

The American Presbyterian.

John Weir 16 July 68

New Series, Vol. V, No. 11.

Genesee Evangelist, No. 1138.

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

PHILADELPHIA, THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1868.

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

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1868.

QUALIFICATIONS OF A LIMITED ATONEMENT.

While, therefore, we do exceedingly blame the Westminster divines for being silent on the great head of orthodox doctrine, the redemption of all mankind, and of all the material creation, out of the hands of Satan and his wicked angels, which is the very basis of all orthodox truth, the ground whereon God and the sinner meet; we will not allow these divines to be stigmatized by their indiscreet admirers, as if they had gainsaid the most precious of all the truths of Holy Scripture, denied the love of God to all men and every man, denied the work of Christ for all men and every man. No; the Westminster divines have enough to bear already for bringing in such a dogmatical confession of faith, and for seeking agreement at the expense of being silent on a great fundamental truth of the gospel; let them not be accused of overturning the foundation. — *Edwards Tring's Notes on the Standards of the Church of Scotland.*

The remarks which we propose to make in the following paragraphs on some accounts had doubtless better be omitted. The inconsistencies of some men, it is well known, are their saving features. Instead of exposing their inconsistencies, it would perhaps be more judicious to hide them. If they are made to appear too plainly, they may be amended and the advantage of them be lost. It is better, however, in the long run, that the policy of candor be pursued, even if the advantage at first seems to be in another direction. Only let it be understood that our aim is, not to put blame on Prof. Hodge for coming so close to our ground, in many places, but to show that his system does not bring him there; and that, as a consistent dogmatist, he must, and on the whole, he does, stick to the doctrine of a Limited Atonement.

On page 243, the Professor says: "The penal satisfaction made by the sufferings of Christ to the law and justice of God is, in its own intrinsic value a full equivalent in the strict rigor of justice for the penal sufferings of all men forever." Further down, on the same page, the assertion is made, in a hypothetical form, with, however, a positive meaning, "that the atonement consisted in Christ's bearing in our [the elects'] stead, the literal penalty of the law in full rigor." On the next page, we are informed that "the intrinsic value of his work is not equal to all that his people could have suffered," and yet, in the next sentence, we read of the difficulty which a Christian experiences in understanding "why infinite wisdom saw it to be necessary to exact so much of such a sufferer." A difficulty not likely to suggest itself to any but a believer in the commercial or limited view of Christ's work. Page 308: "Since then the work of Christ is exactly adapted to the legal relations and needs of each, and since it is abundantly sufficient for all, and since, in perfect good faith, it is offered to all men indiscriminately, it necessarily follows that whosoever believes on Him, non-elect (if that were subjectively possible) just as truly as the elect, would find a perfect atonement and cordial welcome ready for him whenever he comes." Nobly spoken! Welcome to any New School pulpit for the utterance of such views! Yet twelve pages afterwards comes the stunning statement that "it is certain Christ died in order to secure the salvation of the elect, and not in order to make the salvation of all men possible." But if Christ did not die for this end, is it true that the salvation of all men is possible; and if the salvation of all men is not possible, is it fair or honest to offer salvation to all men? Can the offer of a salvation which is not possible be made in good faith?

Again, on page 415, we are told that, among other things designed to be accomplished by the death of Christ, "was to lay in the perfect sufficiency of the atonement for all, and its exact adaptation to each, a real foundation for the bona fide offer of salvation to all men indiscriminately on the condition of faith," and yet he immediately goes on to say, as if alarmed at the admission he has made, "The design has the elect for its sole, ultimate end,—the pointing is his own,—and it in any way respects the non-elect only as it necessarily involves the bringing to bear upon the non-elect among whom [the elect] live, influences moral and otherwise, which in various degrees involve their characters and destinies." Our Old School Professor speaks in the same breath of things as necessary, and yet as not designed by God; of a result of the atonement not contemplated in the atonement! A certain blind fate brings the non-elect into relations to the atonement, while the divine decree intended it only for the elect! Here is a pretty modern dualism. Had our side been guilty in such a wise, some terrible word, like Manichaeism would have been launched at our heads. For ourselves we are content to ask, whether these are the "advanced views" of Princeton?

We cannot leave this discussion without refer-

ing to one painful feature of the Professor's argument; a feature which shows the perverting, hardening effect of such doctrines, upon the finer sensibilities of one's nature. We refer to those passages in which he seems almost to sneer at the idea of God loving the whole world enough to provide an atonement for them. Page 405, he says: "All the advocates of general redemption believed that Christ, moved by an impersonal and indiscriminate philanthropy or love of men as such, died in order to make the salvation of all men possible to them on the condition of faith." Page 408: "The motive which led the Father to give the Son and the Son to die was not a mere general philanthropy, but the highest, most peculiar, personal love." "It is inconceivable that this highest and most peculiar love, which moved God to give His only begotten and well beloved Son, could have had for its objects the myriads who were not actually saved; by it, surely, it is a profane defamation of this love, to say that its effects may be measured in God's providing a salvation for all men to accrue to them upon conditions known and intended in the case of most to be impossible. . . . It is surely an abuse of Scripture to say that the elect and the reprobate 'are all indiscriminately the objects of this amazing, this heaven-daring, this soul-redempting love.'"

Now, while we would not for a moment question the peculiarity and intensity of the electing love of God, we leave it to our readers whether the idea of a love broad enough to encompass the whole perishing world in its plan of salvation would not be even more honorable to the divine nature than the electing love alone; whether, indeed, the idea of electing love alone in the atonement does not rather convey a disparaging impression, as of something quite incongruous in its limitation with the magnitude and costliness of the atoning work; whether the violence which by such a view is done to the grand announcement, John iii. 16: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, is not a veritable crime, for which exegeses and high and dry theologians will have to give an account at the last day?

It remains then for us simply to state our own view of the Design of the Atonement. We say, then, that the atonement was designed to put all men in a salvable condition. It is general, not limited. In the solemn language of Calvin, in his Last Will and Testament, we believe that the blood of Christ was shed for the sins of the whole human race: SANGUINE EFFUSO PRO HUMANI GENERIS PECCATIS. If we may reverently suppose a logical order in the mind of God—a chronological is impossible—we would say that the atoning decree, as the broadest, came first, and the electing decree, by which the atonement is rendered efficacious to a limited number, came next. We do not believe that all, or indeed that any, are saved by the atonement; those actually saved are saved by electing grace upon the ground of the atonement; but on the other hand, we do not believe that the atonement becomes an atonement, gets its whole legal value, merely from the fact that a certain number of persons are put into a position to reap its benefits. We do not believe that an atonement would be logically and legally impossible, as Dr. Hodge consistently must, without a formal compact covering certain individuals who alone should enjoy its benefits as an atonement. The electing decree to certain persons, is only a part of the vast and glorious plan to provide salvation for every one; to embrace the whole world in the arms of infinite atoning love; to put upon every sinner the guilt and sole responsibility of rejecting a salvation provided for him in common with the whole human race.

We do not care to do more than state our view on this subject. The attempt to force a limited atonement upon Scripture is not only beneath argument, but it carries with it, to our minds, something positively shocking. For the *force de force* which hard-headed exegeses have practised upon Scripture in the interest of this doctrine, we believe the inspiring Agent, who meant to make the great truths of salvation plain as the sun and stars, in the sky, will hold them to a strict account. We believe their doctrine is profane, demoralizing, hardening to heart and conscience, prejudicial to true religion and scandalous to the name of Calvinism. And we are not surprised that some Old School teachers are framing a set of terms, under cover of which they may hide from the odium of the doctrine, while yet their system inexorably binds them to it, and meanwhile their extenuating phrases are found devoid of real meaning, and are actually suggestive of duplicity on the part of God.

How inspiring, how gladdening, how god-like, on the contrary, is the idea of this world-embracing love of God in Christ! What an overwhelming appeal to every sinner, that Christ has

died for him and deserves the gratitude and obedience of his ransomed nature! What a blessed solution of the mystery of our sin-entailed condition is this scriptural fact of a divine provision made at infinite cost, and extensively with, and exactly adapted to our profound necessities! How it lights up the wide prospect of sin and woe around us, to see, walking in the midst, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world! There is a ray of light of morning all around the horizon. The whole fallen world is lifted toward God. An atonement for the sins of every perishing soul is provided and may be had for the humble believing acceptance. This, this is the grand evangelical plea, Christ's dying love for men—with which the flinty heart is to be melted and the deep fountains of spiritual life in the long barren nature are to be unsealed. "No doctrine is more vital to Christianity than this; none commends Christianity more effectually to general acceptance, or assures it more certainly, its deep place in the heart of humanity. Despoiled of this doctrine, we believe Christianity would speedily take its place among the faded abstractions of the past. A great united Presbyterian Church in which it should be heresy to hold this doctrine, is a prospect too painful to conceive and too absurd to be possible."

EXCLUSIVISM IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., has been found guilty of a violation of the canons by the Board of Presbytery of the high churchmen, and sentenced to receive "a public admonition" from the Bishop. This implies that at least three clergymen must be present when he is admonished.

Scarcely has this case been disposed of, when another, perhaps more formidable, has arisen. Rev. J. P. Hubbard of the Episcopal Church in Westbury, R. I., on Feb. 8th gave notice that he would exchange pulpits in the following Sabbath with the Baptist pastor of that place. Bishop Clarke of this diocese, although at some distance from the fact, and on Wednesday of the same week, wrote an earnest remonstrance to Mr. Hubbard, not precisely forbidding it, but adding to his remonstrance the following language:

"You may decline to carry out this exchange, if you see fit, on the ground that it is expressly prohibited by your Diocese."

Mr. Hubbard replies at length in a letter, dated Friday the 14th, stating that he always designed to take this step, and that he was acting upon long cherished convictions of duty. He pleads the wonderful outpouring of the Spirit upon the community, as the great argument for union; and says:

"This union and united action have been owned of our Lord and very greatly blessed. Even ungodly men—as one did to me the other evening—are obliged to confess that there must be a mighty power in religion, which can so unite and bind together six Churches, differing so widely as we on minor points of doctrine and discipline, viz: First Day, Seventh Day, and Christian Baptists, Methodist, Congregational, and Episcopal."

As to the possible result of discipline for such an offence, he says:

"If by any such legislation, you cut me off from you, I shall not cease to be an Episcopalian, I shall still remain in the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Many beloved brethren, like myself, shut off, will be with me. We shall, if thus forced, it form a new and more pure branch of the Protestant Episcopal Church—a branch more true to the teachings and practices of our Reformers, more true to the teachings of our blessed Saviour. I have no fear as to the result. We shall have the approval and sympathy of all true Christians; and, better still, we shall have the presence and blessing of Jesus. The guilt of schism will be with you, not with us."

Mr. Hubbard adds, in postscript, that he has the unanimous approval and support of his wardens, vestry and congregation.

The exchange was carried out as intimated, and the fact was communique to the Bishop by Mr. Hubbard. In this second letter, referring to the Baptist minister who officiated in his church, he says:

"I was particularly careful to explain to him, that in our Church, the laying of the declaration of absolution was corded to the presbytery, and that I desired him to add it, to show thereby my full recognition of ministerial ordination."

What I have done, I have done openly, and with full intention of being the question, the recognition by our Church of the validity of non-episcopal ordination."

ELECTION OF A MISSIONARY BISHOP.—The House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, assembled in New York, on the 5th inst., in specification for the election of a Missionary Bishop of Oregon, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Bishop Scott. The election fell upon Rev. Benjamin H.

Paddock, D. D., of Detroit. The session was a private one, but it is understood outside that, in view of the present divisions of sentiment in the church, and the bearing of every new episcopal election upon them, it was a season of warm excitement. We have seen no statement of how the Bishop elect stands affected toward the subject at issue.

LETTER FROM HERRICK JOHNSON, D. D.

MARQUETTE, MICH. March 2, 1868.

DEAR BROTHER MEARS, You have already heard of the religious interest in this place. It commenced just prior to the Week of Prayer, and has been sustained with great power ever since. It has made us think of the Apostolic way of putting whole cities in an uproar and turning them upside down. The devil has been dispossessed of his harvest at a struggle; and he has gone out of some hearts foaming, raging mad. Yesterday we celebrated the Sacrament of the Supper, and seventy-eight stood before the Altar to make public profession of their faith and dedicate themselves to God. It was a scene, not often to be witnessed, and never to be forgotten. There stood "the hoary head," a "crown of glory" now, because found in the way of righteousness. By the side of old age stood young children, giving to God the beauty and freshness, and joy of life's morning. Thirteen husbands with their wives, stood in the presence of God, angels, and men, to plight their faith, not to each other, now, but to Jesus. A father and mother came with their two daughters. Another father with three of his children brought "gifts of gold and frankincense and myrrh." Wives, who for years had sought to make their closets thrones of power as they poured out their hearts there for impenitent husbands, stood yesterday to welcome those husbands to Communion in Christ, thanking God that he had avenged his own elect. Children welcomed parents, showing that in another, than the Scriptural sense, "a little child shall lead them."

It was a happy company, indeed, who vowed their vows at God's altar yesterday in the Presbyterian church here in Marquette.

The faithful, feeble few who before composed the Church, and who had watched and prayed and labored for these souls, were like glad harvesters coming home rejoicing, singing their harvest song and bringing their sheaves with them. And as it should be with good harvesters, the sheaves were more than the reapers. The disproportion between the welcome and the welcomed, made the scene doubly impressive. The membership of the Church was much more than doubled. It made us think of the Master's words, "Fear not little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

The work has been quiet, earnest, seemingly thorough, and manifestly of God. The occasion is valuable, not less from its weight of character and measure of influence in the community, than from its numerical strength. With right development, it cannot fail to affect favorably and decisively the interests of Christ's kingdom in all this upper peninsula of Michigan. May God give wisdom to him who shall have the moulding of these new-born souls. H. J.

FALLING FROM GRACE.—One of our M. E. contemporaries estimates that not less than 700, 000 persons have been in connection with that Church in the last ten years who are not now in that connection. Of these not more than 100, 000 could have been lost by death, removal, transfer to other churches, &c. Of the rest, some are shut out by the [unscriptural] requirement to attend class-meetings, most ought never to have been received as they were, on probation, at all, and were only counted in to swell the Revival returns. Another exchange suggests, that the probation itself is one great reason of the falling away, and that if there had been cordially welcomed to the full enjoyment of the means of grace, and brought under the full and refreshing influence of Church life, they would not have been disheartened.

A Campbellite preacher once gave a Methodist version of the parable of the Prodigal Son; there was no running to meet him "while he was yet a great way off," the poor fellow sneaked up to the gate in all his misery and shame, and when he passed through it he was ordered to "stay in the yard for a year," and there his "elder brother" would tell him what to do, and "order him round," and at the end of his probation he would be let into the house.

As the public debt was diminished about seven and a half millions last month, we hope all indebted to us will feel themselves so much richer as to hasten payment which seem to be delayed longer than usual this year. The present month is all that remains to those whose year began January 1, to pay at the advanced rates.

AFFAIRS AT THE CAPITAL.

The course of the Chief Justice has given occasion for much remark and for some anxieties. The point made by him with regard to the rules does not seem to be of much practical account. His opinion was that the rules for the trial should be adopted after the Senate had resolved itself into a court. This has been done since the organization of the court; but the Senate had proceeded in accordance with precedent—first, in its legislative capacity debating and adopting the rules, then when organized as a judicial body re-enacting them. The Chief Justice disclaims most indignantly the interpretation of antagonism to the Senate, put by many upon his letter respecting the time of adopting the rules, and protests that there is nothing in the letter that does not appear upon its face.

On Thursday he was expected to appear in the Senate and administer the oath, but in the morning he wrote to Senator Pomeroy, that he could not answer the summons of the Senate that day, on account of his duties in the Supreme Court, and that probably a few days would make little difference to the Senate. As soon as this was known, he was waited upon by many Senators and urged to appear. He finally re-considered his determination, adjourned the Supreme Court, and at one o'clock came into the Senate and took the oath as presiding officer. He then administered the oath to the Senators separately in alphabetical order, proceeding without interruption till Senator Wade's name was called, when Democratic Senators objected, and a discussion arose which continued through Thursday and Friday—full latitude being given to debate. It seemed a little singular that in view of the plain provisions of the Constitution, the United States Senate should have indulged in such a debate upon the propriety of administering the oath to a Senator from Ohio, or that the presiding officer did not call them from the laxity of a debating society by an immediate decision. The debate was tedious and provoking. The court was not fully organized, yet the Chief Justice presided and allowed every one to talk freely, both the sword and the usword, and nobody could tell whether it was a Court or simply a Senate. The Senators seemed desirous to avail themselves of an unlimited time to make speeches before the rules should come into effect that would cut off prolix debates. Mr. Dixon gave us his speech upon the whole subject, and although called to order many times, he was suffered to occupy more than an hour. The whole proceeding looked like a lawless one, even though it were the Senate of the United States, and presided over by the Chief Justice. Finally after two days' discussion Senators Wade, Willey, Williams, Wilson and Yates were permitted to take the oath. It may be that the right of Senator Wade to sit during the trial of the President, will be questioned by the counsel of the latter; if so that will be the time to discuss it. No one need fear that Judge Chase will unduly favor Andrew Johnson, or that his political sentiments are undergoing any change, even though he manifest some sensitiveness with regard to his position of Chief Justice.

It is said that the President will ask for a long time to prepare for the trial; failing in this, that he will move to quash proceedings on the ground that if the charges are sustained they do not constitute "the high crimes and misdemeanors of the Constitution"; and then if the trial proceeds will challenge certain Senators on the ground of having formed and expressed opinions, and the authority of the whole body as being but a fraction of a Senate—"hanging on the verge, &c." The impression is very strong, that every expedient will be adopted by the defense that tends to delay proceedings, but the friends of impeachment are not unaware of the dangers of a protracted trial and will push it forward as rapidly as will comport with the dignity and importance of the occasion. The entire absence of passion and of partisan zeal on their part is a pledge that the decision they reach will be one that will commend itself to the favorable judgment of the country.

This most important trial in the history of our country has begun with true Republican simplicity. When we recall by the pen of Macaulay the brilliant pageant at the impeachment of Warren Hastings; and consider the vast difference in character and consequences between his trial and that of the President of the United States, we see how great things may be done in simplicity yet with solemnity, without ostentation, and yet lose nothing of their greatness.

The city is filled with strangers attracted hither to witness the trial and many will come to be disappointed, since the galleries of the Senate can accommodate only about one thousand people.

Secretary Stanton still occupies the War Office night and day. He has not been absent from the building since the President removed him. Thomas of the "interim" has made no recent attempts to gain possession, and is recognized by no one as anything but Adjutant General.

The greatest interest is felt in the election in New Hampshire to-morrow; that opens and gives character to the campaign. We shall have unusual demonstrations of joy from the party that wins. The Republican members now returned from there are full of confidence that they shall have a majority of at least three thousand.

FENWICK.
WASHINGTON, March 9th, 1868.