In his analogy, the woman searching for her coin presupposes that she once knew it (Luke 15).

Second, the alternatives are highly problematic. Creationism, the view that God creates the soul at birth, is repugnant to Augustine because it implies that God creates a corrupt soul to match a fallen body. Traducianism, the other alternative, is little better because it holds that a fallen human is capable, through the sexual act, of generating an immortal soul.

Third and most compellingly, premortal existence frees God of the charge of capriciousness or injustice. As he explains, "if … souls … come to inhabit bodies by their own choice, it is quite easy to see that the ignorance and difficulty that result from their own wills are in no way to be blamed on their Creator since he is without fault even if he himself sends souls to dwell in bodies."[31]

So what changes? Augustine's felt need to defend God's justice. If we are saved by grace, then we are predestined. If we are predestined in spite of or in indifference to our own actions and choices, then clearly, we cannot apply human categories of justice to God. Augustine abandons the enterprise altogether. It is not for us, Augustine suggests, to use reason to salvage God's honor. Free will is not worth defending if such defense compromises God's ability to choose whom, how, or when he will, and relegates grace to the peripheries of salvational history. God's apparent injustice must be subsumed by human capitulation to the mysterious workings of the divine. So our perplexity in the absence of any theodicy becomes a sign both of our abject humility and of God's radically other sovereignty. Or as he puts it more briefly, "What kind of

'justice,' then, is this? The inscrutable justice proper to God's dealings with human creatures," Augustine replies, "a justice beyond both our understanding and our right of complaint."[32]

Once Augustine, the most influential Christian thinker of the 4th century, abandoned preexistence, (he opted instead for traducianism—which only the Lutherans espouse today), the church followed suit. Origenism, the set of beliefs centered on preexistence and universal salvation, undergoes its first in a long line of anathemas by councils and emperors.

God of passions

"And it came to pass that the God of heaven looked upon the residue of the people and he wept, and Enoch bore record of it" (Moses 7:28).

Joseph then revised the text to indicate that Enoch is in this scene weeping *with* God and is surprised when he sees God joining in his grief. "And he beheld, and lo, the heavens wept also and shed forth their tears as the rain upon the Mountains."[33] Though "heavens" stands in here for "God" in poetic metonymy, it is clearly God who weeps, and who personally responds to Enoch's twice- expressed amazement: "How is it thou canst weep?"[34] Significantly, Enoch refers to him as the Father; the Divine Being declares himself to be "God; Man of Holiness," with Christ referred to as "Son of Man" throughout the narrative.)[35]

As Augustine has exempted God from human categories of justice, in his Confessions he deprived God of any semblance of human emotions as well. "Who can sanely say that God is touched by any misery?" says Augustine in a typical formulation.[36] Anselm will later explicate Augustine's views of God's "pity" and "love" in terms distinctly different than their parental

counterparts: "How art thou at once pitiful and impassible? … When Thou lookest upon us in our wretchedness we feel the effect of Thy pity, Thou feelest not the effect. And therefore Thou art pitiful, because Thou savest the wretched, … [but] Thou art touched by no fellow-suffering in that wretchedness."[37] Leading scholars such as Nicholas Wolterstorff are unambiguous in their assessment: "The Augustinian God turns out to be remarkably like the Stoic sage: devoid of passions, unfamiliar with longing, foreign to suffering, dwelling in steady bliss."[38] Joseph Campbell's summation in this regard is pertinent: Augustine's conversion to Christianity represented his repudiation of "the Manichaean doctrine of the immanence of divine light" for "the Christian doctrine of the absolute transcendence of divinity."[77]

4. Cooperative Project

"For behold, this is my work and my glory—to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man; thou hast made me, and given unto me a right to thy throne." (Moses 1:39; 7:59).

The Book of Moses presents human exaltation as a joint project initiated by God, requiring human consent and cooperation (made even more evident in Abraham's account of the Great Council, Abr. 3:22-25). Pelagius saw salvation in just such terms. "We always stand in need of God's help," but he gives to *us* the gift of moral agency: "man always is in a state that he may sin, or may not sin, so as to know ourselves always to be of a free-will."[39] Perhaps the greatest tragedy of the Augustinian revolution, and one corrected by the Book of Moses, is the loss of understanding salvation as a cooperative, transformative venture. The implications of what Augustine reconceived receive their fullest expression at the hands of Luther and the

Reformers. The historian B. B. Warfield wrote: "The Reformation, inwardly considered, was just the ultimate triumph of Augustine's doctrine of grace."[40] That doctrine represents a complete rewriting of the Original Story, and it is based on Augustine's misreading of what it means to be saved, or in his terms, "justified." This is how it happens: "the word 'justification', … in Latin literally means *the making of* someone *to be* righteous. In Luther's understanding it rather meant the *declaring* of someone to be righteous: God 'imputes' the merits of the crucified and risen Christ through grace to a fallen human being, who remains without inherent merit and who, without this 'imputation', would remain unrighteous."[41] No longer are we engaged on a journey planned from before creation, intending the schooling of God's children through the educative experiences of mortality, envisioning our growth into beings like our divine parents. Instead, we are merely human detritus of an Adamic catastrophe; God punished Jesus for the sin that accrues to all humans. Some of us God has deigned to "save" before our birth, for his own glory.

Augustine's reformulation met with initial resistance because, as the Pelagians pointed out, "the absolute priority of the divine initiative in the work of human salvation appeared…to undermine the whole foundation of the Christian life as an active and loving co-operation between God and man."[42]

Other developments roughly contemporaneous with the Augustinian controversies compounded the reshaping of Christian theology. The demise of universalism as the default position, the creedal obfuscation of the nature of God, monasticism as a reorientation of a public for a private framework for spirituality, and many others. My purpose, however, was not to rehearse one more version of what Saints have labeled "the apostasy." My focus, rather, has been to demonstrate the particularity of the Moses text as a compilation of those doctrines specifically

impaired in the confrontation between Augustine and those labeled Pelagians in the early 5th century. Latter-day Saints should recognize the truth of the verdict of R. F. Evans, who writes, "Pelagius is one of the most maligned figures in the history of Christianity."[43]

Terryl Givens

Neal A. Maxwell Institute

---

[1] Walter Bauer, Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).
[2] Alister McGrath, Heresy: A History of Defending the Truth (New York: HarperOne 2009), 11-12.
[3] B .R. Rees, Pelagius: Life and Letters (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1991), Letters 10.
[4] Rees, Pelagius, 10.
[5] Elizabeth A. Clark, The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 250.
[6] Rees, Pelagius, 57.
[7] Augustine copies portions of the council transcript into his Gratia Christi (Grace of Christ and Original Sin, 418). Cited in Rees, Pelagius, 60.
[8] Caelestius, "Written Statement of Belief," trans. Rev. Daniel R. Jennings. http://www.seanmultimedia.com/Pie_Coelestius_Written_Statement_of_Belief.html
[9] Cited in Rees, Pelagius, 132.
[10] Dominic Keech, "Review of Ali Bonner, The Myth of Pelagianism" (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), Journal of Theological Studies (10 December 2019): 374.
[11] Rees, Pelagius, Writings, 10.
[12] Dennis E Groh, "The Religion of the Empire: Christianity from Constantine to the Arab Conquest," in Hershel Shanks ed., Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism: A Parallel History of Their Origins and Development (Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1992), 287.
[13] Stuart Squires, The Pelagian Controversy: An Introduction to the Enemies of Grace and the Conspiracy of Lost Souls (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2019, 204.
[14] Diarmaid MacCulloch, The Reformation: A History (Mew York: Viking, 2003), 144-45.
[15] Squires, Pelagian Controversy, 192.
[16] Marcellino D'Ambrosio, Who Were the Church Fathers (London: SPCK, 2015), 14.
[17] Noel B. Reynolds, "Understanding Christian Baptism through the Book of Mormon," BYU Studies 51.2 (2012): 5-7.
[18] Sterling McMurrin, The Theological Foundations of the Mormon Religion (Salt Lake City:vUniversity of Utah Press, 1965), 52.

[19] Moses 7:32, OT2.
[20] Squires, Pelagian Controversy, 191.
[21] Rees, Pelagius, 129.
[22] Elaine Pagels, Adam, Eve, and the Serpent (New York: Vintage, 1989), 99.
[23] The expression was "sed vicit Dei gratia," in Augustine, Retractions II.27, trans. Mary Inez Bogan (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1968), 120; Robert J. O'Connell, Images of Conversion in St. Augustine's *Confessions* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1996), 305.
[24] Squires, Pelagian Controversy, 282.
[25] Squires, Pelagian Controversy, 283.
[26] "A Sample of Pure Language Given by Joseph the Seer," in Joseph Smith Papers: Revelations and Translations; Manuscript Revelation Books, ed. Robin Scott Jensen, Robert J. Woodward, and Steven C. Harper (Salt Lake City: Church Historian's Press, 2009), 265.
[27] Undated broadside, photocopy, Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
[28] Sang by the gift of Tongues and Translated, Kirtland Revelation Book 2 (27 February 1833), in JSP- R&*T*, 509.
[29] Evening and Morning Star 1.12 (May 1833): 96.
[30] Augustine, On Free Choice of the Will III.21, trans. Thomas Williams (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993), 111.
[31] Augustine, On Free Choice III.20.
[32] Augustine, De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum. Paraphrased by Robert J. O'Connell, The Origin of the Soul in St. Augustine's Later Works (New York: Fordham University Press, 1987), 91.
[33] Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts, ed. Scott H. Faulring, Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, 2004), 618.
[34] "The Lord said unto Enoch . . ." JSNT, 618 (Moses 7:32).
[35] JSNT, 618 (Moses 7:35; compare 7:24, 47, etc.).
[36] De div. quaest. ad Simpl. II, 2. Cited by Nicholas Wolterstorff, "Suffering Love," in William E. Mann, ed., Augustine's *Confessions*: Critical Essays (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006), 120
[37] Anselm, Proslog. 8, cited in Wolterstorff, "Suffering Love," 120.
[38] Wolterstorff, "Suffering Love," 120. Some critics assert that any allegation of a "passionless God" doesn't mean God is unfeeling. I would argue that first, the consensus of religious scholars is that an enormous shift toward a "suffering God" took place in the late 19th century. Such a shift would have been redundant if a suffering God were already standard orthodoxy. Second, what is most germane is the simple inference that average Christians would draw from creedal language—"without passions"—not scholastic distinctions made by theologians.
39 Pelagius, "Confession of Faith," Patristics in English, http://www.seanmultimedia.com/Pie_Pelagius_Confession_Of_Faith.html
[40] B. B. Warfield, Calvin and Augustine (Philadelphia, 1956), 332. Cited in MacCulloch, Reformation, 108.
[41] MacCulloch, Reformation, 115.
[42] Rees, Pelagius, 128.
[43] Rees, Pelagius, x.