

we control those things that the world cannot possibly do.

As I read here, there was one thing that the disciples of the Savior did not accomplish—they did not succeed in establishing that union of spirit and feeling that they ought to have had, and the Lord chastened them for it. The Lord requires that men should forgive one another, even seventy times seven. And even if the party does not ask forgiveness, we are to forgive for a certain number of times. He that forgives not his brother, we are told, there remaineth in him the greater sin—that is, he is a greater sinner than the person that offended him. The Lord requires us to love our neighbor as we do ourselves—a pretty difficult matter under many circumstances; but we will have to reach that point of perfection, and we will reach it. Moses, through the divinity that was always with him, did some extraordinary things. The people of Israel had abused him in every condition. They continually went contrary to his counsel, and on a certain occasion they appointed a captain to take them back into Egyptian bondage. It was as much as he could possibly bear to put up with their indignities. Finally the Lord became angry, His patience became exhausted, and He made up His mind that He would destroy every one of them, except Moses, and He would take him and make him what he proposed to do with Israel—a mighty nation. There are very few in these days but would have jumped at that opportunity, to become as it were the starter of a new world, of a mighty and an everlasting kingdom. That was proposed to Moses by the Lord. Well, Moses had educated himself by the spirit of God that he was able to act in that way that he might save the house of Israel on that very extraordinary occasion. He called upon the Lord with mighty faith, and conversed with Him. He tried to explain to Him that it was not a good proposition at the least. He argued with Him as one man argues with another. How was he capable of doing this? Why, he had seen God face to face, as some men have seen Him in these latter days, and he knew that he could reason and talk with Him. He told the Lord that if He did what He proposed—destroy Israel—the nations around would say that He had undertaken a task that He could not succeed in accomplishing. Well, the Lord changed His mind, so it reads, and did not that which He had intended to do. Now, whether the Lord had a disposition in this matter to try Moses, may be a question; but the distinct understanding with Moses was that if He did not plead with the Lord all Israel would be destroyed. It was the divinity within Moses, brought up to such a high point, that enabled him to do this. There was a divinity within Abraham also. No mortal man could have done what Abraham did—taking up on Mount Moriah his only son as a sacrifice—except he were inspired and had a divinity within him to receive that inspiration. We read of these extraordinary manifestations in the lives of the prophets. We find men at the present day that never could have done what they have done, never could have made the sacrifices they have, unless there had been a receiving and comprehending of the language of divinity—the Spirit.

As to our receiving these wonderful things about which I have read to you, I am just as sure of it as I am that I am talking to you today. Although it seems marvelous, it is here so stated, and I know the Lord tells that which is true. When He gives comfort to His Saints in His promises, those promises when fulfilled are vastly greater than the words seem to have indicated. President Woodruff could

not have gone through the scenes that he has, and come out alive as He has, unless there had been a divinity within him—a part of God himself—receiving and understanding that divine Spirit that came to him and enabling him to accomplish what he has. Other men might be mentioned in the same way. Joseph Smith, the Prophet, with whom I was intimately acquainted for years, as well as I was with my brother, I know him to have been a man of integrity, a man devoted to the interests of humanity and to the requirements of God all the days in which he was permitted to live. There never was a man that possessed a higher degree of integrity and more devotedness to the interest of mankind than the Prophet Joseph Smith. I can say this from a personal acquaintance with him.

Latter-day Saints, we have had a lovely Conference, and the weather has been very beautiful. The Lord has blessed us abundantly. Here we are, gathered from many of the nations of the earth, and it has been a most marvelous accomplishment. God alone could have accomplished it. And the prospects before us are grand and glorious. The time is speedily coming—we do not want to talk very much, though, about going to Jackson County, Missouri, because through our foolishness and weakness we would not care anything about building houses and making ourselves comfortable here. I know when we first started a colony in Brigham City, the people generally thought it was nonsense, perfectly useless, to plant peach trees, apple trees, currant bushes and the like, because we were going to Jackson County so speedily; and it was with the utmost effort that we were enabled to disabuse them of this idea. We are not going tomorrow, nor next day, this week or next week; but we are going, and there are many—hundreds and hundreds within the sound of my voice that will live to go back to Jackson County and build a holy temple to the Lord our God. Be prepared to do these things that have been taught us during this Conference, and make ourselves worthy, and we will receive everything that I have read to you in this section. We have not time to explain these things. We bear our testimony in regard to what we know, and what God has done for us, and what we hope to do with His assistance, and leave it in that way.

God bless you, Latter-day Saints. Love to serve you, and to do everything that the Lord enables us to do, because we expect to be together in the other life, from all eternity to all eternity. May God help us, in the name of Jesus. Amen.

NORMONISM DISCUSSED.

Affirmative.

[By Rev. John D. Nutting.]

As the affirmative has both the opening and closing of a debate, it devolves upon me to rebut very briefly my opponent's argument of last week. He has made the points which I anticipated, chiefly, and they are probably the best possible. It is always feasible to say something for any position—as the woman did when she was challenged to speak a good word for the devil, and retorted that we "might all well imitate his perseverance."

The essence of my opponent's reply is this: First, that the "revelation" in question does not mean what it says; and second, that if it did, the Bible says similar things. Neither is true, if the writer understands much about either the English language, in which he was born, and which he has used in public for twenty years, or about the Bible, which he has studied and used nearly twice as long.

The use of the English language is not a matter of guess-work. It is settled and definite, according to the rules of grammar and correlate science; and the meanings of its words are equally settled according to the dictionary. These uses and meanings of words must absolutely be regarded, or language is of little value and discussion is less. I shall abide by them, and must hold my opponent to them in this discussion, though it is characteristic of Mormonism to neglect them, whether intentionally or otherwise.

When the "revelation" says "all their creeds are an abomination in God's sight," the words cannot possibly mean less than that practically every creed of Christendom in 1820 was characteristically abominable. It cannot possibly mean that a small part of most of the creeds was somewhat different from what it should be, and is "to that extent abominable," as my opponent would make it. Such use of language would be ridiculous, and can hardly be seriously meant, on second thought. Joseph Smith must submit to the rules of language. When God speaks, He always speaks according to the laws of the language used; and if Joseph Smith cannot be logically interpreted, thus it is only another proof that it is not God speaking when he speaks, by any means.

So of the phrase "those professors." "Those" is a pronoun, and must refer to an antecedent word, in correct English; this is not correct, and so the word has no antecedent expressed. But the only idea preceding it which can possibly serve as such, is that of the same sentence the professors, or members of the "sects" so savagely denounced. This is the meaning which my argument gives it; and it is the only possible one. So my position stands on this point.

As to the Scripture argument, only a word. Joseph Smith spoke these words of utter condemnation regarding the saved part of the world—the very best of mankind—and this is the reason why they are not true; the passages from Paul and the Psalms quoted, were spoken avowedly of the very opposite class—those who were wilfully sinners and unsaved—and this is the reason why they are true. To confound the two is to lose sight of the very bottom fact of the whole situation. The Bible never speaks even disparagingly of the Church of Christ; it speaks very scathingly of individual sinners who may be outwardly attached to the Church. The Church of Christ is the sacred body of Christ, (I Cor. 12) and it is this which the "revelation" maligns, not the few unsaved who may be outwardly attached.

My argument only touched upon a few of the possible points in the "revelation" showing its falsity. There is no space for others.

A Brief Reply.

It is exceedingly gratifying to learn that Rev. J. Nutting, at the outset, finds himself in a position to intimate that his knowledge of English is more thorough than that of his opponent, though his assertion that he was born in the English language—meaning presumably in a country or a region where English is spoken—hardly goes to prove superior accuracy; it is gratifying, for as an English scholar he cannot fail to perceive that he has in his rebuttal radically misrepresented our rejoinder to his opening statement. Rev. Nutting says:

"The essence of my opponent's reply is this: First, that the 'revelation' in question does not mean what it says; and second, that if it did ['does,' we presume] the Bible says similar things."

Now this is a glaring misstatement of our reply. The essence of it was