

those oppressors, came taunting and said, "Come, sing us some of your Scotch songs"; and we replied, "How can we sing those songs of our land, those songs of Scotland, in a strange land?" Would anyone draw such inferences from it as Professor Jordan does from these things? There is another point on which I differ.

And see there runs all through this matter a deep line of divergence between such a view of the matter and a view of the revelation that rests upon the conception you have in the Bible itself. People say, "You have your presuppositions too. This man has presuppositions and does not believe in miracles, and so excludes this and that from the Bible; this other man has a presupposition in favor of the supernatural." But the difference is here. When I come with my belief in the supernatural in the Bible and interpret it, I am interpreting it along the line of the Bible itself, and therefore can be in harmony at any rate with the teachings of the Bible. When these other friends come with their denial of the supernatural, or at any rate with the adoption of a theory that at basis denies it, then they are bound beforehand to sweep out and reject the greater part of that history, because it is steeped in the supernatural from beginning to end.

I am sorry I cannot go any further. I shall say a good deal more, if I am permitted, to-morrow evening about the early part of the Bible, but I trust I have indicated in a sufficiently clear way the broad lines of distinction between these two fundamentally opposite views, and I have tried to show that it is not without some reason that one rejects the critical view and the arbitrary constructions connected with it, and adheres to the view which I believe is laid down in the Bible itself.