

ding to the truth of the gospel." We here see that Peter so far forgot himself, and neglected to watch and pray, that he became involved in criminal hypocrisy—We say criminal hypocrisy; for he led others into the same evil line of conduct, and that too on a most important subject. When it is recollected that Peter's conduct had reference to one of the most important subjects of the Gospel, which he endangered, that he was leading men from Jesus Christ to human inventions, that this conduct of Peter was most contrary to his own judgment, the term 'criminal hypocrisy' will not appear too strong. Peter's conduct was a *real Sin*, not a *certain imprudence*.^{*} In Acts 11, we find some of the circumcision contending with Peter for his going among the Gentiles, and preaching to them. The Apostle justified himself, by entering into a full explanation both of his conduct, and of the motives by which he was influenced; and it is particularly observable that he rests his defence, NOT ON ANY AUTHORITY THAT HE POSSESSED—though this, had he possessed such authority as the text gives him, if it gives him any thing, would have been

^{*} The expression used in the Dorsey Test note on the passage - p. 10.