

Sept. 13, 1988.

Dear Bruce:

Sorry to have hung up on you yesterday as I should like to have spoken for some time. My brother had just arrived from New Hampshire and we were in the middle of birthday cake, song, gin, general celebration.

I do not recollect Elder Huff but am happy to have gotten in touch with you again. I cannot recollect at all our respective departures from Provo. Who left first? What I do remember is that I, at least, and perhaps you, left under circumstances very much less than those which could be called Happy. There was the silly shit with the game business—the polemics there escape me as well, save to remember it was extraordinarily childish—further, I was, shall we say, "living alone", and lastly, my schooling no longer interested me. At any rate, Provo is ancient history and now we know where we live and can begin anew.

And about this living alone, I send to you an earnest jest:

I have come to learn a few things, none probably true, which may be of mutual benefit during those quiet moments when one looks up from a page at the light and allows the mind to go where it listeth. Recall the very early conversation in the temple,

E: "Jehovah, is it good for man to be alone?"

J: "No, it is not good for man to be alone Elohim."

E: "Jehovah, Let us make a helpmeet for the man Adam."

Quite conveniently my memory fails me at this point, but consider the declaration "it is not good for man to be alone". Most people infer from this assertion that man must have a woman to be happy. This inference is fatally mistaken. All the declaration makes clear is that it is not good for a man to be in paradise alone; not because he is unhappy there, but precisely because he is happy there. There is no nagging, no denials, negations, ceiling staring, headaches, no babysitting, no insurance payments, no sweating, lots of hunting, fishing, talking with God, observing, learning, books, conversation, games, etc.

Indeed, it is not good for Adam to be in such paradise because he would always recognize and observe the arboreal distinctions, "I shall never eat of the fruit of that tree"—simple, unclothed, joyful obedience; naked uncomplicated happiness.

Such a situation simply would not do. It is not good for man to be alone because he's much happier that way. He must be given a helpmeet to do everything possible in the world but help. How else to explain the paradox that with the introduction of the opposite sex Everything goes down hill, the whole world goes down hill? The earth and everything in it is immediately cursed, from Terrestrial glory to telestial in five minutes time. Things get so botched we need a saviour and a crucifixion.

In our church, which is, contrary to all contrary assertion, a clear and unmitigated matriarchy, Eve is praised precisely because Adam would never have eaten the fruit which led to the

fall. "Adam was too stupid to know what was going on. Eve had the big picture." is the argument. My own belief is that he was extraordinarily clever and knew precisely what was going on. His infinite resignation—"I will partake"—is one we must all make, we do so at a different altar when we say "I do" but its as profound a fall.

Of course I do not argue Eve or women are inferior. They suffer too (but are clever enough to enjoy their suffering). The ideal situation is to have two worlds with respective generic memberships. Further, this world would be greatly improved if children and teenagers could be sufficiently nourished on simple pasture grass like cows. Much less expensive.

At any rate, in this introduction of Eve, from the beginning of Life's Battles, there is a lesson to be learned. Man is that he might suffer, and in that suffering have joy, not in this life, but in the next. The life of Christ is decidedly one of alienation, despair, constant disappointment, constant endurance, constant suffering, thorough misunderstanding, bereavement, and an early death. We ought expect no better. "Blessed ("Happy" in the Greek) are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of God" Right. Not in this lifetime but in the next. Be joyful in your posterity, but not in this life. Have rejoicing in your offspring, but not in this life. Expect the worse in this life. No more.

If one can learn to tell jokes in his Suffering he is saved. One must always tell jokes.

Have you read about this project I think called "The Jerusalem Group" which has undertaken to retranslate the four Gospels back in to Hebrew? Whatever passages go back easily, "naturally", and sensibly into Hebrew grammar, their original, are deemed "authentic", the real words of our Lord. The grammatically problematic passages, alas, doomed forever to be accretions and additions. It seems a reasonable project to me. The book of Mormon would give them absolute fits. The only remaining passages would be the Isaiah borrowings and a few from Third Nephi.

I do hope you are getting on reasonably well inspite of circumstances. You were always too nice a fellow to avoid deep, exquisite suffering. Suffering is the lot of the kind almost exclusively. The wicked rarely have a bad day, not even a broken nail.

I must give a little sermon on the Sacrament. Can you recommend to me any articles? By sacrament I mean what every other church calls the Eucharist. Some theologians have constructed Sacramental theologies in which all things which are sign of God's Grace and God working in the world become Sacraments. Thus Baptism is a Sacrament as is a letter from a friend, etc. I'm interested in articles on the Eucharist.

It is of some interest to me that Hellenistic Greeks occasionally used the same word to describe a wine or olive press (lenos) and coffin. Thus the sacramental wine, symbol of blood,

is directly connected with trodding the wine press alone, or the "death" in Gethsemane (Olive Press). The complex of Sacramental images, it seems to me, revolves around Christ's death, the spilt blood, (expended wine), consequent to trodding the wine press alone. Wine stain on clothing is also a symbol of sin or sin's guilt, as well as the blood which removes or cleans the stain.

Any further suggestions would be of great help.

Cordially, i.e.

Sympathetically

Siebach
P.O. Box 8378
Austin Texas
78712



you can tell how busy I am by the lapse between the letter's composition & its posting.

For an insightful treatment of suffering see John Donne's Sermon preached to the King in April 1629. text is Gen. 1:26.

And about this living alone, I send to you an earnest jest:

I have come to learn a few things, none probably true, which may be of mutual benefit during those quiet moments when one looks up from a page at the light and allows the mind to go where it listeth. Recall the very early conversation in the temple,

E: "Jehovah, is it good for man to be alone?"

J: "No, it is not good for man to be alone Elohim."

E: "Jehovah, Let us make a helpmeet for the man Adam."

Quite conveniently my memory fails me at this point, but consider the declaration "it is not good for man to be alone". Most people infer from this assertion that man must have a woman to be happy. This inference is fatally mistaken. All the declaration makes clear is that it is not good for a man to be in paradise alone; not because he is unhappy there, but precisely because he is happy there. There is no nagging, no denials, negations, ceiling staring, headaches, no babysitting, no insurance payments, no sweating, lots of hunting, fishing, talking with God, observing, learning, books, conversation, games, etc.

Indeed, it is not good for Adam to be in such paradise because he would always recognize and observe the arboreal distinctions, "I shall never eat of the fruit of that tree"-simple, unclothed, joyful obedience; naked uncomplicated happiness.

Such a situation simply would not do. It is not good for man to be alone because he's much happier that way. He must be given a helpmeet to do everything possible in the world but help. How else to explain the paradox that with the introduction of the opposite sex Everything goes down hill, the whole world goes down hill? The earth and everything in it is immediately cursed, from Terrestrial glory to telestial in five minutes time. Things get so botched we need a saviour and a crucifixion.

In our church, which is, contrary to all contrary assertion, a clear and unmitigated martriarchy, Eve is praised precisely because Adam would never have eaten the fruit which led to the

fall. "Adam was too stupid to know what was going on. Eve had the big picture." is the argument. My own belief is that he was extraordinarily clever and knew precisely what was going on. His infinite resignation—"I will partake"—is one we must all make, we do so at a different altar when we say "I do" but its as profound a fall.

Of course I do not argue Eve or women are inferior. They suffer too (but are clever enough to enjoy their suffering). The ideal situation is to have two worlds with respective generic memberships. Further, this world would be greatly improved if children and teenagers could be sufficiently nourished on simple pasture grass like cows. Much less expensive.

At any rate, in this introduction of Eve, from the beginning of Life's Battles, there is a lesson to be learned. Man is that he might suffer, and in that suffering have joy, not in this life, but in the next. The life of Christ is decidedly one of alienation, despair, constant disappointment, constant endurance, constant suffering, thorough misunderstanding, bereavement, and an early death. We ought expect no better. "Blessed ("Happy" in the Greek) are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of God" Right. Not in this lifetime but in the next. Be joyful in your posterity, but not in this life. Have rejoicing in your offspring, but not in this life. Expect the worse in this life. No more.

If one can learn to tell jokes in his Suffering he is saved. One must always tell jokes.

... think called "The

(lenos) and co. in. Thus the sacramental wine, ... of ...