

sacrifice He presented, when 'through the Eternal Spirit He offered himself to God;' but with the Synod I believe that this one atonement has various aspects,—an aspect to mankind-sinners, as such, and an aspect to the chosen of God."

The Synod's motion on this count, introduced by Dr. Paterson of Kirkwall, and their deliverance, was—"That the Synod find the fifth count in the libel, charging Dr. Brown with effectually subverting and rendering void the great cardinal doctrine of our Lord's substitution in the room of His people,—a doctrine firmly held by this Church,—is entirely unfounded."

Thus all the five counts in the libel were declared to be unfounded. The investigation occupied several days, and was conducted, on the whole, with impartiality and candour. The Court was now prepared for a general deliverance on the whole cause. But before we proceed to present this, as it will form the best conclusion to the subject, we shall take the liberty of making a few remarks of our own. In this cause, it will appear that we have not introduced the reasoning of the Court. A volume is almost filled with this; and having quoted so largely from the speeches in the case of Mr. Morison, we deem it unnecessary, there being considerable similarity in their tenor, to introduce any of them here,—especially as the libel, and the answers, and the deliverances, very plainly present the different points. The speeches on this occasion were, however excellent and eloquent, indicative of a thorough knowledge of the christian system; and although shades of difference of sentiment appeared, yet all the speakers manifested an anxiety and zeal in the defence of evangelical truth, and, on the whole, much harmony of doctrinal opinion prevailed. It is but justice to mention that the sentiments of Dr. Brown were, in some instances, called in question, and even objected to by members of the Court, as inconsistent with the Scriptures and the Standards. His explanations, however, satisfied by far the greater number; and, so far as we have noted them, they are indeed satisfactory. But we venture to remark that Dr. Brown, who could give such satisfactory explanations of his own statements, which to many were before ambiguous and obscure, and by some were considered as expressive of questionable sentiments, different from what he intended, might as well have expressed his real opinions at first as clearly as he does in the explanations, and thus have prevented all ground of suspicion, and all necessity for investigation. With regard to Drs. Marshall and Hay, who have lately gone to their reward, we cannot speak of them but in terms of respect and veneration. They were both sound divines, strictly orthodox, perhaps in some particulars, the former at least, was what some might consider hyper-Calvinistic, and we confess we like to see a leaning to this safe side. The church is certainly indebted to them for the stand they made, for, in our apprehension, it was both seasonable and necessary,—not perhaps for Dr. Brown himself, whose modes of expression on some topics gave occasion for the libel, from which he so successfully defended himself, and was so honorably acquitted by the Synod,—but for less talented and experienced brethren, and, in particular, the rising ministry, the students of divinity, who, by giving way, as they are sometimes ready to do, to unprofitable speculations on divine truth, might go far astray from "the good old way" laid down by the venerable fathers of our church. Dr.