

ourselves?

We read in the Scriptures that in olden times men communed with this divine Being, that he walked and talked with men in the flesh, and revealed himself to them. But he is neither seen nor heard of men today, and what is even worse, none seem to know how to approach him to learn of him as his servants did in earlier times. But some will say, "We have no need of such communications now, for we have the writings of these men; they approached him, and they have written books containing his words which have been handed down to us; we have no need to approach God as they did." But who can tell us how to read this Bible aright? These people who say they have no need of revelation do not agree as to what those prophets meant when they wrote these things. Take the minister of one Christian denomination, for instance, and get him into conversation with a minister from another Christian denomination, each of these men of course professing to believe that the Bible is a divine record given to us for our guidance in spiritual things; and in a very short time you will get them into a quarrel. Take half a dozen men from half a dozen Christian denominations, each professing to be called of God to explain his word, and you will find that all of them have different views and ideas concerning that which the prophets wrote. Ask any one of these Christian ministers to tell you anything about God, and after exhausting his store of language in trying to do so he will wind up thus: "God is incomprehensible." There is an attempt to describe God in the Episcopalian prayer book. We are told in that book, which contains the articles of the faith of that body of people, that God is three and yet

he is only one; that there are three distinct personages in the Godhead, yet only one personage, and that this being is without body, without parts and without passions. Here, then, we have an imaginary being composed of three parts, who yet is only one without any parts. We are told further that one of these bodiless, passionless beings without parts had a body, and that he was a man in all points as we are, possessing like passions, but that he sinned not. This is a strange attempt at description of a divine Being. I do not wish to take up the time in further reference to these absurdities, you can read them in the Athanasian creed, and in the thirty-nine articles which all Episcopal ministers must subscribe to before they can receive "holy orders."

We read in the Bible: "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head (when he prayeth), forasmuch as he is the image and the glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man" (1 Cor., xi, 7). According to the Scriptures, when you see a perfect man, as far as man can be perfect in this imperfect condition which we now occupy, we see a being in the image of Deity. When Jesus Christ, who died that we might live, appeared on the earth, we are told that he was "the image of the invisible God," and "the express image of his (the Father's) person." So much indeed, was he like his Father, that when one of his disciples asked him to show them the Father, he answered him saying, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," giving us to understand that the Son inherited the likeness of his Father. Some read it to signify that he was the same person; but the Savior says again, "My Father is greater than I." The words of Jesus to Mary in the