

scheme of the Higher Criticism, as my ultra-orthodox colleagues of the Presbyterian College have done in that absence of mine for which they are chiefly responsible. A more disingenuous action than the superseding of my orthodox lectures by Dr. Bruce's Apologetic it would be hard to imagine. If consistency be a jewel, this is mud.

I have called in question the inspiration of no portion of Scripture, great or small. The doctrine of the atonement has not been impugned by me. Neither have I in any way discredited the divine justice or future retributions. I have been charged with making a subjective interpretation of Scripture. This is utterly false, as the accuser knew when he made the unworthy charge. I interpret Scripture by Scripture and bring all to the bar of Christ in the gospels. Yet if I had made the test subjective, I would still have been within the limits of the Confession of Faith, which plainly says (Ch. i. 5), "Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts." One critic maintained that in Matt. v. Christ objected not to the words of Moses but to Jewish glosses, a view contradicted by our Lord's language, and held by no commentator of any reputation for scholarship and sincerity. Others in the vain effort to bolster up the theory of verbal or plenary inspiration, adduced texts which prove nothing of the kind, laying great stress upon II. Tim. iii. 16, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," the doubtful character of which is admitted by every exegete. In answer to the unworthy accusation of another that I defended my position by exceptional and isolated texts wrested from their connection, I have simply to refer to the cloud of Bible witnesses cited in all documents contributed by me to the trial. The weakness of opposing testimony could not be made more conspicuous than it has been