

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1866.

by
C. F. Hodge

No. II.

ART. I.—*The Vicarious Sacrifice, grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 124 Grand street. 1866. 8vo. pp. 552.

JUDGING from its impression upon ourselves, we should say that this book of Dr. Bushnell is far inferior in power to his former one. That was an outburst, instinct with feeling and poetic fire. This is cold. It is addressed to the understanding. It is an attempt to justify to the reason, and in the presence of the Bible, a theory as to the work of Christ, which is the product of his imagination. It deals in analysis, in subtle distinctions, in arguments, which from the necessity of the case are sophistical, and which must be known to be false, even by those who may not see where their fallacy lies. A man undertakes a desperate task who attempts to argue against the intuitive judgments of the mind or conscience; or who strives to prove that all mankind for thousands of years, who have read and studied the Scriptures, are mistaken as to one of its most prominent and most important doctrines. The case of the Reformers affords no parallel to such an attempt in our own day. The Romanists did not admit the Scriptures to be perspicuous or designed for the people. They did not profess to believe the doctrines against which the Reformers protested,

on the authority of the Bible. They relied on the authority of the church; and the church with them was the hierarchy. The protest of the Reformers, therefore, was not against the interpretation which the people of God, with the Bible in their hands, had, on a great practical and experimental doctrine, been led with unanimity and under the inward teaching of the Spirit, to give to the sacred records. Any such attempt, we say is desperate. Every right-minded Christian would be authorized to put aside the volume in which such an experiment was made without further examination. No man is called upon, for his own sake, to refute arguments against what he knows is true. He is not bound to prove his own existence, or the existence of other men. Life is too short, and too much crowded with higher interests, to justify the waste of time in proving that white is white. Unfortunately, however, many men are not right-minded; and many more have no settled convictions on the plainest points of revealed doctrine. Hence the necessity of answering what the mass of experienced Christians feel that, so far as they are concerned, needs no answer.

A second introductory remark suggested by the perusal of Dr. Bushnell's book, is, that it contains nothing new. By which we mean, first, that it contains nothing essential to his theory, which was not contained in his former volume. This is true both as to what it denies, and as to what it affirms. Besides this, the theory concerning Christ's work propounded in this volume is not new in the history of theology. It did not originate with Dr. Bushnell. There is nothing new about it but its terminology. The reed-bird of the North is the rice-bird of the South; so the theory of the Socinians is the theory of Dr. Bushnell. Apart from the obsolete doctrine of some of the Fathers, human ingenuity has been unable to devise more than three general theories concerning the work of Christ.

The first is, that the eternal Son of God assumed our nature, fulfilled all righteousness as the substitute and representative of men, bore the curse of the law in their stead, and thus made expiation for their sins. Because his work is a full satisfaction to the justice of God designed for the recovery of

men to the image and enjoyment of God, it is represented as the most wonderful display of the wisdom, love, and especially of the grace of God, ever made to the universe; and, therefore, the most fruitful in beneficent results, being the great means which God has devised to promote the glory and blessedness of all orders of intelligences.

The second doctrine is that commonly known among us as the governmental theory. This is founded on the assumption that happiness is the highest good; that "the love of being," or the disposition to promote happiness, is not only the highest, but all virtue; and therefore that justice is only a form of benevolence. The primary end of punishment is consequently the good of God's moral government, or the prevention of the evil consequences of gratuitous forgiveness. Christ's work therefore is a satisfaction to rectoral justice; and rectoral justice is only a benevolent regard to the good of rational creatures. This doctrine flows necessarily from the view of divine justice presented by Leibnitz; and was adopted by the jurist Grotius, and assented to by his Socinian antagonists as removing their objections to the church doctrine of satisfaction. In this country it has been widely adopted as one of the modern, and American improvements in theology.

The third general theory is that which resolves the saving efficacy of Christ's work into its subjective influence. This theory comprehends many different views of the nature and design of the Redeemer's work. The three most comprehensive are the following: 1. That the work of Christ owes its power to the confirmation which it gives to important truths,—such as the immortality of the soul, the willingness of God to forgive sin, &c., &c. 2. That its power is due to the exhibition which it makes of self-sacrificing love. And 3d. The mystical doctrine of the renovation of humanity through a participation of the theanthropic life of Christ. It is to the second of these views the doctrine of Dr. Bushnell belongs. This will be rendered plain by a statement, first, of what he denies, and secondly, of what he affirms.

In the first place, he denies that any such attribute as justice belongs to the Divine character. That is, he denies that the moral excellence of God demands and renders necessary the

punishment of sin. There is an obvious distinction between righteousness and justice. The former is general rectitude or rightness; the latter is concerned in the distribution of rewards and punishment, according to the general understanding of the term; but according to Dr. Bushnell it is concerned exclusively in connecting suffering with sin as a means of the recovery of the sinner. That is, it is only benevolence in one of the modes of its exercise. He distinguishes between law before government, and law after government. He assumes that God himself is subject to the eternal law of right; so also are all rational creatures. It is supposable that a universe of such beings should exist, subject not to God, but subject with God to one and the same rule of right. Should any of these intelligent creatures sin, God would "feel himself elected" to be a ruler, to institute government. P. 244. Here comes in statute law; and, justice to enforce them, penalties, &c., all designed for redemption, or recovery of the apostates. "The problem cannot, therefore, be to satisfy, or pacify justice, but simply to recompose in the violated law the shattered, broken souls, who have thrown down both themselves and it, by their disobedience." P. 246. What he denies is, that there is any such attribute in God, which requires "an exact doing upon wrong what it deserves." P. 267. He admits that there is what he calls "a wrath-principle," in the Supreme Being, which "enables him to inflict pain without shrinking;" just as a benevolent surgeon does. But that is not justice. Hence justice and mercy are one and the same, only different in terms or modes of expression. When a regard to the welfare of the victims suffering evil leads to the exercise of kindness, we call it mercy; when it leads to the infliction of pain, we call it justice. This is the doctrine of the volume before us, on this point, covered in a wonderful amplitude of words and figures. Its thoughts are smothered in rose-leaves. The whole system of Dr. Bushnell is founded in this denial of the justice of God. There might have been, he tells us, just such a scheme of redemption as that effected by Christ, "which has nothing to do with justice proper; being related only to that *quasi* justice which is the blind effect, in moral natures, of a violation of their necessary law." The righteousness of God "never

requires him to execute justice under political analogies, save as it requires him to institute an administrative government in the same." "Law and justice might be instituted as co-factors of redemption, having it for their object simply to work with redemption, and serve the same ends with spiritual renovation." P. 248. The language which Dr. Bushnell at times allows himself to use in reference to the justice of God, must be very painful to his readers. It is language which is seldom heard except from the lips of irreligious men. We are told in representing God as just, in the ordinary sense of the term, we adopt the heathen idea of the Godhead, representing him as thirsting for vengeance, and only to be appeased by suffering.

2. In denying any such perfection as is commonly understood by justice to God, Dr. Bushnell explicitly denies that there has been any expiation of sin made by the Redeemer. Expiation he pronounces to be a purely pagan idea. He denies that it has any support from the sacrifices of the Old Testament or the didactic statements of the New. "What is expiation?" he asks. "It does not simply signify the fact that God is propitiated, but it brings in the pagan, or Latin idea (for the word is Latin), that the sacrifice offered softens God, or assuages the anger of God, as being an evil, or pain, contributed to his offended feeling." "The distinctive idea of expiation is that God is to have an evil given to him by consent, for an evil due by retribution." P. 486. "The classic and all pagan sentiments of worship, being thus corrupted by the false idea of expiation, the later Jewish commentators and Christian theologians finally took up the conception, laying claim to it as a worthy and genuine element in all sacrifices, whether those of the law, or even the great sacrifice of the gospel itself. And now there is nothing more devoutly asserted, or more reverently believed, than our essential need of an expiatory sacrifice, and the fact that such a sacrifice is made for our salvation, in the cross of Jesus Christ." P. 488. "We never speak," he says, "of good deeds, or sentiments, or sacrifices of love, as expiations. Nothing is expiatory that does not turn upon the fact of damage or pain, or just punishment. Neither is there any difficulty of discovering from the manner in which theologians speak of expiation, that they think of God

as having some evil, or pain, or naked suffering offered him for sin, and that, on account of such offering, he may release the evil, or pain, or suffering, his unsatisfied wrath would otherwise have exacted. Thus, taking the mildest form of superstition, it will be maintained that God's wrath is to be averted by sacrifices, that is, by something given to wrath, that is wrath's proper food; which can of course be only some kind of pain or evil." P. 489. "If it is a mere feeling in God which is to be placated by an expiatory sacrifice, then we have to ask, is God such a being, that having a good mortgage title to pain or suffering, as against an offender, he will never let go the title till he gets the pain—if not from him, then from some other? Such a conception of God is simply shocking." P. 491. It is indeed shocking to hear a Divine attribute thus caricatured; to hear justice, which is to the moral world what gravitation is to the material universe, degraded into blood-thirstiness. How this can be done by a man of moral culture is a mystery. Washington was not a monster when he signed the death warrant of Andre; nor is a judge blood-thirsty when he passes sentence upon an assassin. We have no knowledge of God at all unless what is virtue in us be virtue in him. This is a principle which, when it suits his purpose, Dr. Bushnell pushes to an extreme. And yet he violates it recklessly when it works against his theory. Dr. Bushnell admits that God punishes sin. But punishment is pain or evil voluntarily inflicted in satisfaction of justice. Dr. Bushnell indeed makes no difference between the pain which follows a wound, and the suffering which follows sin. He seems to consider both as "the blind effect" of the nature of things. But who constituted the nature of things? Who so ordered our physical and moral constitution that fire applied to living flesh should cause pain, and that crime should burn the conscience? Evil does not cease to be penal because it is a natural consequence. It may be that the sufferings of a future state are to a great degree the natural and necessary consequences of the order which God has established in his universe. But they do not, on that account, cease to be judicial inflictions. The most awful judgment denounced in the Bible is reprobation; which is simply giving the sinner up to himself and his sins.

It matters not, therefore, whether the pain or evil be a natural consequence, or whether it be inflicted *ab extra*, it is in either case punishment; and in either case determined by the will and judgment of God. This being admitted, it follows that the infliction of pain on account of sin, is no proof of blood-thirstiness. The wanton infliction of pain is cruel. But its infliction for a high end, by one having authority, may be wise, just, and good. The only question is, therefore, what are the ends which justify and demand the infliction of evil for the punishment of sin? The thing is done by an infinitely holy God, as Dr. Bushnell admits, and as even Deists admit. Why? Dr. Bushnell and others say, for the reformation or redemption of the offender. Others say, for the prevention of crime. Others say, that these are subordinate, though important ends for the infliction of evil on account of sin, whether in the form of penalty or chastisement, but that the primary and immediate ground of such infliction is the ill-desert of sin; and that its efficacy as a moral preventive of crime arises out of the fact that it is inflicted on the ground of intrinsic ill-desert. That the reformation of the offender is the primary or sole end of punishment is contrary to the Scriptures, and to the universal judgment of men. Among men it is impossible that such should be the object of punishment, when the penalty is death; and no less impossible in the Divine government, when the penalty is eternal death, the utter and final reprobation of the offender. Every man finds in his own consciousness the sentiment which demands the punishment of sin for its own sake, irrespective of the effects of punishment upon himself or upon others. A sinful soul, if alone in the universe, in the presence of a holy God, would feel the sense of guilt in all its force. No man who has ever experienced conviction of sin is ignorant that sin is guilt as well as pollution; that it stands in a relation to justice as distinct and as necessary as it sustains to holiness; and that expiation is as necessary for pardon, as regeneration is to purity and peace. This sentiment is natural. It does not belong to any one class of men; it is not peculiar to those who have been subjected to any one mode of moral culture. It belongs to all men. It is impressed on all human languages. It is revealed in the social,

political, and religious usages of all races of men. It just as undeniably belongs to the constitution of our nature, and is just as obviously a revelation of the nature of God, in whose image man was created, as reason or conscience. Punishment, therefore, that is, evil inflicted in satisfaction of justice, is morally right. It is not an expression of malice, or revenge, or blood-thirstiness, but of a necessary constituent element of moral perfection. But punishment is the expiation of guilt. That is its nature and effect. If punishment is morally right, so is expiation. If the one be demanded by the nature of God, so is the other. If the one be consistent with love, so is the other. Whether that expiation be made by the offender himself, or by a substitute, does not alter the thing. It is expiation still; and it is expiation which Dr. Bushnell pronounces to be a pagan idea, shocking in its nature, and unknown to the Scriptures, even in the sacrifices of the old dispensation. That it is shocking to him, we must admit on his own testimony; and this doubtless is the reason why he rejects and labours so hard to disprove it. But it is not shocking to the minds of the vast majority of men of all ages and nations, as is proved by its universal adoption; nor to the great body of God's people, as is proved by its incorporation in the doctrines and inmost religious life of every Christian church on earth; nor yet is it shocking to the infinitely holy God, as is proved not only in its being the corner-stone of the Divine plan of redemption, but also by every punitive declaration of his word and every infliction of his providence. If God punishes sin, he demands an expiation for sin. And therefore expiation is something holy, just, and good. The rising of the human heart against it, is no objection to its righteous character. This is the pith and substance of all Dr. Bushnell's book, so far as the denials are concerned. He rejects expiation, because the idea shocks him; and hence there is nothing in God which demands it; there is nothing in the Old Testament sacrifices which imply it; and nothing in the work of Christ which involves any such idea. Then, unless the whole Christian world be mistaken, there can be no salvation for sinners.

Dr. Bushnell's objections to the doctrine of expiation are refuted not only by the fact that the idea of expiation is in-

cluded in that of punishment; by the universal recognition of the justice and integrity of such punishment; by the still more authoritative sanction derived from the work of the Spirit in the hearts of the people of God; by its lying at the foundation of the whole sacrificial system of the Scriptures, both in regard to the offerings under the Old Testament economy, and in reference to the great expiatory sacrifice of Christ. It is little less than an insult to the common sense of men, to attempt to show that the sacrifices of the Mosaic economy were not expiatory, but reformatory; not intended to expiate the guilt of the offender, but to cleanse him from moral pollution. Dr. Bushnell's arguments on this point are so unsubstantial they hardly admit of being handled. He says the word used signifies *to cover*, and to cover is to hide, or remove from sight; and therefore properly expresses the idea of cleansing. The offender has his sins covered because the service tends to lead him to repentance and a new life, and thus he is cleansed from inward pollution. Sin is guilt, however, as well as pollution, and needs to be hidden from the eye of justice. It is thus covered, and can only be covered by expiation. And thus the soul, according to Scripture, is cleansed from guilt by blood; as it is cleansed from pollution by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. To deny that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were expiatory can only be done by denying the express assertions of the Bible, and by ignoring the import of all the rites connected with the sacrificial services, and by overlooking the specific effects attributed to offerings for sin. The direct and specific design of the sin-offering is declared to be, not reformation, that was the remote, or ultimate design, as in the great sacrifice of Christ, but forgiveness. If a man sinned he was required to bring a proper offering, "and the priest shall make atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." This is the constantly recurring formula. The words in the Hebrew are just as perspicuous as they are in the English version. In neither case do they admit of any interpretation which excludes the idea of expiation. Sin incurs a penalty, that penalty was remitted on the condition of the death of a victim in the place of the sinner. It is everywhere, constantly and distinctly asserted, that pardon, deliverance from a justly incurred pen-

alty, was the design of every sin-offering. They were therefore not merely "lustral," in Dr. Bushnell's sense of the word. They were not designed to cleanse from pollution, but from guilt; and this cleansing from guilt, is everywhere represented in Scripture as the indispensable condition precedent to reconciliation with God, and reconciliation with God the indispensable antecedent to inward holiness or sanctification. These are the elementary principles of the plan of salvation as revealed in the Bible. And the rejection of these truths is the rejection of the gospel. That the design of the Hebrew sacrifices was to make expiation for sin is, however, clear, not only from the obvious meaning of the formulas above referred to, but also from the express assertions of the Bible as to the mode in which that expiation was effected. It was by substitution. It was by one suffering in the place of another. Life was given for life; soul for soul. I have given, saith God, the blood, in which is the Life of the victim, upon the altar, for your life. This is the declaration contained in Lev. xvii. 11. And hence כֶּפֶר from כָּפַר means "a ransom." Something given for a person or thing as the condition of deliverance. The one was substituted for the other. Thus in Exodus xxi. 30, "If there be laid upon him a sum of money (an atonement, something to cover his offence) then he shall give for the ransom of his soul, whatsoever is laid upon him." Isa. xliii. 3, "I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." A sin-offering, therefore, according to the Scriptures, was an expiation, a substitute, a ransom. The victim was put in the place of the offender; its blood was taken for his blood; its life for his life. A sacrifice was demanded in cases where it is impossible that the moral purification of the offerers should be the object. If a man was found slain, and the murderer could not be discovered, the elders of the city were to bring a heifer and offer it as an atonement, that its blood might be taken for the innocent blood which had been shed. Deut. xxi.

All the ceremonies attending the offering of sacrifice for sin lose their significance if the ideas of substitution and expiation be excluded. The offender brought a faultless animal to the altar; he laid his hands upon its head, confessing his sin; the

victim was slain and its blood sprinkled on the altar or towards the tabernacle, and the offender was freed from the penalty which he had incurred. These acts are as significant as words. They teach that the victim was substituted for the offender; its blood taken for his blood; or, as the Bible itself expresses, its life for his life. This interpretation of the service is given, or this view of the nature of the Old Testament is adopted by all classes of commentators and theologians, even by those who care nothing about what the Bible teaches; by Gesenius, De Wette, Bauer, as well as Hengstenberg and Tholuck. And such has been the accepted meaning of sacrifices among all people and in every age of the world. They were always offered in expiation of guilt and in hope of propitiating an offended God. This is admitted in regard to the pagan world. But in admitting this, it is admitted that the sense of guilt is universal; that the common consciousness of men teaches that God is a just being whose nature leads to the punishment of sin; and that expiation is necessary to forgiveness. In denying these truths, therefore, we deny the intuitive convictions of our sinful race, and set ourselves in opposition to the voice of nature, as well as to the word of God. Besides all this, the Bible expresses by "bearing sin," what it teaches by saying a victim was made a sacrifice for sin. But "to bear sin" never means to sanctify, it always means to bear the penalty of sin. And therefore if a sacrifice bore the sins of the offender, the Scriptures declare that he bore the punishment of his offences, bore it in his place and in order to his forgiveness. This was the symbolical meaning of the Old Testament sacrifices, and it was this which gave them all their value. But if this be so, then Christ's sufferings were truly expiatory. He bore our sins. He died the just for the unjust, in the same sense as the lamb died for the offender under the Mosaic economy. Although Dr. Bushnell in the face of the clearest teachings of Scripture, and especially of the whole design of the Epistle to the Hebrews, denies that the Old Testament sacrifices were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, yet he admits that the one saves just as the other did. And therefore if those were expiatory, so also was the sacrifice of Christ. On this subject there seems to be no room for argument, provided men are

agreed on two points; first, that the Bible is the word of God and our only infallible rule of faith; and secondly, that the Scriptures are to be historically interpreted, that is, that we are bound to take them in the sense in which they were intended to be understood by the persons to whom they were addressed. If the words sin, law, justice, priest, atonement, sacrifice, forgiveness, and so on, are not to be taken by us in the sense in which it can be historically proved they were understood by the sacred writers and their contemporaries, then we are without any rule of faith, or any reliable source of knowledge, and the Bible may be made to mean just what any theory-builder, whether rationalistic or transcendental, may choose. Dr. Bushnell is one of those theory-builders, and his doctrine has no other foundation than his own imagination. He can bring it in to agreement with the Bible only by making the Bible conform to his theory in despite of the plainest and most authoritative rules of interpretation.

As he denies the justice of God and repudiates with horror the idea of expiation, of course there can be no such thing as justification. There may be free pardon, and the restoration of the favour of God, which he admits; but justification he denies. Justification is a declaration that the demands of justice are satisfied. But if there be no justice and no satisfaction, there can be no such declaration. The word, as is usual in such cases, he retains, while the idea is discarded. With him justification is a making morally good. The sinner is recovered from his sins; is made inwardly pure, restored to the love of God, *i. e.*, is made to love him, and on that account is loved by him. This is justification. He endeavours to show that he differs from the Romanists who confound (or unite) justification with sanctification. Because with him justification is in the consciousness and sanctification below it. This amounts to nothing. With Romanists sanctification is not confined to the states or exercises of the consciousness. They hold that justification includes the infusion of new habits of grace, which lie below all conscious holy exercises, and are their proximate cause. So far from Dr. Bushnell's doctrine being in advance of that of Rome on this subject, it is a thousand degrees below it. Romanists admit the doctrine of

expiation; they admit that the work of Christ was a true and proper satisfaction to the justice of God for the sins of men; they admit that his satisfaction is the sole ground for the remission of original sin, as well as of all sins committed before baptism; and they hold that it is the ground on which God visits postbaptismal sins with temporal penalties (which may be satisfied or remitted) instead of eternal death. All this Dr. Bushnell denies. He would push the guilty and trembling soul clean off of the immoveable rock of Christ's righteousness, into what? Why, into the hell which is within him and about him. He would bid him rest all his hopes on what he himself is. If sin be unsubdued in his own heart, if he has not a subjective heavenly state, he is not an heir of heaven. Every thing depends, not upon what Christ has done for him, but upon what the sinner himself inwardly is. All his hopes rest on his own holiness. We have not the least apprehension that there is strength enough in Dr. Bushnell's arm to push into the abyss the weakest soul who has, even in darkness, touched the everlasting Rock; but he may be able to prevent those who are seeking a sure resting-place from seeking it where alone it can be found.

Will our readers pardon us here for a short digression. They are aware that in this country and elsewhere a system of theology has prevailed, founded upon two principles, which are regarded as moral axioms. The first is, that no man can be justly required to do more than he has the plenary power to perform. If he is required to love God with all his soul and with all his strength, to hate and avoid all sin, he must be able to do so. From this, one of two things follows: either, assuming the obligation to remain to be thus perfect in heart and life, every man has the ability to conform himself to this high standard of duty; or, the standard of duty must be brought down to the level of his ability. If we cannot love or hate at pleasure, then the command to love is an absurdity; and love must be reduced to a mere purpose. The second fundamental principle of the system referred to is, that all sin consists in sinning; or, that moral character can be predicated of voluntary acts alone. Hence there can be no original sin, or corruption of nature; no inherent sin or holiness; no principles or habits

morally good or evil. It is a satisfaction to see that Dr. Bushnell repudiates both these principles. He admits the entire inability of sinners to restore themselves to the image of God. In answer to the question, Whether God could forgive sin on the ground of our mere repentance? he answers, "If he could, meaning only what is commonly meant by remission, the remission would make no change and confer no benefit whatever. Besides the question only asks, what could God bestow, if we should do the impossible? For no man is able, by his own act, to really cast off sin, and renew himself in good." P. 424. Repentance, therefore, for a sinner left to himself is "impossible." As to the second principle, Dr. Bushnell is equally explicit. To the objection against his doctrine of subjective justification, that it confounds justification with sanctification, he says, justification is in the consciousness, sanctification below it. "The consciousness of the subject, in justification, is raised in its order, filled with the confidence of right, set free from the bondage of fears and scruples of legality; but there is a vast realm back of consciousness, or below it, which remains to be changed or sanctified, and never will be, except a new habit be generated by time, and the better consciousness descending into the secret roots below, gets a healing into them more and more perfect." P. 440. All voluntary exercises, of course, are in the consciousness; if therefore there be a "vast realm below the consciousness," which needs sanctification, then there is something in the soul besides voluntary exercises of which moral character may be predicated. "And when they arose early on the morrow morning, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face before the ark of the Lord: and the head of Dagon, and both the palms of his hands were cut off upon the threshold; only the fishy part of Dagon was left to him." This was pleasant news for the Israelites. So it is pleasant for us to see the Dagon of a false theology lying headless and handless before the ark of God's truth.

To return to our subject. Justification, as taught by all the churches of the Reformation, and virtually by the whole Christian world, is "an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received

by faith alone." "According to this view, justification is: 1. As to its nature, a declarative and judicial act. 2. It consists in the forgiveness of sins, and accepting the sinner as righteous. 3. Its ground is the righteousness of Christ. 4. Its condition, or instrumental cause, is faith. Those who receive and rest on the righteousness of Christ are justified, and if justified, are glorified. Those who do not then rest on that righteousness are not justified, and are not saved. Every one of these points Dr. Bushnell denies. He denies that justification is declarative or judicial. It consists, according to him, in making its object or subject inwardly good, restoring him to the image of God. He says on p. 415, that the three words, *righteousness*, *just*, and *justifier of*, are moral, and not judicial. "There is no reference of thought, whatever, to God's retributive justice, or to the acquittal passed on guilty men, because the score of their account with God's justice has been made even by the sufferings of Christ." On page 427, we are told "that justification has no reference to justice." "To be justified by faith means to be justified by yielding our members instruments of righteousness unto God." P. 428. The difference between justification and sanctification is, that the former is in the consciousness, and the latter below it. There is, however, he says, "no objection to saying that, in a certain general way, they are one—just as faith is one with love, and love with regeneration, and this with genuine repentance, and all good states with all others. The same divine life as quickened of God is supposed in every sort of holy exercise, and the different names we give them represent real and important differences of meaning, according as we consider the new life quickened in relation to our own agency, or to God's, or to means accepted, trust reposed, or effects wrought. In the same way justification is sanctification, and both are faith; and yet their difference is by no means annihilated." P. 441. Justification therefore is not an act of God, but an inward state of the mind; a form of the divine life in the soul.

In order to establish the doctrine which subverts the faith of the whole Protestant world, and casts the sinner into utter despair, he attempts to prove against all lexicographers and interpreters, against indeed the convictions of every reader of

the Bible, and every speaker of the English language, that to justify means *to make good*, to make subjectively righteous, or conformed to the law of God. If this be so, what business has the word in the language. We have the words to purify, to cleanse, to sanctify, to reform, to regenerate, and a multitude of others, to express the idea of inward purification. What is the use of this other word *to justify*? What is a word, but an expression of thought. But this word expresses no thought of its own; no thought which is not more appropriately and definitely expressed by other words. It is attempting to argue against a palpable fact, to strive to prove that to justify means to make good. When we justify a man for what he has done, we do not reform him. We simply declare that he was right, that the law of the land or the law of God does not condemn his conduct. When we justify God, we declare that God is right in all he does, as the Psalmist, and every convinced sinner, justifies God in his own condemnation. Justification is antithetical to condemnation. If the latter does not mean to make wicked, the former cannot mean to make good. "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned." "Wisdom is justified of her children." The Pharisee justifies himself. We are said to be justified without works; but we cannot be good without goodness. A judge is forbidden to justify the wicked for a reward. He that justifieth the wicked, says Solomon, is an abomination. There is no use however of citing examples. There is not a single instance in the New Testament in which *δικαιώω* means to make holy, or morally good; and there is not a single case in the Old Testament in which the Hiphil form of *קָדַשׁ* is so used. The only doubtful case in the New Testament is Rev. xxii. 11; but there the word is used in a middle sense, and moreover the text is very doubtful. That Dr. Bushnell should say, as he does on p. 420, that he has established his point that *δικαιώω* is not used in a declarative or judicial sense, but means to make morally good, "in a manner that leaves no room for dispute," is an exhibition of the very insanity of self-conceit. So far from the word in Scripture always having that sense, it never has it. He need only ask the first Sunday-school child he meets what "justify" means, to be satisfied that it has been attempting not

only to pervert the meaning of a word, but to upset the intuitive judgment of the common consciousness of men. It is very true that the adjective *δίκαιος* and the noun *δικαιοσύνη* are often used in a moral sense; as when the Scriptures speak of a righteous man, or of the righteous God. But this has nothing to do with the usage of the verb. Indeed Dr. Bushnell feels that he is arguing against a self-evident truth, by proposing to substitute the word "righteouser" for "justifier." The former he makes to mean one who renders subjectively righteous, or good. What is this but an admission that justifier does not mean one who makes good, and cannot be made to convey that idea to an English ear. Of course he urges the common objection against justification being a declarative act, that it is a contradiction to declare a man righteous who is not righteous. This, he tells us, is making "the gospel end off in a fiction that falsifies even the eternal distinctions of character." P. 422. It is indeed impossible that God should declare a man to be good who is not good, or wise who is not wise. And therefore if the word righteous has only a moral sense, it is impossible that God should declare the unrighteous to be righteous. But every one knows, and every one, except Dr. Bushnell, admits, that the Greek word *δίκαιος* (and the English word righteous) besides its moral, has also a judicial, or forensic sense. In other words, it expresses sometimes the relation of a man to holiness, and sometimes his relation to justice; in other words, sometimes his relation to the precept, and sometimes to the penalty of the law. In the latter case it is antithetical to *ἐπὶ ὀδῶν*. There is none *δίκαιος* (righteous), says Paul, but the whole world is *ἐπὶ ὀδῶν* (*under condemnation*) before God. When therefore God pronounces the sinner just, he does not declare that he is morally what he ought to be, but that the demands of justice, so far as he is concerned, have been satisfied. Therefore he is said "to justify the ungodly." The ground of the judgment is not what the sinner is or has done, but what has been done for him. Justification under the gospel, Paul declares to be the "imputation of righteousness without works," that is, to those who have no moral excellence of their own on which a declaration of righteousness can be founded.

In teaching that God in justifying the soul imparts to it, or

“impresses upon it his own character,” Dr. Bushnell of course denies that it includes “the pardon of sin.” According to him there is properly no such thing as pardon. You can no more forgive sin, than you can forgive a disease. The only way to remove the suffering connected with disease, is to heal the patient, and the only way to free the soul from the suffering connected with sin, is to reform the sinner. In neither case is there a remission of a penalty in the ordinary sense of the word. As this idea of remission and penalty pervades the volume before us, it is not easy to quote particular proof passages. We have already seen that on p. 424, Dr. B. says, that remission in the common sense of the term “would confer no benefit whatever.” On page 449, he says of Christ, “His work terminates, not in the release of penalties by due compensation, but in the transformation of character, and the rescue, in that manner, of guilty men from the retributive causations provoked by their sins. He does not prepare remission of sins in the sense of mere letting go, but he executes the remission, by taking away the sins, and dispensing the justification of life, (by which he means the infusion of spiritual life). This one word Life is the condensed import of all that he is, or undertakes to be.” All pardon, therefore, consists in deliverance from the inward power of sin. Remission which does not include the removal of sin, is declared to be “only a kind of formality, or verbal discharge, that carries practically no discharge with it.” P. 424. In forgiveness, he says, God, in the declaration of his righteousness, gets “such a hold of the souls that are sweltering in disorder, under the natural effects of transgression, as to bring them out of their disorder into righteousness. By his moral power, which is the power of his righteousness supernaturally revealed in Christ, he masters the retributive causations of their nature, and they receive more than a ground of remission; viz., the executed fact of remission, or spiritual release. Otherwise, under a mere letting go, the bad causes hold fast like fire in brimstone, and refuse to be cheated of their prey.” P. 426. Remission is, therefore, “spiritual release.” Most errors, even the gravest, are half truths. It is true that there are evils inseparable from the existence of sin in the soul; that these evils constitute a large part of its

penalty; and that deliverance from those evils can only be effected by sanctification. But it is not true that the natural consequences of sin are its only punishment; nor that remission and sanctification are ever confounded; nor are they related as cause and effect. The two things are distinct in their nature, and are always distinguished in the Bible and by the common sense of men. And moreover, it is no less true, there neither is nor can be any sanctification or destruction of the power of sin in the soul, until there has been antecedent remission of its penalty. On Dr. Bushnell's scheme, no sinful soul can ever be saved, if Paul's doctrine of sanctification be true. He teaches clearly in the sixth and seventh chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, that so long as the sinner is under condemnation, he brings forth fruit unto death; that it is not until he is delivered from condemnation, by the body or sacrifice of Christ, that he brings forth fruit unto God. He must first be justified, before he can be sanctified. This is the theology of the apostle; and it is a great blessing that the religious experience of God's people always accords with the doctrinal teachings of the Scriptures, while it utterly refuses to harmonize with the speculative theories of imaginative and presumptuous men.

The idea that the punishment of sin is only in its natural consequences, and that remission is merely deliverance from the natural operations of moral evil in the soul, as freedom from the pain of a burn can be effected only by allaying the inflammation, is so repugnant to Scripture and to common sense as to need no refutation. The expulsion of our first parents from paradise; the deluge; raining fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah; the death of the first-born of the Egyptians; all the plagues brought on Pharaoh; drought, famine, pestilence, threatened as the punishment of the Hebrews; were not the natural consequences of sin, but positive punitive inflictions. Indeed, almost all the judgments threatened in the Bible are of that character. And every human being knows that when he prays for pardon, he prays for something different from holiness. When our Lord said to the man sick of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," no man ever supposed he meant, "Be thou holy." It is true that

the gospel in making provision for the pardon of sin, provides also for the sanctification of the sinner; that salvation in sin is a contradiction and absurdity. But it is utter infatuation to deny the one in order to maintain the other. We need both pardon and sanctification, and cannot have the one without the other. Nevertheless they are distinct and separate gifts of grace through the mediation of Christ.

It need not be added that in denying justice, expiation, judicial justification and remission of the penalty of sin, as any thing different from the destruction of its power, he also denies that Christ or his righteousness is the ground of our justification. One of his distinct propositions, p. 423, is, "Christ not a ground, but a power of justification."

Such are the denials involved in Dr. Bushnell's theory. He denies what has, at least for ages as he admits, been the faith of the church, as to the method of salvation. What then is his own doctrine? How is it that Christ secures the salvation of sinners? It is by the power of expression; it is by the manifestation which he makes of Divine love. There are two kinds of power, "The fiat power, and moral power." The former he seems to exclude entirely from the work of salvation. Every thing is attributed to the moral power of Christ. This power he gradually acquired by a long course of self-denying, self-sacrificing labour for the restoration of fallen men. His sufferings had nothing to do with the saving efficacy of his work, except as the necessary incidents of the task which he had assumed. If a missionary goes to labour in an unhealthy climate, he may suffer, and perhaps perish under its influence. But he did not go in order thus to suffer. That was no part of his missionary work. That he willingly endures such suffering in the prosecution of his mission, may enhance his moral power over those among whom he labours, but sufferings have no specific virtue, they are merely incidental. This is Dr. Bushnell's own illustration, which makes his meaning plainer than any of his formal didactic statements. He supposes (see p. 396,) a case of a prison in a miasmatic district, where the fell poison of the atmosphere decimates the inmates almost every week. It comes to the knowledge of a good monk that a prisoner, formerly his bitter enemy, is infected with the poison.

Whereupon the godly man goes to his relief, nurses and attends upon him until he is recovered and goes free, while the benefactor takes the infection and dies. The rescued man expresses his gratitude by saying his friend "bore my punishment"—"became the criminal for me"—"gave his life for mine"—"died that I might live," &c., &c. After a time "the dull, blind-hearted literalizer takes up all these fervours of expression in the letters and reported words of the reputed felon, showing most conclusively that the good monk actually got the other's crime imputed to him, took the guilt of it, suffered the punishment of it, died in his place, and satisfied the justice of the law that he might be released! Why the malefactor himself would even have shuddered at the thought of a construction so revolting, hereafter to be put upon his words."

Christ therefore saves us as the suppositious monk saved the felon. Our Lord's sufferings arose only from the moral and physical malaria of the world into which he came. He "simply came into the corporate state of evil, and bore it with us—faithful unto death for our recovery." P. 514. The state of corporate evil which follows sin as its natural effect, the Scriptures call it the curse; "and it is directly into this that Christ is entered by his incarnation. In his taking of the flesh, he becomes a true member of the race, subject to all the corporate liabilities of his bad relationship." P. 386. Such being the nature of Christ's vicarious sacrifice, there is nothing in it peculiar to him. It arises necessarily out of the nature of love; and therefore every rational being governed by love, is impelled in the presence of evil to make such sacrifices. This is true of God himself. From the entrance of sin and misery into the universe, he has suffered just what Christ suffered. There is a Gethsemane in the Divine nature. God cannot but suffer whenever he sees evil, and he must strive to correct it and deliver its victims. "Love is an universally vicarious principle." "See how it is in the case of a mother. She loves her child, and it comes out in that fact, and from it, that she watches for the child, bears all its pains and sicknesses on her own feeling, and when it is wronged, is stung herself by the wrong put upon it, more bitterly far than the child." P. 46. "Given the universality of love, the universality of vicarious

sacrifice is given also." P. 48. This being the case the Eternal Father suffered for us as truly and as much as Christ did. Christ did not do the same things in his first year as in his last, so the sufferings of the Father were not the same in kind as those of the Son after the incarnation. But they were as real and as truly vicarious. "In the ante-Christian era may have been one of the heaviest points of sacrifice, that there must be so long a detention, and that so great love must be unexpressed, until the fulness of time had come." P. 60. What is true of the Father must be true of the Holy Spirit. "Whatever we may say, or hold, or believe, concerning the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, we are to affirm in the same manner of God. The whole deity is in it, in it from eternity and will to eternity be." P. 73. This he calls a "full and carefully tested discovery." "There is a cross in God before the wood is seen upon Calvary; hid in God's own virtue itself, struggling on heavily-in burdened feeling through all the previous ages, and struggling as heavily now even in the throne of the worlds." P. 73. The Holy Spirit bears our sins "precisely as Christ himself did in his sacrifice. He is, in fact, a Christ continued, in all that distinguishes the offering and priesthood of Christ, and is fitly represented in the same way." P. 74. "It requires quite as much suffering patience, and affliction of feeling, or even of what is called passion, to carry on the work of the Spirit, as it did to fulfil the ministry and bear the cross of Jesus." P. 76. He is well aware, Dr. Bushnell says, "how very distant such conceptions are from the commonly received impressions of the Holy Spirit." P. 74. But more than all this, "all good intelligences are in vicarious sacrifice." This is true of the holy angels and glorified saints. They perform a priestly work; they bear a priestly character as being intercessors for men. P. 103. They are concerned for sin as God is, and suffer for our sins as Christ did. All this is true also of men here on earth. "Vicarious suffering was in no way peculiar to Christ, save in degree." P. 107. "The true and simple account of his (Christ's) suffering is, that he had such a heart as would not suffer him to be turned away from us, and that he suffered for us even as love must willingly suffer for its enemy." P. 108. All therefore who have his love must suffer,

in their measure, in the same way. Their suffering are vicarious sacrifice in the same sense that his were. See the whole of Ch. V. Part I. Christ therefore did nothing extraordinary. He had no "superlative goodness." He did nothing but what he was "bound to do." See pp. 91, 105, &c. He did nothing more or less than what the common standard of holiness and right requires. P. 108.

Such being the nature of vicarious sacrifice, Christ is in no sense a special Saviour; he does no more than the Father and the Spirit ever did and are still doing; he did only what saints and angels in heaven, and saints on earth are ever doing, except that he brings the power of self-sacrificing love more home to us. He "came simply to be the manifested love of God." P. 141.

The salvation of men, as above stated, is effected, according to Dr. Bushnell, not by the fiat power, but by the moral power of God. Christ is the power of God unto salvation, not as an example, nor merely by the revelation of the love of God, as softness, or instinctive sympathy, (p. 171,) but by the manifestation of all the moral perfections, or greatness of God. It is the power of character. The power of Alexander was that of force, that of Socrates, of character; so in the case of Napoleon and Washington. P. 172. For Christ to take away our sins, "by the force that is manifested in him, is the same thing as to be the moral power which masters the soul's inward disorder, and renews it to holiness of life." P. 180. But this moral power is not inherent; it is not an attribute. It is something acquired, as by Howard, George Fox, and Whitefield. Men think away God's perfections in thinking of them as attributes. They become dry words. "We feel him a platitude more than as a person." "As a kind of milky-way over our heads; vast enough in the matter of extension, but evanescently dim to our feelings." P. 187. He became incarnate in order to obtain moral power. "The undertaking is to obtain, through him (Christ) and the facts and processes of his life, a new kind of power, viz. moral power; the same that is obtained by human conduct under human methods. It will be Divine power still, only it will not be attribute power. That is the power of his idea. This new power is to be power cumula-

tive gained by him among men, as truly as they gain it with each other." P. 188. "His (Christ's) reality is what he expresses; under the law of expression; the power, the great name, he thus obtains under forms of human conduct that make their address to reason, conviction, feeling, passion, sympathy, imagination, faith, and the receptivities generally of the moral nature. What rational person ever imagined that he could state, in a defined formula, the import of any great character; Moses, for example, Plato, Scipio, Washington." P. 214. Thus it is Christ saves us. He acquires, as others do, a moral power, by his life, his deeds of love, by the works of self-denial, labour, and suffering he performed, differing in nothing from the power of character, which attaches to great and good men, except in degree. And this moral power, or character, so operates on the minds of men as to make them good, and by making them good frees them from the corporate evil, or the natural causes of pain inseparable from a state of sin. Such is the nature, and such the method of Christian salvation, according to Dr. Bushnell.

No intelligent reader can rise from the perusal of this book without being convinced that its author has no correct idea of the nature of Christian theology or of the duty of a Christian theologian. Christian theology is nothing but the facts and truths of the Bible arranged in their natural order and exhibited in their mutual relations. The order in which these truths are to be arranged, and the relations in which they stand, are not to be arbitrarily determined. Both are determined by the nature of the truths themselves, and by the explicit teachings of the Scriptures. Such being the nature of theology, the duty of the theologian is first to ascertain and authenticate the facts of Scripture, that is, make it clear that they are indeed contained in the word of God. This induction of facts must, as far as possible, be exhaustive. All must be collected, and each must be allowed its due value. No one is to be ignored or modified. Then secondly, the theologian, having obtained his facts, is to present them in their natural order; that is, the order determined by their nature.

The philosophy of the facts is in the facts; underlies, and arranges them, and determines their mutual relation. The

theologian has no more right to explain the facts by his own philosophy, than he has to manufacture the facts for his philosophy. His business is simply to exhibit the contents of the Bible in a scientific form. His relation to the Scriptures is analogous to that of the man of science to nature. The business of the naturalist is to collect the facts belonging to his particular department. He is bound to collect them all, and to allow each its proper value. His success depends on his fidelity as to those two points. Then he has to observe the relation in which these facts naturally stand to each other; and thence deduce the laws which determine that relation. He is simply an interpreter. He cannot invent facts; he cannot ignore them; he cannot undervalue them; he cannot imagine laws or causes which control the facts which he observes. He must gather the laws from the facts, or they have no more scientific value than the fancies of a poet. This is the inductive method which has given science its firm foundation, and secured its wonderful triumph. Before this method was adopted, all was confusion and failure. Men presumed to determine à priori what matter was, what were its laws, how those laws must operate, and what must be the results. Their whole effort was to make the phenomena agree with their à priori theories. Facts therefore had to be overlooked, or distorted; and combined by a purely *ab extra* process of the mind. Tons of volumes, worm-eaten, and covered with cobwebs, are stored away, filled with these idle and now contemned speculations. Theology has had a similar fate. Thousands of books have been written showing what the truths of revelation ought to be, and must be made to be, in order to conform to the à priori principles of their writers. And these thousands of books are either already keeping company with the worm-eaten tons of speculative science, or are soon to be buried in similar receptacles of useless lumber. Dr. Bushnell has added another to these à priori disquisitions. He has formed a theory which pleases his imagination, and gratifies his feelings, and to this *per fas et nefas* the facts of the Bible must be made to conform. That this is a hopeless and a useless task is self-evident. "No man knows the things of God but the Spirit of God."

We must humbly receive what he has revealed, or remain in darkness.

Dr. Bushnell, for example, has his own idea of God, very different from the scriptural doctrine, and from this arbitrary conception of the Divine nature, he undertakes to determine what the acts and purposes of God must be. According to the Bible God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. Dr. Bushnell denies that he is a just being. That is, he denies that justice, in the established meaning of the word, is a virtue, and therefore denies that it is an attribute of God. But this is one of the facts of Divine revelation; just as clearly revealed and just as well authenticated, as that God is infinite or eternal. As this sentiment of justice is instinctive and indestructible in the constitution of our nature, Dr. Bushnell must persuade men to deny themselves, to deny a self-evident truth, before he can get them to adopt his idea of God, or to accept the conclusions which he draws from it.

He ignores the element of guilt in sin. Guilt is the relation of sin to justice. If there is no justice, there can be no guilt, as where there is no law there can be no transgression. Every sinner knows that he is subject to wrath; not merely to the natural consequences of his sin, as when he burns his hand, but to the righteous judgment of God; to the positive and intentional infliction of evil as the punishment of transgression. He knows that he deserves such infliction. He knows that it ought to be inflicted, and therefore he dreads it from the hands of a righteous God. This is an universal fact of consciousness, as well as one of the clearest facts of revelation. How dreadful it is for a man to devise a plan of salvation for himself and others, which ignores the fact of guilt; which denies the justice of God, who after all is, and will be found to be, a consuming fire.

Again, according to the Bible, God is infinite in power, governing all his creatures and all their actions; working all things after the counsel of his own will. Subject to no law out of himself; but is the law to all rational creatures. An absolute sovereign, not only as ruling according to his own will, but as being free from all limitation either actual or conceiv-

able. As he foresees and directs all things for the attainment of the highest ends, nothing can occur inconsistent with his purposes, and therefore nothing can be the cause to him of surprise, perturbation, or distress. Nothing can disturb his infinite tranquillity and blessedness; a blessedness which arises from the absolute perfection and harmony of his own nature, and the impossibility of anything occurring contrary to his infinitely wise and benevolent designs. Such is the scriptural doctrine concerning God, as understood and received by the Christian church. This is one of the great facts of the Bible which lie at the foundation of all sound theology. Dr. Bushnell's idea of God is very different from this. It must be different or he could not hold his peculiar theory. With him God is as much subject to law as any of his creatures. He speaks of him as bound to do this and to avoid that. He even conceives possible, although not actual, a state in which creatures owe no allegiance to God, but are subject, with their Maker, to a rule of right above both. According to the scriptural doctrine, the absolute reason cannot be irrational, or the absolute good be otherwise than good. That in the highest sense God is a law unto himself, and above all law other than his own nature; and therefore a law to all intelligent creatures. The will of God as the ground and rule of obligation to man, is not mere *arbitrium*. It is the expression of absolute reason, truth, and goodness, which constitute the nature of God as a personal being. And it is to that personal being, to reason, truth and goodness as personal in God, that the allegiance of all creatures is due. Dr. Bushnell concedes to Pantheists the principle on which their arguments against the personality of God and the possibility of his possessing moral character, depends. They say that moral character supposes conformity to law, and the possibility of want of conformity; but such subjection, and the possibility of being other than it is, is inconsistent with the nature of the absolute. Therefore God as absolute can neither be a person nor possess moral excellence.

Again, Dr. Bushnell limits God in another way. The scriptural doctrine is that God can do his pleasure among the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of earth; that all created minds are under his absolute control; that he turns them as

the rivers of water are turned; that without doing violence to their nature, or interfering with their free agency, he can govern all their thoughts and all their actions. This is the foundation of all natural, and of all revealed religion. - It is the only rational ground of hope, or encouragement in prayer. All this Dr. Bushnell's theory denies. It assumes that free agents can be controlled only by moral power, by expression and impression; and that such control is necessarily limited. God strives to prevent sin; exerts all his power to recover sinners from their apostacy; is filled with anguish on their account and because they refuse to be restored to holiness. Now this not only degrades God as impotent in his government, taking the reins out of his hands, and placing them in the hands of creatures, who can at pleasure, one and all, run wild, and make sin and misery perpetual and universal, but it is contrary to the plainest facts of the Bible. God allowed the fallen angels to perish without redemption. If love, from its very nature, unmodified by justice, binds all good beings, created and uncreated, to vicarious sacrifice, to untiring and ceaseless effort to recover the lost, why are not fallen angels redeemed? or, why are the finally impenitent abandoned, as Dr. Bushnell admits they are, to hopeless and endless perdition? It is perfectly plain that the clearest facts of the Bible must be rejected, and its most precious truths denied to make way for this other gospel, which is not another, but the product of a vain imagination.

Again, every believer knows, and delights to acknowledge, that salvation is of grace; that God was not bound to provide redemption for fallen man; that Christ was under no obligation to assume our nature, suffer and die in our behalf; that not only the gift of Christ, but the knowledge of salvation, the means of grace, the mission and work of the Spirit, are all perfectly gratuitous; that God would have been as holy, as righteous, as good, had he allowed men to perish in their sins. This is perhaps the most luminous of all the truths of the Bible. It strikes every eye, even the weakest. It is acknowledged by every Christian heart. Its denial is pronounced by Paul to be a rejection of the gospel. Yet Dr. Bushnell's theory does deny it. Christ did nothing out of the way; he had no superla-

tive merit. He did no more than he was bound to do. This is asserted over and over. He did no more than God the Father has been doing from eternity (how so we do not understand); nothing more than the Holy Spirit is now doing; nothing more than every patriot, philanthropist, missionary or martyr, each in his measure, does, and is doing from day to day.

This remedial scheme, moreover, ignores the scriptural account of the natural state of man. It assumes that we are in a condition to be redeemed by moral power, by "expression," by the manifestation of goodness and greatness; a power which must be earned, analogous to the influence which great and good men exercise in moulding the character of their fellow-men. It is of course admitted that the moral power of the gospel is as great as such power can be made, or can be conceived of; that the plan of salvation contains such an exhibition of love, of self-sacrificing devotion, of moral grandeur and greatness, as fills the intelligent universe with astonishment, and which is to be throughout eternity the great means of revealing to all created minds the perfections of God, and consequently the great means of promoting the holiness and blessedness of all intelligent creatures. Nay more, it may safely be asserted that the love of God as exhibited in the gospel, is unspeakably greater, higher, grander, more wonderful, and powerful for good, than in the fancy-scheme as sketched by Dr. Bushnell. With him that love is nothing superlative, does nothing more than it was bound to do; it surmounted no obstacles; it is just what love in creatures is. It has nothing gratuitous, nothing mysterious in its nature; nothing to excite the amazement of angelic minds. To them, however, it was wonderful that God should love the unholy and spare the guilty. That is what they could not do, and what was to them, as to us the mystery of redeeming love. Compared to this, the love of which Dr. Bushnell speaks sinks to the level of an every day affair—manifested by every philanthropist and patriot. It is like changing a bridegroom's love for his bride into philanthropy; or a mother's love for her child into benevolence. But let that pass. What we have now to remark is, that his theory overlooks the nature of the

end to be accomplished; an end for which moral power, by itself, and in itself, has no adaptation. What could all the love or tenderness in the world accomplish for the redemption of a man under a righteous sentence of death? It could not reverse the sentence. It could not open the prison doors. It could not make it right that the criminal should be pardoned. Here again the great fact of Scripture and of human consciousness, that we are guilty, under a just sentence of condemnation, is in this scheme utterly ignored. A theory which makes no provision for anything but sanctification, which overlooks the necessity of pardon, or more properly of justification, is utterly unsuited to the known condition of sinners. It is also just as impotent for sanctification. What good can all the warmth and light in the world do a corpse? What effect has the love of God on devils? What influence had the love and holiness of Christ on his murderers? or, upon those now who are dead in trespasses and sins? Dr. Bushnell is like a skilful physician who should provide a rich abundance of food, and overlook the little circumstance that his patient was dead.

It need hardly be remarked in addition, that the theory of this book contradicts all those facts of Scripture and experience which prove that God is a sovereign in the distribution of his favours; that "he has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens." The love of God as revealed in the Bible and in history is not a principle which operates by a necessity of its nature, and with equal energy towards all the subjects of sin and misery. "I thank thee," says the tender and blessed Jesus himself, "that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." In point of fact God did not save the fallen angels. In point of fact he does not treat the Chinese as he does the inhabitants of Europe and America; nor the people of Italy and Spain as he does those of Protestant England and of the United States. The exercise of his love is determined by own will and wisdom; by his justice and righteousness. The believer is willing to leave all things in his hands, assured that he will do all things well, that in the end it will appear that the Judge of all the earth does right, however incompetent we may be to understand his ways.

It is intolerable that such an intellectual animalcule as man should sit in judgment on the infinite God, and lay down the law for Him, and decide he must do this and abstain from doing that. Our only business is to ascertain, from his word and providence, what he does do, and on the facts thus furnished construct our scheme of doctrine.

Dr. Bushnell's theory, as it ignores or denies some of the plainest facts of the Bible and the most articulate declarations of the common consciousness of men, so it is destructive of practical religion. If his doctrine be true there can be no conviction of sin. There may be a sense of pollution and degradation, but there can be no sense of guilt, no remorse of conscience, no apprehension of the wrath and curse of God; none of those feelings which arise from the apprehension of the glory of God's justice. Yet the Bible is filled with the record of those feelings; and all Christian experience, and, indeed, all religious experience include them as one of their most essential elements. Without the conviction of sin, as involving a sense of guilt, there can be no genuine repentance. Repentance is not only sorrow for sin and a purpose to forsake it, but an acknowledgment of our desert of punishment, and conviction that we lie at the mercy of God; that it would be just and right, consistent with all his perfections, to leave us to bear the penalty of our transgression. This is not a dictum. The Scriptures abound with evidence that repentance includes the conviction and acknowledgment that the penitent deserves, notwithstanding all his service and all his reformation, to be punished for his sins; that his acceptance by God is a matter purely of grace. The Psalmist says, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and clear when thou judgest." Our Lord puts the language of true repentance in the mouth of the prodigal son, who said, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants." This sense of unworthiness, this conviction of ill-desert, after reformation and in despite of it, is expressed in all the supplications of repenting sinners for pardon. With Dr. Bushnell there is no pardon; any more than for a broken leg. With

him repentance is restoration to holiness, followed by deliverance from the natural evils of a sinful state of mind. It is mere restoration to health. God has nothing to forgive, and forgives nothing, any more than a mother forgives a sick child when she rejoices over its recovery.

Saving faith, or those acts of faith, which secure salvation, includes a receiving and resting upon Christ alone, as he is offered in the gospel. It is the recognition of him as God manifest in the flesh, obeying and dying for the sins of men. It is faith in his blood as an expiation for our offences; a resting upon his merits as the ground of our acceptance with God. It is receiving him not only as a prophet and king, but as a priest to make an atonement for our sins. This is not a transient act merely. It is an abiding state of the mind. It is a habitual relying upon Christ as the ground of pardon, as well as the source of sanctification and of all good, temporal and spiritual. This is the received doctrine of the Bible, inwrought into all the confessions, formulas of prayer and of praise, as well as into the hearts of God's people. It is their life. Sin, as they know, must be expiated, before they can be made holy. All this, Dr. Bushnell denies. Not indeed so much in words, as in reality. The Rationalists of Germany, while holding only the doctrines of natural religion, deliberately retained the use of all scriptural language and representation. They too talked of justification by faith, (meaning by it substantially what Dr. Bushnell does); they did not hesitate to say that Christ saves us; that he is the Lamb of God; that he bore our sins; that he is our high priest; that he makes intercession for us, &c. But the ideas attached by Christians to these words they utterly rejected. So Dr. Bushnell defends the use of the same or similar formulas in an esoteric sense. He is honest enough to admit that his views are very different from those commonly expressed by the same terms. He says he is well aware how insufficient his exposition of the great doctrine of justification by faith will appear to many. P. 439. With him, as we have seen, justification is inward renovation, and of which faith is the necessary condition; it is the receptivity, or susceptibility for the moral power of the gospel.

Of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, which is the

Protestant and Pauline doctrine, he confesses that calling it, "*articula stantis, vel cadentis ecclesie*, I could more easily see the church fall than believe it." P. 439. "We only speak," he says, "of justification by faith, as a new footing of salvation, because there is such a power obtained for God, by the human life and death of Christ, and the new enforcements of his doctrine, as begets a new sense of sin, provokes the sense of spiritual want, and, when trust is engaged, creates a new element of advantage and help, to bring the soul up into victory over itself and seal it as the heir of God. And thus it is, or in the sense thus qualified, that we speak of justification by faith, as the grand result of Christ's work, and the all-inclusive grace of his salvation." P. 405. The simple meaning of all this, in plain English, is, that Christ has made such an exhibition of the goodness and greatness of God, that those who recognize it are thereby strengthened to overcome sin, love God, and are thus delivered from all the evils naturally connected with a sinful state of mind. How sad a prospect the dying thief, or any other perishing sinner, must have had, if that is the way in which Christ saves us; if that be the meaning of justification by faith.

It follows, moreover, from the theory of this book that prayer has no objective power. If God is striving to the utmost, under the necessary operation of love, to convert and save all sinners; if this work is effected not by "*fiat-power*" but by expression, or moral influence, what is the use of praying that God would send his Spirit to regenerate or sanctify, or to do us any good? Dr. Bushnell is bold enough to ridicule the scriptural doctrine on this subject. "We have a way of saying," he tells us, "as regards successful prayer, that it *prevails with God*. Is it then our meaning that it turns God's mind, makes him better, more favorable, more inclined to bestow the things we seek? But the true conception is this—that God has instituted an economy of prayer to work on Christian souls and brotherhoods, and encouraging them to come and make suit to him, for the blessings they need;" and so on through a paragraph all tending to prove that the effect of prayer is purely subjective. P. 521. Was this the design of the prayers of Christ? Were they intended to get him "into

a state more configured to God," so that the Father could "be able to grant, or dispense, things which before he could not?" Was such the intent of the prayer of Elias when he prayed that it might not rain, and it rained not for three years? Is this the prayer of faith which heals the sick? or the effectual fervent prayer for others of a righteous man which availeth much? Is such the mother's prayer for her child, or the constant prayers of the people of God for the conversion of the impenitent?

It is not worth while to continue this review further. It is evident that Dr. Bushnell's theory is at variance with the plainest facts and truths of the Bible; with the facts of Christian experience, or the inward teachings of the Spirit as avouched by the inspired records and the whole history of the church; with the most obvious facts of providence as well as of revelation. It subverts the very foundations of evangelical religion as well as of Christian theology. And all for what? Simply because Dr. Bushnell does not like the idea of expiation. He says, it revolts him. As there is no expiation, there can be nothing in God which demands it—(no justice); nothing in sin, which requires it, (no guilt); nothing in Scripture which teaches it; no atoning sacrifice, only lustrations; no efficacy in Christ's blood beyond what belongs to the blood of martyrs; no judicial, or even rectoral justification; no intervention in our behalf possible even for God himself, but to operate on our guilty, depraved, dead souls, in the "way of expression." This surely is a costly sacrifice to make to propitiate an aversion.