
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

BIBLICAL COSMOLOGY AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALL OF THE WORLD.[1]

BY REV. W. F. WARREN, D.D., MISSIONS ANSTALT, BREMEN, GERMANY.

Science has robbed us of the old heaven up among the stars — the heaven of the Bible and of childhood. She has unroofed the imposing temple under whose dome of spangled azure David sang, and the whole procession of primitive saints reverently trod. She has left us no firmament to support God's throne, and "his footstool" has become a flying, whirling ball. She has taken us down to the ancient Sheol, and lo! instead of souls, there is nothing there but seething chemicals and centres of gravitational and magnetic attraction. The goings forth of morning and evening no more rejoice; it is only an optical illusion, produced by the diurnal revolution of the earth. To ascend into heaven now and twelve hours hence, is to go in diametrically opposite directions. The deeper you descend into hell, the higher you go into the heaven of your antipodes. The world has no longer top or bottom. Up and down are become provincialisms, meaningless to all who take comprehensive views of things. We ourselves are but microscopic animalculae, clinging to a grain of sand, which eddies its little round in the obscurest corner of the great cosmos of nature. Our heaven is gone, our old hell, our biblical picture of creation, the significance of natural evil, our own central position and importance in the universe of being. Science has robbed us of all these things. Science must bring them back.

Can she do it? Is there to come a time when the rain-

[1] Die Schöpfungsgechichte und die Lehre vom Paradies. Ein urgeschichtlicher Versuch von Philipp Friedrich Keerl. Also under the title: Der Mensch das Ebenbild Gottes; sein Verhältniss zu Christo und zur Welt. Erster Band. Basel Bahumeiers Buchhandlung (C. Detloff) 1861. 8vo. pp. xiii and 904.

bow shall again be the seal of a divine covenant, and not an illustration of the laws of optics? Is there to come a time when we shall be able, without scientific compunction, to call the peopled sky *heaven*, and, with the simple souls of old time, joy to descry in its remotest spaces the hearth-fires of the holy, the never-darkened tabernacles of the angels — "the faire folk of God"? *Can* science re-hallow the vast temple she has so ruthlessly, so utterly desecrated? Can she again fill it with the hush of awful presences, the sanctity of a divine habitation? Will she ever be able to cast out the buyers and sellers, the whole herd of scientific speculators which she has introduced, and re-invest the dismantled altars with their original sacredness?

The question is no idle one. A sadness steals over us when we identify ourselves with the childlike believer of old time, who lived all his days with a real heaven right over his head, and a real under-world beneath his feet; to whom the ocean was not a big pond, but a circumambient infinity; to whom all evil and deformity was from sin and the devil, and all beauty and joy from God and his angels. The contrast between his religious consciousness and our own is a painful one, and we cannot but feel it so. So the contrast between our present mature, scientific, world-view and that of our childish years. The latter was infinitely more religious and — let us out with it — more Biblical. To our young, wondering, reverent eyes, the whole world was a grand, starred, and curtained sanctuary, the worthy dwelling-place of God and all his varied families. Now it has become to us a vast out-door infinity, in which dead masses of material swing under the impulses of mechanical force. We used to *believe* in heaven, and in the possibility of some time *going* there, until the astronomers taught us that none was to be found inside the offing of the fixed stars, and that to pass that boundary line would require, even at the velocity of a cannon-ball, the best part of one's expected immortality! We have all known the painful experience of seeing our child-heaven fade out into thin air and emp-

tiness, and we can all join with Hood in that rythmed sigh in which he so pathetically voices his disappointment on learning that the tall fir-tree tops of his childhood home were *not* close against the sky.

> "It was a childish ignorance,
> But now 'tis little joy
> *To know I'm farther off from heaven*
> *Than when I was a boy.*"

But the question: Can science re-hallow nature? has more than this mere poetic interest. It has a high practical importance. Who can find any comfort in pursuing investigations into the wonderful works of God, when every discovery only seems to remove him further from us? Who is not painfully conscious, as he reads the word of God, of a great discrepancy between his scientific world-view and that of revelation? Whose sensibilities are not more or less jarred by this consciousness? How often does our school-wisdom bring us to a dead stand in our religious meditations! We read: "He descended into the lower parts of the earth;" but the picture of the molten, seething centre rises before us, and our shocked sensibilities revolting, check all further thought. We can accompany our blessed Lord through all the scenes of his earthly career; but the moment we leave Olivet to follow him heavenward, imagination, instead of nearing, with ever intenser emotion, "the tall, white portals of eternity," and, with the transfigured King of Glory sweeping through to join the rising acclamations of the heavenly host, falters, finds herself in "the upper regions of the atmosphere," with millions of weary leagues of emptiness between her and any reasonable place for heaven. She can no more soar than a bird in a vacuum. Then we speculate: if heaven be beyond all these shining worlds, whose light, travelling with inconceivable velocity, requires such myriads of years to reach us, it cannot be the heaven which, in the days of Jacob, was within ladder-reach of Syria's hill-tops. It is not the "Paradise" which was within at least a day's journey of the crosses of Golgotha.

Is heaven, then, *illocal*, and are we wrong to speak of here or there? Do we thereby only betray our own "gross materialistic conceptions"? Must we think of the spirit-land as the metaphysicians instruct us, as "*nowhere*"? Must we adopt Dr. Good's dismal doctrine of the soul, and say with him, "the mind or thinking principle can have no PLACE of existence; it can exist no WHERE, for where or place is an idea that cannot be separated from the idea of extension." Must we be content with this metaphysical heaven, absolutely nowhere, and containing nothing but extensionless, positionless, motionless "monads," once known as souls? Or, revolting from this, shall we, with Sears ("Foregleams of Immortality"), conceive of the natural and spiritual spheres as concentric and conterminous; a world within a world; the invisible infolding the visible, earth bosomed in heaven? Why then an ascension at all? The whole scene was illusive. It was a spectral phenomenon in condescension to the prejudices of the disciples, a theatric show. So run our busy thoughts, and meanwhile nature remains as meaningless as the spiritual world is intangible and visionary.

But the reconciliation of natural and revealed knowledge must come. We do not believe in it and labor for it half so heartily and hopefully as we ought to do. It MUST come. If this universe is GOD'S universe; if man bears, in a peculiar sense, the image of his Maker; if this earth is the theatre of that divine drama whereinto the angels desire to look; if nature experienced the curse of the fall, whelmed a guilty world in waters, shuddered at the crime of the crucifixion and hid its perpetrators in a pall; if the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now, waiting for the adoption; if human history is of such central significance that at its completion a grand cosmical revolution is to ensue, heaven and earth pass away with a great noise, the elements melt with fervent heat, a new heaven and a new earth to rise from the universal ruin; in a word, if the grand fundamental doctrines of Christianity respecting the origin, history, and destiny of our globe are tru[illegible]

Bible and natural science come to terms — a place must be formed for nature in the plans of God; a place for God's plans in nature.

Believing as heartily in the possibility, and feeling so intensely the necessity of such a reconciliation, we are prepared to welcome every attempt at mediation, however wild and visionary it may at first seem. Unfortunately in our cosmological speculations in England and America, one-sided tendencies, either materialistic or spiritualistic, have generally prevailed to such an extent as to prevent any perceptible advance toward a satisfactory solution of our problem. We suppose it is generally known that in Germany these speculations are pursued in a broader and more comprehensive spirit. We should antecedently expect it to be so. The whole genius of Lutheranism as a metaphysical, theological, and ecclesiastical system, tends to guard it from that ultra-spiritualism which has often prevailed in the speculations of Reformed theologians and philosophers respecting such subjects as the disembodied state, the resurrection-body, etc.; while, on the other hand, it betrays little tendency to run into coarse materialism. Add to this the healthy realistic tendency of the latest schools of philosophy and natural science, and we are fully justified in expecting from contemporary German thinkers profound and valuable contributions to that edifice which shall ultimately combine the final results of astronomic and geologic science, and the plain, immutable teachings and assumptions of the word of God, in one harmonious, comprehensive whole.

Of all the German works in this department of investigation, perhaps none possesses for our Anglo-Saxon readers a greater intrinsic or representative interest than that from the pen of Keerl, published last year. We have placed its title at the head of this Article with the design of reproducing its contents and mode of argumentation, so far as may be necessary to give the reader a correct idea of the general style of cosmological speculations in the father-land, and of the general results to which many have come.

The work of which we speak is an octavo of eight hundred and four pages, without counting preface, contents, etc. It is published both as an independent work under the title: the History of Creation and Doctrine of Paradise, and as the first volume of a larger one entitled: Man the Image of God; his Relation to Christ and to the World. The body of the work is divided into three parts, each subdivided as follows:

I. The Realm of Creation. pp. 10–123. 1. The Sun. 2. The Planets. 3. Meteors. 4. Comets. 5. The Fixed Stars. 6. The Central Sun. 7. The Changeableness of the Stars. 8. The Binary and Multiple Stars. 9. Nebulae. 10. Dark Bodies in the Region of the Fixed Stars. 11. The Distance of the Fixed Stars. 12. Nature and Condition of the Fixed Stars. 13. Inferences and Conclusions.

II. The History of Creation. pp. 124–686. 1. The Scripture Record. 2. The Creation of the Heavens and the Earth. 3. Tohu va Bohu. 4. The Relation of Satan to the Earth. 5. The Relation of Satan to the Planets. 6. The Angels and the Fixed Stars. 7. The Judgment [final burning up] of the Heavens. 8. The Spirit of God over the Waters. 9. The Evolution of Light. 10. The Superior and Inferior Waters. 11. Creation of Sun, Moon, and Stars. 12. Origination of the Planetary System according to La Place's Hypothesis. 13. The Formation of the Earth out of Water. 14. Formation of the Mountains. 15. The Mountains of the Earth. 16. Continuation. 17. Continuation (the Deluge). 18. Continuation and Conclusion. 19. Character of the primordial Earth. 20. The Creation of the Vegetable World. 21. Creation of Animals. 22. Animals of the pre-Adamic and of the Present World. 23. Continuation. 24. Dividing Line between the Primordial and the pre-Adamic World (Urwelt und Vorwelt). 25. Climatic Relations of the Ur-Vor-und Jetztwelt. 26. Duration of the Days of Creation.

III. The Doctrine of Paradise. pp. 687–804. 1. Relation of Genesis i. to Genesis ii. 2. Continuation. 3. Second

Creation of Plants. 4. Second Creation of Animals. 5. The Site and History of Paradise.

In style the author is remarkably clear, forcible, animated, often rising almost to the poetic. In argument he is acute, searching, thorough. He seems equally at home in theology, astronomy, and geology. His continual reference to important works in each of these departments, especially to the latest productions in each, give his book a peculiar literary value, which all students will know how to prize. As a whole the book must be pronounced a well-studied, well-constructed, and well-written performance.

Now as to his views: What does he advance, which bears upon the solution of the great problem to which we have alluded — the re-habitation of nature in its lost religious significance? We will endeavor to reproduce his whole theory in few words:

The fixed stars are realms of light and purity — the many mansions of God's house. The elements of which our solar system is composed, originally constituted a similar self-luminous and holy world (the "earth" of Gen. i. 1), and was the "estate" or "principality" which Satan and his angels "kept not," the "habitation" which they "left" (Jude 6). By their fall this glorious constituent orb of heaven was precipitated into a dark, formless, chaotic state, and became the Tohu va Bohu of Gen. i. 2. Its light went out in darkness, its elements dissolved, a world of heavenly life and glory was transformed into a Stygian pool of murky waters, the haunt of devils. Over these dark and deadly waters, the Spirit of God swept, at the commencement of the Mosaic creation. Light was brought forth. Then the waters were separated from the waters; i. e. the liquid material of which the sun and planets were afterwards formed, was separated from that which remained as material for the earth. The formation of the solid earth and the mountains is maintained to have taken place according to the Plutonian theory; Paradise was not a mere garden, "an English park," but a superinduction of heavenly life

upon the already deranged and depravated earth, identical with that which shall be in the "new earth." The destination of man was the complete subjugation, redemption, and occupation of the re-erected Satanic world, embracing the whole solar system. Failing to realize this destination, he is driven out of Paradise, the evil physical potencies regain the upper hand, and though the earth still remains comparatively an Eden, and nature possesses all that fulness of vital energy indicated by the astonishing longevity of the antediluvians, the growing corruption of men brings on another world-catastrophe, and a new discovery of the divine resources commences. The heavens to be purified by the final judgment of fire at the end of the world, are the planetary heavens. Composed of the same depraved primordial Tohu va Bohu with our earth, they need the same purification. By this baptism of fire, the drama of redemption being complete, the principle of cosmical evil which has so long poisoned earth and the nearer heavens, will be completely destroyed, the devils will be cast out of their mundane retreats, and plunged into the fiery lake prepared for them, the new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, rise to view, the New Jerusalem descends from God out of heaven, the city which shall have no need of the sun nor of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God shall lighten it, and the Lamb be the light thereof. Thenceforth shall there be no more night in this restored light-world, and no more sea to remind of the chaotic waters over which, in the beginning, the Spirit of God moved.

Such, in imperfect outline, is the view advanced. It would be interesting to trace the main steps by which the author seeks to establish one point after the other, from beginning to end, but it would expand our Article beyond the bounds of propriety. It would also afford no little instruction to take up particular points which have been discussed in our literature with much zeal, as for instance, the questions respecting the length of the days of creation,

the plurality of inhabited worlds, the *Bene Elohim* in Gen. vi. 2, etc., and compare our author's method and results with those of Anglo-Saxon writers. This, however, would only afford a few desultory glimpses into the work before us, and throw no light upon its relation, as a whole, to the grand and only practically important end of all present cosmological philosophising, to wit, the above-mentioned reconciliation of natural science and revealed truth. As, on the other hand, one of the chief difficulties in the way of the Christian philosopher, is found in the presence of physical disorder and death in the world's history anterior to the fall of man, and as with the solution of this difficulty a very long step is taken toward the harmonizing of natural and sacred history, we prefer to select for closer examination that portion of our author's theory which explains all physical disorder and evil, both in the earth and in her sister planets, as resulting from the fall, NOT OF ADAM, BUT OF SATAN.

In the first place, we scarcely need remark that this hypothesis is by no means a novel one. Indeed traces of it can be found in the mythologies of all primitive races.[1] Origenes, as is well known, understood the New Testament phrase, *καταβολὴ τοῦ κόσμου*, which we invariably translate, "foundation of the world," literally, i.e. as "the casting down of the world," and regarded the material world as the ruins ("precipitate") of a higher angelic one. The adherents to this opinion seem to have soon become sufficiently numerous to call for the express rejection of it as an error, by the fifth Oecumenical Council. Tholuck quotes in one of his essays a saying of the old English king Edgar, in the tenth century, in which we find the same view. It was held and stoutly inculcated by Boehmen, and all his theo-

[1] In a very elaborate appendix, of ten closely printed pages, at the close of the third chapter of Part Second, Keerl has adduced, in confutation of an unqualified statement of Delitzsch, to the effect that no extra-Israelitish myth can be found which points to a primitive chaos brought about by an angelic rebellion, extracts from authentic myths of the Chinese, Japanese, East Indians, ancient Persians, Egyptians, Grecians, Northmen, Mexicans, and other ancient people in support of his position.

sophic successors. It is mentioned by Episcopius, Malabranche and Leibnitz, and more or less approved and accepted by many of the latest and best natural philosophers of Germany. Our author claims for it (p. 217) the sanction of the following, among the philosophers: Fr. von Schlegel, Fr. von Baader, Fr. Hoffman, F. Schaden, Kreuzhage, and Molitor; among naturalists: Buckland, von Schubert, K. von Raumer, A. Wagner, and to a certain extent, H. Steffens; among literary men, F. von Meyer, Rougement, Hamberger, Dillmar, and others; among theologians: Kanne, Stier, Drecheler, Rudelbach, Guerike, Tholuck, Schnieder, Kurz, Ebrard, Baumgarten, Hengstenberg, Richers, Delitzsch, Engelhardt, Ranke, Reichel, Kniewel, Wichart, Lebeau, F. W. Krug, Rocholl, Hotho, Werner, L. Schmid. Several of these, as the writer knows, hold to the opinion, and Keerl affirms that all of them do. If true, (and Kurz has before claimed the most of them),[1] our author stands in no danger of "lone conspicuity," or of acquiring the reputation of a fantastic innovator. Right or wrong, he certainly has no reason to be ashamed of his company.

We do not find in the work before us any summary of the evidence in favor of this theory, but it will perhaps serve a good purpose to state some of the considerations which may be, and are, urged by its advocates as proof of its correctness. It will be impossible to do justice to our author's logic in a statement so brief and condensed; since in such matters the full force of the argument can only be seen from the full development and connection of the various considerations. If, however, the main points on which the hypothesis must depend for support are distinctly intimated, the grouping of them will have an independent value for such as wish to reflect upon the subject more at leisure for themselves.

1. The first consideration which occurs to us is, that as a theory it is not intrinsically absurd or incredible. *As a*

[1] See his work, Bibel und Astronomie, and J. P. Lange's Christliche Dogmatik. Vol. II. p. 570.

mere theory it need not be ashamed to challenge comparison with the prevailing ones. The theory which attributes the entrance of physical disorder and death into the world, to the fall of Adam, is well enough as a theory, but unfortunately falsified by every fact of the pre-Adamic period. The theory of "*anticipative consequences*," advocated by Dr. Bushnell and others,[1] needs no other conviction of logical confusion and self-contradiction than that contained in its own name. The supposition that God created chaos with all its horrors, and gradually advanced to the production of the present relatively perfect flora and fauna of the world through those stages of malformed, noxious, hideous, and malign creation, which preceeded merely because to Infinite Wisdom this seemed the best way of creating and furnishing an Eden world,[2] is a little hard to believe, and open to many a plausible objection. The resolution of the whole thing into a matter of divine caprice,[3] or of divine sportiveness,[4] is plainly undeserving of sober consideration. As a mere hypothesis then, this Origenistic one would seem at

[1] Nature and the Supernatural, Chapters VI. and VII.

[2] Meth. Quarterly Review, April, 1862, Art. vi.

[3] See, for instance, Dr. A. Clarke on Gen. i. 24, when speaking of the mastodon he remarks: "This animal, an astonishing effect of God's power, he seems to have produced *merely to show what he could do (!)*, and after suffering a few of them to propagate, he extinguished the race *by a merciful providence*, that they might not destroy both man and beast." What an illustration of divine wisdom!

[4] Poets, in the exercise of their legitimate license, have pronounced flowers "God's smiles." Poetic naturalists, going yet further, have discovered, as they fancy, traces of playfulness and humor in the works of the Creator. Hence a theory, oftener hinted than openly maintained, that all the incohate and fantastic creatures of the pre-Adamite period were only the sportings of God's exuberant fancy — play-creations, burlesques of things about to be. That in a certain sense God *amuses* himself, i. e. finds pleasure in the wisdom and cunning handiwork of his creations, may perhaps be allowed, especially if we translate Prov. viii. 30 with Luther: "Ich *spielete* vor ihm alle zeit, und *spielete* auf seinem Erdboden," etc. But when we look at the real monstrosity, ugliness, and noxiousness of these supposed *play-creations*, the preposterousness of such a theory is at once apparent. What should we think and say of a heathen's deity whose ghastly *pastime* was the creation and destruction of such horrid dragons as those of the primitive earth?

least as good as any that have been advanced. Abstractly viewed it certainly has advantages over all except the one which attributes derangement and mortality and ugliness in nature to the sin of man.

2. The advocates of this theory claim that every presupposition possible to the human mind, every consideration drawn from the perfections of God, lies directly against the common scientific notion. We should not antecedently expect from the hand of a perfect and holy God a chaos. On the contrary, every *a priori* consideration would cause us to deny the possibility of such a creation. So, for instance, Keerl (p. 167), after describing the earth when in its *Tohu va Bohu* condition, continues: "And is this the earth, we may fairly ask, which comes forth directly from the hand of that God of whom the scriptures testify that he is the Father of Lights, from whom every good and perfect gift cometh (James i. 17); who dwelleth in light which no man can approach unto (1 Tim. vi. 16); who covereth himself with light as with a garment (Ps. civ. 2)? Shall we call this desolate, insensate, lifeless mass the work of him who is a lover of life, who has no pleasure in death, who will and must everywhere and always reveal himself as the God and Father of the glory and good order of life in his creation as well as elsewhere? Is not creation a mode of divine manifestation, and will not his being reflect itself in his work? But how shall the invisible things of God, even his eternal power and Godhead, be seen in a *Tohu va Bohu* which absolutely contradicts the light and life-glory of God? The God who himself dwells in light, whose very essence is light (1 John i. 5) can will no other than a world of light. To that God who is the original source of life, everything dead and lifeless must be an abomination. One might perhaps say that the *Tohu va Bohu* is only the beginning and foundation on which God afterwards manifests his being — a dark foil, as it were, that the light may beam the more brightly. Doth the light then need the darkness in order that its glory may be perceived? Then must also the light life of

God repose upon a dark back-ground. Is death the presupposition of life; and can life come to know itself as life only in antithesis to death? But are not in this way the antitheses which sin brought into the world carried over in to God's original creation, yea, made absolute?"

3. The first positive argument is sought in the words *Tohu va Bohu*. These, it is claimed, signify more than a mere negative condition of *un*order and form*less*ness and life*less*ness. They denote a state of positive *dis*order, *disturbed life, derangement of what was once in order*. Our author devotes ten pages of acute philological and critical investigation (pp. 170–180) to the discussion of this point, and arrives at the conclusion that "these words designate a condition brought about by the penal judgment of God." This interpretation has the countenance of Stier, Kurz, Baumgarten, Richers, and many others. Its bearing upon the argument is then of course duly developed and enforced.

4. Another argument is drawn from the Hebrew expression וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ, which Keerl, Stier, and others translate, not "the earth WAS," but "the earth BECAME formless and void." In the work before us the reasons for and against this version seem to be given with much fairness, and we confess that to our own mind they are so nearly balanced that we can find little force in the argument derived from this source.

Another argument is found in the existence of "*darkness*," which cannot be regarded as a direct production of the Creator. The position that darkness, even as a physical phenomenon, is according to scripture language and views "a manifestation of the wrath of God, is maintained with remarkable skill in a discussion of considerable length (pp. 185–195). The doctrine (represented by Nägelsbach) that darkness is just as normal and beneficent as light, is met on scientific ground, and to the author's mind satisfactorily disposed of (p. 188).

6. A sixth consideration is drawn from the word תְּהוֹם, "*the deep*," which it is claimed designates the elements as

heaving, restless, full of *hostile*, *unsubdued*, *irregular* life and force.

7. Another argument of more decisive character is derived from the remarkably close relation which, according to the scriptures, seems to subsist between our world and the fallen angels, Satan in particular. Keerl, after calling attention to the fact that MEN seem the sole object of Satanic hate, their assured destruction and the frustration of all efforts for their redemption the sole aim of Satanic activity, proceeds as follows:

"Not less striking is the relation in which, according to the scriptures, Satan stands to the world. He is called the "prince" of this world (*ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*), John xii. 31; xiv. 30; the "god" of this world (*ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*), 2 Cor. iv. 4; the power and magistracy of darkness *ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους*), Col. i. 13. In a like relation stand also his angels, which with him are styled world-rulers of this darkness (*κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου*) Eph. vi. 12. It is true that the phrase *τοῦ σκότους τούτου* limits his domain, for his activity extends only as far as the darkness reaches. But this darkness extends over the whole (planetary) world, for he is the ruler of the world because it has fallen into the hands of darkness, or because darkness is the essence of this world. The same thought lies in the expressions: "the light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not" (John i. 5; iii. 15); for it is "the world lying in the wicked one," into which the light has come (1 John v. 19). It is in truth no assumption, no "mendacious appearance of truth," as Kurz has it, when Satan promises Christ the kingdoms of the world, in case he will worship him (Matt. iv. 9); on the contrary he had this power, which had been delivered unto him (Luke iv. 6), to give these kingdoms, whose prince and ruler he in fact was, to whom he would. Such a right of possession is also evident from the fact that he cannot be deprived of his dominion over it until deprived by a *legitimate judicial decision* (pp. 245–246).

As additional proofs of the intimacy of the relation subsisting between Satan and our world, may be noticed the fact, that it still seems to be the main residence of the fallen spirits (Eph. vi. 12 and ii. 2); that it is impossible to trace the imperfections, disorder, and mortality which everywhere prevailed in the primeval world, Eden alone excepted, to the sin of man; and finally, that the ultimate doom of the wicked stands in the closest relation to that of Satan. On this last point our author expresses himself thus: "the holy scriptures everywhere place the final doom of the wicked in the closest relation to the final doom of Satan. The same judgment, the same punishment, is dealt out to both (Matt. xxv. 41; Rev. xx. 10; 12–15; xxi. 8). The prince of this world shall be cast out (John xii. 31) but at the same time with him the children of unbelief, in whom he had his work. This utterance of our Lord, "he shall be cast out" (on which Grotius happily remarks, ἔξω ex voce ἄρχων interpretandum ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς), presupposes that this world is his dominion, and will remain so, until the judgment, which commenced in the victory of Christ, is completed; until the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ (Rev. xi. 15; xix. 6). The ungodly, however, are engulfed in the same place of perdition and torment with Satan and his angels, in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone. Where is this fiery lake? Again, the scriptures know no other locality for this place of horror than the lower parts of THE EARTH. Furthermore, those who are under the earth shall one day bow the knee at the name of Jesus (Phil. ii. 10). Wiesinger understands by those dwelling under the earth, the fallen angels. Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6. The apostle is speaking, however, of what is yet hereafter and *finally* to take place. Even the devils will one day be forced to acknowledge the dignity and power of Christ, experienced in the judgment. The lower parts of the earth can therefore be nothing else than the lake of fire into which they will be driven after the judgment. That the identical doom overtakes both Satan

and the ungodly might be explained from the fact, that the latter have assimilated themselves to him; but that the lower parts of the earth should be the place where the judicial sentence is executed upon the former, that can be for no other reason than because the earth was the realm of his activity and rule. Had it not been the earth, but some other heavenly body, which was ruined by his insurrection, this latter would be the place where his sentence would be executed"[1] (pp. 251, 252).

8. The advantages of the theory over the prevalent one, as a theodicy, is nowhere broached, except in a brief footnote (p. 564). Instead of developing the full force of the consideration, our author merely remarks: "It is evident from our representation of primeval history, a satisfactory theodicy is attainable, whereas from the point of ecclesiastical doctrine it is not possible. He maintains with the naturalist, that from the beginning death has reigned upon our earth, nay more — we show what he is not able to do — *why* death has penetrated the world as universal natural law. K. Vogts triumphant shout: "Death existed before man appeared upon the earth. No stride of faith, no pious *Salto Mortales*, can help you over this stone which lies in your garden," etc. (compare similar expressions in Oerstedt, "Spirit in Nature," and G. Combe, "Science in Relation to Religion," from the English; Leipsic, 1857, p. 121) needs from our point of view no refutation."

9. In conclusion, had we the theory to advocate, we should rely not a little upon its superiority to all others as an explanation of the facts in question. However slight the *positive* evidence of a theory may seem when viewed by itself, it may still command an almost universal acceptance, provided only that it explains all the facts and harmonizes all the beliefs concerned in the case better than any other

[1] In locating the fire prepared for the devil and his angels in the lower parts of the earth, Keerl seems directly to contradict what he says further on (pp. 309–313), where he gives it an altogether different location; viz. in the comets. We cannot account for so glaring an inconsistency.

theory. The case before us is one which from the nature of things does not admit of demonstration; indeed, the positive evidence for the hypothesis may be very meagre; but if the evidence in its favor only exceed that in favor of all known theories, the mind will necessarily incline to adopt it. And as a matter of fact, it must be confessed that the theory before us is not only as reasonable and self-consistent *as a theory* as any other known (see remarks above), but also that it finds no small confirmation the moment it is applied. Yield to it heartily and willingly, and how readily the isolated and apparently conflicting facts of science and history, the intimations and presuppositions of the word of God, the whole motley, straggling multitude of our beliefs begin to organize around it as the facts and phenomena of nature gather and range themselves under a newly discovered law. Nature is at once brought back into a closer relation to spirit, the physical world regains its long-lost moral significance. The heavens are no longer a meaningless immensity of space; cosmical history no longer a series of blind or capricious or "pantheistic developments." The theologian has no more to complain that angelology has no place in the system of Christian doctrine; that it introduces "a foreign and disturbing element," which can only be attended to in supplements or excursuses. The personal existence and powerful influence of Satan and his angels seems to acquire new reasonableness. The whole history of redemption has a higher scope and unity, and its final culmination in a renovated heavens and earth a sublime ideal fitness. Most of those who have adopted the theory, have done so, we doubt not, far more under the influence of these considerations, than because they believed it clearly taught or implied in the word of God. It seems to them to systematize and scientifically adjust their cosmological and theological beliefs more satisfactorily than any other.

But has not the theory its own peculiar difficulties? What is gained, if in disposing of one set of difficulties

we raise another equally, perhaps more, formidable? This hypothesis may account for natural evil and disorder, animal rapacity, and death antecedent to the fall, or even creation, of man; but what if valid objections lie against the hypothesis itself, and forbid our adoption of it?

We think the theory *has* its difficulties. Of those occurring to us, we have space for the notice of but two, but these are perhaps the most important. It may be asked in the first place, for instance, what relief is afforded us by this theory as regards the creation of the monsters of the primeval world? The disfigurement and derangement of a world, indeed its complete reduction to chaotic ruin as a judicial consequence of the fall of its occupants, is conceivable enough; it is only an extension of the current conception of the consequences of Adam's fall; but here is more than the *destructive* agency of justice, here is *productive* agency of omnipotence. The annihilation of beauty and order seems a natural enough effect of the wrath of God; but after the work of restoration has been undertaken, light evolved, the firmament fixed, the mountains established, the seas shut up, dry land prepared, why and whence these hideous monsters? Why and whence this animal bloodthirstiness and death? Are not these new creations fresh from the hands of God, and do not all the arguments of the advocates of the theory before us, against the supposition that so imperfect a creation as chaos could proceed immediately from the hand of God, recoil upon the heads of their own originators?

In our author's discussion of "the character of the primeval world" (p. 530 – 566), this point is taken up, and it must be allowed, that no disposition is shown to reject or minify the difficulty. It is, on the contrary, stated in all its strength. The writer takes pains to show the inadequacy of the solutions of Wagner, von Schubert, and others, who maintain that the perished flora and fauna were necessary preliminaries to our living flora and fauna. In so doing he calls special attention to the monstrosity of many of the

primeval creatures, their murderous instincts, etc., and denies the notion that these abortions were necessary antecedents to those peaceable and faultless beings which Adam named and ruled over; denies it even more emphatically than he does the naturalistic maxim, that death is the condition of organic life, decay the mother of bloom. He earnestly and eloquently affirms that God could have, by one creative word, called into being a world perfect in beauty, perfect in its inward harmony. "If he did not do it in the case of the earth," he says, in italics, "the reason cannot lie in his power or goodness, but in the earth itself, in a nature which it had not received from God." This sentence contains the key to his explanation. Terrestrial matter possesses a depraved nature. The action of God upon it and through it is like the action of a holy soul through and in a thoroughly depraved body. It was not passive and receptive; it resisted and modified the creative impulse. The forces and qualities of nature were all hostile, perverted, disturbed; hence when subordinated and utilized by the great Artificer, they marred his work, prevented the perfect divine idea from coming to perfect reality. He illustrates his conceptions of the matter by referring to the analogous case of the Holy Spirit's operation upon a sinful heart. What counteraction, rebellion, intensified hostility does it call forth so long as the sinful principle is unsubdued! Sin takes occasion thereby to work in such a heart all manner of concupiscence; so that that which was ordained unto life, that which was designed, adapted, and exercised to bring forth life, we find to be unto death. Our author finds an express authorization to the employment of this analogy in 2 Cor. iv. 6 ("but God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts," etc.). Just, therefore, as the sinner's illumination," which is the first step towards his sanctification, only stimulates the sinful nature to new spasms of resistance, and to new developments of perversity, so we are to conceive of the results of the primeval illumination of the depraved and perverted earth. The first step towards the

regeneration of the evil world, called forth the same monstrous and abnormal action as the first step toward the sanctification of an evil heart.

This is the first part of his explanation. The elaboration of it is exceedingly skilful and interesting. As an answer to the objection under consideration, it will be differently estimated by different minds. To those who cherish the mechanical view of nature, to whom matter is absolutely inert, and the universe a machine, the whole thing will seem no better than a fantastic, Gnostic dream. To those, however, who cherish the dynamic view of nature, to whom the material atoms are not mere isolated, infinitessimal incomprehensibilities, but at the same time centres of native force, cohesive, magnetic, gravitational, vital; to whom the universe is not a piece of clock-work, but a grand natural organism, it will appear at least allowable, if not entirely satisfactory.[1] As most Anglo-Saxons belong to the first class, the solution will not be very likely to prove among them an additional recommendation of the original theory.

The second part of the explanation is, that Satan was present in all stages of the work, and exerted his powers to their utmost extent, in resistance and counteraction. He sought as eagerly to frustrate the divine scheme for the redemption of nature, as he afterwards did to frustrate the divine scheme for the redemption of man. The fallen earth was his possession, and it was but natural he should resist the effort to take it from him, and to fit it up with all the decorations which divine ingenuity and skill could produce, and transfer it to a new and holy creature. Our author does not refer to it, but the healing of the lunatic, as related Mark ix. seems a good illustration of his idea. The devil could not resist the omnipotent word which rebuked him and charged him to come out of the world which he "possessed," but in obeying, he was permitted to exhibit his

[1] Dr. Taylor Lewis, if we rightly understand him, finds no difficulty in such a view of natural co-operation in the work of creation. See his "Six Days of Creation; or the Scripture Cosmology," pp. 197–232.

malice and hate, by "throwing" and "rending sore" the nature from which he was expelled. The malformations, abortions, and monstrosities of the primeval world, were the results. In theory Keerl is supported by not a few philosophers and theologians, not only of former, but of the most recent times. He quotes with especial approbation from Boehmen, J. A. Kanne, Dauf, Steffens and F. von Baader. Kurz advocates the same views, and Delitzsch, who in the earlier editions of his Commentary on Genesis combats, has since adopted it. For ourselves we must confess the hypothesis, when properly limited, strikes us more favorably than the previous one of malign *natur-potenzen*? Why may not Satan have commenced the manifestation of his hostility to God before, just as well as after, the completed creation? Is it replied: It is unreasonable to suppose God would permit his interference in such a work? How much more incredible that he should permit him to ruin it after its completion! If he is permitted to interfere in the erection of God's spiritual kingdom to introduce error and strifes, to deceive the nations, to lead almost the whole redeemed race of man captive at his will, why may he not have had the same liberty of interference in the erection of God's natural kingdom?

The second difficulty which we proposed to mention is the supposed incompatibility of the theory with those representations of scripture which seem to attribute all natural evil to the fall of Adam. The discussion of this point (in second appendix to the last chapter) is perhaps the least satisfactory in the book before us. Here, however, we apprehend, all theorists stand upon an equality. The old theory found in Josephus, Basil, Luther, and most of the Fathers, according to which the poison of the serpent and thorn of the rose were *dona superaddita*, created and superinduced upon poisonless and thornless organisms in consequence of the fall of Adam, has no longer a defendant. The advocates of the theory of "anticipative consequences," can no more deduce the origin of thorns and thistles from

the primeval curse (Gen. iii. 18), than can the holders of the theory under discussion. When therefore the latter is asked: how his view can be reconciled with the almost universal understanding of those scriptures which touch upon the entrance of evil into the world? he can at least silence his questioner by retorting the inquiry. The holder of the current theory is in the same predicament with himself.

Such, then, is the Origenistic theory of the origin of natural evil. Such are some of the considerations on both sides. We think the whole subject deserves a more thorough and intelligent discussion than it has yet received. In the works of Keerl, Kurtz, and other recent advocates, it is only incidentally treated. In the work before us, as the reader of the above will have seen, it is only a subordinate point, one element of cosmological theory, which is itself only so far elaborated as was deemed necessary to the anthropological work to which the volume is introductory. Such being the case, the only wonder is that the discussion is as full and thorough as it is. We should rejoice, however, to see from a competent hand a special treatise on *the origin of natural evil.* We can scarcely expect a cosmology, satisfactory alike to the naturalist and to the theologian, until this subordinate question has been subjected to a more searching investigation.

As to the broader question with which we set out, the reconciliation of the cosmological teachings of science and the Bible, we must not expect so speedy a solution. The question respecting the origin of natural evil is clear and explicit. We know the terms of the problem; they can be distinctly defined and intelligibly stated. We know what is required in a solution. Not so with this problem. We neither know exactly what the physical assumptions and implications of the Bible are, nor what the ultimate and confirmed results of science will be. Certain data may be regarded as settled on both sides, others approximately

so; but still there is much to be done before the testimony of the rocks and stars can be proved to agree or to disagree with the testimony of God's word. Meantime we should be in no haste to abandon biblical thought-idioms, that general framework of ideas which inspiration everywhere presupposes and implicitly approves. The levity with which many sincere friends and interpreters of the Bible treat the inspired record of creation is truly astonishing. They seem willing to truncate, lop off, interpolate, or allegorize the whole, to suit the demands of each new geological or cosmological theory which comes in fashion. A notion first broached, if we mistake not, by one of the older German rationalists, has recently been brought before the Anglo-Saxon public by a Rev. Mr. Rorison of England, and recommended as the long-sought key to the interpretation of the Mosaic record. According to this notion, the first chapter of Genesis is a grand "symbolical hymn"! We cannot accept the new discovery. It is not a solution, but an elusion, of the difficulty. It does not solve the problem, it only arbitrarily erases one of its terms. The satisfactory resolution of the first chapter of Genesis into a hymn or a myth, or a dream, or a forgery, or into nonentity itself, would relieve the real question but very little, for the fundamental cosmological ideas of that chapter, in their grand characteristic features, underlie the whole Bible, and crop out on every occasion. It is not in the first of Genesis alone that we read that in six days God created the heavens and earth, and all that in them is. "God spake" the same words from the top of Sinai (Exod. xx. 1, 11). It is not from Gen. i. alone that we learn that God commanded the light to shine out of darkness; inspired Paul affirms the same thing (2 Cor. iv. 6). Moses is not the only one who tells us that the original earth was covered with waters until the omnific word caused dry land to appear. Read also Ps. xxiv. 2; cxxxvi. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 5. The fourth day's work is as explicitly described in Ps. cxxxvi. 7–9; viii. 3; Jer. xxxi. 35, and in many other passages, as in Gen. 14–18. The

literalness of the account of the creation of man out of the dust of the ground, and of the taking of Eve from Adam's side, is at least as well vouched as that of the history of the fall (Gen. iii. 19; ix. 6; Job x. 9; xxxiii. 4; xvii. 13–16; Ps. cxxiv. 29; Eccl. xii. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9). The question with which we have to deal is a broader one than the mere reconciliation of an isolated passage of scripture with the results of scientific research; it is the reconciliation of the cosmology of the Bible, as a grand whole, with that of modern science.

We know it is iterated and reiterated in our ears: "the Bible was not given to teach natural science." We reply: neither was it given us to teach us profane history, and yet if the historian of the Roman empire can learn only from it the name of the Roman governor who succeeded Felix in the administration of Palestine, is the information, on that account, necessarily unreliable? It was not given us to teach chronology, and yet if by means of it we can fix the date of the reign of the Phenician Hiram, shall we refuse to do so merely because the Bible was not designed for a handbook of dates? It was not given to teach us ancient geography, but if it incidentally tells us of Jordan and Carmel and Hermon and Genesareth and Jerusalem and Joppa, shall we conclude that all these mountains and waters and cities are figures of speech, in accommodation to the current superstitions of the Hebrews? For ourselves, while confessing our inability to reconcile our scientific convictions with what seem to be the cosmological implications and assumptions of scripture, we must also profess a profound respect for every assumed or implied truth of God's word. What do we know of the existence, nature, and occupation of angelic beings except that which the Bible thus indirectly teaches us? And yet the Bible was not given us to teach the natural history of the angels. Indeed the existence of God, and the immortality of the soul are but presuppositions and implications of the Bible, not revelations. Are we then to suppose that the implicit teachings of the Bible on these

points are mere "reflections of the current" theistic and psychological "beliefs of the Hebrews"? Have they no higher authority? We are old-fashioned enough to believe that these wonderfully self-consistent, peculiar, hallowed, old world-views of Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, answer to the truth, *in some way*, more perfectly than any theory of our late-born schools; *how*, we believe science will itself one day show. We do not herewith imply that every writer of holy scripture possessed a clear, astronomically and geologically correct knowledge of the extent and nature, origin and history, of the material and spiritual cosmos of God; such a supposition is unnecessary. Just as Luke could know and record the historical fact that an imperial census was ordered and taken "when Cyrenius was governor of Syria," without possessing Niebuhr's or Tacitus's knowledge of the whole field of Roman history, so might he and the other biblical writers record such cosmological facts as were incidentally revealed to them without anything like a clear or complete comprehension of the great system to which these facts belong. We simply mean that, as the isolated facts of ancient history, geography, and ethnography, incidentally revealed in the scriptures, are found to fit into the general system of our knowledge on these subjects derived from other sources, as true though meager parts of that system; so the cosmological facts and implications of the word of God will be found to fit into the true system of God's cosmos as integral parts of the same, whenever we shall come to know it. Meanwhile let us hold fast to the great biblical conceptions of the world as a creation of God, of heaven as a locality, of matter as susceptible of inconceivable glorification, of man as the especial object of divine care and effort, of earth as central in the moral universe of God.

We do not ask science to belie herself, to stifle clear convictions, to stay her investigations. Much rather do we desire the most rapid advances, that her discoveries may the quicker interpret the obscurities of the divine record, and

confirm its eternal truth. Thank God, the latest developments in her fields are auspicious. Plutonism, but a few years ago so undisputed in its sway, is now dethroned, and the leading minds in the scientific world are coming back to the defence of biblical Neptunism. Some still hesitate to go to the extent of Bischof, J. D. Dana, James Hall, T. Sterry Hunt, and others, and maintain in the face of every noted geologist of the last generation, the formation of all the rocks, except the modern volcanic ones, by precipitation from solvent fluids, but even the most hesitant make exception only in favor of the granitic, and possibly of the metamorphic formations. The utter discrepancy of the wild guesses which have been made as to the age of the earth, on the part of those who, with Lyell, would trace all its structural and revolutionary changes to the operation of known natural forces acting with their present intensities and under their present laws, has shamed the scientific dogmatism of their authors and destroyed confidence in their fundamental principle. Science is far humbler than twenty years ago; she has just learned how little she has learned, what infinities remain unmastered. The Bible recommends a higher reverence. New discoveries in comparative philology, in ethnography, in ancient history, in chronology, in geography and topography, in almost every department of human investigation, are continually adding new testimonies to its truth. Self-sufficient science has reached the crisis foretold by Tennyson; has been forced to humble herself and cry —

> "Make me a cottage in the vale,
> Where I may mourn and pray."

Ere long we may expect the time to come in view of which she prayed the sparing of her "lordly pleasure-house," —

> "Yet pull not down my palace towers, that are
> So lightly, beautifully built;
> Perchance I may return with others there
> When I have purged my guilt."

She is returning already, and when she shall re-enter her cold marble palace-pile this time, guiltless, humble, hand in hand with sweet-faced faith, and convoyed by the angels of God's revelation, she shall discover to her unutterable joy that the glistering structure, which in the days of her proud self-sufficiency was so empty and magnificently desolate, has been suddenly transformed into the real, eternal house of God — the house not made with hands, — the same old temple of David and the saintly fathers, infinitely enlarged and beautified.

ARTICLE IV.

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT, AND THE DOWNFALL OF PAGANISM IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.[1]

BY DR. PHILIP SCHAFF.

It is agreed on all hands that Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor, the founder of Constantinople and the Byzantine empire, marks one of the most important epochs in the history of Christianity and the world. He was the chief instrument, in the hands of Providence, by which the church was delivered from oppression and persecution, and elevated to a position of honor and power in the proud empire of Rome; from him dates the union of church and state; his reign sealed the doom of Graeco-Roman paganism, and secured the triumph of Christianity. But opinions are not yet quite harmonized as to his personal character and the motives which induced him to favor the Christian religion

[1] Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen, von J. Jacob Burkhardt. Basel. 1853.

Der Uebertritt Constantins des Grossen zum Christenthum. Akademisher Vortrag, gehalten am 12 Dec., 1861, im Grossrathsaale in Zürich, nebst geschichtlichem Nachweis von Dr. Theodor Keim. Zurich. 1862.

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church. By E. P. Stanley. New York: 1862. Lect. VI.