

THE
SOUTHERN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI—No. 51.

C. J. GRIFFITH, EDITOR.

JULY, 1879.

RICHMOND:
C. J. GRIFFITH, 1317 MAIN ST.
LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA LIBRARY



X030236666

CONTENTS OF NO. 51.

ART.	PAGE.
I. ANDREW JACKSON AND THE BANK OF THE UNITED STATES. By Wm L. Royall, Esq., Richmond, Va. - -	269
II. KING HENRY VIII. By Col. Richard M. Johnston, Maryland, - - -	308
III. THE SOCIAL STANDARD OF THE SOUTH. By Hon. Wm. M. Burwell, New Orleans, - - -	318
IV. THE NATIVE AND FOREIGN ELEMENTS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By Mrs. Mary W. Early, Lynchburg, Va., - -	328
V. KIN BEYOND THE SEA—GLADSTONE. By J. J. Pringle Smith, Esq., Charleston, S. C., - - -	337
VI. TOBACCO—ITS FUTURE IN THE SOUTH. By Major Robert L. Ragland, Halifax, Va., - - -	380
VII. ART IN THE SOUTH—WASHINGTON ALLSTON. By Mrs. Margaret J. Preston, Lexington, Va., - - -	394
VIII. LINGUISTIC CURIOSITIES. By Prof. D. R. Macanally, Jr., Missouri State University, -	409
IX. THE SOUTHERN REVIEW'S CRITICISM OF "THE DEATH OF DEATH." By the Author of "The Death of Death." -	435
X. AMERICA'S PLACE IN HISTORY. By Hon. R. M. T. Hunter, of Virginia, - - -	447
XI. PURITAN AND CAVALIER. By Page McCarty, Washington, D. C., - - -	459

CONTENTS.

ART.		PAGE.
XII.	THE REFLEX INFLUENCE OF RELIGION ON THE WORLD. By Rev. Dr. H. C. Alexander, Union Theological Seminary,	471
XIII.	THE WOMEN, WIT AND WISDOM OF GEORGE ELIOT. By Miss Zitella Cocke, Richmond, Va., - - - -	489
XIV.	NOVEL WRITING. By Mrs. Bledsoe Herrick, New York city, - - - -	504
XV.	TABLE-TALK, - - - - -	517
XVI.	BOOK NOTICES, - - - - -	527

THE SOUTHERN REVIEW.

No. L.

ART. I.—*Andrew Jackson and the Bank of the United States.*

It is not of General Jackson as a soldier that I propose to write. The pen of the writer, the tongue of the orator, and the chisel of the sculptor, have all sufficiently celebrated his claims to undying fame in that character. Nor is it my purpose to attempt a biographical sketch of him. I shall confine myself to a view of his civil administration as President of the United States, and to that part of it which concerns his contest with the Bank of the United States. That was no contest between men, or rival factions. It was a struggle between two contending systems; an effort, upon the one hand, to maintain the constitution and to preserve to the people gold and silver, the money of that instrument; upon the other hand, it was an effort to overthrow the constitution, *pro hac vice*, and to substitute for its money a system of paper currency.

The cause of controversy was one fit to engage the attention of statesmen, and the actors in the strife were worthy of the cause. The forces upon either side were marshalled and led by giants; upon the one side by Webster, Clay, and Calhoun; upon the other by such men as Thomas H. Benton, Silas Wright, and Andrew Jackson himself, *primus inter pares*. It was a contest destined to be forever memorable in the annals of this government, and one which will occupy no mean place in the history of the civilized world.

zonry of honor the peasant and the knight, the ragged soldier and the belted chief.

And we cannot fail to recognize the same types of character in the early pioneers, the rangers of a later time, the riflemen who covered the retreat of the crack infantry of England on the Monongahela, the troopers of Light-Horse Harry Lee, and the gray-clad soldiery that charged the height of Gettysburg. They are brave, proud, lazy, good-natured, but immensely enduring in a cause that moves their hearts, and under leaders whom they love with the poetic attachment of the Celtic blood—only a “strain” of blood in their veins, but unmistakable, from the nature of the war, of Puritan and Cavalier, which threw off the latter element into the Virginia colony, and grafted it there on all classes.

ART. XI.—*The Reflex Influence of Religion on the World.*

Lord Bacon, in one of the finest of his essays,* reminds us that when Tigranes, the Armenian, looked upon the Roman army that was marching against him, he seemed to be much diverted, and exclaimed: “Yonder men are too many for an embassy, and too few for a fight.” The essayist pithily adds: “But before the sun set he found them enough to give him the “chase with infinite slaughter.” It was much in this way that the world at first beheld the compact phalanx of the early defenders of the faith. In much the same way, too, the world has been taught to look with different eyes on its mysterious adversary. It may well be questioned whether the tactics of a great part of the current apologetic literature is not grounded in a mistake. However that may be, it is certainly time that the Christian apologist, as in the age of Tertullian and in the age of Lu-

* “Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates.”

ther, should adopt a higher tone and bearing. There is clearly no reason why he should any more appear "*in forma pauperis*;" why he should any longer speak with bated breath and "crook the pregnant hinges of the knee," before his remorseless antagonist. It is precisely because the religion he advocates has grown to be so dreadfully formidable that it is to-day so sharply assailed. We do not wish to be understood as recommending that he should assume an air of vainglorious bravado, much less one of intolerance and rancour. It is of the essence of the true religion that it should be meek, and that it should be benevolent. The example as well as the precept of its great founder is decisive on this head. It is none the less true, however, that the attitude maintained by its adherents now, as in the time of Paul, should be one, not only of serene and intrepid confidence, but also of aggressive and enthusiastic boldness. The apologist ought not to allow himself to be put on the defensive; or, rather let us say, ought not to allow himself to be kept in such a posture. The war should be carried into the enemy's country. The cause of religion has everything to expect, and has nothing whatever to fear, from the adaption of such a course.

In the meantime let all dreams of the possibility of an ultimate reconciliation betwixt the contending hosts be banished from every mind. Even under the most favorable conditions, there can be no such fortunate commixture of elements so diverse, and even mutually opponent, as are light and darkness. And yet what else can be the meaning of many of the professed champions of our controversy? Surely nothing short of this can be boded by the disposition that prevails at present in certain high quarters, to give aid and comfort to the Gideonites of contemporary skepticism.

No, the battle has been joined, and has been going on for ages, and the assertion is full of solemn verity, that "there is no discharge in that war." Compromise is, at times, a laudable procedure. There are instances though in which compromise, in any form, is the recognized preparatory to capitulation, and this is plainly one of those instances. Nothing, indeed, could be more obtrusively self-evident; for it is obvious to the feeblest in-

telligence that no treaty of peace can be negotiated, and that no truce even is possible for one moment between two principles that are reciprocal contradictories, and that are, therefore, essentially and irreconcilably at variance. And what contradiction is, or can be imagined to be, greater than the contradiction between truth and error; between righteousness and sin? This is an affair in which "he who hesitates is lost." In such a position of matters, no thought of a pacific nature (in the military sense of that term) will find easy admission into the breast of honor and loyalty.

These considerations need not be complicated with the question of the final issue. The good soldier has commonly the privilege accorded him (if he care to insist upon it) of dying on the field; and he may often prefer a shining death to an inglorious surrender. The man-of-war may choose to go down rather than to strike her flag, if she may but go down, like the Cumberland, with all her colors flying and all her guns roaring. But if the question of success be raised, we have before us not only the hope, but the indubitable certainty of final triumph. Those whose reliance is on "the true sayings of God" will demand no higher and no more explicit assurance than: "There is no enchantment against Jacob." "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper." For others, there remain, in the records of history, and in the phenomena of passing experience and observation, indications of a prosperous result that are multiplying daily in a geometrical ratio, and that are at once undeniable and unambiguous. The most palpable and unmistakable of these tokens is the contrast presented by the area and seeming power of Christendom at the crucifixion, or even at Pentecost, and the compass and manifest energy of its influence to-day. Not the least noticeable of these signs is the almost universal interest, sometimes amounting to profound anxiety, on religious subjects among thoughtful minds within the pale of Christendom, but without the pale of Christian vows. Another, hardly less remarkable, is the somewhat kindred curiosity that is manifested in the same subjects among thoughtful minds that have outworn the creeds of heathenism, or of a bastard Christianity, in such coun-

tries, for example, as Brazil, and India, and Japan. Still another of these tokens we have already pointed out. It is the growing and peculiarly restless and malevolent animosity of our acknowledged enemies that marks our time. This state of things is largely owing to a bitter sense of *the power* of that harmless religion which is so incessantly traduced and derided. The believer will not need to be reminded that the malice of the Evil One was never so signally displayed as when the Saviour was on the earth; and this was particularly true of that "hour of darkness" when he was about to triumph on the cross. It was before "going out of him" that the unclean spirit "tare" the demoniac. We may gather from this analogy, that when this frenzy, this *furor brevis*, passes, mankind will be found "clothed" and in its "right mind," and "sitting at the feet of Jesus." Infidelity is at length at bay.

The more clearly this appears, the more certain it is that the contest is approaching a victorious conclusion.

But infidelity is not the foe with which religion has chiefly or most directly to deal. Infidelity hangs upon the flank and rear. The enemy in the front is the depravity that is in the world, and the apostasy and sloth that are in the Church. The blows which religion has, from time to time, aimed at religious skepticism have been to parry the thrusts of an adversary who would interfere as much as may be with the onward march against worldliness and sin. In so far as religious skepticism is sincere and unprejudiced, it resolves itself into mere ignorance or into a pitiable form of mental imbecility. The skepticism we have in view is of another sort. It may be honestly held, but, where wholly unmixed with skepticism of the dispassionate, intellectual variety, it is full of the gangrene of hatred. This kind of skepticism is but an extreme form of that earthliness and spiritual corruption, which, we grant, it is the grand errand of religion in the world to resist and to supplant or overcome. The prevalent skepticism of this latter half of the nineteenth century exhibits every shade of variation, from pure speculative doubt to the most violent and most selfish antagonism. It cannot well be denied that the spirit which informs, and animates, and regulates

this heterogeneous mass is, on the whole, the spirit of the world and of the flesh—the spirit which revolts at the heavenly morals and the self abnegating theology of the religion which was inculcated by the word and by the example of the man of Nazareth. Yet, even in this form, it is not the prime office of religion to confront this skepticism directly. This skepticism is one of the boughs of the tree. But the great work of religion, so far as its negative aims are concerned, is, not to remove the boughs, but to remove the tree itself. The tree is to be taken up by the roots, and another of an opposite and a better nature to be planted in its room. The roots of the tree are human guilt and human depravity. “Make the tree good and his fruit good.”

There is a fact of surprising interest and momentous importance that deserves to be stated here with particular emphasis. It is that (unlike other warriors) religion does not, in the first instance, seek to destroy, but makes every effort to save its adversary. It must conquer by one way or the other; but its grand endeavor is to conquer not by means of force, but by means of love. As, under the decree of heaven, the nations that submitted to the Chaldean monarch should be blessed, but the nations that resisted the power of Babylon should be broken or exterminated, so shall it fare with the enemies of Jesus Christ. There is, however, this world-wide difference betwixt the two cases. The empire of Nebuchadnezzar was fitly symbolized by his walls and hanging gardens—it was material and temporary; whereas the empire of religion is an empire over the conscience, over the hearts and the affections of men, and shall endure forever. It was a matter of comparative indifference, therefore, with the earthly potentate whether the “nations and peoples” of the earth submitted voluntarily to his sway or were crushed by the might of his victorious arms. It is, on the other hand, the prime object of religion to revolutionize the temper, to change the heart, to renovate the soul. It is not indifferent, therefore, to the first dawnings of the moral *renaissance*, since the very reason of its own being is the new-birth of the sinner, the spiritual purification of society, and the millennial and celestial glory of the church.

It was necessary to glance at the direct operation of religion on its appropriate object, in order properly to estimate and appreciate its reflex influence, which is now to be made the topic of a more especial consideration. It will first be desirable to have a clear understanding of the terms employed. The "direct" action of any force is intelligible enough to everybody. The "reflex" action of the same force may need a word of elucidation. The term "reflex" only differs from the terms "reflexed" and "reflected," as a participle differs from an adjective; and a force that is "reflex" is, therefore, simply a force that is "reflected" or bent back. Every reflex force or influence must be either one or other of two kinds. It must be a force that is bent back either on itself or on something else. Thus the beam of light that is reflected on a bit of glass may be reflected either upon the eye of the observer or upon some other object. When we speak of the reflex influence of prayer, we commonly mean the reflex influence of prayer upon the man himself who prays. When we speak of the reflex influence of religion, we mean one or other of two things. We either mean that influence which reacts upon the religious community itself from the direct impact of the force exerted by that community on the world; or else we mean the influence which is reflected from that impact back upon the world itself. It is this last sense alone that concerns us in this investigation. There is doubtless such a thing as the reflex influence of religious effort on the personal character and happiness of the religious man. Indeed, Aristotle's definition of happiness in general is, in substance, that it is the reflex of energy. The reflex influence of religious effort, *ad extra*, on religious men, *i. e.*, on the church itself, meets with splendid exemplification in the work of Christian missions. But the only influence of religion that is to be treated of in what remains of this essay, is the reflex influence of religion on *the world*.

There is an apparent difficulty that arises at this point, but one that disappears upon examination. If the direct force of religion is exerted on the world, how can the reflex influence of religion terminate on the same object? The answer is a

plain one. It does *not* terminate on the same object. The explanation of the seeming contradiction is to be found in the ambiguity of the term "world." The principal effort of religion is indeed to convert and renovate the world, in the universal meaning of that term. The sum total of its aims is to make the entire population of the globe, in the highest sense, *religious*. When that end shall have been attained, it will have been attained through the instrumentality of its direct, not of its reflex, energy. It will be observed that as yet this consummation of our hopes lies in the future. At present, the effect contemplated is an ideal, not a real one. When that effect has been produced, the reflex action of religion on the world will have ceased and become impossible. A mighty result has, notwithstanding, been already accomplished. A large portion of the world has been reclaimed, and brought more permanently than before under the direct influence of the church. In other words, a portion of the world has been made, in various degrees, *religious*. This effect has been due to the operation of the spiritual force directly upon its object. That object, we are accustomed to say, is the world. More strictly speaking, it is that portion of the world (in the popular sense of the term) which has been reclaimed; or, at all events, that portion of the world which has been directly influenced. The object of the church's ideal operation is the world at large; but the object of the church's actual operation is that part of the world which has really been made to feel and own the power of religion. This is exactly the condition of things in which a reflex influence of religion on the world is alone feasible. Accurately speaking, it is an influence that is exerted not upon the world as a totality, but upon the world considered as a remainder, after allowing for that portion of the world which has been received into the embrace of the church, or within the range of the church's action.

This point admits of a very simple illustration. The direct beam of light falls, at the angle of incidence, upon a given spot on the earth's surface. The reflex beam is bent back, at the angle of reflection, so as to fall upon some other spot on the earth's surface. We may thus speak of the reflex, as well as of the

direct, influence of *light* upon *the earth*. It is necessary to take notice, however, that the direct operation of religion is not confined to that segment of the world which has become the church in *esse*, but goes out further upon that part of the remainder which is regarded by it as the church in *posse*. We have been treating of the world not so much from the point of view of the geographer as from the point of view of the census-taker. The world we have been speaking of is not the world of territories, but the world of men. When we say, however, that the world is the antagonist of religion, we commonly employ the term not in a popular but in a theological acceptation. Of course we do not now, any more than before, mean absolutely the world at large. That is, we do not mean to use the word in so comprehensive a sense as to include the church. The boundaries of the world in the theological sense coincide in a manner and in a great degree with the boundaries of the world which lies beyond the limits of the church; but it is looked at under a somewhat different aspect. For, speaking generally, the outlying world is in point of fact, the active or inactive foe of the true religion; and, speaking theologically, the outlying world is in a much deeper sense "the enemy of the Cross of Christ." Here we must refer to the difference already pointed out between those worldlings (using the term as it is used in books of practical divinity) who cheerfully submit, and those who obstinately prolong the contest. Both classes of worldlings were originally enemies, and both are eventually subdued. But the first class are overpowered by Divine grace, and are raised to heavenly honor and felicity; the second class alone are subjugated by force of arms, and subjected throughout eternity to the Divine wrath. A broad distinction, therefore, is to be drawn between the world that may be looked upon as within the confines of hope and the world that must be viewed as utterly apostate. The camp of infidel skepticism and the camp of Jesuitical Romanism—to say not a syllable here of the camps of Judaism, of heathenism, and of abandoned profligacy and ungodliness—have been pitched for the most part, it is very sadly to be feared, among the shadows of religious despair, and the dark solitudes

of moral and spiritual ruin and desolation. Let it not be forgotten, though, that it is not given to man to foretell the future, or to read the riddle of the human heart. The bidding is to make universal proclamation of the terms of amnesty; and the adorable founder of our religion has promised a complete and final victory—a victory which is to be brought about not only by quelling defiant and obdurate rebellion, but by transforming hostile dispositions, and making those who were at one time the pronounced enemies of religion become its voluntary, its enthusiastic, its devoted friends. *Nil desperandum* should, therefore, be one of the mottoes of the church.

Let us now cast our eyes, for a moment, backwards, and then fix them steadily upon what lies before us. When reference is made in this discussion to the reflex action of religion on the world, what is intended is not any operation that is brought to bear on the world, considered as rebels against the divine authority, but an influence that is exerted on the world, viewed as separate from the church and as standing in an attitude of indifference even more than of formal belligerency.

This amounts very nearly to saying that the reflex influence of religion upon the world is the reflex upon the outlying masses of human society of the direct energy that is put forth by the Church upon so much of the world of humanity as is within the scope and range of the Church's legitimate and actual operation. It should, nevertheless, be heeded, that the masses of society are here viewed as occupying an attitude, if not of conscious hostility, yet of formal, if not pronounced, neutrality or opposition, and of real indifference or repulsion. The reflex action, if exerted at all, is therefore an action which is exerted, not upon those who might be called friendly allies, but upon those who can be fairly looked upon in no other light than as unfriendly neutrals, or else downright enemies.

This is an important point; and it is the more remarkable from the fact that the influence exerted is beneficial and not injurious. The fact has been made prominent that as regards her direct warfare religion (unlike earthly conquerors) disarms, but does not destroy, her submissive adversary. On the contrary,

she restores to him a hundredfold the spoils of victory, and saves him with a salvation unspeakably precious and glorious, and that is eternal. Her direct efforts, even in the case of obstinate hostility, are in the first instance equally humane and beneficent. The additional fact is now to be signalized, that the outlying world cannot, if it would, get rid of the wholesome effects wrought upon it by religion. The direct operation of the force that is brought to bear upon the world by religion may be, and is, daily resisted; but the benign effects of its reflex action cannot be evaded or easily diminished. The very weapons with which the fight against religion is maintained, on the part of its most skilful and valorous opponents, were forged in the workshop of religion. The nurture of the world's noblest modern heroes has been the nurture generously afforded by the despised foe. Thus, as in the legend of Romulus and Remus, the puissance of ancient Rome was suckled by wolves; so in a manner has religion been a wet-nurse to infidelity. This, though very extensively admitted, remains to be somewhat articulately demonstrated.

But what bounds are we to set to the term religion itself? It may be taken in the indefinite sense, for *any* religion, whether good or bad; it may be taken in the specific sense, for the one definite religion that is *true*, or for the complex of qualities going to make up the true; or it may be taken in the comprehensive sense, as denoting *all* religions, as well bad as good, considered as possessing certain characteristics in common, or as the sum total of *all* religious attributes.

We have been using the term, and shall go on using it, chiefly in the second of these senses. When reference is made to the religion of the Pagan, or of the Turk, to the Jewish or to the Christian religion, designated as such, such reference involves the use of the term in the first of the three senses. In the third sense of the term, the proposition admits of easy illustration—that religion has been in every age the indispensable auxiliary of social progress. The question has been always mooted, whether the effects of atheism are preferable to those of superstition. Bacon seems to incline towards a decision in the affirmative. "The terror," in revolutionary France, at the close of the eight-

eenth century, opened many eyes, and has induced a multitude of recent thinkers to favor a negative determination of this question. Regarded historically, the problem is one of some embarrassment; for the reason that, before the middle of the eighteenth century, atheism never exerted a widespread influence in the world. The positive effect of superstition, we are persuaded, has been more desirable than the state of things which would have resulted from the banishment of all religion from the earth. The essential thing to take notice of now is, that superstition is itself a reflex of piety—that false religion is a shadow, and, in some sense, often an adumbration, of the true.* Milton says that “error is but opinion in the making.”† It is not to be disputed that there is much in Romanism, in Mahometanism, and even in Paganism, that has been good for mankind. The good that is in Romanism is in no sense part and parcel of that corrupt system, but is derived immediately from God’s Word. The same remark is true in general of Mahometanism, which is, however, in the main, a composition of second-hand Judaism and heretical Christianity.‡ The good that is in Paganism is derived with more or less directness from the same fountain-head. Whatever is good in Paganism, and that cannot be accounted for by referring it to the direct or indirect influence of the Bible, is attributable either to the innate principles of natural religion or to the force of the primitive tradition. The scope of natural religion is at best contracted, and is seen to be especially circumscribed in the domain of barbarous heathenism. Natural religion, however, properly regarded, is to be identified, not with the manifestation of a spurious devotion, but with the exhibitions of the genuine faith. It is not so much an ally, as it is a *branch*, of true religion. The benefits which are traceable to natural religion are therefore, with equal justice, traceable to the only

* This is beautifully brought out by Trench in the Hulsean lectures on “Christ the Desire of All Nations.”

† Compare Macaulay’s Works, Vol. VI, p. 9. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1875. And Herbert Spencer, First Principles, Ch. I, p. 3. D. Appleton & Co. 1871.

‡ See Melman’s Latin Christianity, Vol. II, pp. 116, 137. W. T. Widdleton. 1874.

true and venerable *cultus* that has been recognized in human history. But we attach far more importance to the influence of the paradisiacal tradition. Greece owed "much every way" to the contact with Egypt, where it is a noteworthy fact that Pythagoras and Ezekiel were contemporaries. The later Stoics may have borrowed something (through Seneca) from the apostolic prisoner of Nero. We do not lay great stress on what may, after all, be mere coincidences. There were other points of possible, and doubtless of actual, contact. The light of Judaism could not be altogether hid under the bushel. A city set on such a hill as was Jerusalem, could not be wholly secluded from the view of the Gentile nations.

The exile, the deportation of the ten tribes, the captivity, the *diaspora*, had the effect of increasing the diffusive tendencies. Still we are fain to ascribe a great part of the influence to the unwritten words that went forth from the garden-wall of Eden, and again from the doors of the ark on Ararat, and where not wholly lost, were still further scattered at the dispersion. Mr. Gladstone, in his learned volumes on Homer, finds both an *inventive* and a *traditive* element in the Homeric poems, and particularly in the Iliad. Faintly, or more distinctly audible, beneath the multifarious and somewhat frivolous polytheism of the epic narrative there is a ground note of the earlier, the simple, the impressive monotheism that still had not wholly forgotten to point the soul to the one great and only source of justice and supreme dominion.

In speaking of the benefits that have been conferred upon the world by false or corrupt religions, we had reference exclusively to its spiritual amendment. It is our intention, however, to take a much wider view of the matter. Superstition has been the hand-maid, however unconsciously, not only of piety and saintly virtue, but also of secular improvement in every form. The world owes to the religion of the ancients a great part of the monuments that yet remain of their æsthetic and intellectual pre-eminence and development. It is notorious that it was the Turk who was the custodian of the humanities and the sciences during the dark ages. The revival of art was fostered by the

ascendancy of papal Rome. Architecture flourished even whilst thick mediæval shadows still hung over the people. Poetry, sculpture, painting, music, followed in due course. All these things may be legitimately regarded as effects produced, in a great measure, by the direct action of counterfeit religions, and consequently as so many reflections from the impact of the spiritual energy exerted by the true belief.

We go on now to a consideration of those effects of pure religion on the world which are not immediate, and yet which are, in no sense and in no degree, ascribable to the invention of any of the forms of superstition and religious falsehood. The light which has radiated from the cross has been caught as in a manifold mirror, and reflected in every quarter and to the remotest extremities of the globe. The only way to examine this subject properly is to make a comparison between Christian and heathen lands to-day, as well as between papal and Protestant lands, and also between civilized communities in the nineteenth century, and civilized communities in such eras as those of Pericles, or of Augustus Cæsar. It will not be denied that the outlying population in Christian countries that is situated beyond the limits of the Church, is in a position immeasurably advanced above anything that can be found outside the bounds of Christendom. In a less degree the same is true of the position of things in Protestant countries as compared with the position of things in papal territories. The difference between the Christian and the non-Christian elements in the population of nominally Christian lands is not, by any means, so marked. The sharper of these contrasts can only be intelligently explained by referring it to the reflex, yet mighty and ameliorating influence of the religion of Jesus. The most significant and instructive of these sharp contrasts is, perhaps, the one between the civilization of the old world and the civilization of the new. The divergence is here very startling, and evinces itself chiefly in two particulars, to wit: In material progress and in social morals. There will, we surmise, be little disposition to contest the averment that the mental calibre of the Greeks under Themistocles or Alexander was fully equal to the mental calibre of the Ger-

mans under William, or of the English under Victoria. All forms of literature and philosophy, many forms of civic and military government, and some forms of art, received in antiquity the highest development of which they appear to be susceptible. What the cotemporaries of Phidias, and Socrates, and Alcibiades, and Plato, and Sophocles, had most occasion to desiderate was a better provision for their material comfort and a more general and more thorough going observance of the moral law. The superiority of modern nations on the score of their decent behavior and their refined theory of ethics, is so obviously and so entirely due to the reflex action of Christianity upon the outside world, that the proposition might almost go without saying. How else is the difference to be rationally accounted for? In the Christian religion we have a *vera causa* abundantly able to effect such a result, and no other equally suitable has ever been suggested. It is not a satisfactory solution of the enigma to explain the phenomenon in question, by referring to the progress of the human mind. In matters of pure intellect it is by no means clear that the human mind has progressed at all. Cheerfully conceding the studies that have been made in national morals, we demand the *cause* of this moral advance? The extraordinary increase of all the appliances of material comfort and convenience which so distinguish the age we live in, and the astonishing inventiveness which is continually multiplying those appliances, is a phenomenon that is far more difficult of elucidation. The principles of the true inductive philosophy are at least as old as Aristotle.* Those principles, however, received a more extended and more impressive exposition at the hands of such men as Roger Bacon, as Galileo, as Lord Verulam, and Sir Isaac Newton. Such were the influences which presided over the birth of the physical sciences; and the maturity of the physical sciences is naturally the condition which,

* The Ptolemaic astronomers were accurate observers, and the heliocentric theory of Copernicus had been anticipated by Pythagoras. Agassiz calls attention to the fact that some of the most obscure and delicate distinctions connected with the anatomical structure of fishes that have been pointed by recent science, had been anticipated by the Stagyrte.

together with man's growing wants, is alone essential to the existence and indefinite multiplication of the discoveries and inventions that illustrate and distinguish our time. After all, it is highly probable that the enormous supply of labor-saving machines and implements of convenience, which is one of the characteristic features of this age, has been in large part created by a corresponding demand. As human beings grow more refined and delicate, in other words more highly civilized, in the modern sense of the word, so do they become more dependent on external and material sources for the relief of many hitherto unperceived necessities. Now the proposition would seem to be plainly incontestable, that the most refining influence that has ever operated in the world has been the direct and indirect influence of the Christian religion. The institutions of the Sabbath, and of marriage, have tended, for example, conspicuously to the segregation and seclusion of individuals and families, and thus have contributed to wear away the rugged coarseness of the savage condition. Even then, as regards the material improvement of the age, it may be claimed for religion that it has exercised a potent reflex influence. Such writers as Professor Huxley are fond of descanting on the destructive aims and tendencies of religious authority in matters of science. They point with glowing indignation to the treatment extended by the Church to illustrious thinkers like Copernicus, and Galileo, and Bruno Giordano, and contend that the feud between science and religion is one that can never be healed. The Church of that day doubtless erred egregiously in their dealings with those extraordinary men, but it was a period when the Church had become corrupt, or was misguided on many important questions, and when both the Church and the world were alike grossly ignorant in the domain of "scientific" truth.

The attitude of the church towards the advances of physical science has not always been thus hostile; and the most successful of the students of nature have been nursed upon her bosom. Kepler, who discovered the primal laws of astronomy, offered up all his science on the altar of religion. Sir Francis Bacon, the reputed founder of the modern scientific method, was a firm

believer in the Christian scriptures. Sir Isaac Newton, the real author of what is most distinctive in that method—as well as the one who first perfectly explained the fall of an apple and the movement of the heavenly bodies—was a devout follower of Jesus. Cuvier, and Agassiz, and Faraday, all built up arguments in support of the statements of revelation. But we may set the one fact against the other. If the guardians of Christianity have been at times inimical to the unfettered freedom of scientific thought, the wonderful impulse that has recently been given to scientific thought is to be attributed very largely to the peculiar refinement of the age; and the peculiar refinement of the age is (as we have ascertained) due in great part to the powerful reflex action of religious agencies. There is another answer, and it is a cogent one. It was superstition that tortured Galileo and vexed the soul of Columbus; it was mistaken zeal that pressed Servetus with civil penalties; but it was the true religion that broke the bondage of centuries, and reaffirmed the right, and reasserted the dominion of private judgment in the whole realm of religious and secular knowledge. We desire to take a broader view. Christianity has not only fostered civilization in its peculiarly modern form, Christianity has, in all the ages of its progress, been the mightiest civilizing agency on earth. Even the purely *intellectual* development of a people is promoted by the spread of true religion as by nothing else. The intellectual prominence of Egypt and Hellas was something altogether without historic parallel. Heathen nations are for the most part notoriously barbarous. Christianity has been the great educator of the nations. When we rise from the contemplation of a merely intellectual meliority to that of a meliority in the scale of social and moral distinctions, there is no other force or influence whatever to be placed side by side with the true religion as measured by the power it has exerted on the world. Viewing the subject in all its length and breadth, civilization has borne the same relation to religion that the shadow of a man bears to his body. Sometimes the reflected image has been increased, sometimes lessened; sometimes it has not been visible; but notwithstanding the union between shadow

and substance has not been more inseparable than the union between true faith and true culture. The civilization of the world to-day that lies beyond the farthest outposts of Christendom, is not worthy of the name. The civilization of the most favored nations of antiquity was (as we have seen) not wholly uninfluenced by the religion of Eden, or by the religion of the chosen people; was highly exceptional in its character, and taken at its best, fell far short of the requirements of Christian cultivation in the nineteenth century. The superiority of modern over ancient culture we have judged to be philosophically explicable only on the hypothesis of the straightforward or lateral power exerted by Christianity upon the world. We seem to be justified, then, in the bold assertion that civilization is *the shadow* of religion. The very "sweetness and light," so euphoniouly celebrated by Mr. Matthew Arnold, have their real origin in the gospel of divine truth, and of human benevolence, gladness and peace. The "light" has sprung up in the darkness of this world, and is, where properly so denominated, an effluence from Him "in whom is no darkness at all." The "sweetness" has been extracted from the once strong but now vanquished and slain body of native barbarity and corruption. The boasted morality of such men as David Hume, and Theodore Parker, and John Stuart Mill, and of such living examples as Mr. Arnold and Mr. Tyndall, is ultimately referable to no other source than the very religion of their fathers, which they have abjured and disowned. Christianity may be heard to say again, but in a new application of the language of the prophet, "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me."

To revert to the thought with which we set out, religion is already a grand success. With slender means, against incalculable odds, it has overspread the habitable globe and preoccupied the centres of human intelligence and influence, until it has become the dominant power in the earth and in the hearts of men. To estimate what it has accomplished directly, it is only necessary to turn the eye to the state of the world immediately after the ascension, and then survey the present aspect

of society. "Look at this picture and then at that." The result of such a comparison cannot be other than reassuring. But this would not be a complete view of the matter. The influence of daylight is powerfully felt even in those spots which are not "in the sun." The earth, too, is in a manner illuminated before the morning rays have begun to dart along the horizon. In the same way religion has achieved a vast result in an area far removed beyond the range of its direct activity. And what is most remarkable, this result is not more surprising for its extent and power than it is for its character and value. The reflex influence of religion on the world has not only been a wide and a mighty one, but it has been one that has been wonderfully salutary. In both respects, this result may well be regarded as the shadow, not only of the past, but of the future, of "great events" which have "cast their shadows before" them, as a prophecy of the diffusion and blessed effects of direct Christian influence in the latter day.

The princes of the infidel culture have brought forward the soothsayers of modern progress to curse religion, but they have unwittingly done nothing but bless the object that had been devoted to their malediction. The upshot is, that Christianity, inspected from this angle as from every other, is sure to conquer. In the words of Macauley, (words of pensive interest, now that he who spoke them has gone from us,) "Christianity "is not now for the first time left to rely on the force of its own "evidences and the attractions of its own beauty The wisest "and bravest of the Cæsars found their policy and their arms "unavailing when opposed to the weapons which are not carnal, and the kingdom that is not of this world. The victory "which Porphyry and Diocletian failed to gain, is not, to all "appearance, reserved for any of those who have, in this age, "directed their attacks against the last restraint of the powerful "and the last hope of the wretched."
