

3
160.

TOKIO LECTURES.

I.

Christianity and Civilization,

WITH A PRELUDE ON THE

ANTIQUITY OF MAN,

BY

C. S. EBY, B.A.



Delivered in Meiji Kuaido, Tokio,

January 6th, 1883.

Printed at the "Japan Gazette" Office.



TOKIO LECTURES.

UNITED CHURCH
ARCHIVE

I.

Christianity and Civilization,

WITH A PRELUDE ON THE

ANTIQUITY OF MAN,

BY

C. S. EBY, B.A.



Delivered in Meiji Kuaido, Tokio,

January 6th, 1883.

Printed at the "Japan Gazette" Office.



PREFACE.

Hon. J. A. Bingham, United States Minister in Japan, presided on the occasion of the delivery of the first lecture of this series, entitled Christianity and the Progress of Civilization, and introduced the lecturer and his subject in the following terms:—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

Honoured by the committee's invitation to preside on this occasion, I beg leave to say that in my opinion the series of public lectures proposed to be given in this place, the first of which it will be our privilege to hear to-day, may be productive of good, and can by no possibility work harm either to his Majesty's government, his Majesty's subjects, or to the people of any other nationality who may attend them. We have ample guarantee of this in the high character of the gentlemen who have kindly

volunteered to give their time and best thoughts to this service, in the subjects to be discussed, and in the fact that an invitation is extended to all to suggest such inquiries and make such criticisms concerning each lecture as they may wish, all of which will be kindly entertained and responded to. I thank the gentlemen for this liberal invitation, thereby according to others what they claim for themselves, and proclaiming that error itself may be tolerated when truth is left free to combat it, and affirming their faith in the utterance of another age.—“As for truth it endureth and is always strong; it liveth and conquereth for ever—more.”

We are to-day to be favoured with an introductory address on the Antiquity of Man and a lecture on Christianity and the Progress of Civilization.

Being ourselves of the race of man, whatever concerns men concerns each and all of us.

Christianity is a great central fact in the world's history. It commands at this moment the reverent consideration and approval

of enlightened men in all lands. Of the general principles of Christianity it is not for me at present to speak, nor is it needful that I should, as they speak for themselves; but I may be permitted to say of them that they are largely incorporated in the constitutions and laws of the European and American states.

Our modern civilization is largely the offspring of Christianity. It is the physical, intellectual and moral development of individual and collective man, the citizen and the nation. Its beneficent outgoings are to be seen in the science, literature and laws, and in the history, past and present, of our race. They are to be seen in the inventions of genius which have laid the elements of external nature under contribution and made them minister to the wants and comforts of man; and in the gentle, wide-spread, organized charity, which supplies so much of human want, and mitigates so much of human suffering.

In a word, civilization is the sublime march of humanity, the progress of which no earthly power can stay or successfully resist.

For Humanity sweeps onward: where to-day the
martyr stands,
On the morrow crouches Judas, with the silver in
his hands,
While the hooting mob of yesterday in silent awe
return
To glean up the scattered ashes into History's
golden urn.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it only remains
for me to introduce my greatly valued friend
Mr. Eby, who will now address us on the
subjects indicated.

LECTURES IN TOKIO.

I

ON Saturday, the 6th January, the first of a series of lectures on Christianity was delivered at the Meiji Kuaido by C. S. Eby, B.A., to a large audience of foreigners and native scholars. The lecture was subsequently repeated in Japanese to a crowded and enthusiastic audience of natives. Mr. Eby prefaced his lecture with a prelude on the

ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

“The proper study of mankind is man.”

THE most interesting and most important subject that can engage our attention as reasonable men is that of man himself. What is man? Whence came he? Whither is he hastening? are questions discussed since history dawned, and never more earnestly than now, and never were more varied answers given. Momentous interests hang upon our answers to these questions, involving not only the result of scientific

research or theological dogma, but also man's personal woe or weal, the welfare of society, the political consolidation or dissolution of the strength of empires. The present course of lectures aims at the study of man in his manifold relations to the universe, his past, present, and future, in such a way as shall preclude a hasty and fatally one-sided decision, but shall open the path to such a thoughtful weighing of all available evidence as shall culminate in a practical decision worthy of men possessed of reason and conscience. These great questions are of prime importance for the young men of Japan, and above all things at this particular juncture in the development of your country. In this time of transition from ancient forms to the newer ones of a differing civilization, the impress given by this generation of educated men to the plastic masses of the nation will affect your posterity and the welfare of your people for all the ages yet to come. I would therefore ask you to look the matter seriously, solemnly in the face, and allow no petty side-issues to divert us from the line of great principles, which lie at the foundation of true civilization, culture and progress.

As an introduction to the larger questions in hand it seems proper that we should enquire as to the origin of man and how long he has been on the earth. A vast number of answers to this question has been given nor has a satisfactory solution yet been found; it is simply one of those open ques-

tions which are of great interest to us, but the answer to which, one way or the other, is not of the greatest practical importance. We are often reminded, by persons or books dealing with this question, of the angry discussions and misrepresentations of theologians as opposed to scientists and scientific research of pre-historic man. But two very important facts seem often to be overlooked viz., (1) That scientists who were by no means theologically warped, have earnestly discussed the subject, and have as strongly opposed and do oppose to the present day, the teachings of other scientists with regard to the antiquity of man; and (2) That many theologians such as, Mgr. Meignan, R. C. bishop, M. l'abbé Lambert, and M. l'abbé Bourgeois and others, have taken an active part in pre-historic researches, and do not find the teaching of the bible or the dogmas of the church at all in the way.

Now the fact is, there are scientists and scientists, and there are theologians and theologians; and you will generally find that it is not the profoundly scientific man but the superficial sciolist who claims that science is destructive of faith, and who shouts, "down with religions and creeds." On the other hand, it is not the profound and thoughtful theologian, but the narrow-minded and half-educated alarmist only, who decries science and research into every nook and corner of nature, as an enemy of theology and religion. One of the sayings of a theological teacher under whom I studied many years ago remains

in my memory, and has been the guide of my thoughts and studies ever since, and I would recommend the same words to you for in them is a whole heritage of wisdom. "Young men," he used to say, "Young men, the world, of thought is moving on; do not accept a thing simply because it is new, and do not be afraid to accept a thing because it is new." That seems simple enough, but it indicates the path to sure and lasting progress, and a means to avoid disaster and disappointment. There are two classes of extremists, both of which we should avoid with equal care, and these are, if you will allow me to coin for you a pair of new English words *neomaniacs* and *neophobists*. *Neomaniacs* are those who search for what is new, and accept it because it is new, rejecting the old landmarks, simply because they have been there so long. In this class are a great many young people whose ambition is more powerful than their judgment is mature, and who are to be found amongst both scientists and theologians. *Neophobists* represent a class who stick to the old and despise the new because it is new; they will have nothing to do with your new fangled ideas and are constantly praising the past and pointing back to the old landmarks. There are a good many specimens of this species in olden lands, and amongst elderly people in every land, including old women, in the garb of both science and religion. Avoiding both extremes our way must be to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good" and true. I presume you will not

object to that though it is a doctrine of Christianity and the very words of the bible. Test the new, test it fully, and if it is true it must be good, and you must accept it or commit mental suicide. Test the old, test it well, be sure you are right, but if the old is not true, it cannot be good; you must reject it or deprave your intellectual being. The object of these lectures is to urge you to search for and grasp, not what is new, not what is old, as such, but above all things "Buy the truth and sell it not"—as Solomon tells us to do.

But you ask,—does not the bible commit you to a fixed chronological limit for the origin and existence of man upon the earth? Some would-be scientists who knew more about rocks than about the bible which they were affecting to criticise, and some theologians, who knew more about old musty traditions than about the scripture they thought they were teaching, have said so; but (1) no theological truth depends upon our understanding of those ancient chronological tables; and (2) among students of that chronology there are 140 distinct and different opinions as to the date of the beginning of the historical sketch in the bible, differing to the extent of over 3,000 years. Thus the bible asserts nothing positive with regard to that point, and it makes absolutely no difference to the teachings of Christianity whether man has been on the earth 4,000 or 400,000 years before Christ.

Again it is claimed that the Darwinian

theory of evolution set the world on the right track in the study of man, and putting him into his proper place as one of the mammals in the animal kingdom explains the whole mystery of man's origin, position and destiny. While on the other hand physiologists and other scientists of equal note and authority declare that on Darwin's own theory it is as impossible that man should have developed out of any known line of apes as out of cats and tigers. It must ever be kept in mind that the doctrine of evolution is still a theory, a hypothesis; one among scores that have been set up by science, some few of which have been proved true, but most of which have had to be eventually abandoned as they proved to be untenable. It is well, nay necessary, to have some hypothesis as an outline in which to set facts as they are brought to light; but it is going too far to ask the world to accept any hypothesis as *truth*, which we must believe as a scientific deduction until it shows itself true by a perfect adjustment to a sufficient number of facts, and is not to be vitiated by too many exceptions. Now the theory of evolution seems to gather a vast amount of facts, and place them in such an order and harmony as to show that there is a great deal of truth in it as far as it goes. And as far as facts attest the truth so far must we of course promptly accept it, only we must be careful not to suppose that one ingredient in a compound of many forces and facts, fully explains the whole. The dispute is one of science purely, and it seems that

the majority of the best and most unbiassed thinkers, look upon evolution in some form as the law according to which things have come into being. But a vast deal remains yet to be done before it can be substantiated as the Copernican system or the Keplerian laws. And whatever the result may be, whether the hypothesis be true or not—unless it can be shown that matter evolves itself without a creator—it makes absolutely no difference to the principles of the Christian religion or the teachings of the bible.

But when men in the name of science, of which they are not the best representatives, overstep their sphere of empirical research and attempt to teach us what are the ultimate causes of things, and tell us that there is nothing in the world but matter and force and evolution, we cry—"Hold! now you are on ground that is common to us both. We accept your facts as far as you bring us proof, but when you begin to philosophise on those facts, and attempt to construct a system of thought, we too have the same right to enquire into the metaphysical bearings of the case." But, reply certain extremists again:—"The are no metaphysics; that is a region of fancy; there is nothing in the universe but matter, and mechanical force, and evolution. We reply that such a position, ancient though it is, is too narrow, too shallow, to allow room for all the facts of the case, and contradicts all the analogies of our experience. You take a little acorn, plant it, up springs a tiny tender shoot, the forces

of the soil, and sunshine, and air develop its latent powers and increase its bulk until eventually you have the majestic oak with colossal trunk, gigantic branches, unnumbered twigs, a wealth of foliage and perennial crops of new acorns. Now does the acorn, that little seed, alone account for that development and productiveness? Am I to be blamed if I tell you I do not believe that that seed could have produced an oak, even with all the other forces of soil, and air, and light, and heat combined, if there had not first been involved in the acorn the life and powers of a perfect oak tree from which it sprang. Evolution cannot bring out of matter and mechanical force what is not actually involved in them.

Again you see this watch (not Paley's old watch this time). I ask you to explain to me the philosophy of this watch. Well, you say, here are gold and silver, and steel and enamel, and jewels, and all combined make up the watch. Yes, but all those things might be, and still there be no watch. How does it come to be a watch? Why there are the properties of the elements, inertia, malleability ductility, &c., and there is adjustment of part to part, the hands indicating the hours. Yes, but how does it come that these form a watch? Well there are cog wheels, and springs, and balances, and regulators, and mechanical forces, and—Yes, but you have not yet told me about the watch at all, and whole volumes of such explanations would not give me a true philosophy

of that little instrument. I must be metaphysical and talk of forces that I can not see, cannot touch, cannot know; but do you blame me for believing—yes having faith, that all the matter and mechanical forces in the universe could never have produced this watch without the addition of mind. Matter, and properties of matter plus mind, produced this watch. At least so I believe although I don't know how, or when, or where, or by whom the watch was made. Am I unscientific because I confess to you my faith in the existence of a watchmaker who had a mind?

And can you blame me if following these analogies, I find it impossible without the addition of creative mind to believe that matter and mechanical force alone combined ethereal atoms into molecules, and these into suns and systems and orbs each set in its place and moving with more than clock like regularity along its self-appointed way? or that this earth hardened into a sphere and raised the mountain chains, and gave the sea her bounds, and hollowed out a way for the rivers, and prepared a soil for the child it was about to produce? Or that matter and mechanical force brought life into being, by which chemical action is reversed and made to build up by transformation of appropriated matter; and by the loss of which those chemical forces bring forth rottenness and decay; a power which clothes the plains and hills with verdure, secures seed time and harvest, and makes all nature rich and

beautiful with the unbounded opulence of forest and field and flower? Or that matter and mechanical force acting in the vegetable world brought forth animal life, by which the dark sea was peopled with tiny creatures and monsters great, by which the worm of the sod, the beast of the forest and field, the songsters in the sky and the soaring eagle were brought forth? Or that matter and mechanical force alone working through the lower animals brought forth man with his ideas of moral good and evil, his conception of spiritual unseen things beyond, his longing for immortality! Do you blame me when I tell you that as my philosophy of this watch demands the existence of an unseen mind to account for it, so my philosophy of this marvellous universe demands the existence of a mind adequate to produce it, not only out of matter and force, but also to produce matter and mechanical force themselves from a something still behind them. Is it not just possible that this last highest arc in the section of infinity which comes within our reach, the mind, intellect, spiritual longings of man, may give us a clue to the mysterious problem, onward it reaches to spirit worlds and higher possibilities still, away on to the infinite mind, the climax of all; and is it not possible that when we reach that point, apparently the antipodes of matter and mechanical force, we will find ourselves at the fountain of infinite being, the point from which all else has sprung, the infinite cycle there complete. The infinite

mind projecting itself in all the vast laws of matter, and mechanical forces, and vital phenomena, is the one unseen and necessary agent that makes even evolution possible and holds the universe in harmony.

But what has all this to do with the antiquity of man? Much every way. Where does man come in, in this evolution or creation or whatever it may be? Man is of simian origin, say the most of evolutionists, or have so said until lately, some of the links of course being missing; but the point of departure for the development of man seems to be driven back step by step and the missing links to become more numerous than ever. Morphologists, those who study outline and form and resemblances there, tell us that there is a general similarity between the skeleton of the man and the higher apes. Anatomists who study the parts more fully tell us that there is a radical difference in every bone of the body, and every muscle shows a different adaptation. Physiologists tell us that the viscera of man are carnivorous, and those of the ape herbivorous, and that we can as easily have been evolved out of bears and lions as out of apes. Again we are reminded that in the series of phenomena of individual development of the body, the *inverse order* is observed; moreover apes are climbers and men are walkers. Now, say many scientists, "it is evident that when two organised beings follow an inverse order—especially when otherwise antagonistic—in the course of their growth, the more highly

developed of the two cannot have descended from the other by means of evolution." So that even scientifically viewed, man's place in evolution has not yet been defined. It is well to notice that thus far, in all developments of apes from lowest to highest, there is nothing but ape and no approach to man; and in all the degradation of man, there is always man and no approach to apes. Nothing is known to science of man and his progenitors, excepting as essentially and perfectly man, and any talk of his simian origin is pure imagination.

Just here comes in another phase of the question, when did man first appear? Sufficient proof has been given that man existed in the quaternary period along with the mammoth elephant and cave tiger, before Europe was last submerged and covered with glacial ice and arctic cold. But it is also roundly asserted that man lived in tertiary times, that is in geologic time—or 500,000, or 1,000,000 years ago. Now the supposed proofs of this assertion in Europe are confined to a few scratches on some bones, and a dubious flint or two, so that cautious scientists there, hesitate to accept the assertion as fact. But it is said that there is proof positive of the fact in America, remains being found under lava beds in gravel layers which belong to this ancient age. This find in the region of Table Mountain in California, has been used even here to illustrate, above all other illustrations, the stupidity of theologians and the vast age of man. Let us look at this illus-

trious example more closely. I have at hand information respecting those implements found in those gravel beds, and either the asserted facts are wrong, or there is something hard for evolution to explain. As to the facts, (1) doubts are entertained as to the the age of the sublava gravels. They may be no older than the early quaternary. (2) But admitting their pliocene age, there are doubts as to the authenticity of the findings, no competent scientist having seen them there. (3) Admitting their authenticity, there are grave doubts as to the non-disturbance of the gravels previous to the time of the findings, for auriferous gravels are peculiarly liable to disturbance, and there is good reason to think those of California had been worked by other races before the whites. (4) The character of the implements said to have been found gives great force to the last (3rd) doubt, for they are mostly mortars and pestles, and other neolithic implements, such as are in common use among the Indians and Mexicans of to-day. The very idea of neolithic implements in pliocene times is enough to make even the wildest extremist among believers in pre-historic man gasp and stare, it would be like talking of specimens of railways and telegraphs found among remains of the stone age.—So that Favre, and Evans, and Huxley, and Dawkins, and Labbock all say, the existence of tertiary man is “not proven.”

The second difficulty however is here, if, as we have been told in this house, that tertiary

man existed in America, there is certainly something loose about evolution or man must have had an evolution all to himself. I quote from a professor in California. "Not a single existing mammalian species can be traced back beyond the quaternary. The higher the organism the more rapidly species change. Existing mammals can be traced back only into the quaternary, molluscan species, a small percentage to the early tertiary; protozoan species even to the cretaceous. Is it possible then that man the highest of all, will be traced back to the middle tertiary? Why since that time the whole mammalian fauna has changed 5 or 6 times! Shall man be an exception to all the laws governing the evolution of the animal kingdom." Man 500,000 years ago, and man to-day on the same spot precisely the same!! and the universe moving to the march of evolution!! Why such an exception?

The fact is there is less talk about the vast antiquity of man to-day than there was twenty years or ten years ago, and all reliable evidence is bringing him more and more within hailing distance of historic times.

To conclude this subject I will just point out a few facts that seem to be established, not theories or scientific guesses, but facts which seem to have proofs behind them, and see how they compare with the bible account of the first races of men.

1.—Fossil remains of quaternary man tell us, and all traces of pre-historic man confirm

it, that from his beginning man was perfect man physically as the ordinary man of today, and if the brain is an indication of intellectual strength, equal to the ordinary intelligence of the present race of men.

This cannot be shown to conflict with the bible.

2.—Science tells us he probably first appeared in Central Asia, and thence gradually peopled the globe. So the bible teaches.

3.—Every thing seems to show that the present human races all belong to one species, i.e. descended from one original pair. So the bible teaches.

4.—Science tells us that man was naturally naked from the start, and had to clothe himself in leaves or bark or skins—So teaches the bible.

5.—Science teaches that the first race of men were savage in the sense of being great in strength of passion, but children in reason and personal control. So teaches the bible.

6.—Science tells us that pre-historic man was ignorant of art, and music, and metals for a time—So teaches the bible, giving the names of inventors and teachers.

7.—Science tells us that he must have been without inherent legal fibre, that the law faculty had to be developed. The whole story of the first laws in the bible would show the same fact of legal childhood.

8.—Science would indicate that the first races were unmoral, perhaps sadly immoral. The bible tells as that they were inexpressibly vile.

9.—Science tells us that they lived before a general subsidence of land, by which continents were covered with water and glacial ice and arctic cold, destroying nearly all animal life including nearly the whole of the human race. The bible records some such disaster and it may be found that these traditions preserved by men agree with the records of geology. That is yet to be settled.

In conclusion let it be distinctly understood (1) that not a single fact regarding pre-historic man has yet been established contradictory of the Christian's bible. (2) That it is a matter which does not touch the bible or Christianity whether man be proved to have been a longer or a shorter time on the earth, (3) that it does not affect the truth of the bible whether the evolution theory be true or false, (4) that all established facts regarding pre-historic man agree with established biblical teaching where they cover the same ground—in fact nothing has yet appeared to shake my confidence in the bible or my faith in a personal God.

NOTE.—Much that I have given above is due to Figuiet, Quaterfages, Bagehot, Le Conte and other sc: ntists.



CHRISTIANITY AND THE PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

“These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.”

Nothing is more interesting to the young Japan of to-day, than the questions of civilization and progress. The customs of the past, old forms of government and law, are changing along with dress and food and language. Some things seem to be changing more rapidly than others, and some changes do not always appear to be for the best, or at least to entail a momentary loss. Every crisis in a nation's history brings with it a certain amount of trouble, confusion and suffering, but if progress be true, every crisis brings to birth a better future. There are often well meaning individuals, short-sighted and fearful, who, seeing only the momentary disadvantage, decry all change, all progress, as a curse and a wrong. Many doubtless there are to-day in Japan, though their number is no doubt decreasing, who look back fondly on the good old times of settled routine and fixedness of custom, and who look towards the future of the restless present with feelings of dread or dismal forebodings of coming disaster for the state and for society.

I.

Is civilization a blessing? a thing to be desired? is a question often asked; as we are reminded of some sad remnant of evil, or abnormal outcome of artificiality, as though that were the legitimate fruit and sign of civilization, giving the impression that it is not an unmixed good. Now in reply to this question I will give a Scotchman's answer by asking another question—"Is manhood as compared with childhood a blessing?" How often we look back on the frolics of our childhood, its wild, unfettered, careless freedom, and compare it with the life of toil and disappointment, and sorrow perhaps, that we have in maturer years, and in moments of weakness we almost wish ourselves back in our childhood again. But what man of sober mind, of widening thought, and aspiring soul would in reality wish himself back in the narrow though pleasant bounds of child life? Away such a thought. Life's aim is not pleasure and earth-born joy, but a grasping after a something higher than our past, a mastering, ruling of something without us, that shall minister to the enlargement of what is within us though it bring its burden of sorrow. There is no rose without its thorn; shall we therefore cast away the rose? Nay, rather avoid the thorn. Nor shall we cast away the heritage of our manhood, but seek with its increase of strength to lessen its burden of pain. Civilization is the growth of nations into

social maturity and political power, when many of the frolics and liberties of olden barbarisms fall away, and new duties, new cares, new burdens come along with enlargement of mind, the out-reachings of commerce, the developments of social duties and political entanglements, and that pride which is the natural meed of conscious power. Is there a civilized land on the face of the earth to-day that would willingly go back to the ages of savage freedom, of feudal pageantry, or the stagnation of lands that have forgotten to grow? Away with such a puerile thought; better by far the manliness of civilization with its cares, than the childish pleasures of any fancied primitive land untouched by modern restlessness.

Advancement is the normal law of life, a natural necessity of a healthy living organism. The child that grows not is an abortion of being, a failure, physically. The mind that grows not, but is content with a life of routine and custom, is a mental abortion which no one can either admire or choose. A state that does not advance but contents itself with a perpetual looking back at the past, as the highest possible aim of life, will stagnate, decay and be left far behind in the race, by those who look forward and struggle onward for a something better in the future than they have known in the past.

Progress to a higher civilization is or should be the normal fact in all nations, but there are nations which seem to have made advance for a time, to have reached a certain degree

of development, and then to have stopped, stagnated, decayed, or to have maintained an existence only by accumulations of primitive elements rather than by a growth into manlier forms. This is the case with nearly all the civilizations of Asiatic nations, and China, your ponderous neighbour, gives us a tangible example. Thousands of years ago while the world's civilization still was young, China invented written characters—even while her language was in its first syllabic stage; ethics, laws, customs, patterns were fixed; and all the growth of these many centuries since then has been to accumulate in rich but unwieldy exuberance a mass of those primitive characters, representing a language still in infantile form. All her laws and ethics revolve around the one simple thought of the earliest form of government, that of the father having control over his household, and of children obeying their parents; an idea which is made to do duty in every phase of official life even to the Imperial Throne where sits the father of his people; and her indigenous religion is nothing but the worship of ancestors. Not a growth of social and political ideas, you see, but a vast accumulation of varied applications of the one idea of the relation between a father on the one hand, and an ignorant woman with babies on the other. For the idea of the relation of father and son in China is that of father and little child, and has not even advanced to the idea that when the son has grown to manhood, he is one man and

his father is another; but the child is a child for ever, the manly strength of the full grown developed son must bow to the mumbling of a dotard father, and thus a whole hemisphere of ideas, of duties, is unknown while the other half is developed and strained, and stretched to monstrosity.

A relationship prior to that of parent and child, the grand principle of all true sociology, given in the very beginning of the bible, and fundamental in all progressive civilization, is ignored, unknown; viz, the essential equality of the sexes, the husband being first of the two in household rank, and that when the child has become a man he is no longer a child, but a man who may take to himself a wife and these two then set up a new family.

The natural duties and relationships of parents and children are reciprocal, like the two arms of the body, which should be balanced, though one may be a little more expert than the other. But in China the relation of father to child is so exaggerated that it is as if the right arm had been developed into a limb six feet long, while on the other hand, the relation of child to parent from the standpoint of parental responsibility is so minimized that it is as if the left arm had been dwarfed to an inch; and thus as a feeble flabby body with one arm of an unwieldy length and the other infinitesimally small, would be a monstrosity, so the ethics of relationships in China have grown into a social caricature of a fundamental truth. And then the result of this state of affairs is to preclude

all growth. The law of advance is that each generation is like the one preceding it, with some little variety ; now if the variety is an improvement and the little change be allowed to live and grow, it will increase until, in a few generations, there is seen to be a great advance for the better. If however, all variations from the primitive form be prohibited, all advance is impossible, and a dead uniformity of type results.

The tendency to suppress originality is universal. The difficulty in civilizing the world is not to get a people to submit to fixed laws, but to get them out of fixedness of law into a living, growing organism. The tendency is seen even in the west. A Pennsylvania Dutchman of my grandfather's day had a boy who was not satisfied with the old way of carrying wheat to the mill, with the wheat at one end of the sack, on one side of the horse and a stone to balance it at the other end of the sack, at the other side of the horse, and put half the wheat on one side and half on the other. He came running to his father, " O Fader see, I haf put one half on one side and one on die oder, and it coes just as cood." His father scolded him, saying, " what are you thinking about? Do you dink yourself better as your fader and grandfader? You shust go and put in the shtone, as pefore." Now in civilized lands, the progressive boy becomes his own master before he quite loses his new idea, and he develops it independently to practical results, which even his old father

by and by comes to approve, though if he had had his way, it never would have been done.

But in China each rising generation is kept in the rut of its predecessor by the almost absolute control of father over son, until he in turn loses all tendency to vary, and himself becomes conservative—and thus by the tyranny of the past over the present the one type is perennially perpetuated.

II.

What is civilization ?

This is a crucial question, the proper understanding of which will materially affect our discussion. One cause of the endless round of polemical warfare, and the bitter wrangles in the world of thought, is the defectiveness of definitions of cardinal points. Let us try at the start to understand what true civilization is.* Dr. Mitchel says, it is the arresting of the principle of natural selection in the process of evolution, by which man comes to control himself and his destiny. Buckle makes it out to be the sum or outcome of physical causes, the moral element being insignificant, the mind itself the product of matter. Bagehot tells us that the progress of civilization results from creations of mind conserved and propagated by physical or lower causes. Guizot

* These definitions give rather the substance than the words of the authors mentioned.

—whom you all know, and cannot study too much, whose work on European civilization is a masterly philosophy of history—tells us that civilization in its most general idea is an improved condition of man resulting from the establishment of social order in place of individual independence and lawlessness of barbaric life, the progress of the human race towards realizing the idea of humanity.

Now, in attempting to formulate for ourselves a definition of what civilization really is, we must not forget (1) that the state is an aggregation of individual elements, and that there can be no civilized and progressive land without civilized and educated masses of people. (2) No true civilization is in spots or partial developments. A state in which there are few troubles, all things nicely arranged for everybody, but where the people do not think for themselves, being led by officialdom, like a flock of sheep in intellectual and moral childhood—is not a civilized state. A state that has acquired considerable moral and intellectual advance, but where the masses have little physical comfort and no political liberty is not a civilized state. A land in which the people have almost perfect liberty, but where might is right, the weak oppressed and violence rules, is not a civilized land. A people in which every individual has almost perfect liberty, and inequality or difference is rare, but where there is no national sentiment, no cohesion of state, simply an everflowing mass of human individuals—is not a civilized people. A land

in which refinement and culture make a sort of paradise for the favored classes, but where morality is rare, where effeminacy characterizes the public spirit, where no noble ideal or lofty sentiment permeates the masses of the people. cannot be called a civilized state. Thus no one principle alone can make a civilization. (3) Civilization is not a thing that can be manufactured to order, or imported ready made, a something that men or nations can choose and change, put on and off like a suit of clothes. It is the life and growth of a people, the outcome in social and political life of the principles which actuate and control the individual character. Keeping these points before our minds it will be seen that a true form of civilization is only to be found in those lands where civilized individual men combine on compatible principles and evince a matured character in all the various phases of social and political life.

Now what is the character of this unit, this civilized man? It is a man in whom all the elements of human nature are matured or are progressing in harmonious development towards legitimate maturity. A man in whom the physical alone is developed makes a magnificent savage, but is no complete man. A man may cultivate his mind and possess all the external refinement of the scholar and the gentleman, and yet have in his private life a moral foulness to which he would never dare to introduce his mother or sister, and thus make himself a representative, not of true civilization, but of that

gangrene by whose rot many a nascent civilization has fallen into irrecoverable ruin. A man whose moral sense has been aroused, and who follows the bent of his higher nature, who cultures himself into philosophic calm and heroic virtue, but whose soul is still unlightened by eternal hope and the confidence of faith, in regions where faith alone is rational, is a man whom we can admire, but whose gloomy type is impossible as the ideal of a true civilization. The man whose religious instincts have been so warped and misled as to make him a recluse or a cynic, an ascetic neglecter of physical, mental, social, or political manhood, is an egregious failure as a man, and far from the ideal after which we seek. Our ideal man is one in whom all the elements of manhood have full room for development, nothing suppressed or removed, depriving humanity of any legitimate heritage; the lower, however, subject to the higher powers, and all in conscious subjection—not to any man or combination of men, but to Him who has created the universe and is father of our spirits. A man who cares for the physical as a valued inheritance who takes his place as man amongst men in social and political life, whose mind is ever open and earnest in the search after truth in every realm of nature and of thought, whose moral impulses and actions are pure, whose spirit rises unsullied in hope of immortality and in scientific trust upon God, is a civilized man. Let this become the ideal unit, the aim of a people,

fully realized perhaps by few, and that people will surely advance in all that is true and abiding in civilization.

What strikes the mind first of all in a country called civilized, is the external refinement, the comfort and conveniences of life, the power of machinery in manufacture, the ramifications of commerce and the engines of war. A step further and the school house and college, the spread of education and its influence become palpable. It requires deeper penetration, however, to see the occult but still more powerful moral and religious forces behind it all.

That there can be no true civilization without morality is a truism so thoroughly accepted by all that I need spend no time in arguing the point. History tells us, and no one in Japan would doubt the fact, that no amount of outer refinement, or advance of commerce, or engines of war or education could save a nation weakened by moral rot. In so far as a nation is immoral just so far is it weak, and unless morally regenerated it will assuredly perish.

But my next point may be disputed by many and that is this. There is no public or private morality possible without religion, and then of course no true civilization without a religion. Man has a religious instinct that must be satisfied, which, unmet by a something true to match it, degenerates into dark superstition and cruel rites, and which untaught may be wrought upon by designing men to enslave the mind and block the

wheels of progress. If, however, this faculty yearning for the unseen, supreme, and absolute being, the author of our nature and the universe in which we dwell, is met by a revelation which our reason tells us is worthy of belief, it lifts man up, not out of the present world in which we live, but gives him the consciousness of superiority and authority over all that is temporal, and of an heirship to that which is eternal. Man is a worshipping animal "deifies and adores the first thing he meets rather than cease to adore." * This religious faculty is the most fundamental of all our faculties, if developed healthily ennobles, impels our whole being forward and upward, the soul of all true progress. • True religion meeting the most fundamental faculty of man's nature is the most expansive and elevating power in the world. Corrupted it is indeed *corruptio optimi pessima*, the worst of all debasing evils. To attempt to discard all religion because of its frequent abuse, and the errors believed and the crimes committed in its name, is as illogical as the asceticism of the monk, which curses the world because of the evils wrought in it. The man of well balanced mind is neither monk nor infidel; he is religious and social; he neither exiles himself from man nor seeks to repudiate God. And it often happens that as men drift away from a religious life some low superstition develops within the soul. 'Tis very true that in in-

* Coquerel.

dividual cases, the religious instinct seems to be educated away. But blindness in many an individual does not prove the non-existence of light, and the atheism of a few abnormal individuals is as nothing compared with the overwhelming testimony of all lands, of all ages, proclaiming with the united voice of every language, the hunger cry of the human soul for the infinite, that feeling after God, which must have something in which to trust.

Nor is this religious faculty a mere sentiment which can be cultivated by philosophic speculation, or by almost any kind of thing called a religion. The universal hunger of the human heart after God, this mysterious longing for supernatural sympathy, those hopes and fears for the unknown hereafter, can never be satisfied with milk and water disquisitions on "the true, the beautiful, and the good" in the abstract. The sin-struck conscience with forebodings of wrath, and seeking the pardon of a loving father will never be satisfied with learned discourses about the evolution of conduct, the evanescence of evil, and the comparison of relative with absolute ethics. The soul that yearns after personal conscious immortality, and looks upon that hunger as a prophetic instinct of future life, will never be satisfied with any lean theory of transmission of influence; nor will it be much hurt by the small talk of would-be philosophers about this hunger being selfish and low. As well might they tell the common sense of mankind that the desire for food was low and

selfish and animal. And what if it is? Whatever you like to call it, it is there, and it must be satisfied at any cost, philosophize as you may, and so with the hunger of the soul.

The world's religious instincts will not be satisfied with mere hints and suggestions and theories; this faculty demands something definite, something authoritative which will compel the heart's belief. But now as soon as faith or belief in authority is spoken of, up rises the wrath of a certain class of people who call themselves scientists but are not truly so, and they cry out "faith is suicidal of science!" "belief is destructive of reason!" Nothing could be more unscientific, more absurd, than such assertions as these. We don't ask any one to study the sciences by faith, or to allow belief to take the place of thought. There is a place for the microscope, and another for the telescope, and they cannot be interchanged. It would be absurd for the astronomer to ridicule the microscopist because he cannot see the mountains of the moon with his little instrument, that was made for an entirely different purpose; and equally absurd for small thinkers to ridicule faith because it is not adapted to a sphere for which it was never intended. We are subject to laws, to limits, to authority on every hand, obeying which we have freedom, as fish in their natural element; and outside of which is death, as to fish thrown upon the land. All matter to subject to physical laws, the individual is subject to social law, the citizen

is subject to political law, the mind is subject to mental laws, the soul is subject to spiritual laws, and being a conscious personality seeks a conscious personality as the source of that law to which it feels itself subject. Religion is the attitude of man to that supernatural authority, and any communications which may come from him. And here microscope, and telescope, and crucible, alembic, scalpel, and test acids, and whole laboratories of instruments and experimentalists cannot help us one iota—a revelation must come in; nor is it a region of blind acceptance of every thing presented by any class of men. But if any man, or any book, or any system of doctrine, be it Koran, Zendavesta, Pitaka or the Bible, comes asserting a right, to proclaim to us eternal verities, the will of the Supreme, or the facts of the future world, before we believe, we must ask for their credentials; and submit these credentials to human reason. And now you may call in your microscope and telescope and alembic and all the army of scientific experimentalists, with all their facts and specimens and knowledge and let them test those credentials for you. Don't be afraid; those credentials are very important; if they are false it will be the height of folly to believe the message they bring; if they are true, it will be still greater folly not to accept the message they offer. Test them well, for they are the scientific links between the natural and the supernatural, which if proved to be true

will make your faith as thoroughly scientific as any other exercise of the reasonable mind.

No religion that cannot produce its credentials, and triumphantly present them to the test of reason can stand before the onward march of science, can for a moment be considered as an element in true civilization. No religion which debauches the mind can produce thereafter true morality of the heart and life, and in the march of science must go to the wall.

And that brings me now to a statement which I don't ask you to accept on my authority, or on the authority of the Christian church, but which I ask you seriously to consider, and to test scientifically. It is indeed the centre of my thesis, and to prove which this course of lectures is being delivered. And the statement is this; you have seen that there is no true civilization possible without the salt of morality, and that as there can be no general morality without religion, I now make the statement there is no religion but Christianity that can stand the testing of science, the probing of advancing thought; and that can be the torch, the sunlight if you will, of true civilization of modern times. In every religion there are elements of truth, but the large proportion of palpable error, brought to light by modern education, vitiates the good; and those religions that are unscientific are doomed to perish. But amid all the crash of falling creeds, Christianity stands out as the one exception, the soul of all true progress, whose

path is being cleared by the march of intellect, and whose power is being more and more unfolded by the magnificent modern triumphs of mind. And the reason is twofold, (1) Its credentials, when tested, are found genuine, and thus it demands and obtains a hearing from the thoughtful mind of man; and (2) it is the only known force by the help of which the higher elements in the perfect unit of a true civilization can be produced, and all its legitimate influences tend in that practical direction.

III.

What is Christianity?

And now the question properly arises, what is Christianity? Just here let me ask you to dismiss from your minds for a moment all definitions and representations made by opponents of Christianity, whether found in the scurrilous refuse of Tom Paine or Robert Ingersoll, in the superficial pages of a Draper when he leaves his proper sphere, the partial statements of pseudo-scientists or the ponderous but defective philosophy of Herbert Spencer, and bear with me while I give you the view from within, from the Christian stand-point.

Very briefly then, we hold that Christianity is (1) a revelation of the mind of God to the mind of man through Jesus Christ, and of the means by which man may be in eternal harmony with God; and (2) an unfolding to us of the Creator's ideal of a complete man,

in the man Christ Jesus, and of the way by which mankind may reach this ideal; the following of which is the progress of the truest civilization, and the attainment of which its grandest culmination. This revelation is contained in the bible; in the old testament which prepared the world for the advent of Christ and the reception of his teaching; and the new testament which tells the story of his life, and unfolds his practical doctrines. This revelation simply puts into the hands of men that which they could not by any other means obtain, and only so far as will be of practical value for the elevation of man. It is put, however, in the hands of men, that they may use it according to the intention of its Author, in harmony with every other revelation of God which science or thought opens to our view, that they may disseminate its benefits among their fellow men and impart its unfolding riches of maturer understanding to succeeding generations. This practical development of scriptural revelation for human use is three-fold. First, we have Christian doctrine, secondly a Christian church, and thirdly a Christian manner of life.

As it is necessary in studying the facts of nature to put nature's laws into some system that can be comprehended by the human mind, and be taught to the enquiring student, so the moral and religious truths of the bible, imbedded in its history and poetry and narrative and letters, unfold to those who search for them, spiritual laws and facts

which must be systematised so as to be apprehended as a whole, and taught to the young and those who are busy with other lines of life. Hence a system of Christian doctrines or the science of theology is a matter of course. Now you may have been told that the dogmas of the Christian church are illogical, childish, unscientific, absurd ; and if you should call Christian doctrine everything that has been taught in the name of Christianity, I would have to agree with the verdict, for men calling themselves Christian teachers have, in their ignorance, taught many a falsehood, many an unscientific tradition, many a childish absurdity, many an atrocious caricature of the truth, and were ready to damn anyone who would dare to doubt their dogmas. I am not ignorant of these things and am profoundly ashamed—not of Christianity, but of men who have banished Christianity, and in her name have set up the foul evolution of their own ignorance and corruption, or have overlaid the fair face of truth with the hideous mask of falsehood. Be pleased to understand that doctrine and theology are intended to show forth the laws and facts of revelation, just as natural science is intended to show forth the laws and facts of the natural world. And just as false science does not affect the facts and laws of nature in themselves, so false doctrine does not affect the facts of Christianity, excepting to belie them. Christianity is not dogma. You test science by experiment, by natural

facts ; you must test doctrine by the standard of the Christian bible, "to the law and the testimony," any doctrine or tradition that cannot be easily deduced therefrom is not Christian—is alien—is a human addition. With the bible I take my stand, and I challenge anyone to state a single doctrine that is childish, absurd, or false, that can be fairly deduced from the teachings of this standard.

For the conservation of doctrine, for the social wants of religious people, a society is necessary and hence we have a Christian church, but you will please remember that a Christian church is a combination of human beings—of fallible men—but if true must combine on the line of biblical principles. But you have been told that the Christian church is a machinery of priestcraft, designed to keep men in ignorance and mental subjection, whose fetters must be thrown off by all men of science and thought. I beg your pardon, gentlemen ; that is not the Christian church at all, but a foul usurper of the name of Christ under whose guidance men have duped their fellow-men ; have robbed them of liberty of conscience, and the heritage of free thought ; have become instruments of political corruption and tyranny ; have disgraced the name of man, and degraded all that men hold dear ; have trod on the neck of kings, and been tolerant of every crime but that of opposition to themselves. A whole hideous range of dark deeds of oppression and blood stands out before my eyes, until I shudder and blush

for—not Christianity, for she has done none of these things, but for those human beings who could prostitute a thing so holy for ends so vile. Gentlemen, Christianity is not that thing which has often gone by the name of the church. Every thing that men have added to that which can be fairly deduced from Christ's own teachings, is not Christian, and I challenge you to produce any scriptural, biblical principle that in any sense antagonizes the soundest principles of individual freedom, of mental enlargement, of social advancement, of political economy, or any element in the noblest civilization!

Christianity aims also at producing a Christian character, which shall be the normal type of a Christian civilization, the elements of a Christian nation, nay of a Christian world. There are two ways in which the out-working of this aim may be seen in individuals. In the first place in the character of people who intelligently and consciously strive after the Christian ideal. In these you may find many a weakness, many a defect arising from various human imperfections. In so far as they approach the Christian type, the man Christ Jesus, they are found to approach the perfect ideal of complete humanity. In so far as they vary from that type in principle they cease to be Christian. A second way in which this tendency works is in introducing a sort of moral fibre, imparted to national character, to public opinion, to the working of thought and social sympathies, tendencies which

may be seen in many a man who discards the restraints and the sanctions of the Christian religion, and who may even be far from the standard of purity in morals; so that there is often much more of frankness and fairness, and of the fundamental framework of noble humanity than one would at first suspect, in these characters in which the Christian ideal is not yet evolved, where much that is doubtful, or even repulsive and insolent, appears on the surface. But let it be distinctly understood that what is doubtful, and insolent, and repulsive is not due to Christianity, unless you can find it in our standard Jesus Christ, but is due rather to the absence of the best elements of Christianity. But are not all foreigners who come from Christian lands specimens of the Christian type? Alas no, some of us are very far from it. And how does it come that if Christianity is such a boon, any one can reject it? Simply because men are free and fallible, and "men love darkness rather than light" in these things, and for the same reason as in Christ's day "because their deeds are evil." Christianity invites men to the highest good; but God himself cannot, will not, force the unwilling heart to love him. But you speak of "Christian nations," permit me to ask you to say "so-called Christian" nations, for history, neither past nor present, can show us a single nation in which the Christian ideal has been evolved. Christian nations so-called do a great many things as nations which are repudiated by

the Christian element therein; and every national crime, unless you can trace it to Christian principle, is a new evidence that the Christian ideal has not yet been reached, and must not be laid to the charge of Christianity but to its partial repudiation. And yet the wonderful results achieved by the still partially evolved Christian civilization are so strikingly magnificent, and so pregnant with promise of future good, that we look forward with confidence and hope to the time when it shall permeate the world's peoples, and humanity's highest ideal shall be realized by all mankind. This superiority of a civilization influenced even partially by Christianity can be understood only by a comparison of civilizations that have not been influenced by Christianity, with those other lands where Christianity has to some extent exerted her power. To such a comparison I now call your attention. But first let me ask you to remember that Christianity is not to be measured by the defects of pretended followers, but by its principles, its facts, its legitimate influences, and also that Christian civilization is not to be judged by any isolated action or age, but to be traced in the combination of facts and ages, through which the influence of its principles is being gradually evolved in practical life.

IV.

Pre-Christian Civilizations.

We glance first at the history of nations in which civilization made advance before

the rise of Christianity. We pass by the partial civilizations of Asia, where in historical times, one type has ruled, change has been rare, and advance the exception ; merely calling attention to the fact that this unity has tended to despotism and tyranny on the one hand, and truculent ignoble submission on the other. But let us look at the stately march of those six great empires which successively rose and fell, each bequeathing to its successor all the advance it had gained, bringing, at about the time of Christ, the known world to the magnificent zenith of the noblest civilization possible, without the regenerating influences of a supernatural religion. The oldest historical nation is the Egyptian, the monuments of whose greatness of resources, of scientific advance are standing to-day in stately pyramid and silent sphinx, but whose land has for centuries been the home of a beggarly remnant, without a rag even of moral or political greatness. The Assyrian Empire was vast in extent, splendid in its conquests, its triumphs written on stone that are being deciphered to-day, its great capital of Ninevah unsurpassed in magnificence. The Babylonian wave of Empire absorbed all the acquired strength of Assyria, inherited its provinces and rose to greater glory. All the wealth of the Babylonian Empire and its civilization became a part of the Persian wave of splendour, which drew from still wider sources a still greater opulence and grew to vaster grandeur. The keen life of the Greek, in the brief time of the

supremacy of the Macedonian Empire, infused a rich element into the conquered world, and in her fall transmitted her enterprise and intellectual superiority as a heritage to her Roman conquerors. The vast organization and iron strength of the Roman Empire had, at the time of Christ, brought the accumulations of all the preceding millenniums into one vast civilization which was the culmination of the progress of the preceding ages and the climax of triumph for human intellect and political power.

The intellectual greatness of those ages is the marvel of to-day, so far as human genius goes, in philosophy, poetry, sculpture, oratory, statesmanship, they are still unsurpassed. In magnificence and luxury they are unapproachable.

But I dare not linger, let me point out one or two facts. (1) All of these nations rose from a state of partial barbarism, in which were many virtues arising from lack of opportunity for vice, or the earlier impetus of a young religion, and as a natural consequence this virtue with physical strength, gave them military heroism and manly courage. So they conquered, and grew wealthy and refined and civilized; and in proportion as their civilization and refinement grew, so vanished their virtue, their heroism, their courage until they became unspeakably immoral, completely effeminate and an easy prey to the next conqueror. These new conquerors were barbaric, heroic, enterprising, until they in course of time along with ever rising intellectual

and physical civilization, sank into still deeper moral degradation and pitiable effeminacy, becoming an easy prey to the next healthy barbarian with a new religion to replace or add to the old one that had become effete. And so it went on in ceaseless rounds, each empire rising higher in refinement, philosophy and civilization than the preceding, but as a result of that civilization, sinking to still lower depths of moral rottenness, until the rude barbarians of Europe shattered into fragments the vast Roman Empire, the heir of all that had preceded, the culmination and the finis of that style of civilization, revealing at once its power and its signal failure. (2) Another thing worthy of notice is that when these empires began to decay nothing could impede the downward tendency. Advancing thought had undermined the religious faith, and the forms and ceremonies had no longer a moral power; philosophers sought in vain to formulate ethics, and prescribe for the peoples' malady, but the incurable leprosy went on. There was absolutely no morally regenerative force; and for want of that, moral death brought political ruin, which in every case was inevitable. (3) Another fact is that in all these civilizations there was an ideal and a unity of purpose, but the ideal was too low, too narrow, and under none of them, though abundantly realized, could the complete man be evolved. Take for instance the Greek type, in some respects the most attractive of all. Its type is human, its

ideal the physically and mentally developed man, combined in a democracy where all shall be equal and the state supreme. A type which naturally resulted in the Athenians poisoning Socrates because he taught their children to be more virtuous than their fathers, and banished Aristides because he had earned the title of "the just," thus imperiling the uniformity of the state. And just as defective the brutal heroism of the Roman type with its gladiatorial shows, its exposure of infants, and general disregard for human life.

And what was it that put a stop to this long series of revolutions from barbaric strength to civilized weakness and pitiable collapse? Why did not the barbarians who conquered Rome adopt Roman civilization, as conquering Rome had adopted that of conquered Greece, and so on down the long story of the past? Why, because the world had turned over a new leaf, and instead of borrowing from Rome, modern civilization owes its radical difference, humanly speaking, to a despised and feeble people, the Jews, and its perennial vitality, its universally admired and elevating ideal to a village carpenter—crucified when little more than a lad.

V.

Christian Civilization.

And now let us try to discern the cardinal facts and causes of the new civilization of Europe. Those of you who have read

Guizot's History of European civilization will remember his masterly delineation of the three great forces contending with each other at the downfall of the Roman Empire, and for ages afterwards. These were (1) the shattered wrecks of Roman Civilization, which were more an impelling memory of the magnificence of monarchy and of law than anything tangible; (2) the Christian church, which had grown up from a mere handful of poor Christians in the first century, to a vast imperial hierarchy, a great political power; and (3) the barbarian element of individual freedom and brutal coarseness and cruelty. I am not prepared to say that the fact of the church having at that terrible time, considerable political power was an unmixed evil. For although the wielding of direct political power by the Church is alien to the spirit of Christianity, its province being to transform and elevate the individual, and through the unit elevate the whole, yet those ferocious half-savages, whose blood flows in the veins of many of us here, needed a stronger check than kind words, and that check they found in the political power of the church which had survived the overthrow of the imperial throne.

You will of course understand from what I have already said that I do not look upon the Christian church of that time, or of any time when she directly mixes herself with politics, as synonymous with Christianity. The Christian church was a combination of men who had certain political aims in view,

and used as instruments the name, the history, the accumulated social influence, some of the doctrines, the promises and threatenings of Christianity, as a means to obtain political sway. Thus the church became one of the struggling factors in a new civilization, with some grand divine elements behind her, which she often prostituted, so that she was frequently a hindrance rather than a help to the spread of Christianity and Christian influence.

There were then these three elements, monarchical tendencies inherited from the Roman empire, the politico-ecclesiastical tendencies of the church, and the wild brutal democracy of the conquering barbarians. These three elements have struggled together, none ever having the upper hand so completely as to destroy the others; none ever so weak as not to influence the others; each one modifying the others, repelling, advancing, clashing, uniting, exploding, fusing, imparting, increasing; and the struggle goes on to-day, but on different lines, on higher principles, and with less destruction; and will go on until all hearts are fused into one brotherhood around our ideal Christ Jesus.

To the quiet contemplative mind such a series of perpetual conflict would seem to be evil and only evil—and yet that series of war and combat has given birth to a civilization which is totally different from all the civilization that preceded it, in type, in character, in power, and in promise for

the future. I must condense a vast amount of facts into a very few sentences now to show you the salient points of this new civilization, and the potent cause which makes it differ so completely from every other type. Let us recall the three great facts respecting the former civilizations. (1) It was seen that as civilization and refinement and philosophy advanced, religion died, and immorality, political effeminacy, weakness, collapse, resulted. On the other hand as modern civilization advances, pure and noble religion lives on, while superstitious trappings fall away, and immorality is more and more branded with shame and driven into sewers; and along with comfort and peace, there is ever an increase of military strength; and along with this increase of military strength there is a commensurate decrease of military vices. Old civilizations gradually made men unfit for war, modern civilization puts in new energy, and when needed, pours out from farm-house, and manufactory, and commercial offices, and mechanics' shops, deluges of men who need only a little training to make them as steady of nerve, as indomitable, as the most famed veterans of a heroic age. This was seen in the late American war, and can be seen in any war that England or Germany wages. The old civilizations fell before barbarian power; in presence of modern civilization all barbarisms droop, are powerless, their day seems to be done, they must become civilized or die. The old civilizations when warlike

aimed at conquest, not so the new; though the war energy is there, it is turned into an impulse to further the products of peace, and the death of barbarisms is more like the melting of snow under the warmth of the sunshine of spring.

(2) We saw also that the empires of pre-Christian times, their civilizations being only a superficial shell of refinement and culture, with a heart weak with the putrescence of moral decay, could not be saved from irretrievable ruin. On the other hand the civilized nations of modern times have their chief defects on the surface; many an undesirable thing is prominent, many a wrong still unrighted, many a lack still to fill, but at heart there is solid soundness and living force, so that repulses and defeats are followed by resurrections and grander growths. Divisions mean only multiplication, as in the case of the United States separating from Britain. Great Britain is vastly greater than before, and the United States almost as big as her mother. And before long Canada and Australia will be nations greater than any old empire, while Britain herself from which they all sprang, seems younger, fresher than ever, not yet having reached her prime, and without a sign of decay, although already older than any empire of pre-Christian times.

3. We saw also that there was a sort of national type or ideal in the olden civilizations, which, though realized fully, was entirely inadequate to the powers of man or

the needs of a national life. On the other hand the ideal of Christian civilization, whether in the individual or in the nation is still very far from being realized, but as we strain every nerve and every power of complex humanity to reach it, it advances still and every rise we make serves only as a vantage ground from which to behold the heritage of our children, the vaster possibilities of progress. It points us forward to a time foretold more than 2,500 years ago when in poetic language of figure, Isaiah sang of a time when "the wolf also shall dwell with the lamb and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain—for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea—" meaning that when our ideal man shall have become realized as the actual unit of a pure world-civilization, armies will be disbanded, their occupation gone, and the accumulated energy of freer, perfecter men shall be held in moderation, and turned to the production of the blessings of "peace on earth and goodwill to men." I know that this culmination seems still far away; but let me remind you that amid all the din of armaments of war, men are gradually growing ashamed of the business of murder. I can scarcely conceive of circumstances that would necessarily bring war between Britain and the United States.

And just imagine to yourselves a general civilization, a moral development in all, or even most lands, equal only to that of these nations at present, with Canada and Australia, and you would see that the army would be nothing but a police force. And why should not the evolution go on until soldier and policemen both became interesting only to the historian and the antiquarian.

VI.

The Potential Principle.

And now what is the potential cause of this reversal of all preceding civilizations, similar in fact to the introduction of life into the natural world, reversing many of the processes of former ages, and leading to marvellous advance? Just as in the change of the inorganic world into organic, nothing absolutely new was required but life, so in the change from the lower civilizations of those old times to the better one of to-day, there is no absolutely new element, only the introduction of a living spiritual power,—the Christian religion; and you may be still more surprised to learn that the most active assistant is the spread of Christian influence is the colossal advance of modern science. Science has done much to remove incumbrances of old pagan traditions that had fastened themselves like parasites on Christianity, and I hope and expect she will work on the same line until every shred of superstition, and human tradition, and

useless form shall be done away, and the golden Christianity of Christ alone remain. Another thing she has done, and that is to nourish and stimulate a state of mind that is not credulous, which advances only where the way is firm. And may she still go on strengthening the intellectual powers, for then the faith of the heart will be more strong. But let her be careful to avoid that most fatal of human mistakes, the going to extremes, let her not seek in removing the parasites to amputate the limbs, nor in strengthening the mind to harden it against evidence and reason. The influence of Christianity has been exerted in two ways. (1) The politico-ecclesiastical corporation called a church, exerted as a political power a considerable influence in curbing the violence of the barbarian element, and introduced into European laws some vital principles unknown before, or at least not incorporated into the old civilizations. Such for instance as,

1. The fact of a Supreme Lawgiver to whom all human law should be tributary.

2. The importance of the individual man in presence of the fact that each is immortal.

3. The obligation of man to man as being all equal in the eyes of the Supreme.

4. The sensitiveness to human life, proclaiming abortion to be murder, abolishing the gladiatorial combats, forbidding the exposure of children &c.

5. Judging of the enormity of crime by the element of intention, and so on.

The other ways in which Christianity worked, its more legitimate sphere, sometimes with the help of the church and sometimes in opposition to the church, was in transforming individual man by the teachings of the bible, so that he might become a properly developed unit among men, the basis for the highest civilization. To show how this was done and is being done is outside of my present task, and to explain which would lead me to the wide field of Christian doctrine; suffice it to say that Christianity has satisfied the human heart with the revelation of a God whom all can adore and love, and with an ideal man whose supreme excellence is acknowledged by all, and is still an inspiration for the noblest among men. The world was taught to believe in the enormity of sin, and the necessity of internal holiness, as the fountain for purer action. Religion was made to be identical with practical life. The marriage bond was made sacred, the home was elevated, and vast and innumerable streams of charity were sent flowing to the lowest and the farthest of the human race, ameliorating man's present and pointing to a better future. These influences working together have been little by little transforming, elevating men, and through the individual man, nations and civilizations.

I shall now close with the statement of a momentous series of facts, and leave you to consider the problem they contain. The Christian religion is the religion of the bible. The two cardinal points in the bible are the

laws of Moses and the facts and words of Christ. A family of shepherds were taken to Egypt, where their descendents were enslaved in bitter bondage for centuries. They escape to the desert, wander for forty years before settling down in a little land called Palestine. During those forty years of wanderings Moses, their leader, elaborated a system of laws. The time was more than three thousand years ago, and during all that time, by every advance of civilization and of philosophy and science, not one single element or fundamental principle of law has been added to what Moses gave to those escaped slaves. Can you tell me why or how it came to pass that Moses, nearly one thousand years before Confucius was born, laid down every true principle that Confucius taught, and did not teach one of Confucius's blunders? And also how it comes that no civilized constitution or code of laws to-day contains a single principle that was not known to Moses, and applied by him wisely to suit the times and the people that he had to deal with, and that in all his code there is not a single principle now found to be false? Another fact and problem. Palestine has become a miserable province of Rome, as immoral as any other. Out of a wretched mountain village comes a young man of 30 years, who calmly contradicts the spirit of his times, and at the age of 33 is ignominiously crucified. But he leaves behind him a system of doctrine in which every truth contained in every other religion is contained, in which none of their

errors are found, and which contains vital truths unknown to any other; and more wonderful still, from that day to this, through these nearly two thousand years, no new ethical or religious truth has been added, and though he taught only three years yet he left behind him an influence which has revolutionized the very meaning of civilization, and set the world on the track of its grandest, fullest development, infusing also the propelling power.

Tell me, can you explain these facts with reasons purely human?

Gentlemen, I am done!

