

# The American Presbyterian.

New Series, Vol. V, John A. Weir 16 July 68

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1137.

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

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1868.

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

## American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1868.

### LIMITED ATONEMENT TAUGHT BY PROF. HODGE.

We left Prof. Hodge involved in the difficulty arising from ascribing a penal quality to the sufferings of the perfectly innocent, infinitely holy Redeemer; a difficulty which New School men are not forced upon them by Scripture or by the Confession of Faith, and which, to their minds, conveys an immoral idea. They hold, and they think it sufficient to hold, that the sufferings of Christ are in place of the sufferings of the sinner; are intended to express and to express God's sense of the heinousness of sin, inasmuch as He himself suffered in place of sinners, before he would pardon them. These sufferings are not the penalty for sin; they are not called in the Bible or the Confession of Faith, and they can only, by a very great accommodation of language, be called penance, because they answer all the ends of penalty. Perhaps we ought to waive our philological scruples for the sake of peace, and stretch a word out of shape to aid in Re-union. After all, it is only necessary to understand one another, if a different acceptance of terms is all that separates us. And sometimes, as we read this treatise, we are surprised to find how near the views of both branches are together, how purely verbal, sometimes, the differences appear. But, as we continue, we observe a re-appearance of the high orthodoxy, a comparison with which, Prof. Hodge finds fault with Calvin, with Augustine—sometimes faultily, according to the Professor, of using "infinite language, after the familiar example of Scripture,"—not to mention the Bible itself, whose very language, almost, the Professor seems displeased with (page 378).\*

The Professor's statement of his doctrine is found, among other places, on pages 308 and 9; where he says: "It must be conceded by all that justice cannot demand and exact the punishment of a sin upon any party that is not truly and really responsible for it, and that the sins of one person cannot really be expiated by the sufferings of another, unless they be in such a sense legally one that in the judgment of the law, the suffering of the one is the suffering of the other. Now the Eternal Logos, in council with the Father and Holy Ghost assumed the responsibility of the federal relations of his elect to the law from all eternity. They were created and permitted to fall to the end of their redemption in Christ." Again, page 312; where note the exclusive tone of the statement: "The Church doctrine always has been simply that the legal responsibilities (penal and federal) of his people were, by covenant, transferred to Christ, and that he, as Mediator, was regarded and treated accordingly. The obligation to punishment, according to the terms of the eternal covenant, has been taken from the elect and fully discharged in the sufferings of our Substitute."

That there is an ineffable, mystical union between Christ and his people, be it far from us to question or deny. That through that union the Atonement becomes Redemption,—is realized to his people, is very probably the fact. But that there is any necessity for the Princeton and very modern notion of a "federal headship" we deny. Or, if it be admitted that the language of Scripture and of the Confession in regard to the Covenants virtually justifies the use of the technical term *federal*, which they never use,—no more than they do *penal* and *penalty* of Christ's sufferings—it must be pronounced unsatisfactory as a final explanation of the grounds of the efficacy of Christ's sufferings. It is a contrivance to make Christ guilty and to prove his sufferings for sin a just punishment. Christ becomes so truly one with his people, that their guilt and just liability to punishment become his, although without a transfer of character. The legal relations of the two parties are identical. How all this can be, without going the length of Realism,—which Prof. Hodge earnestly repudiates,—or without making Christ as great a sinner as Luther's bold representations—which are equally distasteful to our author; in short, how Prof. Hodge's theory escapes the opprobrium of the transfer dogma, he himself virtually confesses that he cannot explain. He admits ignorance as truly, if not as unhesitatingly, as Mr. Barnes. He says, in answer to the objection

\* In this remarkable passage, the Professor arguing against a general Atonement says: "It represents God as willing at the same time that all men be saved, and that only the elect be saved." Who does not call to mind, with a start, the words of Peter 3: 9, "Not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." We doubt whether these words are among the proofs of the Calvinistic or Reformed doctrine corresponding to them is taught at either place.

that [retributive] justice cannot be satisfied by vicarious suffering: "We have admitted, that this is the precise point in which the Scriptural doctrine of the Atonement transcends human reason. But the whole difficulty lies in our inability to discern fully the grounds upon which the legal oneness of Christ and his people depend."

Now it seems to us a species of speculative trifling, to involve oneself thus more deeply in theories, which do not solve anything, which do not save us from the confession of ignorance, which, in fact, are themselves new difficulties added to a subject already sufficiently involved. And when such theories are thrust upon us, by all the air of final authority, as exclusively the Church doctrine; as tests of orthodoxy; as barriers to a great re-union movement of the Presbyterian Church, we think it almost to speak too severely of author and publishers alike.

And granting the possibility of a federal headship of Christ and of Adam for holding, which, modestly, as a possible, or even, a probable truth, we shall find fault with no one inside or outside of the Presbyterian Church, why produce it as the essential ground and solution of the Atonement, as the only view in which a vicarious atonement can be seen, to answer the ends of justice? Why claim that only as God sees in Christ literally his elect people, he can justly accept his sufferings as equivalent to theirs? We can account for it, only on the ground of what we have termed the rationalism of modern dogmatizers in the Church; the passion, we mean, for a complete logical system of doctrine which is to be installed as authority over the Church; the denial, doubt, or question of any one point of which is to be denounced as heresy. The Federal Headship of Christ is the correlate of Federal Headship of Adam: Those who teach the latter doctrine are so well pleased with it that they must, fair apply it to the Atonement. It is the universal solvent of difficulties in Anthropology and Soteriology. The analogies and illustrations of Scripture are interpreted as logical statements, and the doctrine is triumphantly declared proved by the Bible, and thus a theological novelty of the seventeenth century is presented as the only orthodox doctrine.

The final, conclusive objection to this dogma of federal headship is, that a limited atonement is its necessary logical consequence. To say that the union of the elect with the Saviour is necessary to their redemption; or that some such union is necessary to give efficacy to the Atonement, is to assert nothing which any evangelical Christian would deny; but to say that the reality of Christ's work, the possibility of its acceptance before the law, its whole virtue as an atonement or satisfaction depends on the Saviour's identification with those whose sins are actually expiated, so that the penalty of their sins can in strict justice be demanded of Him, is not merely to make the Atonement efficacious for them, but to confine its relations, as an atonement, strictly and wholly to them. It can have no reference, as such, to any but those by identification with whom it has any virtue at all—it becomes what it is. No sins can possibly be regarded as atoned for, but those of the persons with whom the Saviour was federally united. Justice is not satisfied in regard to any others. The penalty of no others is paid. Outside the strictly marked line of the elect, there is no provision for the salvation of a single soul of man. It is a case of personal substitution. My substitute went to the wars for me and for no one else. He may have fought with a valor more than human. He may have done the work of a company or a regiment. He may have been in god in disguise, and put to flight whole armies of the enemy. But he went in my stead only, and the law makes my liberation only, from military service, possible on his account. The whole community, may mankind may be benefited through his victories in a general way, but as a substitute for military service it is absurd to speak of his benefiting any who were not put in personal relations to him. His substitution, as such, is utterly, valueless, meaningless, except with reference to those with whom he is legally associated. It is this legal association, in fact, which makes him a substitute.

That alone, which according to Prof. Hodge makes Christ's atonement to be an atonement, also makes it a limited Atonement. It is only as it is limited to the elect that it is an atonement. This, we say, is the legitimate, unavoidable inference from the doctrine that the Federal Headship of the Redeemer is necessary to make his sufferings penal, and Prof. Hodge has already insisted that his sufferings must be penal in order to their having any expiatory virtue at all. Limited Atonement and Federal Headship are logically inseparable. We shall show how

Prof. Hodge unasily endeavors to get away from this conclusion in our next.

### STILL MORE ADHERENTS OF THE CANDID POLICY.

The able quarterly of our Church, *The American Presbyterian and Theological Review*, although singularly opposed to any doctrinal discussion of the points at issue between the Old and New School bodies, has in the number for January frankly avowed those differences. It plants itself on the platform for which we have ever contended; Reunion only after, and upon the full admission of differences and the clearest statement of what those differences really are; and no Reunion upon the grossly mistaken supposition that we do think alike. Its friends are, rather those who endeavor to explain the nature and significance of our differences, than those who would stifle all discussion on the subject. And when such a cordial Reunion is brought about, the services of those, who, in the face of some opposition and distrust, insisted on such discussions, will be recognized, if not before. The *Review* says:

"We were asked if we agreed entirely, on all points, with the Old School theology; and we frankly said, that there are three points, on which we suppose that there is a theoretical, but not an essential difference, viz., immediate imputation, unqualified inability, and a limited atonement. Here we agree in the substantives and differ in the adjectives; we say immediate imputation, moral inability, and a general atonement with a specific redemption."

"We have nothing to keep back. We want to be, we ought in such matters to be, entirely frank. But, we also mean, if possible, not to be misunderstood. We mean that this reunion shall not be prevented by any fault of ours. And therefore, we have tried to remove misunderstandings, to explain our exact position, to repel decisively unjust accusations, and to make no accusation in return. If the Old School reject reunion, it shall not be so far as we can help it, by ascribing to us principles which we reject and doctrines which we condemn."

To this we may add Dr. Francis's declaration in a letter to the *Presbyter* of February 5th. Referring to Dr. Hodge's two articles of July and January, he says:

"Anxious as we are to have the reproach of disunion rolled away, and the breach of thirty years repaired, we are not willing to have it effected by a misunderstanding of our true position. We wish it to be understood that we are now what we were last July; and what we have all along been."

### RESUM TENEANTIS, AMICI.

Our excellent cotemporary, the *Presbyterian Banner*, of Pittsburgh, tries to get away from our charge of rationalistic tendencies in Dr. Hodge's book, by calling it a "huge joke." If it be so, the readers of the *Banner* should be congratulated for having such a full quotation from our article, as it is a larger installment of the joke, than they are apt to find in the very respectable columns of our Pittsburgh cotemporary.

Readers of the quotation in the *Banner* will observe that our charge of rationalistic tendencies against Prof. Hodge, was in response to one of exactly the same import, brought by the Professor (on page 342 of his book) against Mr. Barnes, on no better grounds than we had for ours against Dr. Hodge, if so good. Now we will call this fair; if the *Banner*, which seems to speak for Prof. Hodge by authority, will assure us that the Professor meant his assertion in regard to Mr. Barnes as a "HUGE JOKE," we will agree to consider our charge in precisely the same light; and we will pronounce it fortunate if charges of such a serious character against men of such standing in the Church, can thus be smiled away.

But surely the *Banner* itself must have caught the trick of joking, when it says that we call the Princeton Theology "pitiless Hegelianism." We simply, by a process of "analogical reasoning" compared its dialectical spirit, not its subject-matter, to Hegelianism. It may take something clearer than the daylight they have in Third St., Pittsburgh, but it certainly will require no spectacles, to see that this is absolutely all that was contained in our article.

But there is also a very serious side to the *Banner's* attempt at a joke. It is seen (1.) in the claim made in this article that the doctrine of Prof. Hodge's book "is simply the doctrine of the Westminster standards in their true historical &c. the Calvinistic or Reformed sense;" in other words, if we do not accept the teaching of Prof. Hodge, and of Princeton on the Atonement, we do not accept the Westminster standards,—we are outside the Calvinistic or Reformed Church,—we are heretics. This, let us observe, is from a paper regarded as liberal (*sit venia verbo*) among Old School organs. Our readers may

see, what they are to expect from the "liberal" wing of the O. S. Church, if the *Banner* represents that wing. 2. Still more serious and more extraordinary is the idea running through the article, that, because we oppose Prof. Hodge's book, we oppose Reunion. This is an entirely new phase of the agitation for Reunion. There is a measure of impudence in it approaching the sublime. Reunion men in both branches learn what is the measure, not only of orthodoxy but of Reunionism. It is subscription, not to the Confession, not to the Joint Committee's plan, not to the Philadelphia Basis, but to Prof. Hodge's book on the Atonement!

### AFFAIRS AT THE CAPITAL.

There is full expectation here, that the required two-thirds majority of the Senate will vote for impeachment. The facts are open and notorious. The breach of law was made in the most flagrant manner, right in the face of Congress, while both houses were in session, and it would be a most extraordinary thing if the President by any trickery, technicality or treachery escaped conviction. The President and his friends are claiming that Fessenden, Trumbull, Anthony, Sprague, Willey, Tipton, and Van Winkle, will vote against impeachment and thus defeat it. The only ground for the expectation that I can learn is, that these Senators were not satisfied with the election of Ben Wade to the Presidency of the Senate, and consequently, are not willing to engage in an act that will make him President of the United States. That case must be desperate that rests on such expectations.

It is proclaimed too, that enough Republican Senators can be bribed to prevent conviction. I have heard no names in this connection, and do not believe a single candidate for such infamy can be named. I do not believe there is reasonable ground to suspect that any Republican will fail or flinch in this crisis, and surely none of them can doubt that the people they represent, demand that Andrew Johnson be removed, and his power to disgrace and to injure us be shorn away. It were better a thousand times that impeachment had never been undertaken than that it should fail, for in that case the man who has done so much mischief would stand before the country triumphant, and would be incited to fresh deeds of lawlessness. I believe but a few days intervene between us and peace; law is to be sustained; the single man who stands in the way is to be removed; and the long agitation about reconstruction is to be ended.

Report has it this morning that Secretary McCulloch and the President have quarreled—the Secretary insisting upon his right to make changes in the New York custom-house, and the President upon his determination to interfere. The President finding McCulloch falling in subservience, is said to have exclaimed in rage: "Whom can I trust?"

All parties disclaim any previous knowledge of the last brilliant stroke of the President. His own Cabinet say they knew nothing of it. One of the chief members of the Democratic National Committee has said, "If he had hinted that such a game was on foot, we should have protested against it warmly enough." Judge Black, who is supposed to be chief mover in the President's plans, is reported to have said, "The papers talk about me as the President's chief adviser. That is all humbug; he rarely follows my advice; if he did, he would not make such a fool of himself so often." Et tu Brute!

While the public is excited by the topic of the day, and Congress is pressing it to its conclusion, the business of the Session is advancing as rapidly as usual. The House has been busy with the appropriation Bills which seldom come up earlier than this. The Senate has rejected Wise, and Rollins, remains Commissioner of the Revenue. The Senate hope by evening sessions to keep the impeachment trial from stopping or interfering with the regular order of business.

FENWICK.

PAUL NOT OPPOSED TO GYMNASTICS.—His expression, "Bodily exercise profiteth little" is sometimes quoted as if he were opposed. In the *Herold of Health* for February, Moses Coit Tyler says: "Everything turns upon the meaning of the phrase, which our translators have rendered 'bodily exercise.' Does that mean gymnastic bodily exercise? Not necessarily. If you will refer to Dr. Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, you will find that he translates the phrase 'ascetic training.' That is undoubtedly what the Apostle meant,—that ascetic bodily discipline was not good for much. Turn to our honest, sensible American commentator, Albert Barnes, and see what he says. In his note on this passage he uses these words: 'Bodily exercise, here refers, doubtless, to the mortification

of the body by abstinence and penance which the ancient devotees, and particularly the Essenes, made so important a part of their religion.' You see, therefore, that the verse has nothing more to do with gymnastics than it has with sawing wood, hoeing corn, or splitting rails."

RELIGIOUS PUBLICATION SOCIETIES.—With such a book in our hands as Bowen's *Daily Meditations*, (an issue of our Presbyterian Publication Committee), we often think of the great service rendered to evangelical literature by the Church or other Christian enterprises, devoted solely to the publication and circulation of religious works. Houses which carry on the work of publishing as a merely secular enterprise, make the question of a ready sale the first and last, concerning any proposed reprint or manuscript. It is true a conscientious private publisher, of whom we have many noble examples, will not throw a demoralizing book upon the community merely because there is money in it; but on the other hand he will not take up a good book merely on its own merits, and then apply the energy of his house to the work of bringing it before the people, and making it in the end popular for its own sake—popular in the Christian sense of the word. It must carry on its face some of the more obvious attractions, or if its excellencies lie deeper, it must appear under some name which publishers have found a remunerating one, or it will find its way to the waste-basket. The Church, propagating a sanctified literature through its publishing Committees, Boards, or Societies, inquires not so much whether a book will have a ready run, as whether it ought to go. It is true that even here, the question whether an edition will pay for itself, cannot be overlooked. The Church has not yet been sufficiently munificent in this line, to justify its publishing agencies to be reckless on the question of ultimate remuneration; still the whole arrangement is conducted on the principle of subordinating that question to the higher object of overspreading the land with the best religious reading, securing for it the attention of all serious minds, and teaching the people to value, for the sake of the treasures of good which are really in them, books whose very excellencies might otherwise have insured them oblivion. These *Daily Meditations*, which have been the companion of many of our closet hours, we should perhaps have never seen but for this Church agency. So with other works rich with the vitalities of the Christian life. A private publisher would have dismissed them with his doubt whether they would take with the public. The Church, through its appropriate agency, said, they ought to, and they must take. And so they do take, and will.

Lippincott's new Magazine, the only literary monthly in our city, and therefore a matter of peculiar solicitude to all who seek the infusion of a higher degree of literary interest in our business and manufacturing circles, is now in its third number and constantly shows improvement. "Lippincott" is nothing if not respectable. Indeed, from appearances in the first number, it was feared the magazine would die quickly of its eminent respectability. Now, while we would greatly deplore death or atrophy from such a ridiculous cause, we should deplore even more such a want of real Christian respectability as some departments of the magazine are apparently coming to. There are indications that whatever has literary merit, even if serious objections may lie against it from a moral point of view, will receive the approval of its critics and be aided to notoriety by their laudatory notices. Now as some of the most venomous pen-poison of the day is conveyed in the most meritorious and fascinating literary forms, we fear that, on the principle above mentioned, Lippincott's will become the vehicle of this pen-poison to its readers. Those opening to the "Monthly Gossip" will understand our remark, when they observe that among the first matters which attract the pleased attention of the critic are the editions of Walt Whitman and Swinburne's Poetry, but to appear in England. Of the latter, whose genius is as much greater as his swinish propensities are baser than Lord Byron's, the critic says: "Mr. Swinburne, we are glad to hear, has several works in progress." Of Walt Whitman on whom the critic gossips at great length, it is sufficient to say that he is even more infernally than Swinburne.

We earnestly hope for the good name of our comparatively pure city; the managers will see fit to change the policy of their monthly in this vitally important particular.

Revival Intelligence to a greater extent than in any previous issue this season, will be found in our columns for this week. The Churches of the other branch are specially blessed.