

divine person—had it not been a proper satisfaction to justice—had it not been the endurance of the punishment of the guilty in their room—had it not been a vicarious sacrifice—had it not been a price more valuable than corruptible things. They have always taught this, but they have also taught that divine appointment was necessary to constitute this death of Christ, in itself intrinsically valuable enough to be the atonement for all sinful beings, sufficient as a propitiation for all who believe. The defender readily admits that he does not accord with the doctrine of the libellers, which is, if he does not misapprehend their meaning, that, apart from divine appointment, the death of Christ is not only sufficient to be an atonement—but is a sufficient atonement. On the contrary, he holds, that apart from divine appointment, the death of Christ could not have been an atonement at all.”

The Synod, on this count, carried the motion of Mr. Thom, elder, from Greenock, namely, that “The Synod find that Dr. Brown has not taught anything inconsistent with the Scriptures and the standards of our Church, and that this part of the libel is altogether unfounded.”

The fifth and last count is on the substitutionary character of Christ's sacrifice, in respect to which the pamphlet represents Dr. Brown as holding, that, “In some sense, Christ was the substitute of all, though not of all precisely, in the same sense.” Again, “As to the question, whether Jesus Christ was the substitute of all men, in any sense, and if so, in what sense. I apprehend that if our Lord suffered evils, which were the manifestations of the divine displeasure against mankind generally, which he did when he ‘died the just for the unjust,’ that thus far he was their substitute; but since our Lord did not suffer these evils with the intention, or to the effect, that mankind should be universally saved, He was not their substitute to the same extent, in which He was the substitute of those whom, when He gave Himself, the just one in the room of the unjust, He, by that offering of Himself intended to bring, and whom he actually does thus bring to God.” These expressions were thought by the framers of the libel, “To subvert and render void the great cardinal doctrine of our Lord's substitution; *first*, by teaching that there are different kinds or degrees of substitution; *secondly*, by teaching that our Lord might stand in the room of the sinner, bearing the punishment due to him, and yet the sinner not be ultimately set free; and *lastly*, by teaching the doctrine already libelled, that the salvation of the sinner is secured, not by a substitutionary sacrifice offered and accepted in his room, but only by some kind of purpose, or intention, or appointment, connected with that sacrifice.”

The following is the reply to this:—“The defender, in adverting to the fifth and last allegation, has to remark, that the explanatory statement lately made by him in the hearing of his libellers, as it was sufficient, so it ought to have convinced the libellers that there was no ground for this charge. He will trespass on the patience of the Court only this once more, by laying before them what they have already heard and considered. ‘As to a double atonement, and a double substitution, I confess myself somewhat at a loss to comprehend what is meant by those terms. The only atonement I know of, that on which I rest my own hope for salvation, and on which I call my fellow-sinners to rest theirs, persuaded that it will well sustain them, is ‘the offering of the body of Christ once for all,’—the