

part of the inspired scripture any more than I ~~free~~ feel that the fact that David wrote a letter to Joash saying put Uriah in the forefront of the battle would mean that that statement he wrote was inspired. I feel that inspiration is limited to the specific writings intended to be part of scripture, and not something which applies to everything that a man wrote. I feel that when Peter and Paul differed and Paul withstood Peter to the face (~~they~~ were both apostles) that one was right and the other wrong, or else they were both partly wrong. Certainly they were not both free from error. And in their argument with one another, certainly one of them and perhaps both of them said things, the implications of which, or the incidental bearing of which a point may have been contrary to truth. (11) included in the word of God.

Student: Seems like there are three possibilities , that either there was apostolic (11 1/4) accent to the process, like Mr. Wallace has been talking about. Or else they had extra, or historical data right there before them, which had convinced them that this was the Word of God, or else they had the supernatural guidance of the Holy Spirit, at that particular time, to guide them ~~and to~~ into acceptance of the particular books."

Another: You'd put the emphasis mainly on the guidance of the Holy Spirit at that particular time. Rather than the subjective of their individual minds?"

MacRae: Yes, I would say that there ~~may~~ have been individuals who felt that Jude was part of the inspired word because that they thought that Matthias was (12) or Nathaneal had, or some other one of the apostles. It's possible some of them may have, but I doubt if enough of them did for that to be the determining thing. And I doubt if any of them had clear teaching. It isn't as if a council of the church said let's appoint a commission, let's appoint a commission and let this commission examine the historical evidence and find out