

First, a view of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures which impugns and discredits them, as the supreme and infallible source of religious truth; and second, 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.

The Professor denies that he is guilty of the errors charged against him. He, on the contrary, charges the Presbytery with passing over his argument, with paying no attention to the great truths, for the vindication of which he is willing, if need be, to suffer the loss of all things, and with laying hold of certain rhetorical negations in his address. So far may be said to be introductory, and here the defence proper begins.

"I am charged with impugning and discrediting the Holy Scriptures as the supreme and infallible source of religious truth." "The charge is false to the foundation." He refers in evidence of this to the fact that he had not found infallibility anywhere else, and blames the Presbytery for rejecting the fact of progress on revelation, overlooking the freedom of the inspired writers, that many of the historical books and parts of the prophecies are national chronicles, and for holding a theory of verbal, mechanical inspiration utterly unjustified by the facts of Scripture. He (Prof. Campbell) believed the Bible, even the Old Testament, to be on the whole a very truthful book, and its errors in history, chronology, and other matters, to be very few and unimportant. To say that if we had the original manuscripts, these errors might not appear, is trifling with words, because we might find them to differ but little from our received text. Passing to the ethical errors, these the prosecution virtually denies, and the court appears to hold every part of the Bible equally inspired and equally an infallible rule of faith and manners. But the Old Testament sanctioned polygamy, formulated a law of divorce, legalized slavery, punished witchcraft with death, ordered the massacre of the heathen, praised acts of cold-blooded treachery on the part of individuals, invokes in the psalms fearful curses upon the persecutors of the Messiah, all of which are arraigned or set aside by the teaching of Christ in His sermon on the mount.

In holding as he does, Prof. Campbell claims to be a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, in that in His life there was no hatred, but love, no curse, but blessing, who went about doing good, and who said, "I and the Father are one." "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do, for whatsoever things He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." In support of his position in setting the teaching of Christ above that of all others, he quotes Dr. de Witt's recent work on "What is Inspiration?" All historic, prophetic, and didactic revelation of God in the inspired books of the Old and New Testaments is inferior to the revelation of personal truth and grace in the Christ of the historic Gospels, and subordinate." He strongly avers his belief in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation, and denies as unfounded the charge that he impugns and discredits them as the infallible source of religious truth. He simply recognizes progress in revelation, development in doctrine, a shining light that shineth more and more into the perfect day to find the infallible in the progressive at every stage of its progress is impossible. Christ is the infallible, the Teacher sent from God above all other teachers. To place the teachings of Moses on a par with those of Christ is to dishonour Him who reveals the Father. In support of this contention as to the teaching of Moses, he quotes Principal Caven in "The King's Kindness," who says, page 39, "No doubt the Old Testament had a provisional element in its morality. The world was not yet prepared for the higher morality of the

New Testament on, for example, the doctrine of divorce and some other points. It is because he (Prof. Campbell) expounds more fully this doctrine of progressive revelation and development in doctrine as indicated by our Lord, by Mark the evangelist, and by Paul, that he is charged with heresy. Every passage quoted by the prosecuting committee in favour of the inspiration of the Scriptures and as the infallible source of religious truth, as if contradictory to his address, is beside the mark, because he readily and cheerfully assents to and has consistently taught them. On the other hand, our Blessed Saviour nowhere asserts or hints at the inerrancy of the Old Testament, but, on the contrary, in Matthew v. distinctly repeals certain Mosaic enactments, by substituting for them the higher and antagonistic law of love.

In regard to the subordinate standards in this count, he says they belonged to an age of laborious study and most unscientific and scholastic research. There may be a difference of opinion as to their bearing on the question of inerrancy. As for the fourth reason given for it in the Confession of Faith, namely, "That the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages, and therefore authentic," "I must confess that it exhibits utter ignorance of Biblical criticism and a view of mechanical inspiration, such as no scholar of the present day will accept. This section of the Confession has no warrant from the Scriptures, which are the supreme standard to which appeal may be made, and to which I have already appealed in the premises. Wherefore, I hold that the prosecuting committee has made out no case in the first count of the indictment."

As respects the second count, already quoted, the Professor when he asked that the word "immediately" should be inserted after smite, and demurred to the language of the second clause, "who has nothing to do with the judging or punishing of the wicked," was confronted with the very words of his lecture, and so it was allowed to stand. The Professor here calls attention to the fact that his address was a popular one, written to set forth Jesus Christ as the true revelation of the Father, not a scholastic thesis to be guarded on every point, and therefore some rhetorical exaggeration for the sake of emphasizing a special point, was not to be pressed. Logically stated, his thesis was, "That sin and all evil, moral and physical, are no part of God's nature nor God's plan. God gave freedom to fallible angels and men, and doubtless foresaw the evil that would arise from the liberty of choice granted to a being of finite knowledge, yet God is not responsible, in so doing, for evil of any kind. With regard to physical evil and how it arises, he quotes Whewell as saying that "Every good thing in nature and man in its dawn must have its archetype in the Divine mind, but what shall we say of monstrosities, beasts and birds of prey, parasites and all natural implements of torture and suffering? To which he answers, that these are no part of the Divine plan, but frustrations, deviations and negations of it."

As regards the origin of evil, though not called to speak of it, he yet avers that it does not proceed from man, nor from God, who in Christ is represented as the destroyer of it. "Taking, therefore, the extremest form of physical evil, or as the libel calls it, 'smiting,' it is not the act of God, but the result of departure from Him, and the immediate act of the devil." In proof of this, the case of Job is cited. 1 John iii. is quoted. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil." "There is smiting in the world," he adds, "but it is not of God." "It may be said, that God does smite, but even this immediately, I believe to be too strong; rather God permits men to be smitten. He is the source of all power and goodness, so that all minor power and activities are delegated to their owners by Him." On this subject he continues, "I do not say that God does not smite other beings than men, nor that He does not smite in the future. I believe that the Son will destroy the wicked with the brightness of His coming. But in so far as Jesus Christ reveals the Father, I find no smiting nor any sign of it, save in the merciful withdrawing of life from the barren fig tree." Yet I find smiting of men in chastisement, in judgment and in suffering together with Christ, vicariously. The devil still smites. Delitsch states, "that the wrath and curse of God which comes upon the children of disobedience, is this devil, the author of all our evils, moral and physical." Punishment follows sin as it follows every departure from God's law. Christ came

undeniably into Satan's world of darkness, under his tempting power and stroke of death to deliver souls, but His sacrifice was to the Father's love, and to the justice, which decreed that as a man sows, so shall he reap.

With regard to agency in the matter of discipline, he quotes the cases of the incestuous man in the Church of Corinth, and of Hymenaeus and Alexander, of whom Paul says that he delivered them over to Satan, and asks, "If God smites directly, why should then offenders have been delivered into the hands of Satan?" There is a judgment of the world by man, even though that man be the Son of God. The great and comforting truth of the judgment of Satan and all the powers of evil by our humanity, which culminates in Christ, is thoroughly Scriptural. Jesus Christ, the revealer of the Father in His person, words and works, did not smite, nor did He judge. In Matt. xxv. 31-46, the last judgment is set forth in which the Royal Judge is the Son of Man. He calls the righteous the blessed of the Father, but the wicked are simply the cursed, not the cursed of the Father. The Father, therefore, is not revealed as a judge in the New Testament, and ought not to be so regarded. The person of the Godhead who shall judge the quick and the dead, is the Lord, and He will do so, not as the Son of God, but as the Son of Man. The passages of Scripture quoted by the prosecuting committee against him, Prof. Campbell declares not to be inharmonious with those which he has quoted in his defence. To relieve the character of God the Father from the imputation of spiritual and physical evil, was his object in his address. Such statements as, that God will by no means clear the guilty simply mean that man must take the consequences of his sin, either personally or vicariously. "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord," really means that the law of God and the law of departure from God will work out the Divine purpose.

The teaching of the Confession of Faith as respects God's judging and punishing the guilty, the Professor declared, he had in no way impugned, but had maintained, and was prepared to maintain.

Prof. Campbell concluded by saying that he had a great truth to declare, namely, that in Jesus Christ we behold the Father in heaven, whom the world naturally regards with fear, and his object in his presentation of the Father, was to dispel this fear, so that men might rise to a sense of their dignity as assessors on the throne of the Son of Man, and heavenly representative in judgment upon all sin and evil. In doing this he had not sought notoriety or publicity, but as regards this doctrine, he could do no otherwise, and was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.

At the close of his defence, the Rev. Robt. Campbell, D.D., Convener of the Committee charged with drawing up the libel, sought to obtain a categorical answer to the question, whether he withdrew any of the statements made in the address, and failing to do so, proceeded to address the court.

In making this motion, affecting the position of his much loved brother, he desired to acknowledge, as all the members of the Court acknowledged, the distinguished services to science, learning and religion, rendered by Professor Campbell, and the spirit of devoutness and earnestness which characterized his pleadings before the Presbytery, and even the production now under review. It was very reluctantly that he undertook the task as Convener of the Presbytery's Committee for framing the libel, of now moving that the first count should be held proven. So far as his feelings were concerned, it would be a much more pleasing duty to stand at his brother's side for his defence, if judgment and conscience allowed; but he was constrained by a sense of what was due to the truth, to Professor Campbell himself, and to the Church, to perform this unwelcome task, as the duty had fallen to him.

They all recognized that Professor Campbell's official work made it imperative on him to enquire narrowly into everything relating to the sacred Scriptures, their origin and history; and if his investigations led him to desire to cut away all accretions that had grown up around them in the course of ages, in the popular apprehension regarding them, they were not going to condemn him for so doing. The truth must be maintained at any cost, and they must be careful not to believe too much, which is superstition, any more than too little, which is scepticism. Nor would they condemn him if he declared that, in his judgment, the defences and apologies usually offered for alleged discrepancies and difficulties in the Bible were inadequate. In such matters, scarcely two minds took the same view,

and he said that, personally, some of the things which seemed to perplex and trouble Professor Campbell, afforded him little concern, from such attention as he had given them. De gustibus non disputandum. What seemed to be troubling the Professor most of all, was how to account for the breaking in of what he accounted evil, in the domain of even what was good, a problem akin to that which troubled Job and his friends, and which has been found an insoluble problem by the profoundest thinkers in all the ages. It seemed to him that the Professor wanted to be able to explain everything, as if nothing should appear in the Scriptures or in God's government that the human mind ought not to be able to grasp. But the lesson taught in the Book of Job was that, it was not possible for man entirely to comprehend or explain all that belonged to the domain of God. Even when the Scriptures of the New Testament are added to those of the Old, and all that we can learn of God from nature, is farther taken into the account, the most learned among them knew but little of the Divine Nature and its manifestations. So, these are but the outskirts of His ways; and how small a whisper do we hear of Him. But the thunder of His power, who can understand? The Analogy of Bishop Butler, might be held by some as now out of date, but at all events, it conveys this lesson, that if men meet with mysteries and difficulties in the realm of nature, of which the senses take cognizance, they need not wonder if they also find things inexplicable with their present faculties and means of information in the spiritual domain. If Professor Campbell had taken this position when he found himself unable to defend or explain seeming discrepancies or difficulties, such as the one he mentioned in his lecture, about God putting words into the mouth of a lying spirit, no one would blame him. Not even the most learned teacher ought to be expected to profess omniscience, and he ventured to think no harm would result from telling the students that lowliness of mind was a posture not unbecoming to them as well as him.

The motive underlying this apologetic attempt, was no doubt good, but it introduced much greater difficulties than those it set itself to solve. In seeking to absolve the Father of certain responsibilities, supposed to attach to Him, according to commonly received opinions, he defended the First Person of the Trinity at the expense of the Third. The Spirit's work was imperfect, so far as the volume of Revelation was concerned. Satan succeeded in making the Spirit's guidance of Moses, the Prophets, and the other reputed authors of the Old Testament Scriptures inefficient, so that what they produced was sometimes his rather than the Holy Spirit's work. Shocking though this theory is, surely Professor Campbell saw that it only removed the difficulty a step back, but did not entirely get rid of it. Because the child's question immediately occurs to one's mind, Why did God make the devil at all? Unless, indeed, the position taken by some German divines be accepted, that the devil is not a creature, but a divine being, for whose existence God is not responsible. Professor Campbell does not take that ground—he calls the devil God's creature. If he is subject to the Divine control a Scripture implies, then the Latin maxim, quoted to-day by Professor Campbell himself—quod facit per alium facit per se, is in a sense, true; for we cannot get away from the final conclusion, that all the smaller circles that may be taken to represent the freewills of all beings subordinate to God, are embraced in the larger circle of His sovereign will.

The Presbytery is not called upon to import into this discussion any theory of inspiration. The Church has formulated none. It leaves its ministers and teachers free to speculate on the subject, and therefore will not visit any of them because of any theories they may hold or teach, so long as they lead to safe conclusions. This subject as well as that of angelology, also raised in this discussion, are extra confessional; for in spite of the objection sometimes taken to the Confession of Faith, that it is too voluminous, there are not a few subjects and these of importance, too, in regard to which it affords no guidance to the ministers and professors of the Church. Professor Campbell is therefore, not on trial for holding or not holding any particular theory of inspiration, seeing that the Church holds none. But if it lays down no theory of inspiration, it is emphatic in its pronouncement as to the quality of the product of inspiration. The Church has to do with the conclusions to which the theories lead.

(Continued on page 605.)