

It would be out of place to introduce the libel of Dr. Marshall here ; or the answers and defences given by Dr. Brown. Nor would it be seasonable after quoting so copiously from former speeches of a similar character to enter on the discussion, which after solemn prayer, followed in the Court. A whole pamphlet of 124 octavo pages is published, giving an account of this cause.

It will be enough that we present a general view of the points of accusation, and of the defences by the accused ; of the line of argument in the Court, and the final vindication of Dr. Brown ; and of the harmonious and pleasant conclusion to which the whole cause was at length brought.

The libel consisted of five counts, which were considered by the Synod *seriatim*. The first refers to predestination, and the accused is stated, among other things, to have said :—‘ That if Jesus Christ has made the salvation of sinners indiscriminately a possible, though not a certain, event, if he has brought nigh to them the Kingdom of Heaven, which before was at an inaccessible distance, the question necessarily occurs, by what means has he achieved a result so stupendous and beneficent ? Surely the answer must be by means more astonishing than even the result, by his sufferings and death on the accursed tree.’ This sentiment was objected to by the framers of the libel as implying that the doctrine of the scriptures and of our subordinate standards—that some men are predestinated to everlasting life, others fore-ordained to everlasting death, and that the number of each class is definite and certain, is not a true but a false doctrine.

To this allegation Dr. Brown replied that, “ It cannot be denied, in consistency with the Scriptures and our Standards, ‘ that fallen men, including the non-elect, are, by the death of Christ, placed in different circumstances from fallen angels.—different circumstances from those in which they themselves would have been placed had not Christ died, salvation being sincerely and affectionately offered to them. To use the words of a distinguished opponent of indefinite atonement, (Dr. William Symington)—‘ Since an infinite atonement has been made, there is no natural impossibility in the salvation of any man.’ All events, as well as the final fates of men, are determined by God. The fall of Adam was as certain as the perdition of any of his sons can be ; but it would scarcely be counted heresy to say that, previously to his fall, his perseverance in integrity was a *possible* thing ; and we never think we are trenching on the doctrine of the immutability of of the divine purpose, when we say that with a little more wisdom Charles First might have saved his head, and his son James his crown.”

This part of the first count, with the other parts was disposed of in the Synod by the following motion of Mr. James Robertson, Portsburgh, Edinburgh,—“ That the Synod find that the charge mentioned in the first count, in as far as it implies that Dr. Brown has taught, directly or by implication, that it is not a true but a false doctrine ‘ that some men are predestinated unto eternal life, and others pre-ordained to everlasting death, that the number of each class is definite and certain, so as neither to be diminished or increased,’ is unfounded ; and that the Synod express their cordial satisfaction with Dr. Brown’s answers and defences on this point.”

The second count has a respect to views on original sin. The framers of the libel state that Dr. Brown had either made or sanctioned the expression, “ I firmly believe that in consequence, solely and entirely, of the sin of