

duce to all mankind. Neither of these modes of speaking seems to me to be words which become sound doctrine, 'speech which cannot be condemned.'

Again, "The phrase, 'universal atonement,' as the defender lately remarked in the hearing of his libellers, he never employed as descriptive of his own sentiment, and he is not aware that he ever employed it at all from the pulpit, from the chair, or from the press. He is not even aware that he ever heard a student use it in an academical exercise, and if he had he would have cautioned him against its employment. He has taught christianity for more than forty years without finding it necessary to employ this term; and were he to teach it for forty years more with his present convictions, he would never employ it. It is not a scripture term, it is not a symbolical term, it is not necessary to the expression of any christian truth, it is liable to be misunderstood, it has often been used in a false sense, and unless carefully explained, the false sense is the sense in which our people are most likely to understand it. He knows that his late colleague was not quite so sensitive, as he has always been, as to the hazard connected with the use of this term; but he knows, too, that he did not employ it either in his pastoral or in his academical instructions."

The Synod, on this count, sustained the motion of Dr. King, which was as follows:—"The Synod finds that Dr. Brown expressly rejects the Arminian doctrine of universal redemption, and holds the doctrine of the Reformers, of our standards, and of the decisions of the Synod on this subject, namely, that the death of Christ, viewed in connection with covenant engagements, secures the salvation of the elect only; but that a foundation has been laid in his death for a full, sincere, and consistent offer of the gospel to all mankind."

The fourth count respects the sufficiency of the atonement. Here the framers of the libel accuse Dr. Brown of saying, or holding, that "Intrinsically considered, and apart from the divine appointment, the death of Christ, notwithstanding the infinitude of its merit, is not sufficient for the salvation of a single soul; it is not an atonement at all." "The Saviour's sacrifice can be sufficient for those only who for whom it was offered or intended, and, of course, if sufficient for all men, it must have been intended for all men." This is supposed by the framers of the libel to imply "That the sufficiency of the death of Christ depends not on its intrinsic worth as the death of a divine person, but on a certain appointment; and that its efficacy depends not on its being a proper satisfaction to justice, the punishment due to the guilty borne by the surety in their name; not on its being a vicarious sacrifice offered and accepted for them; not on its being the price more valuable 'than corruptible things, such as silver and gold,' by which they have been purchased; but is derived from a certain super-added appointment, or destination, connected with such results in the case of others, while it has made atonement or satisfaction equally for all." In reply to this, says Dr. Brown,—“With regard to the fourth allegation, the defender submits that his departed friend and himself ascribe to divine appointment no place in its reference to the death of Christ as a sufficient atonement, but what sound divines generally have ever done. They have always taught that the death of Christ could not have been a sufficient atonement for any, had it not been the death of a