

or form, or course; upon Christian faith and practice they have no bearing whatever." Then be it so; but why, I would ask, upon *Christian* faith? I suppose the mode and form and course of Christ's revelation were exceptional, not to say supernatural; and why am I to accept them in His case and refuse to do so in the other? He tells us Himself that Abraham rejoiced to see His day, and he saw it and was glad. Abraham could not have done so unless he was divinely illuminated. Are we to suppose the illumination comes only to *us* through the illusory narrative which has to be critically re-adjusted, or is it to be taken in its naked simplicity when it tells us that the angel of the Lord called to Abraham out of heaven and gave him the promise of the seed? The alternative is not that of accepting all or nothing, but that of the broad principle on which we interpret Scripture, whether on that of receiving its own testimony or of inventing a scheme of our own upon which to correct the testimony.

We are told by the writer in *Lux Mundi* that "inspiration excludes conscious deception or pious fraud." Again I would ask, How does he arrive at his knowledge of inspiration, and what does he suppose the word to mean? Is his knowledge based, as it ought to be, on an induction of the facts as they are, or upon an induction of them after he has critically resolved them as seemeth to him right, or dissolved them altogether? But take the case of Deuteronomy. What are we to say of a writer who in the reign of Josiah, eight centuries after Moses, should put forth an ideal representation of the last months of the life of Moses, of which there was no record whatever, and say, among other things, "These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel, in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb"? Would this be conscious deception or pious fraud? or would it be a case in which the purity of the intention would justify the dubious character of the means employed? And is the theory of inspiration resorting to or adopting these means more reasonable than that of accepting the narrative as historically true—a simple record of fact? In the latter case