

The American Presbyterian.

New Series, Vol. 16 July 68
John A. Weir, V. No. 8.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1136.

\$3 00 By Mail. \$3 50 By Carrier.
50 Cts Additional after three Months.

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1868.

Ministers \$2.50 H. Miss. \$2.00.
Address:—1334 Chestnut Street.

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1868.

NEW AND OLD SCHOOL VIEW OF THE ATONEMENT—ITS NATURE.

We have already expressed more than sympathy with Prof. Hodge, in his exposure of the fallacy and unscripturalness of the so-called Moral Influence Theory. And we believe he will find the New School Church with him as a body, in rejecting any theory of the Atonement based upon mere benevolence in the divine nature. He will find us overwhelmingly, if not unanimously, with him in the belief that the atonement was designed, in some true sense, to satisfy justice as an ultimate principle of the divine nature. A great bugbear has been made of Taylorism in the New School Church, both in this volume, and in the July and January numbers of the *Princeton Review*. We believe there is about as much Taylorism in one branch as in the other; that is, next to none at all. And in regard to the claim put forth by T. G. Presbury, that the teachings of Dr. N. W. Taylor and Prof. Park be recognized as orthodox in the proposed united Church, it does not command our sympathy, and we doubt that it would have excited general surprise in the New School Church, if it had not been regarded as an offset to the exclusive and narrow policy, upon which many in the Old School branch were alone willing to have the reunion brought about. We shall be perfectly content with a policy broad enough to include the teachings of our own Theological Seminaries and our own leading theologians, without travelling into other denominations. And we think every Presbytery in our body will say the same thing when the time for saying it comes.

We are glad to have Prof. Hodge with the New School body also, in disavowing the commercial theory, and the absurd and immoral doctrine of a transfer of guilt from one person to another. Prof. Hodge's indignation that Mr. Barnes should quote the coarse bold language of Luther, on imputation, from the Commentary on Galatians, as showing to what results these extreme views legitimately lead, is a healthy symptom. And as to the idea of exacting the same sufferings from Christ as would have been the proper penalty of the law visited on sinners, this Old School professor denounces it as "outrageous injustice," as "an illegal violation of that absolute righteousness which is the principle of the law." The substitution of Christ, he says, "necessarily involves, as a matter of justice, the substitution of different kinds and degrees of suffering." In the following sentence, he comes so near Mr. Barnes' position, that the question is raised whether, like the comet of 1843 (was it?) he does not actually touch the sun. Sweeping towards that steady luminary, he says: "Christ suffered precisely that kind, duration and degree of suffering that the infinitely wise justice, or the absolutely just wisdom of God determined was a full equivalent for all that was demanded of elect sinners in person; equivalent we mean in respect to sin expiating, and justice satisfying efficacy—and a full equivalent in being of equal efficacy in these respects in strict rigor of justice; according to the judgment of God." Mr. Barnes, on page 247 of his book on the Atonement, speaks of two senses in which substitution is accomplished under the atonement. First, "In the fact that the undeserved and voluntary sufferings of one are in place of the deserved sufferings of another," and second, "in the nature of the sufferings endured; that his sufferings shall not be the same in kind or degree which the sufferings of the guilty themselves would have been, but of such a nature as to be a proper equivalent for them, or shall in the circumstances of the case, answer the same ends which would have been accomplished by those sufferings."

These two quotations are probably the most important that can be brought from either of the two books, to illustrate the relative views of the authors and the two schools on the nature of the atonement. Upon these two sentences hinges a great part of the controversy. Prof. Hodge and Mr. Barnes are so nearly alike, that it takes no small amount of analytic power to discern and render comprehensible to others the difference. The comet does not touch the sun, but the lustre of the two bodies is so intermingled that they may well be regarded as in contact. It is Prof. Hodge, however, who makes a great account of the difference, and we must follow him in an attempt to estimate its significance. The comet, for all its puzzling nearness to the sun, whirled around it, and sped away again, and will not be near the central luminary again for ages.

The difficulty arises from the fact, that Prof. Hodge insists on regarding Christ's sufferings as penal, nay more, as precisely the same with what his people would have suffered, when considered as penalty. They make up a penal quantity, which, by reason of the value of one of the factors,—the person of the substitute—is equal to, is precisely the same, as the sufferings, viewed as penalty, of the entire elect people. Now, Mr. Barnes and the New School would say equally with the Professor, that Christ's sufferings are in place of the sufferings of sinners; that they are an expression of God's hatred of sin, which he always shows by connecting it with suffering; that they are necessary before he can pardon sin; but that not being visited on the offender, they are not a punishment of sin, nor a penalty, nor the penalty for sin, but they are a substitute for the penalty of the law, which being voluntarily suffered by the Law-giver himself in the person of his Son, are seen and felt to be equivalent, as a proof of the divine abhorrence of sin, and of the divine faithfulness to law and government.

Let us repeat, for the point is vital: Both parties believe that the sufferings of Christ were endured in the place of sinners; sufferings endured because, and in place of, those owed by sinners to the law; that they are in place of those sufferings which all moral beings, divine, angelic and human, so far as we know, instinctively, i. e. for reasons which cannot be analyzed, demand of all offenders against the law. See Mr. Barnes' on the design of punishment, Atonement, pp. 193, 4, quoted with approval by Prof. Hodge, page 55; see also Barnes on the nature of the Atonement, pp. 252, 256. And here it is well to note the fact that Mr. Barnes parts company with the advocates of the Governmental Theory, although Prof. Hodge with an unparadonable disregard of facts which he himself had elsewhere noted, classes him, pp. 341, 2, with the advocates of this theory. Indeed, on page 351, he declares that "Barnes" with several others, "materially departs from the true faith as to the nature of the Atonement." Of course it was necessary that such a terrible charge should be sustained with some show of argument, if it were only to link his name with a school of known inadequate views. (See also page 39, where he even associates Mr. Barnes with the Socinians.) But Prof. Hodge knows perfectly well that Mr. Barnes' views differ, on an essential point, from the Governmental Theory. That Theory, in the very first lines in which it is described in Prof. Hodge's book, page 327, "places the necessity of the Atonement of Christ in the exigencies of God's moral Government; not in the demands of an involuntary organic emotion of retributive justice common to God and man." Prof. Hodge's own quotations show how wide apart from this view of punishment is Mr. Barnes'. Let us add a few quotations of our own, from page 194 of Mr. Barnes' book: "There is, back of any idea of... protecting the community, the feeling that it is right that the offender should be made to suffer. . . . When we see a man justly punished, we think of this not as . . . designed to protect the community, but we think of him as suffering that which our nature tells us is right, whatever may be the consequences in these other respects. We rejoice in the belief that these incidental effects will follow from the infliction of the punishment, but we should regard it as a violation of justice if these views should guide the Magistrate in determining the amount of punishment; that is, if it were only so much as would best tend to reform the offender, or to deter others, or to protect the community. We demand something more; we demand that which will, in some proper sense, express what the crime deserves." We contend that these extracts put an impassable barrier between Mr. Barnes and the Taylorite view of the Atonement. Mr. Barnes and the New School generally, to the best of our knowledge and belief, cleave to those healthful doctrines, now so widely impugned, on which alone the majesty and supremacy of all-law, divine and human, rest. They hold that justice, in itself considered, demands suffering for sin, and that therefore Christ had to suffer before the sinner could be pardoned.

Now Prof. Hodge insists that we shall call the sufferings of Christ, thus put in place of sinners, penal, nay "precisely the very penalty of the law," pp. 168; although admitting, in the same breath, that the sufferings of Christ are different in quantity and quality from those of the sinner. Mr. Barnes and the New School believe that sufferings which are different in quantity and quality from those of the sinner, cannot with any propriety be called, like those, penal: they would say with Prof. Hodge, "that all which the law, in strict rigor of justice demands on the account of our sins," is rendered by the sufferings of Christ "accepted instead of ours," but they prefer to say that these sufferings of Christ

are not a substituted penalty, but a substitute for the penalty. They press Prof. Hodge with the difficulty, how any suffering can be a penalty which is not visited on the offender himself, in the kind and degree contemplated by law; he, in turn asks, how anything but penalty can answer the demands of justice? Prof. Hodge's answer to our question we shall notice hereafter. Mr. Barnes' answer to the question, how sufferings, which are not penal, can accomplish the ends of penalty, is substantially a confession of ignorance; such as Prof. Hodge is compelled to make, after going but a single step further in his theory. Mr. Barnes introduces the inquirer asking: "What after all is the value of such sufferings? What is their exact bearing?" and he himself puts the question: "What is the bearing of suffering at all? What, in any case, is its exact value?" Instead of answering which he says: "Perhaps, it may yet be found, to be true, that the principle which would show the connection in any case, between suffering and the Divine favor, might explain all the essential principles and remove all the material difficulties in the doctrine of the Atonement." Mr. Barnes, after making a perfectly safe statement of the nature of the Atonement, and answering all the demands of Scripture, pauses out of pure regard to the necessary limits of human knowledge and a sense of the danger, in theology, of pressing beyond them.

The dilemma in which Prof. Hodge is placed, that of making the sufferings of a perfectly sinless, infinitely holy, being, penal, "precisely the very penalty of the law," is avoided in a way to separate him widely from Mr. Barnes and ourselves. It is here that the comet appears again distinct from the sun, with which it seemed to blend, and sweeps away with ominous rush into the regions of a cheerless high "orthodoxy." We shall try to follow it telescopically, next week.

IMPEACHMENT AT LAST.

At length the great patience and forbearance of the thirty-ninth and fortieth Congress towards Andrew Johnson is exhausted. For nearly three years he has been taking the part of the subdued rebellion, and has been laboring to nullify its overthrow. There has, perhaps, always in that time, been a large majority in Congress who believed his impeachment justifiable and desirable; but it was felt to be such a serious matter, and so many other interests demanded legislation, that it was on the whole thought best to tolerate Mr. Johnson as the less evil of the two. Over and over again we have been amazed at this forbearance. Over and over again we have suppressed our indignation and declined to agitate the matter in our columns, because we supposed good and true men in Congress, feeling just as we did, and knowing vastly more, might and ought to be trusted entirely with the decision of so grave and so unprecedented a matter. Yet look at a hasty summary of the acts of this extraordinary man, any one of which almost would seem to contain matter of formal indictment:

He was scandalously and infamously intoxicated when sworn into the office of Vice President. He is guilty of the attempt to bring back rebel agency in the South, as it existed before the war, and of hindering with all his might a restoration on the principle that the rebellion had failed and loyalty and justice had triumphed. He has planted himself obstinately in the way of the national progress in the line of justice and equality to all men, and has labored with all his might to cherish and strengthen the existing prejudice of race and color. He made loud professions of extreme radicalism in order to gain the opportunity to betray the loyal cause.

He is guilty of more than treason in the attempt, which has been the ruling principle of his office, to make treason honorable and loyalty disgraceful. He never attempted to bring to justice a single traitor as such; but among his earliest acts was to pardon unrepentant rebels in multitudes. He has pardoned alarming numbers of high criminals; as counterfeiters and mail robbers; he has made the forms of justice a mockery, in one instance, in which the accused had the President's pardon in his pocket when brought to the bar for trial.

He has dispensed pardons through prostitutes and the vilest characters. He has removed men from office for no other reason than that they were too loyal for his purposes, and too zealous to execute the laws, which he was determined to override. When he dared not violate the law himself, he has sought to corrupt the highest officials in the army, and make them tools of his purposes. He has put such creatures of his into the revenue service, that the

country could not have peace, and he, therefore, hoped that this resolution would be acted upon with dispatch and unanimity. James Brooks was the champion of the President, but weakened the cause by his wild and extravagant threats. He had been in consultation with Judge Woodward and Senator Buckalew, and had made a diligent use of law books up to the time of taking the floor, but in his speech, seemed to be more under the inspiration of such spirits as Henry Clay Dean or Brick Pomeroy. His protestations that he "never, never, never would submit," and threats that "the thousands and tens of thousands, and millions of Democrats" would rise in their might, were received with derisive laughter. He was pale with excitement, and looked, after he sat down and considered more coolly what he had said, ashamed of himself. The defence of the President has been very weak, and has revealed the fact that this act has taken the Democrats as much by surprise as it did the Republicans, that it is indefensible, and that they are not willing to assume the responsibility of it. One of the best lawyers on that side admitted all this in a conversation on Saturday. Some of them are very angry, and declare that this one thing has thrown the country into the hands of the extreme Radicals and confirmed every position they have taken. One thing is quite evident, the most quiet and assured men here now are such men as Stevens, Boutwell, Logan, Kelly, Sumner, Butler, Wade and Morton.

The scene in the House when the resolution was presented on Saturday will be a memorable one to all who were permitted to witness it. Almost every member was in his place, Senators and other distinguished men crowded the lobbies, from the galleries three thousand people looked down with eager interest, while hundreds in the halls, goaded on by exaggerated rumors of what was transpiring within, pressed upon each other at the doorway. The regular business was dropped, and in Committee of the whole when Thaddeus Stevens rose and laid two thin papers on his desk. It is felt that the hour looked for has come at last, the Committee rises, the Speaker assumes his place, announces the rules of the House with respect to demonstrations of applause or disapprobation, and gives the floor to the "gentleman from Pennsylvania." Mr. Stevens, pale and very feeble, takes the floor, while in breathless silence all wait to hear his words. He announces a brief report and a resolution from the Reconstruction Committee, which he sends to the Clerk to be read; these he submits to the House without debate reserving the right to express his views before the vote is taken. Then follows the close of the afternoon, the test of the spirit of the House is made in the attempt to fix the time for a vote on the resolution. It is found that all dilatory motions, objections and filibusterings are as "great with," to that determination which presses straight to the conclusion of the matter, and by unanimous consent it is decided, that after debate through Saturday evening and Monday, the vote shall be taken at five o'clock on the latter day. This first scene foreshadows the end; the President, for some unaccountable reason, has persisted in butting his head against the wall and at last he has destroyed himself.

Meantime, Mr. Stanton holds his place and has not left the War Office day or night, while Adjutant Gen. Thomas, who has filled the air with noisy threats that he would take possession by force, is arrested and put under \$15,000 bonds to appear in Court next Wednesday to answer for the violation of law in attempting to assume the Office of Secretary of War, and the War Department is guarded by soldiers.

The President continues his garrulous talks with newspaper correspondents in which he appears very valiant, but his acts do not follow up and support the defiant removal of Mr. Stanton. It may be that the reply of Gen. George Thomas to the nomination to the place offered to Sherman a week ago declining the honor, or the reply of Gen. Emory in coming to the aid of the District, "You cannot use me," or the attitude of Congress, or the telegram to Congress from Governors Ogelsby and Geary promising support, or the failure to make a favorable impression upon the Democratic Nominating Committee now here, or the fact that none of "the thousands and tens of thousands, &c.," promised by Mr. Brooks, except Alderman McMullen of the Fourth Ward of Philadelphia, seem ready to "come in their might"—it may be that some one or all of these reasons have influenced the President in sending in the name of Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, to be Secretary of War, and in claiming that his intention has only been to gain possession of the post folio of War by civil process.

As I write, Mr. Stevens is closing the debate in the House. Members leave their seats a flock around him. By many it is felt that this may be his last speech, so feeble does he appear, and his words fall with great solemnity on all. At once when he closes, the vote is taken and the Articles of Impeachment are sent to the Senate, only forty-seven [the correspondent writes 42 on the exterior of his envelope, in an unusually full house, voting against them. To-morrow the time for trial will be set, and the President cited to appear. If it be done, "twere well that it be done quickly." FRANKLIN.

AFFAIRS AT THE CAPITAL.

WASHINGTON, February 24, 1868.

I wrote you a week ago that impeachment had been killed again, and then little dreamed that we were on the eve of an excitement on that very subject, such as has not been felt since the assassination of Lincoln. But impeachment has come again, and this time has come to stay till Andrew Johnson ceases to be President of the United States. The conclusion seems foregone, and is looked upon by every one as a certainty. The issue is a clear and simple one. The President, in defiance of a law, passed over his veto, and recognized as a law by himself in his previous suspension of Secretary Stanton and the assignment of reasons therefor, has removed Mr. Stanton during a session of Congress, and appointed his successor. The view taken of this act by the Senate, which is to sit as the jury in his trial, may be inferred from the passage of the law itself last summer by more than a two-thirds vote, by the restoration of Mr. Stanton to his place after his suspension, and by the resolution of Friday, declaring this new act without authority of law, by a vote of more than four to one. The Senators abstain, as in duty bound, from expressions outside, but it is well known that the resolution of Friday commanded the vote of the best lawyers of that body: Trumbull, Fessenden and Conkling.

No one present in the House on Saturday, when the resolution was presented to impeach the President "for high crimes and misdemeanors" could question the certainty that a bill would be carried to the Senate. The resolution was signed by all the Republican members of the Reconstruction Committee, even by those who have ridiculed the possibility of such a step, and was advocated, with great force, by the two most conservative Republicans—Spalding and Bingham. The speech of Judge Spalding was listened to with marked attention, and was regarded as assuring the vote. He referred, with great feeling, to his past course in the matter, and the full determination he had, had to resist every such measure; but declared that his conviction now was, that so long as Congress submitted to having its laws trampled upon

the country could not have peace, and he, therefore, hoped that this resolution would be acted upon with dispatch and unanimity. James Brooks was the champion of the President, but weakened the cause by his wild and extravagant threats. He had been in consultation with Judge Woodward and Senator Buckalew, and had made a diligent use of law books up to the time of taking the floor, but in his speech, seemed to be more under the inspiration of such spirits as Henry Clay Dean or Brick Pomeroy. His protestations that he "never, never, never would submit," and threats that "the thousands and tens of thousands, and millions of Democrats" would rise in their might, were received with derisive laughter. He was pale with excitement, and looked, after he sat down and considered more coolly what he had said, ashamed of himself. The defence of the President has been very weak, and has revealed the fact that this act has taken the Democrats as much by surprise as it did the Republicans, that it is indefensible, and that they are not willing to assume the responsibility of it. One of the best lawyers on that side admitted all this in a conversation on Saturday. Some of them are very angry, and declare that this one thing has thrown the country into the hands of the extreme Radicals and confirmed every position they have taken. One thing is quite evident, the most quiet and assured men here now are such men as Stevens, Boutwell, Logan, Kelly, Sumner, Butler, Wade and Morton.

The scene in the House when the resolution was presented on Saturday will be a memorable one to all who were permitted to witness it. Almost every member was in his place, Senators and other distinguished men crowded the lobbies, from the galleries three thousand people looked down with eager interest, while hundreds in the halls, goaded on by exaggerated rumors of what was transpiring within, pressed upon each other at the doorway. The regular business was dropped, and in Committee of the whole when Thaddeus Stevens rose and laid two thin papers on his desk. It is felt that the hour looked for has come at last, the Committee rises, the Speaker assumes his place, announces the rules of the House with respect to demonstrations of applause or disapprobation, and gives the floor to the "gentleman from Pennsylvania." Mr. Stevens, pale and very feeble, takes the floor, while in breathless silence all wait to hear his words. He announces a brief report and a resolution from the Reconstruction Committee, which he sends to the Clerk to be read; these he submits to the House without debate reserving the right to express his views before the vote is taken. Then follows the close of the afternoon, the test of the spirit of the House is made in the attempt to fix the time for a vote on the resolution. It is found that all dilatory motions, objections and filibusterings are as "great with," to that determination which presses straight to the conclusion of the matter, and by unanimous consent it is decided, that after debate through Saturday evening and Monday, the vote shall be taken at five o'clock on the latter day. This first scene foreshadows the end; the President, for some unaccountable reason, has persisted in butting his head against the wall and at last he has destroyed himself.

Meantime, Mr. Stanton holds his place and has not left the War Office day or night, while Adjutant Gen. Thomas, who has filled the air with noisy threats that he would take possession by force, is arrested and put under \$15,000 bonds to appear in Court next Wednesday to answer for the violation of law in attempting to assume the Office of Secretary of War, and the War Department is guarded by soldiers.

The President continues his garrulous talks with newspaper correspondents in which he appears very valiant, but his acts do not follow up and support the defiant removal of Mr. Stanton. It may be that the reply of Gen. George Thomas to the nomination to the place offered to Sherman a week ago declining the honor, or the reply of Gen. Emory in coming to the aid of the District, "You cannot use me," or the attitude of Congress, or the telegram to Congress from Governors Ogelsby and Geary promising support, or the failure to make a favorable impression upon the Democratic Nominating Committee now here, or the fact that none of "the thousands and tens of thousands, &c.," promised by Mr. Brooks, except Alderman McMullen of the Fourth Ward of Philadelphia, seem ready to "come in their might"—it may be that some one or all of these reasons have influenced the President in sending in the name of Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, to be Secretary of War, and in claiming that his intention has only been to gain possession of the post folio of War by civil process.

As I write, Mr. Stevens is closing the debate in the House. Members leave their seats a flock around him. By many it is felt that this may be his last speech, so feeble does he appear, and his words fall with great solemnity on all. At once when he closes, the vote is taken and the Articles of Impeachment are sent to the Senate, only forty-seven [the correspondent writes 42 on the exterior of his envelope, in an unusually full house, voting against them. To-morrow the time for trial will be set, and the President cited to appear. If it be done, "twere well that it be done quickly." FRANKLIN.