

so unlimited that he would have the Assembly acknowledge that if Dr. Briggs taught anything that seemed to them at variance with the standards of the church, the fault was in their inability to understand him. It could not be either in the head or heart of such a man. Here are the words of this "disinterested observer": "When a minister of Dr. Briggs' well-known intelligence and candor could sincerely subscribe to such doctrines as these, and could conscientiously subscribe to the form of doctrine submitted to Presbyterian ministers at the time of their ordination, the Prosecuting Committee might have been assured that there was some misunderstanding on their part as to his teaching when they undertook to convince him and convince the whole church that he held a totally different doctrine from that which he intelligently and honestly said he held. If he refused to say that there were no errors in the autograph or original manuscripts of the writers of the Bible, they might have been satisfied that he had reasons for such refusal which, when properly understood by them, would be found not to conflict with the terms of his subscription and his ordination vows," p. 86. We rather feel that the proper course for the General Assembly would have been, in the light of the above quotation, to attend a course of lectures in Union College, until they came to an intelligent understanding of Dr. Briggs' views, and also, it may be, have their morals corrected, in daring to question the utterances of such a master. A "Get thee behind me, Satan," is the appropriate answer for such impertinence on the part of the General Assembly.

The first charge made against Dr. Briggs is that he makes the reason a fountain of divine authority, which may, and does, enlighten men savingly, even when such men reject the scriptures and the mediation and sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The Prosecuting Committee, it is pointed out, tried to force upon Dr. Briggs' words the interpretation that he co-ordinates reason and revelation as fountains of divine authority, which Dr. Briggs strenuously denies. The reviewer points out that some confusion arose through indefinite use of the word "fountain"; that the *source* of authority is always God Himself; and that both the Bible and reason are but channels through which God speaks, and that He does speak through reason, although it is not, in that respect, to be co-ordinated with revelation. The question still remains, however, Does God ever speak through reason so clearly that, without the scriptures, He communicates saving knowledge? Dr. Briggs gives an affirmative answer to that question, and quotes Martineau as one who, after rejecting the Bible, "found God enthroned in his own soul." This position the author seeks to fortify by relating the experiences through which he himself had passed, and how he had found peace in the contemplation of God's goodness in nature, after having failed to find it in the Bible. In this way, it is contended, some