

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE

VOL LI.

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LI.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W. 1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1919.

LONDON :

HARRISON AND SONS, PRINTERS IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY,
ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

P R E F A C E .

WE hope, in issuing the annual volumes of the *Transactions* of the Victoria Institute, gradually to return to our pre-war size, and the present book is a slight advance in the right direction.

The war is happily now over ; but owing to the fact of its occurrence, a general upheaval and unrest is everywhere felt. Not only labour but the whole order and conditions of life are in an unsettled state ; and what is of still more importance from the point of view of the Victoria Institute, is that in the region of thought and belief this disturbed condition extends to the foundations of Christian faith and philosophy. It is a day when the work of this Institute stands out as of very special value in calling attention to those things " which cannot be shaken " ; and it can thus claim the active support and co-operation of all who value our common faith. Turning to our own special interests, two events stand out beyond the rest.

1. The awarding of the Gunning Prize to the two books published during the past three years which the Council deem to be those which have most advanced the cause of Christian Philosophy.

Formerly a prize was offered for the best essay on a given subject, but it was decided now to place the award on a broader basis.

As the sum to be disposed of was larger than usual, two awards were made : one of £40 to the Rev. A. H. Finn for his learned and useful book on the Unity of the Pentateuch, and the other of £30 to Sir Bertram C. A. Windle, M.A., F.R.S., etc., for his book " The Church and Science," 1918, which deals in a thorough and convincing way with the relations of Modern Science to Scripture.

Both books are excellent, though very different in their subjects ; the one being on critical research, the other on general science.

2. The second special feature of the year is the publication of six tracts for to-day, edited by Dr. Schofield, from prominent articles of present-day interest in former volumes of our *Transactions*. This has been rendered possible by a special donation for the purpose

from one of our Members, on account of the great benefit and help he had received in his work from the Papers of this Institute.

The scheme has been long thought out, and has at last matured in a first instalment of these six booklets.

We pray that they may be very useful and we trust that all Members and Associates will assist in their circulation.

We regret much that the state of our Honorary Secretary's (Mr. Sewell's) health has obliged him to resign the post he has so conscientiously filled in a time of considerable difficulty. He has, however, been able jointly to edit this volume.

We are glad to say that Mr. W. Hoste, B.A., has accepted the post of Honorary General Secretary to the Victoria Institute. The Papers read during the past year seem to embrace the varied outlook in the worlds of Science, Philosophy and Christianity that the Victoria Institute has ever sought to maintain.

The opening Paper was on "Christian Sanity," and the debate was vigorous and interesting.

The next Paper, by Miss Maynard, First Principal of Westfield College (London University), marks something of an epoch in our procedure; in endeavouring to get fuller and heartier co-operation from women in our work. The Paper was of a high quality and many well-known women-workers were present.

A paper by the Head-Master of Winchester excited great interest. Its lofty and noble ethics should be carefully studied. Professor Langhorne Orchard's paper was most welcome. It introduced an atmosphere of the Greek Classics that we seldom get now, as well as a subject of perennial interest. Both the paper and discussion will be read with interest.

Certain new points were brought out in Mr. Maunder's (Greenwich Observatory) paper on "Ancient Calendars," which shed a good deal of light on the relation of the Sun and Moon to the Calendar.

While our President, Lord Halsbury, continues to manifest his interest in the work of the Institute, he was unable to give the Annual Address. Lt.-Col. Mackinlay, however, Chairman of our Council, stepped into the breach and read one of his inimitable essays. He seems to have made the study of the Third Evangelist peculiarly his own; and certainly he has revealed its structure and order in a wonderful way.

Generally the Membership and Associateship of the Institute

have been well maintained ; but we look for a greater accession in the coming year, now that the aftermath of the war has somewhat subsided, and men are even more able to turn to those abstract and yet all-important subjects with which the Victoria Institute is chiefly concerned.

It appeals indeed to all who value what is stated to be its first object : " To investigate, in a reverent spirit, important questions of Philosophy and Science, especially those bearing upon Holy Scripture."

E. J. SEWELL,
ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, M.D.,
Editors

October, 1919.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1918	1
CASH STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR 1918	7
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 17TH, 1919, LIEUT.-COLONEL G. MACKINLAY IN THE CHAIR	8
CHRISTIAN SANITY. BY ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, ESQ., M.D.	11
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. Fortescue Fox, Mr. A. W. Sutton	22
THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE POSITION OF WOMEN. BY MISS C. L. MAYNARD, FIRST PRINCIPAL OF WESTFIELD COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON	29
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. A. T. Schofield, Lieut.-Colonel Alves, Mr. Sidney Collett	44
THE PHILOSOPHY OF BISHOP BUTLER. BY THE REV. H. J. R. MARSTON, M.A.	51
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Rev. M. Anstey, B.D., Mr. W. Hoste, Mr. Theodore Roberts	61
THE PERSONAL INFLUENCE OF GREAT COMMANDERS IN THE PAST. BY MAJOR-GENERAL SIR GEORGE K. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., C.I.E.	65
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Professor W. P. Ker, LL.D., Colonel C. E. Yate, C.S.I., C.M.G., M.P., Lieut.-Colonel Mackinlay	78
THE TEACHER'S VOCATION. BY MONTAGUE J. RENDALL, ESQ., M.A., HEAD MASTER OF WINCHESTER COLLEGE	81
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Dr. A. T. Schofield, Lieut.-Colonel Alves, Miss C. L. Maynard, Mr. Sidney Collett	93
PLANTS OF THE BIBLE. BY ALFRED B. RENDLE, ESQ., D.SC., F.R.S., F.L.S.	100
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Mr. A. W. Sutton, Mr. W. Dale, F.L.S., Mr. A. W. Oke, Mr. W. Hoste, Lieut.-Col. G. Mackinlay, Mr. S. Collett	110

	PAGE
THE ONE IN THE MANY, AND THE MANY IN THE ONE. BY PROFESSOR H. LANGHOENE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc.	115
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, Miss C. L. Maynard, the Rev. Chancellor Lias, Dr. J. S. Bridges, Mr. M. L. Rouse, Mr. W. Hoste	128
THE MOSAIC CALENDAR, AS A MEANS OF DATING APPROXIMATELY CERTAIN ANCIENT WRITINGS. BY E. WALTER MAUNDER, ESQ., F.R.A.S.	136
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. Harold M. Wiener, the Rev. M. Anstey, B.D., Dr. Schofield	160
<i>Communications.</i> —From the Rev. D. R. Fotheringham, M.A., F.R.A.S., Dr. J. K. Fotheringham, F.R.A.S., the Rev. A. H. Finn, Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay	166
ANNUAL ADDRESS: THE LITERARY MARVELS OF ST. LUKE. BY LIEUT.-COLONEL G. MACKINLAY	173
LIST OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES	193

VICTORIA INSTITUTE.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1918.

READ AT THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, MARCH 17TH, 1919.

1. *Progress of the Institute.*

In presenting to the Members of the Victoria Institute the Fiftieth Annual Report, the Council desire to thank Almighty God for having carried them through the long period of war, now happily terminated by the Armistice, and soon to be followed, they trust, by a permanent world peace.

The numbers attending the meetings of the Institute have been well maintained, and the papers read have attracted good attendances; this is the more remarkable because the long continued war strain has been very widely felt. The quality of the papers has been well sustained during the past year, in fact, many, well qualified to express an opinion, have declared that those of the last two or three years are better than those before that time. Having weathered the war the Council looks forward to a bright prospect of usefulness in the immediate future; but steadfast purpose and effort are needed in the days to come.

2. *Meetings.*

Eight ordinary meetings, and two special ones, were held during the year 1918. The papers read were the following:—

“The Church and the Army.” By the Rev. Canon JAMES O. HANNAY, M.A.

“Sunspots and some of their Peculiarities.” By E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq., F.R.A.S. (Illustrated by lantern slides.)

“The Reserved Rights of God.” By the Rev. H. J. R. MARSTON, M.A.

“Why we die.” By Major W. McADAM ECCLES, M.S., M.B., F.R.C.S., R.A.M.C.

“The Gnostic Conception of the Cross.” By the Rev. Canon J. A. MacCULLOCH, D.D.

- “Terrestrial Magnetism.” By SYDNEY CHAPMAN, Esq., M.A., D.Sc.
(Illustrated by lantern slides.)
- “Germanism.” By the Rev. CHANCELLOR LIAS, M.A.
- Annual Address: “The Future of Education.” By Prof. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.
- “Christian Sanity.” By A. T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.

3. *The Journal of Transactions.*

Volume L of the *Transactions* was issued in December. In consequence of the further increase in the price of paper and in the cost of printing, the reports of the discussions were much condensed, but the skilful work of our Honorary Editor has, in spite of this condensation, resulted in the omission of no relevant arguments or criticism. The papers themselves are published in full.

4. *Council and Officers.*

The following is the List of the Council and Officers for the year 1919:—

President.

The Right Honourable the Earl of Halsbury, M.A., D.C.L. F.R.S.

Vice-Presidents.

Rev. Canon R. B. Girdlestone, M.A.
Very Rev. H. Wace, D.D., *Dean of Canterbury (Trustee)*.
Rev. Prebendary H. E. Fox, M.A.
Sir Henry H. Howorth, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., F.R.S.
Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay.

Honorary Correspondents.

Professor E. Naville, Ph.D. (<i>Geneva</i>).	His Excellency Herr Fridtjof Nansen, D.Sc.
Professor A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D.	Dr. Henry Woodward, F.R.S., F.G.S.
Professor Warren Upham, D.Sc.	

Honorary Auditors.

H. Lance Gray, Esq.		George Avenell, Esq.
---------------------	--	----------------------

Honorary Treasurer.

Arthur W. Sutton, Esq., J.P., F.L.S. (Trustee).

Honorary Secretary.

E. J. Sewell, Esq.

Honorary Editor of the Journal.

J. W. Thirtle, Esq., LL.D.

Council.*(In Order of Original Election.)*

Rev. Chancellor J. J. Lias, M.A.	Lt.-Col. M. A. Alves, late R.E.J.
Theo. G. Pinches, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.	Alfred William Oke, Esq., B.A., LL.M. (Trustee).
Arthur W. Sutton, Esq., F.L.S., J.P.	Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt.
Professor H. Langhorne Orchard, M.A., B.Sc.	R. W. Dibdin, Esq., F.R.G.S.
Rt. Rev. Bishop J. E. C. Welldon, M.A., D.D.	Joseph Graham, Esq.
Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.L.S., F.R.A.S., M.R.I.	Rev. G. Harold Lancaster, M.A., F.R.A.S.
A. T. Schofield, Esq., M.D.	T. B. Bishop, Esq.
Rev. H. J. R. Marston, M.A.	H. Lance Gray, Esq.
Ven. Archdeacon Beresford Potter, M.A.	J. Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A.
J. W. Thirtle, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.	
E. J. Sewell, Esq.	

5. Election of Council and Officers.

In accordance with the rules the following members of the Council retire by rotation :—

J. W. Thirtle, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.
 E. J. Sewell, Esq.
 Lieut.-Col. M. A. Alves.
 A. W. Oke, Esq., B.A., LL.M.
 The Rev. Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt.
 R. W. Dibdin, Esq., F.R.G.S.

of whom the following offer themselves and are nominated by the Council for re-election :—

J. W. Thirtle, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.
 E. J. Sewell, Esq.
 A. W. Oke, Esq., B.A., LL.M.
 The Rev. Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt.
 R. W. Dibdin, Esq., F.R.G.S.

The Council propose as Vice-President A. T. Schofield, Esq., M.D., in the place of the late Lieut.-Gen. Sir Henry L. Geary, B.A., K.C.B.

The Council also nominate the following gentlemen for election to the Council :—

W. Hoste, Esq., B.A.
 Alfred H. Burton, Esq., M.D.

6. Obituary.

The Council regret to announce the death of Lieut.-Gen. Sir Henry L. Geary, F.R.S., the senior Vice-President, and of the following Members and Associates :—

Sir Robert Anderson, LL.D., K.C.B., General the Hon. F. C. Bridgeman, Miss G. Blandy, the Rev. H. A. Crosbie, Miss E. J. Forster, Miss A. R.

Habershon, Prof. T. McKenny Hughes, F.R.S., Mrs. E. D. Nicholl, Prof. Stackpool E. O'Dell, the Rev. J. F. Riggs, M.A., James Stokes, Esq. J. D. Tremlett, Esq., M.A.

7. *New Members and Associates.*

The following are the names of new Members and Associates elected during 1918 :—

MEMBERS.—A. H. Burton, Esq., M.D., H. Lance Gray, Esq., T. A. Gillespie, Esq., C. Marston, Esq., J.P., Miss C. L. Maynard, B. R. Parkinson, Esq., Miss C. Pearce, Rev. W. D. Sykes.

ASSOCIATES.—G. R. Christie, Esq., M.A., Mrs. Scott Challice, W. Dale, Esq., F.S.A., the Rev. T. L. Edwards, F. S. Forbes, Esq., James T. Galathan, Esq., the Rev. Prof. A. S. Geden, M.A., D.D., John A. Gosset, Esq., W. Hoste, Esq., B.A., the Rev. Prof. M. G. Kyle, D.D., Robert Lindley, Esq., F. J. Lias, Esq. (Life), the Rev. Prof. S. A. Mercer, D.D., Prof. W. M. Patton, Ph.D., C. B. Rickett, Esq., Theodore Roberts, Esq., the Rev. D. E. Sharp, M.A., B.D., the Rev. Edward C. Unmack, Edward P. Vining, Esq., G. de Laval Willis, Esq.

8. *Number of Members and Associates.*

The following statement shows the number of supporters of the Institute at the end of December, 1918 :—

Life Members	19
Annual Members	70
Life Associates	59
Annual Associates	242
Missionary Associates	15
Library Associates	27
					—
Total	432
					—

showing a net decrease of 5, as compared with the total number of subscribers under the same headings reported in last year's return. There are also 81 names on the roll of Honorary Corresponding Members.

9. *Finance.*

The War has caused long continued financial stress to the Victoria Institute. The numbers of the Members and Associates have fallen off considerably and the expenses have increased.

These difficulties have been met in some measure by decreasing the size of the Annual Volume and by saving the salary of the Secretary for two years, three members of the Council having

most generously divided the duties among them, thus saving £200. Our warmest thanks are due to these gentlemen, particularly as they have all been very fully occupied with other duties. Now that normal conditions are being resumed the Council look forward to making some more permanent arrangement.

The Council believe that the time is now ripe for a forward movement in which the help of all is required. Every Member and Associate can assist the Institute by making our work widely known, and by inviting their friends to apply to join our ranks.

10. *Special Fund.*

It can hardly be expected that our financial wants will be fully met by any immediate increase in the number of Members and Associates. The steps taken by the Council to meet these conditions will find their place in the report for the year 1919; but the results of them have been so encouraging, so far, that the Council has thought it well to anticipate that report by stating that it has been resolved to open a special Fund at this time of special need, and they trust it will be generously supported. It is calculated that a sum of about £500 is required to place the Institute in a satisfactory financial position.

A few friends have started the Fund, and up to the present £290 9s. has been received.

11. *Auditors.*

The Council desire to thank Messrs. H. Lance Gray and G. Avenell most cordially for their services as Auditors.

12. *Gunning Prize.*

In pursuance of the discretion given to them by the terms of the Trust Deed, the Council have decided to award this Prize to the best book, published within the last three years, in accord with the aims and objects of the Victoria Institute.

The award will be made at the closing meeting of the session, to be held in June, 1919.

13. *Conclusion.*

With the Armistice and with the probable return of peace, for which we are most thankful to God, we are confronted with many problems.

On all sides it is agreed that we shall never return to the conditions of life existing before the war. Restlessness has spread abroad over the nations of the world, and the future course of events is difficult to foresee.

Under the fresh conditions now prevailing, there is ample scope for the Victoria Institute, which humbly seeks for the truth, however revealed, which honours the Word of God, and endeavours to make its message clear by bringing to bear upon it the results of reverent and reasonable study and research.

Our prayer is that our Institute may continue to work for the glory of God and for the advancement of His Kingdom.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

HALSBURY.

CASH STATEMENT *for the year ending December 31st, 1918.*

RECEIPTS.						EXPENDITURE.								
			£	s.	d.				£	s.	d.			
Balance, 1917	5	16	1	Printing	194	3	10
Subscriptions:—									Reporting	2	0	4
2 Members	1917	..	4	4	0				Stationery	18	0	9
69 "	1918	..	144	18	0				Binding	2	2	0
4 "	1919	..	8	8	0				Salary	143	0	4
1 Life Associate	—	..	10	10	0				Rent and Light, etc.	76	1	6
2 Associates	1916	..	2	2	0				Postage	31	0	11
18 "	1917	..	18	18	0				Expenses of Meetings	9	1	3
230 "	1918	..	241	10	0				Life Assurance	3	2	0
4 "	1919	..	4	4	0				Library	7	9	6
						434	14	0	Bank Charges	0	4	5
Sales	41	4	11	Fire Insurance	0	12	0
Dividends	9	1	4	Sundries	3	9	6
Donations	1	4	6	Cash at Bank	4	9	11
Petty Cash in hand, Jan. 1, 1917	2	17	5						
						<u>£494</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>				<u>£494</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>

There were at the end of the year unpaid bills amounting to £63 14s. 9d.

There is a Capital sum of £500 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Consols, also the Capital of the Gunning Trust Fund, £508 Great India Peninsular Railway Stock.

GUNNING PRIZE FUND.

Balance from 1917..	57	12	5	Balance at Bank Dec. 31st, 1918..	75	17	11
Jan. 2nd, 1918, Dividend..	5	14	4							
July 3rd "	12	11	2							
						<u>£75</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>					<u>£75</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>11</u>

We have verified all the accounts and compared them with the books and vouchers, and found them correct.

H. LANCE GRAY, }
G. AVENELL, } *Auditors.*

January 24th, 1919.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
OF THE
VICTORIA INSTITUTE

WAS HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, MARCH 17TH, 1919,
AT 3.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COL. G. MACKINLAY, VICE-PRESIDENT,
TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Annual General Meeting held on March 18th, 1918, were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY read the notice calling the Meeting. The Report and Statement of Accounts, presented by the Council, having been circulated among the Members present, were taken as read.

Lt.-Col. MACKINLAY said :—The Victoria Institute has passed through a critical time during the war, but we have, thank God, been enabled to continue ; the papers read during the past year have been quite up to the usual high standard, and they have been well attended.

It is true that a good many members have had to leave us from financial reasons, and our volume has shrunk to smaller dimensions on account of the great increase in the price of printing and binding ; but now that peace is within measurable distance we may well hope for more prosperous times, and for the return of many members and associates.

Since the Armistice was declared we have had a small increase in membership, instead of the steady decrease during the years of war and stress. The financial outlook has brightened, because since the end of the year 1918, which we are now considering, we have started a special fund, which has been generously responded to ; already we have received £300 out of the £500 needed.

The opportunity for expansion and usefulness is now upon us, and our prospects are bright. Our President has encouraged us by promising to give the Annual Address at the close of the Session in June, when it is hoped that further good progress will have been made.

The success of our Institute, humanly speaking, is in the hands of all the members and associates; it is earnestly trusted that each will use every effort to further its interests, by telling their friends, by inviting them to join, by suggesting subjects, or by reading papers.

The first resolution was proposed by J. NORMAN HOLMES, Esq., and seconded by CHARLES MARSTON, Esq. :—

That the Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1918, herewith submitted, be adopted, and that the thanks of the Meeting be tendered to the Council and officers for the efficient manner in which they have carried out the affairs of the Institute during the past year.

This was carried unanimously.

The second resolution was proposed by PETER WOOD, Esq., seconded by J. A. GOSSET, Esq. :—

That the President, Vice-Presidents, and honorary officers named in the Report, and the retiring Members of Council nominated by the Council for re-election, be elected, and that A. T. Schofield, Esq., M.D., be elected Vice-President, and A. H. Burton, Esq., M.D., and W. Hoste, Esq., B.A., Members of Council of the Victoria Institute.

Carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN said :—We owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Schofield for his services. Not only has he contributed good papers to our Institute in the past, but he has very kindly promised another for next Session, and he has devoted much time and skill to the preparation and editing of six tracts for the times, from former papers of the Victoria Institute, which are of permanent value.

Mr. Hoste also deserves our thanks, as he has expressed his willingness to help in the honorary secretarial work, which is much needed.

Dr. Burton is well known and valued. We warmly welcome these gentlemen to their respective posts of responsibility.

It was then proposed by E. J. SEWELL, Esq., seconded by J. C. DICK, Esq. :—

That H. Lance Gray, Esq., and George Avenell, Esq., be appointed honorary auditors for the year 1919.

Carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN added :—The careful keeping of accounts is most important in all Societies, and we gratefully acknowledge the wise supervision given by our honorary auditors.

Before we separate I should like to mention a fact which I am sure will give us all sincere pleasure. This morning at the meeting of the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, nine prominent men were recommended by them for the honour of being elected Vice-Presidents at the coming Annual Meeting. The first one selected, and whose nomination evoked the warmest applause, was that of Mr. E. J. Sewell, our honorary secretary. For many years he has been Chairman of the Editorial sub-committee of the Bible Society, in which responsible position he has rendered most valuable service.

We congratulate him heartily upon the honour which he has received. (Applause.)

A cordial vote of thanks to Col. Mackinlay was proposed by Col. Alves, and seconded by H. Lance Gray, Esq. This was carried unanimously.

The Meeting closed at 4 o'clock.

THE 603RD ORDINARY MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 2ND, 1918,
AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. FORTESCUE FOX IN THE CHAIR.

THE SECRETARY read the Minutes of the previous Meeting, and the same were confirmed and signed.

He also announced the election of Mr. B. R. Parkinson and Mr. T. A. Gillespie as Members, and the Rev. E. C. Unmack and the Rev. Professor Samuel A. B. Mercer, D.D., as Associates.

CHRISTIAN SANITY. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, M.D.,
etc., etc.

THE subject of this paper has not, I believe, been discussed at this Institute, and to many Members may be quite new. It is full of interest, as well as of difficulties of a very practical kind which I trust both the paper and the discussion will do something to remove.

We must, of course, first define our terms. Christianity needs no elaboration, but what is "Sanity"? We may at first think the question superfluous, for we surely all know the meaning of the word. But that is precisely what we do not know, for its exact definition has long been a standing puzzle to experts. Dictionaries do not help us much with their wisdom, for even Murray's monumental work can only define insanity as "unsound in mind." We surely might expect a little more from the combined wisdom of philological experts!

Webster lengthily defines sanity as "possessing a rational mind: having the mental faculties in such condition as to be able to anticipate and judge of the effects of one's actions in an ordinary manner." Surely this is a most cumbrous and untrue definition, requiring itself much explanation. It is untrue, because sanity may not deal with actions at all, and what

constitutes "an ordinary manner" certainly requires explanation. And this is the best America can give us!

The Century Dictionary defines sane as "mentally sound," which we knew before, and is irritating rather than illuminating.

I think we may fairly conclude that to the most highly trained minds the word is indefinable. It seems, however, to the comparatively untrained mind of the writer that some better results might be obtained by considering the subject from the point of view of "balance." A balanced mind is a familiar term for a sane mind, an unbalanced for an insane. "He has lost his balance" or (in common speech) "has a screw loose," graphically describes loss of reason. The very simile, however, popular as it is, suggests instability, and gives no absolutely fixed point of solid sanity, but a trembling round a perfect poise—at first sight a precarious position for all of us. The matter, however, is not really so bad as this.

We may picture the mind as a pair of scales with two opposed weights, consisting, I suppose, in the main of reason and emotion. As one of the two preponderates by will force or other agencies, the scale sinks on that side, and the perfect balance is lost. The mind continually oscillates thus between opposite forces; but this no more shows it is unsound than the swinging of a compass needle shows it unreliable. The point is, where are both when at rest? If the needle points then to the pole and if the scales are even, however violently the needle may swing, or the scale may be depressed at times, the compass is true and the mind is sane.

If, on the other hand, this be not the case, and the compass steadily points in any other direction than the magnetic north, it is to that extent in error, and if either side of the mental balance be depressed *when quite at rest*, the mind is to that extent unbalanced; and if the condition be fixed and well marked is insane. I do not know whether scientifically this view may not be destructively criticized, but at any rate it enables us to visualize what is meant by sanity, which would thus be defined as "a balanced mind," and this gives us something a little more helpful and lucid than the dictionary definitions.

Before leaving our suggested illustration, we may add that if the loss of equilibrium in the balance is not great, the mental aberration may be slight and harmless (at any rate to others). Such cases abound, and are classed as eccentrics, faddists, extremists, or perhaps as obsessed, ill-balanced or even "not all there."

Official recognition has long been sought for this large army of sufferers as "borderland cases" between sanity and insanity, but so far in vain. Personally I have nothing officially to do with insanity, but am constantly struck with the difficulty of defining such doubtful cases.

It would almost seem that a really perfect mental equipoise is confined to but few, and that sanity in its last analysis is really a question of the degree rather than the mere fact of deflection from the normal. What is perhaps still more remarkable is that the perfectly balanced mind is by no means always the one of the greatest value to its owner or to his country; but that, on the contrary, some slight mental bias or obsession often leads to brilliancy and victory, and indeed may constitute a driving force to successful effort. Faddists often do more than arm-chair philosophers. This is well illustrated on the bowling green, where the bias of the ball is the secret of victory. But if slight inequality of the scales does not amount to insanity, still less does violent oscillation, however alarming, provided the position of rest is equilibrium. One often hears the statement "He is perfectly mad" made of the most sane individuals. It merely means the man is so sure of his equipoise, like an aviator or tight-rope performer, that he can indulge in the most alarming "loops" or oscillations with perfect impunity. It is for this reason that the opposite condition of the *idée fixe* is such a well-known sign of mental disease.

So far from consisting of movements or oscillations, it is that persistent quiet depression of one side of the balance that is really the expression of actual loss of sanity. It is to be further noticed that while the violent movements I have described are all conscious and voluntary, this *idée fixe* or loss of equilibrium is generally unconscious and always involuntary.

It may be remarked here that humour is very closely connected with sanity. No insane person really possesses it, and few who do, become insane. I may also observe that although a person may be insane in thought, legal insanity must be shown by mad actions.

Returning to our immediate subject, we find that it is still further complicated in that it is not "Sanity" but "Christian Sanity." We have therefore to study the effects of an influx of a great spiritual force on the mind of man that tends to disturb the pre-existing balance. The fresh power and energy, the changed standpoint of view, and the entire recasting of values, to say nothing of the new and powerful contact with great

forces, that were originally the results in varying degrees of the entrance of spiritual light into the soul of man, at first no doubt produced such a violent and permanent disturbance of the pre-Christian balance, that observers had no option but to declare Christians mad. It will be remembered in "Flatland" that the dweller in Two dimensions when shown by a messenger in Three dimensions the glories of the solidity of the higher sphere, was perforce accounted mad and placed in an asylum, when on his return to Flatland he persisted in proclaiming the wonders he had seen.

Our Lord Himself, the Source and Exemplar of the New Revelation, did not escape. It was at Capernaum, in the middle of His ministry, that three estimates were simultaneously made of Him. For not only did His own people declaim in so many words "He hath a devil, and is mad" (S. John x, 20), but His own family, alas! (S. Mark iii, 21) would have placed Him in confinement, for "they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself." It is instructive to note that at the same time the Third, the Divine estimate of Christ was "Behold my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased" (S. Matthew xii, 18).

One must, with such a warning, be very careful that in this paper our conclusions on Christian Sanity do not conflict with the Divine judgment.

John the Baptist was also declared to have a devil. The first Christians (Acts ii, 13) were believed to be a noisy company of drunken men, if not mad. Later, Rhoda (Acts xii, 12), a Christian maid, was declared mad, because she told believers that their prayers were answered. Festus declared Paul was mad (Acts xxvi, 24). Church assemblies with miraculous gifts might be (and doubtless were) often accounted mad (I Cor. xiv, 23), and lastly it is stated definitely that there are heights of spiritual life when the Christian is "beside himself" (II Cor. v, 13) towards God, though towards man he is sober enough.

It is indeed small wonder that at such times the balance of the human equipoise should be temporarily disturbed, though in no true case leading to insane or unbalanced actions.

This word "sober" is really a key word that will unlock much of the subject of this paper. It is in Greek "*σωφρονισμός*" and denotes "soundness of mind" or "sanity." "*Σώφρων*" means "wise" and "*σωφροσύνη*" wisdom. It is the only word used for sanity, and connotes both sanity and wisdom. It

is used twelve times and is earnestly enforced in the New Testament as an essential quality of Christian life.

S. Paul especially seems deeply impressed with the paramount necessity of never allowing spiritual visions or transports to obscure or unsettle in the smallest degree the essential sobriety of the sane well-balanced man.

Nothing in the whole range of apostolic teaching is more truly remarkable than the fact that S. Paul should declare that the first thing that Christ teaches us is to be *sane*, or in the very words of Scripture, that "we should live soberly" (Titus ii, 12).

There is great need that this should be carefully pondered, and emphatically emphasized to-day amongst all Christian men.

This sanity further is seen to possess four remarkable qualities (distinguished by four beautiful Greek words) which may help us to recognize and define it. It is first "gentle" (*ἐπιείκεια*), which is Matthew Arnold's "sweet reasonableness," a most fragrant quality, and one only possessed by a man who is absolutely sure of himself; in other words, perfectly sane. It is the direct opposite of every form of obsession, violence of act or speech and of bigotry. It is enjoined on us seven times.

Sanity is secondly temperate (*νήφαλος*). This is the soberness of being on the watch and alert, and includes the sobriety that comes from abstinence from all excess. This also occurs seven times.

The third word is "*ἐγκράτεια*," which again means sober, but in the special sense of self-controlled. It is worthy of special note as a quality that should always and everywhere characterize Christian sanity; being one of the nine fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v, 23), and the only one not stated to be found in Christ: this feature of sanity not being required in Him, inasmuch as there was nothing to keep in check, no danger from within. It is spoken of six times.

The fourth and last of the words is "*ὑγιάνω*," which means to be healthy or whole, showing us that sanity is not only wise, gentle, alert, self-controlled, but healthy. Such is the full teaching of the New Testament on Christian Sanity; and I trust I have already said enough to show that it is a subject that cannot be passed over by any Christian Philosophical Society.

How then can we best define the limits of Christian Sanity in view of such a disturbing factor of the pre-existing balance, as the higher spiritual life?

In the first place we may note that nowhere are deviations from the normal less tolerated than in England. Amongst the Latin nations, as we travel East, and in the Far West, and in the South, in Asia, Africa, and America, all sorts of extravagances are tolerated which would certainly be judged to pass the limits of sanity here. But in this paper we must accept the meaning that is current in this country, while at the same time we fully recognize that the word "sanity" does not represent the same condition everywhere; but that the standard which decides doubtful cases varies greatly with country and race.

As I have pointed out, the influx of the Divine into the human soul tends to the disturbance of mental equilibrium. The truth of God concerning time and eternity, heaven and hell, death and life, is so tremendous and overwhelming in its effect that one cannot be surprised at any disturbance in the mental sphere; and it is on this account that Christians were accounted mad, and that S. Paul devotes such extreme care as to their sanity.

The same care is expressed in the dictum of the Keswick Convention: "Our work is *twofold*—first to make natural men spiritual, and *then to make spiritual men natural*."

The fact is, the mental equipoise between reason and emotion, which we call common sense, must never be lost, whatever the supposed spirituality of the individual. It is not pure reason alone that is sanity. On the contrary, as this is but one side of the balance there is ground for believing, as has been pointed out with great force by G. K. Chesterton, that a large number who trust exclusively in this are in asylums.

I saw a lady the other day who was brought to me because she would do nothing but wash; and in the same week a wealthy barrister who would not wash at all.

In stating their cases to me both were extremely reasonable. Indeed by comparison I seemed to be almost irrational. The lady explained that this is a dirty world, laden with malignant germs, which swarm everywhere, on every piece of furniture or paper, on every article of clothing and on the skin. If she touched a chair, or indeed any object, her hand was covered with microbes. I could not deny it. "Therefore I wash," said she, "and am always washing with disinfectant soap." She smelt strongly of carbolic, and her hands were like a washer-woman's. She was absolutely useless to anyone, and yet was perfectly reasonable. The barrister no less so. He also found it a dirty world. Micro-organisms everywhere! Whatever you

did you were covered with them. Washing was utterly futile as a protection, etc., etc., therefore why wash? Hence he had given up the unequal conflict—reasonable again. I am indeed informed with regard to washing that Mrs. Eddy had the strongest views on ablutions, and in her monumental work she decrees that babies are on no account to be daily washed, declaring such a practice to be neither “natural nor necessary” (p. 413).

Indeed, I have often said that it is really only because this sect does not practise what it preaches, that its members pass as sane; which they no doubt are. To profess that body and digestive organs are non-existent, and that the necessity for food is an error of mortal mind, is all very well so long as you show your sanity by not acting on it; but if one did act on it, one would be in danger of the asylum. So far I have not heard of any of the sect who have done so. Common sense here triumphs over dogma.

To return to our theme. Reason alone does not represent a balanced mind any more than emotion alone. Common sense does, which I have suggested is reason balanced by emotion. Perhaps some still better definition may be arrived at in the discussion, which I hope may be at any rate partly constructive.

It is very interesting to note that before S. Paul had any spiritual illumination at all, when he was still Saul, in his own words (Acts xxvi, 11) he was exceedingly “maniacal”; while on the other hand, when he spoke before Festus the words of truth and soberness, he was deemed a maniac (the same word).

I have already cited the remarkable passage (II Cor. v, 13), where it is asserted that we may be beside ourselves, and yet sane at the same time. The former describing the transports of joy of the saint in the Divine presence, the other the sobriety and calm of the man in this world of sorrow.

As I have already pointed out, and may here repeat, no oscillations constitute insanity, but a fixed loss of balance does. We have shown the standard of sanity varies with country and race, but we may go farther, for the individual estimate varies almost as much as the standard of right and wrong, according to which “one man may steal a horse, while another may not look over the hedge.” Of course in so speaking I do not consider the legal aspect of insanity.

For instance, with regard to Christian sanity, (1) to believe in a

spiritual world at all is insane to a mere materialist. (2) The ordinary man of the world might, however, pass this as sane, so long as it was confined to an opinion only, but he would judge otherwise if actions followed the belief.

(3) To the average churchman, however, the man would still be sane, provided he did not go to any great excess and "sell all that he had and give to the poor."

(4) To some earnest Christians even this might be passed as sane, while the antics of some of the wilder religious sects certainly would not. (5) Members of these sects, however, would undoubtedly believe they were in full possession of their senses.

Here, then, are five different estimates of Christian sanity in the same country, and we might easily have adduced another five.

In Christian sanity as distinguished from legal or medical sanity (on which I shall have a word to say at the close) our only reliable standard, seeing we have such variable estimates, is the Word of God. As a result of a study of the subject in this light I have arrived at a somewhat startling conclusion, and that is that the Biblical standard of Christian sanity is somewhat narrower than either the legal, medical, or general standards of ordinary sanity. I say "Christian sanity"; and by this I mean not the mental condition of all who call themselves Christians, but that which is defined as sanity in the Word of God.

I have already pointed out (in Greek and English) the five qualities the possession of which constitutes perfect Biblical sanity. How, then, are these five inestimable characteristics to be obtained and practised? They are received from God, and not from Christians; and the more He is the source of our Christian life, and that we live in His fear and not in the fear of men, the saner shall we be. Power, steadiness, gentleness, sobriety and self-control are all the sure possessions of those who, like Enoch of old, "walk with God."

There are many insane and erratic Christians, and many strange and fearful and unscriptural beliefs—with God alone is absolute safety. Listen to a description of a man who so lives—can anything be more sane than Emerson's picture? :—

"When a man lives with God, his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of the brook and the rustle of the corn.

"He will weave no longer a spotted life of shreds and patches, but he will live with a Divine unity. He will cease from what

is base and frivolous in his life, and be content with all places, and any service he can render.

“He will calmly front the morrow in the negligency of that trust which carries God with it, and so has the whole future in the bottom of his heart.”

It is obvious this represents a high type of sanity, and there can be no doubt that the standard of the man who is in direct contact with Divine Wisdom is higher than the ordinary one.

Two points may here be noted. First that we are speaking of the life in normal times. Times of stress and storm (as in the great War) call for exceptional conduct; and indeed often actions such as might be called mad in ordinary life. Secondly, we must allow for temperament. S. James, we presume, would always appear conspicuously sane, S. Peter certainly less so, and S. Paul at times perhaps least of all.

Observe in the beautiful *Phædrus* of Plato how Socrates points out that those that seek God are accounted mad.

“They endeavour to discover of themselves the nature of God, and when they grasp Him with their memory (being inspired by Him) they receive from Him their manners and pursuits, so far as it is possible for man to participate of God . . . Anyone who is reminded of this time begins to recover his wings, and having recovered them, longs to soar aloft; but being unable to do so, looks upward like a bird [a striking and pathetic simile] and despising things below is *deemed affected with madness*. When they see any resemblance of things there [in heaven] they are amazed, *and no longer masters of themselves* [remembering] when they beheld in the pure light—perfect, simple, calm, and blessed visions.” Surely Socrates here approaches very nearly to what we have quoted of S. Paul, “Whether *we be beside ourselves*, it is to God” (II Cor. v, 13).

Further light may be thrown upon our study of Christian sanity by considering a few of the ideals and objects in the normal average Christian life.*

From childhood the general trend of Christian development is away from the self-assertive “ego” towards God and man, towards spiritual and altruistic activities.

The Christian ideal is chiefly that of doing good to others.

* These are mainly obtained from Dr. Starbuck’s well-known statistics of Christian life.

Over half of the large number of lives investigated have this object first. One-quarter had as ideals Christian perfection and pleasing God.

It is well to note that the number of those whose ideals were objective and altruistic (out of 1000 carefully examined lives) is double those whose ideals were subjective, and partly egoistic. Nearly half had God as the leading aspiration, one-third Christ, and one-quarter the future life, while the rest had good conduct. Most Christians over forty set God and good conduct principally first.

Dependence on God, reverence, and praise to God, were the three most prominent feelings; while faith, happiness and peace were secondary.

Peace and holiness were the principal desires between twenty and fifty; afterwards interest in God, the general trend being from the subjective and egoistic to the objective and altruistic.

These statistics are not given as absolutely accurate, but simply as representing the sober statements of a large number of educated Christian men and women, who voluntarily replied to a number of carefully arranged questions, and are quoted here to show the eminent sanity of Christianity *per se*.

Danger really begins either in specializing, or in not closely following the Divine Guide in the Bible.

Whenever there is any giving up or loss of self-control (*ἐγκράτεια*) sanity is endangered.

It is a mere quibble to object to the words "self-control" and substitute "God" or "Spirit" control, for it is the self which is controlled, the controller being the human will, energized doubtless by Divine power; but not, as false teachers assert, paralyzed and destroyed by the same power. Such ideas are of the greatest peril to Christian sanity.

I am indeed fully persuaded that so far from surrender of self-control aiding spiritual advance, that it is impossible to reach true spiritual heights without this sane quality. S. Paul himself declares that without it he would be utterly unfit for his high service (1 Cor. ix, 27), and no trace of any such loss can be found in the life of our great Exemplar.

Consider the marked sanity of leaders in the Christian Church—of Liddon, of Lightfoot, of Westcott and of countless others.

In the mission field, of Hudson Taylor, of Paton, of Moffatt, of Carey, of Hannington, of Moody, of Torrey, of Pierson.

My own brother was accounted mad for giving up his eminent

scientific position in England to go as a missionary to China ; but he was one of the most sober and sane men I ever knew.

Look at what is known as the Keswick platform for the last twenty years, and observe how carefully in teaching the highest truths, reasonableness and self-control have ever been enforced.

Religious mania, which so many erroneously believe is the result of Bible teaching, springs from one of two causes of a wholly different nature. It is either caused by a previously unbalanced mind being taught some religious dogmas, or by departing from the Divine Guide, and following some peculiar and specialized teaching, more or less unbiblical and unchristian ; and which unfortunately is only too common to-day.

The truest sanity is that of Christians, for they alone obey Browning's words :—

“ Trust God, see all, be not afraid.”

Their lives are sane and full of good works.

To be under the guiding eye of God produces real sobriety and steadiness of mind and action. To suppose otherwise would be to make God the author of confusion.

The man whose being is most controlled by God is farthest removed from ill-balanced or hasty thoughts or deeds.

So far, then, I have used the words sanity and insanity in a somewhat loose and general way, and not in a medical or legal sense. This I have done purposely, as this paper is addressed to non-professional Christian men. In my closing remarks, however, I should like to say a word on the subject from a medical standpoint.

I am persuaded that the perfect balance of Christian sanity is far too frequently upset by what is loosely termed nervous disorders, or more learnedly “ psychasthenia,” which is really due to another cause altogether.

I find no trace of such a condition in the life of Christ, although the wearing unbelief and misunderstandings in Nazareth, and the vile slanders abroad were more than enough to cause it. I see, on the contrary, constant peace of spirit, and the perfect balance of sobriety and wisdom. I am persuaded, therefore, that most of the nervous breakdowns that one meets with are not due to Christianity, but to the want of it, in its true sane power. Those who go through life with the secret of Christ's yoke, find

the burden light, and are greatly preserved from disturbance of mind or nerves.

The *idée fixe*, or the fixed mental background, is common amongst extreme bigots. When this becomes dominant, the person is no longer sane. In such there is an entire absence of the first quality of sanity—"ἐπιείκεια" or "sweet reasonableness." This *idée fixe* may be produced in Christians when one aspect of truth excludes all others, which is never the case when God is the Teacher, for His Spirit leads into *all* truth, and thus preserves the balance.

There are two times in life—puberty and the climacteric—when "moderation in all things" should be specially observed; for when there is any predisposition, there is special danger at these periods of loss of balance.

The narrow Puritan School, necessary though it may have been at its institution, as a protest against the outrageous licence of the day, is a great cultivator of the morbid conscience, which after all is one of the most common beginnings of the disturbances of Christian sanity.

Practically, however, most cases of insanity resolve themselves into one of two classes: those mainly due to disease, and those due to heredity.

Mere unsound views, one-sided minds, prejudice, and erratic or false teaching seldom lead to insanity by themselves; though they often play an active part in those already predisposed to loss of balance by heredity.

Sober Christianity is a powerful aid to sanity even in the ill-balanced; but a spiritual life, that neglects the safeguards so clearly pointed out in the Bible, and which I have here carefully indicated, especially if it runs in emotional channels, may constitute a real danger to Christian sanity.

The conclusion of the whole matter is perfectly obvious, and is "that the true sanity of a well-balanced mind is the normal condition of every spiritual man taught of God by His inspired Word."

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. FORTESCUE FOX) commented upon the changes in the standard of sanity of which history bore record. The great process of mental and spiritual development, which some called Evolution, and some preferred to look upon as the gradual fulfilment of the divine destiny of humanity, was marked by many difficulties

and disturbances. Delusions and unnecessary fears and depressions of the mind affected peoples, as well as individuals. In the Middle Ages some of these became epidemic manias, like the Dancing Mania and the barking Manias that went through Europe. In the same way, happier generations might look back upon these times as the strange days of the mania of Militarism. The effects of religion upon the equipoise of the mind was very great—and might operate both ways. It was well to remember that in the long run men needed encouragement. Nothing could be true or healthy that plunged men into fears and apprehensions. And now especially, after the long sufferings of the war, men needed encouraging. They needed to be made to see that life was good and glad, and that there was opening now upon the world a new day of unimaginable possibilities of progress and happiness.

Mr. ROUSE asked whether the Christians whose aims were classified on page 20 belonged to the *first* or to the *second original* category, to the number which had mainly objective aims or to that which had mainly subjective ones.

He further said :—Our Chairman has quoted Horace's description of the good and fearless man :—

Integer vitæ scelerisque purus, etc.

But of course he did not mean that this was at all a description of that poet's own character. Horace would have done well if, as Burns did to a similar exhortation, he had appended :—

“ And may you better reckon the rede
Than ever did th' adviser.”

Our Chairman thinks, as I understand him, that we of Britain, of North America, and of Western Europe have grown out of the credulous minds possessed by our mediæval ancestors. But like him I would refer to a striking utterance of Macaulay's : “ A very common knowledge of history, a very little observation of life, will suffice to prove that no learning, no sagacity, affords a security against the greatest errors on subjects relating to the invisible world ” (Essay on Ranke's *History of the Popes*). And this sentiment we shall fully indorse if we contemplate the recent amazing dissemination in America, Britain, and Western Europe of Mormonism, Christian science, clairvoyance and spiritism, the last named cult now announcing even weekly “ services ” of its own in my

suburb of London. I do not, however, allege that Spiritism, in spite of many public exposures, is always mere human trickery : for some who have been its votaries and through Christ's grace have shaken loose from it, have testified that they really saw and heard preternatural sights and sounds, and had knowledge of events in other places that no human being could have given them, but that the aims of their spirit guides were distinctly evil ; so that these spirits were not ministering angels or spirits of good men, but quite the reverse, even as the denunciations of witchcraft in the Bible would lead us to expect. And such subjection to unknown and evil spirits has undoubtedly led from time to time to utter mania.

The true safeguard against all such delusions is not progress in human learning, but real studying of the Scriptures and humble prayer.

As regards mania due to a really religious cause, it is remarkable that in a report upon lunacy issued by our Government less than a decade ago, only one case was set down to religious causes, while forty-five out of a hundred cases were declared to be due to excessive drinking of alcohol.

It is interesting to note that the original meaning of common sense was not, as now, the power of judgment common to the mass of mankind, but a sense conceived of as uniting or being held in common by all the five and making use of their impressions to arrive at a judgment. (See *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, s.v.)

Lt.-Col. MACKINLAY warmly thanked Dr. Schofield for his valuable paper, and asked : Since *self*-control has been pointed out as essential, is it permissible for a *Christian* to resort to suggestion or hypnotism for relief in illness ?

Lt.-Col. ALVES considered that the reader of the paper had well defined Christian Sanity.

He attributed loss of mental balance in many cases to erroneous and foggy teaching, commonly described as mystical teaching, in spiritual matters.

Mr. ARTHUR W. SUTTON said that he wished to express his very sincere thanks to Dr. Schofield, and appreciation of the most interesting and valuable paper which he had read, but his special object in rising was to suggest that Dr. Schofield probably wished to

impress upon all those who professed and called themselves Christians the great responsibility of exhibiting "sanity" in their own lives and conduct.

We are all familiar with instances where the profession of Christian discipleship has been accompanied by a very eccentric and unnatural manner of life, coupled sometimes with éccentricity in the manner of expressing the Christian Faith, and even occasionally in the form of dress, which, although adopted with the best of motives, undoubtedly tend very greatly to alienate others who are attracted by the Personality and Divine claims of our Lord and Master. Although the enemies of Jesus Christ said, "He hath a devil," this was not due to any lack of "sanity" on the part of Christ Himself, but to personal enmity towards the truths which He taught; and if, as we believe, Christianity was intended to meet the needs of the whole human race, it is incumbent upon the followers of Christ to see that they neither add anything to, nor take anything from, God's revelation of Himself in the Person of Jesus Christ.

Mr. W. HOSTE was thankful for the lecturer's words on p. 20 as to the danger to sanity of giving up self-control. Is there not a very false, though commonly received, idea to-day among Christian people, that the normal way in which the Spirit guides is to do so in spite of ourselves? This has favoured aberration from Christian sanity. Demon possession was characterized in the New Testament by this. We read of a boy being cast into water and into fire by a demon. The Gentiles were *carried away* unto dumb idols. But the Holy Spirit respects our personality. The Christian is left so far master of himself as to be able to ask himself questions as to the fitness of things; sanctified common sense is not excluded, as we see in 1 Cor. xiv, where we see that a man should consider before exercising His gift: Is this suitable for edification? Have enough speakers taken part? A man should not lose his self-control, if he is to be truly controlled by the Spirit through the Word of God, otherwise he may find himself the plaything of some false spirit.

Mr. T. ATKINSON GILLESPIE: As to the question of "self-control," p. 20 of this most able paper, which has been referred to by the previous speaker, I would like to point out that towards the close of the Lord's ministry there were two missions, the mission of the

masses and the mission of the guest chamber, and without entering into any detail, but to arrive at the point, I wish to emphasize that the owner of the ass was "compelled" to recognise the Divine claim as being superior to his own. Likewise in the case of the owner of the guest chamber. These two missions conclusively prove to my mind the safety of allowing the "compelling" power of the Holy Spirit to take possession of all control, as in the case of conversion.

In Luke xiv, when our Lord told before the people assembled in the Pharisee's house the Parable of the Supper, we have the same thought intensified in the fact that not one of the invited guests complied with the Royal Invitation. There must be more than an invitation—God must fill the chairs as well as the table—He must "force" His guests in as well as fill the board, showing us that man by nature is not amenable to the Divine Will, but his will has to be brought into line with God's Will through the mission of the Holy Spirit, who makes us willing in the day of His power. Had we not had the Lord's mission, there would have been no supper. Had there not been the mission of the Holy Ghost, there would have been no guests to sit down at the supper, consequently these two missions are essential; the mission of the Son to prepare the feast—the mission of the Holy Ghost to "compel" guests to His table.

Dr. A. H. BURTON, B.A., M.D., remarked: I have been much edified by Dr. Schofield's interesting paper. His trite remark that Keswick has always sought to, first, make natural men spiritual, and, secondly, to make spiritual men natural—this, coupled with what we have just heard from the last two questioners, with regard to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, reminds me of a question once put by a somewhat legally-minded Christian to another, who was the sanest and most level-headed Christian I ever knew. The question was this: "I had been much exercised in mind as to paying a visit to a certain man whom I desired to help spiritually: I had made it a matter of much prayer. On making my call the man was *not at home*. Was I really led of God or not?"

"Quite likely," was the reply, "all the exercise you passed through was good for you, whereas you might have done more harm than good by the visit."

Professor H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD was sure that they would not wish to separate before expressing to the author their hearty thanks

for a most interesting and valuable paper, especially for the remarks upon self-control and God's control (pp. 20, 21).

Much, however, as he admired the paper, he must dissent from its definition of Sanity. If he understood aright this mechanical definition (or illustration), the mind is supposed to be continually oscillating between reason and emotion, as do the scales of a balance between two opposed weights—these weights or “opposite forces” being (in the case of the mind) reason and emotion. If, when both the opposing forces are at rest, the scales are even and the mind in a state of perfect equipoise, the balance is true and the mind is sane. If, on the other hand, this be not the case, and “if either side of the mental balance be depressed *when quite at rest*, the mind is to that extent unbalanced; and if the condition be fixed and well marked, is insane.”

The basic error in this definition lies in the supposition that reason and emotion are two forces necessarily opposed (and equal). This is far from being the case. The two are frequently in alliance. Nothing is more consonant with reason than gratitude to God for all His benefits, and love to Him, and to our relatives and friends; and gratitude and love are emotions. Nor is there necessity that these two forces be equal, so that when both are at rest there is “mental equipoise”; for it will hardly be questioned that two men may have the one “an emotional temperament” and the other be “unemotional,” yet both be equally sane. Aristotle tells us that sanity (*σωφροσύνη*) is the habit of self-control (*ἐγκράτεια*), and the importance of this habit can scarcely be exaggerated.

In the speaker's own view all *health* consists in *harmony* between the structure, powers, functions, of the subject and the environment. Mental health (sanity) is harmony between the mind and its environment. “Christian sanity” must, therefore, include harmony with Christ, and therefore with God. It is His gift to the heart-believer in Christ, and has its statement in 11 Tim. i, 7, and will be found to include the five qualities on pp. 4 and 5 of the paper.

He had great pleasure in asking the audience to pass by acclamation a hearty vote of thanks to the able author for a paper marked by that charm which invariably accompanied whatever he wrote or said.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

The LECTURER (Dr. SCHOFIELD) then replied: I am greatly surprised to find that amidst all the speakers there are only a few whom it will be necessary to answer:—

Lt.-Col. Mackinlay asks “whether in the light of the importance of self-control, suggestion and hypnotism are permissible in sickness,” a question which may fairly be said to arise out of the paper. My answer must be, “Only in selected cases, and under the care of a skilled physician.”

Professor Orchard objects that reason and emotion are not necessarily opposed, nor are they themselves equal in quantity in many cases. This is of course true, and yet a certain balance should be maintained in saying which the simile to a pair of scales must not be unduly pressed. “Opposed” is not exactly in its use the same as opposite, that is to say I do not suggest these qualities are actively and necessarily in opposition; but merely that for the purpose of my argument I place them on each side of the balance.

I still think the simile a good one, though the Professor has clearly shown it must not be strained.

I have to thank the speakers and the audience for the very cordial reception of my paper.

THE 604TH ORDINARY MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 20TH, 1919,
AT 4.30 P.M.

A. T. SCHOFIELD, ESQ., M.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the Secretary announced the election of Miss F. E. Newton, Miss Violet H. Thorold, and the Rev. W. L. Baxter, D.D., as Associates.

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE POSITION OF WOMEN. By CONSTANCE L. MAYNARD (First Principal of Westfield College, University of London).

THIS is a wide subject. Let me speak first on that duality which runs through human nature, that curious cleft which cuts the race in two, that goes by the name of Sex. Physically the division is obvious and runs through the animal world below us (except among the lowest and brainless creatures such as coral and sponge), but in the world of mind the cleft also runs, and this is by no means so obvious, and needs careful study.

The history of the individual-runs parallel with the history of our race, and if we want to trace the story of that obscure being, Primitive Man, we may see it all writ small but very clearly in our nurseries of to-day. First, we see a time when physical well-being is the sole desire of life, and this we call the *Age of Passivity*. Then the perceptions and the will awake, and the supremacy—boy and girl alike—goes to brute force. This is the *Age of Self-will*, the first evidence of the spirit of man. Our babes awake to find they can, by effort, alter the world about them; there is no Reason as yet to guide their actions, and not enough Affection to suppress their violence, but the blind Will

appears in outbursts, and the principle worked on is that of "Might is Right." This is not wrong: it is nothing but uneven growth. It is the man-spirit claiming his inheritance, and obeying the first command ever given to the human race, "Subdue the earth—have dominion."

At about two years old our children scream and fight, and say "No" and "I won't," and clutch a thing so tightly, they will tear it and hurt themselves rather than give way; but, a little later, skill and cunning begin to be mixed with force. Even as Primitive Man found it was easier to snare a wild animal than to encounter its strength face to face, so there comes in a spirit of invention among our babes which it is hardly fair to call lying. The child finds a better way of gaining its ends than by pitting its little strength against that of a grown person, and that is by some kind of artifice or deception. Up to about seven years old children may be considered as racial rather than individual characters, but after this the boy and the girl begin to differ a little, though in my opinion they should be treated alike for some years longer. The new development is the birth of sympathy within, and protective care of the weaker side, and the sense of compassion. This is the awakening of the Woman-spirit, and in our grand old Narrative that will never be discredited we see how true it is that Eve is created a long while after Adam. Some children are most luminous examples of this development of character, and you may see a little boy who was a terror of screams and hitting out at two years old, and who at four did not know truth from falsehood, and would try cruelly to stamp upon the frogs in the garden, become a very Prince Pitiful by eight or nine. Eve is created, the balance is attained, and all goes well.

Now turn from these bright instructive little pictures at our knee and glance at the whole world in its present position. All stages are simultaneous here. The lowest stage is brute force, where the woman, by her obvious muscular inferiority, becomes the drudge and the beast of burden. The early Moravian missionaries describe a feast among the Esquimaux: the men are sitting round the captured seal, cooking and eating for five or six hours at a time, and throwing the bones over their shoulders to a mixed crowd of women and dogs, there to be wrangled for with cries and blows. A little higher in the scale and you may see women counted as a great treasure, but woefully misused. Man reaches the very height of his ingenious tyranny, and then

you may see established the dreary life of the Zenana, the bound feet of the Chinese, and the vapid, miserable existence of the Harem. To me this is worse than the savage stage. The woman no longer shares the hardships of the man, but has developed along a line exclusively her own—a mean and hateful line, where every germ of generous life is stifled. The one weapon left free is her tongue, and she becomes jealous, frivolous, petty, spiteful, without the least sense of justice, a creature it makes one blush to think of. And, alas, when debarred from cultivation and from her true scope, some beings of the same type are to be found in the civilised lands of to-day, and it seems that Eve, the Mother of all living, the summit of things created, is not even yet able to take her right place.

Before going further, let us make it clear that we do not blame the masterful Man-spirit, although most of the wrong is due to his tyranny—not either in our babes nor in the world. You cannot steer a boat unless it has way on it; you cannot teach a horse his paces unless he will go; and you can make nothing of a human character unless it has boldness and adventure and skill, and a desire for conquest. Missionaries tell us that the cruel North American Indian and the crafty Chinese make far better and nobler converts than the inhabitants of some of the Pacific Islands, where people live like tropic birds in a cage, the bread-fruit always supplying food, and with no enemies. There is no need to fight with soil, or climate, or beast, or fellow-man, and life is idyllic idleness. Such tribes become hopeless. Better fight with the wrong thing than not fight at all. Remember the first command given to man, before he tastes of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, before the Conscience is born within, before there is any recognised distinction between Right and Wrong. It runs, “Replenish the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over every living thing.” It was a tremendous task set him by his Creator, and on the whole he has bravely and diligently answered it: he has subdued, not merely the animals—taming some and exterminating others—but he has subjugated the vast impersonal forces of Nature, air for the sails of ships and mills, fire, water, and their powerful child, steam; even lightning is brought down and tamed into electricity, giving us light and voice and tramlines. There are scores of other inventions which combine to make life more comfortable and more effective, and I pray you to remember that man has made these conquests unaided and alone, and that woman has

given no help at all. She seems to have no power of invention. Weapons of war do not interest her, but, mark you, she did not invent the weaving loom or the sewing machine, which touch her own life so closely; and if we turn to the most congenial themes, we find her seldom among the composers of music and writers of poetry. That part of her brain seems to be left out, and hardly one thing, from the safety-pin of the Celtic barrows to the fountain-pen of to-day, owes its existence to her.

Where, then, is her supremacy? Where is the region where she leads? It is outside the world of matter altogether, and is in the world of the heart and the soul, showing itself in protection, patience, hope and love. Her sovereignty has its dim dawn in the instinctive care of the babe, which is a sacrifice of the ease and pleasure of the stronger life for the service of the weaker life. This God-given instinct is clearly seen in the character of all the higher animals as well: in the world of the dog, the cat, the sheep, the horse and the rabbit, and the rest of our friends, paternity is morally non-existent, and the whole burden falls on the mother. We may sum it up by saying that the Man-principle fights for his own present life, to make it stronger, wider, happier; while the Woman-principle fights for the life of another, for something blind, weak, helpless, that does not know its own interests. She works for the future rather than for the present, and in the long period of protective compassion, true love is at last born within her, love that "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," love that "never faileth."

This love at first is very narrow, being limited to her own child, and that only for the years of dependence, as we may see in the savage mother; but, by the good hand of our God over us, it expands and ramifies to every outpost and corner of life. From this one ancestral love springs all the sweetness of communal society where the strong stand back for the weak, and all kinds of loyalty and patriotism, and all sympathy with sickness, suffering and poverty, and, at last, all world-wide philanthropy. When the Woman spirit, the Mother-spirit, is firmly fixed, it is, as time goes on, inherited by the sons as well as by the daughters, and you have that noble being—the sympathetic, generous, beneficent man. At last Eve is fully created within, for the Man-spirit is conscious that there is a superior force in the world to that of mere muscular strength or of cunning inventions: the force of gentleness, sweetness and affection; and

both his great gifts—force and skill—bow down at her feet and become the willing, grateful and laborious servants of her one superiority—love. Man creates toy after toy and glories in them, but there is a side of his nature that is not satisfied even by aeroplanes and wireless telegraphy, and then he comes to the Woman to help him toward the ideal, and to supply the wants of the starving heart of loneliness which lives on amid the fair circle of creation. Might of all crude and obvious kinds yields to the Right of altruism, with its two great executives—Justice and Love. Might is a means, but Right is an end.

I have been a long while in reaching the course of history in this subject, which is, I understand, the theme allotted to me ; but as the lines of the Nursery and of Geographical distribution run closely parallel to those of Historical development, I hope the time given to them has not been wasted.

When the light of History dawns in written records and carvings, we find certain nations already in possession of the world. There are Nineveh and Babylon, dreadful old tyrannies of brute force ; there is Phenicia, the nation of commerce, and Egypt, the land of buildings and agriculture, where the huge works of the drainage of the Delta of the Nile can be traced back to 4000 B.C. Then springs up Greece, beautiful Greece, the mother of art and of thought ; and later again Rome, the executive of the world ; and, running through them all like a thread of gold, the story of Israel, the one channel of true religion. There are many more lesser nations, but, like Assyria, they are all military, spreading destruction around them. Of their inner life, of their women, we know nothing, as they thought nothing was worth recording but battles and thefts. The Man-spirit is seen at its crudest and worst, and as all merely military nations are doomed by the hand of God to perish, so we have nothing but mounds of ruin, and their life is gone from us for ever.

The first two nations of which we know the domestic life, are quiet and constructive Egypt and Phenicia the mother of barter and commerce. Now commerce is good and is highly civilising, for it brings in its train shipbuilding, navigation, coinage and even (so they tell us) the construction of the alphabet, and the general improvement of life, lifting it above the barren existence of the savage. Phenicia had ports and colonies all round the Mediterranean, and was likely to be the agent of much good, but one black blot ruined everything, and that was

her religion. Most ancient religions consisted of mere ceremonial, as we know from the full records of ancient Greece and Rome, and had no connection with moral conduct—if you cared to learn about that you must leave Religion and go to Philosophy—but Phenicia alone of all nations appealed to the worst lusts of human nature and organised them into a system and spread them wherever her ships touched shore. The degradation was unspeakable. The Hittites, Jebusites, Hivites and others were all tribes from Phenicia, and through the whole course of the Old Testament we have hints and horrible allusions to the wickedness of their groves and idols. Baal and Ashtaroth, Moloch and Dagon reigned supreme, but we did not realise how utterly immoral was their life until about thirty years ago, when their carvings and pictures were discovered at Gnosso. For the first time in the history of the world women figure largely in their art, and their whole story, rows and rows of them, is licentiousness. There is one single figure in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, doubtless not the worst, and yet one cannot look at it. Here in Phenicia is real vice, such as the Creator of all nations will not endure. The rotten apple must be cut out, lest it should infect all the rest.

This was effected in many stages, but it was done perfectly. First, we have the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. God had no servants through whom to work, so he worked direct by sending a terrible volcanic cataclysm, and the Cities of the Plain lie buried for ever under the bitter waters of the Dead Sea. Too bad to be looked at, the only monument is the glare of burning Sodom, which gleams through our Bible from the first book to the last.

Next, our God brought against them the hardy, desert-trained bands of Israel under Joshua's leadership, and on the very hills where the worst religion in the world was practised, He established the purest and best: He, the only Deity who cared for goodness and purity in His worshippers, took the land of sin and made it "The Holy Land."

But the capital, Tyre, still flourished and (585 B.C.) the heathen king, Nebuchadnezzar, came against it and then blow after blow came on it, like a hammer, from Persia and from others, until (about 332 B.C.) Alexander the Great burned all the shipping, massacred all the male inhabitants, and Tyre and Sidon were "scraped like the top of a rock." Read Ezekiel xxvii and xxviii, one of the finest historical documents ever penned, and see

how the prophet bewails the lost glories and yet justifies God in the destruction and desolation He deals out to vice. Even so, Phenicia was not quite done with, for the colony, Carthage, was more splendid than Tyre. You all know the story of Cato and his reiterated "*Carthago delenda est,*" and how the austere and lordly Roman was brought against them and finally wiped them out. *That* is the verdict of God on such evil. It took 1500 years to effect, but it was done at last.

Turn to Egypt. Among the thousands of pictures of social life, you find order and decency. You may see here and there gangs of slaves working under the cruel knout, but no representation of moral evil; therefore Egypt has been punished, but not destroyed.

To Greece we owe almost every good thing we possess, except religion. Israel alone was entrusted with the gem of the ring, the priceless treasure of the knowledge of God, but Athens gave us philosophy, poetry, art, civic freedom, and all the treasures of cultivation (except Science) which make life sweet to us. But, alas, Athens was not good in household relations, and sometimes we wish that we did not know so much about her. On the one hand we have detailed and most beautiful characters given us, such as Antigone and Electra, the very incarnations for all time of fidelity and loyalty, showing at any rate what the ideal was for a woman. It is always the same story of courage in the cause of the right and endurance undismayed by death. But on the other hand the domestic life was bad. I am afraid that the total verdict of the nobler men would be that of Hippolytus in the *Phædra*, where he says that women are the authors of all the real evils of life, all the biting, degrading evils; and that he wished the gods would propagate the race on some other plan; how nice it would be, he says, if a man might go to their temples and beg for a little son to teach and to train and to bear his name when he was dead! To look back over such a history is, alas, a sight to make us women ashamed.

Rome we know from its very foundation, the one great virile nation of the world, having the force, the wisdom and the justice of an experienced man. Remarkably austere and pure to begin with, a rod in the hand of God to chastise the loose and self-indulgent lands, and then corrupted by nearly a thousand years of unmitigated success, and sinking to a dissolution so horrible that it filled the whole civilised world with its decay, and had to be swept off the earth by the hordes of the comparatively clean and strong barbarians.

Lastly, we have the history of Israel touching nation after nation in turn, from burning Sodom, through Egypt, Assyria, Persia, right down to the full power of Rome, as seen in the Acts of the Apostles. Under the Great Theocracy women fared infinitely better than they did anywhere else in the world. In all the lands we have passed in review, she was exploited by pitiless man, either as temporary plaything or permanent slave, both being conditions where advance is impossible; in Israel alone she was honoured. All the nation in all its functions was to be holy unto the Lord, and the maiden of the chosen people, the faithful wife, the exultant mother, was held in high respect all through their story. The time had not yet come for anything but reserve and quiet, but that is necessary while the beautiful fruit is maturing. The glimpses of evil and frivolity we have recorded here and there seem to be entirely due to contact with the tribes of Phenicia. Read Isaiah iii, 16-26, and see the fashions of the day: every detail can, I believe, be identified from the pictures at Gnossos.

There is one most charming glimpse of the ordinary social life of the Old Testament, and that, curiously enough, is not in the Old Testament, but in the New. St. Luke has the spirit of the true historian, and he opens his marvellous narrative with scenes of Israel's normal and quiet life. We used to think that the gap after Malachi was spiritually empty, but now we know it was very full. Idolatry at last was banished, cured by the Captivity; the Synagogue, established by Ezra, taught the mass of the people, the scribes multiplied copies of the Law and the Prophets, and the result is seen in the Psalter, the very crown and blossom of Israel's inner life, of which a large proportion was written at this time. Old as David or even Moses, new as the personal experience of men of that day, men we shall never know, all are edited together in the splendid hymn-book of Israel, the prayer-book and praise-book of the world.

A conquered State, a decadent Church, and yet how beautiful is the picture given! We are accustomed to think of Pharisaism as a malign influence, cramping and tyrannical as Rome before the Reformation, but in both cases the written Creed remained, and obscure and devout souls could live out their lives in communion with God and in great beauty of humility. St. Luke introduces us to six people living thus—Zacharias and Elizabeth, Joseph and Mary, Simeon and Anna, and all have the same characteristics, just, devout, righteous, blameless, good; of

the six, three are women, and these are fully as prominent as the men. Now of this retired little company, four added new Psalms to our Psalter, and again two of these are written by women—Elizabeth comes first and is “filled with the Holy Ghost.” Her hymn is not suitable for public singing, but Mary’s glorious *Magnificat*, Zachariah’s beautiful *Benedictus*, and Simeon’s *Nunc Dimittis*, are in unforgotten use among us. Such a glimpse into the hidden life of Israel speaks volumes to us, for doubtless there were many more like these.

At last the Sun arose, radiant, glorious, the Sun of righteousness with healing in His Wings, healing every sore of the world, and, therefore, among them the great, radical, far-reaching one of the position of women.

I am not going into the details of our Lord’s life with regard to His remarkable relation to women. You can hear in sermons about the ambitious mother and the weeping Magdalene, the active Martha and the Mystic Mary, and how women never said a single unkind thing to or about our Saviour, as the men so cruelly did, but were faithful to Him throughout—“last at the cross and earliest at the grave.” These things are often told and I leave them, save to point out two very short incidents.

When men are dying they make their will and leave their library or any treasure they possess by name to the person who will value it most. Our Lord Jesus had only one precious thing to leave behind Him, and that was His mother. In the midst of the stupendous task of bearing the sin of the world, a task that produced the storm of pain we see in Gethsemane and the prolonged agony of Calvary, He turns aside for a single minute to leave His one treasure to the man who would most love and cherish her. That is an example of the perfection of His private relation; now for the public relation. Once, pointing to the crowd of disciples, the material out of which His Church was to be made, He said, “The same is my brother, and my sister, and my mother.” The idea of the brethren is often repeated, but here, added to that, we have the pure, friendly, brotherly affection for the girl and the sweet deference to the older woman; these, He said, are to be constant elements in His Church. The son may know a hundred times more than his mother—that is not the point; it is faithful, self-denying love that is to be thus honoured. When we think of what Christ has done for us as women, it seems a shame that every woman who has heard the Gospel story should not be His devoted follower! To my mind,

the man who is a Christian is the more of a hero. He has difficulties that do not suggest themselves to us, both in body and mind. He may weigh the claims of Christ to be the Light of the whole World, he may find His rule of purity almost impossibly strict, but the woman has another weight in the scale and should listen to His elevating and consoling words, and kneel and kiss His feet. I think on the whole we do.

Let us now leave the sermons and endeavour to understand the great principles laid down for all time for our guidance. The aim of God is our perfection, but the progress is necessarily slow, for, once having created us with a Free-will, He will not force its obedience, but waits until it chooses to follow His leading. Even Omnipotence can only persuade. Once created free, we are free to commit spiritual suicide and to reject the offers of eternal life. This being granted, it is evident that we must not come down on such a living will like a hammer, not appeal to the bare bedrock of authority, but must have principles given us, which, illuminated by the Spirit of God, will by degrees enlighten our minds and capture our wills for good. Even the terrific splendour of Sinai was only for immaturity, only of use in the childhood of the world, and the prophets, and still more urgently the Gospel, restate the Law of God in terms of love and entreaty.

The civilised ancient world (for we do not here count the savages) was ruled by three great fundamental errors: *First*, that one nation was inherently better than another. Look at the proud isolation of the Jew in matters of religion, remember the contempt of the Athenian for the whole world of "barbarians," think of the quiet majesty of being able to say "Civis Romanus sum." Outside races like these there was no one worth considering.

Secondly, That one social rank was inherently better than another. The world was quite naturally divided into two: masters born to rule and slaves born to obey; these were people with no rights, no choice, no personal existence, but who are merely extra hands and feet to their rulers.

Thirdly, that one sex was inherently better than the other, that women were so obviously inferior in force of muscle and skill of brain, that anyone could see they existed solely for the comfort of men and the propagation of the race. Cared for, of course, like cattle, even looked on with some compassion, but not as possessing genuine independent wills to win and

souls to save. That was absurd. Women were indispensable adjuncts, not whole personalities.

Turn now to Gal. iii, 28, and read, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." In one short text we have three blows of a sledge-hammer dealt out by the Spirit of God, one blow for each lie that ruled unquestioned in the whole world of antiquity. There they stand, and, to change the metaphor, we may describe them as three seeds of eternal truth dropped into the soil of the human mind and left there to germinate; the coming out into blossom has been slow, very slow.

If we take St. Paul as our exponent and leader in practical Christianity we never go far wrong. Let us see how he dealt, clause by clause, with these great principles.

(1) "There is neither Jew nor Greek." Here he is fighting a limitation of the Gospel of Christ not to be endured for an hour. It would ruin the whole effort as a world-wide redemption, and, next to preaching personal salvation and holiness, St. Paul gave his life to this one great truth. He nearly died for it several times, for if you look at the causes of his suffering you will find them generally due to this conviction. He persevered and he attained at last. This proclamation could not wait.

(2) "There is neither bond nor free." This truth could wait. The very early Church consisted in great measure of Greek-speaking slaves scattered among Roman citizens, and St. Paul again and again bids them be content with their position. To us it is a shocking thought that he went to stay with Philemon in a large house full of slaves without a word of intercession for their freedom; but so it was. You can serve God as well in the one position as in the other, and there is no need to fret. The idea of the freedom of all men was enunciated, but, as it was not essential to salvation, the seed germinated very slowly. For us English it required eighteen centuries: on August 1st, 1833, Britain washed her hands free of slavery and America followed suit thirty years later.

(3) "There is neither male nor female." The other two clefts were of man's making, but this one is the making of God, permanent, inevitable, insuperable, and therefore far more difficult than the others to establish in all justice. How can it be done?

St. Paul has often been called a misogynist, but if you look at the mission field of to-day you will understand every one of his

severe regulations. Remember, he was not a settled parson and preacher, but a pioneer missionary, always breaking new ground, and then see how wise are his rules and suggestions. When we enter a foreign land as the ambassadors of Christ, it is fully as important to learn the customs and the etiquette of that land as it is to learn the language. Where they are foolish and hindering, they will in time drop off of themselves, but in the meantime they must be carefully obeyed. We all know the wearying ceremonial and self-depreciation of Japanese courtesy and the many difficulties of caste in India. Only one Mission have I seen first hand and that is the one to the Kaffirs of South Africa. For some weeks I lived in mud and wattle huts with the missionaries, and even there I was greatly struck with the care taken to preserve etiquette. The Kaffir woman may not enter the Kraal through the men's wide door, but has a narrow door in another place; and there are a dozen more hindrances to their freedom, all based on custom. Were the missionaries to say, "How senseless is the Kaffir door, the Egyptian veil, the seclusion of the Zenana," there would soon be an end of their Missions. Now think of the Corinthian women St. Paul had to deal with. Here was the spirit of Phenicia indeed: we know all about them, rouged and powdered, a mass of flimsy falsities without and of chattering frivolity within, and for my part I think St. Paul was brave to admit them to the Church at all. He did, and he sent them out on errands of mercy, and every one of his restraints is an outcome of the necessities of the time. As soon as women were better trained, the restraints may vanish. In the world of the soul he places no restrictions. When he flies to the highest height in Ephesians or Colossians, he does not hint, "This is for men only," but expects equal courage, equal insight, equal devotion to the death from both sexes. Once open the door into the world of the Spirit and to Him, and to all His true followers, "there is neither male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus."

Let us now turn to quite modern times. Throughout all centuries and nations and tribes, experience shows us that where women are given liberty and respect and where they approximate to man in education and in decision of character, that country is noble; and where they widely diverge and set up a life and code of their own, that country is base. I think myself they have somewhat separate temptations, the man toward the flesh and the woman toward

the world, and, therefore, it is only when the two draw together and the man becomes pure and the woman brave that a very beautiful society is formed, and at last friendship is possible between the sexes, without the intrusion of that excitement which indicates the approach of love. The Society of Friends has set us a noble example in these directions.

Education is an immense force in the world, second to Christianity, but second to nothing else whatever. The share that we women have had of late in this splendid field has raised us to our right position at last. We need balance, courage, judgment, accuracy, discrimination; we need a spice of peril and a choice in our repudiation of the false and misleading, and all these good things are given by education. I have been able to watch the progress of this movement from the very first, because, leaving a thoroughly Conservative home, I became one of the earliest students at Girton College, Cambridge. I entered in 1872, when the whole cause was a subject of amused contempt, if not even of strong aversion and hostility. I have watched the movement carefully and can tell you of a hundred beneficial effects that have flowed from the one effort. It is a revolution in the world of thought of immense value, it is strong and wide, yet it was accomplished very quietly. Never was there a fire lighted with less smoke. Point after point has been won till at last we are true citizens of the State.

When the vote was first proposed, rather over forty years ago, I was easily convinced it was an act of justice, and yet I held back strongly. "We are not fit for it; we should do harm; give us first a whole generation of education and good hard work in national directions." The generation has passed. We are barely ready, but our work during the war has proved that we do deserve it, and the six million votes are added to the electorate.

Here, then, we stand to-day and our position is noble. We were created by God to be the exponent of all love and patience and fidelity; enfranchised by Christ to take our due share in His work, gifted with the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (for that fact is especially noted), and now we are socially set free that all the work we can do, we may do. We are one with men in the world of the soul, and yet we so differ in mental structure that we are the complement the one of the other, like the two halves of a bivalve shell, and they look to us to lead towards the ideal. Our cause is not two, but one, for in the sight of our Maker we stand and fall together.

“ For she that out of Lethe scales with man
 The shining steps of Nature, shares with man
 His nights, his days, moves with him to one goal,
 Stays all the fair young planet in her hands,—
 If she be small, slight-natured, miserable,
 How shall men grow ? ”

Let me end where I began. Our supreme inheritance is the children, the world of the immediate future. The whole of Immaturity lies in our hands, and first impressions are strongest. The man makes the aeroplane and discovers the bacteria of disease, but we make the man who does these things : we make him, body, mind and soul. The man is the best General, Admiral, Legislator, Magistrate, Lawyer, Explorer, Inventor, and almost all else. I feel no hesitation in saying he is far the best ; but the woman forms the principles on which all these rulers respectively work. *Man rows, but Woman steers.* Man gives the hard work and the whole round world is his heritage to shape and govern, but Woman moulds the men who rule it, and is ever hoping that the next generation will be wiser, nobler, better than the present one. We may indeed say that Man has what is, but Woman has what will be. The whole store of her thoughts and hopes lies always just beyond the blue horizon, out in the unknown, and if the woman is a Christian, that means that she looks toward the ideal of Christ, to *what ought to be* rather than to *what is*. Man represents the solid and practical, and Woman the vague but bright ideal, that she hardly knows how to realise.

It is evident that they ought to live together and work hand in hand, but convention, reasonably enough, makes things difficult, and it is my experience that, whether singly or in communities, Eve lives alone better than does Adam. She must have plenty of work and of outside interests to keep her from petty quarrelling, and then she does nobly. Some lead and some follow, and there is much true love, and much faithful and generous help. My personal experiences have been very happy here. Adam does not fare so well. He may have very hard work, world-wide interests, and good companionships, and yet a kind of lack is ever present with him, and the Divine verdict is proved true, that “ it is not good that man should be alone.” A reason for his labour is needed, an ultimate end to live and die for, for life to a true man is not worth living unless there is something for which he may unhesitatingly fling it away. All his contrivances are uninteresting without this motive in the background of them

all. He wants exactly what she can give, and he begins to starve without it: the appraiser of right, the sympathiser in perplexity, the blamer of hardness, the consoler in misfortune, the peacemaker in contention, the patient waiter during hope deferred, the brightness of his joy, the star of hope amid the clouds of despair, the very hearth-stone of his being and the home of his soul—how can he live without her?

Here, then, we stand. Adam can and does subdue the earth, but Eve proves herself "the mother of all living." Her work is the one in the world that most nearly resembles that of the Creator Himself, the forming, training, upholding and guiding of real living independent wills. The actual mother comes first.

"Happy he
With such a mother! Faith in womankind
Beats with his blood, and trust in all things high
Comes easy to him."

Yet she does not stand alone, for my experience is that she tends to confine her efforts and ambitions to her own flock, and this is not enough. Our children at first belong to the family, but as they grow on they become also the Children of the Nation, the priceless heritage of the country at large. In these complex stages it is the unmarried women who can devote to them their whole time and energy. Every true woman is an instinctive mother: she knows a delight in healthy, happy childhood that at times amounts to rapture, and she bears with the *Age of Chatter* (which succeeds to the *Age of Self-will*) as no man can be expected to do. In the *Age of Silence*, with its hidden intense aversions and its bold unpractical ambitions, she is equally at home, as comforter and encourager. The whole range of Immaturity is hers. My own lot has lain in the final stage, among girls between 18 and 23, and truly it is a beautiful heritage. Often well-instructed but unformed, the fuel ready but the match not struck, standing on the threshold of life and still in hesitation. Then it is that,

"Like the swell of some sweet tune,
Morning rises into noon,
May glides onward into June,"

and they leave college ready to take up the immense responsibilities of womanhood.

The lad and the girl are our God-given material, material nobler and more delicate, and more permanent than

any other. Here in faithful and often unnoticed work, we can write deep into the heart of our Country, and inspire the whole world as no one else can. We write deep, but we do not sign our names to what we write, as the men do! We are the Mothers of the Nation, and through the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that is the highest vocation of which it is possible to conceive.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD): We have all been much delighted with Miss Maynard's paper, which marks a high standard of thought and feeling. As we should like a good discussion I will content myself with a very few brief remarks.

On p. 30 I note that it is said that the principle amongst little children that "Might is Right" is not wrong. I venture to suggest that what Miss Maynard would convey is that "the man-spirit" (in the child) "claiming his inheritance" is not wrong.

That "Might is Right" is a lie, we all know, and for years we have suffered and bled to prove it so. Moreover, on p. 33, line 10, Miss Maynard points out that one is but "a means," and the other "an end," and that Might is not Right. What is right is beautifully brought out on p. 31.

I think no man would have the courage to have made the statement on p. 32 that women "have no power of invention": in the face of many thousands of patents taken out by them, may we not qualify this a little? The fact, however, that the best cooks, musicians, and dressmakers are men certainly strengthens Miss Maynard's position, and is most remarkable.

Lower down on p. 32 we get the great principle that while man "fights for his own present life" woman "looks for the future," a point of enormous importance that is fully dealt with by Benjamin Kidd in his last work, *The Science of Power*. There can be no doubt that our ideals are changing. We are far indeed from the time when the typical "John Bull" had any resemblance to a typical Englishman, and to me it is quite clear that as civilization advances, the typical man and woman tend more and more in many ways to resemble each other. Our Lord was, as we know, "born of a woman," and students have long observed that the characteristics revealed in the Gospels are rather those of typical

humanity than of the typical masculine ; and there can be no doubt that with the spread of Christianity what I may call human characteristics are slowly replacing the purely masculine.

Still the truth on p. 43 will ever stand, that while Adam can and does "subdue the earth," Eve is ever "the mother of all living," and as Miss Maynard so beautifully concludes her most admirable paper, women "write deep, but do not sign their names to what they write as men do"; but in the lives of our great men their noble mothers see the fruit of their labours. There is no fear for England so long as the principles embodied in this paper are the principles and aims of the women of our country, and the value of such ideals cannot be over-estimated in the present crisis.

Lt.-Col. MACKINLAY said : I rise to propose a hearty vote of thanks to Miss Maynard for the great assistance she has given to the Victoria Institute.

Noticing the immense help which our women have given to the nation in time of war, the Council determined to enlist their aid for the Victoria Institute more fully in the times before us, and Miss Maynard has well responded to their invitation. We gratefully remember that a few ladies in the past have read papers to us, notably Mrs. Maunder and Mrs. Lewis, the discoverer of the Sinaitic palimpsest, but we hope in the future that the number of lady readers will be largely increased and that many will follow the good lead which Miss Maynard has given at the beginning of this new era.

Now that the war is, we trust, practically finished, the prospects of the Institute are bright, and many will turn with gladness to the important subjects which we consider.

We again thank Miss Maynard for her paper given to us at a time when the claims of womanhood are beginning to be appreciated.

The Rev. JAMES THOMAS associated himself with the previous speakers in their expressions of appreciation of the value and beauty of the paper. Yet he wished to offer two or three criticisms upon it.

On p. 34 it is stated that "most ancient religions consisted of mere ceremonial . . . and had no connection with moral conduct." Such is not the case with the oldest of the religions of China, *i.e.* so-called Confucianism.

On p. 35 the writer states that "among the thousands of pictures of the social life (of Egypt) you find order and decency," but "no

representation of moral evil." Those who know the sculptures and pictures of the Temple of Luxor, not to mention others, will be unable to endorse that statement.

The very word "family" witnesses to what Christianity has done for women. "Familia," to the ear of a Roman, even when Rome was in the glory of her power, meant a dwelling with a multitude of idle, corrupt and corrupting slaves, ready for any treachery and reeking with every vice. It meant a despot who could kill his slaves when they were old and expose his children when they were born. It meant matrons among whom virtue was rare, divorces frequent, and re-marriage easy. To Christianity our great word "family" owes all that makes it beautiful and sweet.

In setting forth the position of woman among the Jews Miss Maynard has wholly overlooked the fact that polygamy was common and concubinage allowed, both of which are forbidden in Christian lands.

Lt.-Col. ALVES said: On p. 36 is an allusion to "one most charming glimpse of the ordinary social life of the Old Testament, and that, curiously enough, is not in the Old Testament, but in the New." But in the Old Testament we have, notably, three such glimpses—that of Jephthah's daughter, of Ruth, and of Abigail—all showing that the women of Israel had considerable freedom, and were not bound by the restraints of the harem.

But the chief point to which I would draw attention is the remark, on pp. 38 and 39, regarding the supposed "three great fundamental errors," viz., the superiority (1) of one nation to another, (2) of one social rank to another, and (3) of one sex to the other, concerning which the reader quotes Gal. iii, 28: ". . . neither Jew nor Greek . . . neither bond nor free . . . neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

It is evident, however, that this passage refers solely to their spiritual position "in Christ Jesus"; for we find the distinctions still remaining, the first two in the millennium, the last in this age also.

The Old Testament is full of allusions to the supremacy of Israel in the millennium, a supremacy, however, which may be shared by Gentiles who choose it, submitting to the ceremonial law (Ezek. xlvii, 22-23). Gentile nations must send representatives to

Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles (Zech. xiv, 16-19), and on these the rite of circumcision will be enforced (Ezek. xliv, 6-9).

From Joel iii, 1-8, we learn that slavery, as a punishment, will be enforced in the millennium.

In 1 Tim. ii, 11-12, an epistle written some years later than that to the Galatians, we read: "Let (the) woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over (the) man, but to be in silence."

From these passages we see that the passage quoted in Galatians refers solely to the spiritual condition of believers, who in other places are constantly referred to proleptically as if they were already in the resurrection condition.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS desired to record his protest against the lecturer's statement, on p. 40, that the restrictions on women imposed in St. Paul's Epistles were transitory. He considered St. Paul's words as having his Master's authority, and referred to his saying, "Doth not even nature herself teach you?" as proving that the distinction between the sexes in the Christian community were intended to be permanent.

He considered that the lecturer's quotation from the Galatian Epistle referred exclusively to what was to be spiritually realised.

He instanced the message sent by the risen Lord to his disciples by Mary Magdalene, "Go tell my brethren, I ascend to my Father and your Father," etc., as showing the important part women had in the Church, for this message was the Magna Charta of our Christian blessing.

Mr. W. HOSTE sends the following remarks: I have read Miss Maynard's illuminating paper with the greatest interest. It affords quite a liberal education on the question to a mere man. I cannot help feeling, however, that her historical survey and philosophy of things are better based than her Scriptural exegesis. I entirely agree with her estimate, on p. 39, of the teaching of the apostle Paul, only I would leave out the "far" and read "we never go wrong," for he claims that "the things he writes are the commandments of the Lord" (1 Cor. xiv, 37). I cannot, moreover, find any hint that he understood his teaching, on the relations of the sexes, to be temporary. He grounds them on two historical facts unaffected by the lapse of time—the priority of man in Creation, and the

priority of woman in the Fall (1 Tim. ii, 13, 14). The passage in Galatians, referred to at length on p. 39, deals with the position "in Christ Jesus" of all believers, not at all with their relations in the world, nor even with their place "in ecclesiâ," as a reference to 1 Cor. xi, 3-15 and 1 Tim. ii, 8-12, shows. There we see hierarchical distinction fully recognized: "the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man." When, too, we read of slavery in the Bible, is it necessary to read into it the abominations of the African slave trade, as carried on by whites and Arabs? Would it not be more assimilated to the mild form of household slavery practised by the natives themselves, which one has come in contact with when travelling in Central Africa, where the slave is treated as one of the family, and sometimes owns land and cattle, and, "mirabile dictu," even in some cases, I believe, slaves himself? Otherwise it would seem strange that the apostle should have to *exhort* a Christian slave to take his freedom, if the occasion presented itself (1 Cor. vii, 21).

MR. SIDNEY COLLET sends the following: The Lecturer has spoken of the "education" of girls in general; and at the foot of p. 43 says: "They leave college ready to take up the immense responsibilities of womanhood."

Now, is that really so? My experience is that girls, generally speaking, when they leave such colleges, are really much better fitted to become teachers in other schools (for which indeed their education has qualified them) than to assume the responsibilities of a wife and a mother. What domestic training have they had in the way of household work, cooking, and the care of little children, etc.? It is surely the lack of this practical womanly training, of which the Lecturer has said nothing at all, which so often produces—not wives and mothers—but what is colloquially called "Blue Stockings."

Another, and even more serious lack, I could not help noticing in the Lecture, is the absence of any insistence upon the importance of definite Christian training, on Bible lines, in our colleges. It is well known that in most of the colleges for men (even the theological ones) the Bible, as the inspired Word of God, is increasingly discredited; and it is somewhat disappointing that Miss Maynard should not have brought this vitally important matter into

prominence, in a Lecture on the influence of Christianity upon women.

Miss MAYNARD wished to express her strong sense of the courtesy with which she had been treated. Her father had joined the Victoria Institute almost at its inception—she believed about 1867—and in her childhood she had heard it spoken of with great respect. Naturally she had felt some trepidation on being invited to read a paper before such an audience, but her fears had been wholly allayed by the kindness she had received. At the same time, through all the personal courtesy, she did not think some of her actual words had been fairly treated. She said :

My old friend, Dr. Schofield, seems to be intentionally misunderstanding my words—a thing he has never done before ! If you read the context, you will see that the words “ Might is Right ” are *not* quoted with approbation, but rather to show how faulty and evil are the unchecked instincts of human nature, as shown even in our nurseries.

In some of the subsequent criticisms a good deal that I could not endorse springs from the single fact that the speakers evidently hold the Catastrophic Method of Creation, while I hold that the Evolutional Method is proclaimed by the Bible as well as by Nature, and that the story of the inception and growth of the individual and the race run parallel, and this not only physically but as regards the development of character.

One criticism alone I should like to answer, and that is from one who evidently has had no opportunity of knowing about the college education of women for the past forty years. There was a time, I know, somewhere between 1870 and 1880, when it was feared that such a training would unfit women for married life—but have those fears been justified ? I have known some hundreds of such students, and should say they were distinctly nobler in aim and more skilful in practice than the girls trained only at home.

Whether married or unmarried, with the right education we go out into the world as “ Mothers,” for that is our supreme vocation. At college we may hear lectures on “ Citizenship,” or on “ Childhood and Adolescence,” or “ The Psychology of Attention,” or other such themes that prove very important in training both children and servants, and in any case we learn much of public spirit and of

even-handed justice—both of these, alas, plants not indigenous to our peculiar soil!—and start household life with some of the “larger virtues,” in which the old-fashioned mother was apt to be deficient; and this through no fault of her own, but through never having had her reason expanded and her judgment rendered sound by appropriate exercise. Admirable as a mother for the child of five or six, she was perfectly helpless before the problems, the perversities, the conceits and temptations that beset us at fifteen and sixteen. Now, not only may her love be counted on, but also her help in judgment; and as years go on the sad excuse, “But mother doesn’t *know*,” will be heard less and less from our schoolboys and girls. Such is my experience.

On one point alone do I ask your pardon for an omission, and that is, not emphasising the necessity for full and definite Christian teaching not only at school but at college. I almost thought this was unnecessary, but I see it was not. I have made it my one aim in life; amid much laughter and some opposition I started to give the efforts of a lifetime to one endeavour, *i.e.*, to unite the two strongest forces in the world, Christianity and Education. My Principalship of thirty-one years has borne some witness to this effort in the noble body of missionaries, teachers, and “mothers” sent out to labour for the extension of the Kingdom of Heaven.

THE 605TH ORDINARY MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3RD, 1919,
AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc.,
IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed.

Mr. A. W. OKE (in the absence of the Hon. Secretary, Mr. Sewell, on account of illness) announced the election of two Associates, Miss A. C. Knox and Mrs. Harry Barker.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF BISHOP BUTLER. By the Rev.
HERBERT J. R. MARSTON, M.A., Rector of Lydford-on-
Fosse, Somerset, and sometime Fellow of the University
of Durham.

ENGLISH life during the first thirty years of the eighteenth century was in its moral and intellectual aspects dreary and sterile in the extreme. Faith had dwindled ; Morality was low ; Zeal was no more, except for a few fanaticisms in politics and churchmanship.

The nation, weary of strife, glad of security under a firm and tolerant government, addressed itself to the task of becoming opulent and comfortable. The Church, administered by a bench of bishops most of whom were mere placemen tinctured with the irreligion of the Whigs, and some of whom were frankly heterodox, dozed dully among the ruins of her creed and the neglect of her people, heedless of the past and of the responsibilities of the future.

Throughout this period the influence of Sir Robert Walpole was dominant in our public life. By the unscrupulous use of corruption he abolished Parliamentary opposition, and almost abolished Parliament itself. Profane and jovial in private life, and without any sense of political virtue, he nevertheless guided the destinies of the country with extraordinary skill and success ;

and at length relinquished power in 1745, leaving a tranquil and contented people to regret his reign and to reap the fruits of his long dissemination of the doctrines of political depravity.

In literature the influences of Swift and Pope were paramount, and in philosophy the doctrines of the Deists held the field. Happily the universal torpor which spread over the English mind was the torpor of a long winter, and not the chill of death. Brighter days were in store. Forces of renewal were latent. The surface of society was encrusted with the evil influences, but beneath were secretly at work those powers which at last, bursting through the superincumbent mass, once more clothed the life of England with the flowers and fruits of purity, enthusiasm, and sincere religion.

It is not the part of this paper to inquire in any length into the causes of this state of affairs. Yet a few suggestions are not out of place.

One cause was undoubtedly the reaction against the repulsive austerities of Puritanism. The Puritans, after rendering great services to the liberties and the religion of England, had pushed their less important and useful tenets to a violent and ludicrous extreme. *Hudibras* exhibits a caricature of these extravagances, but it lets us see how the austerity and insincerity of many Puritan professors impressed a man who, to great acuteness of observation and penetration of analysis, added qualities of a less reputable order.

For a time, and only for a time, the nation forgot what it owed to the virtue, consistency, and magnanimity of men like Hampden and Baxter, and remembered only the old and grotesque eccentricities of Fifth Monarchy zealots.

Behind this influence lay one more subtle and profoundly mischievous. The Jesuits, who had for more than a century striven to extinguish the Reformation by every instrument at their command, had at last succeeded to such an extent that they had produced throughout Europe a general distrust of the very principles of Christianity and morals. They had identified Christianity with a blind adherence to the dogmas of the Papacy, and had reduced morals to a compliance with a system in which all that was wanted was a consent to be guided by a Jesuit Confessor, who would sanction anything that his penitent asked on the easiest terms. Such a creed and such ethics were inevitably adapted to foster loose conduct and low faith.

To these influences must be added that of the rising spirit of liberty in thought and action, which, though certain in the long run to promote a healthy expansion of the human mind, did at first tend to weaken the hold of men upon doctrines and practices which were generally recommended on the score of antiquity and authority. It was into this England that Butler was born in the year 1692.

Butler was born at Wantage. His parents were of Nonconformist connexions and his first religious impressions were derived from Nonconformists. In course of time he revised his opinions, and having studied at Oxford, took Orders in the Established Church. His writings on philosophy and divinity attracted wide attention, and at last brought him under the notice and favour of Queen Caroline, a lady much addicted to speculation on such subjects.

Partly by her influence, and still more by the weight and power of his own publications, he was raised by steps of preferment till he became Bishop of Bristol, and later was translated to the Palatine See of Durham, where after a short tenure he died in the year 1752.

As an administrator of a diocese Butler was conscientious, diligent, and earnest, although his activities were slow and few, when compared with the miscellaneous and endless work of a modern Bishop. His most notable contribution to the life of the English Church was his celebrated primary charge to the Clergy of Durham, delivered in the year 1751. He took for the topic of that charge the decay of religion in England, and treated it with all his customary seriousness, power, and equity. The Bishop surveys the religious situation of the country and depicts it in gloomy colours. He acknowledges the spread of infidelity, and the prevalence of practical irreligion in all classes. Among other remedies for the evil he strongly recommends the care of the fabrics, greater attention to the externals of worship, more devout and frequent services, and constant instruction of the people in Christian truth.

Under the shelter of his great name some persons have sought to put these things as the primary or even the sole cure for spiritual decay. It may be acknowledged that the Bishop does not make enough of the inward and spiritual forces on which Christianity really depends in the last resort. But to say that Butler was a formalist, or to claim his high authority for making externals the chief matters in religion, is equally absurd and

unjust. He needed certainly the supplement of Methodism, but he must be regarded as the preparer for Wesley, and not as his rival or his adversary.

Perhaps the most important service rendered by Butler to the cause of Christian truth was that which he rendered by the qualities of his heart and mind. These qualities were displayed in his books without ostentation, and were at once felt by a large circle of readers which has only increased with the lapse of time.

I shall consider presently whether his conclusions will stand the test of modern knowledge, and whether his arguments are valid in our day as they were believed to be in his own. But the quality of his mind is a permanent possession—many who do not appreciate his reasonings are affected by his spirit and his temper.

Let me select three of these qualities for special admiration. I take first his openness of mind. Butler was incapable of being one-sided in his thinking. Circumspection was his delight: it was a necessity of his mental being.

He must needs look a subject all round and see it whole. He was, as people say, made that way. Neither the largeness nor the complexity of a subject could daunt him in exploring it. The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth was his maxim, and until he had reached his limit he would not pause or prejudge the matter, and when he had got to the end, so far as he could, he laid down his convictions fearlessly and defended them with vigour and decision.

But this quality of his mind was the product of another, namely, his religious veneration for truth. To see things as they really are, and to impart that knowledge to others, was with him a part of a sacred obligation incumbent on all men and most of all on a Christian minister, charged with the propagation of the Divine Message. And these two qualities composed a third in his mind, which has sometimes been called timidity and sometimes caution, but which I prefer to style sobriety. This inclined him to the method of reasoning which he has made famous—that from analogy.

That method finds support for one thing in another, and is grounded on the common experience of men; and in that experience Butler, a sober and reverent intellect, felt intuitively a generous trust.

We must neither look in Butler for the beauty and eloquence

of Plato, nor for the admirable clearness of J. S. Mill. Yet in philosophical inquiry I believe that Butler exhibited the true temper of the philosopher, shunning both the French rage for lucidity and the German rage for the obscure.

Butler does not try to make a matter clearer than its proper nature admits of its becoming, nor does he care for the elegance of diction in which to clothe what he has to say. Some of his sentences are uncouth; others are difficult to understand. But he tries always to state the case as it really is, and nothing more nor less can pass the severity of his judgment. There are passages of real power in his writings, borne along by an inward inspiration. But he keeps his hand stedfastly on the helm, lest the vessel should ever deviate from the course of verity and rectitude.

This intellectual temper, of which Butler is a grand example, may be called the characteristically English temper. We discern it also in Bacon, Newton, Locke, Darwin, Kelvin. It is accompanied sometimes by a speculative audacity; sometimes by gifts of style; sometimes by remarkable faculty for luminous exposition. But in itself it remains distinct from all these, and its constituents are circumspection, loyalty, and sobriety. We may wish that the great Bishop had had more command of language; that he had allowed some place to poetry, imagination, and ardent emotion; that his fires had sometimes been allowed to burn fiercely, instead of smouldering with regulated and equal heat.

Had these things been in him his books would have been more easily read and more widely read; but they would not have been read with more profit. The absence of these qualities leaves us open all the more to the uninterrupted play of the spirit of the man. We are impressed as we follow his teaching with the same reverence for truth, the same resolve to explore the whole matter, the same patience in suspending judgment till all available evidence has been obtained, and finally, we reach the same strong degree of certitude without which Butler seldom, if ever, left off his investigations.

Butler's philosophy is inseparably connected with three great doctrines. The doctrine of analogy, the doctrine of probability, and the doctrine of human nature.

The *Analogy* is a work of great difficulty, and was said by the younger Pitt to raise more doubts than it solves. In order to estimate it fairly we must take care to see the point of view from

which Butler was writing. He had in view the Deists. This body of thinkers postulated a living God and the immortality of the soul, but they denied the special tenets of Christianity, and the claim that the Bible was a revelation from God. Indeed, they denied that any revelation at all was possible. They rested their specific negations on the alleged difficulties that followed if we allow that Christianity is a revelation. To that contention Butler replied in effect, that the difficulties arising from the belief that Christianity is a revelation supported by miracles, are no greater than the difficulties arising from pain, misery, and the like, if we believe in the moral government of the world by God. The Deists believed in God, despite pain and misery in the world; they ought therefore not to decline to believe in Christianity because of the alleged difficulties caused by miracles.

This celebrated work has exercised an immense influence on many minds. I have heard that it was the book which longest detained the elder Mill from his final rupture with Christian faith. It may, therefore, not improbably have had some indirect effects in bringing the younger Mill to embrace that faith from which for so long a period of his life he was unhappily estranged. It was a favourite book with Mr. Gladstone—a fact of singular interest and significance to the admirers of that extraordinary and versatile statesman. It has passed through many editions, and is still on the list of theological books for most Bishops' ordination reading, and has a place in the philosophical syllabus of the Universities.

I have heard persons declare that Butler is out of date, by which they appear to mean that his argument in the *Analogy* is out of date; for his treatise on human nature can never be out of date till human nature itself is out of date. The objection deserves refutation, not so much on account of its intrinsic force, as for the credit of so eminent a thinker as Bishop Butler.

Those who profess this objection appear to argue thus. Butler's *Analogy* is directed against Deism; Deism does not exist now, therefore Butler's *Analogy* is out of date.

This objection, as I conceive, rests on two fallacies. The first is this, that Deism is dead. I doubt the truth of that proposition. Deism in the exact form in which it existed in Butler's day may have ceased to exist, and its death was probably due in no small degree to the severe damage which it sustained at the hands of its great antagonist. But Deism in forms but

slightly different from its eighteenth-century type is not dead, and never can die until either Christianity ceases to challenge attention, or until all men embrace the claims of Christianity. There will thus always be a place for Butler's great work on the analogy of religion, because difficulties such as he there treats will always recur.

It is further alleged by these critics, that Butler's arguments are of no force against atheism, or against agnosticism, and that atheism and agnosticism are at present the forms of unbelief that hold the field. But even here, something has to be said on the other side.

In the first place I can well believe that an open unbeliever in all religion might be impressed in reading the *Analogy* with the grave and sincere temper of mind which that book breathes, and might feel compelled to acknowledge that such qualities, combined with so much intellectual strength and grasp, constitute a solid argument at least for caution in rejecting the claims of Christianity so admirably defended.

In the second place, to discredit Butler because he does not confute the atheist or the agnostic, is just as foolish and inconclusive as it would be to complain that vaccination does not cure the whooping cough; or to refuse to take quinine for a fever because it does not mend a dislocated limb. Every weapon in the armoury of faith has its value, and none can say how soon or how often each may be required, and the masters of the armour-maker's art, whose gifts have enriched the offensive and defensive resources of the Church, are to be had in everlasting and grateful remembrance.

Butler's doctrine of probability has not found favour with devout and ardent Christians. It has had in their ears a sound of coolness and calculation, which is chilling to the fervour of their faith. I can appreciate the sentiment, but I am sure that it is founded on a misapprehension. It is true that Butler, like most people, even the best of his day, shrank from enthusiasm, and that while he agreed fully with St. Paul in proving all things, he did not quite so fully follow him in the injunction not to quench the Spirit.

Still the probability which Butler relied on in religious argument was a sound element in Christian apologetics. By it he meant that interior confidence which is created by the observation of the steady recurrence of phenomena. This confidence may not amount to that certainty which is produced by formal

demonstration ; nevertheless, it is a real thing, and a thing of real value. It exists everywhere, and is perceptible by all. In moral matters when demonstration is not attainable, this probability becomes an important aid to faith.

The doctrines of Butler about human nature are more interesting to our generation than any other portion of his philosophy. The reason for this is twofold. Psychology has assumed among us an importance far greater than it enjoyed a century and a half ago. The complexion of modern thought is before all things humanitarian, and for both these reasons we take a special and lively concern in all that pertains to the inward frame of man. If Butler's treatment of human nature, compared with that of a writer like Professor William James, seems to us cold and aloof, the impression is true in appearance only. The subject is the same in each case, the interest is identical. The great Bishop is indeed out for a somewhat different issue from that which engages the American Professor. Butler designed to show that the very nature of man, that from which he cannot escape, that by which he is what he is, places him under an obligation to follow virtue. So far, he treats the matter ethically rather than psychologically. Yet, if his argument is correct, and if his premises are sound, he is in no way at issue with those who study man for his own sake without ulterior aim.

In certain respects Butler is pre-eminent in this subject. No philosopher has shown more conclusively what the inward frame of man really is ; no one has shown more conclusively that man carries within himself the mark of a moral and a responsible being ; no one has more conclusively shown the prophetic office of Conscience ; no one has indicated more cogently that the intimations of immortality are latent in us all.

From the point of view of the Victoria Institute this quality of Butler's teaching about human nature is of supreme value. We assemble in this hall under a pledge to show, so far as we may, that Christianity is in accord with all forms and conditions of truth. Here is a teacher who asserts that by the very structure and state of our inward frame we are adapted to virtue and to religion. This is an argument that none can evade, that all may understand by listening to the voice within themselves that nothing can silence.

Man, says Bishop Butler, is a law to himself. Even though

he knows nothing about history or science ; even though he has never heard of a revelation from God ; even if he does not know whether there is a God to be revealed ; still he is a law to himself ; a law which puts him under obligation to act in a way that is good for himself and for society at large.

Whatever may be thought of the enduring value of Butler's doctrines about analogy and probability, all serious persons must feel the cogency of his doctrine about human nature. To deny that doctrine is to lapse into internal anarchy, the parent of all other anarchies. To adhere to that doctrine is to secure to life personal and social the most enduring stability. In this view Butler is a teacher of perpetual importance.

I have thus passed in review some of the features of the intellect, teaching, and influence of Bishop Butler. Imperfect and cursory as that review has been, it may have sufficed to stimulate curiosity in some, to refresh the memory of others, and to impress all with a sense of the real greatness and excellence of the man.

It remains that I should estimate his relation to that great movement in religion which is known as the Evangelical Revival. I do so because that revival took its rise during the episcopate of Butler, and because it was directed, though by very different instrumentalities, towards the same ends which Butler had in view throughout his life. I have often thought that a comparison between the genius and work of Bishop Butler and the genius and work of John Wesley would furnish a most striking and suggestive lesson in Church history, and such a comparison I venture now, very briefly, to indicate. A friend on whose judgment and accuracy I can completely rely has told me that somewhere in Wesley's Journal there is a note of an interview between the great Methodist and the great Analogist, and that John Wesley was not favourably impressed by the Bishop's attitude towards Methodism and its distinctive tenets. I have not been able to verify the quotation, and I can therefore only mention the fact under reserve.

We can readily understand how two men so different in temperament, in situation and in work, might find it difficult to appreciate one another, especially in a brief and perhaps accidental meeting. Yet no thoughtful Christian can doubt that the two men were, in fact, deeply united, however divided by accidents of time. It is certain that Butler's reasoning would never have aroused the nation from the torpor of those dismal years.

It is certain that something more than argument was required to stem the tide of irreligion that had submerged all classes. It is probable that Wesley brought to bear on England forces of which Butler had but a distant and timorous perception. It is possible that in some points the great Bishop's views of Christianity were defective, and that the great Preacher's views on those points were gloriously complete. But the work that Butler accomplished was a needful work, and without it Wesley and his fellows might have effected much less than they did. Butler endeavoured to show that Christianity is inherently reasonable and authoritative.

Wesley, convinced of these verities, preached Christianity to multitudes whose minds and consciences owned the appeal, and thereby verified the reasonings of the philosopher. Butler repaired the breaches in the walls of the fortress from which issued confident and secure the champions of the Gospel, which infidels had vainly thought was no more to be feared, and was incapable of defending itself or of assailing its enemies.

Thus the two men were fellow-soldiers of Jesus Christ. They occupied different places in the campaign and contributed different elements to the fight, but they shared the stress of one and the same battle, and will wear immortal laurels in the grand review.

Our contemporary Evangelicals would be none the worse for a stiff course of the *Analogy* and of the sermons on human nature. There they would find some truths stated which they are prone to forget, and some points of view commended which would adjust and correct some parts of their thinking or lack of thought.

The great philosophical Bishop could impart to many a tincture of his immense and grave respect for truth, and his sane and large perception of things as they really are, and none of us would be the worse for a good deal of that temper; least of all our most zealous Evangelists.

The combination of reverence with enthusiasm, of zeal with knowledge, rare as it is, is not impossible, and a coalition between Joseph Butler and John Wesley is a coalition devoutly to be prayed for. It is surely a gift that may be bestowed by Him who is at once "The Spirit of judgment and the Spirit of burning."

DISCUSSION.

Rev. MARTIN ANSTEY, B.D., M.A., said: Our thanks are due to the lecturer for his most interesting and lucid exposition of the philosophy of Butler. What Butler meant by his *Doctrine of Probability* or by his maxim "probability is the guide of Life" was that every moral act and every religious decision was something that called for the exercise of the moral judgment, the reason, the conscience of the individual, the right or the wrong of which could not be settled by an appeal to any quasi-infallible Jesuitical authority. His *Doctrine of Analogy* was directed against the arguments of the Deists, who rejected Revealed Religion but believed in God, duty and immortality, or what they called Natural Religion. Butler's argument is really a *tu quoque*, in which he showed that whatever could be said against the God of the Bible, could also be said against the God of Nature, e.g., If the God of the Bible was responsible for the destruction of thousands of people, the earthquake at Lisbon showed that the God of Nature was in like manner equally responsible for the destruction of many thousands of the inhabitants of that city. The argument does not solve the problem of the origin of evil, but it shuts the mouth of the deistic opponent of revealed religion by showing that his system is open to exactly the same objection as that which he brought against the teaching of the Biblical revelation. Butler's doctrine of *Human Nature* was directed against those who maintained the right of men to indulge their lower appetites as being as much a part of their nature as their conscience. Butler denies this and maintains that the various parts of man's nature are not related to each other as co-ordinate parts of equal validity, but that the selfish appetites, and the self-regarding prudential motives of self love, are, by the very constitution of human nature, subordinated to his reason and his conscience in an ordered scale of worth or value, so that when a conflict arises between appetite and reason, it is contrary to the principle and constitution of human nature that appetite should prevail, and only truly *natural* that reason and conscience should rule, their authority over the lower instincts being as much a part of their nature as the fact of their existence. If conscience exists at all, it exists with the right to rule over every

other part of human nature, and this authority, validity, or right to rule, is inherent in it, and is a part of human nature itself. One of the characters in Mr. Benson's *Dodo* is made to exclaim "I am as I am made and I did not make myself," a claim which acquits man of the guilt of indulging the appetites of his sensual nature and makes God responsible for all the evil which the human heart contains. We have here an illustration of the perennial validity and present-day application of Butler's philosophy.

Mr. W. HOSTE asked, with reference to the phrase "rage for lucidity," ascribed in the lecturer's admirable paper to French writers, whether there is really any opposition between "lucidity" and the "openness," "love of truth," etc., of Dr. Butler. Anyone who had lived in France would know the phrase, "Tout ce que n'est pas clair, n'est pas français." Would not Dr. Butler have gained in places by a little more "lucidity"? It had been said of Renan that he put more stress on "le bien dire" than on "le vrai dire." Mr. H. suggested "a rage for brilliancy" might be said to characterize French writers. The transparent lucidity of Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales* made their study a pleasure, where that of the *Analogy* might remain a duty.

Lt.-Col. ALVES said: I can fully sympathize with the last speaker [Mr. Hoste] in having tried to read works on deep subjects, whose authors would seem to have taken the greatest pains to make themselves unintelligible. This may have been their misfortune, and not their fault, as it is not always given to one mind both to originate an idea, and also to put it forward clearly and simply.

I am informed that in France there is a recognized profession, that of "*vulgarisateur* (popularizer)," whose business it is to make simple that which in its original form is abstruse; and I think that such an office is much needed in England.

I have heard the obscurity of the style of Bishop Westcott contrasted with the clearness of that of Bishop Lightfoot.

Comparing Bishop Butler with John Wesley, the latter produced evidence of the power of the Gospel, showing that Christianity was Christ, and Christ Christianity. Most of us can understand evidence; but I have found that, even amongst Protestants, the great majority are very poor reasoners, and poor also in following a logical argument; and evidence is what the world needs.

The majority of Christian writers do not seem to have grasped the fact that the Epistle to the Romans was not written to bring sinners to Christ, but to give saints a true understanding of their position. So, except in regard to the period of time in which they lived, Butler might be said to supplement Wesley, and not *vice versa*.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS expressed his disappointment that the lecturer had found the seventeenth century the least interesting from a Christian standpoint. He, on the contrary, considered the century that produced Bunyan and Howe, also Pascal, and witnessed the attempt of the Puritans to set up the Kingdom of God by force on earth, to be most interesting. He regarded conscience as that which God had implanted in man as the result of the Fall, and that while man was bound to follow his conscience, that conscience needed to be instructed. God addresses Himself to man's conscience rather than to his intellect, and in this way man was able to attain certainty with regard to divine things.

Our Lord's miracles were to be regarded at the present time as adjuncts to, rather than proofs of, the Christian revelation. They appeared as the necessary consequence of Who He was, as He could not but use His power to relieve suffering humanity.

Professor H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD (in the Chair) was in accord with the author of this important and most interesting Paper as to Bishop Butler's assured position among philosophical defenders of the Truth, and as to the permanent value of his work—permanent as Human Nature.

Butler's early life being passed amidst Nonconformist surroundings was probably advantageous to his writings. McCosh has pointed out that thought-objects are like many-sided figures, whereof we men see some sides, some men more than others, angels see more than men, whilst all the sides of the polygon are visible to God only. Butler, regarding Christian Truth from the two stand-points, first of Nonconformity, then of the Established Church, would thus obtain a broader and wider view.

Three great qualities—openness, sobriety, reverence for truth—are noted in his mind, to which a common-sense logic may be added as a fourth. The first and second of these have origin from the

third, the essential equipment of a true investigator and in harmony with a temper of mind "eminently English."

To anyone here who, having begun reading his works, has abandoned the attempt, my counsel is—Gird up your loins and resolutely begin again, remembering always that his arguments in "Analogy" are especially addressed not to Atheists but to Deists generally, and particularly to such persons "as can judge without thinking, and such as can censure without judging;" to those who do not pretend that Christianity is proved false, but say the evidence is unsatisfactory and surrounded with many difficulties. To these objections he replies that in matters of our everyday common world life we continually act upon evidence no stronger, being guided by Probability; and that the difficulties connected with the Christian religion are of the same kind as those found in Natural religion, so that a man sane enough to believe in the God of nature must, if logically consistent, believe in the God of The Bible—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This reasoning receives reinforcement from the testimony of Conscience, concerning which he tells us: "You cannot form a notion of this faculty, conscience, without taking in judgment, direction, superintendency. This is a constituent part of the idea, that is, of the faculty itself; and to preside and to govern, from the very economy and constitution of man, belongs to it. Had it strength as it has right, had it power as it has manifest authority, it would absolutely govern the world." (Sermon ii, on "Human Nature.") In this manner Butler may be said to have prepared the way intellectually for the preaching of the Gospel of Salvation proclaimed by John Wesley.

THE 606TH ORDINARY MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH, 1919,

AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR W. P. KER, M.A., LL.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The Secretary read the Minutes of the previous Meeting which were confirmed and signed, and announced the Election of Mr. E. R. P. Moon, M.A., as a Member.

*THE PERSONAL INFLUENCE OF GREAT COMMANDERS
IN THE PAST.* By Major-General Sir GEORGE K. SCOTT-
MONCRIEFF, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., C.I.E.

MARSHAL FOCH, in one of his lectures at the French Staff College, in the days when he was still a professor at that institution, unknown save in his own circle, and ignorant of the great fame which awaited him, states as follows:—"History does no less than justice, when it gives the praise of victory, the blame of defeat, to the generals who have commanded armies in the field. For it is in the influence of the command, the enthusiasm communicated by it, that we must seek for and find an explanation for the unconscious movements of masses of men when an army in the field, without knowing why, feels itself carried forward, as though it were gliding on an inclined plane." And again, "The great events of history, the disasters which it records in some of its pages, such as the destruction of the French power in 1870, are never accidents, but rather the results of superior and general causes, such as the forgetfulness of the commonest moral and intellectual truths, or the abandonment of the activity of mind and body which constitute the life and health of armies."

No more striking example of the truth of this can be given than the wonderful series of victories carried out in the months of July to November, 1918, under the great soldier who expressed

in clear language the fundamental principles of leadership. From the time when, with splendid audacity, he struck at the German flank between the Aisne and the Marne, the armies under his control moved "as though it were gliding on an inclined plane" from one brilliant victory to another until the enemy was fain to sue for mercy. It is perhaps the most remarkable example in history of a leader laying down deliberately, beforehand, the principles of success, and then himself giving effect to those principles with unerring decision.

We are too near the events of 1918, however, to judge of them in their true perspective, and we cannot tell what far-reaching effect the personal example of the leaders may have for the world in the immediate future. For, as we shall endeavour to prove, the influence, not only materially but morally, of a great commander has a far-reaching effect on future generations.

Meantime it may be said that among the many blessings which have befallen us as a nation during the past years of stupendous war, not the least are the characters of the great leaders whose victories have secured to us so high a position—Haig, Allenby and Maude especially—whose qualities of patience, endurance, chivalrous conduct and modesty have been as conspicuous as their military skill, and their inflexible resolution and swift decisive action. And is not "the Nelson touch" still a motive force in our Navy? for that great leader is not merely, as Admiral Mahan has finely expressed it, "the embodiment of sea power," but his personality is the model on which our seamen of to-day base their practice. The similarity between his message to the Fleet after the Nile, and Admiral Beatty's signal to the Grand Fleet after the surrender of the Germans, is no mere coincidence.

It may, however, be asked why the moral influence of leaders *in war* is quoted as worthy of consideration. Surely, it may be argued, the moral effect of the character of a leader in any human enterprise, whether political, industrial, commercial, scientific, geographical, or any other pursuit, must have a preponderating effect on his followers, and on the country which is identified with the cause, whatever that may be. This is true, no doubt, but it has special effect in connection with wars, because there the masses of men directly affected are great, and indeed to-day they are greater than in any previous period of history. Moreover the tremendous issues of life and death

involved in a war affect the intellectual and moral natures of men to a far more profound degree than any other form of human activity, and the results of a victorious campaign are so far-reaching, not only in the triumphs or the depression caused, but in the regrouping of nations resulting, that they cannot fail to effect a far greater result in the minds of the nations concerned than the success or otherwise of civil experience, however admirable and useful that may be. Thus it is that the moral character, for good or evil, of the conqueror or victorious leader, has a profound influence. This may be exerted for evil to a very marked extent. The victories of Frederick, for instance, have exalted him to the position of a great national hero. That he was a great soldier, one of the greatest in history, no one can deny. But the foundation of his success, in the seizure of Silesia, against every principle of international obligation, sanctity of treaty, and private gratitude, was the embodiment of the detestable principle that "might is right," and on that foundation not only his subsequent career was built, but also the malignant edifice which arose in the wars of the later nineteenth century under Bismarck, and finally found its disastrous culmination in the terrible conflict of our own day, misleading in its dire consequences an entire nation and luring them to their destruction, amid the execrations of the entire world.

"Not all the perfumes of Arabia," nor the eulogies of Carlyle, can sweeten the character of the great leader who thus debased the morality of his nation, and though history has done full justice to his military leadership, it must necessarily record the baseness of his methods.

Where the political as well as the military leadership rests in the same man, it is obvious that his influence, for good or evil, must exercise a more marked effect than in cases where the political power is in the hands of another. Thus to take the case of two great contemporaries, Cromwell and Turenne, both of whom were able and successful generals, the work done by the former had far greater effect on the English nation, not only at the time, but in subsequent years, than the work of Turenne had, and has had, in France. Yet of the two, Turenne was probably the greater soldier, possessed of somewhat similar noble qualities of character that were conspicuous in the great Englishman, though undoubtedly not to the same degree.

In comparing, therefore, the moral influence exerted by great

leaders, it is fair to take into account not only their characters and their circumstances, but also the freedom of action, political as well as military, which they enjoyed.

For the purposes of this paper, therefore, I venture to take for consideration a comparison between the careers, character and influence of two of the greatest military leaders on the pages of history, men of very similar personal qualities, both of them possessed of supreme political as well as military authority in their own country, both of them extraordinarily successful in their campaigns, and therefore eliciting profound admiration and respect from their contemporaries, both of them far in advance of those contemporaries in their appreciation of military and political science. These two leaders are Alexander of Macedon and Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden. I do not forget that the greater space of time which separates us from the former, as compared with the latter, may lead us to a less favourable appreciation of his life's work, but it is at least remarkable that the records of his personality and his exploits are as full and clear, if not more so, than those of the great Swedish leader. That the moral influence of the latter was greater than that of the former is, I think, unquestionable, and that I venture to think is due to the foundation of sincere Christianity which actuated him, whereas in Alexander's case that was inevitably absent, though he had the advantage of the highest and noblest of the Greek philosophers and moralists as his guide and to a great extent lived up to their teaching.

There is much that is similar in the characters of these two great leaders. Both were, by accident of birth, rulers over small countries, and were called in youth to take up their rule. Both were sons of capable and strong fathers, both had energetic and vigorous mothers, both were men of active, hardy nature, delighting in exercise and in feats of skill. Both were in their element in the fierce excitement of battle, reckless of wounds and of danger, but both could be cautious and patient in their preparation for a decisive blow. Both had the advantage of the best education that their time afforded, and both had benefited thereby to the fullest extent. The task that confronted each seemed to their contemporaries beyond the power of human skill to accomplish, and though in the case of Alexander the fulfilment of the task was complete before his death, in a sense which was not so apparent in the case of Gustavus, yet the work which the latter did when he fell at Lützen was really

accomplished to a far greater degree than either he or his contemporaries were aware. Finally, it is remarkable that both these great leaders died in early manhood.

A brief *résumé* of the careers of each of these seems essential to a proper presentation of the subject. I feel I owe an apology to such an audience as this for presenting such a summary of well-known historical facts, but it is necessary to have the broad outlines fresh in memory if we are to derive from them the deductions which we seek. In thus reviewing the careers of the two great leaders, endeavour will be made to avoid purely technical details, and confine attention to the main operations and the nature of the tasks presented.

In the middle of the fourth century B.C., when Alexander was born, the Persian Empire extended from the *Ægean* to the Indus, and from the Caucasus to the Sudan. It had endeavoured to extend its sway over Europe too, and had made various partially successful efforts in this direction, but at the time to which we refer, the Greek confederacy had resisted the Persians, and the Kingdom of Macedon under Philip, which extended from the Euxine to the Adriatic, was the most powerful of the Greek states, and possessed a well organised and disciplined army. The Persian rule, immensely powerful though it was, had degenerated from the days of Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes, and was not the vigorous vital force that it had been a century or so earlier. Philip, indeed, so far realised this that he was contemplating a campaign against this formidable power at the time when he had consolidated his own kingdom from being a small province to the most thriving and powerful state in Hellas. But his warlike intentions against the Persian Empire were cut short, for he died, leaving to his son Alexander, then only twenty years old, the heritage of a great cause, and to some extent the means of carrying it into effect. The cause was the freedom of the civilised world from the menace of the Persian tyranny; the means was the army of Macedonia, organised, armed and disciplined in a better fashion than any then existing.

Alexander had already shown his aptitude for the task before him. As a lad of sixteen he had been left as regent at the capital when his father was absent on a campaign, and had not only conducted the business of the State wisely, but had put down a revolt of a Balkan tribe. Later on, when eighteen years of age, he had been entrusted by his father with the command of the cavalry of the left wing of the Macedonian army against

the Athenians and Thebans at Chæroneæa, and had shown then his splendid qualities as a cavalry leader. So when he came to the throne he had already served his apprenticeship both in civil and military rule. He had been, also, carefully educated. His tutor from his thirteenth year was Aristotle. He had a great delight in the classic writers of Greece, and he had the great advantage of recent Greek military experience and authors—Miltiades, Xenophon, and Epaminondas—to stimulate his military education. This breadth of training enabled him to utilise the lessons of the past in the conditions of the ever varying present.

Before he could engage on his great task the young king had to face gigantic difficulties at home. For the Greek States, on Philip's death, considered themselves absolved from Macedonian jurisdiction, the tribes to the north and west rose in revolt, so that from all quarters danger threatened. In one year, in a series of brilliant and original operations, he made himself master of Greece, utterly defeated the Danubian tribes, had reduced the Illyrians to obedience, and had welded the shackles on Hellas. He was now free to turn his attention to the vast problem before him.

The resources at his disposal were ridiculously inadequate. He had only 30,000 infantry and 5000 cavalry, one month's supplies, no fleet worth mentioning, and a heavy load of debt, to cope with the mighty forces of Persia with untold resources and the command of the seas. But morally Persia was rotten to the core and torn by petty factions and jealousies, moreover without any leader of merit.

Alexander marched along the coast to the Gallipoli Peninsula, and unmolested crossed at Abydos and opposite Troy from ground in our own times the scene of terrific fighting.* On the Asiatic shore he found the Persian army drawn up to await him, in numbers, especially in cavalry, far superior to the Macedonians and with the advantage of position covering the fords of the Granicus. The result was, thanks to skilful tactical handling and great personal leadership on the part of Alexander, an overwhelming victory, which opened for him the whole of the southern provinces of Asia Minor. He pushed on at once through these, securing the principal towns and leaving representative governors to assist him in his magazines and lines of communication. He behaved towards these cities and provinces with generosity, restoring ancient rights and reducing taxation. Later on he turned towards the upland plateau of Asia Minor where, not without

severe struggles, victory was secured. Everywhere he adopted the generous policy of friendly treatment of those who surrendered to him or helped his cause. His victorious career again brought him to another struggle in force with the main Persian army at the battle of Issus, at the northern limit of Syria. At this battle Darius himself, who commanded in person, lost heart and fled, a complete victory for the Macedonians resulting in the opening up of Syria and the acquisition of large treasure. Before venturing inland Alexander moved south, without opposition until he reached Tyre, then in the magnitude of her pomp and power. Here a siege lasting eight months, in which wonderful defensive power was met by indomitable perseverance and engineering skill, finally resulted in the capture and destruction of the city. The position of Tyre, it may be parenthetically observed, was very much like that of the free cities of Germany in the seventeenth century. The Phœnician cities furnished not only centres and outlets of trade, but bases for the Persian fleet, still dominant in the Mediterranean. With some of them Alexander made terms, on their surrendering their independence. Tyre, however, would not give way absolutely, and braved the consequences. The terrible doom that befell this proud city is only matched by the horrors at Magdeburg in the Thirty Years War—unless indeed recent atrocities have surpassed even that terrible exhibition of bloodshed and cruelty. That Alexander should have sanctioned such excesses shows how far his usual chivalrous character was stained by the motives of revenge, and how far short he fell of stainless example.

Gaza, too, the outpost of Egypt, made stern resistance but was captured after two months' siege. Thence Alexander went to Egypt, which presented no difficulty. His restless activity took him into the western desert to the oasis of Siwa, and true to his policy of consolidation and settlement he founded Alexandria. By this the conquest of the eastern Mediterranean shores was complete, and he needed no longer to fear the Persian fleet on those waters. He had a fine sense, too, of ruling the people in lands conquered, assuring to them their ancient customs and carrying forward their well-tried laws—only he put one of his own choice, one of his trusted Macedonians, as ruler, with a sufficient garrison of disciplined soldiers. As a rule the people gladly accepted him, knowing that his rule brought them greater freedom and justice than they had under the Persians.

Leaving Egypt early in 331 B.C., Alexander retraced his steps to

Tyre and thence to the upper waters of the Euphrates. Darius had meantime approached him with a view to dividing the Empire, leaving the western portion to the Conqueror, but Alexander would have all or none. Nor can we wholly attribute this to ambition and vainglory. It is more than probable that he saw that the conflict was one between two distinct ideals, *viz.*, of militarism and liberty, and that compromise was impossible. Darius then gathered his armies once more, and prepared for battle in Mesopotamia, where he hoped to deliver a crushing blow on the invader. At Arbela, to the east of the Tigris Valley, the great and final battle between the Greeks and Persians took place, and again Alexander won an overwhelming victory against tremendous odds. Darius fled towards the N.E. mountains.

Pushing on to Babylon, which surrendered without resistance, Alexander reformed his army, made a fresh base, and after due rest for the troops pushed on to Susa, Persepolis, and in pursuit of Darius. Through Persia he pursued the fugitive, at one period performing wonderful marches of endurance, at another time—indeed often—showing marvellous skill in mountain warfare, but he was baulked of his capture of the Persian king by the murder of that fallen monarch near the S.E. shores of the Caspian.

From this period, for the next two years, Alexander carried on a series of the most marvellous operations in history, pushing on to and crossing the Oxus and Jaxartes, then coming south to the modern Herat and Kandahar. Thence he marched to Kabul, wintered there, pushed forward to the Hindu Kush and advanced on India, not by the comparatively easy route of the Kabul river, but by infinitely more difficult passes and defiles farther north, ultimately debouching on the Peshawur Valley, crossing the Indus above Attock, pushing through the tangled ravines near the modern Rawalpindi to the Jhelum, where he defeated Porus in a battle showing consummate skill and leadership, then farther east to the watershed between the Indus and the Ganges, where his Macedonians refused to advance farther and he had to turn. From a military point of view these campaigns are full of instruction and interest. For our present purpose, however, they need only a brief allusion, because it would appear evident that after the fall of Darius, Alexander seems to have somewhat changed his aim, which no longer appears to have been the liberation of civilisation from the tyranny of the Persian rule, but the aggrandisement of himself as the supreme war lord. He assumed Oriental pomp and customs, and there seems to be

little doubt that he was frequently overcome with drink. Moreover, his sense of justice and gratitude appears to have been blunted, and the execution of Parmenio, his trusted general, and Clitus, one of his best "Companions," stain a character otherwise marked by noble qualities of personal generosity. Of the remainder of his active career, little need be said. He marched down the Indus to the sea, undertaking, always with success, and often with much personal risk, various operations. He transported his troops partly by sea, partly through the Baluchistan and Persian deserts, to Mesopotamia, and he settled in Babylon to consolidate his empire. There, possibly from imprudent feasting, possibly from long exposure in travel, he died at the early age of thirty-three.

Such is a bald outline of his career. Before we consider what his influence (apart from the military ardour which was so vital a feature in his leadership) was on the countries he subdued, and the world in which he lived, let us turn to Gustavus Adolphus, so as to retain in our minds the main features in the career of both, so that we may more adequately consider the problems of their personal influence.

Gustavus Adolphus, son of Charles IX of Sweden by his second wife, Christina of Schleswig Holstein, a woman of imperious nature, came to the throne in 1611 when he was only seventeen years old. He had already had, not only the advantage of very careful parental education and capable example, but experience both in administration and in war. A portion of the kingdom had been committed to his youthful charge, and there he was encouraged to act on his own responsibility, in the king's name. He had from the earliest taken the keenest interest in military affairs, had learned all that he could assimilate from books, and, what was of greater value, had been entrusted with command in a campaign against the Danes, where he had shown marked capacity and that absolute fearlessness which was afterwards so characteristic. In all these respects his career so far closely resembles that of Alexander.

The country over which he was called at this early age to reign was in grave difficulties. Denmark still ruled some of its southern provinces. Poland had a bitter cause of complaint against Sweden in that the latter country had refused the rule of the Polish king Sigismund, who, though the representative of an older line of the Vasa dynasty, was a Roman Catholic and therefore refused by the Protestant Swedes. Russia, too,

had causes of irritation and quarrel. The personality and energy of Charles IX had to some extent held back these public enemies, but on his death it appeared that with a young lad on the throne there might be a weakness which would serve as an opportunity for his foes to gain their ends. Moreover, the country was poor, and torn by factions between the Crown and the nobility. On the other hand, there was a very sound system of military organisation bequeathed by the late king, a warm attachment to the young ruler by the masses of his people, and a discipline founded on moral teaching and on Christian principles. For Gustavus was as careful of the religious training of his people as he was of any other phase of national life. He appointed chaplains to his regiments, assembled the men daily to morning and evening prayer, knelt himself with them and frequently addressed them with stirring exhortation. He had, like Alexander, to begin his reign by consolidating his position at home. In the first two years, before he was twenty, he had freed Sweden from the Danish invaders, and secured terms with Christian IV, giving Sweden an honourable independence. In the next four years, warring with Russia, he had secured for Sweden the whole of the Eastern shores of the Baltic, and consolidated the hold on Livonia and Finland. Then followed campaigns with Poland, in which frequently he endeavoured to secure peace on honourable terms, but though this did not come for some ten years he had at least arranged freedom from Catholic aggression for Sweden, and free commerce between the two countries, and freedom of conscience for all the Baltic regions.

We have seen how Alexander took up the great cause of liberty which his father had bequeathed to him, and after securing his position at home, at once proceeded to wage battle against overwhelming odds. This was not quite the case of Gustavus, for though his father had been one of the foremost champions of religious liberty, he had not bequeathed to his son any definite charge of waging war against the Emperor of Germany. Essentially, however, the causes for which these two great captains fought were similar. In the one case liberty against the encroaching tide of Oriental despotism, in the other freedom of conscience, and the right to worship, unfettered by priestly intolerance.

The Thirty Years War was partly religious, partly secular. Germany had, in the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555, arrived at a *modus vivendi* between the Catholics and the Lutherans (not,

however, with the Calvinists, who bitterly opposed both the others), but on the election of the Emperor Ferdinand in 1618, a series of bitter persecutions were enacted against such of his subjects as disagreed with him. But admittedly the spirit of mutual forbearance was absent on both sides. Yet the war was not entirely religious, indeed the Pope refused to give his sanction to it. It was largely the endeavour of the Hapsburg dynasty to rule Germany absolutely, from the Baltic to the Adriatic and from the Rhine to the Oder. Now a powerful German Empire under Roman Catholic rulers on the Baltic would be a serious menace to the independence and commerce of Sweden, and this was, from the purely Swedish point of view, a reason for her entry into the war. It was not, however, until 1630 that Gustavus took an active part. Meantime Denmark had tried, and failed, to drive back the Imperialists under Wallenstein. The Protestant electors of Brandenburg and Saxony were supine and treacherous. The military leaders of the Imperialists, Wallenstein, Tilly, and Pappenheim, were far superior to any of those on the Protestant side. Except the fortresses of Stralsund and Stettin and some of the Hanseatic towns, all Germany was under the heel of the Hapsburgs. Then Gustavus came in. He was the leader of a cause which seemed hopeless. He was incurring tremendous risks, for to the west the Danes were his ancient enemies, and to the east was Poland smarting under defeat. His country was poor, and, as he had laid down as a cardinal principle in his wars that under no circumstances should the cost fall on the innocent people of the country, but all supplies must be honestly paid for, so he needed ready funds for his operations; but his confidence in the sound discipline, stout hearts and moral ascendancy of his troops never wavered, and he felt confident that he could and would lead them to victory. Thus he started with the immense power of moral influence, and in two years drove his armies, like an iron wedge, through the heart of Germany, from the Baltic to the Danube. He had behind him the unanimous weight of public opinion in his own country which, from experience of his personal rule during eighteen years, had learnt to admire the man for his noble and lofty private character, and for the wisdom and courage he had evinced in all his public actions.

His military operations were not on the same brilliant scale of successive victory and advance as those of Alexander, for these indeed are unique in the world's history. But they were

marvellously successful. They fall into regular stages: first the securing of the sea base and the establishment of the "bastion" in Pomerania and Brandenburg, next the acceptance of battle with the Imperial forces under Tilly and the overwhelming victory of Breitenfeld (one of the most decisive battles in history), then the advance on the Rhine and the occupation of Mainz, followed by the advance through the Palatinate, the victory of the Lech, and the occupation of Bavaria, then the operations against Wallenstein, the defence of Nurnberg, and the final victory of Lützen, where the great leader himself fell, but where he finally crushed the Imperialist forces.

Space forbids comment on these operations, and it is foreign to the purposes of this paper to dwell on the military skill and advance in science which led to these startling results, just as we have purposely omitted to review the purely military qualities of the great Macedonian. Both of these great captains had much in common as soldiers, both were cavalry commanders of special skill, both realised the supreme advantages of mobility and flexible tactics, both were able artillery generals, and both realised, as few have done, the powerful aid that engineering science gives to war. But on these topics it is beside our purpose to dwell.

When we come to the objects of the two great leaders we find an essential difference. Alexander may have started with the idea of relieving Europe from the Oriental menace, but certainly he had later plans of personal glory and aggrandisement, possibly as the best solution of a difficult problem, but at least not free from selfish interest. Gustavus behaved throughout with a disinterested regard for religious liberty. Those who knew him best have disclaimed for him any idea of being a rival Emperor—at all times his rôle was that of a deliverer, and at most his political aim was that of a confederacy of German Protestants with the King of Sweden as the Commander-in-Chief of their forces, charged with the duty of their protection. Whether such an idea would have been practicable is impossible now to say, for the death of the king at Lützen prolonged the ghastly struggle for sixteen more years, and the war then assumed a different aspect.

Yet, as regards the personal moral influence of Gustavus we have only to look to our own country and see how it took effect. King and Parliament were at war, and the Royalist cause at first had the better success. Cromwell seems, however,

to have grasped the fact that the striking success of the Swedish King was not only material, but due to a discipline founded on character and moral superiority. It was on this that he formed his New Army, it was this that enabled him to bring his parliamentary forces into line against the cavaliers with success. He said the old parliamentary army was made up of "old decayed serving men, and tapsters and such kind of fellows" unfit to encounter "gentlemen's sons, younger sons and persons of quality." He must have "men of a spirit that is likely to go as far as gentlemen will go," and he "raised such men as had the fear of God before them and made some conscience of what they did." "From that day forward they never were beaten." He showed in England what Gustavus had shown in Germany, that a man may read his Bible and yet use his sword like the best.

Two regiments in the British Army are the modern descendants of those days, the Coldstream Guards, the direct representatives of Cromwell's New Army, and the Royal Scots: first raised to fight under Christian of Denmark, and afterwards the flower of Gustavus' troops at Breitenfeld. It would be incorrect and invidious to say that these two splendid corps have a monopoly of the fine qualities of the Gustavus Adolphus era, but it may at least be said that they have maintained the high traditions of their ancestors, and have evinced this never more notably than in the recent terrible warfare in France, in Gallipoli and Palestine.

In conclusion, let us attempt to summarise the after-effects of the influence of these two great captains. Alexander left behind him a region permeated with Greek settlements, imbued with Greek civilisation, freedom, love of learning and philosophy. It prepared the way for Roman law and order, and for the spread of the Gospel—how rapidly we learn from sacred and secular history. Yet it was necessarily limited in its scope and its ideals. Gustavus, with the fuller light which the knowledge of Christ had brought, raised the standard of discipline to the higher ideal of the fear of God. He restored that trust in the Lord of Hosts which had been the motive power in the great Warrior King of Israel, and the influence of his own noble example has been passed on from generation to generation, sometimes forgotten, often obscured, but still advancing into greater prominence because founded on eternal verity. He was the first of a series of leaders who have exercised a profound influence in

their day and generation : men like Havelock and Charles Gordon, ready to risk their lives with small forces against overwhelming odds ; men like Stonewall Jackson, who without desire for personal glory were actuated by a faith which gave to their characters strength and beauty, and left behind them the fragrance of noble example.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Prof. W. P. KER) said : The subject of Sir George Scott-Moncrieff's lecture, and his treatment of it as well, make one wish for more of the same sort. Lately I have been reading the essays of Mr. George Wyndham, a statesman who was some time a soldier, an officer in the Coldstream Guards. One of those essays is on *Plutarch's Lives*, and Alexander of Macedon of course has his place there. Why should not Sir George write the life of Gustavus Adolphus on something like Plutarch's scale ? There are other commanders, too, who might have their stories told—Turenne, for example, a famous name, whose life and achievements are too vaguely known to most of us.

"What's Fame? A fancied life in others' breath." Pope, in his splendid, possibly not quite sincere, discourse on Fame, in the *Essay on Man*, speaks of heroes and in particular of two : "The Macedonian madman and the Swede." The Swede here is not Gustavus but Charles XII, who more than Gustavus Adolphus, I think, is the hero of his nation. One of my early recollections in Swedish is the description of the old soldier in Bishop Tegnér's poem of *Axel* : "He had two treasures, his Bible, and his old sword with Charles XII's name on it." Might not Sir George give us a life of Charles XII of Sweden ? He would be competing with Voltaire, but there is room for another version of the story. Here I cannot help observing how rich the history of Sweden is in great commanders bravely followed and obeyed and honoured. There is Engelbrekt in the fifteenth century, who raised the country, like Wallace in Scotland, to drive out the aliens ; there is Gustavus Vasa, another hero with the same patriotic task, and Charles Gustavus, a general as adventurous and daring as his more famous grandson, Charles XII.

May I put in one small piece of carping criticism ? Why did Sir George, in speaking of the Lion of the North, omit the name

of the most widely renowned of all the soldiers of Gustavus? He never mentioned Sir Dugald Dalgetty.

Col. C. E. YATE, C.S.I., C.M.G., M.P., said: I should like to support the hope just expressed by our Chairman, that Sir George Scott-Moncrieff may go on and give us more of his historical essays. We have listened to a most interesting account on the influence of those two great commanders, Alexander and Gustavus Adolphus, and we must all hope that we may have the benefit of more.

I would also like to say how much I was struck by the pertinence of the Chairman's remark about the manner in which Gustavus Adolphus was served by his officers, and especially his foreign officers. I remember being particularly struck at Stockholm by the number of coats of arms of Scottish families in the halls of nobility there, who had served and gained notoriety under Gustavus Adolphus and who apparently were most devoted to him.

As to what the Lecturer has said about "the after effects of the influence of these two great captains," I cannot say that I can accept without further consideration the contention that the after effects of Alexander's influence was less than that of Gustavus Adolphus.

The Lecturer himself has described how Alexander left behind him "a region permeated with Greek Settlements, imbued with Greek civilization, freedom, love of learning and philosophy," and, though I cannot recall at the moment the exact dates that those settlements lasted to, we know from coins and other sources that the Greek Kingdom founded by him in Bactria lasted for a very long time, and the after effects of Alexander's influence I cannot help thinking may have lasted longer than those of Gustavus Adolphus.

The latter, as the Lecturer has said, "raised the standard of discipline to the higher ideal of the fear of God," and "the influence of his own noble example passed on from generation to generation," but still I am doubtful if the effects of that influence were greater in the world than that of Alexander's.

There is one thing on which I am entirely in accord with Sir George Scott-Moncrieff, and that is his remark that "where the political as well as the military leadership rests in the same man, it is obvious that his influence for good or evil, must exercise a

more marked effect than in cases where the political power is in the hands of another."

That applies to-day just as much as it did in the times of Alexander, and I imagine most of us here to-day will agree that if the negotiations now going on at the Peace Conference in Paris had been left in the hands of the military leaders of the Allied Armies instead of in the hands of the politicians of some twenty different countries, we should have a better prospect of a quick settlement than we seem to have at present.

Lt.-Col. MACKINLAY drew attention to the fact that notwithstanding the great number of scientific mechanical inventions now used in warfare and the immense amount of organization now involved in military operations, that the man behind the gun remains the important factor, and the influence of the general on the fighting men still remains paramount.

Sir George Scott-Moncrieff has drawn attention, he said, to the good discipline inspired by great captains, and especially by the high religious ideals of Cromwell and Gustavus Adolphus, fighting for religious liberty; the Christian characters of many of our own commanders in our great war have doubtless contributed to the success, which was granted to us after the widespread day of prayer.

Lt.-Col. MACKINLAY then proposed a sincere vote of thanks to the learned Chairman, Professor W. P. Ker, for presiding, and for his helpful opening of the discussion.

Seconded by Mr. HOSTE. Carried unanimously.

THE 607TH ORDINARY MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, MARCH 3RD, 1919,
AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc.,
IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The SECRETARY announced the election of Mrs. J. Cain, of Dummagudem, S. India, as an Associate.

THE TEACHER'S VOCATION. By M. J. RENDALL,
Esq., M.A., Head Master of Winchester College.

EDUCATION has not escaped the chaos and welter which are besetting the rest of the civilised world : every detail of study and administration is in the grip of controversial forces ; there is no sure haven even for that linguistic discipline which has for centuries all but held a monopoly in our Public Schools ; nay, so potent are the forces of disruption that a learned member of your own Society concurs with the rationalist views of Dr. Mercier and wishes to abandon Greek and Latin as general subjects of study.

There are, in fact, few forces of reaction ; but there is a fierce contest between the two types of reform, that which is based on orderly progress and that which cries for revolution. And yet, just as to-day in Berlin, while the streets seethe with tumult and murder, the same sun shines upon all the combatants, the same quiet stars look down upon their nightly scuffles, so, be the contention of the Schools never so fierce, the subjects never so modern, the eternal principles, which are above all controversy and defy all change, stand like beacon lights to those who are fighting for Education. The sun and the stars are not quenched.

I am thinking of those ideals, which, whatever his subjects or status may be, guide and illuminate every teacher in his or her *vocation*. The word itself—calling or vocation—has an old-world, half-ecclesiastical flavour, and, though Falstaff thought it no sin to labour in a vocation of his own seeking and Macaulay allows a moss-trooper to pursue a calling, I prefer to seek my interpretation of the term in a beautiful sentence of Fuller's: "Heaven is his vocation and therefore he counts earthly employments avocations." Seeley, in his *Natural Religion*, gives us a concise definition which exactly concurs with my own view: "Where there is the perception of an ideal, we may expect to find the sense of a vocation."

To put it roundly, no teacher deserves the title whose eyes are so dimmed by questions of salary, status, tenure, etiquette and curriculum, though all these matters are of importance, that he cannot keep his eyes fixed on those special ideals upon which his profession rests. It is interesting to find a champion of working-men's education like Mr. Mansbridge strongly asserting the principle of vocation or, as he by inference calls it, "ordination." "I believe," he says, "that God working through Society does ordain men to specific work for the carrying out of which He confers the necessary gifts and characteristics. Of all the laws which govern the work of mankind the law of diversity of gifts is at once the most obvious and the most ignored. In a Society working in correspondence with the Divine law I believe that there would arise a sufficient number of all kinds of necessary workers—poets, musicians, navvies, woodworkers, stoneworkers, farmers." One other sentence rounds off Mr. Mansbridge's view: "The full and complete exercise of any God-given capacity or characteristic is in itself worship and leads to that fuller worship which is the highest conscious act of man."

I am glad to recognise that navvies and stoneworkers have their ordained profession in a State, and that their whole life can become an act of worship, a claim, by the way, which Froude makes for all his great Elizabethans, and especially for the mariners: their life, he writes, was "one great liturgy." But, no doubt, if Mr. Mansbridge or anyone else were to draw up a hierarchy of the professions, that of the teacher would stand near the top, suspended somewhere between heaven and earth, swayed this way and that by his vocation and his avocations.

If there is any truth—and I believe there is much—in this theory of special aptitudes and affinities for special vocations, we

must choose our men, or rather they must choose themselves, with care and deliberation. It is not a question of selecting a profession, but of discovering the profession which is waiting for us. There is probably no other calling which has suffered so much from haphazard or even topsy-turvy methods of selection. In the past a black or a "blue" coat has covered a multitude of incapacities; a combination of the two has proved irresistible. So much for the higher ranks of the profession. The lower ranks have been too often recruited from men who discovered no other aptitude—many of whom have spent sorrowful years in neglecting and misunderstanding the children under their charge.

What then are the characteristics which we should demand in others or seek in ourselves; what is the "beetle on the tongue" or the "winged eagle on the back" of our Apis?

The first, and perhaps the greatest, is a sense of ecstasy and wonder in the presence of youth, an intimate sympathy with and sensibility for childhood, a full appreciation of the divinity that hedges the child about. The thought is Greek, but the feeling is not confined to Greece, it has come unspoilt down the ages. To plant fair seed in a fair soil, to water and foster it, to watch the harvest growing—"orient and immortal wheat" Traherne would have termed it—this is sheer joy to those who love boyhood. To those who do not it spells boredom ineffable and much vexation of soul. The enthusiasm of the child-lover is the Greek *ἔρως* tempered by Christian *ἀγάπη*. For a real teacher we want the former as well as the latter. I incline to think it is the rarer of the two qualities. Mr. Neville Talbot has a striking passage in his book, *Religion behind the Front*, in which he speaks of the subaltern's "infinite and romantic task of *loving* his men—not necessarily of *liking* them, though certainly this will often follow—but of putting their interests first and his own second."

The teacher must both love and like his children. All the highest educators have felt a thrill of excitement in their work: the contact of spirit with spirit is like an electric current. The classroom is a house of joy or a house of torment. To take two great names, you cannot picture a Vittorino or a Miss Mason (the "Egeria" of Mr. Holmes' Idyll) otherwise than alive and happy in their work, and the cause of all their excitement and wonder is the budding soul which lies somewhere behind and shines through living eyes. The old Greek *ἔρως* is there still;

but it is chastened and expanded by Christian ἀγάπη. The sensitive author of *Pastor Agnorum* put his point well. Facing his class of twenty boys, he says : " All the metals of humanity are here, since the ages of man all run on together ; and our class will show us gold, perhaps, and silver in thrifty vein, and iron, brass, mercury, with the less precious substances of wood and stone and clay and straw. All the human metals and fibres are here ; but there is one substance in all alike, the stuff of which God made humanity and the spark He mingled with it. . . . There are a score of faces, and behind each sits a soul, and a destiny is weaving for it."

If you cannot feel a little of this thrill, mingled with awe and reverence, at the sight of young eyes, which are the gates of the soul, teaching is not your vocation. You had better bestow your qualities of head and heart elsewhere.

I shall perhaps be charged with exaggerating this quality ; but it stands in my view immeasurably above all others in a teacher's work. The old parable of Ion in Plato's dialogue is a true one : the teacher is a θεῖος ἀνὴρ : he catches the inspiration which comes to him from God through some human medium, and passes it on to his pupil : he is a ring in the chain. We need not press the parable too closely ; but his personality must receive and impart magnetic influence. There must be a link of love between teacher and taught.

The second essential, closely connected with the first, is a readiness to accept moral responsibility. The modern school-master is rightly anxious to discard pomposity : he wishes to win his way by sympathy and naturalness rather than by law and authority ; if Mr. Lytton Strachey is right in his delineation of Dr. Arnold—though assuredly the portrait is a caricature—most of us would agree with him in deprecating that portentous attitude towards youth. Priggishness and pedantry are the two accusations which provoke us most, perhaps because we are terribly prone to them both. Our disclaimer may, however, go too far. The teacher, especially in a boarding school, is bound to accept, indeed to welcome, moral responsibility : he cannot and should not desire to throw off the gown worn so beautifully by his great prototype of the Early Renaissance, who stood in many ways in advance not only of his own age, but also of ours. " Vittorino," says his biographer, " definitely held himself the father of his Scholars His School entirely absorbed him. He watched the youngest with affection

and hope, the elders with pride and confidence. Himself moving always amid the larger things of life, the power that went forth from him insensibly raised the tone of thought and motive in those around him He lived a common life with his scholars in meals, in games, in excursions, always sharing their interests and pleasures. . . . It was part of Vittorino's purpose to attract rather than drive, and to respect the dignity and freedom of his boys."* This, it may be said, is a fair picture of a house-master in a boarding school, but does not fit other types of teachers. It is my contention that no teacher, however obscure his position, can shuffle off this responsibility: he bears on his breast, whether he will or no, a larger wallet than other men to contain the infirmities of youth. He is by profession a censor and a moralist. The grown-up world has a right to give him a wide berth—*Hic niger est: hunc tu, Romane, caveto*.

Now there are two tendencies of to-day which run counter to this view. Firstly, there are teachers who study naturalness at the expense of dignity, who fail to emphasize the real issues of life and conduct because they have never wrestled with them, who have hardly developed in gravity since their own school days; who are content to make boyishness their own ideal as well as that of their pupils. They are good fellows, athletes, anglers, clubmen, devoted—to golf, students—of bridge: their avocations have consumed their vocation. The influence of such men—and they are numerous—on the profession is disastrous. They are the very opposite of Vittorino: for they are "moving always amid the" *smaller and pettier* "things of life."

The other class take a different point of view: instruction, they tell us, is their business and not morality. Their profession is that of teachers, not of prophets. Our reply is, you cannot dissociate the two. There are, no doubt, subjects which afford little or no scope for ethical teaching; we might, for instance, cite chemistry or physics; but, whatever may be said of the elementary stages of scientific work, its later developments are intimately connected with religion and morality; no scientific teacher can throw off the prophet's mantle. Still more is this true of history: indeed, Mr. Gould, in *British Education after*

* Mr. Lewis Paton, High Master of Manchester Grammar School, develops the same thought, in a fresh and suggestive manner, in his paper on "The Spirit of Discipline" (in the T.C.V. vol. of essays, "*Education: Its Spiritual Basis and Social Ideas*").

the War, points out that "civilization is essentially morality," and we shall agree that history is little more than a story of the progress of civilization. History, therefore, is the study of ethics. Since, then, we cannot teach history or science, or, indeed, any subject, without dwelling upon moral questions, let all teachers admit their responsibility. Secondly, then, I say to men who question their vocation, do not join the community of St. Peter unless you are content to shoulder moral responsibility and to accept the position of a Pastor Agnorum.

There is a third qualification for a novice or aspirant: he must be prepared for some sacrifice. Pisanello's beautiful medal of Vittorino bears on its reverse side a symbol of devotion and sacrifice, the pelican feeding her young. His own gentle ascetic face tells the same story. Thousands of men have laboured for a trifling wage and ignored all social distinction, and, though the last few months have brought them a higher wage, a reasonable pension and, as a result—Heaven save the mark—some measure of social distinction, the pelican will still, for many, be the reverse of their medal. Listen to the voice of that eloquent old Scot, Mr. D'Arcy Thompson, whose words have lately been disinterred: "In Scotland, also, the profession of teaching, though not sufficiently honoured from a social point of view, is rightly considered as 'specific,' and calling for special qualifications." Speaking of "Adam—Canon of our High School—and Carmichael of our own Schola Nova," he says, "They put their hands to the plough, these simple men; and there was no looking back. . . . They all lived lives laborious, useful and honourable. From dawn to sunset of their day of toil they sowed the seed, or drave the plough, *or brake with harrows the obstructing glebe*. And when at last it was growing dark, these husbandmen dismissed their little reapers and gleaners; and gat them home wearied and turned to; and fell on sleep. No foretaste of earthly glory sweetened the bitterness of the last cup. From modest homes they were borne, unnoticed, to modest graves. But the statues of these Cincinnatus teachers stand, not unwreathed with laurel, in the Valhalla of great and good and single-hearted schoolmasters." These sentences from the *Day Dreams* of a Scotch Dominic, written half a century ago, may seem inappropriate to modern England: yet they convey an essential and not, I think, an ephemeral truth. A teacher, like the member of another calling, "the only one that in the dignity of usefulness

takes precedence of their own," must forego many things if he is prepared to be in his own way a Pastor Agnorum. I could tell you of at least one such shepherd (he was not in Holy Orders), a man of high literary distinction and strong physique, whose mind and body were prematurely shattered by devotion to his charge.

It is natural enough that many of us should not triumph over our drudgery. We become dull dogs, and as such often stand in the pillory of the novelist. When Mr. Hardy, in his gloomiest novel, wanted an unfortunate on whom to empty the vials of his cynicism and contempt, he chose a village schoolmaster for his victim. We teachers cannot quite live the life of other men. I, for one, do not desire that we should. I dread the arrival of an epoch of fashionable schoolmasters. We are members of a separate order—a high order, I verily believe—who have their own rewards in abundance, but whose lives, whose hours, whose routine are, for good or evil, inalienably mixed up with the standards and disciplines of immaturity. If we are wise, we shall accept the limitations of our caste: we shall not seek to escape from our bondage; we shall remember our Master's words: "For their sakes I sanctify myself." On this third heading I would say to all intending schoolmasters: count the cost, and if you are not prepared to put your boys first and yourself second, this vocation is not for you. It offers few prizes or distinctions: it is an avenue which leads nowhere, neither to politics nor (for laymen) to other preferment. You are asked to live not your own life but the life of others. It is no path for ambition or self-seeking.

I demand then enthusiasm for boyhood, readiness for responsibility, acceptance of sacrifice as the spiritual equipment of a teacher, and I am inclined to think with Mr. Mansbridge that there will always be men enough in our Society who bear these tokens and are "ordained" for this vocation. I put this spiritual equipment first because I accord it absolute primacy: it is the *unum necessarium*. I believe that there are men of mediocre capacity with these spiritual tokens who can fill a useful niche in the temple of Education; on the other hand, there is no proper niche for smartness, levity and selfishness, though accompanied by intellectual brilliance.

Before passing from these considerations I would interpose one remark. We must remember that youth catches the "infection," as Dean Inge calls it, not only of religion, but also

of all moral enthusiasms which are parts of religion—say the infection of duty and unworldliness, from masters who are themselves liable to these diseases. I am afraid it catches other and more serious diseases from worldly men. A teacher's enthusiasm and joy, his earnestness and unselfishness, will not only make him a more efficient teacher, but will call to life similar qualities in his pupil.

And now I pass to the general question, which I shall treat briefly. We have seen what are the three necessary graces. What other graces of spirit and what intellectual outfit do we look for in a teacher ?

We cannot wholly dissociate spirit and intellect: their inter-communication are too close and intimate. The man of spiritual gifts will endeavour to move amongst "the larger intellectual things of life," that he may win his pupils, even amid their childish studies and recreations, to breathe the great air beyond, to touch the great thoughts, to catch the whisper of the great music of the world. On this theme no one speaks to us with a more modern note than Milton. His tractate to Samuel Hartlib might have been written to-day; he, if anyone, welds things spiritual and intellectual into one organic whole. The teacher will supply his pupils with "such lectures as may lead and draw them in willing obedience, inflamed with the study of learning and the admiration of virtue, stirred up with high hopes of living to be brave men and worthy patriots, dear to God, and famous to all ages, that they may despise and scorn all their childish and ill-taught qualities, to delight in manly and liberal exercises, . . . and, chiefly by his own example, might in a short space gain them to an incredible diligence and courage, infusing into their young breasts such an ingenuous and noble ardour as would not fail to make many of them renowned and matchless men."

Add to these stirring words the famous definition of a complete and generous education as that which fits a man to "perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war," and we have the teacher's horizon spread before us at its full extent. Milton is here developing what he had learnt from the great Humanists of the Italian Renaissance—Vergerius, Æneas Sylvius and the rest of them; but he assimilates and expands their views in his stately phrase and applies them to the English character. And let us remember that Milton's education was aimed at action,

a practical not a theoretical life, as he himself used and sometimes abused his own great gifts and manly pen in the service of the State.

Hitherto I have carefully avoided any sectional reference to a special branch of education. The whole trend of recent opinion and legislation makes for the solidarity of the profession. But from this point I shall be speaking and thinking chiefly, but not exclusively, of the type of Secondary School with which I am myself concerned. Moreover, the content of the teacher's vocation is too wide a theme to admit of full or adequate treatment. I propose to dwell upon a few points only and make a few suggestions.

In examining Milton's picture one thing strikes us at once: we see set forth all the qualities which we have found beyond our utmost surmise in the boys who have during the Great War saved Europe and Liberty: "brave men and worthy patriots, dear to God and famous to all ages"—"such an ingenuous and noble ardour as would not fail to make many of them renowned and matchless men." These words were written amid the early struggles of the Civil War, and this perhaps enables us to understand them now: they are no fantastic dream of a poet; they are words of sober, practical truth, written by a schoolmaster, who descends in the very next clause to the rules of arithmetic and to that ancient pastime—for Milton so regards it—the elements of geometry.

Meanwhile the teacher will note one phrase—not without some anxiety—"chiefly by his own example." Milton is content to ignore for the moment potent influences of heredity and home—with school traditions he is not concerned; but the fact remains that in all these matters (courage, patriotism, diligence, ardour) he does regard the example of the teacher as an important, if not a cardinal factor.

We may whittle the statement down as far as we like: the world will smile at our pretensions. They may suggest, as Mr. Gwynne does, in his *Second Reading*, that to interpolate our personality into the life of another human being "is always a liberty, it may be an impertinence." No schoolmaster desires to impose his personality on any human being: it would be criminal and foolish to court imitation. Indeed, with regard to many of his own characteristics he will hope to "develop character by instinctive rebellion." But what is a liberty or an impertinence in others is in a sense his proper function. It is

a responsibility which he cannot throw off and an inspiration which need never fail.

Can you teach patriotism? Milton would say yes, you can if you possess it. Others will catch it from you. It is not a knowledge of facts of history, but a personal attitude. Socrates would not have convinced Laches if he had not proved himself a true man at Delium. All our masters who rushed to join the Colours at the outbreak of War, and many who did their duty at home, are and will always be professors of patriotism. They have the essence of the matter in them; such men respond and make others respond to the living words of Shakespeare or Burke, Pericles or Demosthenes. They have won the right to be their mouthpieces, their prophets. The spirit in them, their enthusiasm, will often triumph over imperfect utterance and mediocre understanding.

We shall be told, fifty thousand German schoolmasters did quite as well. Let us give them their due: most of them possessed and taught, only too well, a patriotism which was ardent but not enlightened. In the Prussian sense they were indeed successful. Their pupils caught a vehement attack of Prussian patriotism. In any high sense they were failures, because their eyes were closed to the great visions of all philosophers, Liberty and Justice, on which the highest patriotism must ultimately rest.

Take another subject much in controversy at the moment, which may be regarded as a branch of patriotism, the study of Civics. It is wise and useful to pick out the threads of civic development, especially as a part of historical study. Anyone with a clear head and sane grasp of history may perform the task; but in sowing civic seed the best teacher will be one who has himself some personal contact with municipal government, who knows something from experience of the machinery of the State. If President Wilson could return to his Professor's Chair at Princeton, he could give a series of illuminating and convincing lectures on the whole duty of the citizen.

Perhaps these two instances to which Milton has led us, both of which extend the teacher's scope and show how the classroom can influence action, may serve to explain how example may be of use in things moral and intellectual, in leading the pupil to perform some of the offices, both public and private, of peace and war. I need not labour the point that every moral quality of the teacher, consciously or subconsciously, reacts upon the character of the pupil.

Accepting a recent analysis of the ultimate end of life as consisting of virtue, knowledge and beauty, let us consider the teacher's attitude to knowledge and beauty.

It is a platitude to say that he should be a student and a lover of knowledge; it is a commonplace to assert, as Dr. Mercier does, that the schoolmaster knows and teaches nothing but words. Perhaps we misunderstand the issue. Let us define it further. What is required in a teacher is not so much a compendious store of facts, well digested and neatly arranged in the treasure-house of his brain, but an enthusiasm for some branches of knowledge and an adequate grasp of others; he needs the *multa* and the *multum*; and I incline to lay more stress upon the latter. After all, many facts are so much lumber in the mind, impediments rather than aids to its growth. Living encyclopædias may be indifferent educators. On the other hand, the man who is possessed by a worthy and broad intellectual hobby, so that each new fact falls into its due place and makes part of an organic whole, is a true lover of knowledge: his enthusiasm is contagious, and will kindle responsive fires in a younger mind. In this field it is the attitude that matters: clearness of mind, width of grasp, power of criticism are all desirable gifts, but, to give a new application to familiar words, greater than all these is love. It will often happen that a man's most valuable work is done outside the curriculum. I like the picture of that stern and saintly Harrow Master, John Smith, whose humility forbade him ever to take any but the lowest division in the School, feeding the hungry bellies of two or three boys with the treasures of Wordsworth and Tennyson, as they trotted across the fields to a belated breakfast at his country cottage. That was more than a generation ago; but the moral is unchanged. The teacher's vocation calls upon him to be perpetually storing his mind with something which he loves, that he may have riches to impart to others, that they may feel his ardour and catch its flame. These hobbies will cover many centuries and many countries. One man knows all there is to be known about Waterloo; another holds all the threads of the French Revolution in his mind; with another it is geology or geography. I have found myself that the hobby of the Italian Renaissance, especially its pictures and buildings, makes an unfailing appeal to the young. The heroic figures, the spirit of youth, the sheer joy of living, the infectious enthusiasm among which men lived, above all their vivid sense of beauty, with its

several manifestations in the field of Art, make a splendid starting-point for eager youth.

This brings me to the third section of life in which the teacher's example will tell. Roughly speaking, half the world appreciate beauty and half are blind to it. Among the educated classes—and this seems to show that love of beauty is teachable, or, rather, is asleep and waiting for some electric shock to awaken it—the proportion is higher. I look forward to a time when the purified taste of the people will rise in revolt against the public vulgarity of this age.

Somehow in the past schoolmasters have been half afraid of beauty; yet it is one of God's revelations of Himself, and the culture of it, if governed by austere rules and principles, can be a potent force for good in young lives. If unguided it will break out in less desirable ways. Are teachers awake to this aspect of their vocation? Have they given thought and study to the different revelations of beauty? Have they trained themselves to admire and understand the simple and beautiful things which God and man have put before them? Have many of them made Art or Music a real study, and introduced it bravely into school life? Many young minds are thirsting for it. I have touched very briefly, by way of suggestion only, upon an aspect of school life which has been slow to gain recognition. Milton, who, like the full man that he was, was anxious to "fetch out any secret excellences of his boys," adopted the Platonic view that music has a great power to "smooth (our tempers) and make them gentle from rustic harshness and distempered passions." The same is true of other forms of great Art—*φιλοκαλεῖν μετ' εὐτελείας* is a great end if it be not half the aim of life.

In the latter part of my paper I have touched briefly upon the teacher's training for his vocation. Here we differ *toto caelo* from the Germans, who spend six or seven years in equipping themselves for their profession. Public School boys often leap into it untrained and unequipped at the age of 22 or 23. Wisdom lies between the two extremes. The German method trains all freshness and elasticity out of the man: he has forgotten what boyhood was like before he comes back to it; it leaves him little scope for growing on lines of his own selection. The English method—or lack of method—gives a young man good holidays and some leisure and expects him to use it wisely. If only a decent interval can be secured between the University and the beginning of his life's work, I believe in the unchartered liberty

of the English method. It demands nothing, but it says in effect to the man, train yourself.

I should be glad to see every Secondary teacher bring some special bit of experience with him : let him travel and explore the spirit of another people ; let him go into business, if he likes ; let him study the poor and live among them ; let him take a turn at agriculture ; let him teach in a colony or in an elementary school in England ; let him live the life of a student, at a Training College or elsewhere (some such training is good for all), and lay the foundation of some special study. If he wishes to take Holy Orders, let him read with a parson and get acquainted with the parish. Let him by all means emancipate himself for a little while from the prejudices of a class and he will be better able to train up boys to perform the duty of man, both in peace and war.

It will remain a vexed question for each several teacher whether he should enroll himself among the officers of his Church. Of one thing I make no question that our vocation is high and honourable ; that it stands in its own right and should not be regarded as ancillary to any other calling, even the highest ; but that the sympathy, the earnestness, the sacrifice which form its foundation are all derived from and sustained by the living force of Jesus Christ. There are some striking words of Dr. Paton's which put our service and its only source in their right relation : " The best of us are just passers-on. People talk to us about *our* personal influence and *our* moulding the lives of the rising generation. . . . What am I, what is anybody but just an iron-filing with a capacity to conduct current ? There is only one word for the teacher to live by and it is this. ' I delivered unto you that which also I received of the Lord Jesus.' " That is the root of the matter : it is Platonism in a Christian habit. We, like Ion, are rhapsodists, iron rings in a chain which derives its magnetic life from God.

DISCUSSION.

Dr. SCHOFIELD remarked : May I suggest that the word teacher seems too small for Dr. Rendall's great theme. It is true, on p. 82, he seems to treat education and teaching as identical, but on p. 83 he already begins to give us his larger concept in describing thoughts and feelings which are not in themselves " teaching," in the strict sense of instruction.

Lower down he says the teacher must both love and like his children. This is a true part of education in the wider sense though forming no part of "teaching," strictly so called. The teacher has to *do*, the educator more especially has to *be*.

On p. 84 we get the raw material, "human metals and fibres," and the finished product, "destiny," but the means that changes the one into the other is obviously education in its widest sense, and not "teaching" strictly so called.

The learned Lecturer points out on p. 85 that education is largely unconscious when he says of the educator, he "*insensibly* raised the tone of those around him."

One may note here that education in the Board Schools consists mainly of teaching by books and is addressed to consciousness: whereas in our Public Schools the greater part of education is unconscious, and has no books nor direct teaching. Indeed, it is certain that parents pay their heavy school fees, not for book teaching, but for the education of the unconscious, or of character, in its largest sense.

May I suggest, on p. 87, that Mr. Hardy, in *Jude the Obscure*, does not make the dullness of the schoolmaster depend wholly on his teaching, as the Lecturer suggests.

On p. 89 the Lecturer speaks of instruction "chiefly by his own example": showing his concept that education does not consist mainly in conscious book-teaching, but in unconscious influence.

At the foot of p. 90 Dr. Rendall himself draws the distinction between the conscious and the subconscious.

I think he is too polite to Dr. Mercier on p. 91, when he characterizes his statement that "the schoolmaster knows and teaches nothing but words" as a commonplace. I suggest it is an untruth.

On p. 92 Dr. Rendall rightly eulogizes the cult of beauty.

But may I add that there is a danger in the cult of the natural beauty only of the human form. It caused the downfall of Greece. The cult of the true beauty of man embraces the moral and spiritual as well as the physical. The latter alone is a perilous worship, and it is possible that it may be of this that many teachers are afraid.

The power of the closing passages on p. 93 needs no eulogy from me. Its full force lies in the thoughts behind the words, and not merely in the expression used, and touches our highest ideals.

Lt.-Col. ALVES said : It gives me much pleasure to meet the Head Master of one of our greatest Public Schools, who is also a member of both the Head Masters' Conference and the Incorporated Association of Head Masters.

It is the wearer of the shoe, not the maker, who knows best where it pinches ; and if I have never been a schoolmaster, I have been a schoolboy ; and it is in this capacity that I desire to offer a few remarks which I have put on paper, being less bad as a writer than as a speaker.

Regarding the title of the paper, we may put teaching under two heads, administrative and executive, just as there are "bishops and curates."

As to the vocation, I suppose that we may define the word as a special natural aptitude and desire, a genius, and not merely an itch, for teaching. But even genius, to be of much use, needs training ; and it is comparatively rare. A talent, greater or smaller, is much more common, and, still more than genius, it needs a training to bring it to the surface.

The foundation moral qualities are firmness, patience and sympathy. On these are needed a knowledge of how best to present to the mind of the learner by eye or ear what he is to learn. This needs a knowledge of the general working of the human mind which, in the young, is chiefly animal and imitative, not reflective.

After this, the teacher must have a clear knowledge of what he is going to teach, even though he may be only one lesson ahead of the pupil. A difficult mastery of the special subject by the teacher will probably be an advantage, as he will thereby be more in sympathy with the learner than he would be if he had acquired it easily.

It is to the knowledge of the way of presentation that I would draw chief attention in my remarks.

Parents were intended to be the primary teachers of their children ; if wrongly taught themselves, they will, with rare exceptions, pass on to their children wrong matter, or a wrong manner.

In the opening clause of the paper is an allusion to Latin and Greek, and to "that linguistic discipline which has for centuries all but held a monopoly in our Public Schools . . ." Now, as an ex-schoolboy, may I say that I have been subjected to that "linguistic discipline," which I most unhesitatingly call "linguistic

fettering," a fettering which, being mental, not bodily, affects some (relatively few) hardly at all, some more, and some so much so that they can scarcely move hand or foot.

In this connection may I congratulate the said learned bodies which, with others, have deliberately fostered a system of wasting time over, not properly mastering, languages, a system denounced by Roger Ascham over 350 years ago, by John Milton, and by other wise, learned and thoughtful men. Not only is time wasted because, if learned on right lines, the elements of these old languages might be more easily and quickly mastered, and the heart of the scholar is too often discouraged by what to him is little better than the treadmill or shot drill (both now abolished in England),* but text-books for learning modern languages are constructed on the same old vicious lines; and anyone who, for business or other purposes, desires a mastery of one of them, has to go to one of the great advertised schools, all of which turn the "classical" order upside down.

Our text-books are doubtless perfectly correct, except as to Latin "quantities," which do not exist, Greek pronunciation which is that of Whitechapel, and Greek accentuation, whose chaotic misuse suggests Earlswood.

It cannot be too deeply impressed that the phrase, not the word, is the unit of civilized speech; and the phrase, whole, rightly arranged and rightly pronounced, should be first impressed on the learner's eye and ear.

Also, if after the more elementary lessons, the examples gave some useful knowledge, moral, historical, etc., the examples in each lesson being as far as possible connected with each other, then perhaps we might have time for Latin and Greek, as well as for many other things.

M. Gouin speaks to this effect, "the Sciences through the Languages and the Languages through the Sciences." As it is, neither sciences are learned; nor, by the majority, languages.

The blight seems to lie on other branches of learning. In my youth I learned about the battles of Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt, not knowing in the least where those places were, except that they were "somewhere in France." I have also seen books of travel either

* Is this so?

without a map, or with a map so placed as practically to be inaccessible to the reader, without breaking his thread of ideas.

I have also met many from our greatest Public Schools, almost incapable of following the simplest chain of reasoning; and I am inclined to attribute this density that I have found in all classes of society to our system of education—so-called—which may be summed up broadly as synthetic instead of analytic.

The former system discourages thought, the latter encourages it; the former is a blind-alley, the latter leads to the open country.

To the vast majority, a knowledge of certain ancient languages is—in itself—of little or no use, nor, for the matter of that, is a knowledge of historical facts; as a means of leading out the mind, both—rightly taught—may be of the greatest use; but then they must be taught rightly, not wrongly.

I commend these few remarks to the consideration of the reader of the paper, trusting that he may use his influence with those bodies of which he is a member to have a radical reform instituted in those branches of learning to which I have especially alluded.

MISS CONSTANCE L. MAYNARD (first Principal of Westfield College, University of London): It is always a pleasure to hear one's own individual thoughts worded afresh by an able mind, and I thank the Lecturer heartily for so clearly expressing the principles I have endeavoured to act upon all my life.

This year is the Jubilee of the inception of Women's Education, for Girton was opened in October, 1869. I entered in 1872, and so was one of the earliest students. Men had always had some kind of education, rough as it was, but women, on the intellectual side, had had none. It was therefore very natural that at first the merely intellectual side should be over-emphasised, and all the rest of the being left to develop itself as it might. Facts, accurate facts, and plenty of them, was the demand, as this had been the most obvious lack in times past. Young as I was, I began to see that though this was good, it was not all that was required, and when my time came to shoulder responsibility, I made it my first aim to try to unite the two strongest forces in the world, Christianity and Education.

The principles to be acted on were two. Both were new forty years ago, but I believe now every man worthy to be a teacher would

agree with the first, while many would still demur to the second. They are these :—

(1) That character is a more valuable thing than either ability or attainment. Now ability is very good ; it is like cutting with a sharp knife instead of a blunt one. Attainment is even better, for there are moral elements of perseverance in it. But character, fidelity to a trust, disinterestedness, courage, and all the elements of greatness, is a nobler thing still.

(2) That the sort of character required cannot be formed without true religion, true Christianity. This statement is by no means of universal acceptance to-day, and there is great satisfaction, and great hope for the future of England in hearing it openly expressed by the Head Master of Winchester. Behind the fresh young faces he sees the material that can be moulded into following the character of Christ, the Past-master of purity, the Will of infinite courage, the One who laid down His life for the world.

It is a great encouragement to hear such a lecture as this, a forward-call to every one of us who have the honour of belonging to " the finest profession in the world."

Mr. HOSTE was quite unable to agree with a previous speaker as to the futility of Latin and Greek studies at school. He was most thankful for what had been hammered into him there, and had found it since an immense help in many ways.

He thought Mr. Strachey's account of Dr. Arnold, referred to by the Lecturer, must have hit the mark, for " portentous attitude " so well described a great disciple of Arnold's, the late John Percival of Hereford, under whom he was for seven years. But his influence was immense in the school ; he was a " lover of good men," a terror to evil doers, and boys knew his sternness was that of earnest endeavour and high ideal. A half-smile from him was far more than a pat on the back from most men. But perhaps sternness in any form is not allowed in these soft days. He remembered, when tramping in the wilds of Central Africa in 1916, with his friend Dan Crawford of " Thinking Black " fame, this latter saying how once when dining at White House, President Wilson asked him what had struck him most on emerging on civilization after twenty-three years in the long grass, and he had answered, " No spankings in the nursery ; no gallows in the law-courts ; no hell in the pulpit." I do not know if the first item included " no birch in the school,"

but he would venture to ask the Lecturer whether the good old days of birchings, canings, sixth form lickings were entirely past, or whether an important sign of the vocation of the teacher was not still found in an ability to enforce discipline, as this was a point which did not seem to be dealt with directly in the lecture.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said : I hesitate to make any comments on so learned a paper. Yet there are one or two points on which I venture humbly to offer a few remarks.

In the first place, the question of "vocation," of which the Lecturer speaks with much force and wisdom, is one of the most vital importance. For "there are, undoubtedly, diversities of gifts"—not only in the Christian, but in every human being. And many a life has been sadly wasted because the parents had not studied, with sufficient care, the special qualifications which God had bestowed upon their child.

We also know—and our empty churches witness to the fact—that there are men in our pulpits to-day who were never really intended for the Ministry. But they are there from the same lack of discernment. That is, their true vocation has been ignored.

Then, there is one point on which I wish the Lecturer had laid even greater stress, and that is the regular and reverent teaching of Holy Scripture in our schools and colleges.

One of the saddest things in the education of to-day is the irreverent manner in which the Bible is treated in our universities, colleges and public schools. Many of our professors have been so much influenced by German higher criticism, that large numbers of our young men, when their so-called education is finished, come out of the ordeal with but little faith left in the inspiration of the Word of God. And hence the materialism which is spreading throughout the land with such deadly effect.

It is, however, with a sense of great relief that one gathers that this is not so at Winchester College. And, if the Lecturer could raise his voice in protest against this growing evil, and use his great influence towards giving the Bible its rightful place in our educational establishments, he would be conferring an inestimable benefit, not only upon those young people who are primarily concerned, but also upon the nation at large.

THE 608TH ORDINARY MEETING,
 HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
 WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, MARCH 17TH, 1919,
 AT 4.30 P.M.

ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, ESQ., M.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Secretary to read the Minutes of last Meeting.

The SECRETARY read the Minutes of the previous Meeting, which were confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon Dr. Rendle to read the Paper he is so kind as to bring before us this afternoon, I must call your attention to the circumstances under which he reads it. We were to have had the lecturer whose name is on the card, who was unfortunately taken ill at the last moment, and Colonel Mackinlay succeeded in getting Dr. Rendle to take his place, and this Society is greatly indebted to him.

I now call upon Dr. Rendle to read his Paper.

PLANTS OF THE BIBLE. By ALFRED B. RENDLE, ESQ.,
 D.Sc., F.R.S., F.L.S., Department of Botany, British
 Museum, S.W.

MR. CHAIRMAN, ladies and gentlemen, I am afraid my action is not quite so magnanimous as has been described to you. The real facts of the matter are these: As Dr. Wernham was unfortunately taken ill, I felt it was my duty to supply his place, and do the best I could, and so I told Col. Mackinlay that if a talk on the Natural History of the Bible, more especially the Plants, would be welcome to the members of the Institute, I should be pleased to say something about it this afternoon. It is a subject with which I have had something to do in connection with the Tercentenary of the Bible. We prepared an exhibition at the Natural History Museum, and I had the arrangement of the botanical part of that exhibition, so if I refer to a book in the course of the lecture I am merely referring to some of my own notes. The exhibition as a whole has been removed, but the botanical section still remains in the Central Hall of the Museum.

As regards the natural history of the Bible, there is one other

point to which I should like to refer before I begin. My lecture is announced as being illustrated by lantern slides, and so it is. Col. Mackinlay went all over the place trying to obtain some, to these I have added a few of my own, and will supplement them with drawings and specimens, so if you will regard this as rather a scratch lecture I think perhaps we shall spend an interesting and instructive hour together.

If we are really to understand the natural history of Palestine, we must understand the country itself. You have not a map here, so I have had to draw roughly a chart on the board, which represents Palestine. At the top we have the Lebanon Range. Here is the valley of the Jordan, down the centre. Then there are two parallel ranges of mountains, the Lebanon and on the other side the Anti-Lebanon. The Lebanon runs from the north, and melts away in the hilly country in the north of Galilee. My drawing is not quite good, but it illustrates my point. The Lebanon breaks away into the hilly country of North Galilee; then spreads into the hilly country of Southern Galilee, until near Nazareth we get the Plain of Esdraelon.

South of this it rises again into the hilly country of Samaria, which continues in hills with valleys intervening, through Ephraim, Benjamin and Judah to the south of Hebron. Thus we have a mountainous or hilly country extending from Lebanon in the north until we get to Hebron. Below Hebron the hill country sinks into a wide region of broad valleys suitable for pasture, which gradually pass into the wilderness of Paran, a vast limestone plateau separated by a sandy desert from the granite mass of Sinai. The western shore is fringed by a succession of plains, narrower in the north, but broadening down to Philistia and passing into the desert.

A parallel range, the Anti-Lebanon, culminates in Mount Hermon, and the mountains continue as the trans-Jordanic chain, passing into the Mounts of Gilead and Moab. The hills which rise to the east gradually lose themselves in the great Eastern Desert. The river Jordan, after passing through the waters of Lake Merom, rapidly descends to the Sea of Galilee, and then winds tortuously in a deepening valley between its lower terraces, which form the Plain of the Jordan, rarely more than two or three miles wide. It occupies about two hundred miles in passing through a distance of about sixty miles. The valley then gradually widens, and runs between narrow terraces.

The Plain of the Jordan is a narrow strip on either side of the banks of the river. Above that the higher terraces stretch away to the foot of the hills. Finally the river passes into the Dead Sea, nearly 1300 ft. below the level of the sea. Thus there is between these two parallel mountain chains, and the mountainous country into which they break, a very low and narrow depression forming the Valley of the Jordan. The variety in physical character of Palestine is therefore very marked.

On the sea coast, where frost is unknown and there is abundant rain, the rich plains yield crops of corn, millet and fruits in abundance. The hill country, the chief seat of the population in the times when Palestine was at its most prosperous period, largely precluded the corn farms of the plains, and induced the careful terracing of the hills, where the vine, olive and fig were the staple products. The hills in the days of the Patriarchs were covered with forest, which gave cover to many wild beasts. As these forests were cut down to make room for terrace cultivation, they were replaced by the olive and vine.

It is a serious matter to strip a country of its forest. The presence of forest helps the rainfall, and if you get rid of forest you may have a country which has been flourishing subjected to a very trying period of drought. During the period of anarchy and misrule which followed the fall of the Roman Empire the terraces were greatly neglected, the supporting walls crumbled, or were destroyed, and the soil was washed down into the valleys by the rain, so that where there were once flourishing vineyards, olive gardens and fig gardens there are now bare spaces of rock, and as the trees were destroyed there has been a diminution of the rain, and the country has been subjected to periodic droughts. We find references in the times of the Israelitish kings to these forests, the Forest of Hamath, the Wood of Ziph, and so on.

Arid conditions have replaced very largely the fertile conditions of Judah and Israel at the present day. In the highlands of Gilead across the Jordan we can get a picture of the kind of country which the Holy Land presented during the time of the Patriarchs. Beyond the Jordan was the portion of Gad, Reuben, and Manasseh, and there was never the population there that there was on this side of the Jordan. There was plenty of room in the open glades and valleys among the mountains for

the cultivation of corn, and there was no need to terrace the steeper slopes. From this we can form a very fair idea of what the country round Shechem and Bethel was like in the time when Abraham first visited it, and during the succeeding few hundred years.

The highest mountains are covered with pine, evergreens and other shrubs, lower down are semi-tropical trees, yielding, as we descend into the Jordan Valley, to the jujube, oleander and palm. In open glades corn is grown and olives planted, and the streams are fringed with oleander. Further south we find an open region of fine turf, well-watered and covered with flocks, stretching to the east to the fertile corn lands of Syria; and that again gives a picture of the kind of country in the south of Hebron round about Beersheba, a very open grazing country. In the extreme south is a tropical desert, with a characteristic surface of broken stone and shingle, and a vegetation of scattered, stunted bushes one foot or two feet high.

On the north the conditions are totally different; and towards the east we get the great Assyrian Desert. The most remarkable feature is the Jordan Valley, which we may describe as a tropical oasis. The Nile is a fertilising stream, which overflows its valleys and spreads its fertilising influence far and wide on its banks. "Cast thy bread upon the waters," etc., applies to the Nile, but not to the Jordan. The Jordan winds through what is practically a barren desert, with here and there an oasis of very deep green and remarkably vigorous vegetation.

Owing to the great depression the Jordan Valley is extremely sheltered and the sun is very hot, so that where there is sufficient moisture you have a remarkably vigorous vegetation; in fact it is a tropical vegetation. For instance, in the marshes as far north as Lake Merom, growing by the side of the lake, are acres of papyrus, now extinct in Egypt, but which in Bible times was the bulrush of the Nile. It reaches sixteen feet high, and occurs also in the Plain of Genesaret on the west of the Lake of Galilee.

The date palm was abundant here in the time of Josephus. Below the lake the palm still occurs on the east side, but there are comparatively few. The oleander fringes the river and its streamlets, and many other trees unknown in the rest of Palestine occur. In certain sheltered spots, such as the Plains of Shittim on the north-east of the Dead Sea and of Jericho on the north-west, the climate is truly tropical. The corn ripens in March, and melons ripen in winter. Birds of tropical affinity also

frequent these favoured spots, and the butterflies recall those of Nubia and Abyssinia.

There are two characteristic features about the natural history of Palestine. First its isolation, shut in by the sea, the desert, and the snow mountains; and then the extraordinary variety of its physical geography.

It is estimated that about 120 plants are mentioned in the Bible, and, as in the case of the animals, it is often difficult or impossible to associate the Hebrew name with a specific plant. I must confine my remarks to-day to plants, and I think that will take all the time we have at our disposal.

We must remember two things. The men who were put in charge of the translation of the Bible were not scientists, and in the second place, even if they had been scientists, science had not advanced far at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and practically nothing was known about the natural history of Palestine—in fact, it was not until Canon Tristram spent a year, from fourteen to fifteen years ago, in very careful collection and observation, and until his observations were published, that we had anything at all like an adequate idea of the natural history of Palestine. Hence the names in the Authorised Version were simply an effort, well meaning enough, to express in English the plant referred to, and in some cases the translators have not attempted to find an English equivalent.

The name Gopher wood is simply a transliteration. The word occurs only once, and may be the same as Copher, the Cypress, which is very common in Chaldea and Armenia, and from its toughness is very well suited for shipbuilding. In many cases words have been used which are not correct, as in the case of the Rose, Chestnut, Oak, Terebinth. Some have very general application, as Bramble or Thorn, and it is hopeless to pin down any particular plant to any special term. There is another term, "bitter herbs," which is one of very wide meaning; as Canon Tristram points out, the inhabitants of Palestine used a great variety of herbs in their salads.

I referred just now to one of the woods. I might refer to a second wood mentioned in the Bible, the Almug or Algom tree, which was imported by Hiram, King of Tyre, from Ophir. The wood was used in the King's house and for musical instruments, and it was evidently a very precious wood, and has been identified with the red Sandal-wood of India, which is of a very red colour, and is still used in the East. Or it may have been the true

Sandal-wood, which is very commonly used in India in carving and cabinet-making. Another wood is the timber which was used in the construction of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, the Shittim wood, or wood of the Shittar tree, which is repeatedly referred to. There is very little difficulty in identifying this, because practically the only tree available in the Arabian Desert is the Acacia, which flourishes in the driest situations. The timber of a tree growing very slowly would be hard and close-grained. The tree is also of good commercial value, as it yields gum-arabic. We find names of places derived from the wood, such as the Plain of Shittim, from the trees occurring there. As you will remember, it was the last camping-place of the children of Israel before they crossed the Jordan.

Then it may perhaps be interesting to run through a few of the trees and shrubs mentioned in the Bible, such as the Almond tree, frequently mentioned, where the flowers appear before the leaves; you read of Aaron's rod that budded. There is the Apple which occurs in the Song of Solomon. "Feed me with apples for I am sick of love." There is also a reference to the fragrance of an apple, and also to the pleasant shade of the apple tree. There is also an apple mentioned in Proverbs: "Apples of gold in pictures of silver." There have been a great many suggestions about this. It has been suggested that it was a Quince which was meant; but I do not think anybody would have eaten a Quince. Then some say it was a Citron; but a Citron would not be eaten raw.

Canon Tristram makes a suggestion which I think fulfils all the necessary conditions—namely, the Apricot. This is a fruit which is very beautiful to look at, is very fragrant and has a very pleasant taste, and if we accept that I think we have an explanation of "apples of gold in pictures of silver," for the foliage is bright in contrast with the golden fruit. The Apricot was not indigenous to Palestine, but was introduced from Armenia, and is now one of the commonest trees in the country. Then we find one or two references to the Chestnut tree, but again the Chestnut is not indigenous to Palestine. The Revised Version has altered this, and correctly rendered it the Plane tree, which is a very familiar tree to us in London.

Then there is the Cypress tree, which I have referred to as the tree associated with the Gopher wood from which Noah built the Ark. This is a native of Armenia, and very probably also

includes the Fir tree, which is mentioned now and again in the Bible, as well as the Cypress.

One of the most interesting trees of the Bible is the Cedar, the Cedar of Lebanon. There is a little confusion about this. The term is applied to trees generally belonging to the forests and mountains of Lebanon. Although the Cedar seems to be dying out on the mountains of Lebanon, there are very fine trees on the Taurus mountains, from fifty feet to eighty feet in height, with enormous horizontal branches. The wood was largely used by Solomon in the construction of the Temple and his own palace.

Some of the Cedars of Lebanon are very large. It is a very interesting story, the story of the Cedars of Lebanon. We have not time to go through it in detail, but I have one or two notes which I can give you. The age of these Cedars has been a matter of some controversy. In 1550, a French traveller, Belon, found in Lebanon 28 old trees, and it was said that these were the trees which Solomon planted with his own hands. In the years which have elapsed the number has gradually become less and less, and the slowness of their disappearance confirms the fact that they were already of great age in 1550. In 1574 there were 26 of great size. In 1696 Mandrell says: "These noble trees grow in the highest part of Lebanon. Of the older ones I could reckon only 16." In 1774 Dr. Pococke found 15 large trees standing. Sir Joseph Hooker in 1860 examined the grove, and found 398 trees in nine clumps, of which there were 15 trees much larger than the others, and apparently these were the trees described in 1550. The 15 large Cedars were measured by Hooker, who attempted to make an estimate as to their age by counting the rings of wood on the section of a branch, and he concluded that the largest tree, which was thirteen feet in diameter, might be 2500 years old! An estimate has also been made, based on a specimen brought home, which is at Kew. By a similar calculation 2230 years were obtained as an estimate for a tree of thirteen feet in diameter; so it is evident that these large old trees go back to a very considerable period of antiquity.

I am afraid I have not got a slide showing the Fig tree, which is interesting, because it is the first mentioned in the Bible, and there are very frequent references in both the Old and New Testaments to this. It is a native of Palestine, and is also generally cultivated there; the land was described as a land

of wheat, barley, vines, fig trees and pomegranates. It reaches a considerable size, and affords grateful shade. The figs when dried furnish an article of food. The green or unripe figs were called in the Aramaic "paggá," a word found in Bethphage, which means literally the house of unripe figs.

There is another kind of Fig tree in Scripture which bears a different name, the Sycomore tree. A very old tree at Jericho is known as the Sycomore of Zaccheus; it is questionable whether it is the tree into which Zaccheus climbed. The leaf resembles that of a Mulberry. There are many species of figs. The common Fig is one, and the Sycomore is another. The Sycomore has a short trunk and long-spreading branches, and it would be a very suitable tree for a little man to climb into if he wanted to see what was passing. Before we leave the Sycomore I might tell you that the fruit is not nearly so useful as the fruit of the ordinary Fig tree. It is bitter, but if cut as it is ripening, to some extent this is remedied; the Prophet Amos described himself as "a gatherer of figs"—that is, he cut the unripe fruit, which, as the result of that operation, was not so bitter as if it were allowed to ripen naturally. The wood of the Sycomore tree is light and very durable, and was used by the Egyptians to make their mummy cases.

There is another tree, which is sometimes confused with the Sycomore, and that is the Sycamine tree, which is spoken of in the passage where Christ says, "If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed," etc. The tree referred to there is the Black Mulberry, which is grown somewhat extensively in Palestine. In connection with Mulberry there is another confusion. The children of Israel were given a sign, and were told to fall upon the enemy when they heard the sound of a going in the tops of the Mulberries, but the word does not mean Mulberries, but refers to a species of Poplar, which is quite common along the sides of streams, something like our Aspen, the characteristic of which, as you know, is the very light way in which the leaves are attached, so that they shake and rustle; and the sound of the going was the rustling of these Poplars. So you have a rational explanation when you get the right term.

The Olive is one of the most characteristic trees of Palestine. As I mentioned when we were discussing the general physical geography of the country, the Olive largely replaced the forests in the original country between the maritime coast plains and the River Jordan; but the Olive needs attention, and since the fall

of the Roman Empire and the unfavourable conditions which followed in the Holy Land many trees have been cut down, and young ones have not been replanted, and although the Olive occurs at the present time, it is only a poor representation of the Olive cultivation which existed in the time of the kings of Israel and of our Lord. The trees are small, with leaves of a pretty dull green colour. They grew in the Valley of the Kedron, as you see in this slide. I have a picture here of a branch of an Olive tree, showing the ripe olives, which are like small purple plums. In the Garden of Gethsemane there are still a few very old Olives, which tradition takes back to the time of our Lord. We find references in the Bible to the gathering of the Olives by beating the trees with sticks. You may see this in practice in the South of France at the present day. The Olive must be grafted if it is to yield good fruit, and thus we find a contrast between the wild Olive and the good Olive.

The Oak tree is often confused with the Terebinth. There are several kinds of Oak which are natives of Palestine, but the Hebrew word sometimes means Oak and sometimes means undoubtedly Terebinth. It was a Terebinth tree which was associated with Abraham's occupation of Mamre, but there is a very fine Oak there still known as "Abraham's Oak," which marked the site of Mamre. It is 23 feet in girth, and is 93 feet in height.

My next slide shows the Date Palm, intimately associated with Syria and Palestine. The Greek for the Date Palm is *phoinix* (whence Phœnicia). It also grows in the hotter parts of Northern Africa, and, where warm enough, on the shores of the Mediterranean. It is the tree of the desert, but to be successfully cultivated must have a certain amount of water; the beacon of the oasis is the Date Palm. In the journey across the Red Sea, after passing Marah, the children of Israel were, as we should say, "fed up" and tired, and they came to Elim, where there were twelve wells of water and three score Palm trees, that is Date palms. It has a tall straight stem and is extremely graceful, and hence the association of its Hebrew name "Tamar," which is also used as a woman's name in the Bible, and is applied to the beautiful river which divides Devonshire from Cornwall.

There is no direct reference to dates in the Bible, but they must have been a very common article of food.

The branches of the Palm, which are referred to in the Bible as being strewn in front of our Lord, were the large leaves of

the Date palm. Jericho was the city of Palm trees. The Palm was also plentiful on the Mount of Olives, and Bethany on its eastern side means "house of dates"; but now the Palm exists neither there nor on the Mount.

My next slide shows the Pomegranate referred to in the description of the Promised Land. It is a small, evergreen tree or shrub. The Hebrew name Rimmon is a place-name in Palestine. The fruit and flower supplied models for carving, as on the capitals of the pillars in the Temple.

This next slide you will recognise as a Weeping Willow. It has been associated with the tree connected with the lamentations of the children of Israel in captivity, by the waters of Babylon, when they hung their harps on the willows. The Weeping Willow is a native of China; the tree of the captivity was a species of Poplar. Willows are referred to as growing by the water-courses; and Canon Tristram suggests that this Willow along the water-courses probably refers to the Oleander, a tree with a Willow-like leaf and a crimson flower, which is very common along the banks of the Jordan and the water-courses.

There is one other tree to which I should like to refer, and that is the Locust tree. The husks which the swine did eat in the parable of the Prodigal Son are no doubt these Locust beans. They are largely used for feeding horses. It has also been suggested that this was the Locust on which John the Baptist lived in the wilderness. The seeds, which are very hard and stony, are the origin of the carat weight used for weighing gold. They are very hard, and do not change.

We have not time to talk about the Vine. Since Bible times its cultivation has diminished, but the Moslems still plant the Vine for the sake of its fruit.

This represents the Wild Gourd, referred to as being shred into the pot. You will remember when the man exclaimed, "There is death in the pot," and the Prophet touched it, and the unhappy consequences were averted. The Wild Gourd is the Colycinth, which grows something like a cucumber. It is a fruit which is very tempting in appearance, but has an extremely noxious and bitter pulp; it is used in medicine as a purgative. When quite ripe it has little seeds inside. It is suggested that the Vine of Sodom, or Dead Sea Fruit, is also Colycinth.

My time is gone, but I should like to refer to a few of the herbaceous plants. As a child, I could not understand why it

was considered so difficult in the parable to distinguish between the Wheat and the Tares, but the Tares of the Bible were a kind of grass, the Darnel, which would be very difficult to distinguish from wheat until both were fully grown, and then they were easily distinguishable.

This is a picture of the Papyrus which grows on the northern course of the Jordan ; and this is the Marjoram, which may be the plant referred to under the name Hyssop, which was used for sprinkling the blood of the Paschal Lamb. This is a Mandrake. It is a plant with a golden-yellow fruit much prized by the women of Palestine, in the same way as in the old story in Genesis.

There are very few flowers mentioned in the Bible. We remember Christ's reference to the Lilies, but the Lily as we understand it is not a native of Palestine. If any one flower was meant, I suggest the Anemone, as it grows in very large quantities in Palestine, and forms a brilliant carpet of colour.

Another misnomer is the Rose, the Rose of Sharon. The Rose is not a native of Palestine, and it certainly was not the plant referred to. The Hebrew word denotes a plant growing from a bulb and was, perhaps, a species of Narcissus like a Jonquil, which grows from a bulb and is a very common plant.

I hope I have not detained you too long, but I might spend a very long time on this subject.

DISCUSSION.

Dr. SCHOFIELD (Chairman) said he would not make any remarks upon the very interesting paper to which they had just listened, but rose to propose a hearty vote of thanks to the learned lecturer for his interesting address, which he felt sure would be carried with acclamation.

He should much like, before he sat down, to ask the lecturer three questions:—First, was the prickly pear, which is now all over Palestine, there in the time of Christ? Secondly, the Palm tree is now nearly extinct in Palestine. Is it probable it will again multiply? Thirdly, may not the Rock Cistus be the Rose of Sharon? He begged to propose a hearty vote of thanks to Dr. Rendle for his admirable paper.

Mr. ARTHUR W. SUTTON said that he would like to be allowed to second the vote of thanks to Dr. Rendle for the extremely interesting paper he had read. It was a very special pleasure to join in welcoming Dr. Rendle to the Victoria Institute. He had long known Dr. Rendle in the Linnean Society, and in other circles where the pursuit of science linked together those whose aim it was to discover more and more of the hidden wonders of Nature, and this increased the pleasure of meeting Dr. Rendle on an occasion like the present at the Victoria Institute, where so many men of science have joined with the Institute in bringing to bear upon Bible records the result of their researches.

Mr. SUTTON mentioned that he had had the privilege of visiting Palestine and Syria many times, and the subject of Dr. Rendle's paper, therefore, was of peculiar interest to him. Knowing Palestine so well himself by personal observation, it struck him as a very remarkable fact that Dr. Rendle had obtained so intimate and accurate a knowledge of the country, with its principal features and characteristics, and more especially its flora, without having travelled there himself.

It was a noticeable feature of Dr. Rendle's paper that, although in a few cases, and some of these very interesting cases, it was suggested that a more accurate translation would have given a different meaning to that with which we are familiar, yet the paper generally afforded very substantial and confirmatory evidence of the accuracy of Holy Scripture.

Referring to the olive groves of Palestine, and the Scriptural reference to "wild olives," and "good olives," and the fact that the productiveness of these olive groves depended upon the wild olive being grafted with the good olive, Mr. Sutton asked Dr. Rendle if he could offer any suggestion as to where the Hebrews, or their predecessors in the country, could in the first place have obtained the good olives for the purpose of grafting. Dr. Rendle, in reply, said he was decidedly of the opinion that the good olive must have been cultivated in Palestine before the advent of the Israelites, but as to the source from which it originally came there was at present no certain information, nor was it possible to say whether the good olive had been evolved or developed by any method of cultivation from the wild olive indigenous to the country.

Mr. W. DALE, F.L.S. : I only want to ask Dr. Rendle whether, as regards the Cedar of Lebanon, it is good building wood, because I have read that it is not, and that the Cedar employed in building in Joppa was the Red Cedar. Then I want to know about the Fig tree, which is very interesting, because it grows in our climate. In a garden in Southampton where Dr. Watts once was, there is a magnificent fig-tree, and also in the ancient Abbey of Beaulieu. I can recollect in the middle of March a fig-tree putting forth her green figs which always fall off, and it suggested the stars which fall from heaven, when it speaks of the fig trees casting their untimely figs.

Mr. A. W. OKE : This paper will, I am sure, be much valued, and I hope it will cause us to study our Bibles more deeply in our homes and in the libraries. I hope the paper will be scattered broadcast, as well as in the *Transactions* of the Society. I am sure it will be of great value.

Mr. W. HOSTE : I want to follow the excellent example of our Chairman by asking a question instead of making remarks. I have read that there is a Lily, which is very prevalent along the shores of the Lake of Galilee, and I think there was a Tiger Lily in Palestine which is really what is referred to. I should very much like an explanation.

Lt.-Col. G. MACKINLAY said he wished to join his warm thanks to the others for the excellent lecture which he had enjoyed very much. He was grateful to Dr. Rendle for pointing out how considerable are the references to plants in the Bible, and for correcting the English translation when it is at fault in the rendering of the names of some trees and flowers.

He spoke of the lilies of the field mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount. Sir Isaac Newton had remarked in the same passage that, as our Lord very frequently referred to things actually present there is good reason to conclude that it was then early summer time. This agrees with and confirms the context.

Dr. Rendle also referred to a tree plucked up by the root and planted in the sea (Luke xvii, 6). As transplanting takes place in the winter, we judge that it was most probably at that season of the year when these words were spoken. This also agrees with and confirms the context.

The various seasons of the year are also indicated in many different points of the Gospels by similar indirect references.

These will be found very useful in the construction of a reliable harmony of the Gospels.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT : The Lecturer said that the general appearance of the land west of Jordan had greatly changed during the last few years, but the land east of it had remained unchanged. Perhaps in his answers he would tell us why this is.

Dr. RENDLE : I am very grateful, Mr. Chairman, to you and to my audience for the very kind way in which you have received the remarks which I have been able to make this afternoon on the Plants of the Bible. As I have said, I am afraid one could have spoken at very much greater length, and perhaps in being brief I may not have been quite clear. I think I will answer the last question first. My point with reference to fertility on one side of the Jordan as compared with the other was that on the west there was originally forest, but when it gave place in cultivation to Vineyards and Olive yards, that meant a destruction of the trees, which were replaced by terrace cultivation. If you do not keep up those terraces the walls fall, and then, as the heavy rain comes you get the bare rock. On the other side of the Jordan the population has not been so dense and the trees have not disappeared, whereas in the first case you have driven nature out and supplied artificial cultivation. Then, if these terraces are not kept up, there is no soil left for the trees to grow again. In course of time the trees may grow again, but that will be many years hence.

As regards the Lilies, I remember in my early days we had a picture, the unveiling of the Lilies; and Christ was pointing to Madonna Lilies, but personally I do not think that is what was meant by "Consider the lilies." You get a wonderful mass of colour with the Anemones, and I should have thought that it was the general mass of flowers which was referred to in that case. The Lily is mentioned in the Old Testament, and the word there is quite an indefinite term.

Then the Chairman mentioned the Prickly Pear. This is a new world product, and was not known in our Lord's time.

Then as regards the Palm. No doubt under favourable conditions

the Date Palms may be planted, and will grow again in the Jordan valley in great abundance.

As regards the Rose. The Rock Rose does not grow from a bulb ; the little Narcissus Tazetta grows from a bulb, and is a very favourite flower in the north of Palestine.

Mr. Sutton asked—Where did the children of Israel get the good Olive ? Of course the cultivated one must have been produced from the Wild Olive, but I think I am right in saying that the children of Israel found it when they got into the Holy Land.

The Meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

THE 609TH ORDINARY MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, MAY 5TH, 1919,
AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COLONEL GEORGE MACKINLAY IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The SECRETARY announced the election of seven Associates:—Mr. J. Harvey, Miss E. A. Everett, the Rev. C. Neill, M.A., M.B., the Rev. Principal Samuel Chadwick, the Rev. G. H. Johnson, M.A., Mr. Thomas Fox, and Mr. Albert Close.

The CHAIRMAN, in calling on Professor Langhorne Orchard to read his Paper, reminded his hearers that he was one of the four winners of the Gunning Prize, his subject having been "The Attitude of Science towards Miracles," in 1910.

THE ONE IN THE MANY, AND THE MANY IN THE ONE. By Professor H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc.

First Thoughts.

WHEN, introduced into the universe, we look out *upon* it and then look *into* it, among our first thoughts is the idea of association and content. We associate Unity with Plurality, Plurality with Unity, and each as contained in the other. We note that our body is one, containing many members; that the universe is one, containing things and persons, many parts constituting the whole of which each is one part. We note that things and persons possess *qualities*, many of them possessing one and the same quality,—*e.g.*, stone, iron, wood (under ordinary conditions), have the common quality of solidity; mercury, water, milk that of fluidity; all have besides the common quality of weight; the common quality of gaseity belongs to oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen. Turning our attention to persons, in Plato, St. Paul, Hamilton, we recognise the common quality of philosophy; in Homer, Virgil, Solomon, Schiller, Milton, Shakespeare, that of poetry; in Daniel, Pericles, Bismarck, Lord Burleigh, that of statesmanship; and so on.

The *one* common quality is in the *many* possessors. If we

group them together, we obtain a class—the *many* being in this *one* class, included in its membership.

The Problem of Number.

Although men's thoughts have from their beginning been conversant with Number, few subjects have at once so attracted and baffled inquiry as the *relation* between Unity and Plurality—*how* The One is in The Many, and The Many are in The One. For the acutest and profoundest ancient philosophers, and some of the most gifted minds in our own time, the problem has proved exceedingly perplexing, yet of fascinating interest, leading tireless investigation up a mountain path, steep indeed, but which rewards the climber with a purer, more bracing air, and a wider, clearer view. The far-famed Samian sage held that the ultimate principle of all Being was to be found in Number. Plato, greatest of non-Christian philosophers, agreed to a large extent with Pythagoras and, in conjunction with his great master, Socrates, brought forward his famous theory of the "Ideas," with that of "The One in The Many, and The Many in The One." This theory, justly regarded as one of the supreme achievements of human intellect, may be collected from his Dialogues—"Theætetus," "Parmenides," "Phædo," "Timæus," "Republic," and others.

Plato's Theory.

Taking survey of the universe, Plato recognised its divisibility into two worlds or spheres,—the visible, consisting of our bodies and other objects perceived by our senses, the invisible, containing our souls and thoughts and moral and other qualities of a general kind. He saw that sense objects are transitory, in a state of flux and change, passing away, to be succeeded by others passing away in their turn; whilst general (or common) qualities, such as justice, courage, beauty, have permanence, remaining unchangeable through successive generations. Drawing therefrom the conclusion that the invisible sphere is higher and more important than the visible, he urged that we should especially consider and attend to it,—not to "the things which are seen" and "temporal." This led him to construct his theory: The "Ideas" are ideas of general qualities arrived at by generalization and abstraction from sense objects which suggest them through Reminiscence of a knowledge of them divinely given to the soul when it was in a pre-natal state of existence. Sense objects remind us of certain ideal *archetypes* according to which they were formed by the Divine-and-Human Architect of the universe; these archetypes, having been present as thoughts and purposes (*νοήματα*) in the mind of the

The Ideas, and Sense Objects.

Opinion and Knowledge.

Three Idea Aspects.

Creator when HE created, causing visible things to be what these things actually are. Sense objects offer likenesses—reflections and shadows—of the archetypal Ideas, but, owing to association with matter, these likenesses are imperfect and obscure. We compare them with their archetypes (*παραδείγματα*), and judge that they fall short; whence it follows that we must at some time have known the archetypes. Therefore, as this knowledge has not been obtained by us since our birth, we must have had it before. Originating in the Divine mind, the Ideas have Divine character and unity; pre-existent to things created, they are certain, unchangeable, true, and everlastingly stable, independent beings. They are the objects of knowledge; sense objects, because of their fluctuating unstable* character, cannot be *known*, for there is no certainty on which the intellectual anchor can take hold—they are objects of *opinion*. The Ideas are intellectual objects† with which the pure intuitive reason is conversant and, as like goes to like, they can be known by the soul which is itself pure reason or intellection. Their home is in the Divine mind—the pure absolute universal intellection (*νοῦς*) where they originated, and they make habitation in souls all finite intelligences being manifestations, or modes of existence of the universal *Νοῦς*. An Idea has three aspects—(1) A Divine thought, (2) The imperfect image of this thought presented in the sense world, (3) The mental concept which is the reflection in our mind of this image.‡ Calderwood has pointed out that Plato gives to the general conceptions of Socrates the character of Ideas which constitute the fundamental ideas of Reason, and are at the same time regarded by him as the perfect essences of things—the eternal laws of being. They belong to a super-sensible state—“a world or sphere of ideas.” Intelligence is at first confused by the shadows of the sense state, striving to rise into the “upper world” of higher knowledge, where The Good, which he ultimately identifies with GOD, is supreme. We are reminded by Whewell that the “Reason” conversant with the Ideas is not Reasoning, with its dialectic, but is that *intuitive Reason*§ which apprehends the truth of First Principles

* Like the waters at any point of a river.

† Incorporeal and without parts.

‡ I.e., the reflection of (1) by a finite intelligence subject through limitation to conditions of space and time.

§ GOD, the Soul, the World, are Ideas of the Reason (*Νοῦς*).

Reason and Reasoning.

and discerns truths deduced from First Principles. This is the Reason which deals with knowledge, controlling and governing those emotions and appetites that are impulses to human action, and so producing virtue—a harmony of the soul. Pure Reason, as well as Reasoning, makes use of hypotheses (which are tentative conceptions of the Idea that is being sought); but Reasoning never gets further than hypotheses, whereas Pure Reason arrives at direct apprehension of the first principle or Idea. Thus the conclusions of Reasoning—mere Reasoning—never rise higher than *Opinion* (which, true or false, is a matter of persuasion only), whereas those of Pure Reason, avouched by logical demonstration with direct intuition, present the certainty belonging to *Knowledge*. If Ideas were not realities, *cognition* would be impossible.

Reminiscence.

Opinion, even though true, is comparable to artificial light which shows us but indistinctly the reflections and shadows of the Ideas as perceived in sense objects which, by reminiscence, suggest and recall them. But Knowledge resembles the light of the sun which shows things perspicuously and plainly. True opinion may belong to any man, but intellection is the privilege of only a few men. A Definition (*λόγος*) of a class is the image (*εἰκὼν*) of its Idea, and includes all we can discover about the class from observation; the Idea includes all there is to be known about it. Hamilton ("Discussions") remarks that the word, as employed by Plato, expresses "the real forms of the intelligible world, in lofty contrast to the unreal images of the sensible." Tiberghien says that "according to the Platonic sense, adopted by Kant and Cousin, ideas are, as it were, the essence and matter of our intelligence, they are its primitive elements, and at the same time the immediate objects of its activity. They are the primary anticipations which the mind brings to all its cognitions, the principles and laws by reason of which it conceives of beings and things. The mind does not create *ideas*, it creates by *means* of ideas." (*Essai des Connaiss.*, p. 33.)

"Worthy" and "Un-worthy" Ideas.

Socrates and Plato at first restricted their theory to such ideas as they judged to be "worthy." Moral and intellectual ideas, *e.g.*, justice, courage, beauty, were "worthy"; but many other ideas were "unworthy." Socrates being asked (in "Parmenides") whether he admits ideas of physical things such as man, fire, water, answers: "There I have often felt a difficulty." And to the further inquiry: "And of such things

as hair, mud, filth?" his answer is: "By no means. Indeed the case of such makes me sometimes tremble even for the others. At present I devote my attention to those" (*i.e.*, moral and intellectual) "just admitted." Here Socrates probably represents Plato in his early immature philosophising days. Parmenides pointed to him that his theory would be incomplete unless it admitted the ideas in every branch of knowledge, and Plato appears to have been convinced by the argument of the Eleatic, and to have become "a consistent idealist." The mature philosopher may have believed that ideas of "unworthy" things were in the mind of the good Creator when He created them, and being Divine thoughts they could not be really unworthy according to any accurate definition.

Composite and Opposite (or Contrary) Ideas. Qualities may combine to form composite ideas, the number of qualities varying, *e.g.*, the idea of "man" comprises a greater number of combined qualities than does that of "beauty," and the idea of "you" more than that of "man." Opposite (or contrary) qualities may coexist in the same subject, but will not combine*; neither will qualities combine with contained contraries—*e.g.*, hot and cold are contraries, and, though hot *water* can become cold, *hot* cannot become cold, *i.e.*, heat cannot become coldness—even and odd are contraries, therefore two and three, which always contain them, can never combine respectively with odd and even.

Sense Objects exist. Plato supposed the Ideas to be Substances. Plato affirms that the objects of the visible world must be accepted as *existing*, and that they are Many and One. They "participate" in the archetypal ideas after which they were created, and resemble them, the resemblance of any sense object to its idea being proportionate to the extent of its participation, and the relation between them like that between a man's features and the expression of his face. In the Idea theory Plato saw a simple-unifying principle. The Ideas, although incorporeal, were supposed by Plato to be substances to which parts could be added and from which parts could be taken. He was the first philosopher to affirm the doctrine of *Realism* as a primary postulate of cognition, the Ideas being the only true and knowable objective realities, self-existent and unchangeable, and one of them correlating with each general term. Their genesis was the result of a combination of two factors—"1. The One, the essentially One; 2. The essentially Plural—the Indeterminate

* But on approach, one or both will perish or withdraw.

Genesis of
The Ideas.

The One.

Scheme of Investigation.

Dyad, the Great and Little." The One* has no parts, and is supreme over everything, whether in the visible or in the invisible world : The One is also The Good and Absolute Eternal Truth, Source of all Life and Beauty. In "Parmenides," with a dialectic ability always acute and generally profound, the important question : "Does The One exist?" receives, after rigorous investigation, the answer : "If One is not, nothing is." Since then something certainly exists, One exists. Plato's scheme of investigation may be formulated thus :—

1. If The One is, what consequences follow to The One and that which is not The One ?
2. If The One is not, what consequences follow to The One and that which is not The One ?
3. If The Not One is, what consequences follow to The Not One and that which is The One ?
4. If The Not One is not, what consequences follow to The Not One and that which is The One ?

Since The One has *no parts* (by reason of oneness), it results that The One is without beginning, middle, or end ; therefore, in regard to space, is infinite, and, in regard to time, is self-existent and eternal. Also The One is unchangeable ; for if it changed it would be no longer the same as before, and therefore would cease to be The One. We conclude then that The One is Supreme, Good, Absolute Eternal Truth, Source of all Life and Beauty ; † and is Infinite, Eternal, without beginning or end, Unchangeable, and Self-existent. By Him the universe was created, the efficient cause being His will, according to purpose and plan embodied in the archetypal Ideas. (The One is, therefore, a Person.)

Genesis of The Many
From The One.

Since The One exists, The One is identical with The One *Being*. The One Being (idea) contains two ideas, or (in Platonic phrase) "two *parts*," namely, oneness and being. Each of these two parts has itself two parts, for it partakes of oneness (because contained in The One), and of existence (because contained in Being). Similarly, each of these last two parts has two parts, and whatever becomes a part, however small, possesses the two parts—oneness and being—perpetually. The successive

* Aristotle recognised four modes of Oneness, viz., those of an Individual, a Universal, a Whole, a Continuity. Waddell remarks that to say "One" involves the mental act of numeration, i.e., of reckoning Plurality. "One" and "Many" involve each other.

† Of Whom the beneficent Sun is a type.

stages may be exhibited thus:—(1) (The) O(ne), B(eing) ;

$$(2) O + B; (3) \left(\frac{O}{2} + \frac{B}{2} \right) + \left(\frac{B}{2} + \frac{O}{2} \right), \text{ i.e., } 2 \left(\frac{O}{2} + \frac{B}{2} \right);$$

$$(4) \left(\left(\frac{O}{4} + \frac{B}{4} \right) + \left(\frac{B}{4} + \frac{O}{4} \right) \right) + \left(\left(\frac{B}{4} + \frac{O}{4} \right) + \left(\frac{O}{4} + \frac{B}{4} \right) \right),$$

i.e., $4 \left(\frac{O}{4} + \frac{B}{4} \right)$, and so on perpetually.

And from The Three.

The One Being, and The Many.

Also, since The One and Being differ from each other, but the difference is not owing to The One's existence as The One, nor to Being's existence as Being, that which makes them differ must be a third thing, different from both of them. Thus, there are *three* things, each of which is one, viz., The One, Being, and the Third. Now, since The One and Being are two, i.e., twice one, "is it not necessary" * for twice to be? And, since there are two and twice, is it not necessary that there should be twice two? Similarly, since there are three things, that there should be three and thrice and thrice three? And, since there are three and twice, and two and thrice, is it not necessary that there should be thrice two and twice three? Hence there would be the evenly even, the oddly odd, the oddly even, and the evenly odd. If, then, this is the case, do you think that any number is left that is not necessarily there? If, then, One exists, it is necessary for Number to exist likewise. But if Number exist, the Many would exist. As all existing things are parts of Being, very many, therefore, are its parts. What, then! Is there any one of these which is a part of Being and yet is not *one* part? It must be a certain *one* thing (since it cannot possibly be nothing). The One, therefore, is present to all and each part of Being, deficient in neither a less or a greater part, or in anything else. The One, then, is divided into parts equal in number to those of Being; and neither is Being wanting to The One nor The One to Being, but these two are always equalized through all things—The One † is in The Many. The One in itself is One only, but when distributed by Being is Many,—The Many are in The One. ‡

* Parmenides is speaker.

† Oneness is a property of Being. If anything is, it is one and not many. Omne ens est unum.

‡ I.e., in The One as *existing*, The One *Being*. The One, as One absolute and simple, has no parts.

Plato identified the pre-existent and self-existent One with GOD, and the Ideas with HIS purposive thoughts (*νοήματα*) after which as archetypes HE created the various objects of the visible world in which the Ideas are reflected or are shadowed. These reflections and shadows suggest their Ideas to the soul, recalling them through reminiscence of knowledge of them in its pre-natal state. But, on account of association with matter, they are presented in an obscure confused manner which cannot satisfy the soul. For the soul being an emanation from GOD Who is the Pure Reason, partakes of HIS character, knowing the Ideas as Like knows Like by direct intercourse, because akin to them, loving them, seeks to know them more and more, finding its delight in the pure pleasure* of their contemplation. The aim of the philosopher is to keep aloof (as far as possible) from the influence of matter and the entanglements of the body. The pleasures and pains, weaknesses, maladies, appetites and passions, of the body, greatly hamper and hinder the movements of the soul's activity.

Hence, we cannot wonder at Plato's counsel (in *Republic*, vii), that those undergoing careful preparation to fit them to be guardians of the city should be led, when they reached the age of fifty, to devote themselves to contemplation of the Ideas and especially of Goodness, that alone being Good which is like the Idea of The Good—The Good One, The Summum Bonum, which is GOD. In the apprehension of HIM as the Self-existent Source of the Ideas and as The Chief Good is involved the obligation of making it our aim to know HIM and be like HIM, as *Truth* of every kind involves the evidence of its own eternal stability. The Platonic doctrine of Ideas was an attempt to explain the possibility of such stable eternal truth. We are taught that such truth cannot be derived from objects of sense, they being themselves transient and unstable. But such truth can be had respecting Ideas, which are themselves stable and eternal. As there is thus stable, eternal Truth, so is there stable, eternal *Good*, "which true philosophy aspires to realise and to participate in."

Socrates and Plato bid us find in the doctrine an antidote to the fear of death. To the philosopher, aspiring after the supreme Source of all Truth and Good, death comes as a friend and deliverer.

* Cf. Rom. vii, 22.

The One is GOD, The Ideas are HIS Creative Thoughts.

The Ideas and Human Souls partake of the Divine Character of our Knowledge of Ideas.

Matter is an Obstruction to Plato's Counsel to City Guardians.

Our Aim in life should be to know GOD, Who is the Chief Good.

The fear of Death is removed by true Philosophy.

*On account of our being in the Body, in this life the perfect fruition of Intelligence (the full knowledge of The Ideas and of GOD) can never be attained, although the philosopher accustoms his soul to be as independent of the body as is possible, to withdraw from communion with it and to act by herself—by processes of pure thought, without aid of the senses; Death is to be welcomed by him as the realisation of the philosopher's dream, the fulfilment of that intellectual enfranchisement which by a life-long struggle he has in only scanty measure attained. How, then, can he fail to be of good cheer when the hour arrives of his release from the close confines of his bodily prison into the wide pure air of free intellectual life? The virtuous philosopher is sure of his well-being. In his life, and in the manner of his death, Socrates himself exemplified the virtuous philosopher.

Our consideration of the remarkable theory which I have been bringing before you may well lead us to marvel that Plato's idea of GOD, although falling far short, should be so free from error, and to so great an extent approximate to the Biblical revelation; and that he should have believed the architect and artificer of the universe to be a Person at once Divine and human. Very noticeable also is his insistence that the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. We ask: How did he gain knowledge of these truths? Something is attributable to the circumstance that, after the death of his master Socrates, Plato left Athens and travelled for some years, visiting Egypt and other countries. He would thus probably come in contact with Jews, by whom his attention (that of an earnest truth-seeker) might be directed to the Old Testament Scriptures. Without doubt, however, a fuller explanation is in the fact, which centuries afterwards was to be preached to Plato's keen-witted countrymen by the great Apostle, that The Good One, looking down from Heaven, has in HIS Providence arranged things with the purpose and desire that men should seek HIM if haply they might *feel after HIM* in Whom they live and move and have their being, and *find HIM*. Plato was such a seeker and feeler-after; to him, as to all others, the result followed the inflexible law—"He that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened."

Plato's wonderful theory, although enriched with so much that is true and beautiful, appears to me to suffer from a mistaken supposition as to what really constitutes an Idea or

* Socrates speaks here.

His Fundamental Error.

Quality. To Plato the Ideas were Substances, incorporeal it is true, but yet Substances, which can be added together* after the fashion of material objects, the resulting substance being greater than any of the component substances. Aristotle seems to have detected this error. To his keen insight, the affirmation "that motion, or that smallness, is a thing in itself, set up in nature, is a hard saying." This will also be our opinion. It is easy to see that the doctrine of Realism may lead to absurdity:— Let A and B be two equals, and let smallness be taken from A and added to B. Then, since smallness is a "substance," B plus smallness is *greater* than A minus smallness; whereas it is really *less*, for smallness has been added to it. Similarly, let A, B, be two equal truths, each containing also some error; and let the error be taken from A and added to B. Then, since error is a "substance," B is now *greater* than A; whereas it is really *less*, for error has been added to it. Other cases can be examined in the same way. Plato's knowledge of Algebraic ideas appears to have been but slight. He saw that contrary ideas refuse to combine, but apparently assumed that they could peacefully coexist, *e.g.*, that greatness and smallness are not irreconcilable opponents. Had he been acquainted with the meaning and use of the symbols + and —, he might have steered his theory clear of this Scylla of Realism.

My Own Theory.

Where Plato's profound and keen intellect has failed of success, it may be thought presumption in me to attempt. Yet, encouraging myself with the adage "Fortune favours the bold," I am wishful to submit to the intelligent criticism of this philosophical Society a theory of my own which, in my judgment, avoids the difficulties connected with that which we have been investigating.

The main question relating to Ideas is—What do we mean? or, What ought we to mean? when we speak of a *Quality*. Philosophers and thinkers generally have with remarkable unanimity shirked committing themselves to a strict definition. In the knowledge of the character of a thing or a person we know that thing or that person—their *character* tells what *they* are. Now character is the resultant of (all the) qualities; if we knew all the qualities and their combination, we should know the character, and thus the possessor of the character. Therefore, the knowledge of one or more qualities is to that extent

* By "participation." Plato's theory is here self-contradictory, since participation is impossible in that which has no parts.

Qualities are Manifestations. a revelation of character, and thus of character's possessor. From this it follows that a Quality is a *Mode of Manifestation* of its possessor. We feel a stone, and say that it "is" solid, heavy, hard, or that it "has" solidity, heaviness, hardness; each of these qualities revealing the stone's character to some extent, and therefore being modes of the stone's manifestation, we say naturally and correctly not only that the stone "has," but that the stone "is." We observe the decisions given by a judge, and, noting their justice, we call him a just judge; his justice is a mode of manifestation of his character (to some extent), and therefore of the man. I hold that in every creature lies power, or capability, for self-manifestation, to some extent and by some mode or other, to other creatures.

Explained by the Divine Character. The explanation of this appears involved in the Character of GOD. "The Good One" is LOVE. LOVE would create in order to bless with the highest form and mode of blessing the creatures. Its power brought into being; and the highest form of blessing would be Its own Self-manifestation. Since the creation would be according to Divine purpose and thought, creatures would in some measure participate in the Divine character, and be endowed with power or capability for some sort of self-manifestation to one another for the benefit of each and all. The universe may be compared to a body of which the various creatures are members; the members should manifest themselves to one another for the common good and be united by a common sympathy. They are "The Many in The One" (universe), and, since each is one part of this One, "The One is in The Many." And do not these phrases acquire a deeper and grander meaning as we remind ourselves that the universe with its "Many" had pre-existence in the Divine Mind, that in Christ all things consist and were created, and He fills all things; that out of GOD, The Good "One," and through HIM and unto HIM, are all things, to Whom be glory for ever. Amen!

The Doctrine of The Trinity written large in Nature. Plato deduced all things from a Divine Triad, namely, The One, Existence, and Another united to both. He held also Three Ideas of the Reason. This would lead us to conclude that he regarded Three as the basic and fundamental Many, and is suggestive of the sublime Christian doctrine of The Trinity, The Tri-unity. This doctrine, of The One in The Three and The Three in The One, is written large in the Book of Nature. Let us glance at some of the pages.

(1) The Triune God reveals Himself to His creatures as Spirit (Source of all life and power), Light (Holy and Righteous, Source of all illumination), Love (Giver of His only-begotten Son, for the Redemption of sinners). (2) The nature of Man (made in the Divine image) as spirit, soul, body. (3) Consciousness, as Hamilton points out (in "Discussions"), is "a complex phenomenon comprehending three several terms: 1^o, The idea of the ego and non-ego as Finite; 2^o, The idea of Something else as Infinite; and 3^o, The idea of the Relation of the finite element to the infinite." (4) Mind comprises Reason, Desire, Affection. (5) Mental Life has Thought, Feeling, Will. (6) The Christian spirit, knowledge, hope, have, each of them, three links with GOD. (7) The page of Space tells us of three dimensions—length, breadth, height or depth. (8) That of Time says three—past, present, future. (9) If we turn to the page of Substance, we read three—spirit, ether, matter. (10) And Matter speaks of gravity, pressure, temperature, and of the three states—solidity, liquidity, gaseity. (11) This Globe, on which we are living, shows mountain, plain, valley, points us to its triple kingdom—animal, vegetable, mineral; and reminds us every day of land, and water, and air. (12) The page of Belief is occupied by conjecture, or opinion, or knowledge, according as our minds concern themselves with (mere) possibility, probability, or certainty. (13) The page of Logic, written in the type of syllogism, exhibits two premises and a conclusion built upon them by the laws of thought. (14) Religion declares that in proportion as faith, hope, love, "these three," influence the Christian, so will the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of GOD, and the Communion of The Holy Spirit, live in his daily life. It were easy to mention yet other triads, but these may suffice to show that "The One in The Many" and "The Many in The One" have their basis in the Divine Trinity.

Did some such thought scintillate in Plato's mind when he urged knowledge of the Ideas and contemplation of them as leading to knowledge and contemplation of The Good One—The Creator, Source of all life and power, from Whom the Ideas and human Souls are emanations? It is certain that Plato regarded this knowledge, this contemplation, this intercourse with GOD, as the supreme aim and end of human aspiration, as the soul's fullness of satisfaction. The Ideas, being Divine *Νοήματα*, originated from the Divine Character, and, being impressed on creation, manifested, "by the things that are

made," the "eternal Power and Godhead," and attested the Goodness, of the Creator.

Communion, Assimilation, Unification.

In pursuance of our theory that Qualities are manifestations or aspects of the substance to which they belong, and that all things (including persons, a "person" being a thing possessing consciousness and will) have, as a common attribute, the power or capability of *Self-manifestation*, it behoves us to supply an answer to the inquiry: What is the aim and object of self-manifestation? The aim and object is *Communion*. The purpose and result of communion is *Unification* through assimilation—The One passes into The Many, and The Many are in The One.

Power of the Will.

All things belong to one great family, they are members of one body, The Many in The One. And The Good Creator has tempered this body together so that the members should have the same care one for another and show a common sympathy. The One in the Many implies Self-manifestation in thus going out to others. This leads us to see that the necessary condition for communion is *receptivity, or apprehension*, which in a person involves will and willingness. Since "Like goes out to Like," it follows that, in order to communion between A and B, there must be, as the one goes out to the other, a receptivity (or an apprehension) based on some likeness, *i.e.*, A and B must have something in common. This, therefore, is a *sine quâ non* for communion. In the case of a *person* there is the added condition of *willingness*. The reason why "Like goes out to Like" is to be found in the *attraction* of the something which is common to both. Between two persons, and between a person and an impersonal, this attractive force can be *increased* or *decreased* at the choice of the will; thus personal communion is dependent on personal *will*. The will is itself acted on by those two springs of human conduct—the heart and the head, the desires and affections and the reason. The heart asks: "Is it pleasant?" the head asks: "Is it beneficial?" The heart says: "I like it"; the head says: "I will think it over, and consider whether it is wise." The heart desires; the head considers. In the decisions of wisdom the two should be *unanimous*.

Heart and Head.

Especially is such unanimity important in regard to communion with GOD. HE laments, over HIS People's apostasy, "Israel doth not *know*, MY People doth not *consider*" (Isaiah i, 3); and, when they return to HIM, wonderful blessing is promised in order "that they may see, and know, and consider,

and understand together" (Isaiah xli, 20). We have a supreme reason for loving GOD in the fact that HE first loved us; HIS LOVE is the attraction to our love and our "reasonable service."

GOD has spoken, and out of Zion, the perfection of Beauty, GOD has shined. HE has manifested HIMSELF to men in Jesus Christ our Redeemer and Lord, Whose Name is The Word of GOD, Who is the Forth-shining of HIS glory (Hebrews i, 3), and is also the Mercy-seat (Romans iii, 25), where GOD meets with man for communion (Exodus xxv, 22). It is at the Mercy-seat especially that attraction between HIS Love and ours grows stronger as, under The Holy Spirit's teaching, communion increases communion, as increasingly we come to know that triad—the eternal harmony of three notes of a common chord—the breadth, and length, and depth and height, of the Love of Christ. There, in the fulfilling of His prayer to The Father, for all believers on Him, that they all may be One even as The Father and The Son are One, "I in them and THOU in Me, that they may be made perfect in One," we recognise the perfect ideal of The One in The Many, and The Many in The One, that GOD may be All in All. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ!

GOD'S Self-Manifestation and
Communion through Christ.

The Perfect
Ideal.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Col. MACKINLAY): There is much of value in this careful paper on a difficult subject. One naturally turns to find what the Professor has to say about the meeting of the Christian philosopher St. Paul with the heathen philosophers at Athens as recorded in Acts xvii. It looks as if our author, on p. 123, referred to this incident as showing the Apostle's approval of heathen philosophy. Of course he did approve of it to a certain extent. But has not the Professor somewhat missed the point in the scriptural record? This seems to be that St. Paul agreed with his hearers, as far as he could, in order to attract their attention; but he only did so in order to tell them of their *ignorance*, thus showing that their philosophy had failed to be of any real use.

That being the case, the Apostle told them that God had *revealed* the way, and had attested His Divine Message by raising up the Son of God from the dead. But again heathen philosophy failed: it did not even prompt its votaries to investigate the credibility of the evidence of the Grand Miracle of the Resurrection, and consequently no progress was made.

Philosophy has had its uses in the past, much more than in the present day; when the worldly man, in this materialistic age, admires the man of action rather than the dreamy speculative philosopher; and the earnest spiritually-minded man finds far better guidance in revealed Scripture than in any system of philosophy.

Our author tells us how easily a philosopher may involve himself in contradictions (see p. 124). St. Paul warns us against philosophy, linking it with vain deceits (Col. ii, 8). Although a philosophic wise man himself, he admonishes his hearers of the dangerous effects of mere worldly wisdom (Rom. i, 22; 1 Cor. i, 22, etc.).

It is recorded that in the Early Christian days when numbers joined the Church, that even philosophers were converted, as if they were the most difficult of all to be reached. At the present day the Mahomedans, who have much truth derived from the Bible, are most inaccessible, being satisfied with what they have: another hindrance is their great tendency to disputations. Philo, the Jew, a believer in revelation, was correct when he wrote: "The mind that is to be led forth and set at liberty must be withdrawn from . . . sophistical reasonings and from plausible arguments."

The Professor has done good service by directing our attention to this intricate subject.

At the conclusion of the discussion the Chairman proposed a hearty vote of thanks to Professor Langhorne Orchard for his carefully thought out paper: this was carried by acclamation.

MISS MAYNARD: It has been said that all philosophers since the time of Plato look at the universe through his eyes, and I suppose that is in the main true. He has been quoted to-day as excluding "unworthy" ideas from the Divine Mind, but our Lecturer appears to take the opposite view, and I should be very glad of a little further explanation. It seems that Professor Orchard embraces *all things* in the One, who is God. In the old days the "unworthy" ideas are spoken of as "hair, mud, filth," but to the Christian they also comprise the spiritual evils, illusion, wrong-doing, sin. If these ideas are in the Mind of God, we have Pantheism, and Pantheism is not Christianity. That evil is, as Browning says, "a shadow implying light, a silence implying sound," may be

an attractive view to the world, but it is not that of our Lord, who whenever He spoke of evil treated it as a living and acting force against which the powers of Heaven were arrayed, a battle that demanded the enlistment of our whole will and force if we would be among those "who overcome." I am sure our Lecturer would not deny this, and I should be glad to know whether his "all things" includes no moral ideas, but those intellectual only. Pantheism creates an atmosphere in which Christianity cannot breathe or live at all.

Rev. CHANCELLOR LIAS writes (abbreviated): Plato's teaching about God is a great deal based on Oriental mysticism and its strange vagaries and follies: nevertheless he approaches more nearly to Christianity than any other philosopher.

I will ask you to note that Moses, who must be regarded as the forerunner of the greatest and most successful Teacher the world has ever seen, and who is still widely recognised as having been sent by God as such a forerunner, commences his work with the direct contradiction of the principle affirmed by all the heathen philosophers, Plato included, that man's sin was the result of the impurity of matter. Moses insists on the fact that man, so far from being endowed by his Creator with an impure body, was created by God, and as such was pronounced by Him "very good." Neither does Moses describe him as falling from his original innocence by any innate impurity of his material body, but from a disbelief, insinuated by a tempter from without, that God had (not) given the commands, which He *had* given.

Chancellor Lias adds: German metaphysicians have persuaded some of us to believe in a God of our own manufacture, not a God revealed by Himself alone, through intermediate phases of His Being, commonly called Persons—German metaphysicians tell us to think of God as "The Infinite," "The Absolute," "The Unconditioned." The Bible tells us to believe in a Living God, revealed by a Revealer, and communicated to the human spirit by the Divine Breath—German metaphysicians have bidden us to conceive of God as the moral order of the universe and nothing more.

Dr. BRIDGES thanked the Lecturer for his highly philosophical paper, and recalled with pleasure his student days with Professor Langhorne Orchard. It was generally agreed that all the wisdom

of the world did not belong to modern times—we had continually to guard against the narrowing of our ideals. No one could deny that in the philosophy of the old teachers we had the essence of right living. That of Socrates and Plato might be summed up in two words, “Know thyself.” The philosophy of Marcus Aurelius could be briefly expressed by the phrase “Control thyself,” which he extended in his *Meditations*—to stay impulse, efface impression and quench inclination—the doctrine of a typical stoic. The marvellous teachings of Jesus Christ were built up on the basis of an unmistakable altruism—“Deny thyself”—and thus we had the philosophical trinity, “Know thyself, control thyself, and deny thyself.” But, on the other hand, much of the more profound early teaching was too speculative, too imaginative and theoretical, and little progress could be made on Thought alone. Nor was Experience without careful thought a sure factor of progress. The two must ever be combined; there must be a perfect reciprocity between them, and right Action would be the result. Hence we had another trinity—Thought, Experience, and Action.

The doctrine of the One in Many and the Many in One was as much a scientific axiom as a philosophical truth. The Lecturer had made out a good case for the latter, but both psychologically and physiologically each individual was an example of the Many in One, and the One in Many. It was indeed a marvel of science that after the fusion of the human spermatozoon with the ovum, a cell division was begun that did not end with the individual but passed on through generations of beings, so that each cell in our living frame contained some infinitesimal part of the entire race of our progenitors, and we passed on the living “Atoms” to posterity.

The Many in One was expressed by what we called personality, intuition, hereditary tendency; the one to be in many was nurtured by our ideals, which reflected upon our emotions or, in other words, gave the individual “the emotion of the ideal,” as Benjamin Kidd would say.

There was thus an impelling force, the *vis a tergo*, and the attractive force, both moving in what might be styled Plato’s “Invisible Sphere.” Such should make for the betterment of the race.

Plato’s theory of the search for the beautiful might be tested by modern standards—it was the doctrine of the Good Angel which had a reforming grace of first importance. This was the philosophy of

Jerome K. Jerome's play entitled "The passing of the Third Floor Back"—such was his idea of the essence of Christianity.

Like the old alchemists we still sought the "Essence of one thing." Dr. Bridges said that this one thing was God. Tyndal remarked when he beheld the resurrection of the Spring-time, that "The Kingdom of Heaven was at hand" and the World's greatest Teacher had said the Kingdom of God was within us. God was the One in Many, and in the fullness of time we should return to the bosom of our Father and be the Many in One.

Mr. ROUSE said: Professor Orchard has given us a far better definition of a quality than Plato's; but I venture to amend the new definition a little. The Professor says that quality is that which manifests the character of a person or a thing. But suppose that an unsuspecting stranger in passing over a moor fell into a deep bog, and that a native of the district, before there was even a cry for help, rushed up, lifted him out and guided him on to firm ground, this action would help to manifest the native's thoughtful, kindly character, yet it would not be a quality. Therefore we must [in any case] add an adjective to the definition and say that a quality is that which *permanently* manifests character.

Remarks by Rev. J. J. B. COLES: It is interesting to note that intuition is connected with the soul and emotions, as well as with the intellect—hence an intuitive judgment is often superior to a merely intellectual one.

As to the Greeks and their philosophies, we remember the words of the Apostle Paul: "The Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom—but we preach Christ crucified—unto the Jews a stumbling-block and unto the Greeks foolishness—but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks—Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." The philosophers of Athens did not receive this wisdom—and no inspired epistle was written to the Athenians.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: Our thanks are due to the Lecturer for his suggestive lecture, especially for introducing or reintroducing us to Plato, a seeker after God, who found indeed some golden grains of truth; but what a contrast between what he found and the solid gold of the Professor's closing page: the full revelation

of the Glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. To go back now from Him to philosophy is like forsaking the meridian sun for a rushlight. Plato's conception that all sense-objects are but the reflection of Spiritual Ideas in the Mind of God is striking. Whether true of all sense-objects it would be hard to say, but the Levitical economy of types and shadows is a remarkable illustration. The tabernacle was, we know, the pattern of a heavenly reality. The difficulty of translating sense-objects into their corresponding ideas is shown by the fact that the major part of Christendom has failed to translate the sense-objects of the old dispensation, and we see them around us in all their crudity instead of the spiritual ideas they represent—the shadows instead of the substance: for the ideas are not less solid than the sense-objects (*e.g.*, the resurrection body of Christ; tangible though spiritual), but infinitely more real and lasting. Why this difficulty? Plato ascribes it to the transitory and fluctuating character of the sense-objects that they are associated with matter. But this is the Buddhist, Gnostic, Theosophist concept. There is nothing evil in matter *per se*. The difficulty is in our spiritual being. One of the direct results of sin is to deprive us of the capacity to translate sense-objects into their corresponding Ideas. I think the suggestion of the Lecturer that a "quality is a mode of self-manifestation" valuable, leading to communion and unity: the many thus becoming one. But if *spiritual* unity is to be effected, the self, the ego must be indwelt by the Spirit of God. Sin is a disintegrating force, and though evil may unite temporarily for common ends, such unity cannot last, for the tendency of selfishness is to create as many centres as there are individuals. Poets may sing in their armchairs "All's right with the world!"; but it is only by ignoring that terrible fact which the Bible calls sin and which can only be met by Divine Power on the ground of the Atoning work of Christ.

Remarks sent by Dr. SCHOFIELD: It is a most luminous presentation of Plato, and the criticism of his views seems well warranted if we are to attach its ordinary meaning to the word "Substance," and what the Professor adds seems to a learner like myself on Quality and Character, most admirable.

The dictum, on p. 118, "The mind does not create ideas," of Tiberghien might perhaps be better expressed "does not create *all*

ideas," and must not be taken absolutely with regard to the whole paper, as, with the conclusions of Socrates, they are so numerous, and so absolute on such abstruse questions which depend entirely on the meanings we attach to the words we use that it is difficult to avoid contradictions.

Compare, for example, the first line on p. 120, repeated half-way down the page, and p. 125 (15 lines from bottom), "each is one part of this one." Also p. 121 (6 lines from bottom) and p. 120 (8 lines from bottom) states this one which is divided into parts is identical with the one that is not (line 1).

This beautiful paper ends naturally with line 3, p. 128. What follows is extraneous to it, though very true, and does honour to the Christian instincts of the distinguished author.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

My many thanks are due to this philosophical audience, especially to those who have joined in the discussion, for the patient attention and cordial appreciation with which they have received my paper. Some of the remarks in the discussion invite a brief reply: *The Chairman*, if he takes account of the whole verse, Col. ii, 8, will see that what is there censured is not philosophy as such, but only that kind of philosophy which is "not after Christ." *Miss Maynard*: Is there not what may be called Christian Pantheism? All things are of GOD, and the day is coming when GOD will be All in All. Very reverently we may say that when HE created Satan, and when HE created Man, HE fore-knew every sinful thought and action. Even we ourselves may have ideas in our mind which we do not regard with sympathy but with abhorrence. Perhaps we have an analogy in the ether which, though present in "hair, mud, filth," is undefiled by them; and in the beautiful sunlight shining upon a cesspool, but retaining its own purity. The Lord Jesus touched the leper, yet contracted no defilement. I warmly thank my whilom student, *Dr. Bridges*, for his valuable triads. *Mr. Rouse* can surely not intend to tell us that all qualities are permanent. The remarks of *Dr. Schofield* are, as always, most thoughtful and luminous. He refers to some difficulties or supposed contradictions. These seem soluble by

noting that my theory is not necessarily the same as Plato's on every point considered ; and also that the simple abstract idea of The One (as Oneness) is not identical with the idea of The One Being (where the idea of Existence is added). We are much indebted to *Mr. Hoste* for the way in which he has pointed out the connection between "the invisible things" and "the things which are made," and how Matter is properly subservient to Spirit. He will, I hope, take frequent part in our discussions.

THE 610TH ORDINARY MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, JUNE 2ND, 1919,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, D.LITT.,
IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The SECRETARY, Mr. SEWELL, announced the election of the Rev. Canon Berry, formerly an Associate, to be a Member, and the election of Major P. J. Wiseman and Mr. Herbert A. Hall as Associates. He also announced the death of Sir T. F. Victor Buxton, Bart., a Member.

It was also announced that owing to the serious illness of Lady Halsbury, Lord Halsbury would be unable to deliver the Annual Address on June 16th. Lt.-Col. Mackinlay had very kindly undertaken to deliver the Annual Address, his subject being the Literary Marvels of St. Luke.

“*THE MOSAIC CALENDAR.*” By E. WALTER MAUNDER,
Esq., F.R.A.S., Superintendent of the Solar Department,
Royal Observatory, Greenwich.

BY “The Mosaic Calendar” I wish to denote the complete circle of national religious observances enjoined by the Law ascribed to Moses, and recorded in the Pentateuch. I have no desire to deal with the ritual laid down for these observances, or with the typical, prophetic, or theological significance attaching to them. But these ordinances have a special interest for me in connection with my own profession, since they have a specific relation to the heavenly bodies. Thus in Genesis i, 14-15, we read:—

“And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for appointed assemblies, and for days, and years: and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.”

“SEASONS.”

In our English versions, the word which I have rendered “appointed assemblies” is given as “seasons.” There is no doubt as to its meaning. In the great majority of cases where we meet with it in the Old Testament, it is translated

“congregation,” but here, and in Leviticus xxiii, 4—“these are feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons”—the “seasons” are the “times appointed” for the assembling of the people in acts of worship.

The purposes, therefore, for which the lights of heaven were ordained, were not only to give light upon the earth, to divide the day from the night, and to be measurers of time for all the nations under heaven—that is to say, “to be for days and years”—they were to be “for signs and for appointed assemblies;” signals when men should gather together to worship God.

This general principle, therefore, is laid down in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. The Book of Exodus exhibits the principle put into practice. It records how the children of Israel were delivered from their bondage in Egypt, and how Jehovah called them to enter into Covenant relation with Him as His Chosen People. This new relationship began at that strange supper, eaten standing and in haste, before they were called to start on their moonlight march toward the wilderness. Then came the passage of the Red Sea, by which the chains of their slavery were struck from off them, and a few weeks later, an enfranchised people, they entered into solemn Covenant with Jehovah at Mount Sinai. Then with all possible speed the means for seemly public worship were provided: the tabernacle with its furniture was constructed; the priesthood appointed and the altar consecrated. This done there follows, without a moment’s pause, the record of the appointment of the “continual burnt offering” :—

“Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs of the first year day by day continually. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even: . . . This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation (appointed assemblies) before the Lord: where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee . . . and I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them: I am the Lord their God.” (Exodus xxix, 38–46.)

We find the same observance commanded in the Book of Numbers, chapter xxviii, 1–4 :—

“ And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Command the children of Israel, and say unto them, My offering, and my bread for my sacrifices made by fire, for a sweet savour unto me, shall ye observe to offer unto me in their appointed time of assembly (due season).”

THE DAY AND THE YEAR.

Thus each day was marked out and sanctified by an act of worship at its beginning and by another at its close. And the times for these two daily services were indicated by the sun, which by its rising called men to set in order the morning sacrifice, and as it sank to its setting to offer the evening oblation. The sun was for the two “ seasons,” the two “ appointed assemblies,” of the “ continual burnt offering.”

But the sun was for both “ days and years ”; the day being a miniature of the year, and the year a day on a longer, fuller scale. As, therefore, the day is divided into two portions, the light portion which we call “ day,” and the dark portion which we call “ night,” so the year is divided into a bright, warm portion, the summer, and a cold, dark portion, the winter. And carrying out the analogy of the two acts of daily worship, the morning and the evening sacrifices, two great religious ordinances were instituted in the year, the one at the beginning of summer, the other as the summer drew to its close. And as we use the word “ day ” sometimes to designate a complete period of twenty-four hours, including the hours of both day and night, and sometimes as referring only to the hours of light, so the word “ year,” which usually denotes the complete round of the seasons, is employed in connection with these two great annual religious celebrations, as if it were confined to the summer half. One of these, the Passover, with the connected week of unleavened bread, was held in spring time, in the beginning of the year :—

“ And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months : it shall be the first month of the year to you.” (Exodus xii, 1-2.)

“ These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their appointed times (seasons). In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord’s passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord : seven

days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation : ye shall do no servile work therein. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days : in the seventh day is an holy convocation : ye shall do no servile work therein.” (Leviticus xxiii, 4-8.)

The other—“the feast of ingathering,” or of Tabernacles, as it is more commonly called—was held six months later, in the autumn :—

“Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, The fifteenth day of this seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles for seven days unto the Lord.” (Leviticus xxiii, 34.)

“In the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days : on the first day shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a sabbath.” (*Ibid.*, 39.)

“The feast of ingathering, which is in the end of the year, when thou hast gathered in thy labours out of the field.” (Exodus xxiii, 16.)

Thus, as the morning and evening sacrifices stood respectively at the beginning and end of the bright part of the day, so the great feasts of spring and autumn, Passover and Tabernacles, stood at the beginning and end of the bright part of the year. The sun, when he crossed the equator northward in the spring, was for a sign, and for an appointed assembly, a “season”; and again when he crossed it southward in the autumn. Thus each year was marked out and sanctified by an act of worship at its beginning, and by another at its close.

The month also was sanctified by a religious observance. By its nature, the month does not supply so close an analogy with the day as does the year, and in primitive times the first appearance of the “new moon” was the only phenomenon of the month suitable as a sign or signal from whence time could be reckoned.

So in Numbers xxviii, 11, the ordinance for the continual burnt offering of the sacrifice of a lamb in the morning and of a second lamb in the evening, is followed by the injunction :—

“In the beginnings of your months ye shall offer a burnt offering unto the Lord ; two young bullocks, and one ram, seven lambs of the first year without spot.”

Further in the tenth chapter and tenth verse of the same book, it is added :—

“ In the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings; that they may be to you for a memorial before your God : I am the Lord your God.”

That these five “ seasons ” should be “ appointed ” as times for religious observance, was simple and natural. The beginning and ending of each day, the beginning of each month, the beginning and ending of the summer half of each year (that is to say, the two equinoxes of spring and autumn) are important notes of time, indicated by the heavenly bodies, and appropriate as seasons for public worship.

THE SEVENTH.

But the Mosaic Law laid emphasis on another principle not thus directly dependent on the relations of the heavenly bodies. This is the principle of the special sacredness of the seventh : every seventh day and every seventh year were held specially sacred, and were kept for rest. And the seventh month in every year was peculiarly the month set apart for sacred services ; in particular for the most solemn service of the whole Mosaic ritual, that of the great Day of Atonement.

Let it be noted that there is nothing in the natural character of the seventh day to distinguish it from any of the other six. That which marks it, if we accept Genesis ii, 2-3, and Exodus xx, 8-11, as historical, is the Word of God Himself ; it is an act of choice on His part, and if the seventh day is observed by men, it is observed by men who do so in the exercise of their own power of choice, which they desire to bring into accord with what they have accepted as being the Divine choice. The day is sacred, not as being different in itself from other days, but as being chosen for special observance by God and by man.

Equally so was it with the seventh year. This was a sabbath of rest, just as the seventh day was. Indeed, in Exodus xxiii, the yearly sabbath is put before the weekly sabbath, as if the latter were derived from the former :—

“ Thou shalt not oppress a stranger : for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt. And six years thou shalt sow thy land, and shalt gather in

the fruits thereof: But the seventh year thou shalt let it rest and lie still; that the poor of thy people may eat: and what they leave the beasts of the field shall eat. In like manner thou shalt deal with thy vineyard, and with thy oliveyard. Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed.” (Exodus xxiii, 9–12.)

An analogous regulation dealt with the case of a Hebrew who had fallen into poverty and had been sold into servitude:—

“If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.” (Exodus xxi, 2.)

“And when thou sendest him out free from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty.” (Deuteronomy xv, 13.)

The significance of the observance of the seventh day and of the seventh year was that of rest, and release from slavery.

The seventh month of each year was distinguished in the same spirit. There were special sacrifices over which the silver trumpets were blown on the first day of every month, but it was only on the first day of the seventh month that it was commanded:

“Ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work: it is a day of blowing the trumpets unto you.” (Numbers xxix, 1.)

“Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement: it shall be an holy convocation unto you; . . . Ye shall do no manner of work: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings. It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath.” (Leviticus xxiii, 27–32.)

SEVEN TIMES SEVEN.

This principle of the sanctification of the seventh day and of the seventh year received a yet further application. Seven times seven was to be counted from the sabbath of the week of unleavened bread:—

“When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest:

and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it . . . and ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven sabbaths shall be complete: Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord." (Leviticus xxiii, 10-16.)

The regulation is given in a different form in Deuteronomy xvi, 9-12 :—

"Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee: begin to number the seven weeks from such time as thou beginnest to put the sickle to the corn. And thou shalt keep the feast of weeks unto the Lord thy God with a tribute of a freewill offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the Lord thy God, according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee: and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen to place His name there. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt: and thou shalt observe and do these statutes."

This feast of Pentecost, though ordained *in* the wilderness, was not ordained *for* the wilderness. It was to be kept "when ye be come into the land which I give unto you"; not before. As the fundamental idea of the seventh day was rest, so the fundamental idea of the forty-ninth day, seven times seven, was that of fulfilment, of completeness. The Day of Pentecost was the completion of the feast of unleavened bread, and is still so regarded.

The feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, completes also the seven "holy convocations" whereon no servile work was to be done; and observed as sabbaths in addition to the ordinary weekly day of rest. The other six are the first and seventh days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the four holy days of the seventh month, that is to say, the Feast of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement and the first and eighth days of the Feast of Tabernacles. In most years, therefore, no fewer than eight days in the seventh month were kept as sabbaths in the fullest sense

of the word, a circumstance which influences importantly the rules for the drawing up of the Jewish Calendar to-day.

It should be noted that it was necessary that the people should know some days before these “holy convocations” exactly when they were going to take place, in order that due preparation should be made, and this rule must have applied to the Feast of Trumpets as well as to the other six.

Lastly it was ordained :—

“Thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years : and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof : it shall be a jubilee unto you and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family.” (Leviticus xxv, 8-10.)

This is the complete Mosaic Calendar, the full circle of religious observances commanded to Israel, as laid down in the five books of Moses. The continual burnt offering, day by day, in the morning and at even ; the great annual festivals in spring and in autumn ; the monthly blowing of trumpets at every new moon ; the special hallowing of every seventh day and of every seventh year, and of the seventh month of every year ; the completion of the Feast of Unleavened Bread after seven weeks by the Feast of Pentecost ; and the completion of the seven weeks of years in the year of Jubilee. The circle was thus complete, and thenceforth a new circle began.

CALENDARS.

Whatever calendar men use, or whatever their state of civilization, they count by Days, for the Day gives us our most definite measure of time. If we wish for a larger unit, we have the choice of two—the Month and the Year. Nomadic nations have a natural tendency to reckon by months ; agricultural and settled nations must count by years. But a difficulty is experienced when the attempt is made to reckon both by months and by years,

since in practical life we cannot deal with fractions of a day, and a month is not an exact multiple of a day, for its mean length is equal to 29·5306 days, and a year is not an exact multiple either of the day or of the month, for it is equal to 365·2422 days, or 12·37 months.

In western Europe at the present time no attempt is made to divide our time by the natural month : we really reckon only by years, counting 365 days to the year in most cases, and 366 days to the year in the remainder. We divide the year arbitrarily into 12 portions, varying in length from 28 days to 31, and these we call "months," because they appear to have been long ago once regulated by the moon.

The Mahommedans, on the other hand, use months only, and their so-called years are merely an arrangement for reckoning their months in dozens.

We in western Europe begin our year with the first of January, an arbitrary date, having no fixed relationship to any given phase of the moon or direct connection with any specified position of the sun.

The Mosaic Calendar, on the other hand, was directly dependent both on the natural year and on the natural month. The reckoning employed was therefore strictly luni-solar ; in contrast with the Mahommedan, which is purely lunar, and with the Christian civil reckoning, which is purely solar. To bring this about would seem to be a difficult problem, but the Mosaic Calendar solves it in a way both simple and complete.

The first reference to the Mosaic Calendar in the books of Moses occurs in Exodus xii, which, as we have seen, lays it down that the year is to begin with the month in which the Israelites came forth from Egypt : the month, that is, in which the original Passover was held :—

" This month shall be unto you the beginning of months : it shall be the first month of the year to you." (Exodus xii, 2.)

In the instructions which were given later for the second and all future celebrations of the Passover, it was enjoined that :—

" Ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest : and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you : on the morrow after the

sabbath* the priest shall wave it. And ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt offering unto the Lord.” (Leviticus xxiii, 10-12.)

These two injunctions fixed the date of the Passover :—

“ One of the Jewish ordinances was that a sheaf of barley should be offered before the Lord as the first fruits of the harvest. This was to be done in the Abib, or month Nisan, immediately after the Passover, on the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month. If it were found before this day had arrived that the barley would not be then ripe, it was evident that the season, according to the reckoning by lunar months, had been accounted as arriving too early in the year. It must be made to come later. The first day of the Abib is approaching; the first day of the new year; the beginning of months. But, by the sun, the spring season has not arrived; the barley is not ready for the reapers; the lambs for the Passover are not yet fit to be killed. The first day of the ceremonial year must be postponed till the next lunation commences. The current year which is coming to a close must be increased in length by another month.”†

I would ask your special attention to this point. It was not the calendar that decided when the Passover was to be held: it was the Passover which decided when the calendar of the year was to commence. It began when the necessary provision for the feast was seen to be ready, and not until then.

THE LUNI-SOLAR YEAR.

Twelve natural months contain 354 days, more or less. Thirteen natural months similarly give 384 days. But a natural year is most generally 365 days in length: 11 days longer than the one, 19 days shorter than the other. Therefore the beginning

* This “ Sabbath ” is generally interpreted as referring to the “ holy convocation ” of the fifteenth day of the month. If so, the sheaf was waved on the sixteenth day, but for our present purpose it is a matter of no moment whether the sixteenth day of the month is meant or the ordinary sabbath of the week.

† *Elements of the Jewish and Muhammadan Calendars*, by the Rev. Steward Beaumont Burnaby, M.A., F.R.A.S., London, 1901, pp. 13, 14.

of the first month of the year must shift about with respect to any given point of the natural solar year. But by sometimes including a thirteenth month in the calendar year, the true length of the solar year is represented exactly on the average, and a perfect adjustment made.*

We are not told anywhere in Holy Scripture as to the method by which it was decided when a thirteenth month had to be intercalated into the year. The explanation quoted above from the Rev. S. B. Burnaby, is, however, not only in accordance with tradition, but necessarily follows from the stated conditions of the case. Similarly, no account is given us as to the mode of determining the first day of any month. But here again the

* At one of the meetings of the Victoria Institute, where the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch was under discussion, a visitor urged that "scholars" were almost unanimous against the traditional view. But a scholar can only claim to be an authority on the point where he is "scholarly." Now some of the most distinguished scholars of the day are far from being scholarly on this point of the length of the year. Thus two years ago a neat little edition was brought out by the S.P.C.K. of the well-known Apocryphal book of Enoch, usually known as the Ethiopic Enoch, or Enoch I, and an Introduction was written to it by Dr. Oesterley, in which was advanced an extraordinary argument brought forward by Leszynsky, in a recent work on The Sadducees (*Der Sadduzäer*, 1912). He says (p. xvi), "Leszynsky holds that the original portions of Enoch I emanated from Sadducean circles, and that the special object of the book originally was the bringing about of a reform of the calendar. . . . The basis of reckoning time was one of the fundamental points of difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees, for whereas the former reckoned time by the *lunar* year (360 days), the latter did so by the *solar* year. . . . The writer desires the adoption of the solar year, while his contemporaries wrongly followed a different reckoning, and therefore calculated the feasts at the wrong time. The 'sinners who sin in the reckoning of the year' are the Pharisees," and Dr. Oesterley accepts the argument, for he says: "The point may appear small to us. . . . It is, at any rate, a strong point in favour of the Sadducean authorship."

Dr. Oesterley did not perceive that the Jewish year was neither a lunar year nor a solar year, nor a compromise between the two, but a practical and logical way of combining the two measures of time. Leszynsky's suggestion is both astronomically and arithmetically absurd, and would be fitly paralleled if some foreigner were to assert that the point at issue between members of the Established Church of England and Non-Conformists was a question of the reform of the multiplication table, the Anglican doctrine being that 12 times 30 was 354, while their opponents claimed that it was 365. Three hundred and sixty days is not a lunar year, nor did the Pharisees adopt a year of that length. The Sadducees, on the other hand, reckoned their religious festivals by the luni-solar year, as did the Pharisees likewise.

testimony of tradition and the conditions of the problem are in complete accord.

The average length of the month is 29 days 12 hours 44 minutes. But any particular month must be taken as containing a complete number of days, either 29 or 30. As the twenty-ninth day of the month drew to its close, and the time came for the offering up of the evening sacrifice, the appointed watchers for the new moon must have made themselves ready, so that directly the sun had passed below the western horizon they might carefully examine the whole neighbourhood of the sky where the sun had been seen to go down. If the thin crescent of the young moon was detected, then this day, which, on the disappearance of the sun, had just commenced, was not only the thirtieth day of the past month, it was also the first day of the new, and the trumpets of the new moon would be blown over the sacrifices. That day would have two numbers: in anticipation it would have been the thirtieth day of the month now come to a close, in realisation it would be the first day of the month just beginning. If no crescent moon was seen in the first hour of the thirtieth day of the month, then the search would have to be repeated the next evening, which would necessarily be the first of the new month, and the old month would have been declared to be full. Bad weather indeed might prevent the actual observation of the crescent on either day, but there could be no doubt that the month could not legitimately be stretched out to thirty-one days.

Tradition affords us actual examples of such a watch being kept for the new moon, one of the best known being the occasion of a dispute between the Rabbon Gamaliel, grandson of the Gamaliel of Acts v, 34, and other of the Palestinian rabbis some thirty years after the destruction of the Temple by Titus.

"Rabbon Gamaliel had on a tablet, and on the walls of his room various delineations of the figure and aspect of the moon, which he showed to ignorant witnesses, asking them, 'Was it of this figure or of that?' It happened once that two witnesses came and said, 'We saw the moon in the eastern part of the heavens in the morning and in the western part in the evening.' Then R. Johanan Ben Nourri declared them to be false witnesses; but when they came to Jamnia Rabbon Gamaliel received their evidence as valid. Two other witnesses came and said, 'We saw the moon

on its proper day, but could not see it on the next evening of the intercalary day,' and R. Gamaliel received them; when R. Dosah son of Arkenas said, 'They are false witnesses, for how can they testify of a woman being delivered, when on the next day she still appears with every sign of pregnancy?' Then R. Joshua said unto him, 'I approve your opinion.' Upon this Rabbon Gamaliel sent him word, saying, 'I order you to appear before me on the Day of Atonement, according to *your* computation, with your staff and money in your hand.' R. Akivah went to him and found him grieving. He said then to him, 'I can prove that all Rabbon Gamaliel has done is well done, for it is said, "These are the feasts of the Lord, holy convocations, which *ye* shall proclaim," either at their proper time, or not at their proper time, *their* convocations are to be considered as holy festivals.' When he [R. Joshua] came to R. Dosah ben Arkenas, the latter told him, 'If we are to reinvestigate the decisions of the tribunal of Rabbon Gamaliel, we must also reinvestigate the decisions of all the tribunals of justice which have existed from the time of Moses till the present day, for it is said (Exodus xxiv, 2), "Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders went up [to the Mount]." Why were not the names of the elders also specified? To inform us that every three men in Israel that form a Beth D'in [tribunal of justice] are to be respected in an equal degree with the tribunal of Moses.' Then did R. Joshua take his staff and money, and went to Jamnia, to Rabbon Gamaliel, on the very day on which the Atonement would have been according to his computation; when Rabbon Gamaliel arose, and kissed him on his [fore] head, saying, 'Enter in peace, my master and disciple! My master—in knowledge, and my disciple—since thou didst obey my injunction.' **

There are several points in the above that call for comment: first of all, that thirty years after the destruction of the Temple by Titus, the beginning of the month was determined by observation of the crescent.

* *Mishna Rosh-ha-Shanah* ii, 8, 9. De Sola and Raphael's translation, 1845. The above quotation was kindly supplied to me by Dr. J. K. Fotheringham.

Further, the new moon, the date of which was in dispute between the rabbis on this occasion, was not the new moon of Tishri. The 1st of Tishri was a day of holy convocation, and such a day being one on which no servile work could be done, must, like the weekly sabbath, have its day of preparation. This the 1st of Tishri could never have if it could not be known beforehand on what day it would fall. If the crescent is seen in the sky, and the day fixed as the 1st of Tishri by that observation, then the day has itself begun before it can be proclaimed.

From what date, then, was the first day reckoned? No information is given us in the Law, but the necessary conditions of the case and the present practice of the Jews leave us in no doubt. It was reckoned from the 1st of Nisan. At the present time, the interval between the 1st of Nisan and the 1st of Tishri is always 177 days. So in the original Mosaic Calendar, when the 1st day of the Abib, the paschal month, had been determined, all the days of holy convocation would be definitely fixed for that year, and could be proclaimed at once. The new moon, which was in dispute, was therefore the new moon of Nisan, and Rabbon Gamaliel had already committed himself, either explicitly or implicitly, to the date on which the great annual fast would be held. Before the dispute was settled by the complete submission of Rabbi Joshua, the great feasts of the Passover, of Nisan 15 and 21, of Pentecost, and of the Feast of Trumpets, must have actually been held. Rabbi Akiva was quite right: the rabbis could not declare that all these feasts had been irregular and invalid.

THE JUBILEE CYCLE.

I have already tried to show that the Mosaic Calendar was simple, symmetrical and complete when regarded as a system of religious observances. The day, the month, and the year, each were severally sanctified. The seventh day, the seventh month, the seventh year received a special consecration, and a forty-ninth day (seven times seven), and a forty-ninth year, a yet further consecration in token of completeness.

Similarly, the relations between day, month and year, by which these seasons of observance were regulated, were also of extreme simplicity.

The only ambiguity in the length of a month was whether it should be of twenty-nine or thirty days; the only ambiguity in the length of a year was whether it should be of twelve months

or thirteen. And a very simple practical observation settled the question in each particular case. The forwardness of the season determined whether the twelfth month of the year should be a double month or a single one. The recognition of the crescent in the sky determined whether the thirtieth day of the month should bear that number alone, or whether it should be also numbered as the first day of the next month. For, representatively, the year was always taken as containing twelve months—no month was ever *numbered* as the thirteenth—and representatively the month was always taken as containing thirty days, although the thirtieth day sometimes bore two numbers. The length of the year, therefore, is, representatively, 12 times 30 or 360, although there never was and never could have been that actual number of days in a year.*

The blowing of the trumpet of Jubilee, after the close of the great Day of Atonement, at the end of the forty-ninth year, saw the completion of the Mosaic Calendar. The Hebrew slave received his liberty, the Hebrew freeholder who had sold or forfeited his land entered again on possession. It was the time of "the restitution of all things"; it was also the time when sun and moon returned to the same relative position with respect to each other. The months and years again ran on the same course; the circle of the religious observances of the Mosaic Calendar was a cycle of the sun and moon.

Apart from any typical significance which may attach to this relation, its convenience would be great. The rulers of Israel, by studying the record of the past Jubilee cycle, and noting where the "embolismic" years occurred, that is to say, the years containing the intercalated months, would know with a close

* It is quite apart from my present purpose to enquire what typical or prophetic meaning may attach to the periods 1260 days, 42 months or "a time and times, and the dividing of time" (i.e. $3\frac{1}{2}$ times) which we find mentioned in the book of Daniel and in the Apocalypse of St. John. But the *natural* and primary meaning is clearly this, that the month is *represented* by 30 days, and the year by 12 months. Consequently, $3\frac{1}{2}$ years must be *represented* by 42 months, or 1260 days, and the expression points back to a time when men were little accustomed to deal in fractions. A striking example of this will be found in 1 Kings vii, 23 :—"He made a molten sea, ten cubits from the one brim to the other: it was round all about, and his height was five cubits: and a line of thirty cubits did compass it round about." That is to say, the proportion of the circumference of a circle to its diameter was taken as 3 instead of $3\frac{1}{2}$ or, more accurately, 3.14159.

approach to accuracy when they might expect that observation would indicate intercalation in the near future. The Jubilee period is not a precise cycle : others are more accurate, and occasionally a very forward spring, or a very late one, might cause a deviation from the expected course. But in the great majority of years, the intercalation finally adopted would follow the indication which the Jubilee cycle had already supplied.

SOME GENTILE CALENDARS.

Of all nations, Israel is the one which has been most freely accused of borrowing its customs, its science, its philosophy, its religion from its neighbours. I think if I were a Jew I should be proud of the accusation, for the only possible comment is “how marvellously they improved the material they borrowed.” But without debating that question, they possessed one thing which was certainly their own—the Mosaic Calendar. No nation possessed a system of observances of this nature, at once so exalted on the religious side, and so accurate on the astronomical, and withal so simple and so complete.

“Israel went out of Egypt,” and we may take for example the calendar of Egypt. Here we have a purely solar calendar : twelve months, indeed, were reckoned to the year, but the months had no relation to the moon, and the year itself was so far from being a true solar year that its commencement travelled steadily down the months, and in 1461 years it made a complete journey through the seasons.

Take next the Babylonians : connected with Israel in origin, for Abraham came from Ur of the Chaldees ; connected with Israel in later history, for it was to Babylon that the Jews went into captivity.

In early Babylonian times, before Abraham had left Ur of the Chaldees, the method of determining when the year was to be embolismic was by observing the crescent moon at its setting with Capella. If the two celestial bodies set together on the first day of the month Nisan, that year was normal ; if, on the third day of the month Nisan, Capella and the moon set together, that year was full, *i.e.* contained thirteen months. The method was very simple, but was open to the objection that, owing to the precession of the equinoxes, the beginning of the year fell later and later. The year thus formed was a luni-solar one, and so far like that of Israel ; but the particular solar year employed was the

solar-sidereal year not the solar-tropical year.* It is, however, a year of immense archæological interest, for it preserves to us in the threefold symbol, commonly called the "Triad of Stars," so often found on Babylonian monuments, a record of the earliest astronomical observation of which we know, one that takes us back 6000 years.†

It is evident, then, that the Mosaic method of deriving the beginnings of their years differed essentially from the early Babylonian. It differed also in important points from the late Babylonian. Thus a number of tablets from the mound of Kouyunjik, probably of the age of Hezekiah, show that the equinox was determined at that time by direct measurement of the equality of day and night.‡ Later still, rather more than a century before our era, the Babylonians were computing the actual times of conjunction of the sun and moon, not merely observing the appearance of the crescent. It is evident, therefore, that the methods employed by the Rabbon Gamaliel and the other rabbis were not derived from the Babylonians, else they would have adopted, as a little later they actually did, the method of computation, which was free from the drawbacks attaching to the testimony of witnesses who might be ignorant or corrupt.

The Mosaic Calendar was very simple, but by its continual reference to observation it had a property which not even the Julian or Gregorian calendars possess: it could not get out of order. Both these Gentile calendars slowly slip from their correspondence with the natural year. But the Mosaic Calendar, the longer it was used, would give a value for the mean natural month and year which continually increased in accuracy.

THE MODERN JEWISH CALENDAR.

If we compare the Jewish calendar now in use with the Mosaic Calendar, we notice several important differences:—

1. Many more fasts and feasts are observed. The chief of these are four fasts mentioned in the book of Zechariah viii, 19,

* "Preliminary Paper on the Babylonian Astronomy," by R. H. M. Bosanquet, Esq., and Prof. A. H. Sayce. *Monthly Notices, R.A.S.*, Vol. xxxix, pp. 454-461, also "Note on the Date of the Passage of the Vernal Equinox from Taurus into Aries," *ibid.*, Vol. lxiv, pp. 488-507.

† *The Observatory*, 1908, August, p. 303.

‡ British Museum "*Guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities*," p. 53. Nineveh Gallery, Table—Case E, No. 57.

and the two feasts of Purim (Esther ix) and the Dedication of the Temple (I Macc. iv, 59; II Macc. i, 18; John x, 22).

2. The months, which are simply numbered in the Mosaic Calendar, are now named.

3. The beginnings of the months and the beginnings of the years are computed: not derived directly from observation.

4. The first month of the year is not the Paschal month, but Tishri, which in the Mosaic Calendar is the seventh month.

Now all these changes are the necessary consequence of one series of events; namely, the overthrow of the Jewish kingdom by the Chaldæans, the destruction of the City of Jerusalem, and especially of the Temple, and the carrying into captivity or dispersion of the bulk of the Jewish people.

The four fasts referred to in Zechariah viii are commemorative of the successive stages of that terrible catastrophe. The feasts of the Mosaic Calendar, so far as they are commemorative, hold the memory of another event: “when Israel went out of Egypt”: they recall the Exodus.

Up to the Captivity, none of the Babylonian month names are ever mentioned in any part of the Old Testament. In Zechariah, Esther and Nehemiah these names occur frequently, no fewer than seven of them being named, and these three books are avowedly and admittedly post-exilic.

The extract from the Talmud given on pp. 147, 148 is sufficient to show that a great effort was made to preserve the method of the Mosaic Calendar in making actual observations for the beginnings of the months. This method, so simple and easy, so long as the Jews were in their own land and under the heel of no conqueror, became impossible not long after the time of Gamaliel. In the reign of Hadrian, Jerusalem was again destroyed, and so far as was possible the Jewish race was extirpated, or at least exiled, from their fatherland. It was no longer possible for the Sanhedrin to meet in “the Hall of Polished Stones,” and receive the witnesses to the appearance of the crescent, and, by pronouncing the formula “it is consecrated,” decide that the new month had begun, for City and Temple and Sanhedrin had all been swept away.

Yet with a courage and tenacity unexampled in history, the Jewish rabbis, even after this overthrow, were taking measures, before long, to meet the necessities of their hard case. The new moons could no longer be declared from observation at the

moment, but they might be fixed in advance, and Hillel II (in A.D. 358) is reputed to have published the rules, previously kept secret, by which the calendar had been calculated and the festivals appointed.

The present Jewish calendar is computed on the same general lines as Easter in the Gregorian calendar: that is to say, advantage is taken of the fact that 19 mean solar years contain 6939 days $14\frac{1}{2}$ hours, and 235 mean synodic months contain 6939 days $16\frac{1}{2}$ hours, the two therefore differing only by a couple of hours. The discovery of this cycle is attributed to Meton—about 433 B.C.—and it is therefore known as the Metonic cycle. It supplies the “golden numbers” of the “Introduction to the Book of Common Prayer.”

As the moon in its motion round the earth varies a good deal in its angular velocity, the movements of a mean moon, travelling uniformly, are substituted for those of the actual moon, and the month is taken as beginning with the conjunction of this mean moon with the sun. It follows, therefore, that the beginnings of the Jewish months can be rigidly computed for a long time in advance without any ambiguity or discordance arising from the latitude and longitude of the special place to which the calendar is to be applied. Like our computations for Easter, it is intended for universal application, not merely local.

This great difference between the Mosaic Calendar and the modern Jewish calendar was necessary and fundamental. When the nation was in the land which the Lord their God had given them, then the determination of the new moon and of the embolismic month could be made directly, could be adopted by one single authority, and made known to the whole nation immediately. Now, when the Jews are scattered over the whole world, the only possible method by which perfect unanimity in the decision as to sacred days can be attained is by fixing them by computations based on a definite plan, and made long in advance.

The cycle adopted for the present Jewish calendar is not the Jubilee cycle, but the Metonic. The practical difference between the two, in pointing out when a month was to be intercalated, may be seen from the following table. The embolismic years, according to the Metonic cycle, are generally given as under:—

- 3 6 8 11 14 17 19

The order is then repeated.

The succession in the Jubilee cycle would run :—

3	6	8	11	14	16	19	22	25
27	30	33	35	38	41	44	46	49

In a period of 931 years the Metonic cycle would indicate 343 intercalary months and the Jubilee cycle 342, *i.e.* one month in defect. For a period not exceeding one Jubilee cycle the two cycles would give the same result.

The prediction of the date of the conjunction of the mean moon—the assumed moon, moving regularly—with the sun, derived from the Metonic cycle, is subject to a number of rules by which the adoption of the first day of the year, and, indeed, of the first day of each month, is controlled, and in many instances diverted from the exact date of predicted conjunction. The chief reason for most of these rules is connected with the sacred observances of the “seventh month,” now known as the month Tishri, and the first month of the Jewish year. This month contains, as we have seen, four days of holy convocation beside the weekly sabbaths. But in so hot a climate as Palestine it would be impossible to fulfil the observances of the sabbath for two consecutive days. Therefore, as the weekly sabbath cannot be altered, the holy days must be so arranged that no one of them falls immediately before, or immediately after, the day of the weekly rest. If we may translate this regulation into our Gentile nomenclature, it would amount to saying that neither Friday nor Sunday could be made a holy day, because Friday precedes and Sunday follows the sabbath.

The years of the Jewish calendar are of six kinds: there are three common years of twelve months each; three embolismic years of thirteen months each. Both common and embolismic years may be “deficient,” “regular,” or “abundant.” That is, the common year, if regular, will contain 354 days, but if deficient 353, if abundant 355. Similarly the embolismic year, if regular, will contain 384 days, but 383 if deficient, 385 if abundant.

The first of Tishri, New Year’s Day, the Feast of Trumpets, can only fall on one of four days—Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Saturday. In a regular year, if common, it can only fall on Tuesday or Thursday, if embolismic only on Tuesday.

The seventh month of the Mosaic Calendar was not only pre-eminently the month of worship: it was, as we have seen, the only month of which the first day was not fixed by direct and

immediate observation. This is nowhere laid down in the Law, but can be surely inferred from the Law itself. And similarly, as already pointed out, it follows that the first day of the seventh month was rigidly connected with the first day of the first month. Twenty-five weeks and two days separated the two *always*, no matter what the character of the year, even as they do to-day. The month of the Passover was not fixed to be the first month, and the index for all the great days of the year, by accident. The new moon of spring-time would give the most decided determination of any month in the year, for then the moon is moving most rapidly northward, and consequently the interval of time between sunset and moonset increases most rapidly from one evening to the next.

The determination of the first day of the month Abib fixed the determination of the Feast of Trumpets, and of all the days of holy convocation. The dates, therefore, of all the religious observances of the Mosaic Calendar for any year were fixed directly the beginning of its first month was determined. But not of the following year : that must have been the subject of fresh observation. Year by year, in the original calendar, the state of the readiness of the crops, and of the lambs for the Paschal feast, must have determined the time when the Passover would be held, and consequently all the subsequent feasts of the year.

WHEN DID THE MOSAIC CALENDAR ORIGINATE ?

The little table annexed may serve to give a more distinct impression of the scheme of the Mosaic Calendar, and to bring out its simplicity, harmony, and completeness. It is evidently an essential unity, the product of a single mind : not the chance coming together of diverse and unrelated tendencies.

THE MOSAIC CALENDAR.			
	DAY.	MONTH.	YEAR.
UNIT.	Beginning.	Morning.	New Moon. Spring (PASSOVER).
	End.	Evening.	Autumn (TABERNACLES).
SEVEN.	Beginning.	Sabbath.	<i>Feast of Trumpets.</i> Month of Worship (with Day of Atonement). Sabbatic Year.
SEVEN times SEVEN.		PENTECOST.	Year of Jubilee.

When did this calendar originate? The four last books of the Pentateuch expressly assert that it originated at the Exodus. Thus the book of Exodus takes up the sabbath and the sabbatic year, the three great “ Pilgrim ” feasts, and the continual daily burnt offering. The book of Leviticus does not expressly mention the continual burnt offering, but adds the special rites of the seventh month, that is to say the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement. It also adds directions for the Jubilee. The book of Numbers adds the regulations for the new moon, thus completing the scheme of the Mosaic Calendar, the whole of which is therefore referred to in this book. Deuteronomy gives the law of the sabbath day, and of the sabbatic year, and enacts the observance of the three “ Pilgrim ” feasts.

Current theories, on the other hand, reject the idea that the Mosaic Law was given in the wilderness, and divide it, as regards its date, into three chief portions:—

1. The Book of the Covenant, Exodus xx, 22–xxiii, 33. This is assigned to an early date under the kings.

2. Deuteronomy; the book brought to the notice of King Josiah by Hilkiah the priest, and supposed to have been written not long before, or at earliest under the reign of Manasseh.

3. The remainder of the Law as given in these four books is generally entitled the Priestly Code, and is believed to have taken form long after the return from the Exile and the founding of the second Temple. The mission of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, B.C. 445, may be taken as a representative date.

From the point of view of the Mosaic Calendar, as distinguished from the Law in general, the Book of the Covenant gives the sabbath day and the sabbatic year with the three great “ Pilgrim ” feasts. Exactly the same items are given in Deuteronomy. So far, therefore, these two books are of the same epoch. Both the sabbath day and the sabbatic year are ordained in them, and the three great annual feasts, Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles.

But these five details, though of immense importance, give no means for forming a calendar, and indicate no method by which the actual times of the three feasts of universal obligation were to be fixed. It is only by including the regulations of the “ Priestly Code ” that we get the compact symmetry of the whole Calendar. It is only in Numbers that the regulations are given for the observance of the new moons which made the framework of the Calendar; it is only in Numbers and

Leviticus that the Law of the Jubilee is referred to, which encloses the whole circle of religious observations in an astronomical cycle reconciling the natural month with the natural year.

Was this systematisation never effected until long after the return from Babylon? Because by that time four solemn fasts had been established, fasts that are observed to this day. Three of these commemorate three stages in the Siege of Jerusalem under Nebuchadnezzar. The fast of the tenth day of the tenth month commemorates the investment of Jerusalem; of the ninth day of the fourth month, the storming; of the tenth day of the fifth month, the burning of the Temple and city; of the third day of the seventh month, the assassination of the governor Gedaliah, which resulted in the abandonment of Judæa by a large portion of the remnant still remaining there.

If the Mosaic Calendar was not already in existence as such, *i.e.*, if chapters xxiii, xxv, xxvi and xxvii of Leviticus, and chapters x, xxviii, and xxix of Numbers were not already in the possession of the Jews, how could these chapters have afterwards been successfully introduced as enactments made a thousand years earlier by their great legislator? All Jews would have known that the four fasts which they had faithfully kept year by year for several generations had never stood in a framework of monthly sacrifices such as were now sought to be newly established, or been arranged in accordance with the cycle given by the Jubilee every forty-ninth year.

But though the command to consecrate the new month by sacrifice—the formula by which in later times the beginning of the new month was proclaimed was, “It is consecrated”—is only recorded in Numbers, asserted to be post-exilic, yet that the new months were so consecrated is distinctly mentioned in books admitted to be long anterior to the Exile. In the touching record of the parting of David and Jonathan, and when the Shunammite mother went to Elisha to tell him of her loss, the new moon is referred to as a day of regular observance. The prophets, Hosea and Amos, who lived in the days of Jeroboam II, both bear witness that the new moons were days of holy observance. The Mosaic Calendar was, therefore, familiar in its completeness in the kingdoms both of Israel and Judah, not only before the Babylonian Captivity, but before the Assyrian. And the incident of David and Jonathan shows that we must put it back earlier still: to the days when the Tabernacle was still the shrine where Jehovah was worshipped.

The two great post-exilic feasts, Purim and Dedication, teach the same lesson as the four fasts of the Captivity: they witness that they are additions to the Mosaic Calendar, not original parts of it. The fact, to which I have had to draw attention so often, that the Jewish calendar is luni-solar, bringing together the day, the month, and the year, no two of which measures of time are commensurable, implies that there must be some elasticity in the calendar, some “play” by which the necessary adjustments can be made, some method by which the day may be made to fit the month and the month to fit the year. Now the Mosaic Calendar is rigid in the half of the year from Passover to Tabernacles, and elastic in the remaining half. Purim and Dedication fall in the elastic half, and so does the fast of Tebeth, which commemorates the investment of Jerusalem in the great invasion of Nebuchadnezzar.

If it be the fact that the Mosaic Calendar as a complete system was not instituted until post-exilic times, how is it that there is only one case in the whole of the Old Testament in which there is a departure from the Mosaic numeration of the months, a departure from the acceptance of the Paschal month as the first month of the year? That instance is in the book of Nehemiah ii, 1, “in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the king,” 145 years after the siege of Jerusalem.

The fundamental objection brought against the assertion of the four books of the Law—that they were given during the wanderings in the wilderness—is that many of its regulations look forward to a time when Israel should be in possession of a fruitful land. But this fact is perfectly recognised in the narrative. In the Feast of Unleavened Bread the sheaf of the firstfruits was to be waved “when ye be come into the land which I give unto you.” All the three great feasts of obligation were explicitly for the Promised Land, not for the desert. Where is the impossibility of the Law having been given in anticipation, and, if given, of being accepted as such?

From the beginning to this present day Israel has been the nation of Promise: its gaze has been forward from the time that Abraham came forth from Ur of the Chaldees. He, and his descendants, have lived in the faith that God had given to them a Promise, and in the sure and certain hope that He would fulfil it. No nation has passed through so many disasters, or disasters so overwhelming. Yet it has never lost heart. For 1850 years it has been “without king or priest, without city or

country, without nobles or parliament, without army or navy, without revenue or exchequer. Its ambassadors are not found at the courts of the nations; treaties are not made with it; yet it lives a nation still. How is it, then, that it lives? It lives by hope. It still observes the four fasts of the Captivity, observes them as fasts, but remembers the words of Zechariah, "the fast of the fourth month, and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts" (Zechariah viii, 19), though 2504 years have already gone by since the catastrophe which those fasts commemorate.

If Israel could look forward for twenty-five centuries, as we know it has done, to the fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah, why should not their forefathers have been able to look forward for the few weeks which intervened between their muster on the plains of Moab and their entry into the Promised Land?

And have the events of the past two years given no encouragement to them to hold yet more firmly to their Passover hope:—"This year here,—next year in Jerusalem"?

DISCUSSION.

HAROLD M. WIENER, Esq.—Professor Margoliouth, Mr. Maunder, ladies and gentlemen. As I have no astronomical knowledge, I regret that it is impossible for me to add anything to the discussion of Mr. Maunder's admirable paper in its narrower aspect. But it also has a wider aspect—that of an attack on the current critical position and a defence of more conservative views against a so-called consensus of scholars; and since you have been kind enough to invite me here and to give me an opportunity of addressing you, I think that perhaps I can best show my gratitude by indicating briefly how his general attitude is being supported from other sides.

While it is true that outwardly the position with regard to the Pentateuchal question is more or less the same in this country as it has been for many years, it has undergone a great change abroad. Kuenen was one of the greatest leaders of the critical school; yet, by an irony of fate, his old review, now edited by the Leyden faculty of theology, is the only technical journal in Europe that will publish English conservative work. Here the wheel has gone full circle. Holland possesses three state universities; in two it is taught that

the current view is wrong, in the third it is treated as an open question. Even more important than Holland in higher critical leadership is Germany. When the war came the younger theologians in that country had begun to publish monographs debating positions once deemed unshakably established. In America, where the conditions used to be as bad as in England, we have at last succeeded in forcing higher critics to see that not all scholars are agreed, and to discuss the necessity of modifying the "assured results" of modern criticism.

In the main these changes are being wrought by two factors, textual criticism and archæology, and it will perhaps be best that I should utilise the few minutes at my disposal in giving you some idea of one of the results of recent research, which, owing to the conspiracy of silence, cannot be published in this country, though it has appeared in Holland and America.

You are all familiar with the fact that in 1753 Jean Astruc, a French physician, made a suggestion which has formed the starting-point of all subsequent higher critical work, viz., that different divine names in Genesis point to difference of source. In its modern form the theory is that where the ordinary English versions print LORD (in small capitals) we are to see a document J, while where they have God, we must recognise E or P. The hypothesis never explained the facts adequately, for it was necessary to postulate redactors, revisions, improbable interweaving, &c.; and of late years it has been greatly discredited by the evidence that Jerome and the LXX had texts that differed greatly from our current Hebrew in this matter. Nevertheless it was possible for the documentary theorists to argue that even if individual modifications were necessary, they would not affect the main outlines of the hypothesis, which would stand even if a number of verses had to be transferred from J to E or P, or *vice versa*.

We now come to something that has not yet been published in this country. There is strong evidence that Old Testament texts have undergone extensive revision at the hands of men whose minds were dominated by supposed Divine commands drawn from their interpretation of Biblical texts. If a man be persuaded that a text containing a message from God has a particular meaning, then for him that interpretation is itself a message from God, and it becomes his duty to execute any directions he may understand it to contain.

And this principle of emendation was reinforced by the fact that some books of the Old Testament presented readings which, as times changed, began to endanger monotheism. An illustration will make the matter clear. A Christian will use the expressions our Lord, our Master, Jesus, Christ, Jesus Christ, without any appreciable difference of meaning in nine cases out of ten. Occasionally there will be passages where metre or some consideration of euphony or sense will dictate the choice of one of these expressions to the exclusion of the others, but in the great bulk of the occurrences they are practically interchangeable. But suppose that Christianity were in contact with some heathen religion in which the word master was applied to some totally different god, and suppose further that its use of Christ could lead to dangerous misunderstandings which might threaten the faith of the ignorant. It might then become necessary to revise documents in which any such appellation occurred by substituting one or other of the alternative expressions.

This has happened in all the older books of the Hebrew Bible. The offending word was Baal—which only means lord, master, owner—and is to this day freely used among Jews in certain connections. In the days of Moses, and for long after, it was applied without objection alike to Israel's God and to other Semitic deities. But a time came when a change set in, because the Hebrew faith was menaced by the worship of other Semitic baals, for instance, by the belief in the Phœnician baal in the days of Ahab. Objection was taken to the word on the ground of certain remarks of the prophets. Later, passages like Hos. ii, 16 f. were treated as canons of emendation, and changes were consequently made in the texts. It has long been recognised that bad words, such as *bosheth*, shame, had been substituted for Baal, as is shown by the comparison of our extant materials. Where, for instance, a man is called Ishbosheth (man of shame) in one passage, and Ishbaal (man of Baal) in a parallel passage or an ancient version, there can be no doubt, as to what has happened. The new element consists in recognising that not merely bad words like shame, but good words like God, LORD, &c., have frequently replaced an original Baal. This editorial principle is responsible for phenomena in Genesis which Astruc sought to explain by the hypothesis of a combination of different documents. For instance, the original name of Jacob's eldest son was Reubel (seen of Bel or Baal), and the explanation of that name will have

contained the word Baal. For this the Tetragrammaton has been substituted. But if the author wrote “the Baal,” the view that the passage is an excerpt from a document that used the Tetragrammaton falls to the ground, and the theory of a J writing becomes impossible.

As already remarked, in most instances such a substitution could be effected without damage to the sense, but not in all. An example may be given from Kings and Chronicles, where, by the way, we see not merely the contradictory but the contrary of the documentary hypothesis in actual operation: Instead of having a compilation of one book from two sources, a J and an E writing, we find two books reproducing a single writing, the one often adopting a J form (in the received Hebrew), where the other presents E characteristics. In 1 Kings xxii, 11 Chron. xviii, Ahab consults no fewer than four hundred prophets, who return an answer that some deity (*Adonai*, according to the received Hebrew of 1 Kings xxii, 5, the Tetragrammaton according to 29 Hebrew MSS. and several ancient versions, *Elohim* according to Chronicles) “will deliver it into the king’s hand.” Thereupon Jehoshaphat said: “Is there not here a prophet of the LORD (so Jerome and the best Greek texts; our Hebrew adds ‘besides’) that we might enquire of him?” This makes no sense if the opinion of four hundred prophets of the LORD had just been given, and accordingly we find that no commentator can explain the passage satisfactorily; but the whole narrative becomes good sense and true to the historical character of Ahab, the baal-worshipper, once we realise that the original document presented “the baal.” We see, too, how different substitutions have given varying readings in our authorities.

I must not trespass further on your kindness, but perhaps I may venture to express the hope that even this very inadequate indication of one of the lines of recent research may serve to confirm your belief in the general soundness of Mr. Maunder’s position.

Rev. MARTIN ANSTEY, B.D., M.A.: There are two ways of constructing a calendar. The first is the primæval Biblical method of direct observation, and the second the modern scientific method of astronomical calculation. The first is the method of Moses in the Old Testament, a method at once simple, untechnical, and incapable of correction because incapable of falling into error. The

second is the method of ancient and modern astronomers of Julius Cæsar and Pope Gregory, a method highly technical, involving constant alteration and incapable of attaining accuracy or finality, because the problem it seeks to solve involves the relation of two mathematical quantities by nature incommensurable.

The method of Moses is that of watching the state of the crops, and looking out for the first appearance of the new moon in the spring of the year. Time is measured by revolutions of the sun, which are determined by direct personal observation of the return of the spring. Every spring the ripening of the barley marks the commencement of a new year. The first new moon that appears after the barley is ripe makes the day on which it appears the first day of the first month of the new year. The period of the revolution of the moon is $29\frac{1}{2}$ days. Each month is therefore a natural period of either 29 or 30 days. On the 30th day of the month in which the barley ripens a sharp lookout is kept. If the moon appears on that day, it is the first day of the first month of the new year, and the previous month has only 29 days. If the moon does not appear on that day it is the 30th day of the old month, and the following day is the first day of the first month of the new year. All these facts were obtained by direct observation by the naked eye. The Biblical year is the luni-solar year. Moses measures time by the revolutions of the sun; but the years of the moon are pinned down to the years of the sun. Having ascertained the first day of the first month of the new year by direct observation, all the feasts are regulated by direct reference to that day, the 1st Nisan. The Passover was killed on the 14th of Nisan. Pentecost, the Feast of Weeks, was held exactly seven weeks later, and the Feast of Tabernacles on the first day of the seventh month of the year. The resulting system was perfect and self-adjusting. It required neither periodic correction nor intercalation.

The second method of constructing a calendar is the modern scientific method of astronomical calculation. Compared with the Biblical method it is intricate, inexact, and incapable of arriving at a result which shall be at once final and correct. It is therefore in need of periodic correction, which as, is well known, has frequently had to be applied.

Mrs. WALTER MAUNDER desired to make two remarks with regard to the 1st of Tishri. The book of Nehemiah puts the Chisleu of the

20th year of Artaxerxes before the Nisan of the same year, thus suggesting that Tishri had been taken as the first month. Nehemiah was in Shushan, the palace, when the events of which he spoke occurred, and Artaxerxes was one of the earlier Persian kings. In the book of Esther, it is recorded that Haman the Agagite, also in Shushan, the palace, cast lots “ in the first month, that is, the month Nisan, in the twelfth year of King Ahasuerus, they cast Pur, that is, the lot, before Haman from day to day, and from month to month, to the twelfth month, that is the month Adar.” This seemed to indicate that at that date the Persians had not decided at what point in the year they should reckon its beginning. Later, under the Arsacids, the Bundahish gives the rules for the calendar distinctly. The year began with the spring equinox, not with a new moon, and there were twelve months in the year, which were not natural months or lunations.

Also under the Mosaic law, the 1st of Tishri was a festival upon which no servile work should be done. The Mosaic law was binding on the whole Jewish nation, both men and women, not on the priest and Levite alone, nor merely on the Rabbi, who devoted himself to the study of the law. Now the bulk of the nation was composed then, as now, of tradesmen and tradeswomen, the housewives in the home and the labourers in the fields. It would not be possible for the labourer to know that he must not be found treading the winepress, nor the “ virtuous woman ” laying her hands to the spindle as her candle goeth not out by night, nor making fine linen and selling it, on the solemn Feast of Trumpets, if it were only proclaimed as such after its new moon had been observed. Before the beacon fires had been lit, or the runners had reached them, the whole nation would have already profaned this most holy “ Sabbath ” on which it was commanded “ ye shall do no servile work.”

Rev. W. LAPORTE PAYNE alluded to the statement of the late Dean Burgon that if the Mosaic Calendar is applied to the story of the Flood all the events narrated except one occurred on a seventh day.

Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD said : When I was at Lemach, a station at the southern end of the Sea of Galilee on the Damascus line, I found a difficulty in discovering when the train was expected. At last I found a time-table where the arrival at Lemach was 11, but it came

not. Afterwards I found that the hour meant 11 *hours after sunrise*, which that day was about 4, so I had a wait till after 3 p.m. From this one sees in what close touch the near (and indeed the far) East has ever kept with the heavenly bodies.

I am glad Mr. Maunder has been careful to print that dangerous word Mosaic with a capital M. I was present at his election some years ago as the Secretary of the Victoria Institute, and Professor Sayce then pointed out to me the great value of the capital letter. He had come up to lecture on the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, and the *Times* unfortunately printed "mosaic" with a small "m," to the Dean's great distress.

The learned lecturer pointed out the great unity of thought that pervades the Hebrew Calendar, and also its Mosaic authorship. But although Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, he did not derive his luni-solar and unique calendar thence, for theirs was purely solar. He derived it from Jehovah alone. Now the calendar with its casual intercalated month was suitable enough for the leisurely pastoral people of the near East. In the west we have a different calendar altogether; but it is well worthy of remark that whatever our belief or unbelief all our letters are dated from the birth of Christ. He regulates all time for Gentiles as well as for the Jews, for He is the centre of the Universe and of all in it.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

The Rev. D. R. FOTHERINGHAM, M.A., F.R.A.S.: On page 147, I am not sure about "appointed" watchers. The Temple authorities seem to have expected unofficial or casual reports. Still in practice, I expect they would be a fairly regular band of enthusiasts.

On page 149, I think too much is made of a fixed calendar from Nisan to Tishri. For the 1st of Tishri, the utmost that would be needed would be extra care in observing the beginning of the sixth month. I think, too, I am right in saying that the runners *did* announce the appearance of the crescent on the 1st of Tishri; and it was considered so important that if the day was a Sabbath, they were allowed to profane the Sabbath in order to bring their tidings in time. Still there is an obvious advantage in fixing the sixth month as the runners might easily find the priests had anticipated their tidings.

Dr. J. K. FOTHERINGHAM, M.A., F.R.A.S. : There is very little in Mr. Maunder's paper, “The Mosaic Calendar,” which I could wish either to correct or to supplement. I should, however, be inclined to endorse the accepted view that the feast of ingathering is said to be “in the end of the year” rather because it comes at the end of the year's agricultural operations than because it closes “the bright part of the year.”

I fear that I cannot agree with Mr. Maunder that the new moon described in the anecdote cited from the Mishna was not the new moon of Tishri. It seems clear that the dispute took place a few days after the observation of the new moon, and was followed by R. Joshua's journey to Jamnia on Tishri 10 of his computation. Moreover, as we shall see, there is strong evidence that the new moon of Tishri was fixed by observation, and, if so, it was only the new moon of Tishri that could affect the date of the fast of the Atonement. In Tishri the altitude of the moon at sunset would increase slowly from night to night, and the detection of the crescent one night could more easily be followed by a failure to detect it in a clear sky the following night in that month than in any other month. Neither the Mishna nor the Talmud knows anything of a fixed period of 177 days for the first six months reckoned from Nisan. The Babylonian Talmud does, however, know of a means adopted by some rabbis that Elul, the month preceding Tishri, could never contain more than 29 days. In fact there are passages in the Mishna (Rosh-ha-Shana i, 3, 4 ; Erubin iii, 7, 8), which imply that uncertainty could exist as to the date of the beginning of Tishri.

I quote from my paper on “Astronomical Evidence for the Date of the Crucifixion” in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xii (1910), pp. 125, 126 :—

“This difficulty [viz. that of enabling the Jews of the dispersion to know on what day the new month was commencing at Jerusalem] would be most seriously felt in the months of Nisan and Tishri, which contained the most solemn days of the Jewish calendar, and in particular at the festival of the new year [or Feast of Trumpets] which fell on the first day of Tishri, and which might easily have to be celebrated before news could come from Jerusalem announcing the sanctification of the new moon. The Mishna is not unaware of this difficulty, and mentions some rules adopted for the benefit

of the Jews of the dispersion. Beacons were lit, and afterwards messengers were sent to announce the new moon. Nisan, Elul, and Tishri were all among the months when messengers were dispatched at the date of the Mishna.* The messengers in Nisan are said to have been sent for the sake of the passover, those in Elul for the sake of the new year, and those in Tishri to fix the other holy days (apparently the day of atonement and the feast of tabernacles). It will be observed that this left open a little uncertainty about the date of the new year festival, as the Jews away from Jerusalem had only the Elul and not the Tishri new moon to guide them. The messengers do not appear to have gone beyond Syria, though the beacons which were used at an earlier date carried the news as far as Babylonia. The more distant Jews might in consequence be in doubt not only of the correct date for the new year's festival, but of the dates of the feasts of passover and tabernacles as well. A simple device for remedying the difficulty is mentioned in the Mishnaic tract *Erubin*, where R. Judah is quoted as authorising the doubling of the new year's festival where uncertainty exists as to the duration of Elul.

“Such a rule, though devised for the convenience of the Jews of the dispersion, was capable of very inconvenient expansion. We learn from both Talmuds that some of the more zealous went the length of doubling the fast of the atonement when uncertain as to the length of Elul, and the father of Samuel b. R. Isaac is said to have died in consequence of his prolonged fast.†

“But the difficulty affected the Babylonian Jews more than those of Palestine, and hence it is only in the Babylonian Talmud‡ that we read of the less laborious solution mentioned by Mr. Turner [*i.e.* limiting Adar to 29 days in all years]. Here§ we find it vehemently asserted by certain rabbis belonging partly to Babylonia and partly to Palestine, and denied with equal vehemence by others, that Elul could never contain more than 29 days, and that either the

* *Rosh-ha-Shana*, i, 3, 4.

† *Erubin*, iii, 7, 8.

‡ See the Jerusalem Talmud on *Rosh-ha-Shana* in *Talmud de Jérusalem*, &c. Schwab vi (1883), p. 68.

§ *Rosh-ha-Shana*, 19^b-21^a. See *Der Babylonische Talmud*, ed. Lazarus Goldschmidt, iii (1899), pp. 343-347.

Adar followed by Nisan or even both Adars in an intercalary year were similarly limited, though the duration of the other months was by universal consent to be determined by observation.

“R. Hanina b. Kahana even asserted on the authority of Rabb that, since the time of Ezra, Elul had never had more than 29 days. In a like vein R. Simai testified in the name of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi that each of the Adars might be either 29 or 30 days in length. Both sides declared that the custom of the diaspora supported their view of the length of Adar. Whatever the theory may have been, there are several instances quoted in the Babylonian Talmud where Elul was actually given 30 days. It is therefore not surprising that what appears to have been the older expedient should also have received an expansion. R. Zera is said to have proposed in the name of R. Nahman to double the feast of the passover, and R. Johanan finally gave orders to double the festivals both in Nisan and in Tishri. The doubling of the festivals and the limitation of the duration of the preceding month would appear to be in the nature of things alternatives, each of which rendered the other unnecessary. It is therefore not a little remarkable that Jewish scrupulosity should have ultimately adopted both expedients.”

Although the new moons in the ages represented by the Mishna and Talmuds were determined by observation, the Elephantine papyri show that among the Jews in Upper Egypt in the fifth century B.C. strict calendar rules were employed which aimed at making each month begin at the sunset following mean new moon. See my paper, “A Reply to Professor Ginzler on the Calendar Dates in the Elephantine Papyri,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, lxxi (1911), pp. 661-3.

On the question of intercalation, I may perhaps be permitted to quote from an unpublished paper of my own:—

“The Jewish intercalation was still irregular, and was determined annually at the time represented by the Talmud. According to that work regard might be had to the state of the roads, the bridges, and the passover-ovens, to the possibility of pilgrims who had already started, arriving in time for the passover, to the growth of the goats, lambs and pigeons, of the corn and of the fruit, and to the number of days that had to elapse before the equinox. Intercalation, according to some rabbis, was to be avoided in a year of famine and in a sabbatical year, and a court might be influenced by the fact

that the next year would be or the last had been a sabbatical year. In fact almost anything might affect the decision except the place of the year in a cycle.”*

I know of no authority for regarding the Jubilee period as a cycle of intercalations.

I do not think Mr. Maunder has consulted the best authorities on early Babylonian intercalation. There are few subjects on which the older papers have been so completely superseded. The subject is very fully discussed in the light of our present knowledge in Father Kugler's *Steinkunde und Steindienst in Babel*, II Buch, 2 Teil, 1 Heft (1912) and *Ergänzungen zum I and II Buch* (1913), and Father Kugler's conclusion is that in the time of the first Dynasty of Babylon, contemporary with Abraham, intercalation was irregular.

I imagine that the tradition that Hillel's calendar contained rules observed, but kept secret, before its publication, is merely a part of a Jewish tendency, observable also in the so-called “oral law” to claim an immemorial antiquity for what was really a late development.

On p. 159 Mr. Maunder refers to Nehemiah ii, 1, as a departure from the Mosaic numeration of the months. I cannot admit that. There is no instance either in the Old Testament or in the Apocrypha of the months being numbered from any point except the new moon of Abib or Nisan. But it does not follow that the years were numbered from the same point. Nehemiah clearly numbers the years of Artaxerxes from the new moon of Tishri, and thus the ninth month comes before the first. Why not? It is curious that in the contemporary Elephantine papyri the Jewish month-names are always associated with years reckoned from the new moon of Nisan.

Rev. A. H. FINN: (p. 136) “for signs and for appointed assemblies” (seasons). The Hebrew word “Oth” means a sign, in the sense of a token which signifies (*e.g.*, the rainbow was the sign of the Covenant with Noah; circumcision, of that with Abraham; the Plagues were signs as well as wonders); it can hardly be taken as equivalent to signals. “Mo'ed” is used for “appointed time” where assemblies are out of the question (Gen. xvii, 21, xviii, 14, xxi, 2; II Sam. xx, 5).

* *Babl. Talmud*, Synhedrin 10^b-13^b, ed. Goldschmidt, vii (1902), pp. 32-43.

“Ohel Mo’ed”; in A.V. “the tabernacle of the congregation”; R.V., “the tent of meeting.” Neither of these renderings are quite satisfactory. The A.V. would require the definite article before Mo’ed; the R.V. restricts the meaning. The verb Ya’ad seems to have for its root significance the idea “to fix” or “to appoint.” God promised to *meet* Moses and the Israelites at the Tent, but that was not its only purpose. It was the place *appointed* as God’s Dwelling (Mishkan) where the Ark, the Candlestick, the Table of Shewbread, and the Altar of Incense were appointed to be. It would seem better, then, to take Ohel Mo’ed as “the Tent of Appointment,” *i.e.* the Appointed Tent.

Thus *Mo’ed* means that which is appointed, either of time or place, and as it is used quite generally of time in Gen. i, 14, to introduce “assemblies,” reads into the text more than it actually says. “Appointed times,” as in Lev. xxiii, 4, is the preferable rendering.

P. 139, “the month does not supply so close an analogy with the day as does the year.” But the lunar month also has its two parts. In Burma the days are never reckoned for a complete month; it is always, Such and such a day of the Waxing, or of the Waning, as the case may be. Is not the fixing of the 15th day (the day after full moon) for the beginning of Passover and Tabernacles a recognition of this division?

P. 138, “This month shall be unto you the beginning of months” suggests that some other reckoning had been in use previously. Exod. xxiii, 6 places the feast of ingathering at “the end of the year,” and xxiii, 22, “the revolution (or circuit) of the year” agrees. May it not then be that, until the Exodus, the Israelites went by the agricultural year ending with the completion of harvest? That would account for the present Jewish *civil* year beginning with the festival of Rosh-ha-Shanah in the autumn. There may be a trace of this earlier still. The Deluge began on the 17th day of the second month (Gen. vii, 11), and the waters began to decrease on the 17th day of the seventh month (viii, 3, 4).* If these months were reckoned from the end of harvest, they would correspond roughly to November and April, and the prevalence of the waters could correspond to the winter period (still termed in Arabic *Shitta*, the

* Does not the equating of these 5 months to 150 days imply a year of 360 days?

Rain) beginning with "the former rain" and ending with "the latter."

If this year was the ancient system, and the transference of the "beginning of months" was due to God's decree concerning the Passover, then the arrangement by which the calendar was automatically adjusted to the luni-solar year is of Divine origin.

The commencing of the year with the slack time (after harvest) agrees with the Oriental practice of commencing a day with the previous eve (see Gen. i, 8).

P. 155. Was not the Jubilee cycle one of 50 years? The Jubilee year was proclaimed in the 49th, but the Jubilee year was the 50th (Lev. xxv, 10). Would this affect the reckoning of the intercalary months, or did that run on independently of the Jubilee?

Lt.-Col. G. MACKINLAY: Mr. Maunder's explanation of the details of the Mosaic calendar are most instructive, and expressed in clear, terse language. His consequent deduction of the early date of the Pentateuch therefore seems to be correct.

It is stated in the book of Leviticus (xxiii, 10, 15, 16) that the feast of harvest was as long as seven weeks after the waving of the sheaf, "the firstfruits of your harvest." Where is the parallel to this observance in the Babylonian Calendar?

But this arrangement readily follows from the conditions described in the Pentateuch of the wave sheaf, commemorating the season of the first Passover observed in Egypt, just before which we are told "the barley was in the ear, but the wheat and the rye were not. . . . grown up" (*cp.* Ex. ix, 32 with xii, 14).

In the Promised Land the climate of the hot Jordan Valley resembles that of Egypt (Gen. xiii, 10). Sheaves could therefore be sent from thence for the wave offering at an early time in the year, while the main harvest in the Judæan plains, some thousands of feet higher, would come much later.

Surely the Jewish celebrations connected with harvest point to some ancient connection between the Holy Land and Egypt, and not to a more recent influence of the Babylonian Calendar? If so, the antiquity of the Pentateuch is thus further demonstrated.

611TH ORDINARY MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, JUNE 16TH, 1919,

AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. PREBENDARY H. E. FOX, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN read a letter from the President, Lord Halsbury, who was to have given the Annual Address, explaining the cause of his absence, due to Lady Halsbury's serious illness.

The Chairman expressed his own sympathy and regret, and that of the Meeting, at the President's absence, but they rejoiced to hear that Lady Halsbury's health was improving.

Prebendary Fox referred briefly to the objects of the Institute, and called on Col. Mackinlay to read his valuable paper.

THE LITERARY MARVELS OF ST. LUKE.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE VICTORIA
INSTITUTE, JUNE 16TH, 1919,

By Lt.-Col. G. MACKINLAY, late R.A.

PART I.

THERE is full proof that the same author wrote both the third Gospel and the book of Acts. We shall accept the unanimous tradition that he was St. Luke; this is quite in accord with various indirect Scriptural statements. It is not a matter of importance for the purposes of our investigation to know the actual name of the author, but it is convenient to adopt one.

The study of the methods of expression of the Scriptural writers is worthy of our earnest attention; this is specially true with regard to the works of St. Luke, whose beauties of diction are very striking. His style is said to resemble that of Thucydides, and Renan has pronounced the third Gospel to be the most beautiful book ever written. St. Luke's inspired writings have been examined with minute care by many modern scholars, and they have afforded a rich mine for research, which is by no means exhausted. We shall confine ourselves in the following pages to the consideration of a few of his literary arrangements. The line of investigation which we shall take has the advantage that it can be followed by anyone of ordinary intelligence: technical training is not a necessity.

LUCAN TRIPLICATIONS.

We shall consider some examples of St. Luke's use of triple iteration, and of his appeals to memory in order to give emphasis, involving a very elaborate literary arrangement. Lastly, we shall make a practical deduction, useful in these days of unsettlement, and of the desire on the part of many to restate their beliefs in terms of present-day knowledge.

Triplication is sometimes employed in Scripture for the purpose of giving emphasis; for instance, the three smittings of his ass by Balaam showed the vehemence of his anger (Num. xxii, 28-33), and the same prophet's thrice repeated blessing of Israel demonstrated the earnestness of his message, particularly as cursing had been expected from him (Num. xxiv, 10).

But it is in the writings of St. Luke that the most frequent employment of this method of giving emphasis is to be found, and in beautiful variety.

The purport of the Acts—the preaching of the Gospel throughout the world by the power of the Holy Spirit—is emphasized by the triple account of the commissioning of St. Paul for that purpose at his conversion, and also by a somewhat similar triple account of the commission to Peter to begin the same work, when the servants of Cornelius came to him. These are supported by many other triplications.

In like manner St. Luke has emphasized the object and climax of his Gospel—the Death and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ—by no less than thirty.

The general arrangement of the triplications in the two books is on similar lines.

Those in the Gospel of St. Luke fall into four groups:—

1. Divine proclamations of our Lord (four in number).
2. Those which point forward to the Crucifixion or emphasize some doctrine dependent on it (sixteen).
3. Those during the Betrayal, Trial and Crucifixion of our Lord (six).
4. Those in the last Resurrection chapter, which point back to the Great Sacrifice, or else emphasize some blessing directly resulting from it (four).

Manifestly we have not space in this paper to consider them all, but we shall take a complete group as a sample of the whole, and we shall select the third; it does not contain a large number of triplications, and several of them have long been recognised;

our investigation, therefore, will not be tedious or needing much explanation, and we shall obtain some idea of the elaborate arrangement of the whole.

TRIPPLICATIONS IN THE CRUCIFIXION SECTION.

The triplications in this section come in the undermentioned order, and they are enumerated on the *left* half of the following Table :—

In the Gospel of St. Luke.	Correspondences in the Book of Acts.
I. (Failure)— No. (21) Peter's three denials, xxii, 56-62. ,, (22) Pilate's three failures to save our Lord's life, xxiii, 7-11, 18-22.	I. (Success)— No. (15) Peter's boldness on three occasions, iv, 13, 29, 31. ,, (16) A Roman officer saves Paul's life on three occasions, xxi, 27-32; xxiii, 10; xxiii, 12-33.
II. (Testimony)— No. (23) Pilate's three testimonies to our Lord's faultlessness, xxiii, 4, 14, 22. ,, (24) Similar testimony from three others, xxiii, 15, 41, 47.	II. (Testimony)— No. (17) The testimonies of three sets of Roman rulers that Paul had committed nothing worthy of death, or of bonds, xxiii, 29; xxv, 25; xxvi, 31. ,, (18) Similar testimony from three other groups, xix, 37; xxiii, 9; xxviii, 21.
III. (Death)— No. (25) The three dying sayings of our Lord, recorded by St. Luke, xxiii, 34, 43, 46. ,, (26) A triplet of triplications. Human failure and testimony, and the divine power of Christ. See I, II and III.	III. (Death)— No. (19) The three dying sayings of Stephen, vii, 55-60. ,, (20) A triplet of triplications. Human success and testimony, and the divine power of the Holy Spirit. See I, II, and III.

N.B.—As the Scriptural texts are given in this Table, they are not quoted again in the pages of this paper. The reference numerals to passages in the Acts are printed in italics in order to distinguish them from those in the Gospel of St. Luke.

We shall confine our attention for the present to the triplications in the Gospel of St. Luke. Those in the Acts will be considered in Part II, p. 7.

(21) *Peter's three denials.*

Triplication No. (21) (see Table) tells of St. Peter's three denials of His Master in His time of deepest trial, thus emphasizing the failure of human love.

Examining the structure of this triplication, we notice that the first and third components are the most striking, while the intermediate one, which serves as a link between the two others, is less prominent. The first attracts attention, while the last leads immediately to the climax, the fulfilment of our Lord's sad prophecy to Peter, "The cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me" (Luke xxii, 34, 61).

Our Evangelist states that the first challenger "looked steadfastly" on Peter, and said, "This man also was with him." But he denied, saying, "Woman, I know him not."

The last one "confidently affirmed" that the Apostle had been with our Lord, "for he is a Galilæan." But Peter said, "Man, I know not what thou sayest."

The intermediate interrogator is recorded as simply saying, "Thou also art one of them," without any mention of steadfast looking or confident affirming. Peter's reply on the second occasion is recorded in only three Greek words, whilst the first denial is in four, and the last in five words.

(22) *Pilate's three failures to save our Lord's life,* and (23) *Pilate's three testimonies to our Lord's faultlessness.*

The next two triplications are interwoven with each other; we therefore take their components together. We find it convenient, in each case, to consider those of No. (23) before those of No. (22).

In the first component of No. (23) Pilate declared our Lord faultless when He was brought before him; but instead of releasing Him as he should have done, he at once endeavoured to evade his responsibility by sending Him to Herod, No. (22).

The second components of each triplication are also close together. Pilate repeated that he found no fault in our Lord. As Herod had also come to the same conclusion, there was a stronger reason for release than before. Pilate, however, suggested the fatal compromise, that he should chastise our Lord in order to please the Jews, and then release Him according

to his own inclinations. The multitude then very naturally took advantage of his manifest weakness, and cried out, "Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas," the murderer.

Again, the third time, did Pilate testify to our Lord's innocence, and still further increased his shame, when he feebly descended to argue with his subjects, saying, "Why, what evil hath this man done? I have found no cause of death in him"; and again he repeated his proposal of chastisement and release.

But the voices of the chief priests, of the rulers, and of the people prevailed, and our Lord was condemned by Pilate (xxiii, 24), notwithstanding his great authority as Roman ruler, and that "he had determined to release him" (Acts iii, 13).

(24) *Similar testimonies from three others.*

So careful is our Evangelist to emphasize the fact that our Lord had not broken any human law, that he adds another triplication, No. (24), containing the evidence of three other men to the same effect.

Herod could not find any fault in our Lord.

Secondly, the penitent thief on the cross said of Him, "This man hath done nothing amiss."

And thirdly, the centurion present at the time exclaimed, "Certainly this was a righteous man."

(25) *The three dying sayings of our Lord, recorded by St. Luke.*

With deep reverence we approach the crowning triplication of the Crucifixion section, No. (25), composed of the three sayings of our Lord upon the cross which St. Luke has recorded. Our Saviour's firm confidence of the acceptance of His atoning Sacrifice is strongly emphasized by them.

The first saying was, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."

As the object for which our Lord came into the world was to obtain pardon for sinners through the shedding of His precious blood, the first saying recorded is a prayer for the forgiveness of those around Him. His confidence in the efficacy of His atoning work was so great that His prayer had no reference to His own condition.

Immediately came the firstfruits of the answer. Both of the crucified thieves had railed upon our Lord (Matt. xxvii, 44); but soon one of them confessed his sin, and said to the other,

“Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds”; and then speaking to our Lord he said, “Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy Kingdom” (Luke xxiii, 40-42).

In his second saying our Lord again made no reference to His own position, but, full of confidence, He graciously promised the repentant sinner that he would be with Himself on that very day in Paradise. Our Lord, dying on the cross the death of a malefactor, and surrounded by a hostile crowd, spoke with the dignity and authority of the Divine King upon His throne.

Lastly, we have the simple yet majestic statement that as our Lord died He said, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit”: in full assurance that His atoning Work was finished and accepted (John xix, 30).

God the Father was addressed in the first and last of these sayings, on which Dean Alford has remarked that our Lord “is the Son of God, and He speaks in the fulness of this covenant relation.”

The intermediate saying contained gracious words of blessing spoken to a single repentant and believing sinner—what a contrast!

This arrangement reminds us of the planning of some of the Psalms, in which the praises of Jehovah come at the beginning and end, while His pardoning love in removing our transgressions from us, “as far as the east is from the west,” is dwelt upon in the intermediate part (Ps. ciii, 12).

(26) *A triplet of triplications.*

Tripletions Nos. (21) and (22) both emphasize human failure—of Peter’s love and of Pilate’s power respectively—to succour our Lord in His dying moments. These two may therefore be regarded as one.

Similarly, Nos. (23) and (24) both testify to our Lord’s innocence; they also may be regarded as one, doubled for the sake of increased emphasis.

Consequently we may regard No. (21) with (22), (23) with (24), and (25) as forming a triplet of triplications. The first component shows human failure, notwithstanding the strong human testimony to our Lord’s faultlessness in the second, while the third and last component emphasizes the greatness of our Lord’s atoning sacrifice upon the cross.

Before we leave this part of our subject we may notice the tremendous contrast between the first component No. (21) with (22) of this triplet of triplications, and the last one No. (25); between the sinful fear and failure of Peter and of Pilate in the former, and the absolute sinlessness and majesty of our Lord in the latter.

The facts connected with the Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ are indeed strongly emphasized by the group of triplications in the Crucifixion section of the Gospel of St. Luke.

PART II.

MEMORY.

St. Luke, in his Gospel, sometimes appeals to memory, as, for instance, he is the only Evangelist who records the gracious words of our Lord at the Last Supper, "This do in remembrance of me" (xxii, 19).

But it is in the Acts that Luke chiefly makes use of remembrance, and often in a somewhat subtle form, to emphasize the grand events of the Gospel story.

SINGLE REMINDERS.

In the Acts he seldom mentions the word remembrance or any equivalent to it, though he often tells that the apostles and evangelists preached Christ crucified and risen (ii, 22, 23; iv, 2, 10, etc.), and that they sometimes referred to events in our Lord's life, as, for instance, when Peter said that He "went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil" (Acts x, 38). But a special feature of St. Luke's writings in his second book is that he selects for record certain parts of the careers of the first preachers of the Gospel, which strongly bring to the memory of his readers corresponding events in the Life, and especially in the Death, of our Lord. Luke thus emphasizes the Gospel by his record in the Acts. The Rev. R. B. Rackham* has pointed out many of them: we have only space to mention a few. St. Luke states that just before His death our Lord "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem" (Luke ix, 51). Some years afterwards Luke records

* *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, pp. xlvi and 401, 1908.

that Paul said, "I am ready . . . to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xxi, 13). After our Lord's arrival at that city, the multitude had cried out, "Away with this man" (Luke xxiii, 18), and when, years afterwards, Paul entered Jerusalem, the crowds uttered the same hostile words, "Away with him" (Acts xxi, 36), repeated soon afterwards on the same day with added vehemence, "Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live" (Acts xxii, 22); for other instances see Luke xxii, 42; Acts xxi, 14, etc.

Stephen is introduced in the Acts towards the close of his life. He was indeed filled with the Spirit (Acts vi, 5, 10; vii, 55, see also vi, 3); special attention is therefore drawn to his statement, that the Jews always resisted the Holy Ghost (vii, 51), of Whom the book of Acts testifies so fully.

The account of the death of Stephen therefore brings before us the rejection of the Third Person of the Trinity by the Jews, and it strongly reminds us of the record of the rejection of our Lord Jesus Christ at the Crucifixion by the same people, told in the Gospels.

DOUBLE REMINDERS.

But St. Luke, in his second book, has further reminded us of our Lord's earthly Ministry by what we may call a doubled process: he has told us of various events in the history of two very prominent Christian leaders, which not only show a strong resemblance to each other, but they also unite in reminding us of our Lord's career on earth.

In the Acts, Luke tells the doings of Peter, and, much more fully, those of Paul. It is interesting to notice a few of the number of similar occurrences in the history of each, which Luke has chosen for record, reminding us of corresponding events in the life of our Lord. Some are resemblances, some are contrasts. Both apostles had power to heal the sick (iii, 1-10; xiv, 8-10); both had also a personal curative power; so that the shadow of one (v, 15), and handkerchiefs or aprons from the others (xix, 12), cured the sufferers. Both also raised the dead: Peter restored Tabitha to life (ix, 36-42), and Paul Eutychus (xx, 9-12). Both had divine worship offered to them: Peter by Cornelius (x, 25-26), and Paul by the people of Lystra (xiv, 11-18).

But now we come to contrasts with events in our Lord's life ; for both apostles very rightly refused the proffered homage. There is only the slightest account of the ancestry, and none at all of the birth or death of either of these apostles. The antecedents of each, shortly before he began his work of proclaiming the Gospel, had been sad and humiliating. Peter had denied his Master in His time of deepest trial, as we have just seen, and Paul had savagely persecuted the weak infant Church, and had taken a leading part in the death of the first martyr, Stephen (Acts vii, 58 ; viii, 1). Both had been unwilling to undertake the work of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, and both were granted a special vision, and a divine message ordering them to obey (x, 9-16 ; xxvi, 9-20).

The events in our Lord's Ministry to which these doubled records call our attention, either by similitude or by contrast, are well known, and need not be enumerated.

THREEFOLD REMINDERS.

Not only, however, are Gospel incidents recalled to the reader's memory by the narration of isolated events and also by doubled records in the Acts ; but our author has adopted an even more elaborate plan. The Acts and the Gospel of St. Luke resemble each other in containing triplications emphasizing the main subject of the book to which they belong. Those in the Acts *also* point back to events in our Lord's Ministry, each of them corresponding with a triplication or triplications in the Gospel of St. Luke. We shall only consider those parallel to the six in the Crucifixion section which we have already investigated ; see *right-hand column* of the Table, p. 175.

It is thus claimed that the methods of St. Luke's two books are exceedingly harmonious and elaborate. At the same time, the arrangements are so very skilfully carried out that they are not apparent without considerable investigation. Can we wonder that divinely inspired writings need careful study before all their beauty and earnestness are fully revealed ?

We shall now examine each of these triplications, Nos. (15) to (20) in the Acts in detail, in order to demonstrate the existence of the very close parallelisms with Nos. (21) to (26) in the third Gospel (see Table, p. 175).

(15) *Peter's boldness on three occasions*, and (16), *a Roman officer saves Paul's life on three occasions*.

In striking contrast with the doublet of triplications, Nos. (21) and (22) in the Gospel, of Peter's sad denial, and of Pilate's failure to save our Lord from death, we find two parallel triplications, Nos. (15) and (16) in the Acts, which tell of Peter's *boldness*, and of a Roman officer *saving* the life of St. Paul.

In No. (15) triplication in the Acts, St. Peter's action under very difficult and dangerous surroundings is recorded. Our Lord had gone, but the Holy Spirit had come upon him in power: Peter had preached the Gospel with great blessing in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, and three thousand were added to the Church. Peter and John then miraculously cured a lame man, thus provoking much opposition and persecution against themselves. The priests and others who had arrested and caused the death of the Master, laid hands on the servants, put them in ward until the next day, and then brought them before the assembled rulers, who repeatedly threatened them (Acts iv, 17, 21).

Their position now seemed much worse than on the night before the Crucifixion, when our Lord was with them. But now we read that the rulers, elders, scribes, high priests, and others, before whom Peter and John were arraigned, beheld their *boldness*, and they marvelled, perceiving "that they were unlearned and ignorant men"; they noticed also "that they had been with Jesus" (Acts iv, 13), Who had been publicly put to a shameful death as a malefactor only a little more than seven weeks previously, when it is not unlikely that some of those present may have heard Peter's sad denials. This striking exhibition of boldness in Acts iv, 13, forms the first component of the triplication No. (15) in the Acts corresponding to No. (21) in the Gospel of Luke.

The second component of this triplication in the Acts is formed by the faithful prayer of the assembled believers, who asked with one accord that they might be granted "all boldness" to speak the Lord's Word.

The last component is formed by the gracious answer to this prayer, when those present "were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the Word of God with boldness."

The same Greek word *παρρησία* (boldness) is used on each occasion: it forms the thread running through this triplication; it is only used in two other places in the Acts.

Not only does No. (15) in the Acts contrast with, and correspond to No. (21) in the Crucifixion section of the Gospel, but it strongly supports the main triplications of the book to which it belongs, because it emphasizes the strength and vigour given to the believers to win souls for Christ; it therefore draws marked attention to the main subject of the book, the growth of the Church.

We also find a contrast to No. (22) in the Crucifixion section of the Gospel of St. Luke in No. (16) triplication in the Acts, which tells of Paul's life saved on three occasions by a Roman officer from the deadly plans of hostile Jews.

In the first component Paul was said to have defiled the Temple at Jerusalem by taking Greeks there; the Jews consequently were seeking to kill him; but tidings came to the Roman chief captain, who rescued Paul by his soldiers from the Jewish crowd.

The second component is formed by the events of the next day, when Paul was brought before the council of the Jews, and a great discussion arising, "the chief captain, fearing lest Paul should be torn in pieces by them, commanded the soldiers to go down, and take him by force from among them, and bring him into the castle."

The third component is formed by the events of the following day, and the succeeding night. Paul, being confined in the castle, and beyond their reach for the time, a number of Jews bound themselves under a great curse to taste nothing until they had killed him. But this plot came to the ears of the chief captain, who again saved Paul's life by sending him at the third hour of the night, on a rapid march, under the protection of a large armed party to Cæsarea.

This triplication not only points back to No. (22) in the Gospel, but it also emphasizes the main subject of the Acts, which was manifestly closely connected with the preservation of St. Paul's life.

(17) The testimonies of three sets of Roman rulers to Paul's faultlessness, and (18) the same testimonies from three other groups.

We now come to the consideration of a pair of triplications, Nos. (17) and (18) in the Acts, of testimonies to St. Paul's character, which are parallel and similar to a pair, Nos. (23) and (24) in the Gospel of Luke, that our Lord was faultless. The

reader is thus vividly reminded of events immediately before and during the Crucifixion of our Lord.

In No. (17) in the Acts, three sets of Roman rulers, Claudius Lycias, Festus, and Agrippa with Bernice, all testified that Paul had not committed anything worthy of death.

In No. (18) in the Acts, three other sets of witnesses, the town clerk of Ephesus, some scribes of the Pharisees' part in Jerusalem, and Judæan Jews writing to their countrymen in Rome, also testified that Paul had done no wrong.

The components of the triplications emphasizing our Lord's innocence were all given close together, at about the time of His great atoning Work, at His Death upon the Cross. But the testimonies that Paul had not broken human laws were distributed over the much greater period of time, occupied by *his* work of preaching the Gospel to many peoples in different lands.

This pair of triplications also serves to support the main object of the book of Acts, the record of the growth of the Church among the nations, because they emphasize the fact that the great Evangelist St. Paul possessed one of the necessary qualifications of a Christian leader, "a good testimony from them that are without" (1 Tim. iii, 7).

(19) The three dying sayings of Stephen, recorded by St. Luke.

Triplication No. (19) in the Acts, composed of the dying words of the first martyr Stephen, irresistibly carries back the memory to the three sayings of our Lord on the cross, see No. (25) in the Gospel of St. Luke.

We recognise the overruling influence on the dying Martyr, for we read that he, "full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." The reader is thus forcibly reminded of the second saying of our Lord on the cross, recorded by St. Luke, to the penitent thief, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke xxiii, 43); for Stephen's statement attests the accomplishment of our Lord's confident words on the cross, that He would soon be in glory.

The second dying utterance of Stephen, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," corresponds to the last of our Lord's, when He commended (*παρατίθημι*) His Spirit to God the Father

(Luke xxiii, 46), quoting Ps. xxxi, 5, in which this word is used in the Septuagint version. Dean Alford gives the rendering "to deliver up"—a meaning which is certainly implied in Luke xii, 48, and II Tim. ii, 2, in which the same word is employed. Stephen, when dying, used the word *δέχομαι*, which simply means receive or admit. The one when dying addressed God the Father, the other the Lord Jesus.

The third and last of Stephen's sayings was the prayer, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge": it resembles the first saying of our Lord on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (Luke xxiii, 34).

The death of Stephen not only points back emphatically to the Death of our Lord, but it also marks a very important crisis in the growth of the Church.

For a persecution against the believers arose at the time of the first Martyr's death, and consequently many were scattered abroad in different countries; they faithfully took the opportunity to preach the Lord Jesus wherever they went, "and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord" (xi, 19-21).

The account of the death of Stephen also introduces the reader to the persecuting Saul, so soon to become the Spirit-filled, enthusiastic Paul, who was to be the chief human agent in promoting the growth of the infant Church. The influence of Stephen on Paul must have been immense: one indication of it is shown by the fact that the Apostle's first recorded speech at Antioch in Pisidia (xiii, 16-41) greatly resembles the dying address of the first martyr (vii, 2-53).

(20) *A triplet of triplications.*

As in the Gospel, so in the Acts, we may group the five triplications into three, thus forming a triplet of triplications, No. (20) in the Acts, corresponding to and pointing back to No. (26) in the Gospel of St. Luke.

No. (20) in the Acts also emphasizes the progress of the Gospel.

The first component, made up of Nos. (15) and (16), strongly indicates the boldness of the believers, and the protection afforded to them at that time by the Romans.

The second component, Nos. (17) and (18), also speaks of good progress, because the leader Paul received such good and such widespread testimony to his character.

The last component tells of the death of Stephen, which

led to a wonderful advance—one of the most marked crises in the history of the Church.

We have thus traced some of the arrangements which Luke has adopted in one portion of his Gospel, and we have noticed the striking correspondences which he has inserted in the Acts. It must be understood that similar correspondences also exist between the first, second and fourth groups of triplications in St. Luke's Gospel with others in the Acts.

The following is a very brief outline: we have no space to quote references.

The first group in the Gospel of St. Luke consists of three triplications of proclamations of our Lord Jesus Christ, making a triplet of triplications. The first group in the Acts also consists of three triplications of proclamations, two being of the Holy Spirit, and one of our Lord Jesus Christ, again forming a triplet of triplications.

The second group in the Gospel consists of sixteen triplications, some of which look forward to the coming Sacrifice, while others deal with doctrines connected with that event. Some of these form two triplets of triplications, one on the Sacrifice and one on Doctrines. These are balanced in the Acts by ten triplications which refer to the growth of the Church, three of which make a triplet of triplications on Doctrines: the Sacrifice of our Lord is also referred to in others.

The correspondences in the numbers of the triplications in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts is thus not so close in this case as in the other groups; variations in numbers seem to be required by differences in the conditions, but the parallelism between the arrangement of St. Luke's two books is still quite clear and plain.

The fourth group of four triplications in the Gospel of St. Luke is balanced most systematically by four in the Acts. Each book contains a triplication on (a) Comfort in sorrow, (b) Openings, and (c) Joy; subjects in the Acts which also tell of the growth of the Church, as the "opening" there mentioned refers to the door of faith to the Gentiles. A triplet of triplications is also formed in each book.

Where is there anything in the whole range of literature corresponding to these elaborate and skilful arrangements?

Some of these triplications, such as Peter's denials and Pilate's three failures to release our Lord, and his three testimonies

to our Lord's faultlessness, have always been self-evident ; and many doubtless have noticed the connection between the dying words of Stephen and those of our Lord on the cross ; but it is believed that the existence of the more than fifty triplications in Luke's two books, and their elaborate relations to each other, have not hitherto been observed.

On considering this subject, the thought naturally rises in our minds : as the inspired Evangelist must have bestowed an immense amount of care and skill in the selection and arrangement of the material at his disposal, it surely must be worth while for all who love the Scriptures to study his literary methods carefully.

ST. LUKE'S INTENTION IN HIS LITERARY ARRANGEMENTS.

It cannot be that St. Luke has arranged his two books on his elaborate plan with the intention of merely interesting his readers, and inducing them to decipher his arrangements, so that they might admire them when discovered. His object certainly was far higher.

Ruskin's words about the writings of wise men in general are very applicable to those of the inspired Scriptural authors, particularly of St. Luke.

"Be sure," wrote Ruskin,* "that you go to the author to get at *his* meaning, not to find yours, and judge it afterwards, if you think yourself qualified to do so ; but ascertain it first. And be sure, also, if the author is worth anything, that you will not get at his meaning all at once ; nay, that at his whole meaning you will not for a long time arrive in any wise. Not that he does not say what he means, and in strong words too ; but he cannot say it all ; and what is more strange, *will* not, but in a hidden way, and in parables, in order that he may be sure you want it. I cannot quite see the reason of this, nor analyse that cruel reticence in the breasts of wise men which makes them always hide their deeper thought. They do not give it you by way of help, but of reward ; and will make themselves sure that you desire it before they allow you to reach it.

"But it is the same with the physical type of wisdom, gold. There seems, to you and me, no reason why the electric forces of the earth should not carry whatever there is of gold within it at once to the mountain tops, so that kings and people might know that all the gold they could get was there ; and without

* *Sesame and Lilies*, pp. 15, 16, Edition 1871.

any trouble of digging, or anxiety, or chance, or waste of time, cut it away, and coin as much as they needed.

“But Nature does not manage it so. She puts it in little fissures in the earth, nobody knows where; you may dig long and find none; you must dig painfully to find any.”

Can we find out St. Luke’s intention in constructing his wonderful system of triplications, and why it has not been recognised before?

He was evidently a highly-cultivated man, and also one who fully recognised Divine wisdom, for he frequently described men as filled with the Holy Spirit. There cannot be a doubt that his elaborate plan of triplications was employed to emphasize important spiritual truths to thoughtful readers.

His writings have been examined recently in a variety of ways, which have not all given satisfactory results. Some men question the accuracy of his records, while others seek to find some new doctrines in them, suited, as they think, to the advanced condition of the human mind; many of both classes of these men neglect the spiritual facts and truths of the Holy Scriptures.

Of late years long-buried inscriptions and archæological records have been brought to light, and carefully studied; they have fully testified to the strict historicity of the sacred records, especially of the writings of St. Luke; apparently they were discovered just at the time when their witness was most required.

In this paper we have investigated a few long hidden, but recently recognised literary plans, which reveal to us some of the workings of St. Luke’s divinely-guided mind—a mind as quick and intelligent by nature as that of any modern critic. These plans have also been discovered at the opportune time to meet the arguments of the present-day advocates of the so-called New Theology, for we find that St. Luke has laid very much more stress than was formerly recognised upon the foundation truths of our faith: while no allusion whatever to any new doctrine can be discovered.

“Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein” (Jer. vi, 16).

The subject of this paper will be considered in fuller detail in the author’s book, *The Literary Marvels of St. Luke*, which, it is hoped, will soon be published.

Professor H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD said : They were met together that afternoon with mingled feelings. Regret that their President could not be present—and especially for the cause of his absence—was mingled with glad thankfulness that Lady Halsbury's illness had taken a favourable turn, and with gratitude to the Chairman of Council for gallantly stepping into the breach and giving that interesting, suggestive and lucid paper—a paper well deserving their unanimous thanks.

St. Luke's system of triplication was so remarkable, the parallelisms between the Gospel triplications and those in the Acts were so numerous, and the correspondences so close, that this alone might lead a thoughtful reader to conclude that the two books had one and the same writer.

Especially noticeable were the "memory" triplications in Part II of the Paper.

He concurred with the author in thinking that St. Luke's purpose in his triplication method was to *emphasize* spiritual truth ; and thought that all present would agree with the claim (p. 181) that "the methods of St. Luke's two books are exceedingly harmonious and elaborate."

They would also assent to Ruskin's words (p. 187), and he had much pleasure in proposing a very hearty vote of thanks to the Chairman of Council for digging diligently in this mine, and bringing the gold to the surface for their easy and profitable use.

Mr. W. HOSTE seconded the vote of thanks.

He thought such a paper as that of Col. Mackinlay both humbling and encouraging ; humbling, because it was a reproach to some of us that we had so little sought to understand the depths of teaching, that cannot but exist in a book "given by inspiration of God" ; and encouraging, because we are reminded that "God is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him" and that His secrets are open to the patient enquirer.

Mr. M. L. ROUSE then proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, expressing his pleasure that the Institute had found so good a substitute for Lord Halsbury in the latter's enforced absence. Before Prebendary Fox joined the Institute he had so fine a record of Christian usefulness that the members of the Council rejoiced to admit him at once to their number ; and since then he had read

before the Institute a paper of transcendent merit and attractiveness—one that dealt with his own confirmation of the discovery, among the memorial tablets of Cæsar's household, of four names of worthies mentioned in the inspired epistles, and with his own discovery of a fifth, and which he accompanied with reproductions of the same that he was the first to make for an English audience—the worthies being Amplias, Tryphœna, Tryphosa, Julia and Epaphras. "Colonel Mackinlay's paper," continued Mr. Rouse, "was a delightful surprise. I in no wise expected that such a train of important triplets could be found in Luke; and especially pleasing are the triplets found in Acts that contrast with, and as it were, make good those in Luke's Gospel. John, too, has triplets in his Gospel—three statements made by Pilate of Jesus' innocence, three attempts by him to deliver Jesus, three sayings of Jesus on the cross, and three confessions of love elicited by the Lord from Peter corresponding to his three denials. But I know of no other in John's Gospel, nor of any at all in Matthew's or Mark's; and they certainly have none in the story of the crucifixion. The symmetries shown between Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles in this regard, as now brought out so strikingly by Colonel Mackinlay, are another proof that both the Gospel and the Book of the Acts were written by the same hand, as the writer of the latter distinctly says that they were. The only outside proof that I had hitherto known (and I have thoroughly confirmed it by looking right through Tischendörf's various readings) was this:—Outside Luke's Gospel and the Book of the Acts all texts but B (the *Codex Vaticanus*) practically always spell Ἰωάννης with two *vs*, B spelling it with one *v* throughout the New Testament. Yet throughout Luke's Gospel and the Acts D (the *Codex Bezae*) spells the name with one *v*. This shows that the scribe who made the copy D in the sixth century had before him the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts bound together as one book apart from the other Gospels.

Remarks by Rev. J. J. B. COLES: In seconding the vote of thanks to the Chairman of Council, may I say how well it is for us to bear in mind that the Victoria Institute was founded for investigating in a reverent spirit important questions of philosophy and science bearing upon Holy Scripture.

At the close of the excellent Annual Address we have just listened

to, we are asked whether we can find out what was St. Luke's intention in constructing his wonderful system of triplications.

It seems to me the answer is, that underlying the actual words of the living oracles of God, there is a wonderful system of science and philosophy, of which these triplications in St. Luke's writings are a good illustration.

In God's world of Nature we can trace on every hand indications of latent geometry and of the arithmetic of beauty, in the crystal, in the flower, and in the human form—so it is in a hidden way with His written Word.

In my paper on Theosophy, in 1911, I wrote: "Those of us who have studied the geometrical philosophy of the ancients are aware that Moses, the writer of the Pentateuch, who was well instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, introduced in an esoteric manner into Genesis, the science of geometrical form and of arithmetical numbers."

The trines such as 333, 666, and 888 in the New Testament belong to the hidden "wisdom" which is a complete answer to the perversion of God's truth in the "mysteries" of Paganism.

Dr. SCHOFIELD sent the following: Perhaps I may be allowed to suggest a reason for St. Luke's and other triplets that possibly has not been brought forward.

We live in a world of three dimensions, and men are bounded by this threefold concept. From the glimpses afforded of the spirit-world we find many traces of what would be true of it were it a world of four dimensions.

Scripture is not without evidence of some effort to express this: "Length, breadth, depth, and *height*, etc." I need not give further instances now, as I have elaborated the subject elsewhere. Suffice it to say that a threefold aspect of anything gives completeness and satisfies an intellect, hence the firstly, secondly, and thirdly of our sermons, and the constant presentation of triplets in our material daily life. It is not then in the least surprising that St. Luke, writing as a man for men in his presentation of our Lord as the Son of Man, should constantly give the threefold picture that we find unconsciously satisfies our intellectual need, but it is surprising to find how deeply the Lecturer has dug, and what a number of triplets, and triplets within triplets, he has found.