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Knowledge as the Prize in Adam and Eve’s Test of Obedience

The battle begun in the premortal councils and waged again in the Garden of Eden was a test of obedience for Adam and Eve. However, it should be remembered that the actual prize at stake was knowledge—the knowledge required for them to be saved and, ultimately, to be exalted. The Prophet taught that the “principle of knowledge is the principle of salvation,”[1] therefore “anyone that cannot get knowledge to be saved will be damned.”[2]

This raises a question: Since salvation was to come through knowledge, why did Satan encourage—rather than prevent—the eating of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge by Adam and Eve? Surprisingly, the scriptural story makes it evident that their transgression must have been as much an important part of the Devil’s strategy as it was a central feature of the Father’s plan. In this one respect, the programs of God and Satan seem to have had something in common.

However, the difference in intention between God and Satan became apparent when it was time for Adam and Eve to take the next step.[3] In this regard, the scriptures seem to suggest that the Adversary wanted Adam and Eve to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Life directly after they partook of the Tree of Knowledge—a danger that moved God to take immediate preventive action by the placement of the cherubim and the flaming sword.[4] For had Adam and Eve eaten of the fruit of the Tree of Life at that time, “there would have been no death” and no “space granted unto man in which he might repent”—in other words no “probationary state” to prepare for a final judgment and resurrection.[5]

It is easy to see a parallel between Satan’s initial proposal in the spirit world and his later strategy to “frustrate” the plan of salvation through his actions in Eden. Just as his defeated premortal scheme had proposed to provide a limited measure of “salvation” for all by precluding the opportunity for exaltation,[6] so it seems that his unsuccessful scheme in the Garden was intended to impose an inferior form of immortality that would have forestalled the possibility of eternal life.[7] Fortunately, however, because the Devil “knew not the mind of God,” his efforts “to destroy the world”[8] would be in vain: the result of his deceitful manipulations to get Adam and Eve to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge was co-opted[9] by God, and the risk of Adam and Eve’s partaking immediately of the fruit of the Tree of Life was averted by the merciful placement of the cherubim and flaming sword.

The Father did intend—eventually—for Adam and Eve to partake of the Tree of Life, but not until they had learned through mortal experience to distinguish good from evil.[10]

With this understanding as a background, let us examine the story of the Fall in more detail.

Satan’s Strategy for Confusion and Deception
The serpent, represented in scripture as Satan’s *alter ego* (or perhaps his associate[^11]), is described as “subtle.”[^12] The Hebrew term behind the word thus depicts it as shrewd, cunning, and crafty, but not as wise.[^13] “Subtle,” in this context, also has to do with the ability to make something appear one way when it is actually another. Thus, it is not in the least out of character later for Satan both to disguise his identity and to distort the true nature of a situation in order to deceive.[^14]

At the moment of temptation, Satan deliberately tries to confuse Eve. The Devil—and the scripture reader—know that there are two trees in the midst of the Garden, but only one of them is visible to Eve.[^15] Moreover, as Margaret Barker explains:

> He made the two trees seem identical: the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil would open her eyes, and she would be like God, knowing both good and evil. Almost the same was true of the Tree of Life, for Wisdom opened the eyes of those who ate her fruit, and as they became wise, they became divine.[^16]

A second theme of confusion stems from Satan’s efforts to mask his identity. The painting shown here portrays the Tempter in the dual guise of a serpent and a woman whose hair and facial features exactly mirror those of Eve. This common form of medieval portrayal was not intended to assert that the woman was devilish, but rather to depict the Devil as trying to allay Eve’s fears, deceptively appealing to her by appearing in a form that resembled her own.[^17]

However, the more pertinent aspect of Satan’s deceptive appearance to Eve in the Garden of Eden is the symbolism of the serpent itself. Of great significance here is the fact that the serpent is a frequently used representation of Christ and his life-giving power.[^18] Moreover, with specific relevance to the location of his appearance to Eve, evidence suggests that the
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form of the Seraphim, whose function it was to guard the Divine Throne, was that of a fiery winged serpent.\textsuperscript{[19]} In the context of the temptation of Eve, Richard D. Draper, S. Kent Brown, and Michael D. Rhodes conclude that Satan “has effectively come as the Messiah, offering a promise that only the Messiah can offer, for it is the Messiah who will control the powers of life and death and can promise life, not Satan.”\textsuperscript{[20]}

Not only has the Devil come in guise of the Holy One, he seems to have deliberately appeared, without authorization, at a most sacred place in the Garden of Eden.\textsuperscript{[21]} If it is true, as Ephrem the Syrian believed, that the Tree of Knowledge was a figure for “the veil for the sanctuary,”\textsuperscript{[22]} then Satan has positioned himself, in the extreme of sacrilegious effrontery, as the very “keeper of the gate.”\textsuperscript{[23]} Thus, in the apt words of BYU Professor Catherine Thomas, Eve was induced to take the fruit “from the wrong hand, having listened to the wrong voice.”\textsuperscript{[24]}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{moses_brazen_serpent_detail_1866.png}
\caption{Moses and the Brazen Serpent (detail), ca. 1866}
\end{figure}

The Forbidden Fruit as a Form of Knowledge
Whether speaking of the heavenly temple or of its earthly models, the theme of access to
hidden knowledge is inseparably connected with the passage through the veil. With respect
to the heavenly temple, scripture and tradition amply attest of how a knowledge of eternity is
available to those who are permitted to enter the heavenly veil. For example, Jewish and
Christian accounts speak of a “blueprint” of eternity that is worked out in advance and shown
on the inside of the veil to prophetic figures as part of their heavenly ascent. In a similar
vein, Islamic tradition speaks of a “white cloth from Paradise” upon which Adam saw the fate
of his posterity. Nibley gave the “great round” of the hypocephalus as an example of an
attempt to capture the essence of such pictures of eternity among the Egyptians, and
showed how similar concepts pervade the literature of other ancient cultures.

With respect to earthly temples, a conventional answer to the question of what kind of
knowledge the tree provided is supplied by Psalm 19:7-9 where, in parallel to the description
of the forbidden fruit in Genesis 3:6 (“pleasant to the sight, good for food and to be desired to
make one wise”), God’s law is described as “making wise the simple, rejoicing the heart and
enlightening the eyes.” Gordon Wenham observes:

The law was of course kept in the Holy of Holies: the decalogue inside the ark and the
book of the law beside it. Furthermore, Israel knew that touching the ark or even
seeing it uncovered brought death, just as eating from the Tree of Knowledge did.

However, given explicit admissions about elements of the First Temple that were later lost,
plausibly including things that were once contained in the temple ark, it is reasonable to
conjecture that the knowledge in question may have included something more than the Ten
Commandments and the Torah as we now know them. Having carefully scrutinized the
evidence, Margaret Barker concluded that the lost items were “all associated with the high
priesthood.” Also probing the significance of the lost furniture “list of the schoolmen,”
Nibley, like Barker, specifically connects the missing “five things” to lost ordinances of the
High Priesthood. By piecing together the ancient sources, it can be surmised that the
knowledge revealed to those made wise through entering in to the innermost sanctuary of
the Temple of Solomon included an understanding of premortal life, the order of creation, and
the eternal covenant—and that it “provided a clue to the pattern and future destiny of the
universe” that “gave power over creation” when used in righteousness.
The rending of the veil at the death of Christ thus symbolizes not only renewed access to the divine presence in heaven but also to the knowledge revealed in earthly temples that makes such access possible.\footnote{39}

Consistent with this general idea, Islamic legend insists that the reason Satan was condemned after the Fall was because he had claimed that he would reveal a knowledge of certain things to Adam and Eve.\footnote{39} In deceptive counterpoint to God’s authentic teachings to Adam in the Islamic version of the naming episode,\footnote{40} Satan is portrayed as recruiting his accomplice, the “fair and prudent” serpent, by promising that he would reveal to it “three mysterious words” which would “preserve [it] from sickness, age, and death.”\footnote{41} Having by this means won over the serpent, Satan then directly equates the effect of knowing these secret words with the eating of the forbidden fruit by promising the same protection from death to Eve, if she will but partake.\footnote{42}

The fifteenth-century \textit{Adamgirk} asks: “… if a good secret [or mystery]\footnote{43} was in [the evil fruit], why did [God] say not to draw near?”\footnote{44} and then answers its own question implicitly. Simply put, the gift by which Adam and Eve would “become divine,”\footnote{45} and for which the Tree of
Knowledge constituted a part of the approach, was, as yet, “an unattainable thing [t]hat was not in its time.”[46] Though God intended Adam and Eve to advance in knowledge, the condemnation of Satan seems to have come because he had acted without authorization, in the realization that introducing the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge to Adam and Eve under circumstances of disobedience and unpreparedness would bring the consequences of the Fall upon them, putting them in a position of mortal danger.

Note that the knowledge itself was good—indeed it was absolutely necessary for their exaltation. However, some kinds of knowledge are reserved to be revealed by God Himself “in his own time, and in his own way, and according to his own will.”[47] As Joseph Smith taught:

That which is wrong under one circumstance, may be, and often is, right under another. A parent may whip a child, and justly, too, because he stole an apple; whereas if the child had asked for the apple, and the parent had given it, the child would have eaten it with a better appetite; there would have been no stripes; all the pleasure of the apple would have been secured, all the misery of stealing lost. This principle will justly apply to all of God’s dealings with His children. Everything that God gives us is lawful and right; and it is proper that we should enjoy His gifts and blessings whenever and wherever He is disposed to bestow; but if we should seize upon those same blessings and enjoyments without law, without revelation, without commandment, those blessings and enjoyments would prove cursings and vexations.[48]

By way of analogy to the situation of Adam and Eve and its setting in the temple-like layout of the Garden of Eden, recall that service in Israelite temples under conditions of worthiness was intended to sanctify the participants. However, as taught in Levitical laws of purity, doing the same “while defiled by sin, was to court unnecessary danger, perhaps even death.”[49]

Hugh Nibley succinctly sums up the situation: “Satan disobeyed orders when he revealed certain secrets to Adam and Eve, not because they were not known and done in other worlds, but because he was not authorized in that time and place to convey them.”[50] Although Satan had “given the fruit to Adam and Eve, it was not his prerogative to do so—regardless of what had been done in other worlds. (When the time comes for such fruit, it will be given us legitimately.)”[51]
The True “Keeper of the Gate”

This work by Andrea da Firenze illustrates the descent of Jesus Christ, after His death and before His resurrection, into what is called in Roman Catholic tradition “Limbo.” Limbo was described as a place reserved for the just who died before Jesus Christ came to earth (Limbo of the Patriarchs) and also—in the Augustinian tradition at least—for infants who died before they could receive baptism and be freed from “original sin” (Limbo of Infants). Here, in a depiction of an event called “The Harrowing of Hell,” Jesus Christ is shown carrying a Crusader’s flag into the dominion of Death and Hell, whose broken gates are gaping wide. Satan, grasping a useless key, peers out from beneath the feet of the advancing Christ. Adam (recognizable here by his long white hair and beard) and Eve (at his arm) are shown as the first ones to be reclaimed by Christ, followed by Abel (carrying a lamb), and other notables including Abraham, David, and Solomon. As they are brought forth, Adam, Eve, and the other just souls are typically shown in depictions of this scene as being taken by the right hand or pulled by the wrist from the place of death, emphasizing their utter dependence on the sure and steady strength of the Savior for their escape. Nibley paraphrases the
teaching of the *Pistis Sophia*, which emphasizes that “[u]ntil Christ came … no soul had gone through the ordinances in their completeness. It was He who opened the gates and the way of life.”

About this redemptive hour of unalloyed joy, Elder Neal A. Maxwell has written:

God’s is a loving and redeeming hand which we are to acknowledge, for “eye hath not seen, nor ear heard.” Even His children in the telestial kingdom receive “the glory of the telestial, which surpasses all understanding.” He is an exceedingly generous God! … One later day, Jesus’ hand will not give the faithful merely a quick, approving pat on the shoulder. Instead, both Nephi and Mormon tell of the special reunion and welcome at the entrance to His kingdom. There, we are assured, He is “the keeper of the gate … and He employeth no servant there.” Those who reject Him will miss out on a special personal moment, because, as He laments, He has “stood with open arms to receive you.” The unfaithful—along with the faithful—might have been “clasped in the arms of Jesus.” The imagery of the holy temples and holy scriptures thus blend so beautifully, including things pertaining to sacred moments. This is the grand moment toward which we point and from which we should not be deflected. Hence, those who pass through their fiery trials and still acknowledge but trust His hand now will feel the clasp of His arms later!
Meanwhile: “One cannot read very far in the scriptures without realizing how much God has concentrated on giving us guidance for the journey between the two gates”[67] of baptism and of celestial glory.

**Conclusions**

Satan deceived Adam and Eve by offering them fruit from the deceptively described Tree of Knowledge and by enacting a cynically false impersonation of the Savior. Having protected them from the intended consequences of the Devil’s plan of entrapment, God instead offers the first couple and all their posterity the real thing: the fruit of the Tree of Life, the atoning power of the Redeemer to sustain them through their mortal probation, and, ultimately, an everlasting endowment of His power and glory.
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Endnotes

[6] See J. M. Bradshaw et al., Mormonism’s Satan. If we can trust the accuracy of a retrospective summary of a discourse by the Prophet from the journal of George Laub, it may help to clarify some of the differences between Satan’s premortal proposal and the Father’s plan: “Jesus Christ… stated [that] He could save all those who did not sin against the Holy Ghost and they would obey the code of laws that was given” (J. Smith, Jr., cited in E. England, Laub, discourse apparently given 7 April 1844, p. 22, spelling and punctuation standardized). From this statement, it seems that the kind of salvation promised by Jesus Christ was that all men, except the sons of perdition, would be “resurrected to [at least] a telestial glory, escaping the second, i.e., spiritual death” (B. R. McConkie, Promised Messiah, pp. 271-275; cf. Doctrine and Covenants 76:43-44, J. F. Smith, Gospel Doctrine, pp. 433-435; J. Smith, Jr., Teachings, 10 March 1844, p. 339).

Satan, on the other hand, was reported in Laub’s account of the Prophet’s statement to have countered with an absurdly unconditional proposal: “Send me, I can save all, even those who sinned against the Holy Ghost” (see J. Smith, Jr., cited in E. England, Laub, discourse apparently given 7 April 1844, p. 22, spelling and punctuation standardized). Apparently trying to do away with the need for an atonement, Satan instead “sought… to redeem… all in their sins” (O. Pratt, 18 July 1880, p. 288; cf. S. J. Condie, Agency, p. 6, Helaman 5:10-11).

It is at the very least questionable whether or not such a “redemption” really would “save” anyone in any sense of the word worth caring about. Be that as it may, it is certain that without the empowering atonement, none could hope to ever attain the degree of righteousness and virtue required for exaltation—for, as President Brigham Young said, “if you undertake to save all, you must save them in unrighteousness and corruption” (B. Young, 30 October 1870, p. 282).

[7] In LDS theology, “eternal life” is more than “immortality.” It equates to “exaltation,” the possibility of postmortal life as a gloriously resurrected being in the presence of God, coupled with the enjoyment of permanent family relationships.
[9] One careful reader suggested that I replace the obscure term “co-opt” with the more universally understood word “preempt.” Since there is no real synonym for “co-opt,” I admit that “preempt” would be perhaps the best equivalent, if a replacement term had to be supplied. “Preempt” conveys perfectly the idea that God is acting to stop Satan short. But what would be lost in the substitution is the idea that God, in His allowing the Devil to carry out the first part of his designs, was afterward able to adopt Satan’s strategy for His own use. That was, it might be said, the most “diabolically clever” aspect of God’s strategy.
B. C. Hafen, Broken, p. 30.

Nephi and John both identify Satan by referring to him figuratively as “that old Serpent” (2 Nephi 2:18; Revelation 12:9). However, changes to the Genesis account appearing in the book of Moses lead the reader to a literal interpretation of the term “serpent.” For example, Moses 4:6 says that: “Satan put it [i.e., the idea to beguile Eve] into the heart of the serpent, (for he had drawn away many after him,)” This JST change directly reinforces the idea that the serpent is not to be identified with Satan himself, but is rather a subsequently recruited accomplice. In addition, Moses 4:5 mentions the serpent simply as a “beast of the field which I, the Lord God, had made.” The phrase in Moses 4:7, “And he [Satan] spake by the mouth of the serpent,” further reinforces this same idea. Such an interpretation, however, should be considered in light of what is presented in the LDS temple endowment.

Moses 4:5.

V. P. Hamilton, Genesis 1-17, pp. 187-188.

See below; also Moses 1:19; Doctrine and Covenants 50:2-3; 52:14; 128:20; 129:8; cf. G. A. Anderson et al., Synopsis, 44:1-2a, p. 51E; R. Giorgi, Anges, pp. 85-88.

T. N. D. Mettinger, Eden, pp. 34-41.

M. Barker, Wisdom, p. 2.

J. O’Reilly, Iconography, p. 168. See also E. A. W. Budge, Cave, pp. 63-64.


Ibid., pp. 42, 150-151.

Ephrem the Syrian, Paradise, 3:5, p. 92.

2 Nephi 9:41. This, then, becomes a type for the scene to which Paul alludes in his description of events that were to precede the second coming of Christ: “for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God” (2 Thessalonians 2:3-4, italics mine).

M. C. Thomas, Women, p. 53.

See, e.g., M. Barker, Temple Theology, p. 28; M. Barker, Boundary, pp. 215-217; H. W. Nibley, Teachings of the PGP, 10, p. 117; cf. J. Smith, Jr., Documentary History, 27 November 1832, 1:299.

For examples, see, e.g., J. M. Bradshaw, God’s Image 1, Moses 1:27b, pp. 62-63.

M. i. A. A. al-Kisa‘i, Tales, p. 82.

As an example from a Jewish ascension text, Nibley points out that at the outset of the heavenly journey of Abraham and Yahoel to the presence of God, “the angel promises to show Abraham what is ‘in the fulness of the whole world and its circle’—thou shalt gaze in
(them) all’ (G. H. Box, Apocalypse, 12, p. 51). Accordingly he saw the pattern of the heavens, ‘the firmaments, … the creation foreshadowed it this expanse,… the age prepared according to it. And I saw beneath the sixth heaven, … the earth and its fruits, and what moved upon it… and the power of its men…. And I saw there a great multitude—men and women and children, [half of them on the right side of the picture] and half of them on the left side of the picture’ (ibid., 21, pp. 66-67)” H. W. Nibley, Abraham 2000, pp. 42-43. For an extensive discussion of other examples, see H. W. Nibley et al., One Eternal Round, pp. 188-585; H. W. Nibley, Abraham 2000, pp. 42-73.

[33] M. Barker, M. Barker, Hidden, pp. 6-7. See also M. Barker, Revelation, pp. 120, 205; T. D. Alexander, From Eden, p. 17 n. 7
[34] H. W. Nibley, Return, p. 54; cf. H. W. Nibley, Apocryphal, p. 310. For more on this topic, see J. M. Bradshaw, God’s Image 1, pp. 658-660.
[35] M. Barker, Older, p. 82.
[37] M. Barker, Older, p. 82; cf. JST Genesis 14:30-31.
The Gospel of Philip depicts the rending of the veil not as the abolition of the temple ordinances, as the church fathers fondly supposed, but of the opening of those ordinances to all the righteous of Israel, “in order that we might enter into… the truth of it.” “The priesthood can still go within the veil with the high priest (i.e., the Lord).” We are allowed to see what is behind the veil, and “we enter into it in our weakness, through signs and tokens which the world despises” (see W. W. Isenberg, Philip, 85:1-20, p. 159).

[39] Recalling an Egyptian version of the story, which revolved around the presumption of the hero, Setne, “in taking the book of Knowledge, which was guarded by the endless serpent” (H. W. Nibley, Message (2005), p. 310), Nibley noted the fact that “a book of knowledge is certainly more logical than a tree of knowledge” (ibid., p. 311). For a Jewish account of a book of knowledge given to Adam in Eden, see S. Savedow, Rezial, pp. 2-4.
[40] See J. M. Bradshaw, God’s Image 1, pp. 177-179 n. 3:19b.
[41] G. Weil, Legends, p. 26. The Islamic account recalls an incident in the Gospel of Thomas (H. Koester et al., Thomas, 13, pp. 127-128), where “Jesus reveals three words” to Thomas which, Barker concludes, “must have been the three words of the secret Name” (M. Barker, Hidden, p. 42).
[44] Ibid., 3:2:5, p. 53.
[45] Ibid., 1:3:71, p. 101. Note, however, that this promise actually would reach its complete fulfillment through taking of the Tree of Life, not merely of the Tree of Knowledge as deceptively asserted here by Satan.
[46] Ibid., 1:3:27, p. 96, emphasis added.
[48] J. Smith, Jr., Documentary History, 11 April 1842, 5:135. Though Satan seems to have been aware of what had been done in other worlds, Moses 4:6 states that he “knew not the mind of God” with respect to this one. Satan’s shortsighted strategy can only be explained in terms of an effort to opportunistically exploit his discovery of certain differences between this world and the “other worlds” of which he had cognizance; and God’s success in co-opting the Devil’s strategy depended on Satan’s ignorance of the ultimate purpose for these differences. See J. M. Bradshaw et al., Mormonism’s Satan.
According to Brock, Ephrem’s answer for “why God did not from the very first grant to Adam and Eve the higher state he had intended for them… illustrates the very prominent role which he allocates to human free will” (Ephrem the Syrian, Paradise, p. 59). In his Commentary on Genesis, Ephrem writes (Ephrem the Syrian, Commentary, 2:17, p. 209):

God had created the Tree of Life and hidden it from Adam and Eve, first, so that it should not, with its beauty, stir up conflict with them and so double their struggle, and also because it was inappropriate that they should be observant of the commandment of Him who cannot be seen for the sake of a reward that was there before their eyes. Even though God had given them everything else [in the Garden of Eden] out of Grace, He wished to confer on them, out of Justice, the immortal life which is granted through eating of the Tree of Life. He therefore laid down this commandment. Not that it was a large commandment, commensurate with the superlative reward that was in preparation for them; no, He only withheld from them a single tree, just so that they might be subject to a commandment. But He gave them the whole of Paradise, so that they would not feel any compulsion to transgress the law.

[50] H. W. Nibley, Return, p. 63. See T. N. D. Mettinger, Eden, pp. 90-92 for a discussion of how, in Job 15:7-8, we are made to understand that the “wisdom of the first human being is the quality that was seized by the first man in the divine council. The situation is not one of eavesdropping. Rather, the first man supposedly had access to the divine assembly… [and] this wisdom was attained without divine authorization.”
[52] From Latin limbus, referring to the edge or boundary of hell.
[53] R. Giorgi, Anges, pp. 46-49; cf. 1 Peter 3:18-21, 4:6 and Ephesians 4:8-10—paraphrasing Psalm 68:18. In recent years, the concept of Limbo for unbaptized children has
increasingly fallen into disfavor in the Roman Catholic Church
(International Theological Commission, Hope).

[54] See Harrowing.

[55] The jaws and teeth of the gates shown here are vestiges from imagery connecting the
abyss of hell to the stomach of Leviathan or the great fish that swallowed Jonah. In the
Harrowing of Hell, “Christ shoves the cross into death’s gullet and forces it to vomit up souls”
(C. W. Bynum, Resurrection, p. 148n. 102; cf. ibid., pp. 192-199).

[56] Galatians 2:9; M. R. James, Apocryphal, p. 140.
[58] G. A. Anderson, Perfection, pp. 158, 175. See also T. M. Compton, Handclasp, pp. 620-621
S. D. Ricks, Dexiosis, Mosiah 22:22.
[61] Doctrine and Covenants 76:89.
[64] Mormon 5:11.
[65] See 1 Peter 4:12-14.
[67] N. A. Maxwell, Wherefore, p. 73.