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Scripture Study—Heart, Might, Mind and Strength

Introduction

In ancient literature man has a spiritual as well as a physical being. In Twentieth century naturalism we ignore, if not deny, a spiritual dimension to human existence. Whether or not man has a spirit is a religious question. It also has implications for the teaching-learning process. Educators cannot escape the implications of this issue in developing instructional theory. Any careful explanation of human education must affirm, deny, or intentionally ignore the spiritual dimension of man. We here use a data base that affirms a spiritual as well as a physical dimension to man's nature.

Canonized (formally accepted) Judeo-Christian literature is referred to as scripture—records of God's word to, and dealings with, man. All Judeo-Christian sects, to one degree or another, acknowledge the ancient revelations. A general collection of these records is now widely distributed in book form as the Holy Bible. Traditionally, these writings have been divided into pre- and post-Christian writings and are presented under the titles of the Old Testament (Covenant) and New Testament (Covenant).

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints proclaims that God continues to communicate with man. This church embraces the ancient revelations, as do other Judeo-Christian denominations, but it also claims additional recorded information of God's dealings with his children on earth. Along with the Holy Bible, Latter-day Saints accept The Book of Mormon: A Second Witness for Christ, which chronicles God's dealings with man in the western hemisphere between 2200 B.C. and A.D. 421; The Doctrine and Covenants, a collection of revelations directing the restoration of the Kingdom of God to the earth in these latter days; The Pearl of Great Price, which contains an expanded record of the writings of Moses and Abraham beyond those contained in the Bible; and some of the writings of the Latter-day Prophet, Joseph Smith. These four collections of revelation are referred to as "the standard works" and are used in conjunction with contemporary revelation to govern and guide the affairs of the Church. (In this study the abbreviations BM, D&C, and PGP will be used to denote The Book of Mormon, Doctrine & Covenants and Pearl of Great Price. The term Triple will be used to denote their combined usage.)

We express this note of caution concerning the scriptures. Terms such as heart, mind, might and strength were used as symbols in a particular manner by holy men as they were directed by the Holy Spirit. Those symbols may take on various meaning because the senses of a symbol are supplied by the reader. We do not all understand or interpret symbols in the same manner. That is why the general purpose of the scriptures is not to make clear to man all the ways of the Lord. They were not written to provide textbook
definitions and concise explanations and answers for all doctrinal questions. The scriptures are neither topically organized nor complete in their treatment of any one subject matter. Man, unaided by the Spirit of God, is very limited in his power to interpret correctly the meaning of the scriptures. They need to be read with the same spirit in which they were written in order to be correctly understood. The results of man's efforts to translate the Bible are proof of his fallibility. This is one reason that we do not expect to find clear-cut answers fully outlined and described in the scriptures. But rather, by searching the scriptures we may prepare ourselves for a better understanding of what the Lord has revealed concerning important truths, such as the nature of man.

**Purpose of this Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine all the references in these "standard works" that refer to the Heart, Mind, Might, and Strength of man. As researchers, we assumed that insights into the nature of man may result from a systematic and rigorous examination of these terms in their revelatory context. Accepting the data at their face value, as a revelation of God's knowledge, we anticipated the possibility of obtaining a more correct perception of man's nature and thereby shedding light on factors related to the teaching-learning process. Our immediate objective was to establish, if possible, tentative descriptive definitions for these four terms, which could then be used as guides in further research, exploration, and explanation of teaching and learning.

**Research Procedures**

A computer search generated 3,306 occurrences of the four terms in the standard works. Each of these was printed on 4x6 card stock, along with the complete verse in which it appeared. An initial reading reduced the references to 2,359 relevant citations. (Instances in which the term might was used in ways not related to our study, such as in Genesis 36:7, "that they might dwell together," which uses the term as an adverb rather than a noun, were discarded.) The remaining cards were then cataloged under the appropriate term, resulting in the following distribution: Heart--1,598, Mind--240, Might--115, Strength--406. (See Appendix A, Table 1.)

Each tetradic (all four terms appearing in the same verse), triadic (three of the terms appearing in the same verse), and dyadic (two of the terms appearing in the same verse) use of the terms was identified and classified accordingly. There were 3 tetrads (7 tetrads if one allows the term soul or understanding to be used in place of one of the four terms), 6 triads (9 if one allows soul to be used in place of one of the four terms), and 55 dyads (67 total dyads, but only 55 have a direct and meaningful relationship). (See Appendix A, Table 2.)

The citations under each of the terms heart, mind, might, and strength were then carefully considered and classified under relevant headings and subheadings of variant meanings. References to heart were classified under 5 general categories and 53 subheadings within these categories. References to mind were classified under 3 general categories and 20 subheadings. References to might were classified under 3 categories and no subheadings. References to strength were classified under 8 general categories and no subheadings. The general classifications were arbitrary selections that grew out of reading and discussing the scriptures. The subheadings were the outcome of a more critical analysis. (See Appendix C.)

To organize the data in a manner that conveyed an accurate definition of each term, it was necessary to be sensitive to several considerations in determining what each term...
represented. These considerations were formulated into five steps that functioned as rules or guidelines to assist us in making interpretations. These guidelines are as follows:

(1) **The meaning of a word can be validated only by accurately understanding the context within which that word is used.** Our work with the scriptural use of the terms heart, mind, might, and strength clearly demonstrated the fragile connection between a word and its meaning. This problem is further complicated by the translation process. Context can be easily changed or lost in this process. (See Appendix B for a more detailed discussion of this problem.)

(2) **Generic classes can be used to facilitate the organizing of the data according to similarity of use.** The volume of the data with which we were working and the variety of meanings associated with the four terms demanded some form for clustering the material into meaningful and useful categories. For example, the term heart appeared 1,598 times. The examination of these citations revealed 312 distinct contexts. These distinct contexts were reduced to 5 general classes.

(3) **Classes of data can be physically arranged in file boxes for further study and examination.** Each file box included an index which was color coded, making the location of scriptural references easy and convenient. For biblical references their Hebrew or Greek lexical root was written on the card, as well as other useful information, such as cross references or a reference to the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible.

(4) **Subheadings that reveal differences and similarities in the use of the various terms can help determine distinct and unique meanings.** Generic headings represent the various meanings or senses in which the term may be used, while the subheadings represent the characteristics of the various senses in which the word is used. A careful examination of the similarities and differences revealed by the various subheadings provides a basis for deriving a semantical definition for a particular term. This data base also reveals differences in patterns of word usage between the Bible and Restored Scriptural sources. (See Appendix C.)

(5) **Following guidelines one through four will reduce the window of definition available for each term and thereby restrict the range of meaning that can be appropriately applied to a given term.** (See Appendix D.) If the scope of meaning that can be appropriately applied to a given term is not limited, its original meaning becomes easily obscured and readers are left at the mercy of misuse and possible confusion.

### Analysis of the Data

Two general approaches were used in analyzing the data. The initial approach was to examine the various ways each term was used and to identify as clearly as possible the context for those uses. The recognized variations are reflected in the categories and subcategories that developed as the different scriptures were classified according to use. (See Appendix E.) This procedure revealed a range of possible uses, a comparative popularity for each use, and a contextual probability for mutually distinct meanings for the four terms. In addition to the general classification process, the biblical occurrence of each term was checked against its Hebrew or Greek genitive (the word used in the original language). For example, using this procedure we determined there were eight different Hebrew genitives and three different Greek genitives that are all translated to the English word "heart." (See Table A, Appendix B for the specific tabulation.) The result of this analysis was provocative, but not conclusive, in answering our basic question.
The second approach used in analyzing the data examined the way in which the words were used with each other and in the structure of the phrases or sentences in which they appear. A careful consideration of 15 syntactical or rhetorical devices associated with the uses of these terms provided support as well as raising questions regarding the possibility of mutually distinct meanings for each of the four terms, the evidence not being conclusive. A semantical approach strives to establish meaning for a term by checking it against the context which envelops the term. For the purpose of this study the scriptural citation in which the terms heart, mind, might, and strength appear was considered as the context. Initially, these respective contexts were used to create the various categories and classifications of the terms described above. These contexts were then challenged by a reexamination of each term to see if it could legitimately remain in the category to which it had been assigned. Adjustments were made where necessary. The categories were then used to double check the meanings that should be assigned to the respective terms. The results again allowed the possibility of mutually distinct meanings for each of the terms, but did not close the door on alternative explanations. The final check was an examination of the data to determine if a comparison of the terms with each other as they appeared in tetradic (all four together), triadic (three together), and dyadic (in pairs) forms would enhance or discourage mutually exclusive definitions. New insights appeared. We learned that all the tetradic occurrences were found in the Doctrine and Covenants and that in every instance the message was that everything these terms represented (whatever that might be) was to be focused on serving Jesus Christ. We also learned that in every triadic usage, the term heart was the missing term—suggesting the terms mind, might and strength were lesser extensions of the more central focus, the person. The paired usage of these terms gave us our most compelling evidence. Whether the pairs were used in a composite, equally weighted form such as I Chronicles 28:9, "and serve him with a perfect heart and a willing mind," or in a contrasting fashion as in Alma 13:4 "hardness of their hearts and blindness of their minds," overall pattern augers well for mutually distinctive components of meanings. The denial of this evidence is more difficult to defend than its acceptance.

We acknowledge at the conclusion of this analysis that on the basis of the data alone, we are not in a position to say there is incontestable linguistic proof that heart, mind, might and strength are mutually distinct and definable components of human nature. What we are confident in saying is that the preponderance of linguistic data do support a window of possibility within which one can comfortably and rather clearly define important differences between heart, mind, might, and strength as related but mutually distinct domains within human nature. We are also inclined to argue that the significance of this possibility appears to be so critical to the correct understanding of human nature that it may invalidate or require the reexamination of nearly all contemporary explanations of human nature.

Possible Descriptive Definitions

After carefully analyzing the data according to these procedures, we established the following tentative descriptive definitions. Each of these definitions fits within the window of possibility that remained after we complied with the research provisions. Additional work may make these definitions more operational for evaluation and measurement purposes. In their present form, they are operationally adequate for some theory development.

Heart. The term heart denotes one's character or disposition; it is the governing attitude and feeling of a person. This character or disposition is formed as the individual expresses life in the form of choices. Making choices, in the sense of making commitments, is a function of the heart. The heart constitutes the decision-making center
of human personality and manifests itself as disposition—prevailing tendency, mood or inclination. A person's heart—character or disposition—is subject to change. It not only makes choices, but is influenced by those choices. The heart can also be influenced by forces external to itself. One's heart is distinct from, but necessarily linked to one's mind.

**Mind.** The mind is a system of attracting, organizing, and implementing knowledge or information for use by the heart. It is man's capacity to become aware of things as they are, as they have been or as they will be. The mind, as a capacity, is a tool subject to the management and leadership of the heart. Apparently, it is possible for an individual to choose to relinquish the management and leadership of their mind to another personality but it is not possible to transfer the responsibility for the consequences of that choice.

**Might.** Might refers to the resources—both temporal and spiritual, internal and external—that are legitimately accessible to a person. Might describes all the resources that an individual commands or controls that are at his or her disposal. It includes the moral influences and other forces or materials that are under his or her dominion.

**Strength.** Strength refers to the physical properties associated with an individual's body that are sources of power. These include generative powers in the form of muscle, bone, and tissue; regenerative powers in the form of bodily systems such as the circulatory, respiratory, digestive, neural, and glandular; and procreative powers, i.e., sexual reproductive powers.

**Conclusion and Discussion**

The use of these four terms by God and his representatives to describe the relevant dimensions of human nature can be considered semantic, not stylistic. The four terms do seem to represent mutually distinct components within human nature. It is possible to develop a clear and sensible set of mutually distinct definitions. These definitions provide a technically significant rationale for understanding human nature that has implications for the teaching-learning process. The governing and responsible center of human nature, designated by the heart, has at its disposal a powerful tool, the mind, that is in constant need of management and control. It seems clear that each individual presides over a dominion of resources, called might, that are at his or her disposal. The temporal dimension of man is designated by the term strength, which signifies the physical components and boundaries of the mortal human being. Any attempts to study human nature that deny, ignore or confuse the possibilities implied in this research may entail serious or detrimental limitations.

**Implications**

Some of the general implications of this research for educators could be these:

1. Man is fundamentally a spiritual being functioning in a temporary and restricted mortal environment. Focusing on the temporal dimension of his being while ignoring the spiritual dimension may obscure an understanding of his primary nature and faculties.

2. That dimension of man known scripturally as the heart—character—should be the point of focus and the object of influence for any educational enterprise. Any other approach would, by definition, be misdirected and inappropriate—it would be heartless education.
(3) The mind is a means and not an end in the configuration of human nature. It should be understood and used, but it legitimately belongs to the individual and should not be possessed, circumscribed or coerced by some other personality for training or any other purpose. This does not deny that, by volition, an individual can synchronize his or her mind with some other personality and join that person in mutual endeavors.

(4) The mind is capable of enlargement through proper use, and the heart is capable of perfected development according to prescribed principles.

(5) The might and strength of an individual are the grounds of conventional contact with that person. These are the aspects of human nature most easily understood and most available for use in human interaction. It is through the mind that the person accesses, applies, and adds to or subtracts from these resources. The proper use and expansion of might and strength represents true education. Through the proper discernment of a person's might and strength the educator can discover keys for effectively interacting with an individual's mind and heart.

Appendix A

Table 1

Numerical Distribution of the Occurrences of the Terms Heart, Mind, Might and Strength in the Standard Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scriptural Source</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEART/S</td>
<td>MIND/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD TESTAMENT</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW TESTAMENT</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOK OF MORMON</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; C</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARL OF G. P.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLE</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPLE</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total number of instances in which the term might is used in the scriptures is followed by the number of instances in which might is used as a noun.
Table 2
Identification And Classification Of Tetrads, Triads, And Dyads
Using The Terms Heart, Mind, Might, And Strength

I. Tetrads: coordinate (not subordinate or appositive) words, phrases, or clauses in a group of four, as in Revelation 14: 6 "every nation, kindred, tongue, and people".

A. Scriptural References Using The Terms Heart, Mind, Might, and Strength:

1. Doctrine & Covenants 4: 2 "... serve him with all your heart, might, mind and strength..."
2. Doctrine & Covenants 59: 5 "... love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy might, mind, and strength..."
3. Doctrine & Covenants 98:47 "... turn to the Lord their God, with all their hearts and with all their might, mind, and strength..."

B. Tetradic Scriptural References Using Substitute Terms:

1. Mark 12:30* "... love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength..."
2. Mark 12:33* "... love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength..."
3. Luke 10:27* "... love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind..."
4. 2 Nephi 25:29 "... worship him with all your might, mind, and strength, and your whole soul..."

* Using Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible, the following underlined terms are the lexical equivalents in Greek used in the Biblical translation:

Heart: Kardia, the heart
Soul: Psuche, the breath or spirit
Mind: Dianoia, deep thought- mind, imagination, or understanding
Strength: Ischus, forcefulness, ability, might, power

II. Triads: coordinate words, phrases, or clauses in groups of three's, e.g., lock, stock, and barrel, or life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

A. Scriptural References Using Three Of The Terms Heart, Mind, Might, and Strength:

1. Mosiah 2:11 "... serve you with all the might, mind and strengths.
2. Alma 39:13 "... turn to the Lord with all your mind, might, and strength..."
3. Moroni 10:32 "... love God with all your might, mind and strength...
4. Doctrine & Covenants 11:20 "... keep my commandments, yea, with all your might, mind, and strength."
5. Doctrine & Covenants 20:31 "... love and serve God with all their mights, minds, and strength."
6. Doctrine & Covenants 33:7 "... reap with all your might, mind, and strength."

B. TRIADIC SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES USING SUBSTITUTE TERMS:

1. Deuteronomy 6:5* "... love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

2. 2 Kings 23:25* "... turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might . . ."

3. Matthew 22:37* "... love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."

* Using Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible, the following underlined terms are the lexical equivalents in Hebrew for Old Testament citations and in Greek for New Testament citations:

- Heart: Hebrew: Lebab, the heart (as the most interior organ).
- Greek: Kardia, the heart
- Soul: Hebrew: Nephesh, a breathing creature, vitality
- Greek: Psuche, the breath or spirit
- Might: Hebrew: Me'od, vehemently, diligently
- Mind: Greek: Dianoia, deep thought--mind, imagination

III. Dyads: coordinate pair of words, phrases, or clauses, such as sugar and spice.

A. Heart - Mind (36 relevant citations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bible:</th>
<th>Book of Mormon:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy 28:65</td>
<td>1 Nephi 7: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel 2: 35</td>
<td>1 Nephi 14: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles 28: 9</td>
<td>1 Nephi 17:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 36: 5</td>
<td>Jacob 3: 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel 5:20</td>
<td>Jarom 1: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians 4: 7</td>
<td>Mosiah 2: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews 8:10</td>
<td>Mosiah 7:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews 10:16</td>
<td>Alma 13: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alma 16:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C:</td>
<td>Alma 36:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C 6:22</td>
<td>Alma 48: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C 8: 2</td>
<td>3 Nephi 2: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C 43: 34</td>
<td>3 Nephi 7:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C 45:65</td>
<td>3 Nephi 7:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C 64:34</td>
<td>Ether 4:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;C 104:81</td>
<td>Ether 15:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearl of Great Price:
- Moses 4: 6
- Moses 7: 18,33
- Joseph Smith - History 2: 6, 71: 7
Appendix B

The Challenges and Difficulties Associated With Translation

For the purposes of this study, the Bible was considered in a different light than the other standard works. The Bible is the word of God "as far as it is translated correctly" (PGP, Articles of Faith #8). Because the Bible has been subjected to numerous translations over a large span of years without the availability of the original documents, it has been very susceptible to errors and changes. The Book of Mormon, Doctrine & Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price are accepted as direct revelation or inspiration from God and recorded as such. Joseph Smith served as the principal receptor of these modern-day revelations, and his record stands today in these standard works with almost no variation from the original documents beyond grammatical, format, and typographical adjustments.

Webster's dictionary defines **translation** as "the act of giving the sense or equivalent of, as a word or an entire work, in another language; to give form to ideas; also, to interpret; hence, to explain in other words." It is simply the rendering of a literary work originally produced in one language into another. At one extreme of translation stands the literal rendering of the work into another language, word for word, without concern for the primary differences in grammatical structure, idiom and imagery between the two languages (known as a literal translation).

At the other extreme is the adaptation of the work into another language, an attempt to comprehend and communicate the spirit and meaning of the work by adopting it to the conventions and idioms of the language in which it is being rendered (known as an idiomatic or free translation). Translations always involve interpretation; a translator uses the imperfect medium of language to render in another symbolic form what he thinks the author said. A faithful, or word-for-word translation, can rarely preserve the meaning the author intended. Commenting on this phenomenon, Hugh Nibley wrote:

> If language followed natural laws, then the area of intuition might be reduced to nothing and a machine for perfect translation be devised. But one of the greatest charms of language is that it may be used waywardly, wantonly, whimsically, ironically, subtly,inanely, or literally to any degree which a writer chooses--and it is the greatest masters...
of language that take the most liberties with it. ("Way of the Church," June 1955, p. 385)

Beeckman and Callow, writing about the translation process, add:

The goal should be a translation that is so rich in vocabulary, so idiomatic in phrase, so correct in construction, so smooth in flow of thought, so clear in meaning, and so elegant in style, that it does not appear to be a translation at all, and yet, at the same time, faithfully transmits the message of the original. (Translating The Word Of God. Zondervan Publishing House, 1974)

Translation involves many difficult decisions. In the choice of words and phrases, a translator must choose among alternatives in the receptor language. Other issues, such as what should remain implicit and what should be explicit, must be decided. Implicit information, for example, is found in the same paragraph or an adjacent one (the immediate context), elsewhere in the same document (the remote context), and outside the document (the cultural context). Two important questions that need to be answered to determine the faithfulness of a translation are 1) Does the translation communicate the equivalent meaning of the original? and, 2) Does it communicate it as clearly and as idiomatically as the original did? This study is mainly concerned with the first question, although answers to the second question may help shed light on the meanings of the terms heart, mind, might and strength as used in the scriptures.

All scriptural citations from the Bible are based on the Authorized King James Version (1611). This translation is extremely faithful to the texts available at the time of translation and can be classified more as a literal translation than a free translation (see J. Reuben Clark's Why The King James Version for a more detailed discussion of this problem). One weakness of a literal translation is that it transfers the linguistic form of the original language to that of the receptor language whether or not this is the most natural and clearly understood form. In a more idiomatic translation, the translator uses the natural grammatical and lexical forms of the receptor language to convey the meaning of the original. (See the American Revised edition for an example of this type of translation.) Even the King James translators, who were selected because they were learned men "having special skill in the Hebrew and Greek languages, having taken pains in their private studies of the scriptures for the clearing of any obscurities either in the Hebrew or Greek, or touching any difficulties or mistakings in the former English translations," expressed the liberties they took with their word selection:

For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free? use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit as commodiously? . . . therefore he [God] using divers words in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our English versions out of Hebrew and Greek, for that copy or store that he hath given us.

We have not tied ourselves to a uniformity of phrasing or to an identity of words. (Foreword To The Authorized King James Version)

It may appear that all translations can be classified on a continuum ranging from "literal" at one extreme to "idiomatic" at the other extreme. This approach does not accurately
reflect the basic issue of translation. The differences between translations are more often of emphasis rather than degree of faithfulness. Because languages have different structures, no translation can be completely literal and at the same time convey the meaning accurately. The King James Version is very literary and makes use of many rhetorical figures of speech. Such translations become more complicated as both meaning and power of expression become intertwined to produce good literature. Before considering the actual Biblical citations involving the four terms of this study, we must give attention to the three main reasons why translations often produce unclear passages. They will serve as useful cautions in the analysis of the Biblical data.

(1) **Loss of meanings originally understood by both the author and his audience.** We must assume that the author wrote in a language which was understood by the people to whom his writing was addressed. A translator, therefore, must be highly competent in the language of the original documents and in its nuances and peculiarities. There are no known surviving original manuscripts of the Bible. With the exception of several chapters of Ezra and Daniel, the books of the Old Testament were written in Hebrew. The Hebrew language was generally maintained up to the exile of Israel (722 B.C.) and Judah (586 B.C.), when Aramaic replaced it as the spoken language. At the time of Christ, Greek was the language spoken in the Mediterranean region. Although they were influenced by the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, it appears that the books of the New Testament were originally written in Greek. The Gospels of Matthew and John are possible exceptions. The King James translators were selected based on their "having special skills in the Hebrew and Greek languages," but this was no guarantee that they understood what had been written in those languages and cultures thousands of years before. If a specific concept of the original is unknown or lost, a translator must decide what equivalent it will be given in the receptor language. He may do so by modifying a generic word. Thus, if to the translator the heart represented the base of rational thought, the term "mind" would be used when the faculty is referred to for rational thought. To another translator, it could be the mind that is responsible for rational thought.

(2) **Poor translations.** When we read a book that has been printed from a manuscript prepared by the author himself, and is published under his guidance, we do so with the confidence that its text represents the intended author's meaning in its wording, and even in the details of its punctuation. Any deviation from the author's original intention we attribute to the reader. Although any number of readers may misinterpret or misunderstand the author, having the original document as written and approved by the writer makes it much more possible for one to correctly interpret and understand the intended meaning of the written words. That possibility of correctly understanding the author's meaning is seriously jeopardized when the original documents are lost and only copies or translations into other languages are available. In the case of the Bible, the available texts are copies that are separated from their originals by centuries, with an unknown number of intermediary copies, and in many cases by languages.

No original biblical manuscripts are available today, and many of the documents that were copied over the centuries were, in fact, copies of other copies of the originals. The possibility for errors to occur in copying a text is great. Errors can be introduced by both the casual or absentminded scribe as well as by the conscientious scribe. The results are predictable -- a copy tends to preserve and add to the errors of its predecessors. Many versions of the Bible are available today because translators did not always use the same Hebrew and Greek texts or have the same understanding of the original Hebrew or Greek. None of these texts were free from transcriptional errors. Although the work of the scribes was monumental in preserving the Biblical texts, we must be careful to differentiate between differences that are presented as corrections of faulty texts, and
differences that are deliberate alterations to avoid theologically unacceptable writings. Joseph Smith stated, concerning this matter, "I believe the Bible as it read when it came from the pen of the original writers. Ignorant translators, careless transcribes, or designing and corrupt priests have committed many errors." \(\text{（Teachings Of The Prophet Joseph Smith, p. 327）}\)

Before the invention of the printing press, all documents were copied by hand. Different kinds of material were used for writing in ancient times. From about 200 B.C., a special technique of treating leather was used to produce parchment, which became the principal material for writing. Scrolls were inconvenient to use, and the codex (book with pages) replaced the scroll as the most common format for recording written records. Papyrus and parchment were subject to wear and tear and decay; this necessitated their being copied. It was difficult to keep errors from becoming part of the documents. A word might accidentally be missed or repeated; groups of words might be inadvertently transposed or replaced by synonyms; handwriting might have been difficult to read, requiring guessing. Errors might have been due simply to carelessness. Scribes often worked under poor conditions and were required to work rapidly without being familiar with the material they were copying. Or if he was familiar with the material, a scribe might have felt that some corrections were needed to clarify the meaning of the text, or to increase its readability and so altered the manuscript. The possibilities for errors are endless, but the major challenges can be summarized as follows:

(A) The confusion of letters and even words with similar appearance. The Hebrew script has several letters that are very similar in appearance and can easily be mistaken.
(B) The accidental transposition of letters within a word.
(C) The incorrect division of a group of words or of groups of letters into words.
(D) Dittography, the accidental duplication of a letter or letters in a single word or group of words.
(E) Haplography, the failure on the part of the copyist to repeat a letter, a group of letters in a word, or even a whole word.
(F) Homoioteleuton: a word in a line occurs again in the next line; and the copyist, having written that word in the first line, continues from that word in the next line, thus leaving out all the intervening words.
(G) The incorrect vocalization of a correct consonantal text due to a misunderstanding or divergent interpretation of the author's intent.
(H) Glosses, a brief note, often consisting of a single word that was evidently written above a word that was thought to need some clarification, and meant to remain external to the text. In the course of time, such explanatory notes were incorporated into the text.
(I) Carelessness or fatigue.
(J) When confronted with a strange word or with a familiar word that produced either an unacceptable or nonsense meaning, the scribe inserted another word to fit the context.\(^5\)

The evidence from the comparisons of available texts suggests that the incidence of copyists' errors are infrequent. Their presence, however, indicates a real need to seek supporting evidence for any possible interpretation given for a single passage. The problem is magnified as errors enter into texts and are then propagated in copies.

(3) Language change. Hebrew and Aramaic are Semitic languages, having a different sentence structure than English. Hebrew and Greek have different verbal systems than English, which requires some adaptation in the tenses used. When the
books of the Old Testament were written, biblical Hebrew was a living spoken language. It possessed a range in vocabulary and grammatical construction much greater than that which can be determined by a few limited surviving documents. Words and phrases that were unintelligible to translators may have been replaced with more familiar terms, thus losing the original meaning. Living languages constantly change, and words that translators may have used in 1611 have taken on different meanings.

Cultural influence may have played a significant role in the word selection of translators. For example, in the 16th century the liver was considered to be the seat of affection and passion. References to the liver as the organ of love can be found in Shakespeare's plays. In our modern society, the liver is never associated with love; it is the heart from which love springs. A translator from either century would approach a reference to the seat of love in man with a different understanding. Jerome, who translated the Latin version of the Bible from the Hebrew and Greek, wrote, "I could translate only what I had understood before." (Quoted in Beeckman & Callow Translating The Word Of God.) The Hebrew and Greek world views probably exerted an influence on the translators. For example, the Greek influence, with its passion for categorization and definition, provided more alternative ways to express concepts. The New Bible Dictionary provides the following explanation in their definition of the term heart:

The Hebrews thought in terms of subjective experience rather than objective, scientific observation, and thereby avoided the modern error of over-departmentalization. It was essentially the whole man, with all his attributes, physical, intellectual, and psychological, of which a Hebrew thought and spoke, and the heart was conceived of as the governing centre for all of these. Character, personality, will, and mind are modern terms which all reflect something of the meaning of "heart" in its biblical usage. The heart is, however, a wider term, and the Bible does not distinguish the rational or mental processes in the way the Greek philosophy does.

The translators may have restricted the use of the four terms heart, mind, might, and strength so that they were congruent with the philosophical tenets of the Hebrews in the Old Testament and the Greeks in the New Testament. (See Table 1 in Appendix C for a comparison of the frequency in which the four terms are used in the standard works. Note, for example, the high frequency in the New Testament of the use of the term mind as compared to the frequency of its usage in the Old Testament.)

Biblical Data

The reader is well aware by now that human limitations prohibit perfect translations. All translations are susceptible to error and distortion. The Bible in its translated form has limitations. It does contain the word of God, and as such it is a valuable resource for understanding truth. But one must ask the questions: Does the Bible today contain those things which the holy men of God spoke by divine inspiration? Are the messages the same, or have they been altered? Since we no longer are in possession of the original manuscripts, are the meanings of these texts as the translators understood them? In order to answer such questions we must be aware of 1) the senses of the Hebrew and Greek words as used by the authors, 2) the senses of the Hebrew and Greek words as understood by the translators, 3) the English words adopted for their Hebrew and Greek equivalents, 4) the senses of the original Hebrew and Greek words as understood today, and 5) the senses of current Hebrew and Greek words as we understand them today. Unfortunately this information is not available to us today. We can only examine the data
as we now find them and try to understand them in the light of those considerations we have discussed.

Using Strong's Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible, we can identify the English lexical equivalents of the Hebrew and Greek texts. Each of the four terms is listed in Table A and Table B with their Hebrew or Greek genitives and the percentage of occurrences when that term was translated from that genitive (all references to the Hebrew are from the Old Testament; all references to the Greek are from the New Testament).

Several things become readily apparent from an examination of these data. First, there are multiple lexical genitives in the Hebrew and Greek for each of the four English terms. Second, some of the same lexical genitives are shared by or translated into different English words. For example, the Hebrew word nephesh is translated 15 times as "heart," and 15 times as "mind." (See Table C for a more detailed comparison of the shared genitives for the terms heart-mind and might-strength.) Multiple genitives for each term, some of which are shared, are the results of translation and indicate that any interpretation of Biblical references must be made with caution. Human language, as a medium of communication, is imperfect in its forms and meanings. We can not account for the actions or intentions of all who have influenced the present state of the Bible and must refrain from making judgments concerning the accuracy of the Biblical references. The other standard works--modern revelatory literature--are used to determine the basic meanings that will be affixed to the terms heart, mind, might and strength, and as a standard from which we may compare the Biblical data. It is the authors' conviction that the sources of the modern revelatory scriptures are both sound and more reliable.
Table A
Genitives in the Hebrew and Greek For the Terms Heart and Mind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Genitives</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leb</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lebab</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nephesh</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libab</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l'bab</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mecah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qereb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Genitives</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kardia</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sklerokardia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyche</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Genitives</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nephesh</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leb</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lebab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeqar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Genitives</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nous</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dianoia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phroneo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prothumia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noema</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyche</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anamimnesko</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gnome</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophromeo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prphonema</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ennola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epanamimnesko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homothumalon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homophron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prothumos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapeinophrosune</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hupomimesko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table B**

Genitives in the Hebrew and Greek for the Terms *Might* and *Strength*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MIGHT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Hebrew Genitives</strong></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th><strong>Greek Genitives</strong></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* 177 77</td>
<td>gebuwrah 26 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dunamai 6 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kowach 7 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dunamis 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chavil 6 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ischus 2 .9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>owz 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ischu 1 .1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>own 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ezuz 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teqoph 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yako'el 1 .5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yakowl 1 .5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me'od 1 .5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>otsem 1 .5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Use of the term *might* as the past tense of the verb *may*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STRENGTH</strong></th>
<th><strong>Hebrew Genitives</strong></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th><strong>Greek Genitives</strong></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>owz 57 27</td>
<td>kowach 54 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dunamis 7 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macuz 22 11</td>
<td>gebuwrah 17 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ishus 4 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chavil 10 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ischu 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>own 7 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stereoo 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ezuz 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kratos 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etsem 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exousia 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>netzach 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>endunamoe 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tow'aphat 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>astenes 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mezach 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chozeq 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bad 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethan 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tsuwr 5 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 others 20 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C

Comparison Of Shared Lexical Genitives For The Combinations Of Heart-Mind-Soul And Might-Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Incidence of Translation From Hebrew Genitives %</th>
<th>Incidence of Translation From Greek Genitives in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leb nephesh lebab</td>
<td>psoche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEART</td>
<td>66 2 30</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIND</td>
<td>29 39 11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUL</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gebuwrh owz kowach chayil own ezuwz tegoph dunamis ischus ischuol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGHT</td>
<td>11 1 3 2 1 .5 .5 2 .9 .1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRENGTH</td>
<td>8 27 26 5 3 1 .5 41 24 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

Distinctiveness And Similarities Among The Terms Heart, Mind, Might, And Strength

In languages there are words which have generic meanings as well as words which have more specific and precise meanings. Transportation is a generic term that encompasses specific types of transportation, such as by air, water, or land. These specific words are semantically related by sharing a component of meaning. By identifying specific words that have some known relationship, these words can be compared and contrasted to identify the differences in meanings between the words. Also, if one can identify the generic category of a known semantic set, the same result can be accomplished.

The terms heart, mind, might, and strength are used in the Biblical record singularly, in dyads, in triads, and in tetrads (see Appendix A, Table 2). When terms are found in these various combinations, their meanings and relationship to each other can help support individual word definitions and help eliminate certain alternative explanations. The primary question we need to deal with is whether or not the use of these four terms in the standard works allows for mutually distinctive referents. Because the prophets who wrote the scriptures understood the message in a certain way and communicated this message by selecting words as symbols to represent this meaning, we must allow the text to serve as a guide in understanding the meaning of these words. We recognize that scriptures can have multiple meanings, and that meanings for symbols are supplied by people, who interpret the symbols. Symbols do mean different things to different people at different times. Our purpose in examining the four terms when used either singularly
or in some combination is to identify, if possible, any shared component of meaning as well as meaning specific to each term.

**Combinations And Relations Of The Four Terms**

The contexts for these terms, when used in their various combinations, communicate a clear message. An examination of their contextual meaning is instructive and insightful. The four terms, when used in various combinations, are linked to a referent by an action verb. In almost every case the referent is Jesus Christ. In 13 of the 16 references in which three or more of the terms are used, the referent is Jesus Christ. The few instances in which it is not specifically Jesus, the terms refer to ways of serving him, such as by keeping the commandments. The verbs that link these four terms to the Lord Jesus Christ are all similar in their connotations. The verb *love* is used eight times, the verb *turn* is used three times, *serve* is used twice, and *worship, reap,* and *keep* are each used once. The message is clear: heart, mind, might, and strength are components or features of man's nature that he is to employ in worshiping the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord states his eternal purpose, "For behold, this is my work and my glory--to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man" (Moses 1:39). The Lord's work is to bring about the perfection or completeness of man, and for this to occur, man must fully employ his heart, mind, might, and strength in loving and serving the Lord. Failure to recognize and fully utilize one's heart, mind, might and strength will result in man becoming less than what the Lord makes possible for all men.

From studying the contexts of these scriptural citations we know that heart, mind, might, and strength are members of a semantic set. A semantic set is a group of words that are specifically related to one another, and to which a generic classification can be assigned to identify them as a group. The use of the terms indicates that they are components or features of man's nature--his being. They are the features that man possesses and controls that are required to fully love, serve, and turn oneself to the Lord. The identification of a component shared by all four terms serves as the first step in understanding the distinctive meaning of each term.

If we are to hypothesize that the terms *heart, mind, might,* and *strength* are mutually distinctive, then we must ask upon what basis the terms are mutually distinctive. Ultimately, it is the meaning of each term in its proper context that is most important, but alternative approaches may help establish the distinctiveness of the terms of this study. Two useful approaches involve the study of syntax and of semantics. Syntax is the way in which words are put together to form phrases and sentences; semantics is the study or science of meaning in language forms, especially with regard to its historical change. We will examine the data first on syntactical usage, and then on semantics.

**Rhetorical Terms**

Sentence structure differs in each language but generally includes a subject and a verb. To this core are often added objects (direct or indirect) and modifiers (adjectives, adverbs, pronouns). The expansion or shortening of sentences is often completed with the use of rhetorical devices. Each rhetorical device performs a different function within the sentence structure which may produce a different meaning. The examination of the syntactical structure of all tetrads, triads, and combinations helps us to better determine whether the terms are used in a way that reflects their distinctiveness or whether they are used as various expressions of some common component. Following a presentation of the data using the aforementioned combination of terms, other rhetorical devices will be presented as possible explanations or insights into the meaning of the four terms.
Tetrads, Triads And Dyads

We have previously discussed in Appendix B the special nature of the Biblical citations. The effects of translation and deliberate changes in the Biblical record become evident as we compare the references using combinations of the four terms. Only three tetradic references use the four terms in the standard works, all three are found in the Doctrine & Covenants. The substitute terms soul and understanding are used in three other tetrads found in the Bible and one in the Book of Mormon. Six scriptural references use three of the four terms (triad). Of the six, three are found in the Book of Mormon, three in the Doctrine & Covenants. If the substitute term soul is considered, three other triads may be identified in the Biblical account. Of the six true triads, the term heart is always missing; and of the three references using a substitute word, the term strength is always missing.

As mentioned, an examination of the contexts of each of these references reveals a clear message. Conjoining words are often used to reinforce one another, not to distinguish each term. That is, as the number of terms in a conjoined series increases, the meaning of each term decreases, since it is contrasted with more terms with no appreciable change in the meaning for the whole. Certainly there is some overlap in the meaning of the terms, for they are complimentary. The Lord emphasizes his message and uses the rhetorical force of all four terms in conveying that message. If we hypothesize that the meanings of the four terms are separate and distinct, and complementary in defining a semantic set, then it becomes necessary to isolate the significance of the triads without one of the terms to see how the other terms contrast with the isolated term. This presents no difficulty in arranging the data, for the term heart is always missing in the triads. We examined the contexts of each of the triads and found them to be very revealing. Before the specific injunction to serve or love the Lord with your might, mind and strength, reference is made to a particular disposition or state of righteousness in which one must be found. Accompanying scriptures provide the contextual meaning for the term heart, and once one's heart is in the proper state identified by the Lord, it then becomes essential to employ one's might, mind and strength in the same regard. The term heart is different from the terms might, mind and strength.

The most compelling evidence of some distinctive components in the meaning of each of the four terms is evident in an examination of the dyads. For example, the most common dyad is that of heart-mind. We have discussed the confusion in the biblical record of translating these two terms from the Hebrew and Greek. Examination of the relationships of the two terms when used together strongly indicates distinctiveness. The two terms symbolize components of man which are interrelated and their relationship may vary from being equally weighed, such as in 1 Chronicles 28:9 "and serve him with a perfect heart and a willing mind," to a completely opposite state, as recorded in Alma 13:4--"hardness of their hearts and blindness of their minds." Various contrasts exist between these two states. Never do they appear to be used as synonyms when used in combination. The term heart has some distinctive component which the term mind does not possess, and vice-versa.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine precise definitions for terms that are conjoined in a specific context. Conjoining terms tend to work together when used in the same context. The longer the list of conjoining terms, the more overlap in meaning. Meanings are stable because they overlap. Therefore, there exists some redundancy in the use of the terms in combination, but it is also apparent that differences or distinctiveness exists between the terms.

A discussion of selected rhetorical terms presents alternative explanations of the use of the terms heart, mind, might and strength.
1. **Polysyndeton:** three or more words joined by conjunctions, as in

Mark 12:30  
all thy heart  
and with all thy soul  
and with all thy mind  
and with all thy strength  

Luke 10:27  
all thy heart  
and with all thy soul  
and with all thy strength  
and with all the mind  

(See also Mark 12:33, Deuteronomy 6:5, 2 Kings 23:25, Matthew 22:37, Doctrine & Covenants 59:5, and Doctrine & Covenants 98:47.)

The purpose for the insertion of the "ands" is to make the reader slow down and consider briefly each listed word. The author wants the reader to be aware of each term. There are examples of polysyndeton in all the standard works, perhaps an indication of the importance many prophets felt in communicating the distinctiveness and vital relationship of each term, or in emphasizing the overall message from the Lord.

2. **Asyndeton:** giving a series of words or phrases without any conjunction between them, as in

2 Nephi 25:29  
worship him with all your  
might,  
mind,  
strength,  
and your whole soul.  

Alma 39:13  
turn to the Lord with all your  
might,  
mind,  
and strength,  
that ye lead away the hearts no more to do wickedly.  

Asyndeton allows a reader to move quickly over various matters presented to reach a climactic or summary statement at the end. For example, in 2 Nephi 25:29, the prophet Nephi points out that one could and should worship the Lord with one's mind or one's might or one's strength. However, to emphasize the possibility of one worshipping with some, and not all, of these resources available to man, he includes the summary statement, "and your whole soul."

3. **Permutations:** a form of parallelism in which two parallel lines are quoted with permutations (change in the order of sequence, of elements, or objects in a series) of the original balanced term and its position in the line. If we assume the earliest use of the terms of this study is recorded in Deuteronomy 6:5, we can compare this use with later parallel usages and positions of terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scriptural Reference</th>
<th>Terms In Their Positions In The Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy 6:5</td>
<td>heart soul might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 23:25</td>
<td>heart soul might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 22:37</td>
<td>heart soul mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 12:30</td>
<td>heart soul might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 12:33</td>
<td>heart understanding soul strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 10:27</td>
<td>heart soul strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nephi 25:29</td>
<td>might mind strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:11</td>
<td>might mind strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma 39:13</td>
<td>mind might strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroni 10:32</td>
<td>might mind strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 4:2</td>
<td>heart might strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 11:20</td>
<td>might mind strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. With permutations, important meaning cannot be given to individual words or to the order of words, but only to the overall rhetorical effect of the lines. There appears to be distinguishable patterns of usage in the individual books of scripture. In the Doctrine & Covenants, the order of the terms is consistent. See number four, Parison, for further consideration of word order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 20:31</td>
<td>might, minds, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 33:7</td>
<td>might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 59:5</td>
<td>heart, might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 98:47</td>
<td>heart, might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Parison: phrases or clauses in parallel construction often with similar words in similar positions in the clauses. The pattern in which these terms are located in the scriptures, along with the particular terms that are included in these references, may very well be a result of the specific message being communicated in each book of scripture. Consider the scriptural references from the Latter-day revelatory works:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 4:2</td>
<td>heart, might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 59:5</td>
<td>heart, might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 98:47</td>
<td>hearts, might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:11</td>
<td>might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroni 10:32</td>
<td>might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 11:20</td>
<td>might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 20:31</td>
<td>might, minds, strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. &amp; Cov. 33:7</td>
<td>might, mind, strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or the Old Testament use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy 6:5</td>
<td>heart, soul, might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 23:25</td>
<td>heart, soul, might</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The particular pattern in which these terms are located in the scriptures, along with the particular terms that are included in these references, may very well be a result of the specific message being communicated in each book of scripture, or the same message being communicated to different cultures and times.

3. Tetrads and Triads: These two rhetorical terms have been discussed previously. In order to produce a certain effect on the reader, conjoining terms may also be positioned so as to create assonance, alliteration, or rhyme. Consider the impact of the following phrase:

```
8    6    7
\| | \| |
heart, might, mind, and strength
8    7    9
```

4. Alliteration: the repetition of the same sound at the beginning of words.

5. Prefixal alliteration: the repetition of the same prefix in words that are close together.

6. Consonance: the repetition of consonant sounds, regardless of spelling.
9. **Suffixal homoeoteleuton**: the *placing of words that end* in the same suffix close together.

10. **Superconsonance**: the repetition of *a group of sounds*, as in a consonant cluster.

A possible explanation for this particular arrangement of terms is to cause the reader to vocalize the words with a certain rhythm, to emphasize the importance of each term. Of course this would be the result of the work of translators, if the phrase was not originally given in English. The only three references that use this order are, however, from the Doctrine & Covenants.

11. **Anabasis or Catabasis**: listing *words or phrases* in an order of increasing or decreasing order of importance or of appreciation. Our purpose at this point is not to determine the relative importance of each term. We are considering the possible explanations for the manner in which the data are presented. For example, in the following two scriptures we find this arrangement:

   Doctor & Cov. 59:5  
   with all thy heart,  
   with all thy might,  
   mind,  
   and strength

   Doctor & Cov. 98:47  
   with all their heart,  
   and with all their might,  
   mind,  
   and strength.

Whether or not ranking is present is difficult to determine. This ordering does draw distinction between the individual terms.

12. **Enumeration**: listing several *specific examples* in order to define the scope of a generality or to express magnitude and pervasiveness. We discussed this possibility previously when we considered the common contexts in which we find the various combinations of these terms. Some redundancy does exist in the use of the four terms as well as distinctiveness.

13. **Pleonasm**: the addition of *unnecessary words* or words repetitious in meaning in order to express an idea completely or to add emphasis. When considering the generic-specific word distinction, the terms heart, mind, might, and strength were used to *express the idea* that man is to employ fully all the components or features of his nature in serving and loving God. The possibility exists that the emphasis in these references is on the concept of giving of oneself completely, and not on the individual terms.

14. **Syntheton (complementary)**: *two or more words* conjoined in common usage, where the words are related in meaning but are not synonyms. The dyads provided the greatest evidence for syntheton as an actuality. Again, the use of this rhetorical device supports the idea that the terms are separate and distinct.

15. **Systrophe**: providing a series of *descriptions* of a thing without having defined it. The contexts in which the four terms are used in some combination indicate that the duty of man requires him to employ his heart, mind, might, and strength in serving the Lord. The Lord neither defines these terms nor indicates how one is to employ these resources. This may be the generic component shared by all four terms.

What can we conclude after considering the most plausible syntactical explanations? At this point we are unable to define or give a precise definition to any one term. The four terms within the sentences and phrases of the scriptures reinforce one another in expressing an important message from the Lord. The Lord neither defines the four terms
nor indicates how one is to employ these resources. The specific meaning of these terms must come from another source or approach than syntactical analysis. Therefore we will turn our attention to the study of semantics for help in understanding the meaning of each term based on its scriptural usage.

**Semantics**

A word is no more than a symbol used to represent an area of experience or a part of one's environment or culture. Human language has limitations in conveying meaning. Even to formulate a definition of any one term takes some combination of words. Each word may be given different senses, or symbolize more than one area of experience or part of one's environment. The different senses of a word are present depending on the context in which the word is used. The senses of a symbol are provided by those who use them; a word as a symbol does not have senses. In translation, a translator constantly makes choices between lexical alternatives in an effort to match what he perceives to be the original meaning. Various senses of each word are considered in determining what the word represents. Dictionaries are created based on this principle. Anything less than a complete understanding of the word in all its usages leaves a translation susceptible to error. Translators can make errors by placing a word in a context in which it does not communicate the meaning of the original. Therefore, any attempt to define a term requires an examination of that term in all its contexts. For the purposes of this study, as previously explained, the scriptural citations in which the terms mind, might and strength are used will serve as the relevant contexts. Because of the large number of citations involved, a systematic approach was essential in determining word senses, and thus word definitions.

The five-step process used in determining tentative descriptive definitions for the four terms of this study was stated previously (see page 3). Step 1 involves identifying each word in all its contexts. In Appendix B we discussed the myriad of problems and challenges of translating from one language to another. A context can be easily misunderstood, changed or lost in the process of translation. The Biblical citations are especially susceptible to the loss of word meaning and substitution by other of different senses for the original symbol. For this reason we will give more weight to the other books of scriptures in which these conditions are not present. An examination of the frequencies of the use of the four terms in the scriptures reveals a higher frequency of use in the nonbiblical sources. (See Table 1 for a comparison.) The following general categories resulted from our analysis of the scriptural citations for the terms heart, mind, might and strength. Appendix E provides a complete list of the contexts in which each term was used in the scriptural citations.

**HEART**

The 1598 references in which the terms heart or hearts were used were classified into five general categories. These five categories emerged as a result of the examination of the context in which this term was used. The five categories and the percentages of the total within each category are as follows:

1. **Indicator of an individual's eternal identity.** Each person possesses a soul, which is the cumulative eternal personality of an individual, including 1) the original intelligence, 2) the premortal spirit body, and 3) the mortal or physical body. Examples include:

   Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life. (Proverbs 4:23)

   The meek shall eat and be satisfied: they shall praise the Lord that seek him: your heart shall live for ever. (Psalms 22:26)
He hath made every thing beautiful in his time: also he hath set the world in their heart (Hebrew: hath set the eternal in their heart without which man cannot find out the work that God hath done.) (Ecclesiastes 3:11)

2. The seat of rational functions and decision making. The heart thinks, understands, makes decisions, enlightens, processes information, and stores it in memory. Examples include:

And immediately when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? (Mark 2:8)

For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he: Eat and drink, saith he to thee: but his heart is not with thee. (Proverbs 23:7)

But we, brethren, being taken from you for a short time in presence, not in heart, endeavoured the more abundantly to see your face with great desire. (1 Thessalonians 2:17)

3. Indicator of a positive disposition. With the ability to make decisions and express volition, the heart manifests itself as disposition--prevailing tendency, mood, or inclination. A person's heart--character or disposition--is subject to change. Positive examples include the following:

I know also, my God, that thou triest the heart, and hast pleasure in uprightness. As for me, in the uprightness of mine heart I have willingly offered all these things: and now have I seen with joy thy people, which are present here, to offer willingly unto thee. (1 Chronicles 29:17)

And it is requisite with the justice of God that men should be judged according to their works; and if their works were good in this life, and the desires of their hearts were good, that they should also at the last day be restored unto that which is good. (Alma 41:3)

Behold, verily I say unto you, that the heart of my servant James Covill was right before me, for he covenanted with me that he would obey my word. (D&C 40:1)

4. Indicator of a negative disposition. Dispositions can also be of a negative nature and, just as with positive dispositions, certain consequences necessarily follow. Examples include the following:

But behold, there are many that harden their hearts against the Holy Spirit, that it hath no place in them; wherefore, they cast many things away which are written and esteem them as things of naught. (2 Nephi 33:2)

And their hearts are corrupt, and full of wickedness and abominations; and they love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil; therefore they will not ask of me. (D&C 10:21)

But thine eyes and thine heart are not but for thy covetousness, and for to shed innocent blood, and for oppression, and for violence, to do it. (Jeremiah 22:7)

5. Seat of Feelings and Emotions. The heart manifests nuances of disposition such as grief, joy, desires, passion, affections, afflictions, etc. Examples include the following:
Yea, and cry unto God for all thy support; yea, let all thy doings be unto the Lord, and whithersoever thou goest let it be in the Lord; yea, let all thy thoughts be directed unto the Lord; yea, let the affections of the heart be placed upon the Lord forever. (Alma 37:36)

But Ammon said unto him: I do not boast in my own strength, nor in my own wisdom; but behold, my joy is full, yea, my heart is brim with joy, and I will rejoice in my God. (Alma 26:11)

Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him. (Leviticus 19:17)

The distribution of the references among these five categories is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Eternal Identity</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Seat of Rational Functions</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Indicators of a Positive Disposition</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Indicators of a Negative Disposition</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Seat of Feelings and Emotions</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIND

The mind is a system of attracting, organizing, and implementing knowledge or information for use by the heart. The 240 references were classified according to the following three categories: 1) an indicator of a capacity or attribute of the mind, 2) a function performed by the mind, and 3) a condition or state in which the mind exists. The three categories and the percentage each category makes up of the total number of references are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Capacities or attributes</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Functions</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conditions or states</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Capacities or Attributes. The mind as a system possesses different capacities and attributes. The scriptures indicate at least nine distinguishable capacities or attributes of the mind: 1) depository, a receptacle or stage in which thoughts enter or attempt to enter (the mind also acts as a filter) to gain attention, 2) capable of disposition, inclinations, and desires, 3) veihble, the veil acts as a controller, 4) focusable, capable of concentrating on one thing to the exclusion of other things, 5) directable, by the divine, mortal beings, Satan, or self, 6) that which the mind deals with may be reflected in a person's actions or "state of mind," 7) attuneable or connectable to other minds, 8) expandable, or capable of greater performance, and 9) responsive to light and darkness. Examples include the following:

Now, as my mind caught hold upon this thought, I cried within my heart: O Jesus, thou Son of God, have mercy on me, who am in the gall of bitterness and am encircled about by the everlasting chains of death. (Alma 36:18)

And I said unto them that the water which my father saw was filthiness; and so much was his mind swallowed up in other things that he beheld not the filthiness of the water. (1 Nephi 15:27)
And now, behold, is your knowledge perfect? Yea, your knowledge is perfect in that thing, and your faith is dormant; and this because ye know, for ye know that the word hath swelled your souls, and ye also know that it hath sprouted up, that your understanding doth begin to be enlightened, and your mind doth begin to expand (Alma 32:34)

2. Functions. The mind is the capacity man has by which he becomes aware of things as they are, as they have been, or as they will be. The scriptures indicate that the mind has the ability to perform the following functions: to recall or remember, to forget, to study, to think, to change, to love, to serve, to question, and to assent. Examples include the following:

And the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept. (Mark 14:72)

But, behold, I say unto you, that you must study it out in your mind; then you must ask me if it be right, and if it is right I will cause your bosom shall burn within you; therefore, you shall feel that it is right. (D&C 9:8)

And we have beheld that the great question which is in your minds is whether the word be in the Son of God, or whether there shall be no Christ. (Alma 34:5)

3. Conditions or States. The mind, as a capacity, is a tool subject to the management and leadership of the heart. At any given moment, its condition or state is directly related to the desires of the heart of said person. Minds can be prepared, enlightened, or disturbed. They may exist in numerous states such as excited, peaceful, corrupt, etc. Examples include:

These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so. (Acts 17:11)

Behold, thou knowest that thou hast inquired of me and I did enlighten thy mind; and now I tell thee these things that thou mayest know that thou hast been enlightened by the Spirit of truth. (D&C 6:15)

And also Zeezrom lay sick at Sidom, with a burning fever which was caused by the great tribulations of his mind on account of his wickedness, . . . And this great sin, and his many other sins, did harrow up his mind until it did become exceedingly sore. (Alma 15:3)

MIGHT

The term might refers to the resources--both temporal and spiritual--that are legitimately accessible to a person. Might is all the resources that an individual commands or controls that are at his or her disposal which function independently of the body. It includes a person's moral influence and all other forces or materials that are under his or her dominion. Might is expressed in terms of 1) a person's willful application, 2) one's personal effort and resources, and 3) one's resources, including, but extending beyond the physical body. Examples include the following:

Forasmuch as there is none like unto thee, O Lord; thou art great, and thy name is great in might. (Jeremiah 10:6)
Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thine hand is power and might; and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all. (1 Chronicles 29:12)

The references to might have been classified according to the three categories listed below with their respective percentages:

1. Willful application 25%
2. Personal effort and resources 33%
3. Internal and external resources 42%
Total 100%

**STRENGTH**

Both might and strength share several similar contexts. The term strength can be distinguished from the term might by a certain significant characteristic. Strength denotes the physical properties associated with an individual's body that are instruments of power in a bodily sense. Thus, strength includes life, energy, power, vitality, support, endurance, regenerative powers, and procreative powers as expressed through the physical body. The term might may also include these dimensions of man, but includes influences that extend beyond the physical body. Representative examples include:

And now, because of this great thing which my people the Nephites, had done, they began to boast in their own strength, and began to swear before the heavens that they would avenge themselves of the blood of their brethren who had been slain by their enemies. (Mormon 3:9)

Neither did Jeroboam recover strength again in the days of Abijah: and the Lord struck him, and he died. (2 Chronicles 13:20)

And it came to pass that they ate and slept, and prepared for death on the morrow. And they were large and mighty men as to the strength of men. (Ether 15:26)

Cast me not off in the time of old age; forsake me not when my strength faileth. (Psalms 71:9)

**SUMMARY**

In our attempt to understand the meanings of the four terms as they are found in the scriptural references, we have followed the steps we outlined previously. In Step 1 we identified the contexts in which each term is found. In Step 2 we formed general categories that emerged from an examination of the various contexts. In Step 3 we regrouped the contexts according to the subcategories that belong to each term. The subcategories suggest the different senses of each term. In Step 4 we compared each term and its subcategories to determine distinctiveness or similarities among the terms. The subcategories represent a characteristic of the term in each of its senses. We recognize that scriptures can have multiple meanings as the senses originate with people. We wanted to know if some characteristic or identifying attribute was unique or was stressed for a given term that would help us understand its meaning. A comparison of the specific components of each term reveal that which gives that term its distinctiveness. On completion of these four steps, we were in a position to formalize our tentative descriptive definitions for each of the four terms, which is Step 5.
Table D

A Comparison of the Frequency of Scriptural Use of the Terms

Heart, Mind, Might, & Strength In the Standard Works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency of Scriptural Usage by Referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heart/s **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.M. 2073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D&amp;C 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>O.T. 1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PGP 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N.T. 1093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* O.T. = Old Testament  N.T. = New Testament  B.M. = Book of Mormon  
D&C = Doctrine and Covenants  PGP = Pearl of Great Price

** The figures in this column represent a weighted value based on the expected frequency of references if all the books of scriptures were of equal length. Actual number of references are listed in Table 1 of Appendix A. The Old Testament represents 50% of the total volume of scriptures in the standard works; the New Testament record represents 15%; the Book of Mormon accounts for 22%; the Doctrine and Covenants represents 10%; and the Pearl of Great Price accounts for 2%. When one examines each of these records to determine the actual number of references to heart, mind, might and strength, it becomes apparent that each record does not give equal attention to the four terms. The relative emphasis each source gives to these terms can be illustrated by standardizing the frequency of their appearance with the total volume of scripture represented by each book. The results of this standardization are depicted in the charts above. It is apparent that the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine & Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price use the terms of this study proportionately more often than the Biblical record.

Formula:
(Actual number of references) x (Expected percentage) = **
Appendix D

A Systematic Approach to Substantiating Definitions or Meanings Given to the Term Heart

The objective of our analysis was to systematically eliminate the unlikely or unsubstantiable meanings associated with the term heart, until what remained was a window of possibility within which we could then establish tentative but defensible and descriptively operational definitions for these terms. Our operational definitions are based on the results of this analysis. These same results can be useful in examining the adequacy of any definitions offered for these four terms. A definition may be found inadequate if it is too narrowly defined, that is, if it focuses on fewer than the major components identified by its use in the scriptures. Or a definition may include components that are neither defined nor alluded to in the scriptures. An example will help illustrate the usefulness of our analysis.

Although the authors have examined many theological dictionaries and commentaries, we selected the following definition to provide an illustration for examining the adequacies of definitions. This particular entry for the term heart reads:

A basic concept of primitive anthropology ("primordial word") which designates that single center of the personal spirit's self-control and psychosomatic autonomy which can only be reached asymptotically. It cannot, of course, be localized in the physical heart, but the latter is its primordial symbol. Strictly speaking, the heart is peculiar to man, being the primordial unity of man who is naturally and substantially composite (at once body and soul). The heart is also the dynamic principle which drives man to see that ultimate and ultimately unattainable understanding of himself which can only be found in his own heart. (Theological Dictionary, Herder and Herder, 1965, p. 199)

The definition stated above uses the term heart as a symbol of the composite body and spirit or soul of an individual. The heart is unique to man in that it possesses volition, autonomy, desire, and the capability to know oneself. The definition assumes that man is driven by this innate or primeval desire to know oneself.

According to our analysis of all the scriptural citations using the term heart, the definition cited above is lacking in both scope and depth of meaning. It is true that heart is often used symbolically. But this symbol is denotative, referring to the state or condition of an individual's eternal identity, and not the specific components of man, such as spirit and body. This state or condition emerges within the individual as one makes choices and exercises control and management over the resources at its disposal, such as the mind. The heart possesses rational as well as emotional capacities. Therefore, the heart is the decision-making center within us, which manifests itself as disposition—prevailing tendency, mood, or inclination. We find these aspects missing from the definition provided. Numerically speaking, the Herder & Herder definition does not account for 86% of the data found in the scriptures (see Appendix C).

Our purpose in examining all the scriptural citations using the terms heart, mind, might and strength was to provide defensible and descriptively operational definitions for these terms. We felt these definitions should be broad enough to include all relevant information contained in the scriptural uses of the four terms, but should not exceed what the scriptures reveal about the heart, mind, might and strength. The window of
Appendix E

Classification Of The Terms **Heart, Mind, Might** And **Strength** According To Their Contexts

### I. HEART

**A. A person's eternal identity**
1. Description of characteristics
   - 1. Condition or state of disposition

**B. Seat of rational functions**
1. Without saying anything aloud
   - a. consider
   - b. decreed
   - c. feigned
   - d. imagine
   - e. meditate
   - f. mused
   - g. ponder
   - h. say, said
   - i. utter
2. Seat of thought
   - a. think, thought
   - b. doubt
3. Seat of understanding
   - a. know, knowledge
   - b. study, instruction, search
   - c. understand
   - d. wisdom
4. Processing of information
   - a. deceive
   - b. discemeth
   - c. condemn
   - d. lay, laid
   - e. presume
   - f. reason
   - g. set
   - h. tempted
   - i. treasure
5. Memory and storage
   - a. in
   - b. retain
   - c. all the heart
6. Functions
   - a. bless
   - b. commune
   - c. conceive
   - d. counsel
   - e. entered
   - f. perceive
   - g. pray
   - h. receive
   - i. take it
   - j. teacheth

**C. Indicator of a positive disposition**
1. 
   - a. abide
   - b. according
   - c. all
   - d. after
   - e. applied
   - f. arise
   - g. assure
2. 
   - a. be
   - b. believeth
   - c. bind
   - d. broken
3. 
   - a. carried
   - b. come
   - c. changed
   - d. circumcise
   - e. clean
   - f. contrite
4. 
   - a. decreed
   - b. desire
   - c. direct
   - d. do
   - e. dwell
5. 
   - a. endure
   - b. engage
   - c. enlarge
   - d. enter
   - e. established
   - f. exalted
6. a. faithful b. found c. flesh d. free
 e. full

7. a. give b. glory c. grace d. guide
 e. found

8. a. harden b. have c. hid d. holiness
 e. honest f. humble

9. a. incline b. inscribe c. inspired d. integrity
 e. is in

10. a. keep b. knit c. know

11. a. largeness b. lay c. lift d. lowly

12. a. magnify

13. a. new

14. a. obey b. one c. open
d. pray

15. a. penetrated b. place c. plaque d. pray
e. prick f. proved g. put h. perfect
 i. plant j. pout k. prepared l. pride
 m. purpose n. pure

16. a. regard b. require c. right d. rend
e. revive f. right g. rule

17. a. santification b. search c. secret
d. set e. shed f. shined g. sincerity
 h. singleness i. soften j. solemnity k. song
 l. sound m. spirit n. establish o. stirred
 p. strength q. stubbornness r. subduing s. sunk
t. sway

18. a. table b. take c. tell d. tender
e. thankful f. took g. touch h. treasure
 i. try j. true k. trust l. turn

19. a. understanding b. united c. upright

20. a. vanity

21. a. wash b. willing c. wise d. whole
e. win f. withheld g. written
D. Indicator of a negative disposition

1. a. adultery   b. affecteth   c. against   d. all
   e. astonished

2. a. backslider   b. be   c. blindness   d. blotted
   e. broken   f. bowed   g. brought

3. a. carry   b. changed   c. come   d. conceiveth
   e. corrupted   f. covetousness   g. cut

4. a. deceit   b. decline   c. deliant   d. depart
   e. desireth   f. despiteful   g. devices
   i. died   j. divided   k. doubtful

5. a. ensnare   b. err   c. enticed   d. envy
   e. entereth   f. evil   g. exalted
   h. exist

6. a. fail   b. fears   c. fill   d. foolish
   e. fretteth   f. forgave   g. froward

7. a. gain   b. gathereth   c. glory

8. a. hath   b. haughty   c. hid   d. hold
   e. humbled   f. hypocrites   g. harden

9. a. imagination   b. impenitent   c. inspire   d. intent
   e. is

10. a. know

11. a. lay   b. lead   c. lift   d. lust

12. a. magnify   b. make   c. melt   d. moved
   e. murderers   f. murmurings

13. a. perfect   b. perish   c. perverse   d. place
   e. plan   f. poor   g. power
   i. pride   j. put

14. a. rage   b. rebellious   c. removed   d. reproach
   e. right   f. riveted

15. a. satisfied   b. seek   c. set   d. slow
   e. sit   f. smitten   g. soften
   i. sown   j. steal   k. stir
   m. sworn

16. a. take   b. things   c. trust   d. treasure
   e. turn

17. a. unbelief   b. uncircumcised   c. unsteadiness
E. Seat of feelings and emotions
1. Feelings and emotions
   a. affections and feelings
   b. capacities of an emotional heart
2. Positive feelings
   a. rejoice
   b. glad
   c. joy
   d. merry
   e. lifted up
   f. comfort
   g. cheer
   h. love
3. Negative feelings
   a. anguish
   b. astonishment
   c. broken
   d. bitterness
   e. cried
   f. depressed
   g. desolate
   h. discouraged
   i. despair
   j. envy
   k. empathy
   l. faint
   m. fear
   n. failed
   o. grieved
   p. groaneth
   q. guilt
   r. hot
   s. hate
   t. heavy
   u. lust
   v. mourn
   w. offense
   x. overwhelm
   y. pained
   z. ravished
   aa. sorrow
   bb. sick
   cc. sad
   dd. trembled
   ee. troubled

F. Other Usage
1. Figurative application (e.g. "heart of the land.")
2. Literal references to the physical organ

II. MIND

A. Capacity or attribute
   1. depository
   2. disposition, inclination
   3. veileable
   4. focusable
   5. directable
   6. content display
   7. attuneable
   8. expandable
   9. sensitive to light and darkness

B. Functions
   1. recall, remember
   2. forget
   3. study
   4. direct attention
   5. change
   6. love
   7. serve
   8. think
   9. question
   10. assent

C. Condition or state
   1. Pre-state
      a. prepared
      b. enlightened
      c. disturbed
   2. Description
      A. a.alienated
      B. a.bitter
      C. a.carnal
      D. a.divine
      e.despiteful
      e. frenzied
      E. a.excited
      F. a.faint
      e.frenzied
      b. fervent
      c. firm
      d. fixed
      c. covered by darkness
      c. delicate
      d. deranged
G. a. grief  b. humility
H. a. hardened   b. humility
I. a. impressionable  b. invigorated
P. a. peaceful   b. pure
R. a. ready  b. renewable  c. reprobate
S. a. satisfied  b. shaken  c. sober  d. sound
V. a. vane
W. a. weary  b. wicked  c. willing

II. Might

A. Willful application

B. Personal effort and resources

C. Resources, including but extending beyond the physical body

IV. Strength

A. As expressed through the physical body
1. Life
2. Energy
3. Power
4. Vitality
5. Support
6. Endurance
7. Priesthood
8. Generative and regenerative power