(James Y., 10); and since the standards of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (Confession of Faith, chap. 1, sections 9, 4, 5, and 8) declare (1) That under the name of the fiely Scriptures, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and Now Tostaments, all of which are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life; (2) hat the authority of the Holy Scriptures, for which to ought to be believed and obeyed, dependent not inport the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is Truth itself), the author thereof, and therefore it is to be received because it is the Word of God; (3) that the heavenliness of the matter, and efficacy of the dectrice, the majesty of the style, the come of the whole (which is to give glory to God), the full discovery it makes of man's sairstion, the many other incomparable excellences and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God; and (1) that the Old Tostament in Greek being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular over and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical; and since, according to the Word of God who keeps m rey for thousands, forgiving infinity, transgression, and since, according to the Word of God who keeps m rey for thousands, forgiving infinity, transgression, and since will be means clear the guilty (Ex., xxiv., 0), God shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be will keel. It is a summary to the work of the minute o

## ULIOTATIONS PROMITHE PROPERSOR'S LECTURE.

dostruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE PROFESSOR'S LECTURE.

Yet true it is, and of verity, that you, the said John Campbell, hold and have taught the erroneous dectrines above stated, in so far as in an address delivered by you in Convocation hall, Queen's University, you have stated: (1) In page 12 of the lecture and fifthilme—"These to whom God spoke at sundry times and in divers manners had very different and contradictory views of God. as mere screams in the House of the Father, they keep my soul in bondage until the Son comes to speak more excellently." (2) Page 12, line 18—"Jesus places this divine perfection in opposition to the imperfection of old times, contrasting his revelation of the Father with other revelations."

(3) Page 12 hine 13 from foot—"We find God tempting abraham to commit murder and David to number Israel in order to bring His people to destruction, souding lying sprints forth to deceive, and commanding Hosea to sin tilthily. Then James, the just, meets us and reproves the thought in the words. God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man. Which are we to believe?" (1) Page 13, line five—"Savo in the Bo k of J.-b., and the 21st chapter of 1st Chronicles, and in a few other places, the Old Testament writers merged two supernatural agents most divergent in power and in character, namely, God and His creature, the devil, in one. There are some who appear to think thisa very small matter. To my mind it is intolorable blasphemy. If you are an intelligent Christian, zealous of your father's reputation, you can react between the lines and tell when God speaks, and when the evit one; when man is moved to act by the giver of every good and every perfect gift, and when the giver of every good and every perfect gift, and when the other of the fold of the provailing old Testament notion concerning God was that of an oriental monarch, subject to no law, ruling absolutely, sitting upon the circle of the earth and looking down u

teachers. Why did God allow men, holy men, to err is describing the divine character and in imputing to Him what was not His L. word and deed? (10) Page 18, line G.—"Why did the chronicler of the book called Bamuel say that God tempted Pavid to number Israel, and he of the Chronicles impute the act to Satan? Because they were free to view the act from their own standpoint. There can be no doubt which is the more truthful. The divine perfections set forth in the New To tament declare the untruthfulness of the statement of Samuel. The more I study the subject of inspiration in the light of the Bible itself, the more I am overwhelmed at the contemplation of Uod's long suffering gentleness with men, considering how the divine character suffered down the ages through man's freedom, even as an inspired agent. The tendency to bondage in thought and action and relation to God has all along been man's work under the guidance of his great adversary, and the bondage of many to-day to the letter of the Old To-timent, logically, but happily not practically, hinders their being made free in spirit by the Son in His Father's house. Such men ask what neither revelation, reason, nor the analogy of faith gives them a right to domand, when they seek assent to the proposition that the Scripture frem Genesis to Revelstion were in the original manuscripts infallibly void of all error." (11) Page 18, fifth line from foot—"There is nothing to spolegise for in the Father whom Christ reveals, but the Revelation tells me the moral difficulties of the Old Testament are real difficulties. The facts are doubless truthfully narrated, but the imputation of them to Coal by the an clout writers places the student on the horns of a diffemma, in choice between the infallible Father and the infallible Book." (12) Page 19, line 16—"Some times they knew the Father or the goblin, and were sore straid and terribly perplexed. These interviews the child world wrote down in their diaries, which the Father, or the Father for the goldin, and were sore

## THE SECOND COUNT.

THE SECOND COUNT.

Count No. 2. (1) Page 12, 3rd line from the foot of the page:—"Even in matters of trial and Church discipline God does not smite." (2) Page 15, 10th line from foot of page:—"The Apostle Paul must have known that the infliction of evil is not of God's nature or he would not have re-regalzed His thern in the flesh from Satan, nor have delivered delinquents into the power of the adversary for punishment, yet the Isinguage he employs concerning the vengeance of God has encouraged the Old Testament notion of a divine smiter, which the revelation of God in Christ does not justify." (3) Page 16, 5th line from the top of the page:—"God's law is plain, but neither sin nor the penalty of sin are parts of His perfect nature." (4) Page 19, 7th line from the foot of the page:—"Sin and damnation are in the worlds of men and of spirits, but neither are of God. He leads in the paths of rightenmess. He blesses and curses not. There is a judgment and a heli for all impenitent ones. Men judge themselves unworthy of eternal life, and sin makes its own hell by its subjective departure from Goi. God has nothing to do with the making of either."

All of which, or part thereof, being confessed by you, or being found proven against you, the said John Campbell, by the Presbytery of Montreal, before which you are to be tried, you the said John Campbell ought to be visited with such censure as the laws and discipline of the Church in such cases prescribe, in order that the pure dectrine of God's Holy Word, as held by this Church, may be vindicated and maintained, or to be otherwise dealt with in the premises as to the said Prosbytery may appear expedient and proper.

as hold by the state of the sta

Rev. Principal MacVicar revised the case at length, holding that Professor Campbell's famous lecture, fairly interpreted, taught in a startling and indefensible sense the errancy of the sacred writers while speaking by the Holy Spirit, and at the same time sets forth views of God's character, of His government and reof God's character, of 1118 government and re-demptive work which were manifestly con-trary to Scripture. The sacred writers are regarded by him as having erred so egregiously that they sometimes really spoke from the devil and not from God. They mistook the voice of the goblin for the voice of the Father and made record accordingly, and this record constitutes part of what we are accustomed to egard as increant Scripture; and there is no limit set as to the extent to which this is the case and no means furnished to discriminate between what belongs to God and what be longs to the goblin, except that we are told that we "can read between the lines." It seems plain that errancy, as held by Prof. Campbell, affects not merely a few words, phases or verses of Scripture, but renders unreliable whole chapters, books and epistles. I ask is this the creed of the Presbyterian Church or of any evangelical Church in Christendom? Is this what we were ordained to teach and preach, and what we voluntarily promised to maintain and defend? I indeed promised to maintain and defend? I judge promised to maintain and delend? I judge not. And here I close my remarks bearing on the first count of the libel. It appears to me to be fully sustained by both the letter and the spirit of the recture before us. Equally conclusive are the passages cited from the lecture in the libel in proof of the second count. The statements that "God nover smites," that "in Him is no hate at all," that the New Township he is not a release of as in the New Testament he is not spoken of as

"the judge" and "the avenger," contradict so many passages in the Old and New Testament that one wonders how any reader of the Bible could venture to make them. God hates and punishes sin in every form, and the record of his judgments upon workers of iniquity fills a large part of the Bible history—one of the subjects embraced in Professor Campbell's chair; and it is worse than idle to say that Christ condemned this view of the divine character and government.

The Professor tells us that "the plea of the lecture is for a New Testament theology, a theology according to Christ." If so why contradict and ignore the words of Christ and His apostles in the passages referred and in many others that I have not cited? The fact is that if his positions are accepted it becomes impossible to explain and justify the government of God in the present world. God rules in the physical as well as the moral universe. He has made and He enforces all physical laws. He is the God of Provident particular and in the control of Ho is the God of Providence, and within this domain chastisements, calamities and judgments have a place, and they do not hap pen by chance, but are directly controlled by his hand.

I have kept silent for months some may think too long—and it is a painful task for me now to be compelled to review in this manner the work of one who has been my manner the work of one who has been my colleague for the last twenty years and whose friendship I have enjoyed during all that time. He knows that I am now animated by no unkindly feeling towards him, but the reverse. He will acknowledge, and so will all others, that my duty to God, to the truth, and to the Church comes first. My hope was while his lecture was in the press, and while I was wholly ignorant of its real import, that I was wholly ignorant of its real import, that I might be able, consistently with my obligations to God and my follow-creatures, to defend the position advanced, and it is with unfeigned sorrow I find myself, in spite of the explanations he has offered, unable to do so.

At this point Prof. Scrimger suggested that it would be well to hear the other side if any one desired to take it up. He hoped that the fullest opportunity would be given for this purpose.

Then there was a pause, and as no one accepted the suggestion, Professor Scrimger took the floor himself and made an address which

will appear in a later issue.

As soon as Prof. Scringer sat down, the Rev. James Fraser, of Cushing, rose and asked Dr. McVicar for informaton upon a passage Dr. MeVicar for informaton upon a passage of Scripture, and proceeded to read a long passage from the Old Testament, in which the following words were found, "Now therefore the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these prophets." In his view of the words, the prophet, in speaking of the name of God, gave that truth in an inconsistent form—in a form in which it would not have been given in the New Testament. Dr. have been given in the New Testament. Dr. Campbell had only spoken in a similar manner. He felt, therefore that he could not vote for the "relevancy" of the libel.

Dr. MacVicar reminded Mr. Fraser of a

of the meaning of an obscure passage or doctrine, or view, we should go to all the passages which bear upon the case, and explain the obscure by the light of the texts which

This incident was likely to plunge the Presbytery into a long discussion; but this was shut off as not bearing directly upon the matter in hand.

The Rev. J. Myles Crombie said that he could not vote for the "relevancy" of the libel, and was compelled, therefore, to take his

place beside Mr. Fraser.
The vote was then taken and resulted as follows: For relevancy, 15; against relevancy, 2.

The relevancy of the libel was, therefore, carried, and the clerk was ordered to serve it upon Prof. Campbell at once.

The second Tuesday in September was fixed The second Tuesday in September was fixed as the time when the accused must appear before the Presbytery and answer the charges which are formulated sgainst him. According to the law of the Church, this action of the Presbytery suspends Prof. Campbell from the discharge of all the functions of his office with the age, he with the functions of his office with the age. until the case be settled.