

tion for the Jews [Why should we believe this at the outset? Surely there is an assumption involved here!] gradually worked out upon the basis of a Mosaic institution, there is nothing materially untruthful, though there is something uncritical, in attributing the whole legislation to Moses acting under the Divine command." Is it possible that the writer can forget that every one of these precepts is specially introduced? "And the Lord said unto Moses"—sometimes with the circumstances of time and place, and very frequently concluding, "I am the Lord." Surely our ideas of truth must be perilously slack if we can bring ourselves to think that there is nothing "materially untruthful" in this.

Now my position is that we have certain books in which this formula occurs over and over again; the very nature of these books is that it does so, and unless we are to assume at the outset that the formula is only a form, we must decide how we are to deal with it, because if we decide that it means nothing, then we are not treating these books as we should treat any others which lack this characteristic feature. We are condemning them *ab initio*; and if we decide that Ezra and his priests inserted this formula whenever they pleased, and made use of no other—knowing all the time, as they must have known, that it was a lie—it seems to me that we are begging the very question that we have to prove. We may make this conjecture, but conjecture is not proof; and we have a right to insist upon incontrovertible proof before we allow the conjecture. And it is the same with revelation. What do we mean by revelation? If the Old Testament is the record of God's revelation, in what sense is it so? Is the form of the record part of the revelation? Did the revelation take the form of a promise to Abraham and a promise to David? If so, how was the promise given? by any natural means?—if so, what were they?—or by some method above nature and perhaps above our comprehension? Because it will not do to deny the reality of the promise to Abraham and the promise to David, and then speak of the revelation as contained in the record of these two promises, neither of which was true. It is all moonshine to talk of the revelation of God as the net result