

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1867.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Sanctification.*

SANCTIFICATION is the maintenance and progression of a new life, imparted to the soul, by a direct agency of the Spirit of God, in regeneration or the new birth. Of the latter, Coleridge admirably says that “not the qualities of the soul merely, but the root of the qualities is transcreated. How else could it be a birth, a creation?”* By nature, or the first birth, we are not only destitute of every element of this Divine principle, every spiritual desire or aptitude, we also have within us a principle utterly, and to finite power invincibly antagonistic to it; a deadly, death-working energy, that reigns and rules with a sovereign sway throughout and over our entire nature. It is described by the apostle as a merciless tyrant that rouses himself and asserts his supremacy at the least symptom of resistance to his malignant sway. This is sin, original sin, knowing no infancy, adult in the new-born babe; as Augustine says, *Tantillus puer, tantus peccator*;† the spring-head and ever-flowing fountain of all wrong acts and words and thoughts and feelings; it is like the poison in the viper, which makes it

* Works, vol. v. p. 370, Shedd's edition.

† See South's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 430, Bohn's edition.

profession and worship had resulted in dividing the church and creating deadly animosities. Under the free toleration of the Commonwealth all sects lived together peacefully. The lesson, poorly learned by the party which came next into power, was not forgotten by sounder thinkers; and when, upon the downfall of the Stuart kings, the government was remodeled, Cromwell's doctrine of toleration was incorporated into the constitution; and although the church was still connected with the state, the separation between religion and politics, as far as then practicable, was also revived.

The Commonwealth passed away, and its work for a whole generation seemed to be utterly undone; but its leading doctrines are those which are appointed not to die, its efforts were in the line of Christian progress, and even its errors have proved of most salutary warning to succeeding reformers. It was the generative epoch of that religious freedom which revived at the revolution, and operating to the present day in the British churches, has found a more congenial and fuller development on this side of the Atlantic.

ART. VI.—*Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository for July 1863; Art. III. Doctrines of the New-School Presbyterian Church.* By Rev. GEORGE DUFFIELD, D. D., Detroit, Michigan.

THE Plan of Union proposed by the Joint-Committee requires that the Confession of Faith be adopted in "its fair historical sense, as it is accepted by the two bodies." We know what its "fair historical sense" is, both in itself, and as it is accepted in the Old-school body. But its "historical sense" as accepted by the New-school body is equally to be legalized; and clearly to this extent, that no minister or office-bearer who holds it, in that sense, can be molested in, or refused admission to, the united body, without breach of covenant. It is therefore a chief test in regard to the merits of this proposed Plan of Union, if we can ascertain what the "fair historical sense" of these standards, as accepted by the New-school body, has been,

and is. On this subject we are able to refer to authority of the highest kind, which ought immediately to be laid before our church.

The *Bibliotheca Sacra* has, for some years, been publishing a series of articles from men in the different Christian denominations, selected with special reference to their known qualifications for the work, giving an account of the doctrine and polity of the several churches to which they respectively belong. This was done in order to obtain a presentation of the faith and practice of these several communions, as understood and acknowledged by their own members. The Rev. George Duffield, D. D., of Detroit, Michigan, was procured to do this service for the New-school Presbyterian body. Probably, in view of his antecedents, and present position, his known ability, his participation in the controversies which led to the disruption, and his intimate acquaintance with the growth and spirit of this church of his love, no truer witness, or better expounder of its doctrine and spirit could be found. That he more or less misconceives, and so misrepresents or caricatures, Old-school principles, is no argument to the contrary. For this is the genius of New Divinity, inherent in the system. His article is nearly eighty pages long, thoroughly elaborated, and spares no pains to set forth the theology of our New-school brethren to the utmost advantage. It appeared in the No. for July, 1863, and had in view the movement, then initiated, looking towards reunion, and was shaped, as he assures us, with the "hope in doing so, not only to subserve the general cause and interest of theological science, but to promote the reciprocities and courtesies of Christian confidence and fraternal fellowship;" and that "it can be shown that there is in reality no radical difference between Old and New-school Presbyterians," thus furthering "a much desired reunion." What then has he to say of the doctrinal and ecclesiastical views of New-school Presbyterians in this attempted Irenicum?

I. OF THE ACTS OF THE ASSEMBLY OF 1837.

These expurgated the Congregational element from our organization, of which Judge Gibson, in the final adjudication of the case, in the civil courts, said, that "the two were as immiscible as oil and water." Dr. Duffield says of these procedures, "They

were in violation of the Constitution, revolutionary in tendency and design, and, establishing a new basis, consummated a plan of secession for the Old-school, from those who maintained the union and government of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," etc., p. 567. This will do for a first step towards "promoting the reciprocities and courtesies of Christian confidence and fraternal fellowship." Are things ripe for organic reunion with those who, to pave the way for it, think, and feel, and speak thus?

II. IMPUTATION OF ADAM'S FIRST SIN TO HIS POSTERITY.

Says Dr. Duffield, "The disobedience of Adam was his crime, and rendered him obnoxious to death, its ordained punishment. According to the theological theory of the Old-school, that crime was imputed to his posterity, and being so imputed involved them in his guilt, and rendered them obnoxious to the same punishment, that is death. . . New-school Presbyterians dispense with this and every other theory by which to explain the moral relationship of Adam and his posterity. They receive it as a fact divinely revealed. Preferring the language of common sense to theological technicalities, they are contented to say that, as the result or in consequence of Adam's transgression, his posterity became mortal and morally corrupt." This is precisely what Pelagians say. Thus they utterly reject imputation, as mere groundless human "theory." They prefer what they call "the language of common sense" to the clear "historic sense" of our standards, and the equally clear teachings of Rom. v. 12—21.

The words "physical," "nature," "constitutional," figure so largely in Dr. Duffield's representations of Old-school theology respecting sin and grace, and serve so fully to mystify the whole subject, that it is difficult to present in full force his repudiation of Old Calvinism, without quoting passages in which these words occur. Nor will the emphasis of these appear, unless something is said to clear up the confusion which Taylorites and New Divinity men have, with considerable adroitness and success, contrived to throw about these terms. Dr. Duffield uses them just as Dr. N. W. Taylor was wont to use them. In repudiating hereditary sinfulness, inborn depravity, a principle of sin anterior to, and causative of, sinful acts,

as taught in our Confession, and held by Old-school Presbyterians, they stigmatize it as a doctrine of *physical* depravity, inherent in our *constitution, faculties, nature, as created by God*. And they denounce the correlate doctrine logically flowing from this, and taught in the Bible and our standards, viz., that regeneration is the removal of this corrupt principle, and the implantation of a new principle of life and holiness, as “physical” regeneration, a change in the constitutional faculties, &c.; also as being wrought by the exercise of God’s mere “physical” omnipotence. Of this evidence enough will appear as we proceed.

Now, for our present purpose, it is sufficient to observe, that the word “nature,” φύσις, and, perhaps, in a less degree, the word “constitution,” as related to these subjects, is used in a threefold sense. First, for human nature unfallen as it came from the hands of God in the creation of our first parents. Secondly, for that nature as fallen and morally corrupted in the fall of our first parents. Thirdly, for those essential faculties and properties which belong to man as such, whether fallen or unfallen, in the absence of which he is no longer man. Now when our Confession and Old-school divines speak of “corrupted nature,” or “principle,” and use other like phrases, they mean it not in the first or third, but the second of these meanings. And they hold that there is such a sinful vitiosity of nature derived from the fall of the first man to all descending from him by ordinary generation; which nothing but the Almighty power of God can remove in regeneration. Herein they follow the Scriptures, which declare that we are “by nature, φύσει, children of wrath;” meaning thereby not our original nature as made upright by God, nor yet the essence of human nature as it exists in man fallen and unfallen: but nature as corrupted by the fall, and dead in sin. Since the English word “physical” is a derivative from the Greek φύσις, so the older Calvinistic divines have applied it to our original moral depravity, or inborn sinful dispositions, to indicate that they are by nature, φύσει, and not merely acquired, nor mere acts. In like manner, they used the word with reference to regeneration, to signify that it is a change of this nature, φύσις, lying back of acts, whereby we are children of wrath;

and hence they sometimes even speak of a "physical" operation of the Holy Spirit in regeneration; meaning thereby that the change is no mere act of the sinner produced by moral persuasion through the presentation of the truth, even such objective presentation of it as may be made by the Holy Ghost; but a change of the moral nature, φύσις, or disposition of the soul, lying back of acts and causative of them. This is especially a frequent use of language with Owen, whom Dr. Duffield is fond of quoting. Since the word "physical" has come to be used chiefly in the sense of material or corporeal, Calvinistic divines have dropped its use to avoid ambiguity, and substituted such words as "direct" and "immediate."

New-school divines, however, have been constantly in the habit of objecting to the old Calvinistic view of original sin and regeneration as "physical," often in a way which shows that they understand it, or wish to understand it, in these connections to be synonymous with material or essential; that they mean to charge upon the Old-school the doctrines of depravity and regeneration of the soul's essence, and of an exercise of omnipotence in regeneration which changes that essence; indeed that the Old-school divines make sin a part of the very constitution, *i. e.*, of the original substance or essential nature of the soul as such. The following passage from Dr. Duffield is an illustration of this, while it sufficiently evinces his own and the New-school repudiation of the doctrine of original sin, as held among us and set forth in our standards.

"New-school Presbyterians thought that their Old-school brethren, in setting forth their views of original sin, regarded as the corruption of our moral nature, believed, and by their language and illustrations implied, that man's natural depravity, as a moral and accountable creature, is something, if not physical, so inwrought or involved in his constitutional nature as to be transmitted like *any other corporeal faculty or quality, lege procreationis*, by 'ordinary generation.' Although this was denied, yet their language and modes of illustration led unavoidably to the inference, that moral corruption was believed by them to be some psychical peculiarity, property, or cause—something *in the very constitution of the soul or mind*—determining by necessity of nature, to sin, and therefore

itself sinful. This view New-school Presbyterians could not reconcile with the fact, as affirmed by the Confession of Faith, that God is not the author of sin, nor with the nature of God's moral government, the freedom of the human will, and the accountability of the moral creature.

"The Old-school Presbyterians, on the other hand, charged their brethren who dissented from their theological ideas as to the nature of moral corruption, with denying that 'Adam's posterity inherit from him a depraved nature,' and also 'that there is any such thing as 'a corrupted nature,' distinct from voluntary acts. The ground of controversy here lies in a *terra incognita*. *New-school Presbyterians care not to explore it.*" Pp. 587, 588.

"If Old-school Presbyterians do not believe that the agency of the Spirit in regeneration is physical, like that of his physical omnipotence in creation, they have failed to make themselves understood. We confess ourselves utterly unable to get any other idea from such language as this: 'the formal efficiency of the Spirit, indeed, in the putting forth the exceeding greatness of his power in our quickening, is no otherwise to be comprehended by us than any other creating act of Divine power.'* Dr. Rice, the exponent of Old-school views, insists upon there being 'a moral nature or disposition, distinct and anterior to its acts,' produced, of course, by a *new creation*, 'so that the regenerated man is, in his moral character, as really a new creature as he would be in his physical character, if the natural powers of his mind were radically changed.'" Pp. 605, 606.

Thus it is avowed that New-school Presbyterians regard our doctrine of native and hereditary sinfulness, as, "if not physical, inwrought or involved in his *constitutional* nature, transmitted like any *other corporeal faculty or quality*," so reducing it to the genus of "corporeal faculties or qualities," and making it a part of man's original and essential nature. They ignore, and "do not care to" know anything about depraved nature inherited from Adam, or distinct from voluntary acts. To say that this is *terra incognita* to them, is to say that they disbelieve it, and do not hold it. Moreover it shows that their meaning of the word "physical" when they

* Owen on the Spirit, book iii., chap. i. p. 225.

use it in such connections, and their interpretation of it as used by Owen and some old divines, is equivalent either to "corporeal," or else to something in the original constitution, and essential nature of man as created by God. And further, they clearly maintain that the removal of this innate sinful principle or disposition in regeneration by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, is a "physical" work of "physical omnipotence," in their sense of the word physical; and, in short, is what they wholly disown and repudiate. This will yet more fully appear. Whatever else may be true of this view, it is at war with old Calvinism, Old-school Presbyterian doctrine, and the Confession of Faith.

Let the reader bear in mind all this, whenever in our succeeding quotations from Dr. Duffield's article, they find opposition to the Old-school theology, or rather to the plain doctrines of our Confession, masking itself under such words and phrases as "physical," "constitution," "nature of man," etc. It is simply and purely the style of the Taylorism and New Divinity of thirty years ago at the time of the disruption.*

III. ORIGINAL SIN.

In addition to the passages adduced in the preceding preliminary explanation, Dr. Duffield quotes with approval the deliverance of the New-school Synod of Michigan, after much circumlocution, gathering up their meaning in the following summation of doctrine on this subject. "We mean, what our standards affirm, that in all we inherit from Adam there is no provision made for our holiness and salvation; but, on the contrary, it is morally certain we shall sin." P. 587. So much for the positive side of the "historic sense" of what, in the New-school view, "our standards affirm." They affirm all this and a great deal more. This of itself does not amount to the doctrine of original sin. It rises but little, if any, above Pelagianism.

Again negatively, Dr. Duffield tells us: "New-school Presbyterians concede that, both by omission and commission, it is natural to fallen man to sin. But when required by their Old-school Presbyterian brethren, as does Dr. Rice, to adopt his

* See this evinced in *Princeton Essays*, First Series, Articles XIII—XVI.

metaphysical theology and technicalities, and, with 'Dr. Owen and the old Calvinists, to speak of original or indwelling sin (moral corruption) as a *principle* or SOMETHING which has *the efficiency of cause*, and which exists in men *anterior to any acts performed by them*,' he demurs." "He prefers instead of the vague terms, 'principle' or 'SOMETHING,' (?) to designate supreme selfishness, distinguishable from instinctive self-love, as the primary originating cause or source of all developments of moral corruption. He can trace the voluntary acts and exercises, of which he predicates sin, to the demands and control, or impulse, of a generic, governing purpose." P. 590. "When Old-school theologians will show—what thus far they have failed to do—*how sin* exists *in* a moral creature anterior to, and separate or distinguishable from, any or all volitions or voluntary exercises of intelligence and will, or actings of the passions and affections, then may they, with greater show of theological acumen, as well as aid to Christian charity, accuse their New-school brethren with denying what, by such ill-defined and vague theological technicalities, they either do or design to teach about innate corruption, inherent depravity, a corrupted moral nature, a deep-rooted principle of depravity, and the like." P. 591. If this is not a denial of original sin as set forth in our Confession of Faith, and in all the great Christian symbols, Latin, Greek, Lutheran, Reformed, then it is hard to find words amounting to such a denial. It is confessedly counter to the "historic sense" in which the old Calvinists and Old-school Presbyterians have held it. It is purely and simply the theory of Dr. N. W. Taylor, or Taylorism, which resolves all original sin into a generic, governing purpose, formed at the beginning of moral agency. The italics and capitals in the above quotations are Dr. Duffield's.

IV. REGENERATION.

Dr. Duffield quotes the following from Dr. Owen, and appends the subjoined comment. "If," says he (Owen), "there be not an impotency in us by nature unto all acts of spiritual life, like that which is in a dead man unto the acts of life natural; if there be not an *alike* power of God required unto our deliverance from that condition, and the working in us a principle of spiritual obedience, as is required unto the raising

of him that is dead, they may as well say that the Scripture speaks not truly as that it speaks metaphorically. We see not how any other idea could have been intended by such language, than that the *same sort of physical omnipotence* which gives vitality to material organisms, is both real and necessary in imparting spiritual life to the sinner in regeneration. This is the theology of Old-school Presbyterians on the subject, *who talk of implanting and infusing into the soul a principle of spiritual life. But that the New-school Presbyterian accounts philosophic theory, and a very fallacious one also.*" P. 575. So we have supposed in regard to many of them, and that it is no calumny to say so. What if old Calvinists and Old-school Presbyterians do hold that regeneration is a new creation, or implantation of a principle of spiritual life, requiring an exercise of Divine omnipotence, even as any other creation? Is not this clearly and manifoldly taught in Scripture? Yea, that it involves "the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead?"

Again, says Dr. Duffield: "Dr. Owen says explicitly, 'There is a real *physical* work of the Spirit on the souls of men in their regeneration. There is not only a *moral*, but a *physical* immediate operation of the Spirit, by his power and grace, or his powerful grace, upon the minds or souls of men in their regeneration.'*" Accordingly he understood and used the phrases, 'new creature,' 'new creation,' 'created anew,' in their strict, literal sense, and not either metaphorically or analogically, to denote resemblance in a moral point of view. He attributed it to the same omnipotence which is exerted in every part of the material creation. Hence, to deny the reality and necessity of the intervention of this Divine omnipotence in regeneration, he accounted a fatal heresy. So, too, averred Old-school Presbyterians." P. 593.

Are there two kinds of Divine omnipotence? If not, then whatever is wrought by Divine power, in the realms of matter or spirit, nature or grace, must be wrought by the one Divine omnipotence which never differs from itself, although it may

* Owen on the Spirit, book iii. chap. v.

differ in its modes and results of operation, according to the subject upon which, and end for which it works. This, taken with what we shall soon quote from the next page, excludes omnipotence, as such, from the work of regeneration. But meanwhile it is proper to say that when, in the passage above cited, Owen asserts "not only a moral, but a physical immediate operation of the Spirit" in regeneration; by the former he means moral suasion through the objective presentation of gospel truths and motives by the Spirit; by the latter he means simply the implantation of a new principle of holiness, over and above all mere suasive influence, by the immediate exertion of almighty power. This appears abundantly in all the preceding part of the chapter from which Dr. Duffield quotes. Owen had been laying down this in such language as the following: "First, the work of the Spirit of God in the regeneration of sinners, or the quickening of them who are dead in trespasses and sins, or in their first saving conversion to God, doth not consist in *moral suasion* only." Again: "we say that the whole work, or the *whole of the work* of the Holy Ghost in our *conversion* doth not consist herein; but there is a real physical work whereby he infuseth a gracious principle of *spiritual life* into all that are effectually converted and really regenerated. . . . There is a real physical work of the Spirit on the soul of men in regeneration. That all he doth, consisteth not in this *moral suasion*, the ensuing reasons do efficiently evince. First, if the Holy Spirit worketh not otherwise on men in their regeneration or conversion, but by proposing unto them and urging upon them *reasons, arguments, and motives* to that purpose; then after his whole work, and notwithstanding it, the will of man remains absolutely indifferent . . . for the *whole* of this work consists in proposing objects unto the will. . . . Secondly, this *moral persuasion*, however advanced and improved, and supposed to be effectual, yet it confers no new *real supernatural strength* unto the soul. For whereas it worketh, yea, the Spirit or grace of God therein and thereby, by reasons, motives, arguments, and objective considerations, and no otherwise, it is able only to draw out the strength that we have," etc.

Our view of Dr. Owen's meaning, in the passages quoted and condemned by Dr. Duffield, is thus confirmed beyond a

peradventure by the whole context, which was evidently before him, and could not pardonably be misunderstood. And Dr. Duffield thus plainly evinces his aversion to the doctrine, that in regeneration, over and above all mere Divine moral suasion, “the Holy Ghost infuseth a gracious principle of spiritual life.” And this all the more decisively in the following language, on page 594, next succeeding our last quotation from him.

“The life of the soul of the moral creature man, beginning in or with regeneration by the power of God, was referred [by Dr. Owen and others] to the implanting in the mind, heart, or soul a new principle, as the proximate and efficient cause of holy sensibilities and spiritual actions constituting the life of the new creature, of the sinner born again. This ‘principle of holiness’ created by the physical omnipotence of God, according to this theory of regeneration, when implanted in the mind and heart, formed the life of the soul, just as the soul itself was believed to be the life of the body. *New-school Presbyterians cannot understand this life-theory of regeneration*, as we take the liberty to call it, according as Old-school Presbyterians employ it for illustration, *in any other light than as intended to teach that the very same sort of physical omnipotence by which God raises a dead body to life, is exerted and requisite to infuse spiritual life into the dead sinner by the work of regeneration.*” Pp. 594, 595. What then? Is not this just what the Scriptures teach and our standards teach, unless another sense be twisted out of them by forced interpretations? We surely need no further evidence that, on the great subject of regeneration, Old and New-school doctrines are poles apart. The foregoing quotations from Owen will also shed light on Dr. Duffield’s deliverances upon the next topic. It deserves notice too, in this connection, that, in concluding his remarks on this subject, Dr. Duffield refers in terms of commendation to Dr. Taylor’s celebrated review of “*Spring on the Means of Regeneration*,” and without any word of dissent or qualification. This, more than any other single production, brings out the grand peculiarities of the system known as Taylorism, which deviates from old Calvinism in precisely the same direction as Pelagius diverged from Augustin. Beyond any other publication of its author or his coadjutors, it served to arouse and

organize that opposition to the system among Congregationalists and Presbyterians, which gave birth to East Windsor (now Hartford) Theological Seminary, and culminated in the disruption of the Presbyterian church.

V. THE NATURE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT'S AGENCY.

In regard to this there are at bottom but two views. These are negations of each other. The Calvinistic and scriptural view is, that in regeneration a change is wrought in the soul by the direct and immediate agency of the Spirit, back of and beyond any mere acts of the sinner, by no *mere* agency of truth and motive—a change which certainly and infallibly causes a willing and hearty obedience of faith to all scriptural truth and motive. This change therefore may be wrought in infants, sanctified from the womb, leading them freely to embrace Christ, when their reason is sufficiently developed to be capable of knowing him. In an adult this change of state *may be* wrought, by Him who worketh where, when, and how he will, in the oblivious prostration of extreme sickness, as well as in the fullest conscious activity; so that, while life lasts, there is no exigency in which we may not properly pray for the interposition of that almighty grace in behalf of perishing sinners, which is able, even out of the stones, to raise up children unto Abraham. This, however, is not to the exclusion of a suasive influence through the truth in the case of adults not bereft of reason and capable of understanding such truth. Such agency also is employed by the Holy Ghost, in the view of old Calvinists; so that in this sense he begets and sanctifies by the truth. This sufficiently appears in the extracts already made from Owen, in this respect *instar omnium*. But what is also maintained is, that, over and above and beyond all this, all influence of mere truth and moral suasion, divine or human, there is a renovation of the soul, by the direct, immediate, irresistible agency of the Spirit of God, making it “a new creature,” without which it will not and cannot, with which it will certainly, freely, and joyfully yield to such divine truth and persuasion. Such agency of the Spirit, Pelagians and others maintain to be inconsistent with moral agency in the subject of it. Dr. Owen and old Calvinists maintain that it not only consists with moral agency, but frees moral agents from their bondage to sin. Says

Owen in the chapter so much quoted by Dr. Duffield, "The power which the Holy Ghost puts forth in our regeneration, is such in its acting or exercise, as our minds, wills, and affections are suited to be wrought upon, and to be affected by it, according to their natures and natural operations. . . . He doth not act in them any otherwise than they themselves are meet to be moved, and move, to be acted and act according to their own nature, power, and ability. . . He offers no violence or compulsion to the will."

So, in language still more explicit and felicitous, our *Confession of Faith*, chap. x. 1, 2, represents the Spirit in Effectual Calling, as "enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God; taking away their heart of stone and giving unto them a heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good; and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man; *who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.*"

The other view denies any agency of the Spirit otherwise than in the presentation of truth and motive with a suasive power beyond that of man, even as God is mightier than man. But however powerful, it is still in the way of moral suasion, and only by the vivid and powerful presentation of the truth, which it is the prerogative of the sinner's will to yield to or resist, and which many do effectually resist.

The only possible medium between these two views is the synergistic theory, according to which man coöperates with God in regeneration. This is in reality only a form of the moral suasion theory, such coöperation of the sinner being wholly inconceivable and irrelative on any other hypothesis. Now, of these views, it has already been made evident enough that Dr. Duffield and the New-school Presbyterians represented by him, reject the first. But if there be any doubt, the following extracts will dispel it.

"They [the more astute Old-school Presbyterians] talk of a

'direct,' 'immediate' agency of the Spirit in the work of regeneration . . . saying, 'we are far, however, from denying that in regeneration the Holy Spirit operates *in connection with the truth.*'* How in connection? Whether by mere juxtaposition, or as 'over, above, and beyond the truth'—favourite phrases with some—or, plainly and frankly, by means of the truth? To answer this question would not be so embarrassing as it is to the Old-school Presbyterian, if he did not believe the agency of the Spirit to be other than *through*, i. e., *by means* of the truth." Pp. 600, 601. He then proceeds to contrast New-school Presbyterians with them in this respect. The embarrassment here attributed to Old-school Presbyterians is the merest fiction of our New-school brethren. It exists only in their own imaginations. The former have no difficulty in recognizing an influence of the Spirit with and through the truth, which must yet be inefficacious upon a soul not quickened and renewed, and made willing in the day of God's power, by a divine inworking "over, and above, and beyond" the truth, as already explained—such as the above exhibition of New-school Presbyterian theology disowns.

But again, says Dr. Duffield, "The agency of the Spirit is not physical, not literally creative, but in perfect consistency with man's free moral agency, as a rational, accountable creature, held rightfully under obligations of obedience to the law of God. It is such as in its nature may be and often is resisted." This shows, 1. That in the writer's view a literally creative is the same as a "physical" work of God in the soul, in his meaning of that word, and therefore to be denied. 2. That, in his view, such a creative work is inconsistent with moral agency and obligations of obedience to God's law, and therefore to be denied. 3. That in his view the agency of the Spirit in regeneration is such as may be and often is effectually resisted. Hence, 4. a logical result of this is, that regeneration must really be the work of that human will whose prerogative it is to render unavailing or efficacious the whole agency of the Holy Spirit in the case. This harmonizes with the theory that regeneration is the act of the sinner's will forming a new governing purpose, the cardinal doctrine in Dr. Taylor's

* Dr. Rice.

review of "Spring on the Means of Regeneration," the article mentioned with approval by Dr. Duffield.

Moreover, Dr. Duffield condemns the sinner's looking "for an agency of the Spirit to save him, lying back of and beyond the sphere of his own conscious exercise of faith in Christ," as dangerous. P. 603. As we have already seen, he objects, and represents New-school Presbyterians as objecting to the statements of Dr. Rice, that there is, in regeneration, "a moral nature or disposition, distinct and anterior to its acts," produced of course by a new creation, "so that the regenerated man is in his moral character, as really a new creature as he would be in his physical character, if the natural powers of his mind were radically changed," as implying that "the agency of the Spirit in regeneration is physical, like that of his physical omnipotence in creation." P. 605. It is thus clearly proved that Dr. Duffield, for himself and New-school Presbyterians, in manifold ways repudiates the first of the forementioned views of the manner of the Spirit's agency held by the old Calvinists and asserted in our Confession. What remains to them but the second, towards which, in the passages already quoted, so strong a leaning has appeared in various expressions and implications? But does he make any direct statement or avowal, as to whether he regards the influence of the Spirit suasive only, consisting in a Divine vividness and efficiency in the presentation of truth?

Says Dr. Duffield: "The New-school Presbyterian believes that the moral suasion of the Spirit of God—although the phrase is seldom used by him—which, it cannot be denied, he has exerted by the truths revealed in the Bible, and enforced by exhortations, remonstrances, appeals, motives, and considerations of varied character therein contained, is just as much more mighty, as *God employs them* in applying them to men's minds, hearts, and consciences, and gives them force and efficiency, than anything man can do by *his* moral suasion, as the omnipotence of God exceeds the power of man. In so doing he is far from admitting, and utterly denies, what is charged upon him by Old-school Presbyterians, that the Spirit's agency, in the regeneration or conversion of the sinner, is merely *objective*, consisting only in the presentation of truth

before the mind—first, by originally inspiring the Scriptures, and second, by the preaching of the gospel.” P. 606.

For the due interpretation of this, let it be considered: 1. How utterly the direct and immediate agency of the Spirit on the soul in regeneration, together with the infusion of any new principle or state back of the sinner’s acts, has been repudiated in previous extracts, as being something “physical,” or the product of “physical omnipotence.” 2. That the only form of the Spirit’s agency positively asserted and defined, is the “moral suasion of the Spirit of God.” 3. That in repelling, as unjust, the charge that they hold the “Spirit’s agency” to “consist only in the presentation of truth before the mind,” he explicates this statement by what follows as meaning “a presentation of truth before the mind, *first, by originally inspiring the Scriptures, and second, by the preaching of the gospel.*” This caveat, therefore, is perfectly consistent with holding that the whole agency of the Spirit in regeneration is that of Divine moral suasion, the only doctrine consistent with his other utterances on this subject.

VI. ATONEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION.

Says Dr. Duffield: “The Old-school Presbyterian insists upon using the *ipsissima verba* of the Confession and Catechisms, when they speak of the righteousness of Christ being ‘imputed by faith.’ The New-school Presbyterian is not tenacious about this technical term of theology, but prefers to express the idea intended to be conveyed by it in the plain language of common sense.” P. 617. “They prefer to regard and speak of the atonement of Christ, his obedience and death, by which he satisfied the justice of God for our sins, as the great expedient and governmental procedure adopted by the great God of heaven and earth in his character of chief executive, the governor of the universe, in order to magnify his law and make it honourable, rather than as a juridical plea to obtain a sentence in court for discharging an accused party on trial.” P. 619. “The questions, how Christ’s sufferings and *death* atone for sin, and how his obedience avails unto justification through faith, as they do—the philosophy of the way of salvation—receive from them different answers and explanations, according to their views of the nature of justice, and their theories of government. . . . They are not essential to Christianity.” P. 621.

Suppose one should hold that they avail for this purpose, simply as instructive, symbolical, or in the way of martyrdom. What then? Again, says Dr. Duffield: "As in human governments punishment is sometimes commuted, as banishment or solitary confinement for death, or release from imprisonment by the payment of a pecuniary fine, so in the government of God, his justice, it is contended, admits of commutation, and is satisfied as fully if the penalty be inflicted on a surety or substitute for the transgressor as upon the transgressor himself. The sufferings and death of Christ are accounted, according to this view of justice, by Old-school Presbyterians, to be the penalty of the law for sin, inflicted on him as having stood 'in the room and stead' of his elect. . . . The Old-school Presbyterian's idea of the substitution of Christ is, that his person is commuted for the persons of the elect, and therefore his sufferings and death were the very same punishment in penalty, in law, which might have been exacted personally from them in their eternal sufferings and death. To deny this, they account a denial of the vicariousness of Christ's sufferings and death, and of their real expiatory value."

"The New-school Presbyterian does not so understand it. It is contrary to the very nature of distributive justice—which has reference to personal character and conduct—to punish innocence and protect crime. No legal fiction can ever make it possible to transfer the personal properties of guilty sinners to the innocent Son of God, so that he should assume their character and become guilty and merit their punishment. The substitution of Christ and his vicarious sufferings and death he does not believe to have been a procedure either of commutative or distributive justice. He suffered and died, 'the just for the unjust,' not according to law. . . . Hence there arises a difference between Old and New-school Presbyterians as to the applicability and extent of the atonement; the former limiting it to the persons of the elect, as the ransom paid specifically for each one, and designed for them only." Pp. 623, 624. He confesses on the next page, however, that the Old-school theologians "affirmed the infinite sufficiency of the atonement of Christ, in itself, for the whole world, if God should see fit to apply it." Again, "New-school Presbyterians believe that the

atonement of Christ may be much more satisfactorily explained by regarding it in the light of that sort of justice appropriate to, and required in, a public governor. This is called public justice, having relation to the public interests, the general good. . . . All sanitary regulations and abatement of nuisances and measures for general improvement must be traced for their sanction, to the obligations of public justice. Its exercise has no direct reference to law, and its obligations are those of high, ennobling morality, enforced by the demands of benevolence, and the dictates of virtue." P. 626. This is clearly the governmental theory of atonement. It denies that Christ's sufferings are properly penal and *in this sense* vicarious. It makes them an expedient of mere sovereign benevolence, like the abatement of a nuisance, or tearing down private buildings to stop a fire. They have no direct relation to law or distributive justice, *i. e.*, justice proper. They are designed indefinitely for all or any. Not only so, but Dr. Duffield falsely represents the Old-school view as making its adherents, "embarrassed in preaching the free and universal offers of salvation by God to sinners of mankind without exception." Just as much as, and no more than, the doctrine of election. Are our New-school brethren "embarrassed" in making a universal offer by this? Or do they hold it in some qualified sense only? Let us see.

VII. PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

Says Dr. Duffield: The New-school Presbyterian "prefers neither to assert nor deny," "that as friction is incident to matter, so is sin to a moral system, and that therefore while God would not absolutely prevent it altogether, he seeks, like a skilful machinist, to limit and restrain it, and overrule it for the greatest good. . . . If the Old-school Presbyterian affirms that God's foreknowledge is founded on his purpose, the New-school Presbyterian replies that the absolutely certain futuration of any event is not essential to its being apprehended by Omniscience." P. 631. Surely this is equivalent to the famous dictum of Dr. Taylor, that "no one can prove that God could prevent all sin in a moral system." It implies also that events can be known from eternity, as about to come to pass in the future, of which in eternity there was no certainty of their coming to pass. That can be known then as certain which is

not certain. For how could events in time be made certain in the eternity past, otherwise than by their futuration through the purpose of God that they should come to pass?

In regard to election he says: "Believing that God foreknew all of the human race who, in the progressive development of his plan of redemption through Christ, could be led to faith and repentance by the Holy Spirit, the New-school Presbyterian avers that he affirms nothing at variance with the sacred Scriptures and the standards of his church, when he says, that the Divine decree of election embraces all whom God foresaw that he could, by the blood and Spirit of Christ, in the providential development of his plan, bring to faith and repentance. The Apostle Peter affirms believers to be 'elect according to the foreknowledge of the Father.' Elect, says the New-school Presbyterian, expanding this thought, not because God foreknew that this one and the other left to themselves would believe; but because, according to the mystery of the Divine Omniscience, he foreknew whom he could, by the truth and Spirit of Christ, bring to faith and repentance." Pp. 632, 633.

The foregoing account of the New-school doctrine of election is simply the Taylorite doctrine on that subject. Divested of circumlocution, it amounts simply to this: God elects to salvation those whom he foresees, by the utmost power of his Spirit, word, and other agencies, he shall be able to induce to believe and obey. If this is anything higher than the Arminian doctrine of election upon foreseen faith and good works, we do not see it. It must be a distinction without a difference. His representations of the Old-school view involves the usual misconceptions of Arminians and Pelagians. He says, "Old-school Presbyterians are apt to adopt a more summary process by which to explain the mystery of election, affirming the choice of God to be wholly arbitrary, a simple absolute exercise of sovereign will, without any reason whatever except its designed arbitrariness." Because they deny that it is founded on faith, holiness, good works, or any other condition foreseen in the creature, does it therefore follow that it is without any reason whatever in God's all-wise counsels? Old-school Presbyterians, like the Scriptures and our Confession, pronounce election sovereign relatively to its objects. But when have they ever

pronounced it without reasons within the Divine mind, or solely "for the sake of its designed arbitrariness"?

Dr. Duffield claims that Dr. John Witherspoon has done more than any other man, "in giving form and character, not to say originating, New-school views of truth." The stupendous error of this statement was fully exposed in this journal, Oct. 1863, Art. III.

Such is the testimony given by one of the most competent and trusted leaders of the New-school church, as to the doctrines characteristic of that body. It was given with the utmost care, and under circumstances of the highest responsibility. It speaks for itself, and needs little comment. It shows most fully the "fair historic sense" of our standards as understood by the New-school body, and that in fundamental doctrine it is in diametric opposition to their "fair historic sense" among ourselves and in Christendom. We rejoice to know that the New-school church contains many honoured exceptions, whose theology differs slightly, if at all, from our own. We should most cordially welcome all such to our communion, by that regular door which is open to all who agree with us. But Dr. Duffield has put it beyond all doubt, that the doctrinal scheme known as "New Divinity," which was the main cause of the disruption of our church, and the protection of which was a chief end of the New-school secession, prevails, though we trust it does not predominate, in that body now. At all events he shows one "historical sense" of our standards which the basis of union now proposed requires us to tolerate without let or hindrance other than by free discussion.

Nor does the Doctrinal Protest of the New-school in the Assembly of 1837, readopted by the Auburn Convention, and reproduced by Dr. Duffield with approval in his Article, prove anything to the contrary. For first, it is drawn with a sort of controversial skill and diplomatic adroitness which evade many of the chief issues without appearing to do so. And secondly, the question is not merely what they hold, but what they require as a condition of ministerial and official standing. It proves nothing therefore either way.

And now the question arises, what means the loud and bitter clamor uttered and echoed by leading New-school ministers and

journals, and to some extent even reëchoed among ourselves, against those as calumniators of their New-school brethren, who have offered as a reason against the projected scheme of reunion, that the foregoing scheme of doctrine has place among them, and must be tolerated in the united body, if union on the proposed basis is consummated? Who are the calumniators, and who is calumniated in this matter?

The question before us is a very simple one. Shall we give the foregoing theology sketched by Dr. Duffield equal liberty, privilege, and authority in our church with that of our Catechisms and Confessions? Shall we fill our pulpits and church courts with its proclaimers and defenders? Shall we subject our theological seminaries to their control, and admit them to our vacant theological chairs? Shall we submit the books of our Publication Board to such an *Index Expurgatorius* as this theology would require? Shall we bring back the intolerable strifes which preceded and caused the disruption? Shall we, in short, surrender unconditionally? For ourselves we say No, and in this we believe we speak the deliberate mind of our church.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Law of Creeds in Scotland. A Treatise on the Legal Relation of Churches in Scotland established and not established, to their Doctrinal Confessions. By Alexander Taylor Innes, M. A., Solicitor before the Supreme Court of Scotland, and Member of the Faculty of Procurators of Glasgow. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1867. 8vo. Pp. 493.

This is an able, elaborate, timely, and valuable work. It consists of two parts. The first is devoted to an historical exhibition of the relation of the law to the Creed of the Established Church in Scotland; and the second to the bearing of the legislative power on the Non-established Churches with their creeds. To each chapter is added "An Appendix—of Statutes, Acts of Assembly, Articles of Faith, Legal Decisions, Judges' Speeches, and illustrative documents generally," together with an Index of Subjects, of Statutes, and of Cases.