Beginning with Paul’s reference to baptism for the dead and the early Christian practice thereof, many theologians—from Augustine and Cyril of Alexandria to Thomas Aquinas, Joseph Smith, and some of his contemporaries—have discussed the fate of the unevangelized dead. These authors have provided many ideas to solve this soteriological problem of evil; however, until the restoration, none could balance the three truths that God is all loving, one must accept Jesus Christ to be saved, and many have died without knowing about Christ. This article chronicles the thoughts of these and other theologians as well as the development, through revelation, of Joseph Smith’s own thinking on postmortem evangelization and baptism for the dead.
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at the end of the book of Mark energizes the hearts of believers in capturing the intended scope of the gospel message: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark 16:15, emphasis added). This universal commission was followed by a sobering stipulation that “he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned” (Mark 16:16). Since many of God’s children have lived without ever hearing the gospel, the question arises: how can they be saved?
Stephen Davis, Claremont-McKenna professor of philosophy, expressed the problem this way:

Suppose there was a woman named Oohku who lived from 370–320 B.C. in the interior of Borneo. Obviously, she never heard of Jesus Christ or the Judeo-Christian God: she was never baptized, nor did she ever make any institutional or psychological commitment to Christ or to the Christian church. She couldn’t have done these things; she was simply born in the wrong place and at the wrong time. Is it right for God to condemn this woman to eternal hell just because she was never able to come to God through Christ? Of course not. . . . God is just and loving.1

The problem Davis states is known as the soteriological problem of evil,2 which can be expressed as an inconsistent triad of three apparently true premises that become contradictory when conjoined:

1. God is almighty, perfectly loving and just, and desires that all of his children be saved (1 Timothy 2:3–4).

2. Salvation comes only in and through one’s personal acceptance in this life of God’s salvation through Jesus and the ordinances of the gospel (exclusivism, Mark 16:16).

3. Vast numbers have lived and died never having heard of Christ or never having had a fair chance to personally accept God’s salvation.

As outlined in our first article, some prominent Christian theologians after the third century qualified the first premise in the triad rather than seeking ways to harmonize all three.3 They spoke of the massa damnata of God’s children, “as though it pained God not at all”4 to damn even those who, like Oohku in Davis’s example, did not have the chance to “believe and be baptized.” As we will briefly explore in this paper, others rejected or significantly revised the second premise: personal salvation was understood by some as being achieved through obeying whatever light any given person received (inclusivism) rather than being based upon a strictly exclusivist ideal, thereby diminishing the role of ordinances, or even the personal acceptance of Christ, in the salvation of a believer.5

The early Christian doctrine of Christ’s redemptive descent into hell and vicarious ordinances performed on behalf of the dead can be contrasted with both of the above positions. Unlike the religious doctrine articulated by St. Augustine6 and
reaffirmed by prominent Reformers like Calvin, this early doctrine does not compromise God’s justice and mercy, nor does it weaken the significance or necessity of gospel ordinances. Christ’s descent into or “harrowing” of hell, whereby he instituted and enabled postmortem evangelization, was a common early Christian teaching among many Christian communities. Christ’s harrowing, taken in conjunction with vicarious ordinance work, a rite which some early Christians practiced, provided these Saints with a solution to the soteriological problem of evil by qualifying premise three. However, vicarious ordinances were largely condemned by “orthodox” Christianity from an early date, garnering little, if any, support from mainstream Christian theologians as a viable solution to the paradox.

Strangely, even though vicarious ordinances fell into disfavor, it appears that remnants of the doctrine of postmortem evangelism remained. This interesting disconnect between orthopraxy and orthodoxy will serve as our starting point in contextualizing the practices of the Restoration. We will therefore begin by (1) briefly sketching historical responses to the doctrine, beginning with St. Augustine’s rejection; (2) examining, as a prelude to the Restoration, modern treatments of postmortem evangelization and vicarious baptism for the dead; (3) detailing the sequence of Joseph Smith’s revelations and teachings wherein the doctrine of postmortem evangelization was gradually laid out; and (4) showing how this doctrine, in conjunction with proxy ordinances, largely solves the soteriological problem of evil. In a subsequent paper, we will detail the doctrine’s further development in the teachings of later church leaders, including Joseph F. Smith’s 1918 revelation on the redemption of the dead.

Christian Thought through the Medieval Period

As we explored in our first paper, St. Augustine of Hippo’s (354–430) interpretation of Peter’s writings on the preaching of the gospel to the dead was very influential. Augustine denied that Christ’s descent to hell provided evidence of a second probationary state. He feared such a doctrine would create apathy, weakening people’s desire to repent, receive baptism, and keep the commandments. As a result, Augustine was inclined toward a restrictive interpretation of 1 Peter 3:19-20 and 4:6.

While popular, Augustine’s interpretation did not overturn all acceptance of postmortem evangelism. Cyril of Alexandria (376–444), for example, thought that Christ preached to the spirits in prison to deliver all those who would believe in him. He described Christ as “appearing to them as one soul to other souls, . . . the only-begotten Son shout[ing] . . . ‘Come out!’ and to those in darkness: ‘Be enlightened.’ In other words, he preached to those who were in hell also, so that he might save all those who would believe in him.”

In the next century, Severus of Antioch (465–518) taught that Christ’s descent to hell saved only the righteous. For prior to his descent, “everyone, including those who had been educated in righteousness, was bound by the chains of death and was awaiting his arrival.” Severus specified that those who were released from hell were only those who had believed and acknowledged Christ while alive, as all spirits however, even righteous ones, had to remain in hell until Christ released them. Though rejecting an inclusive posthumous evangelism, Severus acknowledges that Christ’s descent allowed righteous men to come to paradise.

In the eighth century, St. John of Damascus (ca. 676–749) considered the harrowing as Christ bringing light to the underworld “just as He brought the message of peace to those upon the earth . . . and became to those who believed the Author of everlasting salvation . . . so He might become the same to those in Hades.”

In the eleventh century, Theophylactus strongly denied the Augustinian interpretation of 1 Peter (3:19 and 4:6), insisting that postmortem evangelism must be seen in the text. He wrote:
Ann Lee (1736–84), the founder of the Shakers, developed a detailed portrayal of postmortem evangelism. She taught that the gospel will be offered to all souls, either in this world or through postmortem evangelism in the world of spirits. The Shakers had a duty to preach the gospel to the living and the dead, and they believed that they could minister to the dead while in the flesh.

It was the habit of the Fathers to take this verse completely out of context. They therefore said that the word dead has two different meanings in Scripture, referring either to those who are dead in their sins and who never lived at all or to those who have been made conformable to the death of Christ. . . . But if they had paid the slightest attention to the context, they would have seen that here the “dead” are those who have been shut up in hell, to whom Christ went to preach after his death on the cross.18

In concluding this abbreviated survey, we would leave this paper wanting if we did not mention the contribution of the great Thomas Aquinas (1225–74). Thomas held that Christ descended into different layers of hell for different purposes:

For going down into the hell of the lost He wrought this effect, that by descending thither He put them to shame for their unbelief and wickedness: but to them who were detained in Purgatory He gave hope of attaining to glory: while upon the holy Fathers detained in hell solely on account of original sin, He shed the light of glory everlasting.19

This interpretation became the official Catholic position on the harrowing, later defended by
Pope Pius IV (1499–1565) and the Council of Trent (1545–63). 20

**Prelude to the Restoration**

The Reformation brought about a radical rethinking of many Catholic doctrines. Among these was the doctrine of postmortem evangelism. This doctrine was immediately suspect due to its direct connection to indulgences. 21 Another factor that contributed to its being suspected was the growing acceptance of “soul sleep,” or Christian mortalism. 22 Martin Luther’s (1483–1546) opposition to the doctrine was largely motivated by his defense of soul sleep. 23 However, Luther did not always doubt Christ’s descent. In his 1537 lectures on Genesis, Luther entertained the idea that the dead to whom Christ preached were those who died during the deluge, but his preaching would have been restricted to children and those whose simple-mindedness had hindered them from belief. 24 Likewise, Melanchthon (1497–1560), who collaborated extensively with Luther, believed that Christ descended into hell to make himself known to the spirits there. 25

In the same way, some Renaissance theologians felt that God may have predestined some of the righteous heathens for salvation, like Socrates and Brutus; 26 Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536) thought Cicero was probably saved. 27 Even so, most saw God as actualizing the pagans’ salvation in a manner that did not involve postmortem evangelism.

The Anglican Church tried to pave a middle road between the Catholic faith and the more radical Reformation movements. Striving to show its commitment to orthodoxy, the articles of the Anglican Church issued in 1552 asserted that while Christ’s “body lay in the sepulchre until his resurrection; the spirit which he gave up was with the spirits who were detained in prison, or the lower regions, and preached to them, as the passage of Peter testifies.” 28

Other Christian thinkers were also contemplating the nature of God’s administration of the gospel message. John Milton (1608–74), 29 Isaac Barrow (1613–80), 30 and the Quakers under George Fox (1624–91) 31 held that God grants all men a part of his light and grace, by which they receive a time of probation to obey. As this light is received and accepted, salvation is granted them.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, more Christians began to reconsider postmortem evangelism. Samuel Horsley (1733–1806), bishop of St. Asaph, attempted to reconcile a generally traditional interpretation of the harrowing with the belief that there is no repentance after death. Horsley’s solution was that Christ did actually visit hell and preach to spirits in prison, but these spirits were the antediluvians who believed and repented before perishing in the flood and others who repented before death. 32

Other thinkers allowed that repentance was possible in the spirit world but believed Christ’s preaching was efficacious only for the unevangelized. 33 A few Christians claimed that the message of postmortem redemption was open to all. Universalists cited Peter as evidence that men can repent after this life and that God would eventually save all mankind. Indeed, they claimed there never is an end to the period of probation; man can always return to God. 34

Many other Protestant thinkers, including Henry Dodwell (1641–1711), rejected or qualified the Augustinian interpretation. Dodwell believed that Christ preached to the souls of those who had passed away before his Incarnation. 35 Charles Hudson, a pastor in Westminster, Massachusetts, supported a form of postmortem evangelism in which the disembodied spirit of Christ brought the gospel to the disembodied spirits in hell in order that they might accept his preaching and make a moral change in the realm of spirits. 36 The preaching allowed them to repent, but they would still be judged based on their deeds in the flesh. 37

Ann Lee (1736–84), the founder of the Shakers, developed a detailed portrayal of postmortem evangelism. She taught that the gospel will be offered to all souls, either in this world or through postmortem evangelism in the world of spirits. 38 The Shakers had a duty to preach the gospel to the living and the dead, and they believed that they could minister to the dead while in the flesh. 39 Ann Lee even claimed that while Shaker elders preached to the living, the dead also attended the meetings and listened to their words. In addition she claimed to have seen faithful Shakers preaching to the dead after they passed away. 40

However, as Protestantism evolved, new opinions arose regarding the possibility of baptism for the dead. Dodwell believed that since Christ
preached to the dead, there was a possibility that the dead might “be Baptized also. And that even with the Baptism of Water.” He supposed that “the Reason of the Practice alluded to by the Apostle, of Baptizing for the Dead” was for the spiritual cleansing of the deceased’s sins. He imagined that some worthy believers died before being baptized yet warranted the “Equity of the Baptismal Covenant.” In 1837 Alexander Campbell (1788–1866), a Christian restorationist, and John B. Purcell (1800–1883), the Catholic Bishop of Cincinnati, debated tenets of the Catholic faith. In trying to prove the doctrine of purgatory, Purcell defended prayers on behalf of the dead and even cited baptism for the dead as an early Christian practice that validates the performance of pious works on behalf of the dead:

The doctrine of purgatory can be proved by a few plain texts. The first is from 2d Machabees, xii. 42; where we read, that the valiant Machabeus sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice, to be offered for the souls of the dead. “It is, therefore,” says the scripture, “a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.”

He continued,

What is the meaning of the universally prevalent practice, of which St. Paul speaks, of performing pious works, called baptisms for the dead: “Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all. Why are they then baptized for them?” (1st Cor. xv. 29.)

Even before Purcell’s statements, baptism for the dead was practiced in Ephrata, Pennsylvania, by an offshoot of the German Baptist Brethren, or Dunkers, led by Johann Conrad Beissel (1691–1768). One member was concerned that a deceased leader of the group had not been baptized correctly. As a result, queries were made to Beissel to see if baptisms could be performed on behalf of dead relatives. Beissel approved the proposal, and starting in 1738, baptisms for the dead became an extravagant and popular ceremony for the whole community, as members were eager to secure blessings for departed family members. Author William Knecht claims such baptisms were performed for several years afterward, but the practice eventually died out and did not spread from Beissel’s community to any other.

The United Society of Believers in Christ’s Second Appearing, or Shakers, who accepted post-mortem evangelism, also practiced a form of baptism for the dead. Jeffrey A. Trumbower investigated how Shaker communities practiced the rite during the early 1840s. According to Trumbower, Shakers summoned the spirits of the unevangelized—often Native Americans, Eskimos, and Hottentots—and invited them to receive the gospel and be baptized. If accepted, the spirits expressed their desire to listen by possessing the bodies of the Shakers. In the bodies of the living, the spirits of the dead could then be baptized and saved.

These radical communities were not representative of Christian orthopraxy overall. However, their contribution is telling. For as we have seen, the scattered remnants of the doctrine of the harrowing of hell had led to a disparity between belief and practice. These radical communities had merely reconnected practice and belief in an attempt to make sense of the doctrine of Christ’s descent and apostolic teachings on salvific ordinances. Their attempts show us, definitively, that the doctrine of harrowing was never fully erased from Christianity.

**Joseph Smith’s Restoration of Salvation for the Dead**

The doctrine of salvation for the dead was restored to Joseph Smith gradually through divine revelations, beginning as early as 1823 and coming to full fruition in 1841. The revelations came primarily as a result of his study of, meditation on, and prayers concerning passages contained in the Bible and later in the Book of Mormon. And troubling events in his life also, no doubt, occasioned sustained reflection and searching. These events include:

- The death in 1826 of his unbaptized brother Alvin, whom he loved and admired dearly.
- The reluctance of Joseph’s beloved father to accept baptism. Joseph worried about his
father’s salvation until he witnessed his father’s baptism on 6 April 1830 into the newly organized church.

• The deaths of several of his infant children: Alvin lived only a few hours in 1828; twins Thaddeus and Louisa lived only a few hours in 1831; adopted son Joseph Murdock died at 11 months in 1832; Don Carlos died at 14 months in 1841; and a son was stillborn in 1842.

These events, in light of Joseph’s steadfast belief in the biblical requirement of baptism for entrance into heaven, no doubt weighed heavily on Joseph, causing him to seek fervently to understand the eternal condition of his own loved ones, as well as the eternal condition of all mankind in similar situations.

Insights from the Book of Mormon

One of the primary objectives of the ancient authors of the Book of Mormon was to show God’s desire to save all his children. The authors were univocal on Christ’s central role in that process (see, for example, 1 Nephi 13:40; 2 Nephi 9:23). Nevertheless, Book of Mormon writers were mindful of the fact that not everyone has the opportunity to hear the gospel of Christ during his or her mortal life. However, their approaches to this problem were not completely uniform. Specifically we can see two apparently opposed sentiments that create a field of tension. The relief of such tension requires further restoration insights. The first sentiment is that God grants to all men a portion of his light to live by; if they are obedient to that light, then they will be heirs of salvation (inclusivism). The other is the view that without belief in Christ and baptism, mankind will be damned (exclusivism).

For all we know these tensions were left in place by the Lord so as to provoke further reflection by the Saints on the subject, thereby paving the way for the restoration of subsequent truths. Whatever the case, the solution given through Joseph reconciles these two positions, thus releasing them from opposition and inviting them into a mutually beneficial solution to the soteriological problem of evil.

Therefore, to begin, let us examine the first of these two approaches as outlined by Book of Mormon authors. These writers noted that although not all men have the opportunity to learn and obey the gospel’s laws during their mortal life, man is not left totally in the dark, no matter when or where he was born. They taught that while many inhabitants of the earth are unaware of the gospel message and its ordinances, they are still all sufficiently instructed by God to be judged of him (2 Nephi 2:5). For example, the prophet Mormon taught that the light of Christ “is given unto [man] to judge, that [he] may know good from evil; and the way to judge is as plain, that [he] may know with a perfect knowledge. . . . For behold, the Spirit of Christ is given to every man, that he may know good from evil; wherefore, I show unto you the way to judge; for every thing which inviteth to do good . . . is sent forth by the power and gift of Christ” (Moroni 7:15-16; see also Ether 4:7-11). In this sense, all people are given a chance to abide by the light or knowledge given to them, even if it is less than the full gospel message.

Likewise, Jacob, an early Nephite prophet, explained the salvation of the unevangelized in this manner:

where there is no law given there is no punishment; and where there is no punishment there is no condemnation; and where there is no condemnation the mercies of the Holy One of Israel have claim upon them, because of the atonement; for they are delivered by the power of him. For the atonement satisfieth the demands of his justice upon all those who have not the law given to them, that they are delivered from that awful monster, death and hell, and the devil. (2 Nephi 9:25-26)

Similarly, the prophet Abinadi proclaimed, “they that have died before Christ came, in their ignorance, not having salvation declared unto them,” will have part in the first resurrection, which Abinadi called eternal life, as they are “redeemed by the Lord” (Mosiah 15:24). He further stated that “little children also have eternal life” (Mosiah 15:25). However, those who have accepted the law of the gospel, and the faculties to follow it, must be true to their covenants or they will be damned (2 Nephi 9:27; 28:7-9; 3 Nephi 11).

The prophet Alma the Younger learned from an angel that when one dies and the spirit returns to God, the spirit will be consigned to either paradise or hell, paradise being a state of happiness, rest, and peace (Alma 40:12). It is important to note that, according to Alma the Younger, one’s assignment to paradise (or elsewhere, such as spirit prison) is
not based on the acceptance of the Christian faith and its ordinances, but rather depends on whether or not one performed good works in the flesh. The standard seems to be the extent to which one hearkened to or disregarded God’s light (Alma 40:13–14).

As we can see, the Book of Mormon delineates a sense in which divine light is given to all mankind to enable them to obey God.55 All are called by Christ and can come unto him even without their conscious recognition of his hand.56 As Nephi noted, “he inviteth [all his children] to come unto him and partake of his goodness; and he denieth none that come unto him . . . and he remembereth the heathen; and all are alike unto God” (2 Nephi 26:33).

Next, we briefly present the second approach—namely, that man without baptism and belief in Christ is damned. This teaching comes from the most definitive of sources. In 3 Nephi 11:33–34 the resurrected Savior speaks to the people in Zarahemla, teaching that “whoso believeth in me, and is baptized, the same shall be saved; and they are they who shall inherit the kingdom of God. And whoso believeth not in me, and is not baptized, shall be damned” (see 2 Nephi 31:13–21; D&C 84:64, 74; 112:29.)

Thus the Book of Mormon apparently presents somewhat conflicting answers to the soteriological problem of evil. There are ideas similar to inclusivism (each person’s salvation depends on how well his life conforms to whatever light he received), and yet there is an absolute requirement for baptism (exclusivism). To understand this paradox, the reader must remember that the principle of continuing revelation was just as pertinent in Nephite history as it is in our dispensation. Nephite prophets received “line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little” (2 Nephi 28:30; D&C 128:21; see 98:12).

However, one thing is clear. The emphasis in the Book of Mormon on the necessity of gospel ordinances was in tension with the inclusionist ideas presented in other Book of Mormon passages. Thus, questions akin to those that had troubled Augustine were posed to early Mormons.57 Joseph’s own writings attest to a struggle to reconcile scriptural passages stating that God’s grace is open to all men with those passages explicitly stating that salvation is available only through the gospel ordinances. The reconciliation that emerged came only through a significant reformulation of traditional notions of salvation and damnation, heaven and hell, and the introduction of the concept of exaltation58—in other words, it came through additional divine revelation.

Joseph’s Early Revelations

In March 1830, Joseph received a revelation that clarified the nature of damnation. The Book of Mormon, as we have previously shown, spoke of the unbaptized as being damned. Understood in the traditional sense, damnation is of an unlimited duration. But Joseph was told by the Lord that man’s torment shall have an end (see D&C 19:6–12). Specifically, the Lord revealed to Joseph in those passages that the terms eternal punishment and endless torment refer not to nonterminating punishment, but to divine or God’s punishment since God is “eternal” and “endless.” Even those who suffer “endless punishment” shall be released.

In December 1830, Joseph’s translation of the Bible paved the way for a revelation now known as the Book of Moses, which noted the liberation of captive spirits who perished in the flood. As the text records, Enoch saw in vision the wicked generation of Noah, and the Lord tells him that

> These which thine eyes are upon shall perish in the floods; and behold, I will shut them up; a prison have I prepared for them. And That which I have chosen [Christ] hath pled before my face. Wherefore, he suffereth for their sins; inasmuch as they will repent in the day that my Chosen shall return unto me, and until that day they shall be in torment. (Moses 7:38–39)

Enoch saw that “many of the spirits as were in prison came forth, and stood on the right hand of God; and the remainder were reserved in chains of darkness until the judgment of the great day” (Moses 7:57). Between these two early revelations, a very broad, inclusionist doctrine of harrowing is unveiled, especially when one considers that these passages do not speak specifically of the unevangelized but rather of the willfully rebellious.

In March 1831 further details pertaining to the resurrection of the unevangelized were unveiled by the Lord. For the first time in non—Book of Mormon revelations, we are given information as to the state of those who have never heard of Christ. Specifically, Joseph was informed that, “they that knew no law shall have part in the first resurrection; and it shall be tolerable for them” (D&C 45:54). Again, in
Already, within three years of the commencement of the latter-day restoration and the publication of the Book of Mormon, the Saints were given a considerably more detailed harrowing doctrine. Among these revelations, Doctrine and Covenants 19 added significantly to the existing Mormon canon of the time. To this point, the restoration account of Christ’s salvific scope was wider and deeper than others given previously.

January 1832, the Lord revealed that in the day of judgment “it shall be more tolerable for the heathen” than for those that reject the voice of warning raised by the Mormon missionaries (D&C 75:20–22, consistent with Alma 24:30 and 9:23).

Already, within three years of the commencement of the latter-day restoration and the publication of the Book of Mormon, the Saints were given a considerably more detailed harrowing doctrine. Among these revelations, Doctrine and Covenants 19 added significantly to the existing Mormon canon of the time. To this point, the restoration account of Christ’s salvific scope was wider and deeper than others given previously. However, the doctrine had not been fully revealed and would await further eschatological clarification and eventual reintroduction of proxy ordinances.

Joseph’s Understanding Continues to Expand

During his inspired revision of the King James Bible, Joseph also expressed his understanding of the doctrine of postmortem evangelism during the harrowing of hell. His revision of Peter’s first epistle, which may have preceded or followed his vision of the degrees of glory, enlightens us regarding the preaching of the gospel to the dead:

For Christ also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, that he might bring us to God. For which cause also, he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Some of whom were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the long-suffering of God waited, while the ark was preparing; wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. . . . Because of this, is the gospel preached to them who are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live in the spirit according to the will of God. (1 Peter 3:18–20; 4:6 JST)
This undated revision clarifies that Christ’s preaching to the spirits in prison is aimed at drawing men to God and encouraging them to follow the Father’s will. Furthermore, this account and Joseph’s 1832 vision of the three degrees of glory remove any possible particularization problem in the traditional King James rendition of the passage. Peter mentioned only the disobedient spirits of Noah’s day. As such, the passage does not indicate whether Peter meant to also include other disobedient souls who lived either before or after the days of Noah until the Savior’s harrowing of hell. By contrast, Joseph’s version clarifies that the wicked antediluvians were only a subset of the people the Savior taught in the spirit world.

At the conclusion of 1832, Joseph received his “olive leaf revelation,” which explained the inheritance of kingdoms of glory in terms of each heir’s obedience in abiding by the law corresponding to a respective kingdom of glory (D&C 88:20–26, 38). The whole universe is filled with kingdoms, each with its own bounds and conditions. Individuals can inherit a kingdom if they abide by the laws of that kingdom. This revelation showed how God brought the gospel within the reach of all.

The revelation presents the resurrection chronologically. Doctrine and Covenants 88:95–98 explains that at the second coming, people on the earth and in “their graves” who are worthy of celestial glory will be caught up to meet the Lord. The next verse describes the terrestrial resurrection, subsequent to the second coming, for those who “received their part in that prison which is prepared for them, that they might receive the gospel” (D&C 88:99). The final judgment and the telestial resurrection will not occur “until the thousand years are ended” (D&C 88:100–101). Lastly, the sons of perdition are judged and found to “remain filthy still” (D&C 88:102).

Postmortem evangelization is again affirmed, for “all people, both in heaven and in earth, and that are under the earth,” will hear the trump of the angel who bears the everlasting gospel (D&C 88:103–4). So Christ’s preaching of the gospel during his three days in the tomb is not the only instance of postmortem evangelism. With this doctrine, Joseph’s vision relates to texts of apocalyptic Christianity like the Apocalypse of Zephaniah and even the Apostles’ Creed, in which the spirits in hades can hear the word of the Lord and repent of their sins.62

While Joseph’s vision of the three degrees of glory and the olive leaf revelation shed significant light on the soteriological problem of evil by deepening and enlarging Joseph’s understanding of the nature of salvation and allowing the unevangelized an inheritance in the terrestrial and telestial kingdoms after accepting the gospel, there still remained what appeared to be an unpleasant implication that the unevangelized could not receive the highest degree of salvation.63 This is similar to the burden in Enoch’s Dream Visions, as we explored in part one of this series: While righteous Gentiles could become the “white cattle” that the Lord delighted in, they could never achieve the higher glory of the Jews described as “white sheep.” How was such a plan just, either in the ancient Jewish text or in Joseph’s vision?64

In a later vision of the celestial kingdom at the Kirtland Temple in 1836, Joseph received clarification on this issue. In God’s highest kingdom, Joseph saw both living and dead members of his family, including his deceased brother Alvin. That the Prophet and the Saints previously did not think unbaptized adults could enter the celestial kingdom is evident when Joseph “marveled how it was that [Alvin] had obtained an inheritance in that kingdom, seeing that he . . . had not been baptized for the remission of sins.”
explained to Joseph, “All who have died without a knowledge of this gospel, who would have received it if they had been permitted to tarry, shall be heirs of the celestial kingdom of God” (D&C 137:7).

The Lord’s explanation above seemingly implied what is referred to as “middle knowledge”: the idea that by knowing the characters of persons, the Lord can ascertain whether they would have accepted the gospel if they had been given the opportunity. However, this revelation does not claim that the Lord’s “middle knowledge” is sufficient for salvation in the celestial kingdom of the unevangelized. While the Lord will ensure they are saved in the celestial kingdom, the means by which he will accomplish their salvation was not disclosed here. This vision in the Kirtland Temple also discussed the fate of unbaptized children, thus adding to the previous pronouncements on the doctrine in the Book of Mormon and an earlier revelation. Joseph learned that “all children who die before they arrive at the years of accountability are saved in the celestial kingdom of heaven” (D&C 137:10). Again, how little children would receive celestial salvation is not disclosed in this revelation.

The Promised Coming of Elijah: Turning Hearts and Restoring Authority

In translating the Book of Mormon in 1829, the words in 3 Nephi 25:5–6 must have stood out to Joseph. For not only do these verses match the prophecy found in Malachi 4:5–6, but six years earlier an angel had repeated a variation of the verses to Joseph at least four times. Joseph learned that “all children who die before they arrive at the years of accountability are saved in the celestial kingdom of heaven” (D&C 137:10). Again, how little children would receive celestial salvation is not disclosed in this revelation.

The phrase “plant in the hearts of the children the promises made to the fathers” is different enough from the King James rendering as to change its meaning. Elijah’s coming reveals the priesthood and plants the promises made to the fathers in the hearts of the children, rather than turning the hearts of the fathers to the children. Joseph was quick to point out this different reading, though he left no written commentary on its importance. It appears the “promises made to the fathers” would reference the Abrahamic promises—or covenant relationship—made to the Old Testament prophets and peoples throughout the Bible. Rather than focusing on priesthood keys alone, Moroni’s quotation seems to suggest that Elijah’s coming held a broader import in restoring the Abrahamic tradition. This variation of the prophecy found in Malachi 4:5–6 and 3 Nephi 25:5–6 may have been brought to Joseph’s memory again when he was told in an 1830 revelation about “Elijah, unto whom I have committed the keys of the power of turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers, that the whole earth may not be smitten with a curse” (D&C 27:9). From this time onward, Elijah was connected more and more with the specific duties of restoring priesthood keys that provided the authority to “turn the hearts of the fathers to the children” (D&C 110:15) rather than focusing on the broad restoration of priesthood, covenants, and doctrine noted earlier. The understanding of Elijah’s role in the restoration was becoming more specific. It was not until April 1836 that Elijah actually appeared to the Prophet Joseph and Oliver Cowdery subsequent to the dedication of the Kirtland Temple:

Behold, the time has fully come, which was spoken of by the mouth of Malachi—testifying that he [Elijah] should be sent, before the great and dreadful day of the Lord come—To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers, lest the whole earth be smitten with a curse—Therefore, the keys of this dispensation are committed into your hands; and by this ye may know that the great and dreadful day of the Lord is near, even at the doors. (D&C 110:14–16)

In fulfillment of Malachi’s prophecy, the keys of Elijah were finally committed to Joseph Smith in the temple at Kirtland. Significantly, Elijah’s appearance followed that of Elias, who committed into Joseph’s hands the dispensation of the gospel of Abraham,
On 15 December 1840, Joseph wrote the brethren regarding baptism for the dead and assured them that the ordinance was practiced by the ancient Christian churches. Joseph’s letter confirms Simon Baker’s account, as Joseph stated that he “first mentioned the doctrine in public while preaching the funeral sermon of Bro Brunson.”

which encompasses the promises made to Abraham and the accompanying covenants. Supporting Joseph’s 1830 revelation, his experience at Kirtland reaffirmed Elijah’s special place in restoring the keys of the priesthood that allow for the hearts of the children to be turned to the fathers. While very enlightening, these accounts do not tell us when Joseph came to understand that the keys restored by Elijah specifically allowed for performing baptisms for the dead and other vicarious ordinances relating to the salvation of the deceased. At least by 1840, Joseph associated the keys from Elijah with the ability to properly perform all the priesthood ordinances:

Elijah was the last Prophet that held the keys of the Priesthood, and who will, before the last dispensation, restore the authority and deliver the keys of the Priesthood, in order that all the ordinances may be attended to in righteousness. And I will send Elijah the Prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord. . . . Why send Elijah? Because he holds the keys of the authority to administer in all the ordinances of the Priesthood; and without the authority is given, the ordinances could not be administered in righteousness.
Joseph used the prophecy in Malachi 4:5–6, explaining:

It is sufficient to know, in this case, that the earth will be smitten with a curse unless there is a welding link of some kind or other between the fathers and the children, upon some subject or other—and behold what is that subject? It is the baptism for the dead. For we without them cannot be made perfect; neither can they without us be made perfect. Neither can they nor we be made perfect without those who have died in the gospel also. (D&C 128:18)

By 1844 the connection is explicit, and there is no question that Joseph associated Elijah’s keys with the authority to perform baptisms and other ordinances on behalf of the deceased:

This is the spirit of Elijah, that we redeem our dead, and connect ourselves with our fathers which are in heaven, and seal up our dead to come forth in the first resurrection; and here we want the power of Elijah to seal those who dwell on earth to those who dwell in heaven. This is the power of Elijah and the keys of the kingdom of Jehovah.

Returning now to April 1836, the prophet Elijah appeared to Joseph and Oliver Cowdery in the Kirtland Temple, as had earlier been foretold by the angel Moroni (see D&C 2:1–3; JS—H 1:38–89). Elijah informed the Prophet that “the time has fully come” for the turning of “the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers, lest the whole earth be smitten with a curse” (D&C 110:14–15). Then, Elijah committed into their hands “the keys of this dispensation” (D&C 110:16).

In an article in the July 1838 Elders’ Journal, Joseph responded to the following question: “If the Mormon doctrine is true, what has become of all those who have died since the days of the apostles?” He answered, “All those who have not had an opportunity of hearing the gospel, and being administered to by an inspired man in the flesh, must have it hereafter, before they can be finally judged.” Thus, those who died without the law would eventually hear the gospel message.

**Baptism for the Dead**

Over time, Joseph came to understand that the “turning of hearts” spoken of by Malachi, Elijah, and Moroni (D&C 2:1-2) and the keys that Elijah had committed to him referred to the baptisms for the dead that Paul had mentioned (1 Corinthians 15:29). This, then, was the means by which Alvin and others could fulfill the baptismal requirement for entrance into the celestial kingdom of God. Simon Baker recorded Joseph’s first public pronouncement of baptism for the dead, which occurred on 15 August 1840, at the funeral of Seymour Brunson. Baker, who was present at the event, recorded in his journal:

[Joseph] saw a widow in that congregation that had a son who died without being baptized, and this widow in reading the sayings of Jesus “except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven,” and that not one jot nor tittle of the Savior’s words should pass away, but all should be fulfilled. He then said that this widow should have glad tidings in that thing. He also said the apostle [Paul] was talking to a people who understood baptism for the dead, for it was practiced among them. He went on to say that people could now act for their friends who had departed this life, and that the plan of salvation was calculated to save all who were willing to obey the requirements of the law of God.

On 15 December 1840, Joseph wrote the brethren regarding baptism for the dead and assured them that the ordinance was practiced by the ancient Christian churches. Joseph’s letter confirms Simon Baker’s account, as Joseph stated that he “first mentioned the doctrine in public while preaching the funeral sermon of Bro Brunson.” The baptisms were “for their relatives who are dead, who they feel to believe would have embraced the gospel if they had been privileged [sic] with hearing it, and who have received the gospel in the spirit through the instrumentality of those who may have been commissioned to preach to them while in prison.” Therefore, at this time, baptism for the dead was exclusively intended for those considered righteous but unevangelized in the flesh. Indeed, the wicked could hardly qualify for entrance into the celestial kingdom, so what would vicarious baptism achieve for them?

Throughout the rest of his life, Joseph gave several discourses in which he very energetically discussed baptism for the dead and postmortem evangelism, as did other Latter-day Saint leaders. In this, the Saints followed some primitive Christians in correlating postmortem evangelism with ordinances performed for the deceased.
The Need for a Temple

In January 1841, the Lord instructed Joseph that the Saints must build a temple with a baptismal font for the purpose of officiating on behalf of the deceased (D&C 124:25–55) and clarified that baptism for the dead was an ordinance that belonged to the temple rites (D&C 124:39).

In 1841, many Saints were already discussing and writing about baptism for the dead and post-mortem evangelism. An article entitled “Baptism for the Dead” appeared in the church newspaper the *Times and Seasons* in that year. The author argued that the scriptures clearly state that those who reject the gospel and are not baptized in this life are damned, but that if the deceased accepted the gospel in the hereafter and received a vicarious gospel ordinance they could “be blessed with a part in the first resurrection, and be a partaker and an inheritor of a celestial glory.”

A poem by Joel H. Johnson entitled “Baptism for the Dead” supported the doctrine. In the following issue the Twelve published an epistle that spoke of the opportunity the Saints had to “enter the Baptismal Font for their dead relations, so that they may be judged according to men in the flesh, and live according to God in the spirit, and come forth in the celestial kingdom.” Temple ordinances for the salvation of the unevangelized were understood to act in conjunction with the preaching of the gospel to the dead.

On the same day these statements were published in the *Times and Seasons*, Joseph gave a discourse in which he explained that vicarious baptism was the means by which “men can appear as saviors on mount Zion.” He also shared how ministering spirits teach the gospel in the spirit world and cited the Savior’s visit to the spirits in prison after his death as an example. He explained:

A difference between an angel and a ministering spirit; the one a resurrected or translated body, with its spirit, ministering to embodied spirits—the other a disembodied spirit, visiting and ministering to disembodied spirits. Jesus Christ became a minstering spirit, while his body [was] laying in the sepulchre, to the spirits in prison; to fulfill[] an important part of his mission, without which he could not have perfected his work or entered into his rest. . . . Jesus Christ went in body, after his resurrection, to minister to translated and resurrected bodies.

Vicarious Ordinances: A Manifestation of God’s Tender Mercies

Joseph thought it reasonable that God would raise and save the dead and that “there is never a time when the spirit is too old to approach God.” According to Joseph’s revelations and teachings, all can receive God’s mercy except those who have committed the unpardonable sin of denying the Holy Ghost. Joseph was aware of how this belief reflects upon the merciful character of God and answers the soteriological problem of evil. Joseph asked the audience to consider

the case of two men, brothers, equally intelligent, learned, virtuous and lovely, walking in uprightness and in all good conscience, so far as they had been able to discern duty from the muddy stream of tradition, or from the blotted page of the book of nature. One dies, and is buried, having never heard the gospel of reconciliation, to the other the message of salvation is sent, he hears and embraces it, and is made the heir of eternal life. Shall the one become a partaker of glory, and the other be consigned to hopeless perdition? Is there no chance for his escape? Sectarianism answers, “none! none!! none!!” Such an idea is worse than atheism.

The doctrine of baptism for the dead established God’s compassion, justice, and mercy “in preparing an ordinance for the salvation of the dead, . . . their names recorded in heaven, and they judged according to the deeds done in the body.” However, on 3 October 1841 Joseph declared the need to do such work in a temple rather than in the Mississippi River and therefore proclaimed that no more vicarious baptisms would be performed until they could be attended to in the Lord’s house.

Joseph knew that the doctrine was new to the Saints and that some questioned its biblical basis. After all, the practice was mentioned only once in the New Testament. So in March 1842, Joseph explained that “if the[re] is one word of the Lord that supports the doctrin it is enough to make it a true doctrin.” The Saints have the privilege “to be baptized for the remission of sins for & in behalf of our dead kindred who have not herd the gospel or fulness of it.” The ordinance was designed for those who, like Joseph’s brother Alvin, would have received the fulness of the gospel if given the opportunity.

An article in the April 1842 issue of *Times and Seasons*, presumably written by Joseph Smith,
extolled the goodness of God in bringing about baptisms for the dead. Though religions have often claimed exclusive salvation for their adherents and damnation for all others, yet, the author wrote, God looks upon all with paternal regard and mercy and judges men of all nations equally, “not according to what they have not, but according to what they have.” Thus those who lived without the law will be judged without the law. Joseph then testified against traditional views that sins committed in this life cannot be forgiven in the next. Joseph cited Peter’s account of Christ’s preaching to the spirits in prison and asked: Why else would Jesus preach to them unless there was something they could do to improve their condition? This visit was evidence of God’s equal love for the human family. Joseph believed that God “knows the situation of both the living, and the dead, and has made ample provision for their redemption, according to their several circumstances, and the laws of the kingdom of God, whether in this world, or in the world to come.” That God should damn men for circumstances beyond their control is contrary to the love of God. Rather, God has authorized servants to administer to our forefathers in the spirit world. Their release from imprisonment will be brought about upon the same principle as the disobedient of Noah’s day when visited by the Savior. The living are baptized on behalf of the dead, just as in ancient times. Joseph further noted the witness of John Chrysostom as to the Marcionites’ practice of vicarious baptism. Although Joseph admitted the church by the Marcionites’ time was degenerate, he felt it was yet evidence of an originally pure practice sanctioned by God.

Procedures Formalized for Baptisms for the Dead

Later, in August 1842, Joseph expressed his desire to address the Saints on his revelations regarding baptism for the dead, but persecution forced him into seclusion. As a consequence, Joseph wrote two letters, one dated 1 September and the other 6 September, containing what had been revealed to him and laying out the doctrine of baptism for the dead at length. The first letter detailed the manner in which the baptisms were to be performed and recorded (D&C 127:5–10). The second letter dealt with the recording procedures in more detail and stressed its importance for the accounting and judgment of the people (D&C 128:3–8). The second letter further instructed the Saints to construct a baptismal font with appropriate symbolism in the temple in which baptisms for the dead could be performed. Because of this ordinance, Joseph believed, the dead should “speak forth anthems of eternal praise to the King Immanuel, who hath ordained, before the world was, that which would enable [the Saints] to redeem [the dead] out of their prison; for the prisoners shall go free” (D&C 128:22).

A Comparative Analysis

These letters and Joseph’s previous writings and discourses show a marked distinction between Joseph’s baptism for the dead and the
earlier practice of the Ephrata community under Beissel. The Pennsylvanian Dunkers’ baptism on behalf of the deceased was not based upon any belief in postmortem evangelism. Rather, the practice was instituted to secure the salvation of one of the group’s founders; thus the intent was to save faithful Christian ancestors rather than to bring salvation to the unevangelized.\(^{95}\) The practice Joseph introduced also differed in another regard from the contemporary practice of the Dunkers. While both the Ephrata community\(^ {96}\) and the early Mormons baptized for the dead in rivers, Joseph quickly directed that the practice be suspended until it could be performed in the temple. He also instituted systematic record keeping and ordinance procedures for the salvation that God had conceived on a very broad scale.

Joseph’s pattern for baptism for the dead was also different from the Shakers’. While both showed more concern for the unevangelized than did the Dunkers, the Shakers did not baptize for the dead unless their members were possessed by disembodied spirits who were interested in receiving the gospel. Such baptisms were largely targeted toward the spirits of deceased Native Americans. Latter-day Saint baptisms, on the other hand, did not involve possession and were generally performed without any supernatural knowledge of the salvific state of the deceased; early LDS baptisms also did not target specific ethnic groups.

**Continuing Revelation**

On 11 June 1843, Willard Richards wrote in Joseph’s diary that the Prophet taught about Christ’s mission to save the spirits in prison. Joseph elaborated that when Jesus spoke to the penitent thief on the cross (Luke 23:43), he said, “this day you will be with me in the world of Spirits. & then I will teach you all about [the gospel].”\(^ {97}\) Joseph also cited the passage from 1 Peter 3:19 concerning Christ’s visit to the spirit world and said it was for the purpose “that [the spirits] would receive [the gospel, and] could have it answered by proxy [baptism for the dead] by those who live on the earth.”\(^ {98}\) He also explained that “God ordained that he who would save his dead should do it by getting together” and building a temple to perform the saving ordinances of God.\(^ {99}\)

**Additional Vicarious Ordinances**

On 21 January 1844, the Prophet addressed the Saints about the coming of Elijah. He explained that the “turning of hearts” mentioned in Malachi (and by Moroni in 1823) would be better rendered the binding or sealing of hearts.\(^ {100}\) During this discourse, Joseph also extended the proxy ordinances performed on behalf of the dead beyond baptism. He taught that the Saints are to receive “all the ordinances, Baptisms, Confirmations, washings[,] anointings[,] ordinations & sealing powers upon [their] heads in behalf of all [their] Progenitors who are dead & redeem them that they may Come forth in the first resurrection & be exalted to thrones of glory with [them].”\(^ {101}\) These ordinances bind the hearts of generations together.

**Joseph’s Final Teachings**

In March 1844, Joseph gave his famous King Follett discourse in which he stressed the importance of receiving knowledge as a preliminary step to obedience in one’s path toward salvation. According to William Clayton’s report of the sermon, Joseph declared that “knowledge saves a man and in the world of spirits a man can’t be exalted but by knowledge. So long as a man will not give heed to the commandments he must abide without salvation.”\(^ {102}\) The preaching by Jesus and by faithful Saints who have passed on, therefore, was necessary for saving the dead from ignorance. The Prophet also taught during this sermon how effective their missionary efforts could be: “All sins . . . except one there is a provision [for] either in this world or in
the world of spirit... every spirit can be ferreted out... [and] every man who has a friend in the eternal world who hath not committed the unpardonable sin[,] you can save him."103

On 12 May 1844, Joseph explicitly declared that the Saints must receive “their washings and their anointing for their dead” for the purpose of connecting “to the ones in the dispensation before us and trace their leniag[ sic] to connect the priesthood again.” Joseph continued to preach the glad tidings of postmortem evangelization and vicarious work for the dead, and the Saints’ role in both, saying

those who will not obey the gospel will goe [sic] to the world of spirits there to stay till they have paid the utmost farthing or till some person pays their de[b]ts they owe. Now all those [who] die in the faith goe to the prison of Spirits to preach to [those who are] de[a]d [as to the] body, but they are alive in the Spirit & those Spirits preach to the Spirits that they may live according to god in the Spirit and men do minister for them in the flesh and angels bare the glad tidings to the Spirits & they are made happy by these means.104

Other church leaders echoed the Prophet’s teaching that the faithful Saints would evangelize in the spirit world, and Orson Pratt specifically included women in this work.105

Samuel W. Richards, who was also present at this May 1844 discourse, wrote that Joseph felt his position was morally superior to other Christians. Perhaps unaware of some Christians’ acceptance of postmortem evangelism or other answers to the soteriological problem of evil, Joseph, according to Richards, claimed, “The sectarians have no Charity for me but I have for them. I intend to send men to prison to preach to them, and this is all on the Principle of entering in by Water and Spirit.”106 Joseph continued, saying the Saints can perform baptism and “the ordinances being administered by proxy” for the dead, by which “administrators in the eternal world [can] release those spirits from Prison... when the law is fulfilled.”107 Both Richards and Thomas Bullock noted, however, that Joseph instructed that baptisms were only to be performed on behalf of one’s ancestors and near relatives, although Bullock recorded Joseph saying “we may be baptized for those who we have much friendship for, but it must be revealed to the man of God, lest we should run too far.”108

Conclusions

Joseph Smith’s understanding of redeeming the dead via postmortem evangelization and vicarious ordinances performed by the living on behalf of the dead came line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, there a little. His concern for the eternal condition of the unevangelized dead likely arose most immediately as a result of premature deaths in his own family, causing Joseph much anguish of soul as he feared for their eternal salvation. To this his soul expanded in concern for the eternal outcome of all mankind.

Joseph began with the precepts taught in the Book of Mormon (although, admittedly, the highest knowledge of the Book of Mormon authors remained unrevealed to our generation in the sealed portion of the golden plates).109 From this basic foundation, Joseph studied the scriptures, meditated, and prayed fervently for further light, which came gradually from heaven over a period of fourteen years. In the end, Joseph had the joy of comprehending the infinitely tender mercies of the Lord, who provided the means of working for the salvation of each and every soul who would accept it. He had the joy of knowing that God loves us all and desires not to lose a single one of his children.

Joseph’s understanding readdresses the soteriological problem of evil by adding a fourth premise to the original inconsistent triad (see page 30): 4. Those who live and die without having a chance to hear, accept, render obedience to, and receive the ordinances of the gospel will have that opportunity following death. All will be judged according to their works and the degree of light they received while in mortality and in the spirit world and can receive an appropriate kingdom of glory.

This fourth premise resolves the soteriological problem of evil we have explored in this paper. With this premise added, the previous premises no longer contradict one another, and the prospect of God damning entire populations because they had no possibility of hearing the word of salvation is dismissed. God’s plan of salvation has been shown to be both just and merciful, inclusivist and exclusivist110—and the determining factor was not being fortunate to hear and belong to the right religion, but rather, one’s personal reception of the truth
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