

## **Brent Schmidt: *Charis* or Grace**

I would like to share how I got interested in the topic of grace (*charis*) before I talk about the relational and covenantal nuances of grace to demonstrate why understanding the meaning of grace is so important. I honestly need a lot more time to fully explore this topic and we'll unfortunately only be able to cover the basics. It would be great if I could even put a number on how many uses of *charis* there are in Greek literature or in the New Testament. The actual number of extant uses of *charis* in the ancient world likely number a *myriad*, a Greek word that means 10,000 or a numberless amount of something.

I grew up in Layton, Utah, near Hill Airforce Base with other young people from diverse Christian backgrounds. Many young people often argued about salvation theology. Grace and faith are two really big topics that often get people really riled up everywhere. I always wondered what grace meant. Because I really wanted to know, I remember asking a lot of people as a teenager and as a missionary and no one inside or outside of the church seemed to be able to answer my simple questions about the meaning of grace. I needed a simple, one word answer to define what *grace* is. When I was in college, instead of studying things that could potentially make me rich or famous, I studied classics. I'm sure many people here are not sure what that is. The branch of classics I studied was Greek and Latin literature. It was great to study about grace or *charis* with some great scholars and when I was finishing my PhD work, I took a graduate seminar on Thucydides. Thucydides is a very challenging Greek historian who writes about the destructive, lengthy conflict between the Spartans and the Athenians or the Peloponnesian war in the fifth century BC. I still remember studying some of Thucydides' difficult speeches and noticing that when Thucydides used the word *charis*, he was referring to a gift that created alliance relationships. In contrast, most people today consider grace to be a no-strings-attached, freebie. Most also consider grace a mystical Biblical concept that automatically makes them saved. However, I began to notice that in ancient Greek literature, including the New Testament, that *charis* or grace did not have the modern nuances that grace is free in the sense that one does not have to do anything. But it is free in the sense that it is available to everyone. I remarkably noticed in many Greek texts that *charis* gifts were associated with creating and maintaining covenants and vertical relationships. These *charis* relationships helped the recipients of these gifts to gradually become better and sometimes even become like the giver.

As a graduate student, I often read the Septuagint and the New Testament in Greek and I noticed that if the ancient classical Greeks used this word *charis* to mean a gift that has reciprocal and relational nuances, why wouldn't Biblical scholars and translators not render *charis* that way in the New Testament to reflect its first-century context? I eventually got enough courage to approach the professor of this Thucydides seminar and I asked her (Susan Prince) in her office whether Thucydides was correctly using the word *charis* in his *Histories*. Thucydides certainly did not use *charis* as a freebie or a no-strings-attached gift like most Protestants render it today in

the Bible. My instructor began to laugh and I became a little bit nervous about what she might say. She remarked “*you figured it out.*” And I said, “*Well, what did I figure out,*” and she said, “*Grace is never a freebie in any ancient Greek text. People in Christian history just made that up that doctrine to make themselves feel better.*” I was completely shocked! Today I’ll show you her statement is true by taking you through dozens of Greek texts and explaining why *grace* becomes changed by late Roman times because of neo-Platonic philosophy. Because of neo-Platonic philosophy, grace begins to have these freebie, no-strings-attached and mystical connotations that have perverted the truth that God-given gifts should create relationships and obligate us to make and keep covenants that enable us to become more than we are now. This relational grace process ultimately enables us to become like our Heavenly Father.

After making this astonishing discovery, I tried to catalog every use of *charis* in antiquity and how each passage was probably understood in the first-century. A few years ago, I published *Relational Grace*, a book that contains an abridged summary of this evidence. If you carefully read the program, you’ll notice that this e-book is available at no charge. And in many ways that is exactly how *charis* works. It’s a gift that is universally given and could be received. You can’t repay the gift of this book or the thousands of hours I spent researching and writing it; you can’t earn it; you don’t merit it either. However in ancient times and in the social sciences, whenever anyone receives a gift, that person becomes obligated to reciprocate and have a relationship with the giver. Therefore the reciprocal obligation established by downloading this e-book at no charge is to read it, wade through some of the extensive Greek evidence, and then teach someone else about what grace is or write a review of it to get the word out about what *grace* is and how it works.

Okay, Why is grace so important? For all the reasons I already mentioned...There are significant doctrinal points that you should notice as we go through what *charis* meant in the first century and I’ll try to point them out along the way. I hope that this knowledge about what *charis* is will help us to appreciate and take full advantage of the gift or *charis* of the atonement of our Savior Jesus Christ. Understanding *charis*, I hope, will help us establish a better relationship with our Heavenly Father as we make and keep covenants. In this enabling process we’ll gain more spiritual gifts and blessings and we’ll can receive all the gifts that God has given us, grace for grace. We’ll conclude by contemplating how we can show more love to God by reciprocating even more than we already are.

I also need to thank John (Jack) Welch and all my Greek professors who are not here. Jack’s been a great cheerleader for me as I’ve been working on this project for many years (although I do not see him in the audience at this moment). I also should thank my wife for supporting me and having to listen to me talk about Greek texts all the time.

Alright, Hopefully you will all get a lot out of this presentation. I'm also going to discuss how an apostasy happened just by analyzing *charis* (grace) and if you stick around until 2:00 we're going to talk about how faith, not only *grace* gets messed up. Faith, by the way, gets completely changed during the apostasy. The Book of Mormon luckily fixes all these problems. As we just read the Book of Mormon we're spiritually fine. We don't really need to worry about Greek or reading this book titled *Relational Grace* or any other book really. Just read the Book of Mormon and you'll already know what grace and faith anciently meant.

Okay, now I'll give you just a one-word answer about what grace or *charis* is. I probably should have written it out in the Greek alphabet but I figured a lot of you guys wouldn't know it. However, maybe if we said it to a neighbor, it would stick better. *Charis* is just a gift or a favor, okay? So just remember, though, gifts are always reciprocal and they're covenantal and they establish relationships. I think if you just understand this definition of grace, that's all you need to know. Will everyone turn to their neighbor and just say *charis*? In Greek class we'd say *Kharis* with a hard "k", and the Greek letter *ch* is guttural or made in your throat. Please go ahead and say *charis*. Alright, now just say *gift*. Just say *gift* to your neighbor. Okay, now please just remember that as we go through all this material and hopefully it will stick in order to note how the meaning of grace changes throughout time.

In the social sciences, the work of Mauss or Sahlins in anthropology and sociology concludes that all gifts always have strings attached, okay? So this is how Heavenly Father works with all of his children. Now you shouldn't normally expect anything different, right? There are different kinds of reciprocity in sociology and generalized reciprocity is the particular kind is the most common. Generalized reciprocity is vertical in a sense that it usually describes individuals who are higher up who are giving things and reciprocating with people who have a lower social status. So for instance, in Thucydides, the Athenians give service to the Korcyreans and then they're supposed to reciprocate, right? Or in a gospel sense it's Heavenly Father who gives us tons of gifts and we're supposed to receive them and, in turn, reciprocate through making and keeping covenants. However, Augustine and the neo-Platonists would say we're obligated to receive grace or gifts. In the restored gospel however, we know we have agency and we are not obligated to receive gifts. But when we choose to receive them, the reception of these gifts creates kinship relationships in the social sciences and in the ancient Greek language. By reciprocating gifts, we can truly be sons and daughters of God. The greatest gift, of course, that our Heavenly Father has given us is the gift of his Son or Jesus Christ's atonement and we're going to talk about that doctrine more, and there are lots of other gifts Heavenly Father also gives us. Paul says to seek after the best gifts and wouldn't it be great if we could receive them all!

Okay, societal cohesion, social equilibrium, do not exist without reciprocity and return of service embodied in grace. Basically, sociologists have concluded that no society would ever exist without these principles (called "functionalism"). So when you give gifts, there's an obligation to

receive it and there is an obligation to repay it, and this exchange creates relationships. This is why this book about grace is titled *Relational Grace*. And there are some theological advantages to knowing that our Heavenly Father is loving; he has a physical body as well so he can grant different kinds of gifts. His body is different than ours, and because of his generous gifts that are sometimes material, our Heavenly Father has an expectation that something small will be given in return, establishing and maintaining a covenant relationship, even though what we reciprocate in turn might be something quite insignificant. There is an expectation to reciprocate, and kinship and friendship are established this way in any culture anyone has ever studied.

I'm not a Hebrew expert. But I do know some basic Hebrew and if you look at grace in Hebrew, you'll find a lot of reciprocity. There are many people here in Provo who know Hebrew well and hopefully one of them will write a book on this subject. My focus has only been on the Greek word *charis* in the New Testament. *Hesed* is often the Hebrew word usually meaning grace and it is translated as *charis* in the Greek Septuagint. There are many examples of reciprocity in the Old Testament as one would already expect by studying the social sciences. The Joseph Cycle in Genesis is one really good place to look to learn more about reciprocal grace. I'm now going to show a lot of information about *charis* or grace. If you want to see ten examples of each topic instead of one or two in the powerpoint, please just download the book. The web address is on your program.

Aristotle insightfully says "giving and returning is that which binds men together in their living arrangements and some gifts others receive while others again make a return gift for what they've received." Reciprocity is how all these ancient societies functioned as described in classical texts. My purpose in looking at *charis* through the ages is to demonstrate how Gentiles would have read Paul's epistles in the first century.

Grace drives the Iliad, beginning with the narrative Achilles who becomes upset with King Agamemnon because reciprocal *charis* is not being exchanged. Achilles sulks in his tent for a lot of the Trojan war and many heroes are killed. The Iliad is about the terrible things that happen when *charis* is not reciprocated. Also, there are different ancient characters in epic poetry who are asking gods to do certain things for their benefit. Chryses asks Apollo to help him and the reason that Apollo is going to reciprocate is because Chryses has made many sacrifices. Chryses wants him to destroy the invaders of his land and Apollo obliges. There are dozens and dozens of examples in my book about reciprocal *charis* in early Greek times..

The very classical Greek in Socrates' plays depicts *charis* as a favor so it gives birth to another favor and so this is how classical Greek society functioned. There's a great line in the Oedipus Rex that says: "I'm welcome everywhere, every man salutes me, and those who want your favor seek my ear since I know how to manage what they ask." This unfortunate king realizes he has

become a power broker. We also find this theme in Paul's writings as grace sometimes describes Jesus as the power broker between us and our Heavenly Father.

In Xenophon's writings, the Persian King Cyrus will feel grateful to you if you are most zealous in his cause and he'll return the favor (*charis*). This is written in the powerpoint slide, *charin* which is in a different form called the accusative or the direct object form of *charis* (and it is from the same noun *charis*). I have lots and lots of inscriptions documenting this phenomenon in my book. James R. Harrison, who has done a lot better work than I have about *charis*, has come to same conclusion about the reciprocal nuances of ancient *charis*.

In a second-century BC epitaph pictured on the slide it says "the people of Tomi (a Black Sea people) give appropriate thanks, and this is an accusative plural form of *charis*, to the Gods for their protection from the recent attacks of a barbarian tribe, the Karoi." How did the people of Tomi show their thanks? They paid their tithing or one-tenth of all their blessings to the god in return. Their action is known as the cycle of the god's beneficence. We pay our tithing because we love our Heavenly Father. Our Heavenly Father has asked us to just do this small thing because of *charis* and we reciprocally get many blessings. Today we enter this cycle of reciprocity when we pay our tithing; that's how grace (*charis*) actually worked before New Testament times for people out in the boonies all over the Greco-Roman world. There are many more surviving tombstones that document this reciprocal phenomenon. One mentions a woman, the descendant of the ancestors who hold all the public positions in the country, by the name of Debra, given in marriage to illustrious man, she loved his children and because she was a chaste woman, the widower set up for her a splendid tombstone. He can't really pay back all the great things she did when she was alive but he's going to make her a nice tombstone to reciprocate to a small degree.

The Roman writer Seneca concluded the greater the favor, the more earnestly must we express ourselves, resorting to such compliments as "you do not know what it is that you have bestowed upon me, but you have a right to know how much more it is than you think." Or "I shall never be able to repay you with my gratitude, but at any rate, I shall not cease from declaring everywhere that I am unable to repay it." We need to not only act, but also speak. Because of the atonement of Jesus Christ, we need to be good missionaries as Seneca taught in the first century. We also find this principle in Luke. You should expect it to be in Luke. Luke has the best Greek and he's writing to a Gentile audience and so he's going to tell us how *charis* works and it's very vertical in this particular passage (6:31-5):. Luke wrote: "as you would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. For if ye love them which love you, what *charis* have ye?" Luke's idea is that we are in a relationship with our Heavenly Father and we only reciprocate with Heavenly Father as we bless and help other people around us. Luke also puts a lot of emphasis on how sinners reciprocate in a bad way. We could talk about negative reciprocity; that's also a huge

theme in the ancient world. Our Savior though emphasizes positive reciprocity. A lot of Roman history is about negative reciprocity or what happens when you're not obedient to Roman rule. We also have the story of the ten lepers in the New Testament. There are ten lepers who are healed, but there is only one who returns to give thanks. Jesus asks where the other nine are. He emphasizes the importance of the reciprocity and returning thanks after receiving gifts from God.

Let's now talk about proof texts that other of our Christian brothers and sisters use to justify doctrines of cheap grace. This is one proof text that Martin Luther really liked (Romans 3:24). It has some problems when you look at it in the Greek and the word "freely" doesn't necessarily exist in the Greek. One could reasonably argue that this adverb *dorean* technically means "as a gift." Joseph Smith correctly stressed "only" in his translation to describe the magnitude of the Savior's sacrifice that cannot be merited. Of course gifts are always reciprocal so there is the nuance of becoming right or just as a gift by his *charis*. Jesus Christ is the *charis* gift of our Heavenly Father, right? The gift of the atonement should inspire us to reciprocally be obedient and make and keep covenants with our Heavenly Father.

Okay, other Protestant proof texts about grace are very problematic. There is a lot of freebie grace here the King James Translation of Romans. These translators emphasize you're saved by free grace (especially Romans 5) that many today interpret to mean a freebie. However, the ancient idea of *charis* is that we're really rescued by the gift of *charis* through a covenant. If you stick around until 2:00 I'm going to explain how faith sometimes actually means a covenant in the New Testament. The KJV's "So not of yourselves, it's a gift of God. So it's not of works" (Ephesians 2:8-9)...should be rendered in a first-century context: "You are rescued by the gift (of Christ's atonement) through a covenant and this gift of God is not of yourselves, nor are you rescued by practices of the law of Moses so that someone may not boast." Did my context-informed rendition destroy Protestant theology about no-strings-attached grace? I think it did!

Okay, There is so much reciprocity in Paul's teachings. In Pauline writings we have *charis* obligations to parents, converts are expected to reciprocate materially and spiritually, he mentions the phrase *giving and receiving* in Philemon. There are dozens and dozens more examples in the book if you want more examples.

I love this verse in Jude that clearly states cheap grace is unacceptable and even the King James translators got this one right: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the *charis*, or we would say reciprocal gift, of our God into lasciviousness and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ." These apostates thought they could do whatever they want after receiving the *charis* gift of the atonement and Jude rightly rebukes them.

Where does the old idea of relational grace become different? Okay. If you study a lot of neo-Platonic philosophy you'll notice it has a lot of error. I have spent too much time with this

philosophy in graduate school and it's painful, okay? Many people think philosophy is bad but this kind of philosophy is really bad for the most part. Plotinus is obsessed with the One, that becomes his very abstract idea of God, which he says, "freely gives by an act of love." And this is where later Catholic and Protestant theology get these ideas about grace as love. However, Grace is a gift not love, remember? There is another Greek word for love that we will hear about later today. *Charis* or grace is certainly given out of love but this is where this idea comes that grace is mystical love. It's from pagan neo-Platonic philosophy and it says "grace is to all things." So everybody automatically receives *grace* and you must accept grace and grace also starts to become mystical as *charis* changes in late Roman times. Plotinus especially makes grace become very mystical.

If you read a lot of Augustine, you'll soon realize he admires Plotinus. One time I remember I was in a graduate seminar in which we were studying the *Confessions* and *the City of God* in Latin. I once remarked to the professor, there are more quotes of Plotinus than there are of the scriptures in his writings. Someone could write a long book about that subject. Augustine is very interested in Plotinus and his late pagan ideas of *grace*. This Augustinian interpretation severs these *charis* nuances of reciprocity and obligations. Augustine eventually argues that the human will cannot resist the will of God. So by late antiquity, *grace* has to now be free in the sense that you don't have to do anything to be saved. For Augustine, God picks and chooses who gets grace and who doesn't. Augustine also justifies the doctrine of a limited atonement from misunderstanding grace.

One big problem with Augustine's views about grace is in *the Confessions* book eight when he admits that he doesn't know Greek. And so he talks about how his teachers beat him with a lot of sticks and it didn't help him learn this challenging language. He wrote that if his wet nurse would have just spoken Greek to him when he was a kid he would have been able to pick it up. But can you imagine, though, this is the great scholar who defines what *grace* is for Christendom for sixteen hundred years—and, in fact, he didn't know Greek very well nor did he understand all the ancient nuances of *charis*. His misunderstanding distorted these central principles of the plan of salvation for millennia. That's a big problem!

In contrast, Augustine's contemporary Pelagius understands *charis*. He was a very learned British monk. Pelagius knew Greek really well and he taught whatever one ought to do, one should do. He asserted we have moral agency and we're not responsible for Adam's transgression. Some of these other doctrines like original sin pop into Christianity through Plotinus. Unlike Pelagius, Augustine argues for a no-strings-attached and irresistible *grace*, which he claims is not reciprocal. The problem is that most of Pelagius writings don't survive. It is now difficult to piece his ideas and theology together. Pelagius unfortunately lost the theological debate about *charis* and was later condemned as a heretic. But Pelagius' theological defeat demonstrates that there was a terrible apostasy related to salvation doctrines that occurred at the beginning of the

fifth century AD. The word apostasy in Greek just means a walking away or a rebellion against the pure, plain and simple truths that we learn about in the Book of Mormon. I'm really grateful for the Book of Mormon because the Book of Mormon restores reciprocal grace for us.

Okay, now Martin Luther, of course, is an Augustinian monk, so you can already imagine where he's going to go with *grace*. Luther says, a very famous passage, he says: "God has taken my salvation out of my hands and into his, making it depend on his choice and not mine and has promised to save me, not by my own work and exhortation, but by his grace and mercy." Like Augustine, Luther knew Latin really well but he didn't know Greek very well. Maybe he needed to study some Thucydides and he would have figured out how grace works. But he also promotes the notion that grace is a freebie and Luther provides lots of quotations of Augustine to talk about what *grace* is. Luther wrote: "God is to be thought of as saving them by free, unconditional, invincible grace." Luther further innovates the idea that *grace* is invincible, that there's nothing you can do about grace. Of course if you remember, *charis* or *grace* is just a gift; Are gifts invincible? No. Okay. We're still on the same page.

Alright, you've probably have heard of the acronym TULIP. With the acceptance of TULIP we're getting really far out in the weeds of the apostasy. we're walking really far away now from how first-century Christians thought of reciprocal *charis*. With the "T" we have the doctrine of the total depravity of man, derived from neo-Platonic philosophy, unconditional election from the "U," meaning some people are elected through *grace* while others aren't. The "L" in TULIP describes a limited atonement of Jesus Christ and for Calvinistic theologians *grace* is irresistible or the "I", and once you receive *grace* you'll persevere, from the "P" as a saint. In contrast to these false doctrines, the Book of Mormon beautifully explains how we must choose to endure to the end. There even are some passages in the New Testament that mention the possibility of falling from *grace*. This reformation interpretation grace is now becoming very, very unscriptural when one understands it's first-century reciprocal context. Does this make sense?

I'm a big fan of Bonhoeffer as you can imagine and there are several twentieth-century thinkers who correctly understood *grace* who I quote in my book. Bonhoeffer, he says "cheap grace wasn't what Christ intended" and he rightly contrasted it with costly grace, the radical discipleship that was required of our Savior's followers.

We could talk for a long time about how Joseph Smith restores the ancient idea of *charis* or *grace* if there were more time. This passage in 2 Nephi is often mocked by many critics of the Church (2 Nephi 25:23): "to be reconciled to God for we know that it is by his grace that we're saved after all we can do." However, in this verse there's the ancient idea that *grace* is given as a gift and it is free in the sense it's available to us. We also have the nuances in this verse that there are obligations, reciprocity associated with reciprocal gifts and we need to make covenants and stay on the covenant path as our Prophet, President Nelson has been emphasizing.

So one question I always ask my Greek students is, how would Joseph Smith know how to restore all the ancient nuances of *charis*? Isn't the restoration amazing? I testify that Joseph Smith was a prophet and we're very, very blessed to have a first century understanding of *grace* in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. I'm very grateful for the Prophet Joseph Smith. I know he's a prophet. The Holy Ghost has already told me that, even though I've studied Greek and Latin my whole life and I find Greek evidence justifying the restoration all the time. I know that Joseph Smith is a prophet.

In the Book of Mormon we also have examples of people who teach cheap grace. One good example is Nehor (Alma 1:3-5). Nehor testifies to the people that all mankind will be saved at the last day, that they need not fear nor tremble, but they might lift up their heads and rejoice for the Lord has created all men and had also redeemed all men and at the end all men should have eternal life. Book of Mormon prophets don't teach this easy *grace* that is very popular today in our world. Understanding that the principle grace is reciprocal and covenantal will help us be better disciples and reciprocate with our Heavenly Father through the gift of his Son's sacrifice.

We are all certainly freed from physical death. We can be saved from spiritual death upon conditions of repentance and obedience by our Savior's atonement. It's free in a sense its open and available. There's no charge for it. Okay? But there are many commandments that we need to keep that prophets emphasize so we can and take full advantage of our Savior's atonement and someday receive a celestial, resurrected, physical body. We have many examples of people who mock the idea of making and keeping covenants and following our Savior in the Book of Mormon. Ancient and modern prophets teach us how to endure to the end through covenantal, relational grace.

I love this passage in Moroni chapter 10 where Moroni states "we're sanctified by grace only by dedicating all to God including our might, mind and strength." If you consider the implications of might, mind and strength, these terms imply many things don't they? Okay. You'd probably get to the temple more often to serve God with all your might, right? If you dedicated your strength to our Heavenly Father, or you probably would read the Book of Mormon like President Nelson's asked to do if you really dedicated your mind to this great work.

Reciprocal grace enables us to have this great relationship with our Heavenly Father. That's how we become reconciled to God. It's through the grace of God that we're ultimately saved, protected and preserved, and we can become like him. I found through reading many ancient texts that when people reciprocate with each other for a while, the recipient actually can become like the giver; isn't that amazing? They say birds of a feather flock together. That's also how grace works.

Okay. So gratitude for receiving grace helps individuals move forward and repent. One of my favorite examples of gratitude is Enos. Abinadi is another really good example. He calls out King Noah and the wicked priests who are comfortable with their sinful lifestyle. We're unprofitable servants but we're still obligated to keep the commandments. This is King Benjamin's main message. Grace is also occasionally used as justice in the Book of Mormon since justice and mercy are two sides of the same coin. There are more examples of this principle in the Book of Mormon quoted in my book.

Lehi's tree of life vision also teaches we're obligated to hold onto the word of God in the context of reciprocal grace. There are many ways to do that. When we continue on the covenant path we are on the road to everlasting life. There's a chapter on this subject in the book if anyone would like to see all of the evidence. Enduring to the end is one of the great messages of the Book of Mormon that counteracts the apostasy. In contrast, today there are many "grace greasers" who believe that grace automatically slides people into heaven. Isn't that easy? However, verses in the Doctrine and Covenants perfectly explain how gifts work and imply that grace is a reciprocal gift. Now how would Joseph Smith know all these ancient nuances of *charis*? Isn't this amazing? Listen to this: "they shall return again to their own place to enjoy that which they are willing to receive because they were not willing to enjoy that which they might have received for what doth it profit a man if a gift (can we substitute *charis* in there?) is bestowed upon him and he receiveth it not. Behold he rejoices not in that which is given unto him; neither rejoices in him who is the giver of the gift." So it's really important we rejoice in the gifts as we recognize they are gifts and fully receive them by appropriately reciprocating. Joseph Smith says we should receive a fullness; it's a *grace* by *grace* process; we reciprocate in covenant relationships with Heavenly Father so we can become like him. This process will be enough for us to receive eternal life if we'll reciprocate. Grace finalizes gospel ordinances in the Doctrine and Covenants, like the very old Catholic Church. What are some gifts our Heavenly Father has so generously given us? Well here's a really long list including: The sacrifice of His Son, Jesus Christ; the gift of the Holy Ghost; agency; bodies; ordinances; prophets; priesthood, etc. We can receive even more gifts too and the best one is charity. I'd now like to invite you to think about how you can reciprocate more with Heavenly Father. I know these things are true and I say these things in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.