

subjective side, and denies, or neglects the objective side. His view is a protest against all merely external, mechanical and unspiritual confidence in the Atonement, and an emphasizing of the fact that Christ is a Redeemer in man; but while he does this, he totally ignores the other Scripture fact, that Christ is also a Redeemer for man. He takes no account whatever of Christ's objective satisfaction. There is truth in the view, but it does not go far enough. We all preach the moral influence theory, but Scripture will never permit us to teach this doctrine of the Atonement as involving the whole truth. The Bible everywhere declares that it is the death of Jesus, and not "a passion for Jesus," or "the moral influence" of Jesus, that saves men. The Moral Influence Theory leaves the sacrificial language of the New Testament and the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament a meaningless riddle. Take away God's purpose to save and Prometheus Vincetus has then more meaning and purpose than the Old Testament, and is not so horrible to read. What Dr. Watson's views of Old Testament sacrifice are, we know not. Bähr's view seems the only tenable one—that Old Testament sacrifice was simply "an exhibition of the sinner's self-surrender." Go and tell men that yonder bloody tragedy enacted on Calvary is a cool, calculated, theatrical exhibition gotten up for the express purpose of producing a melting, touching effect on their hearts and sensibilities, and within the heart of every manly, noble man, you rouse resentment, disgust and scorn. Such a view robs Christ's death of every vestige of pity, justice and love, and confines its benefits to those who are fortunate enough to witness it, read of it, or hear of the story and its purpose. The rest of the race it leaves to sink in starless darkness forever.

There is truth in every theory of the Atonement. Every theory is true; true so far as it goes. Is it the theory of Pelagius, Socinus, Bushnell and company. It teaches the great truth of the necessity and grandeur of Christ's example, and the moral influence of His sufferings and death on the hearts of men. Is it the Grotian or governmental theory?