

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

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

VOL. LXXIX.

1947



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY

THE INSTITUTE, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## 873RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1 ON  
MONDAY, 12TH MAY, 1947.

R. E. D. CLARK, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

The following elections have been made : E. J. J. Daley, Esq., Fellow ;  
A. Oakley John, Esq., M.B., B.S., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Fellow.

---

### *SEX MORALITY.*

By D. R. MACE, Esq., M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D.

WHATEVER demerits this paper may have, it can at least be claimed that it is upon a topical subject. The question of standards of sexual conduct is a burning one at the present time ; and there is hardly a field in which there is more confusion of thought or controversy in discussion. The social life of our time has been characterised by a widespread and startling landslide away from the traditional Christian standards of sex morality.

I must begin by defining the scope within which this paper will attempt to discuss the subject. Sex morality covers a very wide field. It might be taken to include problems of purely personal morality, such as masturbation and homosexuality, and also problems more directly within the sphere of social morality, such as prostitution and illegitimacy. Some of these questions will arise incidentally in the course of my paper. But the field which I wish to cover will be that of normal sex relations between men and women, meaning normal in the sense that no sexual deviation or perversion is involved. Within this field, I shall endeavour to show that the traditional Christian standard is still a valid one, and that it conforms to the best interests of individual life and of the welfare of the community. That is to say, it will stand the strictly utilitarian test.

Indeed, I believe it must do so. Sex is a phenomenon which, in human life, has significance only within the limits of this

material and temporal world. "In heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage." That is the authoritative pronouncement which defines the limits of sex. Consequently, it is logical to assert that the right use of sex must conform to the conditions which obtain within the natural order. In certain individual cases it may be justifiable to renounce the fulfilments of sex for the attainment of a spiritual end. But for the generality of mankind, sex exists to be *used*. And since its use belongs properly and exclusively to this life, the conditions of that use must be agreeable to the ends for which human life was designed. It must make men and women happy and make them good. That we believe to be the divine purpose. And sex must be so used that it contributes to that purpose. To use it otherwise is to misuse it.

First, let us consider briefly how sex has in fact been used in human life and human society in the past.

It was believed by those who held the evolutionary theory of marriage in the last century—notably McLennan, Herbert Spencer, and Lewis Morgan—that there was a time when the human race passed through a stage of general promiscuity, when there was no clearly defined pattern of sexual behaviour such as we know in civilized communities. That theory is now no longer held. It could not be sustained in the light of ascertained anthropological and sociological facts. But it was abandoned only after a good deal of controversy; and that controversy stimulated a good deal of research. The result is that much information was amassed about codes of sexual behaviour both in ancient and modern society, civilized and uncivilized (a distinction, incidentally, not now capable of as clear definition as it once was!). Much of the result of this enquiry was assembled in Edward Westermarck's "History of Human Marriage," which established the hypothesis, now probably universally accepted, that no human society has ever existed in a stable and reasonably permanent condition, without having some clearly defined code of marriage and sex morality. This is the first elementary point at which it might be said that the study of anthropology and sociology in this field confirms the Christian teaching; namely, that no human society can survive in a state of sexual amorality. Some kind of defined code of sexual conduct is essential to community life.

But history has shown that there have existed many and different codes and standards of sexual behaviour. These have

varied largely according to the circumstances of the societies in question. The studies of Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg, in their "Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples," make it plain that conditions of life have tended to determine codes of sexual behaviour to a considerable extent. Thus certain patterns recur in the presence of certain environmental factors. This is of course what we should naturally expect. "Humanity has been led, in all ages," says Dr. Lofthouse, "by what it has from time to time considered to be its interest or advantage. Men do not sit down as Herodotus described the Persian nobles sitting down, to discuss under what institutions they shall live . . . they feel their way forward through the jungle of circumstance, not on the high road of theory."

Nevertheless, it is pertinent to ask whether, amid the medley of codes of sexual conduct which the study of anthropology and sociology reveal, there is any basic pattern which tends to fulfil, better than the others, the fundamental ends of human life. This question was taken up by J. D. Unwin; who, as a result of formidable researches, recorded in his "Sex and Culture," arrived at an interesting and, from our point of view, highly significant conclusion.

Unwin examined socially the principle enunciated by Freud that civilization arises from the restraints placed upon crude biological impulse, and the redirection of the resulting potential into cultural channels. Confining himself to the sex impulse, Unwin asked whether there was some particular code of behaviour which, more than any other, resulted in the highest output of what he called cultural energy. After a study of all human societies, ancient and modern, he came to the conclusion that there was. And his conclusion was that the standard in question was what he described as "absolute monogamy"—in fact, the Christian standard of chastity before marriage and fidelity after it. In his own words, "There is no recorded case of a society adopting absolute monogamy without displaying expansive energy. Whenever the evidence is complete we see that such a society, on arriving in the historical arena, was regulating the relations between the sexes in this particular manner." Then he puts the other side. "In human records there is no instance of a society retaining its energy after a complete new generation had inherited a tradition which does not insist on pre-nuptial and post-nuptial chastity."

I am not here concerned about details of Unwin's work—only his general conclusion. I am not aware that this conclusion has ever been seriously challenged, let alone refuted. And, from a sociological point of view, it means simply that, other things being equal, the society which accepts the Christian standard of sex morality will achieve the highest level of culture.

Now let us see how all this applies to the life and custom of our own time. In recent years, as I have already indicated, we have seen the Christian standard of sex morality seriously challenged as a valid principle, and increasingly ignored as a working code of behaviour. There is not time now to trace the long history of this movement, or to analyse the complex network of causes which have brought it about. Intellectually, it reached its culmination in the doctrines of the "new morality" which were much in evidence in the 1930's, but of which little is heard today. Its *practical* consequences are only now really appearing, in the free sex relations which are so widespread at the present time.

It would be idle to suggest, of course, that there have not always been serious departures from the accepted moral code. Lecky makes this clear when he says that "In all nations, ages, and religions a vast mass of irregular indulgence has appeared, which has probably contributed more than any other single cause to the misery and degradation of man." But what is new in the modern scene is the assertion that these departures from conventional morality do not, as Lecky suggested, lead to "misery and degradation"; but that they in fact result in the betterment of society. It is this contention with which I wish to join issue.

As it happens, there is sufficient evidence for us now to be able to see how this new attitude to sex is working out. No one knows precisely the extent to which, in Britain today, the standards of chastity and fidelity have been overthrown. But there are hard and indisputable facts which give us some indication. For example, the returns of the Registrar-General since 1938, when the Population Statistics Act was first introduced, enable us to estimate the number of extra-marital pregnancies which occur each year. In a statistical analysis published in 1945, I showed that, over a period of six years, the number of women becoming pregnant outside marriage each year in England and Wales was not much less than one-tenth of a million. These are, of course, only cases where neither the man nor the woman used any contraceptive, or those where the contraceptive

employed failed to prevent pregnancy. There is good reason to believe that this is a mere fraction of the total number of unmarried women who have sex relations. The total may well be as high as a million. And since in all there are only about four and a half to five million unmarried women in England and Wales, between the extreme age ranges of 15 and 49, it will be seen that the "unchaste" group may well be quite a large one. There is no reason to believe that the number of men who have extra-marital sex relations is any less.

This means that there are enough people in the community who have abandoned the Christian standard for us to begin to see how the new policy is working out. We cannot, of course, hope to see any of the long-term consequences to which Unwin pointed. He made it clear that it takes several generations for the decline in culture which follows the removal of sexual restraint to manifest itself plainly. But we may rightly enquire whether there are any more immediate personal and social effects which *can* be discerned. I believe the answer is in the affirmative.

Let us consider the social consequences first. The point which has become outstandingly clear is that, in our society, there is a close and inextricable relationship between the two standards of chastity and fidelity. Many exponents of the new morality tried to separate these. They proposed to allow free sex relations in youth *before* marriage, but to require strict fidelity *after* it. They made much of the fact that in certain South Sea island communities the young people are permitted to enjoy a period of sexual freedom, but after marriage are required to settle down to constancy in their subsequent relationships. But such a state of affairs is quite impossible in our society. In these tribal groups, the adolescents are generally separated off for a period into almost completely self-contained communities. In any case, marriage takes place very early, so that the period in question is necessarily short. In our highly complex society, on the other hand, the married and the unmarried of all ages are inextricably mixed up together. It is simply impossible to have one standard for the unmarried and another for the married. To permit sexual freedom to the unmarried group will inevitably mean a tendency for the married group to adopt the same code. Thus many young people accustomed to sexual freedom will find that, after marriage, they will desire to follow the same pattern—especially when marriage becomes difficult for any reason. And the man who is accustomed to make free

with women will tend, when he finds himself attracted to one who wears a wedding ring, to ignore this fact. So free standards among the unmarried will inevitably come in time to invade the security and stability of the existing marriages in the society in question.

There is, in fact, no need to assert this in theory. It is manifest in the life of our time. We have witnessed in recent years a lessening of respect for the marriage tie, so that men and women nowadays frequently do not hesitate to make amorous advances to persons of the other sex whom they know to be committed to a binding marriage relationship. And there can be no doubt that the abandonment of fidelity today is the direct and logical consequence of the abandonment of chastity yesterday. In fact the two standards are not separate ones at all. They are different aspects of one code of morality. This the Christian Church has always proclaimed. And the events of our times give it all the confirmation we need.

It follows therefore that the overthrow of chastity leads to the insecurity of marriage, and the consequent instability of the family. The results of this, in personal misery, in hardship imposed upon little children, in general social tension and unrest, are to be seen on every hand. I do not, of course, assert that the present disorder in family life is due to this cause alone; but I do suggest that the abandonment of the standard of chastity in our society in the period between the two wars has contributed directly and considerably to the present crisis in family life.

Now let us turn to the individual aspect of this matter. There is not time to go into the many complex psychological issues which are involved in the study of sexual behaviour. This would require another paper to itself. I can only point now to one or two salient issues which are worthy of our careful consideration.

I have referred to the fact that in simple communities marriage generally takes place soon after puberty. In such societies, the problem of pre-marital chastity as we know it hardly arises. The crux of the difficulty for us lies in the fact that an interim period must elapse between the time when young people become physically capable of sex activity, and desirous of it, and the time when they are emotionally and mentally sufficiently developed to embark upon the responsibilities of marriage and the maintenance of a family.



We shall achieve nothing by ignoring or minimising the problem which this involves for young people. And we shall do well to face the fact that this period has in the past been unwarrantably protracted for social and economic reasons which are not sufficiently compelling. To prolong unnecessarily the time when marriage is possible for young people is dangerously to exacerbate a human problem which is quite serious enough in any case. No enlightened Christian community will wish to neglect its duty in this regard.

Let us state quite simply the question which we have to answer. "Since young people may not marry for five, ten, or fifteen years after the sex impulse has become vigorously awake within them, why should they not be allowed to indulge it? It is a very powerful impulse, and its exercise leads to pleasure. Why restrain it?"

For centuries the stock answer to this question was that the unrestrained exercise of the sex impulse might well lead to a great increase of illegitimacy and of venereal disease. These possible consequences of unchastity were both very real and very formidable; and for all practical purposes they served the ends of keeping the community reasonably chaste. But now both of them have lost their sting. Illegitimacy, it is contended, can be prevented by the use of efficient contraceptives. Venereal disease can now be cured. So the twin bogeys which guarded the gates of chastity have been robbed largely of their terrors.

It is useless to pretend that this does not confront the Christian with a major crisis. If the negative prohibitions upon which his code has rested have now largely collapsed, the implication is that his code is no longer valid. Millions of people today are in fact fully persuaded of this. And they are acting accordingly.

The result is that we are now gradually coming to see that the real case for chastity rests upon another and a deeper foundation. The fundamental evil of unchastity is being at last unmasked. It is that it destroys the security of marriage and the family.

We have seen this to be true socially. But it is also true personally. There is a growing consensus of opinion amongst responsible psychologists today that sexual freedom before marriage results in impairment of the individual concerned for the achievement of a successful marriage relationship. This was recently stated quite baldly by the late Professor Ernest R. Groves, of North Carolina University—generally recognized as

America's foremost authority on marriage. In the introductory statement to his college course on Marriage and the Family, referring to the achievement of happy marital adjustment, he asserts that "pre-marriage experience is no advantage but frequently instead the chief cause of marital maladjustment."

The reason for this, in psychological terms, can be fairly clearly expressed. In the development of the love life, most of us pass through a stage of what Havelock Ellis calls "poly-eroticism." This means the tendency to rapid and frequent change of the love-object. The phenomenon is well known in adolescence. The boy or girl may fall in and out of love, in rapid succession, with a bewildering number of persons of the opposite sex. What is happening is that the emotional compass needle is swinging wildly in search of the true definition of the particular mate who will become the mature love-object of the individual concerned. But if the youth expresses these passing infatuations in sexual union with the persons concerned, or with some of them, the process of growth towards the achievement of emotional maturity and the clear definition of the proper love-object is arrested. The dynamic driving the personality towards adulthood is weakened. The result is that the growth of the love life ceases, and there is a "fixation" at the poly-erotic level. The individual consequently remains adolescent so far as his capacity to love is concerned. There are plenty of these individuals about, and their reactions can easily be studied. I think most psychologists will agree that these adult men and women who seem unable to extricate themselves from a promiscuous pattern of behaviour are always suffering from emotional immaturity. They are incapable of maintaining stable marriage relationships because they are always drifting back to the poly-erotic phase. Kipling expressed this with simple directness in the verse

"I've taken my fun where I've found it,  
And now I must pay for my fun,  
For the more you 'ave known o' the others  
The less will you settle to one."

Of course it is generally contended that pre-marital sex relationships need not mean actual promiscuity. That is true enough in theory, but it is surprising how often it breaks down in fact. Probably the most exhaustive research yet undertaken in this field is the American enquiry by Bromley and Britton, published under the title "Sex and Youth." This revealed that,

among undergraduate men who had pre-marital experience, six out of seven had to be classed as promiscuous. That is to say, only one out of seven who had embarked on a sex relationship outside marriage had been able to resist the pull to further adventures. In youth, once the line is crossed, the tendency is to go the whole hog and follow the rapid, kaleidoscopic variations of the love-object. And once this habit has been set up, the damage is done.

However, there are those who, while they agree about the evils of promiscuity, contend that the risks must be taken. Their plea is that sexual experience is advisable as a preliminary to marriage, because it is the only way of testing compatibility between the partners. For example, a speaker in a B.B.C. discussion said that, in her opinion, two people who embarked on marriage without having slept together beforehand were asking for trouble. Do the facts substantiate this ?

Strangely enough, this argument is presented on two different and in fact opposite grounds. It is worth looking at each in turn.

First, it is contended that people must test their sexual compatibility before embarking upon marriage, because the latter involves a sex relationship. At first sight this is a very plausible argument. How can two people know themselves to be sexually matched, it is asserted, unless they try out this side of the relationship in advance ?

But, in fact, what is sexual matching ? It is an exceedingly difficult thing to define. Certainly it has little to do with the comparative dimensions of the physical organs. It might be said to relate to the strength of the sex impulse in the individuals concerned. But this again is a very difficult factor to determine. And, moreover, it is a factor which varies in every individual from time to time, and is particularly subject to emotional conditioning.

Of course, it could be contended that capacity to perform the sex act is important to successful marriage. No one will question this. So universally is this recognised that, if the act cannot be performed, the marriage can be annulled. So it might rightly be claimed that this remote contingency is allowed for. But in fact experimentation before marriage might hinder rather than help at this point. I have known cases where functional impotence has arisen in attempts at pre-marital sexual union when in fact probably all would have gone well had the couple waited

to embark upon their first intimacies within the more secure emotional setting of the marriage relationship.

If it is contended that two people should discover whether they can achieve harmonious sex adjustment before they marry, the matter becomes more complicated than ever. Those of us who deal with marriage problems frequently encounter cases where husband and wife take literally years before achieving the mutual orgasm which is regarded as the criterion of really satisfactory sex adjustment. Yet in the end, when they do arrive at it, it becomes the foundation for what is frequently an extremely successful marriage. And it is almost always found in any case to be dependent on the achievement of real emotional harmony and response. Experiments before marriage in such cases would almost certainly confuse the issue hopelessly.

The best way to see clearly the fallacy of this argument is to think of a hypothetical case in which this became the decisive factor. Here is a man who cannot decide between two women whom he regards as potential wives. According to the exponents of the doctrine of sexual experimentation, what he must do is to try out the possibility of sex adjustment in both cases, and settle the issue on the result of that experiment.

In point of fact, he may achieve comparatively good sex adjustment with one woman, and yet, in fact, he may have a superficial basis of personal compatibility with her. The result is that, as the marriage proceeds, and the personal quality of the relationship wears thin, the sex relationship, which is always a function of personal response, begins to deteriorate and may ultimately break down. In the case of the other woman, the underlying basis of personal compatibility may be much more satisfactory, and yet attempts at sexual experimentation may fail dismally. Yet, were he to marry that woman, the growing depth and richness of their personal fellowship would in time find expression in their sex relationship, which in the end would become much more satisfactory than in the other partnership. Therefore in such a case (and it is obviously a test case), to follow the advice of those who advise trying out sexual compatibility beforehand would actually lead to the choice of the least satisfactory of the two potential marriage partners.

The other ground on which the argument for pre-marital sex relations is preferred is not that the couple must test out their physical compatibility, but that on the contrary they are unable to judge of their personal compatibility so long as they are

tortured by unsatisfied physical desires. They are said to be blinded by sexual cravings, and therefore unable to see each other in a detached way. It is therefore argued that they should satisfy the physical craving, and thus be enabled to look at each other objectively.

It may be conceded that strong sexual desire is capable of obscuring rational judgment. But it is ridiculous to suggest that two people contemplating marriage, and seeing each other as frequently and under as many varied circumstances as people in that state generally do, are all the time in a state of urgent and clamorous sexual desire. Of course they are not. And the implication that satisfying sexual desire makes immediately for clear and detached judgment is highly questionable. It may result in all kinds of mental conditions, from heightened desire for repetition to nausea and reaction. In fact, it is a well-known psychological fact that the fulfilment of sexual desire tends to diminish the interest of the man in the woman, and greatly to increase the interest of the woman in the man. So in this sense it works unequally.

But the underlying principle in this contention is in any case seriously fallacious. It is that sex can arbitrarily be disconnected from the other elements of personal interaction, and dismissed from the picture by being physically satisfied. This is going back to a theory of sex which was much in vogue some twenty years ago, and which regarded it as a mere incidental act unconnected with the wider and deeper aspects of human personality. That theory can be said now to have been thoroughly and finally exploded from the psychological point of view. Therefore when two people embark upon a sex relationship they are inevitably deeply affected by it, and their judgment will inevitably be strongly coloured by the quality of the sex experience in question. This takes us back to the difficulty we have already discussed, that the achievement of a permanent and satisfactory harmony in the sex relationship often takes a long time, and is dependent ultimately upon the whole quality of the fellowship of the two persons concerned, at the other levels of relationship which are inevitably involved.

The argument might be pursued endlessly in the discussion of all kinds of specific instances. But perhaps I have said enough to indicate that, in terms of basic principle, the case for pre-marital experimentation has never been convincingly established.

In conclusion, let me quote the considered judgment of three of the leading American authorities in this field. I select American authorities deliberately because the study of this subject has been carried further in America than it has in this country—probably because the problem emerged at an earlier date and has reached more serious dimensions.

First, here is the judgment of Professor Norman Himes, whose written works make him a high authority in the field. "One of the greatest superstitions of our age," he says, "is that marriage needs a test of passion. Popular and unscientific literature on sex is mainly responsible for the prevalence of the notion. It is relevant to observe that the primary tests of successful marriage are not tests of passion at all, but rather tests of character and personality. . . . It is a common rationalisation of many young people that pre-marital sexual experience will enable them to adjust better in marriage . . . No good purpose can be served by fooling themselves with the belief that such conduct prepares them for marriage."

Secondly, here is Professor Hornell Hart—"The fear of some young people lest inexperience in sexual intercourse may leave them unprepared for marriage is groundless. The vital part of the love relationship is the creative interweaving of the personalities. This is a fine art. . . . When two normal people are able to achieve that art together, they may almost always look forward to deeply satisfying sex relations after marriage. . . . Pre-marital sex relations are likely to damage subsequent affection and to obscure the psychological and social aspects of the search for well-matched mates."

Finally, here again is Professor Ernest Groves—"I believe that no form of trial marriage can help youth to meet its pre-marriage problems, but instead, trial marriage is a menace to the idealism, ethical character, and feeling of commitment that successful marriage demands ; sex adjustment is not a technique, but an achievement through a unique fellowship which involves the total personality of both the man and the woman."

It will therefore be clear that there is no serious danger that our Christian standard in this matter can be finally overthrown. That we may depart far from it is possible and even probable ; but the further we do so, the more bitter will be the price which we shall have to pay, both individually and socially. There is already good reason to believe that, among more responsible people, the implications of that departure are being fully realised.

and an effort is being made to call a halt. In Soviet Russia, in America, and now in our own country, there is a marked tendency to return to the basic Christian standards which it was thought could be lightly overthrown and dispensed with. But this cannot be. And once again, the stone which the builders rejected is being brought back to become the head of the corner.

#### DISCUSSION.

The Chairman (DR. R. E. D. CLARK) said: This paper of Dr. Mace is one of very great value and I should like to take this opportunity of thanking him for it on behalf of the VICTORIA INSTITUTE. He has presented his case with admirable lucidity and it is difficult for me, at least, to imagine any effective rejoinder from those who are opposed to his views.

No one would expect Dr. Mace to cover all the ground in so short a paper but it would be interesting to hear his views on one or two topics which he has not had space to mention.

First of all he has mentioned the twin deterrents to sexual intercourse in days gone by—fear of a child and of venereal disease. Is it possible that the theory of the inheritance of acquired characters may have been equally strong as a deterrent and perhaps in cases, stronger? At one time it was customary to paint harrowing pictures of how the sexual sins of the fathers would be visited upon the children.

Secondly, I. D. Suttie pointed out the extreme need for love in early life. Observation would seem to suggest that it is those young people who do not find love in their homes who seek for it elsewhere and, therefore, encounter sexual temptation. Must we not conclude that Christian parents should show a great deal more love to their children, and should continue their affection to a later age than is normal if the children are unlikely to be in a position to marry early?

Thirdly, Dr. E. J. Dingwall, in his *Racial Pride and Prejudice* has presented some evidence that racial prejudice is often due to sexual jealousy—the white man supposing that the black enjoys unlimited sexual freedom. I do not know whether this interpretation can be taken as authoritative but, if so, it might appear that the subject which Dr. Mace has discussed may be bound up with the recent rise of racial hatred throughout a large section of the world.

For, in the old days, it was customary to regard the blacks as "sinners," white men being proud of the sexual restraints of their civilisation. To-day, however, many white people imagine that they have a "right" to enjoy freedom in their sexual relations but are held back by the taboos of society—taboos from which the native is free. One would imagine that this changed outlook would be bound to cause an increase of sexual jealousy and, therefore, on Dingwall's theory, of race feeling. But I am not, of course, suggesting that race feeling owes its origin to such causes—the origin is to be found in slavery more than in any other factor.

DR. A. OAKLEY JOHN said: May I ask for your opinion on this point. I can quote an actual case I have in mind, but would really appreciate a view concerning the general principle. Your Council, Dr. Mace, has as its object the treatment of people who are suffering from a "diseased" Sex and Morality, and I think it is fair to divide your work into prophylactic and curative. In the former part you strongly advocate premarital instruction both verbally and/or by suitable books. In the case I have in mind the fellow has read at least half-a-dozen fairly comprehensive books, and in spite of agreement with your views I am busy dissuading him from reading any more. He thinks he ought to get his fiancée also to delve deeply into the subject, but here again I was against it. The woman is the "passive" partner and though for successful marriage full co-operation is vital, is it not the duty (and privilege) of the husband to woo and teach his wife the art of love-making? Is not, therefore, a book such as Herbert Gray's *Men, Women and God* quite adequate for the woman?

MR. CHARLES H. WELCH said: I am glad that Dr. Mace has spoken so highly of the moral code of sexual morality found in the Old Testament, and I feel that the following note may be of interest.

Recently I had occasion to investigate the usage of the Hebrew *chata* and its derivatives, translated "sin," and turned to the book of Genesis, feeling sure that there would be many and varied occurrences of this word. To my surprise I found that only one company are called "sinners" in that book, namely, "the men of Sodom," their sin being called "very grievous" (Gen. xii, 13; xviii, 20). Apart from rather general references such as the attitude



of Joseph's brethren, the possible consequences of the suretyship of Judah, and the offence of the baker who had been cast into prison ; the two outstanding references to specific " sin " are limited to sexual transgression.

The first occurrence of the verb " to sin " does not occur until the twentieth chapter, and we have to wait until we arrive at the thirty-ninth chapter for the second occurrence. In Ch. xx we read that Abimelech had taken Sarah, Abraham's wife, and had been " withheld from sinning " by Divine intervention (Gen. xx, 6, 9). In the thirty-ninth chapter the word occurs in connection with Joseph and Potiphar's wife, a " great wickedness and sin against God " (Gen. xxxix, 9).

This is but one of many similar items which go to establish the doctrine of the " two seeds " (" Cain was of that Wicked one " for example), a subject too vast, however, for the present moment.

Dr. MACE replied briefly to the points which had been raised.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

Mr. P. W. PETER wrote : I have read this paper with much interest and am in complete agreement with it.

Religious restraint unfortunately is having less and less effect upon those who have turned away in unbelief of Divine revelation. Apart from this, the strongest argument, to my mind, ever put forward against promiscuity is that from Trade Unionism ; something as follows :—

The, what I may call, " Union " price to be paid to a woman for sex-intercourse is care and maintenance for life. This of course is only tolerable where there is mutual love, but any less price is to pay less than the recognized " Union " price. And any woman who accepts less than this is what Trade Unions call a " Black Leg " and is doing herself a grave injustice, and what is even worse lowering the price and doing a great injury to her fellow women.

I recognize, of course, that sex-intercourse is not all that a man receives for care and maintenance for life. A good woman will return far more than the man can give. But sex-intercourse is the essential condition for which nothing less than care and maintenance for life is the proper payment.