

of a series of illusions, misconceptions, misrepresentations, and what not, every one of which is a mistake in itself, though the whole together constitute the revelation. Doubtless, God has a revelation in the history of the Christian Church—its mistakes, sins, defections, divisions, and the like—but this, I presume, is different from His revelation in the acts and words of Christ. So in like manner He had a revelation of Himself in the history of the Jews after the death of Nehemiah, but this again, I believe, was different in kind and method from that in Old Testament times; and if it was not, we not only have read the Old Testament wrong, but the Old Testament itself has entirely deceived us, and the New Testament writers have deceived us in the use they make of it. We are told, indeed, by this writer, that “a myth is not a falsehood”; but his friends profess to have largely convicted the Old Testament writers of falsehood, and yet they ask us to accept the revelation which they imagine underlies the falsehood. For instance, we are told by Driver,¹ “Deuteronomy *does not claim to be written by Moses,*” and he prints the words in italics; but I turn to chap. xxxi. 9 and there I read, “And Moses wrote this law;” and again at ver. 24, “And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished,” &c. Now which am I to believe, the book itself or Driver? and if I am to believe Driver, why am I to believe that that, and that only, was the method which God adopted for revealing Himself? and why am I to believe that this is a revelation of God? and why not rather say that it is no revelation at all, but only the profession and pretence of a revelation? for it seems that this is the more reasonable thing to do, unless there is some *à priori* reason in reserve for believing that God made a revelation, and that He made it in this way. I repeat, then, that the question is not one of inspiration or revelation at all, but one of the good faith and simple trustworthiness of the book as a book.

In like manner the same writer¹ says, “Critical investigations concern really not the *fact* of revelation, but its mode.

¹ *Contemporary Review*, February, 1890.