

that no one who can judge of such things at all can fail to see the conflict. Here is a very brief comparative statement of the two doctrines, in parallel columns:

BIBLE TEACHES THAT

1. There is Only One God. "The Lord, He is God in heaven above and the earth beneath; there is none else."—Deut. 4: 89. "I am he; before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I am the Lord."—Isa. 43: 10, 11. "There is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, . . . as there be gods many and lords many, [idols and princes] . . . there is but one God."—1 Cor. 8: 5, 6. "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me."—Ex. 20: 3. And hundreds of other passages, as Isa. 40: 12-31.

2. God has always been God; is uncreated and eternal, present and future. "The eternal God is thy refuge."—Deut. 33: 27. "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God."—Ps. 90: 2. "GOD IS NOT A MAN; . . . NEITHER THE SON OF MAN."—Num. 23: 19. "I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God."—Isa. 44: 6 and 48: 12. "Him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever."—Rev. 4: 9.

3. God is the Father—there is no female idea whatever given us about him. "Our Father, which art in Heaven." (Matt. 6: 4-18.) is the thought in some 300 passages, more or less directly cited. There is absolutely no passage even hinting at the "mother-god" idea. This idea, also, would imply more than one God, and is hence directly contrary to and forbidden by such passages as under 1 above.

4. God is Spirit without material body.—"God is a Spirit."—John 4: 24. "The God of the spirits of all flesh."—Num. 27: 16. "Do not I fill heaven and earth?"—Jer. 23: 24. The invisibility of God proves him to have no fleshy body, as do his omniscience, omnipresence, omnipotence, eternity and all others of his qualities and relations which would be impossible except to infinite spirit.

5. God is the Governor and Lawgiver of the Universe, and is subject to no physical law. God is not ruled by any higher power, but himself rules all, both matter and spirit. "And God said, Let there be light!"—see whole account of creation.—Gen. 1. "He stretched out the north, over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." "God faileth not, neither is weary."—Isa. 40: 28. See whole chapter. Every miracle is proof of this point.

6. God is perfectly Holy. "The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works."—Ps. 145: 17. "The Lord our God is holy."—Ps. 99: 9. "A God of truth and without iniquity, just and without guile."—Deut. 32:

MORMONISM TEACHES THAT

1. There are multitudes of Gods. "And they, (the Gods) said, let there be light."—Pearl of Great Price, p. 63, etc. "Then shall they be Gods." Doc. & Cov., 132: 3, etc. And note the following quotations, besides other references innumerable, including the admission of the editor of the News.

2. Mormon Gods were once men, and thousands more are now being raised, as Mormon parents and children. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are now "not angels, but God."—Doc. & Cov. 132: 37. Those who remain faithful to God shall grow in perfection and finally become Gods themselves.—Ed. News. "As God is, we may become; as we are, God one was."—Quoted by Ed. News.

3. Mormon Gods are Male and Female. See the hymn, "O, my Father," especially the line "I'm a mother there."—Doc. & Cov. 132: 20. "Then shall they be Gods," speaking of polygamous Mormons, male and female. The editor acknowledges this point also.

4. These Gods are partly made of matter. This follows from the doctrine that they were once men, who have material bodies, as well as from many direct statements from Joseph Smith's time down to date, and is very tenaciously advocated.

5. These Gods are subject to the laws of Matter, as to their bodies, like a stone. The editor denies this point.

6. These Gods "are All Sinners: First, because they shined white on the earth as human beings, for the Bible says "All have sinned," (Rom. 3: 23); and second, because since becoming Gods they have created men so that they were

4. "There is no unrighteousness in Him."—Ps. 92: 15.

7. God is a Trinity. "In the name of the Father," and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. 28: 19; and many other passages stating or implying the doctrine. The Holy Spirit is A L W A Y S spoken of as divine.

Other points might be named, but these are enough. In every one of the foregoing items the Bible is flatly against the Mormon doctrine, as any one can see. There is no possibility of avoiding this conclusion; yet my opponent said that "the agreement" (between the Bible and the Mormon books) "is perfect!" Perhaps he had never compared them as above; not one person in thousands has, or has matched the two systems together in any fair way. Of course, I understand that the Mormon books have some things about God which accord with the Bible; the 10,000 verses of the Bible which are put bodily into the Book of Mormon will do that, of course. But the distinctive points of Mormonism are what we are discussing, and such are the above. In the clear view of them presented, is it possible to believe that the Mormon teaching is the true, Christian, Biblical one?

"NOTES" ANSWERED.

"Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are certainly not angels in the other world. . . The children of God are not redeemed for the purpose of becoming servants in the other world." No, they are not angels, but less (Ps. 8: 5); only saints at the foot of the throne instead of "gods" upon it, according to the pen-pictures by God in Rev. 7: 9-17 and 5: 6-14. And the sacred record contradicts Mormonism as above flatly again in Rev. 7: 15, saying, "Therefore are they before the throne, and serve him day and night." That Mormonism regards service as degrading is only another proof that it is not Christianity; for Christ said, "I am among you as one that serveth," and, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." (Matt. 20: 25-28, Luke 22: 27.) The principle and fact of service extends from the throne of God, who is the Divine Servant, down through all to the gates of hell, beyond which it does not go. The idea above is not found in all this distance.

If I am ignorant in saying that the Mormon gods are made of matter as to their bodies, and subject to its laws, then Joseph Smith, Parley P. Pratt and others of the greatest authors of Mormonism or more so. Who is my opponent, that he calls down the greatest Mormons who have ever lived?

The Fatherhood of God is not at all distinctively a New Testament doctrine. As early as in Deut. 32: 6 it is mentioned, and in Ps. 103: 11-14, Isa. 63: 16 and 64: 8 are as tender statements of it as can well be put into words.

The attempt to prove a heathen origin for the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity is only another proof of my position that Mormonism is un-Christian in substituting duality for Trinity. It is indeed "necessary to be clear on this point;" but when one

* The author has probably inadvertently omitted the Son in this quotation.

compelled to sin, according to the Book of Mormon, 11 Nephi, 2: 11-25, which closes thus: "Adam felt that men might be; and men are that they might have joy."

7. God is Not a Trinity, but a Duality. "How many personages are there in the Godhead? Two, the Father and the Son."—Doc & Cov., 5th Lecture on Faith, page 56. "Ancient occultists explain the universe as a triad. The Christian theologians called this the Godhead." Editor News, argument against Trinity.

gets clear he will know that there is not any truth in ascribing other than Biblical origin to the doctrine of the Trinity, which has always been held by the Christian church. Dualism is far more a heathen doctrine than triads, and the Trinity is indeed far from triadism.

Now that Mormonism retreats to the notion of two Holy Spirits, one who is God and another which is "an influence at work in nature and the Church," we shall know how to avoid the force of the statements in the Key which were clipped out of my last article. But the position will be just as untrue. The Holy Spirit is God, and nothing else.

As to Hebrew, note my challenge, already given. Besides this, I challenge my opponent to name a single Hebraist who admits what he says that all do! Perhaps nobody is "bewildered" but himself!

My opponent argues that the fact that both himself and Christ have been accused of blasphemy is the greatest possible testimony to the truth of Mormonism. This is a splendid specimen of Mormon logic, I admit; but any logician would call it a "non-sequitur," nevertheless. In Rev. 13: 16 we find that a devil from hell also blasphemed God. Apply the same logic: "Mormonism and this devil are both accused of blasphemy, therefore they are alike"—and the logic would be just as good, and the conclusion far more true, according to the thinking of the Christian world!

My opponent fails to grasp the fact that none of the great doctrines of Christianity have either originated in or been largely shaped by any council or authority whatever, aside from the Word of God in the Bible. The present age pays little attention to such, and personally I give none at all, in any such connection. There is no priestly authority over brain or heart in the Christian church. "To the Bible," only, is the cry.

Answer.

[To Mr. John D. Nutting:

Sir:—You call public attention to the fact that the "News" eliminated from your article preceding this your references to the Catechism, Key to Theology, etc.; by so doing you simply expose your almost impudent violation of our agreement published in the "News" of August 24th, over your own signature. The matter was thoroughly discussed at the time, and any further reference to it will be treated with significant silence on our part. The imputation that we have "revised" your argument, or even weakened it in any way, is false. The references spoken of are left out of this article, too. If it does not suit your purpose to discuss Mormonism as found in our standards of faith, as agreed upon, you are at liberty to end the discussion at your earliest convenience.—Ed. "News."]

Rev. John D. Nutting charges that Mormonism seems to dislike clear logic, the dictionary and the established laws of interpretation of language. What that charge is based on does not appear. To the best of our understanding it is clear logic, a correct use of the dictionary and the correct application of the laws of interpretation for which we contend. It would be easy to hurl the charge back, on the head of our opponent, but there is no need of retaliation. The public is the judge as to which side has the clearest logic, etc. We, at least, need not formulate