

body of My Spirit;" revealing the fact that even spirits have bodies, in accordance with the statement of Paul: "There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body." (1 Cor. 15: 44.)

The Book of Mormon recognizes throughout the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as the great ruling power of the universe. It was given for the very purpose of establishing the truth of the Bible, for it is written: "These last records which thou hast seen among the Gentiles, shall establish the truth of the first, which are of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.... and shall make known.... that the Lamb of God is the Son of the Eternal Father and the Savior of the world." (1 Nephi 13: 40.) There is, therefore, no discrepancy between the Book of Mormon and the Bible on the doctrine of the Deity.

In the Doctrine and Covenants we read that "the Lord is God and beside Him there is no Savior: great is His wisdom, marvelous are His ways, and the extent of His doings none can find out. From eternity to eternity He is the same, and His years never fail." (Sec. 76: 1-5.) Further: "He comprehendeth all things, and all things are before Him, and all things are round about Him: and He is above all things, and in all things, and is through all things, and is round about all things; and all things are by Him, and of Him, even God, for ever and ever." (Sec. 38: 41.) Further: "These three [the Father, Son and Holy Spirit] constitute the great, matchless, governing and supreme power over all things; by whom all things were created and made that were created and made, and these three constitute the Godhead; and are one." (Fifth Lecture on Faith.) In the Doctrine and Covenants what may, perhaps, be called a new truth is revealed relative to the destiny of man, that those who remain faithful to God shall grow in perfection and finally become Gods, themselves. We read: "Then shall they be Gods, because they have no end; therefore shall they be from everlasting to everlasting, because they continue; then shall they be above all, because all things are subject unto them. Then shall they be Gods, because they have all power and the angels are subject unto them." (Sec. 132: 20.)

The great truth here revealed is, however, only relatively new. It is implied in former revelations. "Thou shalt not revile the gods [meaning the judges of Israel] nor curse the ruler of thy people." (Ex. 22: 28.) "Is it not written in your law; I said, ye are gods?" (Joh. 10: 34.) "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as he is." (1 John 3: 2.) "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne." (Rev. 3: 21.) We may leave to the reader to judge which of the two records is most emphatic on this point, the Doctrine and Covenants, which says: "Then shall they be Gods," or the Bible, which says that we shall be "like" the Second person in the Godhead and sit on His throne as He is seated on the throne of His Father.

In the Pearl of Great Price God appears, as in Genesis, as Lord God Almighty, who is from eternity to eternity, or endless. (P. 1.) Moses is His son, created in the similitude of the Only Begotten. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are recognized throughout in their offices, as in the Bible. (P. 4.) The accounts of the creation are substantially the same as that in Genesis. In the Book of Abraham the original for God is translated "Gode," as it probably should be in the opening chapter of Genesis.

We are now prepared to state that the agreement between the revelations concerning the nature and attributes of God, as recorded in the Bible and the other sacred volumes, is perfect. Had it been possible in this limited article to give a complete concordance of all the passages in which the subject is referred to, this fact would appear more clearly, but those quoted are sufficient, we hope. Our position is this: In all of the inspired records the picture presented of the Deity is the same. Does the Bible represent the supreme power as One (even in a higher and more mysterious sense than Man is one); and yet more than one, inasmuch as there is a plurality of Wills, Agents, Persons? So does the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price. Does Mormonism as represented in these standards of faith, speak of "many Gods?" So does the Bible. Of a male and female element in the Godhead? So does the Bible, since the "Spirit" active in the creation is in the Hebrew represented by a female noun, "Ruach," and since man, male and female, was created in the image of the Gods. Does Mormonism speak of God's children? No doctrine is made plainer by the Bible revelations than that. Does Mormonism believe in a God, or Gods, in human form? So do undeniably the authors of the Bible. Paul, not to refer again to the sacred records of Moses, has given sanction to the beautiful expression of the ancient poet: "For we are also His offspring." He argues: "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." (Acts 17: 28, 29.) Logic compels us to conclude that in Paul's mind the form of God was that of man, of which He is the Father; else, what is the point of his argument, of which one of the premises is that we are his offspring? Show us, we may well exclaim, one single statement concerning God in the Mormon standards of faith at variance with any statement in the Bible. Mr. Nutting has utterly failed to do so.

This is all the more remarkable because of the exultant attitude he assumes in contemplating his own concept of the Deity. That is, as we understand it, chiefly the one founded on the Nicene and Athanasian creeds. Now these creeds are not the Bible. They were born under peculiar circumstances. We think when they are studied without prejudice, they will be regarded as clumsy attempts to reconcile the Bible theology with the dreams of pagan philosophy which exercised so much baneful influence on early decadent Christianity. The council of Nice, A. D. 325, was called by the emperor Constantine for the purpose of settling the remarkable question whether a son can be as old as his father. Not that Constantine cared for the theological controversies, but he needed a united church to lean on, and commanded the theologians to unite. So the delegates to the council came. There were hundreds of them. Constantine met with them, too. It was the first time the church and the state stood face to face as friends. It is said that "he felt disgusted at the coarse, cringing creatures who one moment scrambled around him to snatch up a bit of his munificence, and the next flew madly into each other's faces for some incomprehensible mystery." These "creatures" are hardly reliable in a matter of this kind, even if they did add a curse upon those who differ with them in views. The Athanasian creed with all its mathematical absurdities is probably traceable to the time of Augustine, perhaps to his theology. But even his authority is of no account, when it is remembered that his Bible exegesis is extremely arbitrary sometimes, not to

mention that there is some doubt as to his veracity as a chronicler of facts. To the best of our understanding the god of these creeds is essentially the god of the early Gnostics minus the intermediate emanations or aeons that constituted the Pieroma, or bridge, between them and the Infinite, who himself was unknown and unknowable. Incapable, in fact, even of entering into immediate relations with the material creation. But that doctrine is severely rebuked by Paul in his letter to the Colossians, and it is a miracle that it should have survived to this day in the Christian world. It is a mystery—a mystery of iniquity. The doctrine of God has a practical bearing on the ethics of its adherents. The Gnostic idea developed both into sickly asceticism and unbridled licentiousness. Are the results in the Christian world today different?

Mormonism gladly leaves the creeds that have been weighed and found wanting. It takes its position on Bible ground, and more especially on the revelations that portray God as the eternal Father of the children of men. In these revelations they recognize the God of the creation, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of Moses and the Prophets, and the God of Him, who in the parting hour declared to his followers: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God." (John 20: 17.) If the Fatherhood of God is merely a figure of speech, Mormonism is wrong; but if it means something in relation to the Elder Brother, it also means something in relation to His brethren; and if so, the entire doctrine is clear. Can it be considered derogatory to the Deity to believe that the children of God partake of His nature, His attributes? Children not of the nature of the parents are called monstrosities. Are God's children such? If we as children are partakers of His nature, is it unreasonable to expect that through His saving power, and by obedience, this nature will develop? Where will the development end? Must a child be rebuked because he aims one day to do what he sees his father do? Answer these queries in the light of Scripture, of nature, of history, of logical reasoning, and the reply can be but one: "As God is, we may become, as we are, God once was." This is the reply Mormonism offers to those all-important questions.

#### NOTES.

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are certainly not angels in the other world. Angels are ministering spirits, at the service of the children of God. (Heb. 1: 14.) The latter are not "redeemed" for the purpose of becoming servants in another world.

The statement that Mormonism teaches that God is "made" of matter and is subject to the laws of matter, like a stone, shows only the profound ignorance of Mr. Nutting concerning Mormon doctrine. It needs no refutation.

The subsequent statement that the Gods of Mormonism are all sinners, we regard as an ineffective attempt at placing Mormonism in an absurd light. No Mormon ever taught or believed that blasphemous doctrine.

The statement that the theology of Mormonism is contained in heathenism is no argument against it, even if the statement were true. The very doctrine of the existence of God might be assailed on that ground, since even paganism recognizes the existence of God.

The Christian concept of God is believed to have originated in paganism. In its essential features, the triad, it is found in ancient Hindoo teachings, and