

with him was greater than any ecclesiastic.

We believe the Roman Catholic church should have listened to the voice of Luther as he attacked growing abuses.

We believe that Luther was in the kingdom. We further believe that much of the opposition and antagonism to Luther at that time was against knowledge. They substituted indulgences for faith. They made the way to heaven easy, or tried to. How they succeeded, the triumphs of Protestant Christianity best tell.

Now if John the Baptist, the greatest of the prophets, could waver in his allegiance to Jesus, if Peter could deny Jesus with oaths and curses, if all the disciples could forsake Jesus and flee, if Elijah could sit under a juniper tree and request God that he might die, if Job could say "perish the day wherein I was born," if David could sin grievously as he did with Uriah's wife, if the heart of Solomon was "not perfect with the Lord," if he did evil in the sight of the Lord and went not fully after the Lord, if his wives turned away his heart after strange gods, if Abraham could lie and declare that his wife was his sister, if Lot's two daughters could bear children to their father, if Jacob could lie to his father Isaac and declare he was Esau, if Paul and Barnabas could have sharp contention, do not all these things only prove that the religion of Jesus was and is superior to any other religion either before or after his advent.

Jesus never sinned. As he was, so are we in this world. Jesus did always the things that pleased his Father. As he was, so are we in this world. It was his meat and his drink to do his Father's will.

The "least in the kingdom" is greater than John the Baptist, than David, Abraham, Noah or Solomon, while he remains in that kingdom which is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Righteousness is necessary for entrance into the kingdom. Righteousness is necessary to remain in the kingdom. Without righteousness—holiness—no man shall see the Lord.

H. DICKENSON.

REVELATIONS.

THE editorial in last month's EXPOSITOR on the experience of W. T. Stead and Lady Henry Somerset, has started a train of thought which may be of interest to readers of the EXPOSITOR.

The church tells us that inspiration has ceased—that it died out when the canon of Scripture was finished or closed and has not existed since. But what is the meaning of inspiration? Evidently the church thinks it different from revelation. That men still receive revelations the church abundantly teaches—in theory at least. So that when it is stated that inspiration ceased with the apostles it is not meant that men no longer received revelations, but only that they no longer received or were under inspiration to teach the rest of mankind absolute truth. The difference then between organized Christendom and the Association is this, viz., the former teaches that some few men were inspired to teach absolute truth to the whole world, but yet all men *can* or *may* receive personal revelations for their individual guidance. We hold, however, that *no* men were ever inspired in this dispensation to teach absolute truth to the rest of the world, especially as such inspiration would be altogether unnecessary in a world where each could receive personal revelations for his own guidance.

But *does* the church believe in personal