

Church has patience to hear me. I never dreamt that I should be honoured to bear such public witness for my Father in Heaven, nor have I in this, nor in aught else, sought publicity or notoriety; but since it has come to me all unasked for, I say, in regard to my doctrine, as said Martin Luther "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; God help me. Amen." And as said One greater than he, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ."

The learned professor then stepped down from the platform amid a burst of applause.

The Discussion.

Rev. Dr. Campbell, of St. Gabriel church, asked if they were to understand from Prof. Campbell's statement that nothing was withdrawn, nothing was modified from the published lecture; in short, was his position the same as it was when the Presbytery entered upon its proceedings?

Prof. Campbell replied that while the majority of the Presbytery declared the relevancy of the libel, he declined to admit it. That was his position.

Rev. Dr. Campbell thought the argument as to the relevancy ought to have been addressed to the Presbytery before. The question to-day was the proof, whether it was true or whether it was inadequate. Was Prof. Campbell's position in relation to the published letter the same to-day as when the case was instituted?

Prof. Campbell replied that he was called upon to reply to the two counts in the indictment, and it seemed to him, in his humble judgment, that he had done so in the document which he had just read. The question now, in his opinion, was really the relevant one, and he did not desire to answer the other question unless the court pressed it.

Rev. Dr. Campbell then re-opened the case for

THE PROSECUTION.

There never was a question, he said, in regard to which he felt such a great responsibility as the present one. He had not desired the position of convener of the committee that had initiated the proceedings; "but," he continued, "whilst it was a duty to which I addressed myself with great reluctance, I felt that if the brethren desired it, I would have to do the best I could. There is, perhaps, this advantage in my doing it—it will be a thoroughly impersonal matter, as my relations with Prof. Campbell have been of such a character that if I were called to his defence I would address myself to the task with great cheerfulness. There is no one in whose interest I would more eagerly appear if my conscience and my judgment permitted me to do so. However, as convener of the committee, I beg leave to move that in the judgment of the Presbytery the first count of the libel be held proven." This count was that Professor Campbell held and taught "a view of the Holy Scriptures which impugns and discredits them as the supreme and infallible source of religious truth." "In making this motion affecting our much loved brother's situation," he said, "I am sure you will agree with me when I say that I acknowledge his admirable services to truth and religion, his ethnological writings, his exquisite Yoho discourses, his spirit of devotedness which appears even in the production now under review; and then the eloquent address this afternoon cannot but touch us; and it is a matter of regret to every member of this Court, I am sure, that we should feel constrained by reason of what we owe to truth, to Prof. Campbell himself, and to the Church of which we are the constituted ministers, to take these proceedings. First of all, we all recognize that the professional work imposed upon Prof. Campbell led him necessarily to make narrow enquiry into everything relating to the origin of the sacred Scriptures, and if he found accretions around them, if popular apprehension as to their origin and nature, no one can blame him from putting his hand to these and clearing them away. Neither are we going to condemn him and call him to the bar if his judgment did not deem the usual apologies adequate for ever, difficulty and discrepancy in the Old Testament which he came across in the performance of his duty; if he declared these defences and apologies were inadequate, I am bound to say that he has raised questions about passages that have never afforded me any difficulty. He has been honestly seeking, no doubt, to put everything in the true light before his students, seeking a solution for problems hitherto held as insoluble. Now, with regard to the Word of God, and the works of God alike, and all that is within the apprehension of man on earth, there are questions that man cannot understand, and, I suppose, is not expected to understand, for He has declared that there are many things yet beyond the ken of man. We are promised fuller light in the great hereafter. I think our friend has taken the position as if he had the fulness of light now since Christ came. I go further than he and say that the process of enlightenment is not yet completed." Dr. Campbell proceeded to say that if Professor Campbell, who had been chiefly engaged in the professor's chair, had declared to his students and to all men that he did not and could not understand many things that were in the Word of God, he believed that no harm would come from that position either to the Church or to the students. It was not necessary that omniscience should be professed by even the most learned teacher. In these well meant attempts to solve problems and remove difficulties, had not much greater ones been introduced?

The Church, he admitted, had no theory of inspiration, and the Church would demand of none of its teachers, details as to the modes of inspiration. It was the results of inspiration rather than the mode of inspiration with which the Church was concerned. The Church did not place the Confession (of Westminster) above the Bible, nor on a level with it. The Scriptures were the best, the supreme judge of all the controversies. He differed from the learned professor when the latter stated that the Sermon on the Mount contradicted the Old Testament. Paul uniformly contended for the truth of the Old Testament. And though Peter spoke of things hard to be understood, all agreed that the Book was the Word of God. But, in a word, the position of the professor was that much that had been believed to be in-

spired by the Holy Ghost was really inspired by the devil. The whole book was attacked because it would require omniscience, according to his theory, to read between the lines and say what was inspired by the Holy Spirit and what by the lying spirit. Prof. Campbell dealt in a priori arguments that would not be supported by the testimony of the ages. It was not needed to impart any extraneous discussion into this debate. Prof. Campbell was within his rights to stand for trial without first resigning his position in the church. He has the right even to appeal from this Presbytery if he thinks necessary to the General Assembly. Dr. Robert Campbell quoted extensively from the Professor's Kingston lecture to show that he impugned not a part but the whole of the Old Testament. He hoped that he had not wreathed anything to the disadvantage of his "dear friend the Professor." But he saw nothing for it but to move that the first count of the "libel" be held proven.

Rev. A. J. Mowatt, in seconding Dr. Campbell's motion, said he had prepared something on both counts. He took it, he said, that they were all on trial in this matter. No doubt what they said would be canvassed from one end of the land to the other. They were seeking to say what they ought to say, and to leave unsaid what they ought to leave unsaid; and he hoped they would try and leave unsaid the bitter word. It was an unhappy affair. They all felt that, and he was sure they all wished that there was some other way out of it. But there was no help for it. He provided without qualification the character and scholarly attainments of Professor Campbell. But he hoped that he would take back much that he had said in Kingston and here before the Presbytery.

It sounded strange to have to read the battle songs of the Old Testament to a Christian audience. But the time might come when the homes of those present would be surrounded by relentless enemies, and they might be constrained to pray for skill and strength to send bullets home to the hearts of their adversaries. But the Professor had no right to say that the Old Testament caricatured God, representing him as a monster. He (Mr. Mowatt) had found many difficulties in the Bible, but he did not attempt to overcome them. He recognized the fact that his reason was fallible. But God's work, the Bible, needed no defence. The clever cartoonist (in the Star) represented the members of the Presbytery as rushing to the rescue of the Church, but the Church, the truth, was in no danger. The press and unbelievers might applaud the Professor digging at the foundation of the Church. But the truth would last forever.

Rev. Prof. MacVicar suggested that before the vote was taken, Prof. Campbell should be permitted to make any further statement he desired, as after he was once removed from the bar he could not be allowed to speak further. He had no intention now of speaking on the merits of the case because, as they all know, he had delivered his views upon the whole matter when the relevancy of the libel was under consideration. He had not changed his views as to the propriety of having done so, notwithstanding all the allusions in certain quarters as to his having misunderstood the case. The relevancy and the truth of the libel in this case were almost identical.

AN AMENDMENT BY DR. BARCLAY.

Rev. James Barclay then rose to move an amendment that the first count of the libel be not proven. He spoke in unimpassioned, yet impressive and thrilling tones. "I cannot in any sense agree," he said, "with the resolution that is now before this Presbytery. I regret as much as any of you the professor's lecture, which has been published. I regret some of the extreme, I will rather say weak, utterances that appear in it. I regret that the professor's zeal led him into statements that were rash, harsh, and that could not but grate upon the susceptibilities, I will not say of the narrowest, but of some of the very broadest minded in our Church. At the same time I regret the action that has been taken upon the question. I think it would have been better to allow it to die a natural death. If it had any power to do harm the action that has been taken has only increased its power. Where one would have read it before, a thousand will read it now. I regret it, as extremely unbecoming, that ministers outside of our Church took it upon themselves to deliver in public judgments upon the case. I think it unseemly also that any member of the Presbytery should have so spoken in public as to what their judgment would be in this matter. I also regret the haste with which it has been brought forward by the committee. I think the Presbytery should have appointed a committee to sit in prolonged deliberation over that explanation which had been made by Prof. Campbell. I think that if there was anything to hold out the hope that this painful case could be prevented from reaching its present stage, all such means should have been first exhausted. It seems to me that there was an undue eagerness on the part of some of the brethren to get their brother tried and condemned. In the first place, I think the libel is misleading, and in the second place, I think it is extremely weak. I will confine myself entirely to the first count in which the professor is arraigned with teaching the doctrine of inspiration to the dishonour of the Scriptures. It struck me when I read this that it was misleading the Church. The Christian churches and our own Presbyterian Churches, according to it, stand in exactly the same attitude towards the Confession of Faith as they did fifteen years ago. I do not think that is so. Am I to be told, with all the tide of historical research, all the archaeological research, all the Biblical investigations of the greatest minds, that no new light has been thrown on the Confession of Faith, on the texts of the Bible, on the authors who wrote them and the authors who read them. I myself feel bound to confess that I have changed my attitude as regards these questions, and believe there is no man to-day who stands in the same position as he did fifteen years ago. I think, therefore, that this libel suit is misleading. I think in the second place that the libel is extremely weak. I should be very sorry to say that the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures should be dependent upon the few scattered isolated texts thrown together here. Apparently the strongest of the texts is that often quoted from the Epistle of Paul