

“removing legal and external barriers,” they considered as calculated to lead to the supposition that there was a denial, on the part of those who used them, of the substitution of Christ only for the elect—“these being bought with a price,” or “purchased with his own blood.”

In consequence of a representation from an aged minister who had not been at the Synod in 1843, and some observations published by Dr. Marshall, of Kirkintilloch on the speeches of the two Professors (in an appendix to a work entitled “The Catholic Doctrine of Redemption Vindicated”) the whole cause was thrown open, and the Professors felt it necessary to recall the attention of the Synod to the subject, at their meeting in May, 1844.

The representation given in, resulted in permitting the minister, who made it to enter his dissent from the decision complained of; but the Synod saw no reason for disturbing that decision, as there was reason to think its meaning had been misapprehended, and the Synod make this statement in their minutes, that the decision was not intended as an alteration of the standards of our Church, but rather as a declaration of the existence of harmony in regard to the system of Divine Truth which these standards contain.

At the same time they appointed a committee to take into consideration the observations made by Dr. Marshall and the pamphlet published by the two Professors, to which he referred, and which had occasioned the publication of these observations. The report of this committee led to the following minute of Synod:—“That the Committee, after different meetings, found that Dr. Marshall did not mean to intimate that the two Senior Professors, or any other of the parties referred to in the concluding pages of his book, taught what they did not believe to be true, or that they taught what they did not believe to be in consistency with the standards of the Church; and, further, that he (Dr. Marshall) spontaneously intimated his purpose to suppress the appendix altogether: whereupon the two Senior Professors expressed their satisfaction with the statement of Dr. Marshall, disclaiming any intention of ascribing moral blame to them, and took the opportunity to add, that, in their own apprehension, no language ever used by them countenanced any Pelagian error; and, in particular, that the expressions ‘opening the door of mercy to all,’—‘removing legal and external barriers to salvation,’—and ‘the atonement, having a general as well as a special reference,’ are not understood by them to mean, ‘that the atonement, in the order of nature, precedes election, or that it opens for all a way of salvation, without securing the salvation of any, and that then sovereign love comes in to complete the arrangement, by ordaining the elect to life.’ In these declarations of Dr. Marshall, on the one hand, and of the two Professors on the other, the Committee cordially acquiesced, as a satisfactory termination of the matters remitted to them. This report the Synod adopted, and thanks were given to the Committee for their diligence in this business, which they had brought to so happy an issue.”

One of these Professors, the amiable and accomplished Dr. Balmer, whose character we formerly noticed, went home from this Synod in comparatively good health, and set himself to the prosecution of his usual labours. But, in about three weeks afterwards, after a short illness, he finished his earthly