

Robert Campbell answered on behalf of the Montreal Presbytery.

He protested profound admiration for the appellant's character and attainments, but claimed that great misapprehension existed as to the parts of the lecture that were actually libelled. He was not libelled for inquiring into the literature and construction of the Bible; it was his duty so to do. The Presbytery did not condemn him for any sympathy he might be supposed to have with Prof. Briggs and other of the higher critics. He was not libelled because he called into question the truth of certain parts of the Scriptures, nor was he called into account for his belief in the personality of Satan. But it was where he believed that he found traces of Satan's work in places where they were taught otherwise that the Presbytery took issue with him. They did not accuse him of casting off Scriptural authority altogether, nor of casting doubt upon the Word of God. He had not been disciplined for any mere divergence from the tenets of the Presbyterian Church. Fault was not found with all of Prof. Campbell's lecture, but with the views he had given utterance to with regard to the authority of parts of the Scripture. Speaking on the first count of the libel, he quoted in support the Westminster Confession of Faith, and parts of the Scriptures to sustain the views of the Presbytery. He claimed that these Scriptures, vouched for by Jesus Christ and His apostles, were the sections questioned by Prof. Campbell. His whole point of view was theological, not historical. In the speaker's judgment, Prof. Campbell had wholly failed to comprehend what was meant by saying "God is love." He mistook love for tenderness and forgiveness, forgetting that the term also implied justice. None of the professed opponents of the Bible had ever said anything, to his mind, half so shocking as was said by Prof. Campbell. The notorious atheists had been content to claim that the so-called inconsistencies and discrepancies were due to the human imperfections and weaknesses of the writers. Prof. Campbell went further. He claimed that these things were due to the active interference of the devil, who influenced the writers to give a false idea of God. If it were admitted that the devil had been an active factor in the writing of the Old Testament, why not the New Testament, and what would then become of their conception of Christ?

As the hour for adjournment had been reached, it was moved that the Synod sit for two hours longer. The motion was carried on division.

Dr. Campbell then resumed his argument, the remainder of which consisted of arguments in defence of the points of accountability to God in the hereafter and the authority of the Holy Scriptures. With regard to Prof. Campbell's course in the matter, he thought that the professor had taken the right course in inviting the acquiescence or repudiation of the Church.

Prof. Scrimger, of Montreal, was the next speaker. He severely commented upon the newspaper references to the matter on former occasions. He regretted the personal references made by Prof. Campbell; they showed something of an animus against certain members of the Presbytery. He, personally, had no knowledge whatever of who the writer was who had attacked Prof. Campbell in *THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW*, and repudiated any connection with the matter. Prof. Scrimger confined himself almost entirely to the first count of the libel. "The Bible is the supreme and infallible Word of God," was the text of his defence of the Presbytery's action. Prof. Campbell had set Scriptural statement against statement, contrasting them, and calling one false and the other true, instead of reading one with another, and trying to reconcile them. On the subject of the character of God, the professor said the Old Testament references were intolerable blasphemy, and gave them the choice of the perfect Father or perfect book. The speaker claimed that this was impugning the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God, and clearly proved correct the view of the Presbytery. As a professor in one of their colleges, he considered that Prof. Campbell had virtually abandoned their position and surrendered it to the enemy. The

case presented by Dr. Scrimger occupied nearly one hour in delivery.

NEARING A CLOSE.

When the Campbell case came up on Friday morning, Professor Campbell waived his right to reply to Rev. Messrs. R. Campbell and Scrimger, preferring to wait until all the representatives of the Presbytery had finished, and Rev. Dr. Paterson continued the case for the Presbytery on the second count of the libel: "A view of God which sets Him forth as one who does not smite either in the way of punishment or discipline, and who has nothing to do with the judging or punishing of the wicked." He congratulated Prof. Campbell and the Synod upon their superior conduct of the case, as compared with the recent heresy trial in the United States. He defended the action of the Presbytery in refusing to add the word "immediately" to the libel after the words "God does not smite," on the ground that the change would not affect the professor's position, as he had said that God was not responsible at all for pain and suffering. By saying that God does not smite or inflict pain, and that those who said He did had misrepresented His character, Professor Campbell denied the practical inspiration of many parts of the Scriptures. To say that physical suffering and the connection between moral and physical evil had no part in the Divine plan was to speak unwisely and un-Scripturally. The professor thought that the ascription to God of giving pain was a calumny upon His character, and that evil was punished by the devil and not by God. According to him sin was either not fit to be punished or was neglected by God. But God is King, the Supreme Ruler, and the devil would certainly not punish evil to magnify God in the eyes of His people. When God and the devil are spoken of as punishing sin in the different passages, the professor asked which were they to take? His answer was that they were to accept both as true, for what the devil does is done as God's agent or executioner. The devil has the power of death only because God gave it, as is proved when Christ said to Pilate, "Ye have no power against Me unless given from above." If the devil did these things himself, and not by God's will, the world would be indebted to the devil for the punishment of sin and regeneration by discipline. That was the *reductio ad absurdum*, to which the professor must come if he refused to admit that Satan was God's executioner. Again, Prof. Campbell claimed that sin was punished naturally, as a burn follows fire, or death poison, and that power makes for righteousness. But God had no hand in it, according to the professor. Is the infliction of punishment on transgressors, the old Divine law that he who sinneth shall die, to be ignored? When disease and punishment smite the sinner, Prof. Campbell might call it nature, but others would see the power behind. Dr. Paterson quoted numerous passages from Scripture to prove that God inflicted punishment with His own hands. He had punished the Egyptians; He had prevented the destroyer smiting Israel, and turned him against Egypt. He had threatened to visit the Egyptians with plagues. The professor said there was no smiting or cursing about God, but Malachi, the last of the prophets, said there was; and, said the doctor, emphatically, "we believe in the assertions of the Old Testament, notwithstanding the great learning of Prof. Campbell." (Applause). In the New Testament, taking the professor on his own ground, John the Baptist speaks in the same way when he says that the tree bringing not forth good fruit shall be cast down. The same awful warning of Divine judgment against impenitent sinners was repeated over and over; even from Christ's loving lips came the terrible denunciation against the Scribes and Pharisees: "Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?" The last book of the Scripture was full of the judging and punishing of the wicked by God. Prof. Campbell had contended that it was contrary to God's nature to smite. He could not do it, because God is love; but He is also light, truth and justice, as well as love,

and all these must harmonize. Might they not argue that love required the punishment of the wicked? The professor said that God judges through His Son. Does it not follow, if the Son is kind and merciful, and destroys the works of the devil, that God does so also? It was not only by God's permission, but by His commission, that the Son performs justice, even to the extreme penalty. When a petition for the reprieve of a criminal is made it is not taken to the executioner, nor even to the judge, but to the foot of the throne; and who represented the throne in this case if not God? God's deliberative justice is bound up with His whole history in connection with man, as was shown in Eden, at the flood, and elsewhere. There could be no remission of sins without the shedding of blood, because God's punitive justice was necessarily involved in the atonement; and the death of Christ must be accounted for on some other basis than that of a sacrifice to save man. These views were part of the flaccid theology that prevailed in some quarters, sapping the foundations of true religion and not declaring the whole Council of God, but only part. It was no comfort to Christians to think they were given over to the enemy for punishment. Satan is merely an instrument of God's authority. Dr. Paterson concluded with an affecting plea to Prof. Campbell to retract.

DR. MACVICAR'S ADDRESS.

Principal McVicar said he had been appointed by a vote of 27 to 2 in the Presbytery to take his position before the Synod. He thought it a very strange mission to give to Satan, the opposing and smiting of sin, and proceeded to make an analysis of the famous lecture, criticizing different passages and taking generally very much the same grounds as Dr. Paterson. He asked who had cast Satan out of Paradise when he sinned? Was there another devil to do it, if God had not punished him? If God did not smite what became of the judgment in the world to come? Was it to be left to the church in Canada to teach that God broke every law He ever made and that the sacred writers failed to teach the difference between God and the devil? Were they to teach and believe this new theology? An emphatic "no," he believed would be given to the question by sustaining the Presbytery, and he was confident in leaving it in the hands of the Synod.

PROF. CAMPBELL'S REPLY.

Prof. Campbell was then called to the platform to make his final reply. He appeared to be under the influence of strong emotion, and spoke with vehemence and some excitement. He said he had failed to see any title of that kindly feeling so much spoken of. He had failed to see any attempt to understand his position and there had been only malignant thrust after thrust at his ecclesiastical life. He did not want the praise he had received from certain quarters, an honest man's praise he loved, but that he cast behind him. The picture drawn of him by Dr. Robert Campbell, who had said: "spoken so fulsomely in his praise and afterwards stabbed him, had pained him so that he trembled to look at it. He believed as truly, if not as idolatrously, in the Old Testament as did any man in the court. He had preached personal revelation years ago at an inaugural lecture before Sir William Dawson and his accusers in the same terms as had been used in the Kingston lecture, and not a word had been said at that time. Was not this conduct contradictory? (Applause.) Prof. Scrimger had spoken in terms he could not regard as candid, and the strictures made upon his lecture were like those of pettifogging Police Court lawyers. They sought to send him forth into the world to be pointed out upon the streets, to be avoided by children, a marked man. The injury done him had been very great. He had been told that his students would go further than he; that he might hang on to the church, but they would drift away into unbelief. He wished to sink personalities, but he would like to have his students say who was the man more likely to drive them into infidelity, Prof. Scrimger or himself. (Applause.) He claimed the right allowed others to use rhetorical figures of exaggeration without being called to book as he had been over his lecture. He quoted several arguments advanced in his original