

do "image" and "likeness" here stand for? Is it only resemblance as to moral qualities? The prohibition would in that case read somewhat like this: "Thou shalt not make unto thee anything that resembles anything in heaven in its moral qualities; nor the moral qualities of anything in the earth beneath or in the water under the earth." But that would be absurd. Yes, but not more so than the statement of our opponent that the image and likeness spoken of in Gen. 1: 27, means not an image or likeness, but merely a resemblance as to moral qualities. We cannot admit that the same word means one thing in Genesis and another in Exodus, unless the context shows that the author intended to convey two different meanings. No sound exegesis can admit such arbitrary interpretation.

Paul enlightens us concerning the true Scriptural meaning of the word image. Speaking of the resurrection, 1 Cor. 15: 49, he says: "As we have borne the image of the earthly [that is of Adam] we shall also bear the image of the heavenly [that is of the resurrected Lord]." Our Lord was the express image of the Father's "person" as well as the brightness of His glory (see Hebr. 1: 3), and the glorified Saints in Paradise restored will be the image of their Lord and Savior. That was the image in which man was created, which sin defaced and which the atonement is to restore. It is an image of the "person" of the Father, not a resemblance merely of His moral perfections. Let the word of God speak and mortal man hear and believe, even when the finite mind fails to comprehend to the fullest extent the infinite that is opened up before it like the expanse with its countless worlds and systems of worlds.

Mormonism does not deny that God is a Spirit. It does not deny anything that has been revealed regarding the attributes of God. But it does deny that the word of our Lord: "God is a Spirit" contradicts anything the ancient servants of the Almighty spoke concerning Him. Paul teaches that there is a spiritual body as well as a natural body (1 Cor. 15: 44), and if this is true, the statement that God is a Spirit is in perfect accord with the Scripture passages that represent Him as having face, hands, eyes, feet, etc.

Nor do these passages conflict with the statement that God is invisible. Invisible is that which is not for the time being perceptible through the organs of vision. It does not mean that God cannot be seen, but that He is not now seen. A lighthouse may one hour be invisible to the sailor, on account of fog or darkness or distance, and the next hour it may be visible, the intervening obstacle having been removed. A microbe may be invisible on account of its size, but become visible when the eye is aided by the microscope. In this sense of the word our Father in heaven is invisible to His children here. So is also our Lord and Savior, and so are John and Paul and Mary and Martha and the host of Saints beyond the veil. Moses and Elijah were invisible, too; yet mortals had the privilege of seeing them on the mount. They were visible for the time being. The Bible is very clear on this point. It teaches that no one has seen God. (John 1: 18.) Moses was denied the favor for this reason: "There shall no man see me, and live," which indicates, not indeed that God cannot be seen, but that no one in that dispensation was to be granted to see God and live. That God, however, if He wills it, can show Himself to mortal man is clear from Exodus 33: 22, 23, where we read: "And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee

in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by. And I will take away my hand and thou shalt see my back parts, but my face shall not be seen." Job did not entertain the idea of a God that cannot be seen. He says: "In my flesh shall I see God: Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another." (Job 19: 26, 27.) Our Savior confirms this. When Philip, evidently actuated by a desire similar to that of Moses, asked the Master to show him the Father, Jesus did not tell him that his prayer was blasphemy; that God is a Spirit that cannot be seen, and so on. He told him: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." (John 14: 9.) And in the sermon on the mount, He gave this wonderful promise: "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." (Matthew 5: 8.) How can human language in clearer terms convey the truth that God, the Father, in due time, will grant His redeemed children to see Him in His glory? Whom are we to believe—the Word of God or modern, wind-filled theology?

The Fatherhood of God, our opponent admits, is not to be understood as merely a figure of speech; but, as if sorry that he had in an unguarded moment taken a single step in the direction of truth after so long a ramble in the labyrinth of errors, he hastens to flatly contradict himself by stating in substance that the Fatherhood of God is merely a figure of speech meaning that God is the "Creator of the race and its momentary preserver and benefactor." Now, if that is all there is in the expression "the Fatherhood of God," must we infer, pray, that God also is the Father of the beasts of the field and the monsters of the deep? He certainly is their creator, preserver and benefactor. See to what straits we are driven when our every effort is strained to escape the Word of God.

Balaam, our opponent meets an angel with a drawn sword, turn wherever he will. As was pointed out in our previous article, the Scriptures teach that we are God's "offspring;" and that Jesus is the "first born" among many brethren (Rom. 8: 29); that His Father is our Father and we, therefore, are the "children" of God. If this is true, we ask again, is Mormonism to be condemned because it has pleased God through it to reveal the glorious truth that "as we are, God once was and that as He is, His children may become?" Does that not follow from the very fact that God is our Father? What do we or does anyone, know about the Infinite? Do we know enough about it to justify us in making the broad statement that the finite can never become the Infinite? Where is that written, pray?

At last we arrive at Mr. Nutting's "Doctrines in Parallel Columns." We pointed out in a previous article that it is our opponent's task to prove that the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants or the Pearl of Great Price contains doctrine concerning God, contradicting that which is taught in the Bible. We endeavor to prove that he had utterly failed, inasmuch as the doctrine of the plurality in the Godhead, a feminine element in the Godhead, man's "likeness" to God, the Father, man's glorious destiny, etc., are all taught in the Bible. We asked our opponent, very modestly, to find one passage if not more in the Bible contradicting anyone passage in the other three sacred records. Instead of complying with this reasonable request, he merely restates in parallel columns what he previously stated and we refuted. We have no definite idea of the aim of this kind of tactics. Prob-

ably it is a very clever move. But it seems to us that a series of false statements are as false when they are printed in parallels as when they appear consecutively. We would like to have the opinion of expert mathematicians on this point. It is an important one to dialecticians. It is evident that if by virtue of parallels a falsehood can be transformed into truth, two falsehoods might become truths by stating them in print in the shape of a triangle, a square, or possibly some other and more potent mathematical figure.

We need not now linger very long over this restatement by Mr. Nutting of our respective conceptions of the Deity. With regard to the left-hand column we need only say again that Mormonism accepts without hesitation the quotations from the Bible, as far as they are correctly given. All that is Mormonism. We reject, however, Mr. Nutting's comments, interpolations and headings so far as these contradict the passages quoted, or others in the Word of God.

With regard to the right-hand column we beg to remark:

1. The passages quoted from the Pearl of Great Price and the Doctrine and Covenants do not prove that Mormonism teaches "Multitudes of Gods," but a plurality in the Godhead, in the same sense as this doctrine is taught throughout the Bible from Genesis to Revelation of John. Mr. Nutting distorts facts either wilfully or by reason of ignorance.

2. When Mormonism teaches that God's children may become Gods, it simply teaches Scripture doctrine: "I have said, Ye are Gods, and all of you are children of the Most High." (Ps. 82: 6.) "We know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him." (1 John 3: 2.) To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne." (Rev. 3: 21.) Is any more evidence needed?

3. There is, notwithstanding the denial of Mr. Nutting, a hint in the Bible of a feminine element in the Godhead in the account of the creation, where the Ruach Elohim is represented as "moving upon" the waters, and where it is expressly said that man, male and female, was created in God's image and likeness.

4. The statement that the divine persons in the Godhead are "made" of matter and subject to the laws of matter "like a stone" is a gross perversion of Mormon doctrine. It is on a par with the ancient pagan accusation that Christians were cannibals, because they partook of the body and shed blood of the Savior. That pagan logic is just as good as Mr. Nutting's when he says: "This follows." Mr. Nutting has formed his own image of Mormonism, and it is this image he proceeds to demolish.

5. The same remark applies to his statement that "These Gods are all sinners."

6. The Scriptures do not teach the Trinity of the Athanasian creed. That doctrine never was part of true Christianity. The Trinity taught in the Bible is taught in the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price, as we have previously proved. Finally, with regard to both Mr. Nutting's columns, we will say that whatever is true in them we claim as Mormonism, whether it is on the left or the right side of the rule; whatever is not true we leave to him who may claim it as an essential part of his theology.

After all has been said, this great fact remains that the four sacred volumes mentioned present to the student certain revelations regarding the Deity, which it is his duty to investigate in