

For ourself, we hesitate not to utterly dispute the authority of these deliverances. That part which recognizes the possibility of Gentile as well as Jew walking in the Spirit is in harmony with the teaching of Christ, and was plainly taught to Peter and through him to all the rest by the Holy Ghost, but the rest of the deliverances do not stand on this basis, and, moreover, they take no authority whatever from the simple fact of being the solemn verdict of this first council.

For Protestants to attach the smallest particle of *authority* to them is to play into the hands of Romanism. For granted the authority of the one set of deliverances, and iron logic demands that they grant like authority to the Pore in council.

### PART III.

Another incident related in the book of *The Acts* is worthy of notice in this connection. It is in connection with Paul's journey to Jerusalem. The narrative says, that when Paul and his company landed at Tyre they found certain disciples: "Who said to Paul through the Spirit, that he should not go to Jerusalem." In the R. V. it reads "And these said to Paul through the Spirit, that he should not set foot in Jerusalem."

Now the singular fact in connection with this oracular utterance of these disciples is, that apparently Paul accepted these disciples as brethren in Christ, and yet gave not the slightest heed to their professed revelation from the Spirit, whilst the historian makes no comment whatever on the circumstance.

Luke tells the incident as if these disciples really did receive such a revelation from the Spirit and yet makes Paul, who everywhere paid deference to the work of the Holy Ghost, treat the matter as not worthy of the slightest consideration.

Now, if these disciples had been taught

the true meaning of Christ's gospel, they could not have presumed to be the mouth-piece of the Spirit for Paul, unless they, in that act, intentionally declared that Paul himself did not walk in the Spirit. But this, it is evident, was not their thought concerning the great apostle of the Gentiles. Hence, it is clear that they themselves did not understand Christ's teaching concerning the Holy Spirit as guide and teacher for the individual.

But did Paul realize their glaring inconsistency? If so, it is all but certain he did not publicly call attention to it, else would Luke not have left the narrative as we find it. If Paul and Luke knew these disciples to be weakminded and their *presumed* revelations only a matter for a passing smile, why should the historian, in giving what he evidently deemed a truthful report of the circumstance, deliberately credit their utterance to the Spirit? For our part we see no way of explaining the words "who said to Paul through the Spirit" without compromising seriously some of the parties concerned. Either the original story has not come to us complete, or some of the parties concerned are seriously compromised.

The wording of the text in the Revised Version would indicate seemingly a prophecy that Paul could not reach Jerusalem. But, if that was its meaning, then it was a false prophecy, and then the words of Luke, "through the Spirit," after their falsity had been made to appear, would be still more compromising.

On the whole, we incline to the belief that some of the original facts have been left out, hence leaving the narrative obscure.

And now, we have to consider a still more complex incident in the life of Paul.

When he reached Jerusalem he was received cordially by the church, his money offering accepted, to wit, the collection from his churches for the poor at Jerusalem, and his account of success in founding churches amongst the Gentiles heard with