

mation ; while, according to Paul and the Apocalypse, there will be a period of indefinite duration between the *Parousia* and the last judgment, in which all forces hostile to the kingdom of God will be destroyed. The distinction of a first and second resurrection, which we find in the Apocalypse, seems also to be intimated by Paul, as he connects the glorification of believers with the coming of Christ, but the resurrection of unbelievers with the final judgment.

ARTICLE III.

THE CREATIVE PERIOD IN HISTORY.

BY REV. EDWARD A. LAWRENCE, D.D., MARBLEHEAD, MASS.

THE ORDER OF EVENTS.

THE student of the creative period in history meets, at the starting-point of inquiry, the question of an authentic record. Where is such a record to be found? In geology, and the first two chapters of Genesis—the rocky and the written revelations. This is the best, perhaps the only, general answer which the case allows.

A thoughtful reader of the first verse from the inspired penman is startled by its simplicity, comprehensiveness, and grandeur. "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth." It proclaims the one absolute, originating, and creative will. Thus the written record places itself, in its first announcement, in bold conflict with atheism, polytheism, and pantheism. There is a God, it says, and there is but one. That God is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, not the mere distributor, reformer, or manipulator of his own being into a finite universe. He is the originator of a new substance, by a fiat and force clearly personal and infinite.

How comprehensive, yet concise, is this opening of the book of creation and providence! How appropriate this

title-page of history! How grand as the frontispiece of the universe!

Some doubt whether this is the record of the first creative act, or only the reconstruction of an old ruin, preceded by successive creations, catastrophes, and re-formations, recorded in the rocks, but of which the inspired writer makes no mention.

The later and the most careful examiners, however, concur in accepting this as a statement of the creative origin of the material universe. "And the earth was without form and void." The conjunctive particle *vav* conversive, denoting the continuity of results, favors this as the idea of the writer. The object, order, and unity of the record favor it, as do the leading facts of geology. For, if this be the record of only a mere re-fashioning of old material, and not the creation of a new substance, the history of the world commences, singularly enough, in the middle, and not at the beginning, of the creative work. It should also be borne in mind that, if this is not an account of the origin of the material universe, there is none on record; and that God's first and most noteworthy act of wisdom and power fails of all mention, and that in a document claiming expressly to record the beginning of things.

Further, there is in the Hebrew term *בְּרֵאשִׁית*, *beginning*, an admirable expressiveness of the object and exigencies of the case. It was at the first, at the head of all things, the beginning of the finite and of history, that this first fiat came forth. And no event, no thought, even, of creative act, can antedate the simple force of this phrase, "In the beginning."

This fact of a beginning is also a corner-stone of theistic history. It stands out in fundamental contrast with the atheistic and pantheistic philosophies, which, because they deny creation, and hold, instead, a necessary and eternal emanation, give only a beginningless movement, without progress or end.

After this introduction of what may be called the raw

material of the universe, organization, by the same creative agency, comes next in chronologic and logical order. The Spirit of God brooded over the chaotic deeps, and, by the molecular activity imparted, out of the dark, dead mass sprang light, and with it heat. This discrimination of light and heat from frigid darkness introduces the chief mediate element of the rocky formation, and of growth in the forthcoming vegetable and animal kingdoms.

By a second discriminative act the upper waters are divided from the lower, and an atmosphere created — a vast aerial reservoir for vapors drawn up by the sun, and condensed by cold, sent back in rain, dews, and snow, to cool and refresh the heated earth.

A third creative gravitating force gradually consolidates the mineral kingdom; the waters, falling away from the rising continents and islands, settle into oceans and seas; and thus is provided for the coming race, on the one hand, a fruitful soil, and on the other, a broad, ever-flowing highway for its commerce.

In these three discrete movements of the creative will, four preliminary and indispensable elements of science and of history are brought into being — light, air, earth, and seas. This completes the azoic or ante-life period.

The next introduces in the vegetable kingdom, the lowest grades in the order of vital organisms — the grass, the herb yielding seed, the fruit-tree yielding fruit, “each after its kind.” Thus was enacted that great law of organic unity and reproduction which defines and limits species in nature, which all the sciences now hold as fundamental, and on which rest so many of their most important classifications and generalizations.

For the more perfect development of the vegetable kingdom, and in anticipation of the animal, the hitherto diffused, cosmical light is collected into the sun, as a great light-distributer — to rule the day, and as a divider of times and seasons. How much is implied in this ruling of the sun, it was left for modern science to discover. “The accumulated

power of its delicate rays," says Professor Cooke, "produces every motion and every change which takes place on the surface of this planet, from the falling of an avalanche to the crawling of a worm."

Next, comes forth from the waters "the moving creature that hath life," — the first forms of the animal kingdom, and "the fowl that may fly above the earth."

On the last of the creative days, two works come together — the production of land animals and of man — in the completion of the life-period, as two did at the close of the ante-life period. The whole was finished appropriately when God created man in his own image: "In the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

"And God said unto them: Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth"; a potent mandate, including the mysterious law of sexual appetencies and soul-affinities, for the continuity and ethical unity of the race, with all the cementing and culturing influence of progenitors and descendants.

From the explication of the first chapter in Genesis given in the second, Adam, it appears, was for a time the sole human inhabitant of the new-made earth. But God saw that solitude was not good for man, and Adam felt the same.

In a profound sleep, and dreaming, perhaps, of some coming bliss, a rib taken from the sleeper's side was divinely made a woman; whom God brought, in the bloom of innocence and beauty, to be a help-meet for him. In this created duplication of man come into history those primal and most influential of all the institutions — marriage and the family; a very pivot of society and of destiny.

From the peculiar and significant manner of the woman's creation, in taking her at the wedding from the hand of her God-Father, the man says: "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called (אִשָּׁה) woman," — the feminine form of the Hebrew אָדָם, *man*, — "because she was taken out of man." As to her physical nature, she is, therefore, by creation, a derivative and betterment of man.

Hence a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh. Here is the law of a dual unity, the peculiar and affectional agglutination of a most rigid monogamy. It is a unity for which the sexes were formed by creative wisdom, and to which they are drawn by the purest elective affinities. To this divine oneness all forms of polygamy and concubinage are a most grievous offence.

In every attempt to abrogate this primal law,—whether ancient or modern, by the Buddhist ascetics or Christian priestly celibates seeking a higher sanctity than they conceive it to allow, it has avenged itself on the experimenters, in the dry or dreamy degeneracy, in the shallow half-humanity which it induces in them, or else by the out-breaking assertion of its normal force in the debasements of scortatory violations. The purest and richest sanctities of life are attained only within the harmonies of these primal institutions; not by breaking them down, on the one hand, or assuming them, on the other, to be clogs to the holy aspirations of men and hinderances to their highest destiny, either in church or state.

The six epochs of this creative period, called in the record “days”—those long working-days of Providence—are followed by a seventh, as a period of rest: “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.” Creation, in the proper sense, was concluded on the sixth. So far as science can ascertain, no new kingdoms or genera or species in nature have since been produced.

Thus is explained that sevenfold division of time which is more or less manifest in almost all ages and nations. Six days are for labor; one for rest and a reverent, simple worship. This proportion of labor to rest has been demonstrated, by actual experiment, to be just what the physical nature of man and of beast requires, for healthful and most productive service. And the prescribed season for worship, with equal wisdom, meets an equal need of man’s moral nature. To increase essentially the number of successive working-days,

as was attempted in the French Revolution, by substituting a tenth for a seventh day of rest, is to waste the physical forces, and was a blunder of atheism in political economy. Any attempt, on the other hand, materially to lessen this number by multiplying obligatory holidays, as is done by the Romish church, is an equal infraction of the providential order by superstition, though not, perhaps, equally disastrous. All deflections, as matters of religious or irreligious enactment, prove by their results that this Sabbath arrangement is one of those nice harmonies and hinges of Providence of which history is so full, and which show God to be wiser than men.

Thus, with these two institutions, marriage and the Sabbath, closes the creative period in history. Both have their origin in a peculiarity of the creative work; one, in the formation of woman out of the man; the other, in the six-fold division of time for labor and a seventh day of hallowed rest. One looks towards human society, by the natural unity of the race in the family; the other to a divine society, by its moral unity with God in the church.

As creation is the door through which God makes his entrance into history, so these two institutions, marriage and the Sabbath, are the chariot-wheels of Providence, upon which he moves forth in the unfolding of his purposes and plans of government. Or they may be called the corner and key-stone in the arch of human history and human destiny.

OBJECTIONS TO THE FACT OF CREATION.

To this view of the creative period two objections are alleged — one, to the fact of creation; the other, to the inspired record as a veritable statement of history. In the former, the atheist and pantheist join their forces, and on nearly the same ground. The atheist, from his central assumption of no God, alleges that there is no creation, but, instead, an eternally mutating mental and muddy universe, without beginning, purpose, progress or end.

The pantheist, from an equally controlling dogma, claims that everything is God—the one substance self-diffused, self-modulated, in a complete *homoousian* universe of nature and God.

Both agree in the form of the objection—the impossibility of the origin of the world and history by creation. *Ex nihilo nil fit*, has been held as an invincible argument, from the old Greek atheists down to the modern German pantheists.

Benedict Spinoza demonstrated, as he supposed, the impossibility that one substance could create, or be created by, another. But the demonstration was purely ideal. It consisted solely in a definition: "Substance is that which exists *in itself*, and is necessarily *infinite*." What is infinite cannot be created. And if a substance should be created, there would be two substances, where there is, and can be, but one. What is not substance, is phantom—is nothing. This is not argument, but assumption. It proves nothing, and casts not a ray of light on the problem of creation. M. Comte affirmed the same impossibility, and even the incomprehensibility of the idea. Emanuel Swedenborg enlarged on the difficulty, and ran it into a clear contradiction. "Every one," he says, "who thinks from clear reason, sees that it is impossible for anything to be made out of nothing; for nothing is nothing, and to make anything out of nothing is a contradiction."

"Is it supposed," asks Herbert Spenser, "that a new organism, when created, is created out of nothing? But this supposes the creation of matter, and the creation of matter is inconceivable. It implies a relation between something and nothing—an idea that cannot be formed into coherent thought." Those who entertain it, he thinks, do so "because they refrain from translating their words into thoughts. They do not really believe, but rather believe that they believe." Thus he dismisses the theory of creation as "worthless and absurd." This is very explicit, and equally dogmatic.

But is this summary decision final? Were Kepler and Copernicus the receivers of incomprehensible, contradictory, and absurd propositions? Were Bacon and Newton and Cuvier mere word-men on this profound subject? And are our Humboldt and Wagner and Murchison and Silliman and Guyot and Agassiz and Dana mere believers that they believe? Has all the thinking upon this subject been done by those who deny the possibility of creation?

Besides, such bold averments of absurdity and impossibility indicate shallowness, rather than thorough examination and profound thinking. When the project of navigating the ocean by steam was first conceived, Dr. Lardner demonstrated, to his own entire satisfaction, that it was practically impossible. And when Walter Scott heard that it was proposed to light the streets of London with gas, he said: "It can't be done; it's only the dream of a fanatic." And even Sir Humphrey Davy said, in respect to the plan: "It's all nonsense; you might as well talk of lighting London with a slice of the moon." But these prophets of impossibility were mistaken. Our cities are illuminated with something more brilliant even than moonshine, and which serves us when we have no moon. And the ocean is ploughed by innumerable vessels—merchantmen and men-of-war—all propelled by steam.

That there are difficulties in connection with this creative starting-point of history no thoughtful student will deny. How can it be otherwise, when the Infinite enters on a plan which includes the production of a finite universe, and the revelation of himself to the intelligent of that universe? The astute Hamilton perceived these difficulties, and staggered under them well-nigh into the postulate of pantheism or atheism, in his doctrine of the inconceivability, either of creation or the infinite. Yet he held each as one of two inconditionates, neither of which can be conceived as possible, but which must both be true.

But what, exactly, is the theistic and historic doctrine of creation? The common phrase, "God created all things

out of nothing," and Webster's definition of *create*—"to bring into being from nothing"—contain the truth. But they are likely to confuse those who do not think carefully, if not to convey a positive error. They give occasion for the dilemma in which we ourselves were once placed by a learned emanationist: "Did God create the world out of something?" he asked. We answered: "No." "What did he create it out of?" "He did not create it out of anything," we replied. "Such is not a formula for the thought—out of something, or out of nothing."

The production of something out of something else is emanation, formation, or development, not creation. The other horn of the dilemma—creation out of nothing—supposes nothing to be an antecedent something; an absurdity into which only those fall who adopt the Hegelian starting-point in philosophy: "Sein und Nichts ist dasselbe,"—being and non-being, something and nothing, are identical. That nothing is something is indeed a contradiction; and that, by its own force, it can become something, is, of course, impossible and absurd. That a finite agent can create a new substance—a sculptor produce, as well as chisel, his marble—indeed, that any effect can be produced without an adequate cause, admits of no question. Within the province of the finite, "Ex nihilo, nil fit" has a universal application; but beyond that it is irrelevant, and of no value. Nature, with all her voices, disclaims creative power. But her disclaimer is worthless and impertinent, except in her own sphere. No human skill can produce even a new form without material to work upon, and tools to work with. But the Infinite, in his work, requires neither materials nor tools.

From all these difficulties, impossibilities, and absurdities, the theistic doctrine of creation stands entirely clear. With them it has nothing to do, except to enter its protest against them.

The doctrine of creation, simply stated, is, that the Absolute and infinitely Perfect, by his omnipotent will, brought

into being the material of the finite universe, which before had no being, either in himself or anywhere else.

Is there anything inconceivable or unintelligible in this? anything impossible or absurd? Does it not contain the elements of our most rational thoughts? our most solid, most universal logic? the law of cause and effect, and the operation of a power perfectly adequate to the effect—a personal intelligence, an infinite causative will for the created universe?

What, then, is the source of these objections? Atheism, pantheism, naturalism, and nothing else,—the assumption that there is no God, or that everything is God. But what advantage does either of these assumptions bring to science? Is it easier to suppose that this matchless harmony, beauty, and utility of the material world, this grand astronomical, geologic, biologic, and moral machinery, has no beginning or end, no cause or designer, but has been eternally gyrating—a vast hap-hazard universe? What do we know of an originating and guiding intelligence, of design or will anywhere, if all these signs are deceptive?

Or, is it more rational to assume, with the pantheist, an unconscious and reasonless expansion of a vast impersonal substance into the numberless particles and personalities that fill the world, the dividing of the indivisible, and finiting of the infinite, the mutation of pure spirit into gross matter, and its transmutation back into spirit? Does science, in any of her crucibles or laboratories, disclose any such changes? Has matter ever been detected in passing into mind, or mind into matter? the divine in pressing itself out of the Deity, and then recalling itself back again?

If spirit and a stone are only terms applied to opposite ends of the same, ever-mutating, one substance; if this stone was once spirit, and may be attenuated to it again, and the spirit be cooled and consolidated into stone; if the one is God immanent, and the other God emanent, then all the discriminations of science are at fault, and science itself worthless. For, if anything is clear, it is the essential

difference between mind and matter. If science has a first principle, it is that a bridgeless gulf separates them. One may be the product of the other, matter of the infinite mind; but parts of the same thing, flowing and reflowing, and thus originating and modulating the world and man and history, without intelligence, will, or plan at the starting-point—this it pronounces impossible. And if these ground-discriminations of reason and science cannot be trusted, reason itself is delusive, and science a lie; everything is confused and chaotic; nature and the supernatural, the tinker and his tools, the worshipped and the worshipper,—all are swallowed up in this all-devouring generalization.

OBJECTIONS TO THE MOSAIC RECORD.

The objection to the written record of the creative period follows naturally from the denial of creation. For that record is discriminatingly and positively theistic. In its doctrine of creation it sets forth, as we have seen, the existence of God against atheism, and an infinite creative personality against pantheism; cutting off the infinite series of the former, and the eternal emanations of the latter. Hence the confederation of all the schools of these anti-creative philosophies in sternest opposition to it. Some impugn its genuineness, its authenticity, its cosmology, and its harmony with itself and with natural science. Some pronounce it fragmentary, mythical, and allegorical.

Lord Bolingbroke says the account of the creation, in a historical sense, is false, unphilosophical, and absurd. Strauss thinks the course of events cannot have taken place in the manner there represented; for the supernatural is unhistoric and impossible. "Such things may be known from common sense," writes the Swedish seer, "not to have been, and are not acknowledged by any one who thinks interiorly, as possible."

A few of the many attesting harmonies of the rocky with the written revelation respecting this period will place the objection in its true light.

1. The Mosaic account refers the creation of man directly to the Almighty fiat; and the rocky record, according to the testimony of its best interpreters, does the same. Chemistry, physiology, and paleontology, so far as they speak at all on the subject, vouch for the correctness of this testimony, and make it evident that man had his beginning, not from any self-developing force in nature, but by a personal will and power wholly above nature.

2. The record ascribes the commencement of animal and of vegetable life to the power of God; and all the efforts to establish a counter-origin, by spontaneous generation, natural selection, electricity, or chemical combinations, have signally failed. The careful experiments of Schultz and M. Dalle must be regarded as settling the question of artificial vitalization.

3. The record refers the production of light to the creative fiat, and places it in the first day. The objectors vauntingly alleged the absurdity of this, when the sun was not created till the fourth day. But they did not distinguish between chemico-cosmical and solar light, nor perceive, what chemical science now makes perfectly plain, that light is a result reached by creative energy through molecular activity and gravitation, and, as a first step in the organizing process, made its appearance necessarily on the first day. "Science," says Professor Guyot, "teaches that the first creation was accompanied by the manifestation of light; and that which has been a stumbling-block to the sceptics is thus, in reality, the corner-stone of creation."

4. The status of the newly-created substance was unorganized, matter in its simplest and most homogeneous condition. To this result the best modern chemists have all arrived, and with them the astronomers, geologists, and physicists, so far as they say anything, entirely agree.

5. The divisions and subdivisions of the creative work, as given by the Mosaic record, are marked and minute. The whole is mapped out in a sixfold division of time. Then occurs, on a larger generalization, first, what is called the

azoic or ante-life period, filling up three of the six days, the material of the universe being produced in the beginning; then light, as an organizing force; next the evolution of the atmosphere; and last, the mineral kingdom, as a foundation for what was to come; the waters, falling off into seas, closing the period with the prophetic dawn of vegetable life.

In the discriminations of the second, or the life-period, the record is even more full of intelligence and minuteness of plan. The vegetable kingdom, introduced at the close of the former period, makes three steps in the progressive work; the seedless grasses, esculents, and fruit-trees, the last, and the perfection, of vegetable life.

In the animal kingdom comes a fourfold division — fish for the sea, fowl for the air, quadrupeds to roam over the land, and man, the crown and sub-ruler of all the rest.

Each great division constitutes an epoch in the creative work. No one kingdom slides into another, as if by development. No one species passes over to another, or crowds it aside, by any principle of natural selection. Nothing develops anything which was not enveloped by the creative fiat.

Now, here is a series of divisions and subdivisions, drawn out minutely in the order of logical progress by a clearly defined plan. The record is didactic and perfectly unambiguous. It touches on the profoundest problems of ontology, physiology, philosophy, and history — the relations of the finite and the infinite, the production of the finite by the infinite. It steps with a masterly freedom into almost every department of science, with no fear of being ruled out, or of counter-testimony.

This appeal to the sciences for harmonic confirmation is made in the quiet confidence of perfect certainty. It is made, too, where the averments were sure to come to trial, though not till thousands of years after, and where error, if it existed, would not fail of detection. Such an appeal, there and then, was a venture of no ordinary boldness. It is one of the highest historic sublimities, based on one of the completest of historic harmonies.

And what is the result? Some of the sciences in their infancy have been dragged into apparent conflict with the Bible; but in coming to maturity, they have all placed themselves with its friends and allies. "The first thought that strikes a scientific reader of the first chapter of Genesis," says Professor Guyot, "is the evidence of divinity, not merely in the first verse, but in the whole order of creation. There is so much that the recent readings of science have for the first time explained, that the idea of man as the author of the account becomes utterly incomprehensible. By proving the record true, science proves it divine; for who could correctly have narrated the secrets of eternity, but God himself?"

Thus, before all its accusers, and in the illuminated centre of the sciences of the nineteenth century, the providential Book stands unharmed and undismayed. More and more, as intelligence increases, is it found to be the inspirer of the best poetry, the patron of the best philosophies, and the light of the best sciences. All these come to it for the seeds of their profoundest thoughts and their most beneficent discoveries. Earlier than Thucydides by a thousand years, it is more lucid and exact, even in what is purely historical. Before Homer by seven hundred years, it is more poetic and more dramatic. It is the only record of the course of events for the first three thousand years which has any repute at the bar of science or philosophy.

As a providential record, it connects the great facts of history with the profoundest principles of social, political, and religious life. It is not idealistic, or nominalistic, but a most practical realism, bearing on the great problems of history, in the enlightenment, and for the regeneration, of humanity. It punctures the balloon-like inflations of a self-confident naturalism, and yet tasks the reasoning faculties on the plane of a most rational science, and in the solution of the weightiest moral problems. It treats of man and his Maker—the finite and the Infinite—and their relations; of man's duties and destinies. It tells him

whence he came, what he is, and whither he is going — just what he most needs to know.

It is not necessary to inquire how this earliest record came to be in such remarkable harmony with the latest sciences, and to embrace in its statements so many of the the first principles of social and political life; though we can see but one satisfactory explanation. It is sufficient that it can be held as veritable history, against those who resolve it into a myth or an allegory, or allege against it the contradictions of science and common sense. These harmonies scatter forever the fogs and fancies of the fabulists and allegorizers. Can the writing be a fable, and the things written solid and scientific facts?

Thus this written record stands in no danger from the sciences or the sound philosophies. No essential error has been discovered in it. No fact, in any department of knowledge, has been shown to be at variance with it. Not a feather or a fin strikes against it. Not a star or a stone impeaches it.

But how is this? Because it is a book of creative history. Because God's revelation of himself in nature and in the Bible can never be discrepant. And the students of these two great books cannot, by any fair interpretation of either, be placed in antagonistic or rival relations. Neither side has occasion for jealousy, or to fear the effect of advancements on the other. The chief danger comes from ignorance, self-conceit, and dogmatism; and this danger lies more or less on both sides.