

haps without knowing or considering that John, after his release from Patmos, as history informs us, wrote the Gospel of St. John. Supposing that John was questioned on this point, how do you think he would have explained himself? He would have said that that caution had reference to the book written on Patmos. He would have said further, that the caution was against man's adding, but that God has the right to give to his people line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little, book after book, yea, even ten thousand revelations, or more as he may deem proper; and he never pronounced a curse against himself, but that man has not the right to add a single word. The same language may be found in the book of Deuteronomy, which of course has a direct bearing to the five books of Moses, without any reference whatever to the succeeding books of the Bible. May not the same objection be just as consistently raised against all the books of the Old and New Testament which follow the last book written by Moses, containing the same caution, as against the new revelation of today? Surely the people who lived in and after the days of Moses might just as consistently have objected to receiving any further revelations from the Lord, because of the caution referred to appearing in the Book of Deuteronomy, as the people of today have for objecting to receive any new revelation, because the same caution appears in the last chapter of the revelation on Patmos. Both have reference to particular books only, and it is absurd and folly in the extreme for men claiming to have any knowledge of God, and the great plan of salvation to interpret it otherwise. And it can be for no other reason than to attempt to cover up the state

of apostasy which the whole world is in, that causes the ministers of the various sects to quote this passage as they do.

There is another passage of Scripture which I will refer to, in connection with this; it reads as follows: "When Christ ascended up on high, he led captivity captive and gave gifts to men. And he gave some Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," etc. It is acknowledged that you have not Apostles as part of your Gospel. Let us inquire further. Have you got Prophets? No, you assert there is to be no more Prophets. Have you workers of miracles or healers of the sick? No. Have you discerners of spirits, or speakers with tongues, or do angels minister to you? No, you assert that these are all done away. Do you not know that all these constitute the body of the Church of the living God, and that all these are necessary to form the whole, so that one part or member cannot say to another, "I have no need of you?" What then have you got? You reply, We have teachers and pastors. Then you consider that you have the body of Christ among you? You reply, "O yes; we are the Church of Christ." Who authorized you to do away with these essential parts of the body or Church of Christ? Have you not been instructed of the Lord through the mouth of his Apostles, that "If all were one member, where were the body?" If pastors and teachers are the only members you have, how is it possible that the body can exist among you? The Apostle, in thus comparing the human body complete with all its members to the body or Church of