B.H.Roberts Answers Ministerial Association "Review"

Its Sophistry Annihilated-Slanderous Charges Disposed of One by One-Inconsistency and Insincerity of Clergy Clearly Demonstrated-They Say Doctrines of Church Not as Fully Proclaimed Flsewhere as in Utah, and Then Proceed to Quote Copiously from Mormon Publications Issued in U. S. and Europe and Sent Broadcast Over the World.

NOTE: The following answer to the Ministerial association's prolow of the Address of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint's to the world, was deliv-ered at two meetings of the Sait Lake hormare. Sunday afternoon and even ing, June the 9th. The speaker ex-pected to close his remarks with the afternoon meeting, and there fore omlitted certain matters that were intended to be discussed at the time the subject to which they were related was presented in the afternoon, but which for lack of time, as he then supposed went over to the evening session. In this store of the remarks in the evening are formed to be discussed at the time they most properly belong. Also the spraker has added some items that were evulined in his notes prepared for the or mote of evening. In order that such new matter might be designated, it is placed

ODAY, my brethren and sisters, we convert this pulpit into a forum, from which we propose

a defense both of our faith and the Church. Nor do we violate any of the proprieties in this change, because when truth is to be defended and in justice resented, then all place a temple, and all seasons summer.

The occasion to which we address ourselves this afternoon arises out of these circumstances: At the late general conference of the Church, the First Presidency issued to the world an address. Submitting it to the general conference, it was approved and endorsed by the saints assembled, so what it became an address of the Charch of Christ to the world. Of course, as we might have anticipated. this address met with adverse criticism, and finally there was formulated against it an alleged review by the Ministerial association of evangelical ministers in the State of Utah. Represented in that associaton are the Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Christian (Campbellite) and regular Episcopal churches -so that practically the whole of Protestant Christendom is represented by these ministers who challenge the correctness and the candor of the ad-dress issued by the Church to the world world.

world. In our consideration of their review we will suppose the representatives of these churches present, sitting right here [indicating a place close to the stand] in a body. And I wish they were so present, because there is nothing like talking it out face to face with these gentlemen; and I doubt not but their presence in a body yould be quite an inspiration to one in discussing the document they have submitted to us. Having then before us the circum-stances out of which this occasion arises, let us procy ad to our task. AS TO ARECURITY.

AS TO DESCURITY.

AS TO DESCURITY. The first of the church made by these gentlement is the church made by these gentlement is the effect that the doc-trines of the international the church proclaims is assessed as the transition in review in fact runs the innucle of that the Church deceitfully through the review in fact runs the innucle of that the Church deceitfully teachers are doctrine at home and an-oth is broad, and that the address of the series of Mormonism. Here these gentlemen propose to help the world to a fuller presentation of Mormon doctrine and practise, as set world the ter is with to propose this unestion to these gentlemen: The doc-ument they have issued quotes very contents is not a with the more with the there is with the or on what

All else is commentary, and of a sec-ondary character as to its authority, containing much that is good, much that illustrates, much that illuminates the doctrines of the Church, and yet liabel to have error in them for which the Church does not stand. proaching solid ground of con-troversy. Mor-monism does de-ny that divine authority exists in the churches of the world, the caurches of men, miscalled Chris-PROPER DISTINCTION. tian churches. We do not blanch from the posi-tion. We pro-claim it, although claim it attributes we do not wish to do so in any offensive way but we have to be witnesses for

The Church does not stand. PROPER DISTINCTION. "Well," says one, "do you propose to repudiate the works of men holding your priesthood, and who are supposed to speak and act under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit!" Jo you not de-stroy the effectiveness of your Church ministry when you take this attitude?" Not at all, We merely make what is a proper distinction. It would be a glorious thing for a man to so live that his life would touch the very life and Spirit of God, so that his spirit would bend with God's Spirit, under which cheamstances there would be no er-ror in his life or utterances at all. That is a splendid thing to contemplate, But when you take into account, human weakness, imperfection, prejudice, pas-sion, bina; it is too much to hope for human nature that man will constantly thus walk linked with God. And so we make this distinction between man speaking sametimes under the in-fluence of prejudice and pre-conceived notions, and the utterances of a man who, in behalf of the Church of God, and having the requisite position, may, apon occasion, lay aside all prejudice. all pre-conception, and stand ready and anxious to receive the divine impres-sion of God's Spirit, that shall plead.--"Father, Thy will and Thy word be made known now to Thy people through the channel Thoo has appoint-ed." There is a wide difference be-tween men coming with the word of God thus obtained, and their ordinary speech every day and all kinds of oc-sions. be witnesses for the truth, And God has reveal-ed that to be the truth. Mor-monism is in the world because there was a real necessity for its coming into the coming into world. It not come inte existence through theological disputations, be-cause of differ-ences of views about baptism, or church government, or the nature of Deity, or any of these things; but there

FOLLOWING EXAMPLE.

FOLLOWING EXAMPLE. In thus insisting that only the worl of God spoken by inspiration shall live and be binding upon the Church, we are but following the illustrious exam-ple of the ancient Church of Christ. You do not have today all the Chris-tlan documents of the first Christian centuries. These books that you have bound up, and that you call the word of God. Holy Bible, were slitted out by a conscasus of opinion in the churches running through several hundred years. They endured the test of time. But the great bulk of that which was uttered and written, even by apostles and prominent servants of God in the prim-itive Christian Church, the Church re-jected; and out of the mass of chaff preserved these Scriptures – the New Testament. The Christian world up to this time is not quite decided as to all that should be rejected. You Protest-ant gentemen repudiate several heads called the Apochrypha which the Catholic church accepts as of equal authority with the rest of the books of the New Testament. And so I say in this procedure of ours in re-fusing to accept only that which time and the inspiration of God shall dem-onstrate to be absolutely true, we are but following the example of the an-In thus insisting that only the world

and the inspiration of God shull dem-onstrate to be absolutely true, we are but following the example of the an-clent Church of Christ. We move forward now in our in-vestigation to this charge of yours. You say of us that "Adding no spirit-ual truth to the aggregate of things al-ready revealed; . . . contributing noth-ing to reverence for God or to justice and mercy towards men, "Mormon-lared mercy towards men, "Mormonand mercy towards men. 'Mormon-ism' claims to be the only authorized church of Christ on earth, and sets up a wholly unbiblical test of salvation.

NOT UNBIBLICAL.

Gentlemen, you may not believe, of course, the claims of the 'Mormon' Church, but you cannot in truth say



B. H. ROBERTS.

things: but there had been, and mark it gentlemen, a complete apostasy from God's truth by the world. The Church of Christ as an organization and the Gospel as a sys-tem of truth had been displaced by the institutions and systems of men, consequently there was need of di-vlne authority being again conferred upon man and a new dispensation of the Gospel of Christ given to the world. It is our pride that Mormon-ism is this restored Gospel and Church of Christ. EPISCOPAL HOMILE?

of Christ. EPISCOPAL HOMILE" I notice among this body of men I am addressing, the members of this Ministerial association, the représent-ative of the Episcopal church, a branch of the great English church. He ought not to complain of this attitude of the Mormon Church, for the reason that In one of the Homilies of his church. In the Homily on the Perils of Idolatry. It is expressive stated that "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages and sects and degrees have been drowned in abominable idolatry, most detested by God and damnable to man, for 800 years and more." (Perils of Idolatry, p. 3). Certainly Mormon-ism does not proclaim the apostacy more harshly than that, nor do we declare its universality more emphatically, but I presume we are offensive to the representatives of this particular church, the Episcopal because we in-clude him and his organization as among those who are in the apostacy and who have not the gospel of Christ. Yet we are not harder on him or his church than he is upon the Catholic and all the rest of the Christian world previous to the establishment of the Church of England under the patron-age of King Henry VIII. of England, of unsavory memory, and we do have this advantage, viz: That if we proclaim a universal apos-

This advantage, viz: That if we proclaim a universal apos-tasy, we also proclaim the restoration of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the re-newal of divine authority, the resumpion of present-day and continuous rev-lation from God. So we are in an in-litely better position as to the reason-ibleness of our attitude, than are those who proclaim this apostasy and yet are without a renewal of a dispensation of the gospel to the world.

ecause you yourselves, in perform-og the marriage ceremony say "I romonnee you man and wife until romonnee you man and the until "I think you!" I think you because you yourselves, in perform-ing the marriage ceremony say "I pronounce you man and wife until feath does you part." I think you ought not to take offense at what we say on this subject—we say your mar-riage ceremonies are of no binding ef-fect in and after the resurrection, you make no pretensions of marrying for eternity. The fact is you scorn and ridicule it. Before leaving this group of propositions with which I am deal-ing. I desire to say respecting this question of universal apostasy from the Christian faith—we can sustain the truth of that declaration from Scripture, from history, from the con-dition of the religious world at the opening of the inneteenth century. We have no anxiety about it, but we have not time on this occasion to enter into an argument on the justification of our argument on the sustification of our attinue. attitude

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE. But, gentlemen, Christian gentlemen, what in reality is the difference be-tween your attitude and ours in re-spect of the world at large, and the existence of the gospel in the earth and consequences growing out of those re-spective attitudes? You proclaim, do you not, that there is no other name given under heaven whereby men can be saved except the name of Jesus Christ? You insist, do you not, that there must be acceptance of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and do you not hold that those who do not accept this gos-pel cannot receive the benefits of its salvation? Now then, after 2,000 years of proselyting in the world, under the most favorable circumstances, what is the sum total of your achievements? Why, less than one-third of the inhab-itants of the earth are even nominally Christians! and what is your attitude toward God's children whom you have not converted? Why, that they are lost. That is the inevitable result of your attitude and doctrine. Or else you must say that men can be saved without the gospel of Christ. Now the difference between your position and ours is simply this: The proposition without the gosper of Christ. Now the difference between your position and ours is simply this: The proposition that you present to the world at large, we present to you as well as to the rest of mankind,—and you don't like your own medicine—with this excep-

THE L. D. S. POSITION.

Careless or Dishonest Statements Respecting Marriage Contracts Receive Quietus-Every Argument of Reviewers is Answered, and With Biting Sarcasm, Keen Logic and Irresistible Reasoning, Gentlemen of the Cloth are Dislodged From Each Position-John W. Taylor's Lefter of Resignation to Council of The Twelve.

the Church of Christ of this dispensa-tion shall make scriptures just as the Church of Christ of former dispensayou are aware that there is a school of thinkaware ions has done. who will tell you WHY 1T WAS BRIEF.

to your teeth and they wil come very nearly proving the truth Now I read to you another passage from this review. Complaint is made against our eddress upon the ground that it treats very briefly-all too briefly the loctrines of the Church. I do not know but what it is open to just criticism on that ground; for our doc-trines are but stated, as you may say. in headlines. I presume the presidency of the Church did not think the occa-sion called for an elaborate exposition of the principles of our faith, with chapter and verse given for warrant of the authority on which they rested. But the Church had been under the fire of severe criticism for a period of four years or more. Its doctrines had been assailed, the practises of its peo-ple had been unisrepresented, their character traduced, and their "whole course of conduct reprobated and con-Now I read to you another passage of it, that suc progress in civil ization, in sci ence, in arts, as the world has past not bemade in has ages, been made cause of vou churches but in spite of them. They hold that that your organiza-tions have been found quite as often against the progress of truth as standing in support of it. Taking the whole character traduced, and their "whole course of conduct reprobated and con-demned." Taking these circumstances under advisement the presidency of the Church thought. I presume, the time propitious for an utterance which would in outline tell the world what we believed, and correct the misunder-standing that obtained respecting our nast history and present position. The time range into account, from the close of the sec ond to the open ing of the nine-teenth century standing that obtained respecting our past history and present position. The address was not designed, as I under-stand it, to be a complete exposition of our faith, but a declaration of our present attitude. • On the doctrine of the Godhead, these Christian gentlemen, our reviewers, think that the statement of the Address to the offect that we hallow in the God it would puzzle you to meet their evidence and ar gument.

polygamist.'

GRAPPLES WITH CHARGES. Let me say, in treating this group of statements that these gentlemen nowhere support these allegations by itations from our authoritative works that the Church accepts as binding in doctrine; but they do quote the com-mentaries of men, which often express

fashion. I propose to grapple with them and meet them: I trust to your satis-faction and to the satisfaction of these

is claimed that the brevity

This is a but that it is positively misleading." First our reviewers claim that the address is misleading on the subject of revelation. Still these reviewers are able to quote from the address as follows: "The theology of our Church is the theology taught by Jesus Christ and His apostles, the theology of Scripture and reason. It not only acknowledges the sacredness of ancient Scripture, and the binding force of divinely inspired acts and utterances in ages past; but also declares that God now speaks to man in this final gospel dispensation." That Ghost--is a "declaration that will not perhaps suggest Tritheism or material-ism to Christians unfamiliar with Mor-mon theological terms." "But," they continue, "when the full doctrine of the Deity, as taught in Mormon con-gregations, is known, it will at once be seen that no Christian can accept it." "In fact," they say, "the Mormon Church teaches that God the Father has a material body of dash and hons: Church teaches that God the Father has a material body of flesh and bone; that Adam is the God of the human race; that this Adam-God was physi-cally begotten by another God; that the Gods were once as we are now; that there is a great multiplicity of Gods; that Jesus Christ was physically begotten by the heavenly Father of this final gospel dispensation." That seems quite explicit to me. But com-menting upon the passage the reviewers say: begotten by the heavenly Father of Mary, His wife; that as we have a heavenly Father, so also we have a heavenly mother; that Jesus himself was married, and was probably a nolvgamist."

CLAIM OF MORMON CHURCH.

"Under this declaration lies the "Under this declaration ness the chaim of the Mormon Church---con-stantly insisted upon in its congrega-tion here and in surrounding regions ---that the Book of Mormon, the Doc-tring and Covenants, the Pearl of of which is so necessary to even a tolerable understanding of their sys-tem of relief, is not plainly and ex-plicitly set forth in the declaration of doctrine contained in the address, but it has repeated and urgent em-phasis in their teachings in Mormon communities." Now be honest, gen-tlemen, is it not repeated everywhere with just as much emphasis as in Mormon communities in Utah. Isn't it a universal proclamation that we make to the world? You know it is, and you prove that it is from the very works you quote to establish the fact that we believe in that doctrine, and which are of world-wide circula-tion. It was a vile effort at misrepre-sentation on your part to make it ap-pear otherwise. But on the subject of revelation, let us go to the address itself. What is said upon the subject of revelation is found on pages three and four, and fourteen and fifteen: "Our religion is founded on the reve-lations of God," . . . "It," (the Church of Christ) "not only acknowl-edges the sucredness of ancient Scrin. mentaries of men, which often express only individual opinion. I might dis-miss this group of charges against the Mormon Church therefore by this statement of the case: the Church is not bound to defend any doctrine that is not explicitly found in the works of the Church setting forth authorita-tively her doctrines. But I do not pro-pose to dismiss the charges in any such fashion. I propose to graphle with them

which says that Jesus was the bright-ness of God's glory, "and the express image of His person" (Heb. I, 3). And as we know what kind of a person the Christ is, who "possessed all the full-ness of the Godhead bodily," and who, when He declared that all power in heaven and in earth had been given unto Him, and He was in the act of sending His disciples into all the world to teach and baptize in the authority of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit-was a resurrected, immortal man of spirit, flesh and bone. And since, I say, the express image of the Father's person, we conclude that the Father must be a personage of spirit, flesh and bone, just as the Son, Jesus, is. Indeed your Athanasian creed, says that "such as the Father is, such is the Son;" and of course, it follows that, such as the Son is, such is the Father; that is, the Father is a personage of spirit, desh and bone, united in one person, "very God and very man," just as Jesus is. And there are two separate personages, each distinct from the other in person, two individuals, but both of the same divine, nature; and if two sesparate personages, individuals, may participate in the one divine nature it logically follows that a larger member than two or three may participate in that ma personages, individuals, may participate in the one divine nature it logically follows that a larger member than two or three may participate in that na-ture. And hence the Scriptures repre-sent in many places the existence of a plurality of divine personages, how many we do not know and it does not matter. But we hear of God saying "Let us make man in our image;" "the man has bescome as one of us, knowing good and evil;" "God standeth in the congregation of the Mighty, He judgeth among the Gods. . . I have said Ye are Gods, and all of you are children of the most High." The last a passage of the Psalms quoted and de-fended by the Savior as a justification of his own claim to sonship with God, BAD ARITHMETIC. to the effect that we believe in the God-head, comprising the three individual personages—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—is a "declaration that will not

BAD ARITHMETIC.

Of your nonsense of one being three, and three being but one, we will say nothing, except to remark that you must reform your arithmetic if you ex-pect sensible people to pay attention to your doctrines.

nust reform your arithmetic if you expect sensible people to pay attention to your doctrines. One other item in which we offend these reverend gentlemen is that we believe Jesus had a Father as well as a mother. Now, gentlemen, honestly, is it any worse for Him to have had a Father than it is for Him to have had a mother? You concede that He had a mother? You concede that He had a mother? You concede that the had a mother? You concede that the had a mother? You concede that the had a mother? Hat His body grew as yours did, in the womb of His mother; that He came forth of the womb by birth pains; that He suckled at the breast of, woman; that through the months and years of infant weakness He was watched and guided by the hand of a loving mother. Tell me, is it true that in your philosophy of things it is all right for Jesus to have a mother. Is not fatherhood as sacred and holy as motherhood? Listen, people, there is something else. Having objected to our idea of Jesus having a father? Is not fatherhous pawel as well as a heaven-ly pious gentlemen turn now and object to our given to this world through the in-spired mind of Eliza R. Snow: the hymn is known to us as "O My Father."

SPIRITUAL PARENTS.

In the Scripture we read: "We have had fathers of the flesh and we did give them reverence, shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of spir-its and live?" So that we know we have had a father to our spirits; but because we hold that the spirits of men have a spirite of the spirits of men because we hold that the spirits of men have also a mother in heaven, as well as a father, behold, these reviewers complain against us. Now, observe the peculiar position of these critics: It is all right for Jesus to have a moththe peculiar position of these critics: It is all right for Jesus to have a moth-er; but it is all wrong for Him to have a father. On the other hand, it is all right for men's spirits to have a Fa-ther in heaven, but our reviewers ob-ject to our doctrine of their having a mother there. I sometimes wonder what in the world is the matter with you, gentlemen, I am puzzled to clas-sify your views, or the kind of beings with which you people heaven. One of your own number, however, has thrown some light upon that subject, and has so classified you-saving me the trouble-as to enable us to under-stand to some extent your peculiar views. I have a book here that I am going to use in this controversy. It is a new one. I got it three days ago, and have read it nearly through in or-der to be prepared for this occasion. It is the work of Rey, R. J. Campbell, of City Temple, London, and it is a of City Temple, London, and it is a treatise on the "New Theology," just now much talked of in Europe. He describes ministers of the gospel and gives them the classification referred to a memory discussion. how much taked of in Europe. He describes ministers of the gospel and gives them the classification referred to a moment since, and which I think must aceds be all right, since it comes from a minister. He takes the aver-age business man of England, naming him "John Smith." for convenience, and he says this about John: "John Smith, with whom we used to go to school, and who has shice de-veloped into a stolld British man of business with few ideas and a tend-ency towards conservatism-John is a stalwart, honest, commonplace kind of person, of whom brilliant things were never prophesied and who has never been guilty of any. His wife and children go to church on Sundays. John seldom goes himself, because it bores him, but he likes to know that religion is being attended to, and he does not want to hear that his clergy-man is attempting any daring flights. He has a good-natured contempt for clergymen in general, because he feels somehow that, like women, they have to be treated with half-fictitious rever-ence, but that they do not count for much in the ordinary affairs of the to be treated with half-fictitious rever-ence, but that they do not count for much in the ordinary affairs of life; they are a sort of a third sex." "Now, ladles, I ask you to remem-ber, in passing, that I am reading the words of somebody else; they are not ne words. The phrase "half-fictitious reverence" is not mine. I think you ought to have real more that you ought to have real reverence, no fici-tious reverence at all.

copicusly from our published church works. I want to ask them, on what books and utterances do they rely for books and utterances do they rely for this Jarger, fuller, proclamation of Mormonism? I find quoted the Millen-nial Star, the Journal of Discourses, the Seer (by Orson Pratt), the Improve-ment Era, the Manuals of the Young ment Era, the Manuals of the Yound Men's Mutual Improvement association Orson Spencer's Letters, Epistles of the Orson Spencer's Letters, Epistes of the First Presidency of the Church, Dr. Taimage's Articles of Faith, and last, and of course least, some of my own works. Now, where is the Millenial Star published? In Liverpool, Eng-land. Where were the Journals of Dis-courses published? In Liverpool, Eng-land. Where was the Seer published? In Washington, D. C. Does it not oc-cur to your couldemen, since these are cur to you, gentlemen, since these are the works on which you chiefly rely for your larger view of Mormon doctrine, that we have published them elsewhere quite as fully as we have in Utah. The Improvement Era, of course, is pub-lished in Salt Lake City, but two thoulished in Salt Lake City; but two thou-sand copies of it are sent free to our missionaries abrond, to use as tracts and to scatter everywhere in the world. So with Orson Spencer's Letters; so with all our publications duoted by you except the Seer, of which more pres-ently. They are all sent broadcast, and you will find them in the hands of our cloads abroad and from them they friends abroad, and from them they learn the doctrines of Mormonism. So that your practical charge that we that preach one set of doctrines and prine ples in Utah and guite another in the world, and that we are trying to play the double game of having one doctrine for home consumption and another fo lamation abroad, is as shallow as j is untrue.

A REPUDIATED WORK.

One other thing. I find in this revies One other thing. I find in this review to lengthy quotations from the Seer, which was published by Orson Pratt, yet the Seer, by formal action of the first presidency and tweive apostles of the Church, was repudiated, and Elder Orson Pratt himself sanctioned the re-pudiation. There was a long articles published in the Descret News on the "2nd of August 1865 over the signatures Sign of August, 1865, over the signatures of the first presidency and the twelve, setting forth that this work—the Seer-together with some other writings of Elder Pratt, were inaccurate. In the course of that document, after predshig, as well they might, the great bujk of the work of this noted apostic, they

Say: "But the Seer, the Great First Cause which we have feit to discown, so that the saints who now live, and who may live hereafter, may not be misled by our silence, or be left to misinterpret it. Where these objectionable works, or parts of works, are bound in volumes, or otherwise, they should be cut out and destroyed." And yet these gentlemen, our review-

And yet these gentlemen, our review-ers, who, of course, we must believe, since they are ministers of the gospel, and hence they are ministers of the truth and believe in fair dealing, make 10 long quotations from a repudiated work, and one quotation only from a work that is accepted as standard in the Church, viz., the Docurine and Covis-nants! For a long time the Church has announced over and over again that her standard works, in which the word of God is to be found, and for which alone she stands, are the Bible, the Book of Mormon, the Decirine and Covenants, the Pearl of Great Price. ainteenth century."

that we apply an "unbiblical test of salvation." I pray you think of it r moment. What is the claim made for Joseph Smith? That he was a prophet sent of God with a divine prophet sent of God with a divine message, with a dispensation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Now, just for a moment, just for the sake of the argument, suppose that claim to be true, is the test we apply, at all, much less "wholly" unbiblical? May one re-ject God's message and stand uncon-demned before God? Assuredly not. What was the example Jesus set? This: "He that believeth and is bap-tized shall be saved, and he that be-lieveth not shall be damned." He was but proclaiming the message that God had given to Him and He laid down this principle as connected with the authority and commission Ho had bestowed upon the apostles when sendbestowed upon the apostles when send-ing them into the world: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that acciveth me receiveth Him that sent rec." What do we do, when we rodaim the divine message with proclaim the divine message with which the Prophet Joseph Smith was commissioned to the world but just apply this same principle? Nothing more than this, and of course we could do nothing less. As I remarked a moment ago, you may refuse, as you do, to believe this message and testi-mony, but you canot say in truth that there is anything unbilied in the mony, but you can't say in truth that there is anything unbiblical in the principles on which we proceed to nake this declaration to the world' and, by the way, dan't you claim the same thing for your message? If you don't, what does your message amount to? Are you not ministers of Jesus Christ? Have you not come with the gospel of Jesus Christ? Can men re-

gospel of Jeaus Christ? Can men re-ject you and your doctrine and your necessage and still be secure in the favor of God? Gentlemen, if you take that position. I brand you as false teachers, untrue servants—not repre-sentatives of the Master. You are weaker than water spliled upon the ground which one may not gather again, if you come with a message one may reject with impunity. You are talking an infinite deal of nonsense when you undertake criticism of this hen you undertake criticism of this

JUGGLING WITH WORDS.

JUGGLING WITH WORDS. Now we are told that because of the taims of Mormonism it provokes earching investigation for the reason hat "li involves eternal reprobation of those who finally reject it." Gentle-nen, have you not juggled here a lit-le with words? And is it not just ossible that a wrong impression may to out from your view of our Address ather than from the Address itself? is there such a thing in Mormonism as ternal reprobation as generally uo-lerstood in the theological terminol-gy of the world? With the single ex-eption of those who come to know he truth and then so far sin against tata they have no power of repent-tace nor desire for forgiveness—the oas of perdition, which all our works each will be comparatively few in number-does not Mormonism aside tom these few, hold out a hope of sit of this we shall have more to say reseatly; but the above in passing. Value, this searching investigation is provoked" because the claim of the dormon Church to being the only au-horized Church of Church, "Involves be validity of all the Church ordin-ness and of all ministerial functions, we cluding the right to solemnize mar-

inces and of all ministerial functions, beluding the right to solemnize mar-inges as administered by the Chris-lau church from the second to the dateanth century." Here we are ap-

CARELESS OR DISHONEST.

nsive,

your own medicine—with this excep-tion, and it is a grand exception, one that goes far towards establishing the divine origin of this great latter-day work, the exception is this: that where-as your attitude and prioniples con-demn the great bulk of the human fam-lie to everlasing condition—and L are There is one thing particularly ofin this ministerial Review. nisrepresentation put in the most of ensive form. Not only do the Review fensive form. Not only do the Review-ers set forth that we deny the existence of divine authority in their churches and the non-existence of the church of Christ for centuries in the earth, but they say that our attitude involves the validity of all ministerial functions, in-cluding the right to allowing mark to everlasting perdition-and I am going to talk to you about perdition in a little while, and point out what you mean by it—while you consign to eternal perdition. I say, the great bulk of our Father's children, we proclaim an "everlasting gospel," one that shall not only walk beside men through this life but through all the ages that are to cluding the right to solemnize mar-riages. They are not, I take it, respons-ible for the head-lines of their Review as they appeared in the public press, but in order to make the attitude of the Mormon Church as offensive as it could be made, the head-line said. "Gentile Marriage Ordinances Useral come. You say in your review that we "contribute nothing to reverence for God, or to justice or mercy toward nen." Well, here is one little item that "Gentile Marriage Ordinances Illegal Before God." Now in justice to us I think this matter should have been put fairly and the exact status of the mat-Mormonism adds to the idea of justlee and mercy: that is we hold that in any age, now or a thousand years hence, or or 10,000 er given. It should have appeared that we regard marriage as a civil as well us a religious contract, and our attitude with reference to divine things nowhere 10,000,000 years hat when an intelligence, a man, hall learn that it profiteth nothing to iolate the law of God, but that it which reference to divine things nowhere involves us in a contradiction as to the validity of marriage as a civit contract, hor as a relationship wholly sanctioned and approved by the divine favor and blessing of God in this world. The extent to which we in any way, in thought or word invalidate marriage ordinances is in saying that marriage totate the new of God, but that it profitch everything to yield obedience to that law, and repentance takes hold of him, and he stretches out his hands toward God-through the gospel of Jesus Christ the hand of God will find the man's hand and bring him unio salvation. That is the difference be-tween us, and I leave you to judge which smacks most of the inspiration contracts formed in this world, either by civil authority or by the authority of sectarian churches, do not extend the marriage covenant beyond the perind truth of heaven and truth of heaven. We take up now another group of propositions: It is complained by you gentlemen that the Mormon Church de-nies that the Christian churches have been representing Christ for 1,700 years, notwithstanding Christian martyrdoms, organized charities, the reforms the churches have fostered, the progress of manking which Christians have chiefly od of this life. These gentlemen ought to have been a liftle more careful, if not a little more honest in stating our position upon this question. Allow me to do it for them.

WORD OF THE LORD.

Turning to the revelation on the sub-ject of marriage, this is to be found: "Verily I say unto you that the con-ditions of this law are these: All cove-mants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, yows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations, that are not made and entered into, and sealed, by the Holy Spirit of promise of Him who is anointed, both as well for time and for all eternity, and that too most holy, by revelation and commandment through the medium of mine anointed, whom I have appointed on the earth to hold this power - are of no officiency, virtue or force, in and after the resurrection from the dead; for all contracts that are not made anto this end, have an end when men are dead." Again, "And executions that is in its Turning to the revelation on the sub-

And everything that is in the world

"Again, "And everything that is in the world, whether it be ordained of men, by thrones, or principalities, or powers, or things of name, whatsoever they may be, that are not by me, or by my word, saith the Lord, shall be thrown down, and shall not remain after men are dead, neither in nor after the resurrec-tion, saith the Lord your God." "For whatsoever things are not by me, shall be shaken and destroyed. Therefore, if a man marry him a wife in the world, and he marry her not by me, nor by my word; and he covenant with her so long as he is in the world, and she with him, their covenant and marriage are not of force when they are dead, and when they are out of the world; therefore, they are out of the world." So far as any denial of the vamained there was necessarily the

So far as any denial of the va-lidity of marriages is concern-ed, it relates only to down lidity of marriages is concern-ed, it relates only to deny-ing their validity after the resurreces of mankind which Christians have thichy promoted, you are aware, gen-demen, that there is a certain class of thinkers among us-1 mean in the "bristian world, not among Mormons -ing their validity after the resurrec-tion-not this side of it; and, gentle-men, you eight not to complain of this

'hurch of Christ) "not only acknowledges the sacredness of ancient Scrip-ture, and the binding force of divine-ly-inspired acts and atterances in ages past; but also declares that God now speaks to man in this final gos-pel dispensation." At page 14 of the address:

is sometimes urged that the permanent realization of such a de-sire is impossible, since the Latter-day Saints hold as a principle of their faith that God now reveals Filmself o man, as in ancient times; that the priesthood of the Church constitute a body of men who have, each for him self, in the sphere in which he move special right to such revelation; that the president of the Church is recognized as the only person through whom divine communication will come as law and doctrine to the r years hence, or hence-we hold ligious body: that such revelation spiritual or temporal, as God wills, and finally that, in the mind of every faithful Latter-day Saint, such rev lation, in whatsoever it counsels, a vises, or commands, is paramount."

Now, gentlemen, will you tell me how we could be more frank or ex-plicit on the subject of revelation? And when you charge that in this document we have not dealt candidly with the subject of with the subject of revelation id you not quote this passage I have ust read, with the other passages that you have quoted? Were you not try ou have quoted? Were you not try-ng to do a little misleading on your wen account? Did you deal quits airly with the address when you fall. to quote this very explicit passage ust read?

BOOKS AND CHURCHES.

mankind which Christians have chiefly promoted. I wish to explain briefly the stitute of the Church with reference to this interregnum hetween the apostacy Complaint is made about our belief a "Living Oracles" in the Church, i. e-ertain members of the priesthood who re divinely inspired and who may f that gospel in the nineteenth century brough our prophet. aterpret the revelations and the lay

Well, gentlemen, why do you com dain of that? Books do not mak Our position is this. While there was churches. How came we by the ancient Scriptures? The Old and the New Pestament I mean. We are instructor the universal apostney, while the Durch of Christ as an organization was destroyed, and replaced by the churches of men, yet just as when the sun goes down there still remains light is the sky-reation, netwithstanding this constant from the church there still n the Scriptures that no scripture is o rivate interpretation, but that "holy ion of God spake as they were moved pour by the Holy Ghost," hence your postacy from the Church, there still vere left fragments of truth among the bildren of men; and some measure of he truth, thank God, through His upon by the Holy Ghost," hence your Old Testament and your New Testa-ment. They came into existence (x-actly in the same way that our scrip-ture is coming into existence. The living oracles make scripture; scripnercy has always remained with man, of only with Christians but with all fold's children. He has not left Himself n any of the ages of the world without with all nving oracles make scripture; scrip-tures do not make living oracles. And that is what is the matter with you gentlemen; you have been relying upon books instead of relying upon the foun-tain source of all wisdom, truth and knowledge, the inspiration and revela-tion of God to the human soul. You are book-made teachers cather than His witnesses, and He has scantified all the withesses, and He has scatting determined with energiations of man with some measure of the truth; therefore, when we pro-lain this apostacy from the Christian elizion and the destruction of the hurch of Christ, it does not follow claim this apostacy from the Christian religion and the destruction of the Church of Christ, it does not follow that we hold that all truth, that all vietue had departed from the world, or that God had absolutely withdrawn from His creation. Not so. The light of truth burned in the bosom of good men: but it does not follow that be-cause these fragments of truth re-mained there was necessarily the orare book-made teachers, rather than God-made teachers. That is the differ-ence between the living oracles in the Church of Christ and those who speak as the scribes and the Pharisees were wont to speak. The people in ancient times were able to discern the differ-ence; for they said of Jesus that He ence: for they said of Jesus that He spoke as one having authority, and not as the scribes and the Pharisees. We are in harmony with the whole course of God's dealings with His children in this matter of developing His word in His Church. Yes we have living ora-cles in the Church, thank God; and when they speak as moved upon by the Holy Ghost their utterances are the year word of God; and when the teachganized Church of Christ and divine authority in the world. These frag-ments of the truth could remain in the so-called Christian parts of the world is we now know them to exist in what s called the heathen world. Relative o the reforms you claim that your hurches have fostered and the progvery word of God: and when the teach logs, and discourses of the elders of the Church shall have been sifted and tried in the fire of time, much that they have said will prove to be scripture; and thus

faction and to the satisfaction of these gentlemen. First, as to God having a body of flesh and bone-being a material per-sonage. I want to find out what there is wrong, unscriptural, unphilosophical or immoral about that doctrine. And for the purpose of this discussion I am going to put in contrast to our belief that God is a spirit inhabiting a body of flesh and bone-an excited, a perfected man, if you will-the state-ment of the belief of these reviewers as of the belie f of these reviewers as to the nature of God. And, by the way, they are so nearly at one upon this doc-trine that the Church of England's creed, the statement of the Episcopal church on the doctrine, will be accept able I doubt not to them all. On this subject these gentlemen hold: "There is out one living and true God, everlast-ng, without body"—and that term body," by the way, does not mean o deny that God has a body in fashion ike man's; but it means that He is not matter, not material. Continuing the "without body, parts or passions: of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things, oth visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godbead there be three Persons, of one substance, power and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy

Thos Of Jesus the creed says: "The Son, which is the Word of the "ather, begotten from everlasting of

the Father, the very and eternal God the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Man-hood, were joined together in one Per-son, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man." Again: Again

Christ did truly rise again from "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day."

THE RESURRECTION.

Mark what is said here of Jesus. You say that "the Godhead and man-hood" in Jesus "were joined together in one person," that is, His sphit and His body are united, never to be severed or disunited. Now, I put to you this ques-tion: Is the Lord Jesus Christ God? tion: Is the Lord Jesus Christ God? Yes, you must answer. Then is not God an exaited man according to your creed? Listen-and this is your belief as expressed in your creed—"Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfec-tion of man's nature; where with He as-cended into heaven, and there sliteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day."

According to this statement of the matter, Jesus has not been dissolved into some spiritual, immaterial essence, and widely diffused throughout the universe as some spiritual presence. N He is a substantial, resurrected perso No He is a substantial, resurrected person-age, a united spirit and body; and "The Godbead and Manhood" that are united in the person of the Christ-the human-ity and the divinity-are "never to be divided." He is recognized and divided." He is recognized and wor-shiped by you gentiemen as "very God and very man." This, of course, scarcely meets the description of the first paragraph of the creed used here where God is declared to be, not matter, that is "without body, parts or passions." But then that contradic-tion is your affair, your trouble, not ours. It is enough that I call your at-tention to the fact that the second part of your creed leads you closely to the Mormon doctcine that God is an ex-He is recognized and

"SORT OF THIRD SEN."

The ministers are here in this passing described as "a sort of third sex," and i am inclined to think that is right or when a man in one case object a person having a father, and in a other case considers it altogether un-holy for persons to have a mother. I do not know how else to classify him but as "a sort of third sex" kind of a man. traferi.

There seems to be objection in the review to the idea of the marriage relation existing in heaven and subsisting between divine beings. Loud complaint is made, if you hold that the intelligences of tention to the fact that the second part of your creed leads you closely to the Mormon doctrine that God is an ex-alted, perfected man, since Jesus, ac-cording to your creed, is God, and yet a resurrected man sitting in heaven unit. The return to judge all men at the last day. WHAT SCRIPTURES SAY. And now as to there being more Gods than one. We believe the Scripture