

1st. It implies a *distinction between revelation and inspiration*. Revelation relates to truth and inspiration to the recording of the truth. It was not really the Bible that was inspired, but the writers of the Bible, who were thus divinely and infallibly guided in recording the matters of which they wrote. The inspiration relates to the divine direction of the sacred writers, revelation to the truths supernaturally revealed to them, which otherwise they could not know. Many things they wrote, which were not matters of revelation—this takes in, indeed, the largest part of the Bible, viz.: history and matters of ordinary experience and observation. Some things they wrote by revelation which they could spiritually discern at least in part, and some things they wrote which they could not understand. Moses had probably but a limited view of the marvellous economy and significant symbolism revealed to him. The prophets may have caught some glimpse, but, at best, a defective glimpse of the glory to be revealed. Daniel tells us plainly, after the wonderful revelation made to him: "And I heard, but understood not; then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the issue of these things? and He said, Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are shut up and sealed till the time of the end." There is a disposition generally among writers on this subject—*eg.*, Morell, Atwell, and Ladd—to draw some kind of distinction between revelation and inspiration, although the bases of this distinction are somewhat different from what has been stated. The last of these, Ladd, considers that inspiration and revelation must be co-existent, and that the former subjectively prepares the way for the latter. I prefer the view of Hodge, which is the one already stated, that inspiration is subsequent to revelation, and that it is the supernatural guidance of the mind of the writer, by which he is kept from error. While, through custom, we call the whole work a revelation, it is to be borne in mind that most of its contents were not in any sense matters of revelation. The very cosmogony of Moses may have been a matter of tradition. The story of the fall of man and of the deluge recorded by Moses was, doubtless, of the same traditional character as the almost identical and contemporaneous narratives discovered not very long ago on