

God." The reference here appears to be to Deuteronomy viii. 3, which reads "Man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord, doth man live."

And why is it that the revisers have struck this out of the New Version in Luke and left it in Matthew? Did Luke not say that man shall "live by every word of God" as written in the Old Version? or did the revisers think that man could receive no word from God except the Bible? or that the Holy Ghost was sent to repeat parrot-like the words that Jesus spoke?

"Now it came to pass while the multitude pressed upon Him, and heard the word of God." Of course it will be readily admitted that Jesus spake the "word of God," but will it be as readily admitted that the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Trinity, can in this generation speak to the multitudes without the Bible? Who was to teach the "many things" that Jesus said they could not yet bear?

"The seed is the word of God." Did Jesus mean that the seed was the Bible, that as soon as He had ceased speaking nothing more should be said, that woe would come upon anyone who added to the words of the Bible? This is the popular belief, and yet Jesus said just before going away that He had many things to say to His disciples but they could not then bear them, but when He, the Holy Ghost, was come, He would lead them into all truth. It is just as popular a belief that God cannot and does not speak to His children except through the Bible to-day. Then how many of the "many things" that Jesus had to say have been said? He did not say them, therefore they are not recorded, as Luke states in Acts, speaking of his former treatise (Luke), "the former treatise I made concerning ALL that Jesus began to do and to teach." And if Jesus only began His teaching, who has carried it on since, and when did it stop, or what real difference is there between the "Acts" of apostles that Luke chronicled and "Acts" of apostles to-day, or are there no apostles to-day, and is this according to the mind of God

that there should be none, that there should be no "Acts" to chronicle?

"My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it."

What "word of God" was it necessary to "hear" and "do" to become Christ's brother? Was it to hear only the words of the Old Testament which was written and the New when it should be written? Was the Holy Ghost to illumine the pages of these written words or was there an unwritten word of His own to each individual that it would be necessary to "hear" and "do" before being entitled to Christ's interpretation of brother?

"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and they spake the word of God with boldness." What word of God was it that those were ushered out of the upper room to speak? Was it the Old Testament—the New was not as yet written, nor was it for many years after? Or did God respect the 120 who tarried in some way that He will not respect you and me? Was it possible that the 120 could speak the very "word of God?" One would imagine that only God Himself could speak that. But this is the record and we believe it, because it is written and harmonizes with the other Scriptures—they even spoke the very "word of God" just what was according to the mind of the Holy Ghost who had just come.

"It is not fit that we should forsake the word of God and serve tables." What "word of God" was it that the disciples did not want to forsake? that they wished to continue in the ministry of? Was it the Old or New Testament—the New was not yet written?

"And the word of God increased." Was it the Old Testament or the New that increased? Or was it rather that those who were irrevocably abandoned to God increased, and consequently those who were able to speak it, or that the Holy Ghost could speak through, increased? We opine this latter was the increase of the word that is referred to, and it does not follow that the disciples did not cease to observe this word later.

"Samaria had received the word of God." "Gentiles also had received the