

The American Presbyterian.

John A. Weir
18 July 67

New Series, Vol. IV, No. 16.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1091.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 1867.

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 1867.

SUMMARY AND COMPARATIVE VIEW OF DOCTRINE.

Our position in these articles may at this point be properly restated. Embracing the Westminster Confession of Faith, "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," we claim equal rights with any other section of the Church in interpreting these Standards; and under the charter of the Adopting Act of 1729, as American Presbyterians, we claim certain other rights of assent or dissent, but all within the easily defined limits of the spirit and intent of the Confession, and in entire harmony with the system of doctrine which it contains. There need be no doubt or difficulty in this matter with those who really wish to agree. The cry raised against what is called the New School part of the American Presbyterian Church, as unfaithful to the Standards, accomplishes nothing so effectively as to reveal the peculiar type of mind of its authors, or their peculiar aspirations in the councils of the Church; while it gives, so far as it is believed, to the Westminster Confession and to the Presbyterian Church of this country, most unfairly and injuriously, the attitude of rigidity, severity and assumed infallibility, as if Rome and the Pope themselves had assumed the Presbyterian name.

Not a single doctrinal opinion has gained currency in what is known as the New School branch of the Presbyterian Church, which may not readily be shown to be perfectly consistent with the purport and drift of the Confession, and with an *ex animo* adoption of it, as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures." Not a claim for liberty is asserted, which in the slightest degree undermines or imperils the Calvinistic structure of doctrine. No tendency has appeared in the history of the New School body to cut loose from the Standards, which are printed unaltered and in various forms by our Publication Committee, taught in our Sabbath-schools and families, and solemnly subscribed to by all the official persons in the Church. They are our inheritance and our glory as Presbyterians. Their fulness and compactness, their richness as of honey gathered from all the flowers of the fully developed theology of the Reformation, their unctious and their evangelic fervor, testifying to something far beyond mere intellect in their authors—the *pectus quod facit theologum*—have made them dearer to us than any other human composition—dearer because not viewed as the letter which enslaves and which kills, but as the spirit which is liberty and life.

Let us look at some of the leading doctrines of the Confession, placed side by side with statements which represent the doctrinal position of the "New School."

CONFESSION.
Chap. VI. 3. "They [our first parents] being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed, to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation."
NEW SCHOOL.
"By a Divine constitution, Adam was so the head and representative of the human race, that as a consequence of his transgression all mankind became morally corrupt and liable to death, temporal and eternal."—*Auburn Convention, 1837.*

VI. 4. "From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."
"Original sin is a natural bias to evil, resulting from the first apostacy, leading invariably and certainly to actual transgression."—*Ibid.*
"Born with a depraved nature."—*Barnes' Defence.*

VI. 3. "The guilt of this sin was imputed . . . to all their posterity."
"By reason of the sin of Adam in his peculiar relation, the race are treated as if they had sinned."—*Aub. Con.*

"All the sufferings to which the posterity of Adam are subjected, in consequence of his sin, are designed as evils of a judicial nature, intended to set forth his (God's) abhorrence of the crime."—*Barnes' Defence.*
"In virtue of the union, representative and natural, between Adam and his posterity, his sin is the ground of their condemnation, that is, of their subjection to penal evils."—*Dr. Hodge Com. on Romans.*

IX. 1. "God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty that

CONFESSION.
it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined to good or evil."
IX. 3. "Man by his fall hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation."

"Man is wholly inclined to evil and opposed to good."—*Mr. Barnes.*
"The thing wanting is not a being able, but a being willing. Nothing is wanting but a will."—*Jonathan Edwards.*
"The error of those who assert that the sinner has no power of any kind for the performance of duty, strips the sinner of his moral agency and accountability, and introduces the heresy of Antinomianism or Fatalism."—*Dr. S. B. Wilson, Dr. Plumer, and others, 1836.*

"Independently of the influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, they never will comply with the commands of God."—*Auburn Convention.*

VII. 3. "The Lord was pleased to make a second (covenant) commonly called the covenant of grace, wherein he freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ."
"By virtue of this atonement, overtures of mercy are sincerely offered to the race."—*Ibid.*
"All the sins of mankind are become venial, in respect of the price paid by Christ to his Father, but all do not obtain actual remission, because most offenders do not take out, nor plead their pardon, as they ought to do."—*Letter of Arbp. Usher, read and recommended to his class by Dr. Chalmers.*
"Albeit Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world and he indifferently through the goodness of God offered unto all, yet all do not receive him."—*Calvin on Rom. v. 18.*

It is true there is a want of fulness* in the Confession on this latter point, yet we have no idea that the Westminster divines meant to construct their system so as to leave no room for it. We do not believe they meant to ostracise sentiments which must have been known to be those of John Calvin, in his later life and at his dying day; sentiments which he put into his will just before he died in such memorable words as the following: *Sanguine summi illius Redemptoris, effuso pro humani generis peccatis; i. e.* "the blood of that exalted Redeemer, shed for the sins of the human race."

Nor is there in New School doctrine any statement which can be fairly put as an equivalent to the realistic proposition—"sinned in him and fell with him," however much some "Old School" leaders wish to persuade themselves that in denying realism they are not dissenting from the Confession. We are with Dr. Hodge in repudiating realism as a theological dogma, but we are not with him in the assumption that he is consistent with the Confession in denying it. In short, if Dr. Baird in the *Elohim Revealed*, and Samuel Rutherford among the Westminster Divines, who said, "We sinned intrinsically in Adam, as parts, as members, as being in his loins," be Old School, then Dr. Hodge, who says, in the *Biblical Repository*: "There is no mysterious oneness of the race, no transfer of moral character, no assumption of the moral guilt of men for the sin of Adam involved in the doctrine of imputation,"—is as much New School as is Mr. Barnes. Or rather, both are older than any "Schools," having discarded human philosophy and gone back to the simple statements of Scripture.

This, then, is the height of our offending: to believe, with Dr. Hodge, that imputation means nothing more than that Adam's sin is the ground of our subjection to penal evils; to believe, with John Calvin, that Christ died for the sins of the whole world, and to believe, with Jonathan Edwards, in regard to the will, "that the thing wanting is not a being able, but a being willing." This is what makes us "New School," latitudinarian, unsafe, ineligible to equal rights, and the like. It is the least that can be demanded of those who make such charges, that they agree among themselves what the meaning of the Confession on such a doc-

* This is precisely the language of Rev. Charles J. Brown, of the Free Church of Scotland, in a paper read by him by appointment, at the Bicentennial celebration of the Westminster Assembly, Edinburgh, July, 1843, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Chalmers. Mr. Brown said: "Considering the vast importance of this matter, and its prominence in the Scriptures, I should be disposed very humbly to say that there was a certain want of fulness with reference to it in the Westminster Standards."—*Bicentenary, Cincinnati, 1845, p. 213.*

NEW SCHOOL.
a just accountability."—*Auburn Convention.*

"Man is wholly inclined to evil and opposed to good."—*Mr. Barnes.*
"The thing wanting is not a being able, but a being willing. Nothing is wanting but a will."—*Jonathan Edwards.*
"The error of those who assert that the sinner has no power of any kind for the performance of duty, strips the sinner of his moral agency and accountability, and introduces the heresy of Antinomianism or Fatalism."—*Dr. S. B. Wilson, Dr. Plumer, and others, 1836.*

"Independently of the influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, they never will comply with the commands of God."—*Auburn Convention.*

"By virtue of this atonement, overtures of mercy are sincerely offered to the race."—*Ibid.*
"All the sins of mankind are become venial, in respect of the price paid by Christ to his Father, but all do not obtain actual remission, because most offenders do not take out, nor plead their pardon, as they ought to do."—*Letter of Arbp. Usher, read and recommended to his class by Dr. Chalmers.*
"Albeit Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world and he indifferently through the goodness of God offered unto all, yet all do not receive him."—*Calvin on Rom. v. 18.*

It is true there is a want of fulness* in the Confession on this latter point, yet we have no idea that the Westminster divines meant to construct their system so as to leave no room for it. We do not believe they meant to ostracise sentiments which must have been known to be those of John Calvin, in his later life and at his dying day; sentiments which he put into his will just before he died in such memorable words as the following: *Sanguine summi illius Redemptoris, effuso pro humani generis peccatis; i. e.* "the blood of that exalted Redeemer, shed for the sins of the human race."

Nor is there in New School doctrine any statement which can be fairly put as an equivalent to the realistic proposition—"sinned in him and fell with him," however much some "Old School" leaders wish to persuade themselves that in denying realism they are not dissenting from the Confession. We are with Dr. Hodge in repudiating realism as a theological dogma, but we are not with him in the assumption that he is consistent with the Confession in denying it. In short, if Dr. Baird in the *Elohim Revealed*, and Samuel Rutherford among the Westminster Divines, who said, "We sinned intrinsically in Adam, as parts, as members, as being in his loins," be Old School, then Dr. Hodge, who says, in the *Biblical Repository*: "There is no mysterious oneness of the race, no transfer of moral character, no assumption of the moral guilt of men for the sin of Adam involved in the doctrine of imputation,"—is as much New School as is Mr. Barnes. Or rather, both are older than any "Schools," having discarded human philosophy and gone back to the simple statements of Scripture.

This, then, is the height of our offending: to believe, with Dr. Hodge, that imputation means nothing more than that Adam's sin is the ground of our subjection to penal evils; to believe, with John Calvin, that Christ died for the sins of the whole world, and to believe, with Jonathan Edwards, in regard to the will, "that the thing wanting is not a being able, but a being willing." This is what makes us "New School," latitudinarian, unsafe, ineligible to equal rights, and the like. It is the least that can be demanded of those who make such charges, that they agree among themselves what the meaning of the Confession on such a doc-

* This is precisely the language of Rev. Charles J. Brown, of the Free Church of Scotland, in a paper read by him by appointment, at the Bicentennial celebration of the Westminster Assembly, Edinburgh, July, 1843, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Chalmers. Mr. Brown said: "Considering the vast importance of this matter, and its prominence in the Scriptures, I should be disposed very humbly to say that there was a certain want of fulness with reference to it in the Westminster Standards."—*Bicentenary, Cincinnati, 1845, p. 213.*

trine, for example, as Imputation, really is; that they decide whether John Calvin or Dr. Hodge is to be regarded as authority in interpreting passages bearing on Calvinistic doctrine; whether a doctrine which was in vogue among Calvinists before the date of the Confession, but which was not distinctly mentioned in that instrument, is to be considered New School; whether, when two sorts of opinions may be traced in the Confession, either of them is any "older," theologically speaking, than the other; whether a teacher of veritable New School doctrine is to be called "Old School," because he happens to be a professor in a theological seminary in that branch of the Church; whether, in fine, the term Old School is not the mere badge of partizanship, indicating a certain set of men who got the control of the Presbyterian Church, and who gave the term New School as one of opprobrium to those who did not choose to be ruled by them, whatever their doctrinal views might be.

A NON-COMMITTAL REPLY.

In our issue of March 21st, we addressed a respectful inquiry to such of our cotemporaries of the other branch as had not previously expressed themselves, upon the precise terms of the Re-union of the two branches, which they were understood to favor. Our language was as follows:

"We ask these papers, one of which is the special representative of the union movement in the other branch, whether the union they favor is one in which what is commonly understood as the New School Theology—on the extent of the atonement, moral ability and original sin—will be recognized as having equal rights in the Church with that taught in Princeton, Allegheny, Danville, or Chicago?"

To this question the *Pittsburg Banner* made a prompt reply, which, though not direct, was sufficiently clear to place it upon the old ex-cending platform. The *Cincinnati Presbyterian*, however, which has taken the lead among the organs of the "Old School" branch, in advocating Re-union, and which, up to the time of our inquiry, had been discouraging of Re-union by the column, instead of making a prompt and liberal reply, at once lapsed into total silence; and after three weeks of lubrication, it comes out in its issue of April 11th, with a reply, the evident perplexity of which is distressing to all who admire candour in religious journalism. It does not pretend to be a direct answer to our query, which is not quoted save through another, and we are compelled to say, a very unfair source—*The North-western Presbyterian*.

In the first part of the article, the *Presbyter* "has a few words to say in response to the interrogatories;" in the last part, the editor, "as a member of the re-union committee" has "no opinions to express in answer to the AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN." In one paragraph it says:

"If, however, one party insists upon the *ipsissima verba* subscription, or the other upon the substance of doctrine adoption of our standards, re-union will be impracticable. If the great majority adopt our standards in the same spirit as well as words, re-union will be effected in the fulness of time."

In another, quoting from the *Pittsburg Banner's* response to our question, it says: "We accept as our own every view expressed by the *Banner*, except what is said in regard to Mr. Barnes and Dr. Beman," *i. e.* refusing to give their peculiar views equal rights in the Church with those taught at Princeton, &c.

In another place, the editor, being engaged in defending his orthodoxy from suspicions of "New-School" taint thrown out by the *North-western*, says:

"As to our theology, it is that of the Confession of Faith, in its plain and obvious sense, and if any think that there is room for much difficulty as to what that sense is, we may say that the Old School sense is our sense. We may add that we believe that the great body of the New School are as sincere and thorough as we are in receiving the standards."

In one paragraph it rebukes us for "probing old sores," and in another refers to its "own opinion of the propriety of using means to ascertain the mind of the Church."

Instead of appreciating our attempts, as we might expect an intelligent, liberal minded man would, to discover whether it is really union, or the very different matter—*uniformity*—which is sought by our "Old School" brethren, we find the *Presbyter* ill-humoredly classing us with the *North-western Presbyterian*, as endeavoring to "overthrow the work" of Re-union "by appeals to old prejudices and strifes." We think we had a right to expect something of a far higher level of frankness and Christian magnanimity

than this self-contradictory result of three weeks' delay on the part of the *Presbyter*. There may be some latent liberal intention involved somehow in these paragraphs, just as there are sunbeams in cucumbers, but we confess that they elude our powers of analysis and development in any practical form.

These, then, are the ultimate lengths of conciliation to which our brethren of the other branch, through their accepted organs of opinion, will go for Re-union. All but one require that Mr. Barnes and Dr. Beman should be marked as heretical, and the other, which has been the very head and front of the Re-union movement in the Old School body, has only such vague words on the subject as we have quoted above. The editor of the *Presbyter* accepts the Confession in the Old School sense, and bases his hopes of re-union on the supposition that the great body of the New School are as sincere and thorough as he in accepting the standards. Not an Old School paper has dared to breathe the word "liberal" in reference to the basis of union; not one has ventured to hint at a toleration of differences of opinion in the re-united Church. Not a correspondent, lay or clerical, has offered or has been admitted into the columns of an Old School paper, to argue for anything less than a rigorous construction of the standards as a basis of Re-union.

Our readers can draw their own inferences.

NATURAL SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN PHILADELPHIA.

Natural science as pursued and taught in Philadelphia has never in any public or extensive way been perverted to the service of infidelity. The proceedings of her societies and institutes and the various courses of scientific lectures delivered under different auspices, have been such as, for the most part to harmonize with our reputation as a Christian community. But perhaps the most striking illustration of this fact has been given in the popular course of scientific lectures which has been delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association during the season just closed. For this service a dozen or more of our most able and interesting lecturers, some religious men and some not, gladly volunteered their services, esteeming it a privilege to bring their stores of information and their various and often splendid apparatus for illustration to aid our Christian young men in their labors for the protection, improvement, and rational entertainment of the multitudes of their class exposed to temptation in a great city.

On Friday evening of last week, the Lecture Committee having closed their labors for the season, gave an entertainment to the lecturers and other workers in this department, in the halls of the Association at 1210 Chestnut street. The early part of the evening was spent in social intercourse of the most delightful character, and at 9 o'clock the company, about 40 in number, sat down to a sumptuous repast. The chair was occupied by Geo. W. Mears, Esq.,—Chairman of the Lecture Committee, who after the appetites of the company had been satisfied, called for brief speeches, from one and another of the company, adding not a little to the life and good cheer of the company by the peculiar appropriateness and individuality of the summons addressed to each. Peter B. Simons, Esq., commenced by thanking the lecturers for their valuable and gratuitous services, and was followed by Professors Hartshorne of the High School, Hayden, McQuillen, Chase, Theo. D. Rand, Esq., Rev. Dr. Beadle who lectured on Mollusks, Rev. A. M. Stewart, who lectured on Entomology, Major Calhoun, formerly of Kentucky, who had lost a foot, been shot through the lungs and in other parts of the body in the service of his country and who had lectured with thrilling interest on the caves of the limestone formation, with others, in lively speeches admirable for brevity and pointedness. The lecturers expressed themselves as the parties really under obligations for the opportunity afforded them to take part in so good a work, and declared themselves in readiness for another campaign in the coming winter. Ex. Gov. Pollock was also present and made an admirable off-hand speech, Dr. March responded to a call for the clergy, and Rev. John W. Mears responded in behalf of the press.

At a reasonable hour the guests separated being dismissed with the benediction by Dr.

March, feeling that they had not only passed a season of uncommon enjoyment but had encouraged one another in a work of the highest importance and utility.

"THE MOST CERTAIN FACT OF HISTORY."

It is in these triumphant terms that the Commentator Lange speaks of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Judged according to the ordinary canons of evidence, there is no event of the past so well established as this. The strongest possible testimony from witnesses whose credibility cannot be impeached has been in possession of mankind from the date of the event to the present time. It occurred among the bitterest enemies, the murderers of Christ, men shrewd and powerful no less than eager to fasten falsehood upon the story if they could. Even the amazed disciples of Jesus discredited it, at first, as stoutly as His enemies. "Their words seemed to them as idle tales and they believed them not." Honest, blunt, incredulous Thomas, the very sort of an ally which a skeptic would have desired to have among the disciples at such a time, would listen to no hearsay testimony on the subject whatever. The thing was impossible in his view. Nothing but the most overwhelming sensible proofs would satisfy him of such a fact. Even this obstinate doubter was more than silenced; with joyful adoring wonder he was fain to cry out, "My Lord and my God." Thus the risen Lord was obliged to convince His very friends, as well as enemies, of the reality of His resurrection. Their testimony has all the value of that of men convinced against the current of their opinions and beliefs.

And only such an event as the Resurrection can at all account for the subsequent history and the invincible life and power of Christianity. Had Christ died and disappeared like any ordinary man, we may be sure the Christian religion would have been a poor pietism, would have died out from the active forces of the world. It is utterly impossible that the Acts of the Apostles would have been done or written. Those great Christian heroes would have remained a poor, stricken, trembling band, never to be rallied from the dispersion caused by the cruel and ignominious death of their Master. The mighty movement which stirred the whole world, which overthrew the splendid idolatries of Greece and Rome, which in three centuries converted the civilized world through the zeal of martyr witnesses, would have been as great a miracle as the resurrection itself, had not Christ Himself risen. That Resurrection is the only adequate explanation of such a wonderful series of events in the world's history.

And the Resurrection of Christ is that one great event which, however surprising, would alone give congruity to the life and works of such a being. He who had so marvellous a beginning; who taught duty and morality and truth in such a matchless style of authority, simplicity and purity; who wrought, by His single word such mighty works, cleansing the leper, giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb; who cast out devils and raised the dead; who suffered Himself to be announced as the world's promised Redeemer and divine sacrifice, that He should die and pass away; that His body should see corruption; that He should share the common lot and never be heard of more, would be so out of all keeping as to mar irremediably the whole narrative. Beginning and middle would be discredited by such an end. Slow as His followers were to believe it, only a resurrection on the third day becomes the exalted Jesus, the Great Teacher, the mighty healer, the Redeemer of mankind.

The resignation of Dr. Adams, is at last a *fait accompli*. The congregation of North Broad St. Church, at their meeting of April 15th, refused to accept it, offered Dr. Adams six months, vacation, and promised to supply the pulpit, but Presbytery yielding to the serious representations made by Dr. Adams of the state of his health, as given by medical authority, agreed unanimously to consent to the dissolution of the relation. All parties are agreed that this is one of the sorest acts that Church or Presbytery have been called to perform for many years. Dr. Adams it is hoped will be in time to attend the Scottish Assemblies as a delegate from our own body to which service he has been invited by the Stated Clerk, Dr. Hatfield.