

sor Campbell occupies. This is an easy task, for he is absolutely transparent, and he said nothing in the now famous sermon that he has not said over and over again in one form or another for twenty years. Even if we confined ourselves to the sermon, it would be manifestly as unfair to press for a literal construction of rhetorical statements as it would be to deal similarly with the popular language of the great Teacher. We know how some of His statements troubled His immediate followers and what nonsense many intelligent men have made of them for nineteen centuries. Why then did He use rhetorical language? Disciples murmured "how can this man give us his flesh to eat," and turned away from Him in disgust. The Doctors of Divinity said again and again "this man blasphemeth." Quakers still prove from His words that He forbade judicial oaths and war of all kinds. From another word Roman Catholics prove the primacy of Peter. But it is needless to give instances, for the fact is admitted and we do not now dream of construing literally even the Sermon on the Mount, much less such expressions as "all that ever came before me are thieves and robbers." Our Lord's style was not modelled on blue books or catechisms. In dealing with the spiritual we must always try to get behind the form and to estimate the spirit. In Campbell's case this is not difficult; for when he met with the Presbytery of Montreal last July he gave a formal statement of the thoughts that he had presented rhetorically to the students of Queen's; and if the Presbytery at that meeting had not been in such a hurry, actually appointing a committee to draft a libel and waiting for its report, as if the work were much the same as the drafting of a complimentary minute, it would have probably based its procedure—if procedure were deemed necessary—on that statement and not on the sermon. We find there that his general positions are that there has been progress in God's revelation of Himself to man and progress in the apprehension of God by man or in the God-consciousness of Israel; that consequently there is a human element in the Scriptures or errors resulting from human limitations; that God is love, not hatred; that He is all light and that in Him there is no darkness at all; that we are under Jesus and not under Moses, Jesus being the Son and all others servants; that the devil is a real person, a seducing spirit whom men would do well to fear, and that it seems to be the will of God that Satan should do the dirty work of the universe. Now, one would like to know which of these positions is anti-scriptural or anti-confessional. Dr. Campbell states them in his own way, and his way may not be ours. He sometimes states them effectively and sometimes crudely because hastily. But all Christians surely agree with him in "the root of the matter," to use the wise phrase of the religious people of Scotland.

All are agreed that there has been development in revelation, development so great that John said—after fifteen centuries of revelation—"the darkness is past and the true light now shineth." That there was progress in the apprehension of God in Israel can be denied only in the interest of an *a priori* theory. Inspired Deborah sang "blessed among women shall Jael be;" and an inspired psalmist, centuries afterwards, sang "blessed shall he be that taketh and dasheth out the brains of the little ones of Babylon against the rock." We

make full allowance for the times and for the intense Jewish nationalism, but we ask, is either of these the song of Jesus, or of apostles filled with His spirit? Again, who now believes that there are no errors in the Bible? There are indeed Rabbis who say that there could have been none in the original autographs. Rabbis will say anything. How can they possibly know? God, they say, dictated errorless books to many fallible men and then took no means to preserve still more fallible scribes, collectors, copyists and printers from spoiling His work and defeating His purpose? At any rate, Dr. Campbell never concealed his views on this point, and no one ever challenged them. His life aim has been "to vindicate our Bible as the truthful word of God, contained in fallible earthen vessels." As he puts it elsewhere: "The modern view of the inerrancy of Scripture has no warrant in Reformation theology nor in earlier utterances of the leaders of church thought. Every man who has studied his Bible with intelligence knows that its heavenly treasure is in earthen vessels, and that the tang of the cask is sometimes very strong." In this every scholar is with him.

His root position is concerning the character of God and the absolute revelation of Him in the Christ. Here too he stands where he always stood. He believes that our defective modern Christianity results in great measure from our not knowing God's name as revealed by Jesus and defined by John in the glorious word, "God is love," and from our not trusting the power of love. Reviewing an article on the Jewish question that appeared in the Century of January, 1892, and quoting the words "Judaism gives the Ten Commandments, and Christianity the Beatitudes, but only the two together can yield the perfect ideal—the love that is simply the highest duty, and duty that is lost in love," he says with emphasis that shows how completely the grand thought possesses him,—

This is true. If men, even Christian men, only knew it, what this world wants for its regeneration, and every individual soul for its purification, is the defeat, the death, the annihilation, of hate. As Whewell said, "we don't want the Poet's hate of hate and scorn of scorn, but the Good Man's sorrow for hate, and pity for scorn, along with the love of love." Meet hate with hate, call it by whatever godly name you choose, and the world's corrupting leaven grows. You delude yourself, when you pretend to hate an impersonal, an abstract evil, for there is no such thing. You hate the man in whom the evil works, instead of pitying him and sorrowing over the wrong. You would hit him if you dared, you would crush him if you were able, you would fill him with the arrows of your righteous indignation, and drive the sword of your heart hatred of wickedness deep into his heart, all to the glory of God. In so thinking and acting, you claim kindred not with Christ but with devils. The only thing that will kill hate is love. The devil cries to the preacher: "Come on, hate me with diabolical hatred, hate all the men in whom my spirit dwells, for I like that, I revel in it; a Christian minister's hatred is the corner stone of my kingdom." I don't say that we are to love the devil, or even be neutral towards him and his crew, but, as the Archangel Michael did not rail against him, we need not think that our angry passions will atone for that neglect on his part. "Love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God." "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer."

As to his Satanology, we do not pretend to speak with special authority, but is it a greater error to believe in the personality of Satan and in his power to mislead and tempt men, when he

tempted even the Son of God, than it is to teach that there is no devil, and that "evil cannot be a kingdom?" It would seem so, for the latter is accepted modern teaching. Rev. Mr. Peyton, of Broughty Ferry, in his recent work, "The Memorabilia of Jesus," states it clearly and against him no dog has barked. On the contrary, he is considered an authority in some Free Church circles. Dr. Campbell was almost the only one to criticise his book. He did so from his usual orthodox standpoint and in his usual spirit of appreciation of good points in those from whom he differs. An extract will show his attitude: "God has suffered temporary defeat in this world, in spite of all that Mr. Peyton may say, a defeat that comes not through any power or merit of the Satanic kingdom, but through the free choice of apostate man, and through God's love for His free creatures of humanity. Anti-diabolism in the sense of explaining away the existence of man's great enemy, is the most untruthful feature in the book. The theology is generally sound, but evolution vitiates the anthropology. Yet thoughtful readers, who read slowly, will find much of an interesting and suggestive character in this remarkable book of a genuine though erratic genius. To minds that have no sympathy with dogmatic theology, but are approachable on the side of science and sentiment, the Memorabilia may prove a useful apologetic."

Evolutionists, to whom all the evil in the world is a necessary ingredient to the gradual moral and spiritual development of the race and to whom the devil is merely a figure of speech, naturally object to his Satanology and call it dualism; but why should orthodox Christians, who interpret Scripture literally and accept Milton's Satan without question, object?

We have been led to speak of Dr. Campbell at greater length than we intended, but our excuse is the many-sidedness of the man and the interest that his prosecution is exciting among thinking Canadians. It is not merely John Campbell who is on trial at present. The Presbyterian Church has prospered greatly since its union in 1875, chiefly because it has steered clear of heresy trials. The only one that was commenced, that of the Rev. J. D. Macdonnell, was dropped, after much clamour, before it got beyond the stage of precognition. What member of the church has not been thankful ever since that that trial was dropped? May equal wisdom be given to the church in this case! But, no matter what the issue, every student who has been taught by Professor Campbell to think will pronounce him not guilty, and every one who values the possession of moral qualities in professors of theology above correctness in pronouncing shibboleths will agree with his students.

PRESBYTER.

An interesting ruling in a divorce case has been made by a Cincinnati judge. A woman who had secured a divorce applied to the Court to restore her maiden name, but was refused on the ground that there were children. The Court held that it was the common law that the children should be protected in their name. This ruling will be universally approved as being common sense as well as common law. If it shall serve to lessen the number of divorce proceedings it will have accomplished an admirable purpose.