

The Wayback Machine - <https://web.archive.org/web/20020610065925/http://www.geocities.com:80/ldsbelief...>  
**My Response to "Patriarchal Blessings -A True Restoration?" By Lane Thuet**

LANE first error comes from an assertion by Ungers Bible Dictionary, pg. 967 that *"The patriarchal age in the Bible lasted from 2086 to 1871 BC. It included Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Jacob's 12 sons"* but we believe that it begins with Adam who is the great Patriarch of the entire human family. Lane states *"One of the things associated with this period is the patriarchal blessing, given by these fathers to their children"* Now why patriarchal blessings can only be applied to the time period that Lane states. Where in the Bible does it state that this practice was done away with? If it was good to do for 200 years, as Lane basically claims, then why not now? Lane does not explain.

Lane is upset that we give patriarchal blessings to members of the church. He correctly states that a patriarch is a *"is the father who stands at the beginning of a family"* but then falsely asserts that the only people that it applies to are Abraham, Issac, Jacob, Jacob's 12 sons and King David.

What about Adam? He is the first of the entire human family. What about Noah as he with is family after the flood? Surely they are fathers that stand at the beginning of a family. Any father can be called a patriarch over his whole family. They stand at the begining of it. Yes those men cited by Lane are also patriarchs but where does it say that they are the only ones that get that title? Joseph Smith is a patriarch of the LDS church. He stands at the beginning of the dispensation and presides over it. Or the father of any family. I am a patriach over my family. And of course most importantly God the Father is the ultimate patriarch. Who is Lane trying to kid here.

Lane then tries to discredit the patriarchal blessings in the LDS church by comparing them to a specific examples in the Old Testament where Jacob and Joseph did something and since it is not exactly the same and under the same circumstances, then the LDS blessings are false. He states that *"the patriarchal custom was for the father to impart a blessing on his sons shortly before his death. These blessings were highly prophetic in nature and foretold the destiny of the child as well as the family line that would come through that child. The father usually reserved the most favorable blessing for the eldest son."* but where does it state that this is the custom or a requirement that in be done by the father shortly before his death? They can be prophetic but there is no requirement for it to be given to the eldest son.

Its also unreasonable requirement as often children die unexpectedly. So if a child were to die suddenly, then the father would not have been able to give his son a blessing. Also fathers die unexpectedly so it would be crazy to limit it to just before someone dies.

Just glancing over my Logic fallacy lists, I see Lane drawing a hasty generalization--Drawing conclusions from too little evidence and the "no true scotsman" fallacy. In this case, that would be "No true patriarchal blessing unless it is given to a son shortly before they die and only given to the eldest son. I counter by saying I know of many patriarchal blessings that were given to people not near death and were not the eldest sons. Lane counters, ah yes but no true patriarchal blessing since ALL have to be given to a son shortly before they die and only given to the eldest son."

The Bible never defines all patriarchal blessings as only being given to a son shortly before they die and only given to the eldest son so its not a valid definition. Its like saying, I saw an 80 year old man riding on a motorcycle thus only 80 year old men ride on motorcycles. Lanes example fails to prove his case.

Lane also asserts that the blessings given in the LDS church are almost never given by the father or even someone related to the person receiving this. This is true but the scriptures do not require this either. Lane then falsely asserts that one of the main reasons for the blessings is to "provide an 'incentive' for the member to live according to LDS Gospel principles" but this assertion might be true for some but his hardly one of the "main purposes" he claims. He cites no evidence to support such a statement.

The other purpose he says its for is to "declare lineage" of what tribe of the house of Israel we belong too. He quotes Joseph Fielding Smith

*"A blessing given by a Patriarch is intended to point out the path which the recipient should travel. It should be given by the spirit of revelation and should be a great comfort and incentive to the recipient to continue on in faithfulness to the end. The Patriarch also holds the key by which the lineage of those whom he blesses may be made known." (Doctrines of Salvation 3:170).*

Lane states *"You can readily see the difference between the patriarchal blessings given in the Bible and those given in the LDS Church. First, in the Bible the recipient's father gave it. That is rarely true in Mormonism."*

Since Lane has not shown any evidence that the scriptures make it a universal requirement that only the recipient's father can give it, his claim is moot. Citing specific examples of blessings does not establish a rule for them in all or even most cases. What would happen if the paternal father died prior to giving his son a blessing? The son is just out of luck?

Lane claims that since no lineage was given by the specific blessings in the Old Testament, that means it would not be done in other blessings. The people in those examples knew their lineage already, then there would not have to be a requirement to give the lineage in the blessing. This does not mean it could not be given. No verse in the Bible prohibits it. Most people don't know their lineage so its appropriate so they could know it. Once again, Lane is simply citing specific examples in the Bible but they are not universal requirements. It is like citing a couple of plane crashes and how they happened and declaring that if any planes don't crash under those exact circumstances, they did not crash.

Lane claims the biggest problem is the blessings he cites from the Old Testament all came true regardless of the actions of the person who received them unlike the blessings done in the LDS church which are said to be fulfilled upon the faithfulness of the recipient. Once again, he is appealing to specific examples and then making a general rule out of them. Nowhere in the scriptures does it make the requirements Lane is stating.

Lane then appeals to his own blessing that he had when he was a member in support of his assertion. He is upset that in his blessing that there was a requirement that he had to remain faithful and work to attain them. I guess Lane just wants to be lazy and have the Lord give his blessings because Lane is just a "good guy"

What he does not understand is blessings often occur in ways that the person receiving it do not understand or expect and there is no timetable set. Maybe if he would have remained faithful, you would be beginning to see their fulfillment. Regardless, he did not remain faithful so he will NEVER receive the blessings.

Lane then makes an absurd claim because his blessing told him he was a direct descendant of Ephraim and he has since left the church, he is now considered "rebellious" and in Doctrine and Covenants 64:34-36, a rebellious person can't be of the lineage of Ephraim. Thus either the blessing was wrong or the D&C is wrong. D&C 64:34-36 is not making the statement Lane claims. It states *"Behold, the Lord requireth the heart and a willing mind; and the willing and obedient shall eat the good of the Land of Zion in these last days. And the rebellious shall be cut off out of the Land of Zion, and shall be sent away, and shall not inherit the Land. For verily I say that the rebellious are not of the blood of Ephriam, wherefore they shall be plucked out."*

Where is Lane getting the idea that a person of the blood of Ephriam can't rebel? That would be violating the law of agency. Verse 36 is not saying that a person of the blood of Ephriam can't rebel, its saying that if a person does, they will be "plucked out" so they will not be accounted by the Lord as part of the blood of Ephriam. Its speaking about Ephriam as a collective body and not individuals. It is to be a righteous body and the Lord will purify it from time to time to keep the body righteous. The people being "plucked out" are those rebellious people of the the blood or tribe of Ephriam. Though lineage is important, a person's righteousness is much more important to the Lord. There are many people who are the direct descendants of Ephriam who are not members of the church nor have ever heard about the church. They have not made the necessary covenants so they have not promises granted to them yet.

If one choses to reject their covenants after they are made, then the Lord voids out his promises and the person is like those who have not made covenants except they are now in a worse postion. This would include Lane. He has been plucked out, or Lane plucked himself out and now is not eligible for the blessing the Lord has for the tribe of Ephriam, regardless of your lineage. The lineage only qualifies you for the blessings that are promised to the tribe, but does not guarantee you of them. The promise is to the tribe itself, not every individual member that is part of the tribe. The individual members have to be righteous and make the covenants or they do not get the blessings. Its that simple. Lane is in error again.

Lane then asserts that *"The New Testament church set up by Christ never had any patriarchs."* Where does it say that there were none? Can Lane prove there where not any? Saying that the New Testament does not speak of them is not evidence but an arguement of silence. Who says everything the apostles taught or did or everything found in the church is mentioned in the New Testament?

In D&C 107:39-53, we find that evangelists can be a patriarch. Evangelists are mentioned in the New Testament. Before anyone objects, let me remind you that D&C 107 was given through a living prophet of God. So if you believe evangelists in the New Testament were not patriarchs, make sure you base that claim primarily from a prophet of God.

Lane claims that the patriarchs in the Old Testament are totally different than those in the LDS church but there is no why he knows this. His examples do not define all the rules regarding Patriarchs or nor do they conflict with the LDS view. He is making a rule by citing a specific example. That is like me seeing two old men riding motorcycles and concluding that all old men ride motorcycles. This is nonsense.

Many thousands of LDS members can testify that their blessings have been or are being fulfilled. That Lane did not realize his blessings is something he has to deal with and with God. Lane then goes off on a short tangent that we are not to gain direction or promises from blessings but from scripture. Yes we do get direction and promises from scripture but nowhere in scripture does it say that is the sole source. Lane fails to prove his case that the blessings in the LDS church are not valid.

