

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 26.—OCTOBER, 1893.

---

I. ILLOGICAL METHODS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.<sup>1</sup>

I SHALL scarcely be expected, on an occasion like this, to speak on any other theme than Old Testament Criticism. When, eleven years ago, I was inducted into a similar chair in another institution, the discussion of this subject, in its present peculiar aspects, had just begun in this country; to-day it is the question of questions in the theological world. The movement, at once a sign and a fruit of the times, has passed far beyond its incipient stages. Its literature is already large. Even single phases of the subject have come to occupy no inconsiderable place in current thought. It is to one of these phases of the general theme that I shall invite your attention at this time. It especially concerns the style of reasoning adopted by those who advocate the newer views of the Bible. Is this reasoning in harmony with the accepted rules of logic? Can the critics of this class vindicate their often asserted claim to be scientific? On the answer to this question really depends the value of the conclusions reached.

Mr. Gladstone, not long since, speaking of modern criticism of the Bible, while confessing that he was no expert, gave this excellent advice. He said: "We must be on our guard against drawing warmth of affection into the field as having the force of argument. We should rather endeavor to defend the Scriptures upon the same principles of evidence and reasonableness governing our mental processes in other matters. When the arguments of specialists point to negative conclusions, we should beware of haste. We should reserve our judgment, even if yielding provisional as-

---

<sup>1</sup> Inaugural Address, May 3, 1893.

fifth chapter of Romans, and you find the page worn and brown, you may safely set him down as a devotee of the sacred science." Precisely so; and that theory of the *Adamic union* which he may finally decide upon will tell you the *quality* of his theology. Our author rejects the realism of Augustine and Dr. Shedd and the federalism of the Westminster Confession and the Hodges. "What, then, is our doctrine of the connection between the transgression of Adam and the universal sinfulness of the race? It is simply this: As the result of Adam's sin, all men come into the world with a corrupt or disordered nature, inherited from their ancestors, which, in connection with the sinful influences of their surroundings, leads them all into sin. But this disordered nature is only the occasion of their sin, while the true cause is their free choice." "This nature is not in itself sin, nor is it sinful in any strict sense of the word." This is an unequivocal statement of the doctrine that the race's union with Adam was purely and solely *parental* in its character. Now the *Adamic union* is the same in kind under both covenants. That union under the covenant of grace could not be either *realistic* or *parental*. It could have been *federal*; and only of that kind. Consequently that was the nature of the union under the covenant of works. The *federal* idea will fly, like a weaver's shuttle, between the two covenants; no other will. The nature of this *Adamic union* will determine the doctrine of sin and redemption.

3. It is provoking in our author to say that the Scriptures are fallible "in matters which lay outside the scope and purpose of their inspiration." The assumption that there are any such "outside" matters is preposterous. He discards the doctrine of verbal inspiration because of the variations between the quotations in the New Testament and the original passages in the Old Testament. Such variations do not warrant nor in any way require the rejection of verbal inspiration. *The Spirit could have even dictated the exact words of the free quotation.*

R. A. WEBB.

Clarksville, Tenn.

#### BRUCE'S "APOLOGETICS."

APOLOGETICS; or, Christianity Defensively Stated. *By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892. Pp. 522.

This treatise is the third in order of the *International Theological Library*, which is brought out under the editorship of Professors Briggs and Salmond. Driver's *Introduction* and Smyth's *Christian Ethics* have already been noticed in THE QUARTERLY, and now Bruce's *Apologetics* lies before us.

Like all Professor Bruce's works, this is written with clearness and vigor. It is evidently written to interest the popular mind in the important topics which it discusses. It may also be safely said that this book reveals Professor Bruce's growing sympathy with the results of recent criticism, and with the conclusions of modern liberal theology.

In regard to the scope of the treatise, our author, in a brief *Preface*, says that "it is not an abstract treatise on apologetics in which all the traditional

common-places of the subject—*The Theistic Argument, Revelation, Inspiration, Miracles, Prophecy, The Canon, etc.*—are discussed without reference to present needs and trials of faith. It is an apologetic presentation of the Christian faith with reference to whatever in our intellectual environment makes faith difficult at the present time. The constituency to which it addresses itself consists neither of dogmatic believers for whose satisfaction it seeks to show how triumphantly their faith can at all possible points of assault be defended, nor of dogmatic unbelievers whom it strives to convince or confound, but of men whose sympathies are with Christianity, but whose faith is stifled or weakened by anti-Christian prejudices of varied nature and origin." This being the aim of our author he deals with what he calls "burning questions," and, of course, his treatise is an *apology* rather than a scientific system of *apologetics*. It may be described under its secondary title as Christianity defensively stated in relation to present day honest and inquiring skepticism.

With this lower aim before him, and with his work narrowed by his aim, it may be admitted that he has achieved a measure of success, for difficult and perplexing questions of faith are handled in an earnest and devout spirit, and in a frank and interesting manner. At times, perhaps, too much is conceded to the honest doubter, but at the present day to err on that side is to secure a hearing on the part of the doubter when otherwise he might refuse to listen. Still, the utmost care should be taken by the apologete to make no *vital* concession to doubt, for doing so may betray the interest of truth, and confirm the doubter rather than win him to the truth.

In this connection our author shows great readiness to accept the main results of modern criticism in regard to the sacred Scriptures and the religious system which they unfold. In our judgment the time to construct an apology for Christianity upon the assumed validity of the general results of advanced critical theories has not yet come, for the simple reason that no well-defined results are agreed upon by the critics. Criticism, lower and higher, has its place, and can render valuable service in the interests of faith; but the author who at the present juncture ventures to build an apologetical scheme on the basis of the assumed conclusions of one school of criticism, is taking his literary, critical, and theological life in his hands.

Viewing Professor Bruce's treatise from the standpoint of conservative criticism and Calvinistic theology, the charge may be fairly brought against it of being out of sympathy with both. Reconstructive criticism and remodeled theology have his kindest regards, and at times the older views are treated with scant respect. Rigid criticism might say that the treatise before us is an apology for advanced criticism and a new theology, rather than for the Christian system broadly considered. Its secondary title would then run thus: Christianity defensively stated from the standpoint of the results of modern criticism, and in the interests of a new theology.

The plan of the treatise is clear and definite, and the materials of discussion are arranged in a very orderly way. The work consists of four main parts. The *Introduction* has two chapters; Book I. discusses the *Theories of the Universe, Christian and anti-Christian*; Book II. treats of *The Historical Preparation for Christianity*; and Book III. deals with *The Christian Origins*.

The *Introduction* contains two well-compacted chapters. The first gives a brief but perspicuous historical sketch of apologetical discussion in New Testament and Patristic times, and of Free Thought in the last and in the present century. This chapter forms a suitable prelude to the subsequent discussions.

The second chapter seeks to answer the difficult question of the function and method of apologetics, and also to mark out its proper place in a theological curriculum. After explaining and criticising with discrimination various views, our author presents his own, which may be best understood from a few brief extracts: "The aim (of apologetics) is to secure for Christianity a fair hearing with conscious or implicit believers whose faith is stifled or weakened by anti-Christian prejudices of varied nature and origin. The purpose of apologetics, as thus conceived, is not so much scientific as practical. It is not designed to give theoretical instruction in a branch of theological knowledge, but rather to serve the purpose of a moral discipline, by dispossessing ingenuous truth-loving minds of opinions which tend to make faith difficult, presenting Christianity under aspects which they had not previously contemplated, suggesting explanations of difficulties which they had not before thought of, and so making it possible for them to be Christians with their whole heart and mind." (P. 42.)

For this end he says that "the first step obviously is to make sure that men know what Christianity really is," and to do this aright "we must not begin," he says, "with any ready-made idea of the Christian religion extracted from the creeds, or current in the churches, but, remembering that much prejudice against both creeds and churches exists in many minds which we should desire to influence, we must remount to the fountain head, and learn the nature of our faith from the records of Christ's life and teaching contained in the gospels." . . . "An honest endeavor to extract from these gospels a simple account of what Jesus was and taught might, without further trouble, win to hearty faith many whose alienation has its root in social grievances, rather than in science, or philosophy, or biblical criticism." He further admits that "there are prejudices arising out of philosophy, science, history, criticism, which cannot be so easily healed," and so the apologete must consider the "presuppositions of Christianity." These are two-fold, "speculative or philosophical and historical." As Christianity has a certain "theory of the universe," it is open to speculative objections which must be met; and as it has its facts, historical difficulties arise, and these are to be resolved. Book I. takes up the former, and Book II. the latter, lines of discussion. (P. 43.)

A single remark upon our author's views thus set forth is all we can make. We cannot resist the conviction that our author narrows the function of apologetics more than is expedient. This contraction of view appears chiefly in two particulars: First, The Epistles as well as the Gospels, the Old Testament as well as the New, contain primal elements which enter into the Christian system. Secondly, The apologete should be prepared, not only to commend Christianity to those who have doubts, but are favorably disposed towards it; but also to deal with the avowed opponents of the Christian system, and to ward off attacks of every kind made against it.

In Book I. *The Theories of the Universe* are discussed in seven chapters, as follows: *The Christian Facts*, *The Christian Theory of the Universe*, *The Pantheistic Theory*, *The Materialistic Theory*, *The Deistic Theory*, *Modern Speculative Theism*, and *Agnosticism*.

The treatment of the profound problems involved in the Christian philosophy of the universe is popular, rather than philosophical. The statement of the Christian Theory is good, and leaves little to be desired in such a brief presentation of it. Pantheism, Materialism, Deism, and Agnosticism are all described and criticised in a way which indicates that our author is acquainted with recent phases of anti-Christian speculation, and that he is able to estimate its significance with real insight.

The chapter on *Modern Speculative Theism* is somewhat disappointing. By this it is not meant that the treatment is entirely defective, but that the usage of the term *theism* by our author is not that which is generally found in writings upon that theme. By *speculative theism* our author denotes those views of the relation of God to the universe which emphasize his *immanency* in the world of nature and spirit, as opposed to the deistic view which puts his *transcendancy* in the foreground. As against deism much that our author here says is effective: but, if the meaning of speculative theism here expounded be admitted without qualification, it will surely lead to semi-pantheistic conclusions. Our author virtually shows this, not only in this chapter, but also in the chapter on *The Christian Theory of the Universe*. In our judgment it is better to apply the term *theism* to the true view of God's relation to the universe, which asserts both his *immanence* and *transcendence*, and yet merges neither in the other, nor separates them too widely. This gives the true philosophy of the problem of the relation of God to the universe, and it affords the basis which revelation assumes as the rational foundation for the Christian system. Other theories may all be properly classed as deistic or pantheistic, according as transcendence or immanence dominates the theory, and there may be many shades of opinion under each of these two classes of theory. We think it well to keep the term *theism* close to this meaning, and our author could easily have so arranged his *usus* of terms as to have prevented confusion in the mind of the ordinary reader, when he criticises, as he properly does, speculative theism.

There are points in the chapters on pantheism and agnosticism to which we would like to refer, but our space entirely forbids. We pass at once to the second book of the treatise.

This brings us to what our author terms the historical preparation for Christianity. To its discussion ten carefully written chapters are devoted, as follows: *The Sources*, *The Religion of the Prophets*, *The Prophetic Idea of Israel's Vocation and History*, *Mosaism*, *Prophetism*, *Prophetic Optimism*, *Judaism*, *The Night of Legalism*, *The Old Testament Literature*, *The Defects of the Old Testament Religion and its Literature*.

In the limits of a brief review it is impossible to do anything like justice to the exceedingly important questions here raised by our author, and handled by him in his own interesting way.

The *sources* of the historical preparation for Christianity are the *Hebrew*

*Scriptures.* Here our author comes in contact with modern critical theories of these Scriptures and of the religious system which they contain, and we see at once his sympathy with some of these theories. His views, so far as they can be gathered, are not unlike those of Professor Driver. Still, it is exceedingly difficult to know when our author is expressing his own views, or simply expounding the views of the critics without approval or refutation.

As to the proper attitude of the apologete to these critical views of the authorship and dates of the Hebrew Scriptures, our author says, p. 171: "To this question it may be answered, first, that the apologist is not called upon to accept the results of modern criticism, or to constitute himself an advocate of its claims to scientific certainty. He is entitled to hold himself aloof from critical dogmatism, and to keep his personal opinions in a state of suspense." On p. 172 he adds: "He (the apologist) must adjust himself to the new situation. He must take into account opinions confidently advanced by others for which he declines to be personally responsible, to the extent at least of considering how far they are compatible or the reverse with the faith he is concerned to defend." And on p. 173, he further says, in indicating the starting point of his apologetic: "We must allow our method to be controlled by criticism, so far as to make our starting point what critics of greatest weight and authority regard as certain."

These three extracts clearly confirm what we have already said concerning our author's sympathy with advanced critical theories, and the construction of his apologetic upon the basis of the results of these theories. It is somewhat comforting to the conservative apologist to be assured that he is not in duty bound to accept the results of modern criticism, as our author says in the first extract above. The second extract must puzzle any apologist. What is the new situation to which he must adjust himself? Who is to be his guide to the new citadel of faith? Then, how far should an apologist allow himself to be affected by "the opinions of others, for which he declines to be responsible"? That the critical theories have to be taken into account, may be admitted, but until the apologist is ready to be responsible for these critical results, he cannot securely set up his apologetic in the "new situation." The previous question is as to the truth of these theories.

The third extract puts the apologist at the mercy of the critic, whereas the true view apologist is to be the judge of the critic, so far, at least, as the bearing of his methods and results upon faith are concerned. Such at least is our view.

Our author starts his apologetic, therefore, with the *Religion of the Prophets*, and discovers that it was *ethical monotheism*, and that Jehovah was not a mere national deity. He also shows that Israel was an *elect* people, not for their own sake as a nation merely, but for all nations. Here the relation of the pagan peoples to salvation is discussed, and liberal opinions advanced. The result of the *election* of Israel was "some light even for pagans," but "heathenism on the whole a failure," and "its failure a preparation to receive the true religion." (P. 207.)

Then follow discussions upon *Mosaism*, *Prophetism*, and *Judaism*, and throughout the same general attitude already noted towards advanced critical

conclusions is observed. We cannot follow our author as he carries forward his historical inquiry in the interests of his apologetic step by step, but must content ourselves with a few brief remarks on some salient points.

Throughout, Professor Bruce treats historical questions in a most interesting and penetrating manner. What he says often sheds light on the history of Israel, and corrects some one-sided views as to the relation between Israel and the other nations usually called *pagan*. Still, we note all through the critical *bias* by which he is affected, and his readiness to accept the results of criticism and rest thereon.

Then, too, in the order in which he presents the development of the contents of *Mosaism*, *Prophetism*, and *Judaism*, we see very clearly how far his apologetic is ruled by criticism. He is constantly toning down critical views, and showing how they may be accepted without detriment to faith. In his discussion and for his apologetic service, he does not accept the view that the complete legislation and elaborate ritual found in the middle books of the Pentateuch came from Moses. It was only matured after the exile. Mosaism was first, and here the Decalogue and *external* morality or righteousness were prominent. Then Prophetism followed and laid stress on *internal* morality or righteousness, and last came Judaism with the emphasis laid on ritual. To show our author's position on this important point a few quotations must be made: "The question as to the relation of Moses to ritual is not one which concerns the *existence* of ritual in the time of Moses, but only the *place* to be assigned to it in the Mosaic system." . . . "The hypothesis that the Deuteronomic and priestly codes are post-Mosaic does not necessarily mean that their true authors *invented* their contents and imputed them to Moses. It only means that religious customs, mostly ancient, though in some particulars new, were then reduced to written form, and ascribed to Moses not so much as author, but rather as authority." (P. 221.)

As to the Decalogue, our author says: "He (Moses) did not discover these laws, he did not need to discover them, or to have them revealed to him for the first time on Sinai; they were written on the hearts of all men, Egyptian and Israelite alike." (P. 222.) "While Moses set before the Israel of the Exodus the moral ideal, the prophets told the Israel of six centuries later how far short she came of realizing that ideal." (P. 232.) "With Moses, as with the prophets, morality was primary, ritual secondary." (P. 237.) "Judaism, apart altogether from critical questions, was distinct from Mosaism." (P. 262.) "The last eight chapters of Ezekiel's book of Prophecy appear to be a first sketch of a Levitical system, prepared by one who believed that it would serve the end which all the prophets had at heart. These chapters, so viewed, are one of the strongest proofs that the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch was not Mosaic." (P. 264.) Concerning Israel at the time of the exile, our author says: "The logic of their position might be put thus: One God, one sanctuary, and at the one sanctuary a carefully regulated service offered by a people scrupulously guarded against all uncleanness in all relations and actions of their lives." . . . "Thus men zealous for God's honor were forced on to the final stage in the logical process, one uniform, carefully constructed, strictly enforced system of worship." (P. 267.) "Thus far my aim has been to show

that Neo-Mosaism, as I have ventured to call the movement initiated by Ezekiel and consummated by Ezra, was a thing in which God-inspired men might have a part." (P. 270.) Much of a like nature might be quoted, but these passages must suffice. They show clearly that our author follows out consistently his position, that his "method is controlled by criticism." And we cannot but feel all through these chapters which deal with the Old Testament literature and religion, that the discussion is as much an apologetic for advanced criticism as for Christianity. This is our cardinal objection to our author's method all through. Criticism has its rights, and can render most useful service, but has the reconstructive theory of modern criticism been so securely established that a solid apologetic can be constructed on its basis, is the question to settle. We are inclined to think that the position taken by Professor Robertson in his *Early Religion of Israel* is the impregnable foundation for the apologetic to take regarding the Old Testament literature and religion. It seems to be the view which the Scriptures themselves avow, which the plain man reading the Scripture finds there, which the New Testament writers assumed, and which we firmly believe criticism will finally rest in.

The discussion of the way in which the Messianic ideal of the royal man and the kingdom of grace was formed is interesting, but not new to those familiar with Professor Bruce's other writings. The chapter on the *Defects of the Old Testament Religion*, is well worth careful study, even though we may take issue with some of the views therein set forth.

In Book III. the Christian Origins are discussed in ten most readable chapters, as follows: *Jesus, Jesus as the Christ, Jesus as the Founder of the Kingdom of God, Jesus Risen, Jesus Lord, Paul, Primitive Christianity, The Synoptical Gospels, The Fourth Gospel, The Light of the World.*

On the whole, the discussions in this book are much more satisfactory than those of Book II. Few men are better qualified than Professor Bruce to give a judgment on New Testament questions. In the chapters above named we find substantially the same views concerning Jesus, the kingdom of God, and miracles as are set forth in our author's other writings, especially in *The Chief End of Revelation, The Kingdom of God, and The Miraculous Elements in the Gospel.* The discussions are always fresh and suggestive, and many modern naturalistic theories are carefully criticised.

The connection between Books II. and III. is somewhat vague. To make the Old Testament religion merely the historical preparation for Christianity, is to incur the danger of regarding all the elements of that old religion as superseded by Christianity. The old religion was a preparation for the new, but the new still retains elements of the old, so that Christianity is not simply the religion of the New Testament as Judaism was of the Old Testament; it is the religion of the Old *and* New Testaments, as they stand related to each other. This important point is often overlooked, and it is worth while to call attention to the weakness in the logical arrangement of the materials in the hands of our author.

The chapters on *Jesus*, and on *Jesus as the Christ* are well written, and it is clearly shown that Jesus was distinctly historical, that he was not an opportunist Messiah, and that he must have been conscious of his Messiahship.



In the chapter on *Jesus as the Founder of the Kingdom of God*, the kingly office of Christ is exalted above his priestly. Indeed, this trait marks our author's whole trend of thought. In this chapter, too, there is passing allusion to the evidential function of miracles. Our author's view is expressed in a single sentence on page 376: "Men do not now believe in Christ because of his miracles; they rather believe in miracles because they have first believed in Christ." With this position we cannot fully agree, for while it is true that miracles are revelations of love, they are also appealed to by Jesus and the apostles as marks of the divine nature of their mission.

The chapter on *Jesus Risen* is one of the best in the whole book. The various false theories of naturalism are criticised with much acuteness, and the historicity of the resurrection is confirmed most effectively.

In the chapter on *Jesus Lord* there are some suggestive remarks on the virgin birth, and on the sinlessness of Jesus, which are excellent.

The chapter on *Paul* is a good one also as against pure naturalism: but many apologists will be inclined to think that Professor Bruce scarcely does justice to Paul in regard to the large part he had in the development of the doctrines of the gospel which grew out of the mission, teaching, and death of Jesus. Dr. Bruce's dislike for the old doctrinal theology, and sympathy with the new ethical theology may have had something to do with the direction in which his thought moves concerning Paul.

The chapter on *Primitive Christianity* is an excellent one. The naturalistic theories of Baur, Weiss, Werthsächer, and Pfeleiderer are stated and criticised with fine penetration, and the discussion brought up to date.

In two chapters the *Synoptical Gospels* and the *Fourth Gospel* are the subjects of consideration. The historicity of the three synoptical gospels, together with various problems arising in connection therewith, engage our author's careful attention. The Fourth Gospel in Professor Bruce's opinion affords the "hardest apologetic problem" which has to be faced. He shows that the *Logos* theory does not supply the key to the Gospel, and that its apostolic authorship is credible, but a measure of timidity marks the discussion at several points.

In the last chapter, on *The Light of the World*, the great question of the source of authority in religion is handled by our author. His view in general is that Christ, not reason, nor the church, nor even the Scriptures, constitutes that authority. Our author's treatment of what really constitutes the ultimate authority in matters of religion is far too brief to be of much real service in the present state of the controversy upon this topic. He makes some good remarks in regard to the rationalistic theory, which exalts the authority of the individual reason to the seat of honor and power, but his exposition of the function of the church in this connection seems to us quite imperfect. Then, too, it is in our judgment a mistake to set the authority of Christ and of the Scriptures in opposition, as our author is in danger of doing. We all agree that Christ, as the king and head of his church, is its supreme lawgiver; but is it not true that he has given in the Scriptures the law of his kingdom, and that that law, as his voice to his subjects, is the authority to which they must bow? To say that Christ, apart from the Scriptures as his law, is the source of authority is to present a theory which is impracticable, for Christ is not now per-

sonally present to speak to men. But having given his word, he speaks by means of that, and by the aid of his Spirit, and hence the doctrine of the Confession of Faith, that the Scriptures are the supreme rule, and the Spirit, speaking in the Scriptures, is the supreme judge in matters of religion, is the true one. But this assumes, and does not contradict, the related doctrine that Christ is the head of his church. This is a large question, and we can do no more than point out the elements of confusion between Christ and the Scriptures, which our author's position, and the cry "back to Christ," introduces, unless it be very carefully considered.

But we must conclude. This treatise is one which well repays a careful perusal. We were in turn both pleased and pained, delighted and disappointed as we read it. As an apologetic of permanent value, it can scarcely be pronounced a success, but as an apology for the present distress it may serve its purpose.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville.

#### OTTS'S "UNSETTLED QUESTIONS."

UNSETTLED QUESTIONS TOUCHING THE FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY. A book for thoughtful young men. *By J. M. P. Otts, D. D., LL. D., Author of "The Fifth Gospel," etc.* New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. xii., 169. 1893.

At its annual commencement in 1892, Davidson College, illustrious in its history, in its faculties, in its alumni, and in its services to the church and education, took an important step forward. Through the generosity of one of her sons, himself accomplished in scholarship, prominent as an author, and able as a preacher, this institution was enabled to announce the endowment of a "Lectureship." It was highly fitting that the first course upon the new "foundation" should be delivered by the distinguished benefactor himself, and the authorities of the college did not only a courteous act, but an intrinsically meritorious one when they selected Dr. Otts, of Greensboro, Ala., at different times pastor of Presbyterian churches in Columbia, Tenn., Wilmington, Del., and Philadelphia, Penn., as their first lecturer. The volume before us is *The Davidson College Divinity Lectures for the Year 1893*. It is saying a great deal, and yet not too much, to say that the book is worthy both of its author and the institution in whose halls its lectures were delivered. All three—the college, the author, and the book—grade high in excellence. We feel like exclaiming, "Hail, Davidson! the whole church felicitates you; the whole church applauds the generosity of your benefactor! May the sons of other institutions emulate yours!"

We have a word to say to the publishers, or to whomsoever it ought to be said. The present volume is the first of a series; others are to follow as the years go by. We hope the series will be uniform in mechanical execution, and that each volume will be marked as it takes its place in the growing "set."

Dr. Otts has dedicated his book to his wife, to his eight sons, to Davidson College, and to "her numerous sons who are filling various positions of usefulness in church and state." This is considerate, but the partnership is too extensive to be exquisite in taste.

In the Preface, Dr. Otts tells us that the lectures were prepared for