

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 6.—OCTOBER, 1888.

I. THE PENTATEUCHAL STORY OF CREATION.

IN the opening portion of the Book of Genesis we have a history of creation which claims to be a direct revelation from God. Geology aims to give us a history of creation gathered from a careful study of the structure of the earth itself, especially the study of its fossils—those “medals of creation,” as they have been aptly termed—in which many things respecting the order of creation are written for our learning.

These two histories ought to be in perfect harmony the one with the other. The books of revelation and of nature, where they cover the same ground, ought to agree. And yet, as a matter of fact, and as these two records are often interpreted, so great is their apparent discrepancy as to lead Prof. Huxley to write:

“My belief is, and long has been, that the Pentateuchal story of creation is simply a myth. I suppose it to be a hypothesis respecting the origin of the universe which some ancient thinker found himself able to reconcile with his knowledge of the nature of things, and therefore assumed to be true. As such I hold it to be not only an interesting, but a venerable monument of a stage in the mental progress of mankind, . . . and to possess neither more nor less scientific importance than the cosmogonies of the Egyptians and Babylonians.”—*Order of Creation*, page 147.

Such discrepancies as are alleged in this case are, I believe, apparent, not real, and may be owing either to a misinterpretation of the Pentateuchal story of creation, or to a misreading of the

does not symbolize with the Arminian. We are apt to think that any theological system interjected between these two, like the corn poured into the hopper, is likely to be triturated between the upper and the nether millstone. He affirms neither Calvinism nor Arminianism; he affirms Alexandrianism. His system is *sui generis*, as might have been expected from his dislike to "Dogmatic or Ecclesiastical Theology;" and unless it be a supreme revelation of theological truth which is destined to eclipse and supersede all other systems, there is no assumption of prophetic sagacity in forecasting for it neither a wide nor a permanent influence.

The paper, the printing, the binding of these volumes are simply exquisite. The beauty of the book would tempt a Calvinist to read the strictures on Imputation, and an Arminian the censure of Universal Atonement.

JOHN L. GIRARDEAU.

THE NEW THEOLOGY IN THE ANTIPODES.

THE REIGN OF GRACE. A Discussion of the Question of the Possibility of Salvation for all Men in this Life, or in the Life to Come. *By William Salmond, D. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, University of Otago, New Zealand.* Dunedin: James Horsburgh. 1888. pp. 64, 12mo. (Fourth Thousand.)

THE DAY OF SALVATION, obscured in a recent pamphlet on "The Reign of Grace." *By Rev. James Macgregor, D. D., Oamaru.* Dunedin: New Zealand Bible, Tract, and Book Depository. 1888. pp. 72, 12mo.

These two pamphlets bring us news of the outbreak of the "new theology" at the ends of the earth. Dr. William Salmond, formerly Professor of Theology in the Theological School of the Presbyterian "Church of Otago and Southland," almost immediately on his transference to the chair of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Otago (a chair endowed by and apparently filled by nomination of the Synod), startles the church by the publication of this pamphlet, in which he proclaims his adherence to an extreme form of the teaching of the "new theology" as to human destiny. He feels how equivocal the situation is and anticipates "the barbed question," why he has kept silence until it has become "convenient" to himself to speak. Of course the question is asked; and in the vigorous hands of Dr. Macgregor it becomes a severe arraignment of the at least apparent immorality of years of silent acceptance of the emoluments of the church "as teacher of that doctrine which at the time he did not believe," followed by almost immediate speech so soon as "he was placed by his church in his present office, where for the present his temporal interest is secured independently of her will." It has been the misfortune of the "new theology" that it has produced as yet few martyrs.

Dr. Salmond's pamphlet is admirably and strongly written, and seems to spring from an earnest spirit upon which the ills of humanity weigh heavily. It is characterized by a degree of candor unusual in books of its class. Its precise contention is for "an extension of time during which the mercy of God endures for repentant sinners" (p. 46); and the church doctrine to which it is most pointedly opposed is, therefore, that which teaches that death ends probation. "Probation" is scarcely a suitable word to use, however, in this connection, for it seems to imply that the issue may be doubtful, while Dr. Salmond cannot but hope that the persistent mercy of God will bring all souls back to him, though he will not dogmatically assert it. The doctrine of the pamphlet is thus an undogmatic universalism; it is even frankly said that no kind of answer can be given on its theory "if only

one soul were lost" (p. 51), and if any one is not saved, certainly God "will not uphold him in existence for no reason but to inflict tortures on him through endless ages" (pp. 63-4). There is clearly a more serious departure from confessional theology here than mere universalism, and Dr. Salmond is candid enough to confess it. Here is a changed view of the condition of man, of the relation of God to man, of the relation of Christ's work, and even of the nature of God himself. The author very correctly perceives that the roots of the whole matter are set in the question as to "the Divine Nature and Attributes." Is he a just and holy God who hates sin and will visit it with his displeasure? or is he Love in such a sense that he has no displeasure, and, by necessity of nature, must withhold his hand? Dr. Salmond stands for the latter view.

Of course such teaching has not been permitted to pass unchallenged. The ablest reply that it has as yet called forth, is the second pamphlet named at the head of this notice, which comes from the pen of Dr. Macgregor, formerly Professor of Theology in the Free Church College, Edinburgh. Its hasty preparation will doubtless account for the traces of insufficient dignity that sometimes mar its style. But as a refutation of Dr. Salmond it is fully adequate. Dr. Macgregor rightly makes the doctrine of God central to the discussion and shows that the contention that God must prolong his proposals of mercy into the next world rests on a conception of him which denies that "he doeth all things according to the counsel of his will," and places his activities under the direction of a grinding necessity arising from his love conceived of not as the love of choice but as that of mere general benevolence, to which is allowed no power of will to choose the recipients of its benefits or to fit its favors to desert. Thus we are brought perilously near to an impersonal and non-moral necessity in substitution for the christian God. Dr. Macgregor next insists that the real question is after all not what such a God must do, but what the real God has said he will do. And here Dr. Salmond has confessed judgment, as he admits that his theory will not agree with the sayings of Christ, who, he will have us believe, habitually spoke with the fervor of a popular preacher and thus failed to preserve that equilibrium between the urgency of the preacher and the calm of the religious philosopher for which we must strive.

What the outcome of the controversy will be for the little church whose peace it has broken can scarcely be foreseen. But thinking men will not fail to note Dr. Salmond's witness to the opinion which is so rapidly gaining ground in America, that the "new theology" is but the natural fruitage of the new views which were sown so broadcast a generation ago, and that it stands, therefore, as the historical judgment upon them. If men "affirm without qualification the Universal Fatherhood of God, and his equal love to all men, that Christ died for all men and every separate man [in the same sense], and that God unequivocally wills that all men should be saved," they will find no harmony for their teachings "with the ways of God in Providence and the facts of human life, if death puts an absolute limit to the possibility of salvation." Men are not treated with equal love here. "Let us go back, if we will," he adds with the greatest justice, "to the stern attitude of those who pointed to these things as proof of God's eternal decree of preterition; but, if not, let us not shrink from the inevitable inference that here we see but a part of the ways of God with men, and that the message of mercy must needs resound in both worlds." The advice is good. The vagaries of the newest theology of our day is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the new teachings of the last generation and God's scourge to drive men back to his truth.

B. B. WARFIELD.