

to Timothy, "All Scripture is given by the inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." But when Paul penned these words to Timothy what Scripture was he speaking of? Why, the Old Testament, to be sure, and if you are going to rest your doctrine upon such sentences as that, it will never apply to the inspiration of the latest New Testament Scriptures which the Apostle had not seen. Where, then, can we base the inspiration of the New Testament? There can be nothing more dangerous than the maintenance of the Christian doctrines on a few isolated texts. I think it was Richard Baxter who said in speaking of this that it was the devil's last attempt to refute the authority of the Bible by overwhelming it. Again, suppose we say that our interpretation, as it stands in our English version is correct, it has not touched the Professor's position. He will accept as truly as you do that sentence of the Apostle. Does the Apostle say anything about the measure of inspiration? I find by my Concordance that the word inspiration only occurs twice in the whole Bible—once in Job and this one in Timothy. I do not find any writer who claims any other inspiration. I find Paul says: "In this I have the mind of Christ." He is not quite sure of his own inspiration. I believe in the inspiration of every book of the Bible, but I am not going to be tied down to any theory of men! I want to know how far it is inspired, and I can only get at that by searching the Scriptures themselves. I read with great delight part of the professor's explanation. He preaches and believes all the great doctrines of Christianity, all the great dogmas of truth upon which we base our Christian religion, what does he say? He believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures and in their infallibility. Will any one say that inspiration guarantees no mistake in names, no mistake in dates. Am I to be told that if a man is a heretic, he must cease to teach in the Church? You say yourself that there are passages of Scripture that are contradicting. I do not think that is forbidden by the Church, and I hope not. Is all the integrity of the book of Isaiah or the Psalms to be maintained? It is no part of Christ's teaching. I do not believe it is part of inspiration to teach historical tales or to teach historical facts. I am sure that in speaking of Christ and in criticising the logic of the peculiar saying of "the sun rising and falling," I am not attacking the inspiration of the Bible. There are grounds infinitely higher than mere isolated texts. Is there any one of our Presbyterian Churches in the old country that to-day will forbid a man like Prof. Campbell from teaching under their authority and in their name? No, but there are many men in the Old Country who go far beyond Prof. Campbell in the broadness of their views. I have in my mind's eye the Free Church of Scotland, and it will ill become the Presbyterian Church of Canada to come in and say that they will not allow Prof. Campbell to teach. I have asked myself the question with prayerful earnestness whether Prof. Campbell should be forbidden to teach in His name, and there has come back to my emphatic enquiry the answer "No, I will not take upon myself to forbid him to teach. I am not prepared to go beyond my Master." Prof. Campbell finds himself in a large and distinguished company. The views he has held have been taught over and over again. You will find one after another of the early Fathers, Origen, Jerome, Butler and Alford, going a good deal farther than Prof. Campbell in their views on verbal inspiration, and these were men who lived and revered the Scriptures and certainly did not impugn them. I do not think those men who have denied the verbal inspiration of the Bible are the greatest enemies of the Church. I conceive them to be those who, by straining the authority of the Bible, try to claim for it an authority it has not claimed for itself. I do not think Dean Alford was a man who dishonoured the Bible, and he did not hold to the theory of verbal inspiration. "I had hoped," he concluded, "that there might have been a unanimous judgment in this case, but it seems to be otherwise, and in duty to my conscience, I cannot refrain from moving in amendment:

"That the Presbytery, while deeply regretting many expressions into which over zeal for certain aspects of truth led Prof. Campbell, yet does not find the first count of the libel proven."

Rev. J. Myles Crombie had much pleasure in seconding the amendment. He did not wish to take up the time of the Presbytery, because he would simply go over the same ground covered by Dr. Barclay, but he would second the amendment in order to bring it before the House.

The Rev. James Fraser, of Chatham, Que., supported the amendment contending that the Church could not afford to lose Professor Campbell after all the services he had rendered her as a scholar and teacher.

Mr. Wm. Drysdale, while strongly commending the tone of Mr. Mowat's speech, briefly spoke in support of the amendment.

The Rev. C. B. Ross begged to suggest that Dr. Barclay was wrong in charging the Presbytery with undue haste in preparing the libel.

Rev. F. M. Dewey desired to say a word. He regretted that Dr. Barclay had not given the Presbytery something great upon the matter. But he regretted to say that the Doctor had only trifled with it. It was impossible for him to vote for the amendment. Reluctantly, therefore, he would have to vote for the motion of Dr. Robert Campbell.

Mr. Walter Paul rose just before the afternoon sederunt adjourned. He began the evening debate by declaring himself a supporter of the main libel resolution.

The Rev. Professor Scribner had stated his opinion upon the case at a former meeting. He might point out that while Prof. Campbell declared his belief in inspiration, at the same time he attacked that inspiration in detail. It was difficult to find anything in the Professor's statement which modifies his views, as proclaimed in the lecture. So far from this, the statement they had listened to to-day, rather re-states and emphasizes the unfortunate position which the Professor took at the first. Dr. Barclay had expressed regret at the statements made in the lecture; the Rev. Mr. Fraser had ex-

pressed regret; Mr. Drysdale had expressed regret; and the Rev. Mr. Crombie had expressed regret. But the accused himself had not expressed one word of regret. As far as he was able to judge, the passages adduced by Professor Campbell, in his defence, in nine cases out of ten, were not capable of the exegesis which had been forced upon them; and in the remaining case there was palpable irrelevancy. He expressed deep regret at the possibilities contemplated by the motion, but he saw no other way open.

The Rev. Mr. Patterson, of St. Andrews, contended strongly for the total inerrancy of the Gospels. He, therefore, supported the main motion.

So also did the Rev. James Fleck, who urged the unity and harmony of the whole Book. There was no contradiction between the Gospels nor any portion of the Gospels.

The Rev. Prof. Ross wished that some others had spoken in some kind of defence of Professor Campbell. And yet he felt that some kind of defence was possible, and ought to be made. Is Professor Campbell's position so clearly defined, and so clearly opposed to the Bible and the subordinate "standards," as to warrant the extreme course contemplated by the motion? The accused repudiated the meaning attached to his statements by the libel. Why should not some notice be taken of this repudiation? Again, the Professor had stated that he did not wish to be held to every rhetorical utterance in the lecture. Is there not something here that should be taken into consideration? He thought that if Dr. Barclay would modify his amendment, making it express in stronger form condemnation of the position taken by the professor, some of the members of the court might vote for it who cannot vote for it in its present form. Again, he deprecated the idea of the Presbytery taking any action which would seem to shut out freedom of discussion. If discussion is not to be free, the Church must suffer many things which she may hold to be foolish. You cannot grow wheat without growing chaff. He did not wish to be held as endorsing all that Prof. Campbell had stated, but rather as suggesting that there might be a more moderate way of dealing with the case than the extreme one which the motion contemplated. He asked Dr. Barclay to amend his amendment to the effect. That the Presbytery, taking a conjunct view of all that Prof. Campbell has stated, find that the first count in the indictment is not proven; but hold him answerable for hasty and ill-balanced statements. Dr. MacVicar took a point of order. The amendment pronounced a judgment, and the court is not yet in a position to take such a course.

The Rev. Dr. MacVicar objected to this as being out of order, inasmuch as the sub-amendment passed judgment before the two counts were considered. It found him answerable for "hasty and ill-balanced utterances" and yet it found the count not proven. The Moderator ruled that the sub-amendment was in order. Dr. MacVicar asked that his objection be recorded.

Dr. Barclay thereupon revised his original amendment to read as follows:

The Presbytery, after having taken a conjunct view of the lecture delivered in Kingston, and the explanatory statement to the Presbytery at its last meeting by Prof. Campbell, also the statement made to-day, finds the first count of the libel not proven, reserving to itself at a future stage any action which it may deem necessary.

Dr. MacKay had not intended to say anything upon the case. But in view of the amendment now before the court he felt that he ought to say something. There can be no doubt that the statements contained in the lectures were both opposed to the word of God, and the Confession of Faith. The libel, as prepared by the committee, abundantly proved this. He could not see how any reasonable man could vote "not proven." He felt in his conscience and before God that he had no course left him but to vote that the libel has been proven.

Dr. MacVicar protested against the statement of Dr. Barclay, that there was any undue haste in the action of the Presbytery and the prosecuting committee. Conferences had been held and every means tried to settle the matter amicably. He also wished to ask Prof. Campbell to state definitely whether he believed that much or little of the Old Testament was inspired by the devil. There was much that was good and beautiful and true in the Bible, but did that neutralize the statement that the Book was not all from God? If it was not all from God he would like to know how much was from Him and how much from the devil.

Prof. Campbell then summed up his defence. The whole of the Presbytery here was at the judgment seat of Christ. He reiterated his arguments of a Perfect Father, meek and humble as the Son. He could see no way of justifying his conception of the Perfect Father without denying much of the current Old Testament theology. He wished to teach the high Christian ideal as seen by such men as Tolstói. He protested that all the speeches of the afternoon had practically ignored the quotations of Scripture he had made to prove his position. They called him a fool, or words to that effect, but he pleaded industry and intelligence against that charge. In answer to Principal MacVicar, he repeated that there was progress in revelation. He urged that the Church had lost sight of the great science of demonology. He never dreamt of saying that the Old Testament was a mass of errors. But as long as he lived he would preach the great cardinal truth that God was good and merciful, and that only Satan was to be feared. He had been charged with speaking harshly and asked to retract. He did not know what to retract. He prayed the Presbytery not to think of him personally. He was of no consequence, but the truths he had uttered were of vital importance. He thanked the members who had spoken well of him. He bore malice to none. God forbid. He left himself in the hands of the Presbytery, hoping only that what would be done would be in the interest of truth and of immortal souls.

The Rev. Dr. Robert Campbell closed the prosecution, insisting on the libel charge unless the Professor withdrew all the phrases of his lecture, objected to in the libel. He said that some of the