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Now the story of that bone has gone all over Europe and America, as a testimony to the antiquity of man; but when you have men like these calmly and nobly acknowledging that so much has been assumed in their statements and arguments, I think we may say that great good has been done, and it is such societies as this which have brought it about. Before the meeting closed, Professor Boyd Dawkins not only said that the bone was not human, but he gave reasons for believing it to be the fibia of a bear. I think that in the Geological Society, the Anthropological Society, and in all other scientific societies, we shall hear no more of the existence of man previous to the pre-glacial period, at all events until further evidence is brought forward.

The resolution was then agreed to.

The Chairman.—Upon this last resolution I will trouble you with a word of thanks. I have been pretty constant in my attendance at the meetings of the Council of the Institute, and I may, perhaps, respond for all those who are honoured with your confidence as holding office in the Institute. The labour we engage in is a labour of love, for we hold it to be the duty of every person who believes to contend for his faith; and certainly it is the duty of every member of this Institute to work as hard as he possibly can for the maintenance of the Institute and its very noble object. Our work is a labour of love, because we all enjoy these discussions, and the making of the necessary arrangements for them once a fortnight; and, indeed, we all feel much obliged to you for permitting us to be your officers, especially as you not only honour us with that permission, but are also pleased to express your confidence in our conduct. I am sure that, on behalf of my brother officers and myself, I may return to you our sincere thanks.

Mr. J. E. Howard, F.R.S., then read the following address:—

INFLUENCE OF TRUE AND FALSE PHILOSOPHY ON THE FORMATION OF CHARACTER.

Having been asked to deliver the Annual Address, I have resolved to bring before you some considerations resulting from a rather long and varied experience as to the diversified influence of True and False Philosophy in the formation of character; a subject worthy the attention of an Institute pledged "to investigate fully and impartially the most important questions of Philosophy and Science."

I shall put in my plea for the Christian faith, as the alone foundation on which to rear the superstructure of a truly useful education; and I shall distinguish between "Divine Philosophy," which is, indeed, as Milton has said, "a perpetual feast of nectared sweets," and the Secular Philosophy of the day, which is rather to be described as "love of error" than as "love of truth," and which is an unfailing source of interminable mischief.
The contest between the partisans of these two opposing philosophies must be regarded, by all reflecting minds, as a most serious one.

The prize contended for, though not likely to be gained by either party, is nothing less than the empire of the world; for to whomsoever should fall the exclusive privilege of instructing the minds of the rising generation would belong the prerogative of guiding, and even dominating, those minds when once matured.

The position which I occupy is favourable to impartial examination of the claims of either party, and also to call forth my sympathy with both.

It has been considered expedient, that the Address should this year be delivered by a layman; and in intrusting me in so far with the defence of those principles to which we are pledged, the council have shown that it is no question of ecclesiastical authority or of additional theology for which we are contending, but for Christianity itself.

This will become more evident when I explain that for two hundred years my ancestors belonged to a sect having no connection with any "Church," and that my present position is subsequent to and the result of my reception of the Faith itself.

I feel somewhat as the hero of the Indian poem,* who causes his chariot to be driven between the two opposing hosts on the eve of the great battle which is to decide the empire of the East. "He looked at both the armies, and beheld on either side none but grandsires, uncles, cousins, tutors, sons and brothers, near relations, or bosom friends; and when he had gazed for a while and beheld such friends as these prepared for the fight, he was seized with extreme pity and compassion, and uttered his sorrow" to his celestial guide, who nerves him to the combat by a full display of mystical philosophy—a philosophy, let me observe, which is well worth the study of those who would comprehend the character of the Indian mind.

* The Bhagvat-Gita. — The presentation of this work to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales shows the estimation in which it is still held. Man consciously needs some philosophy which can support him under the difficulties of life and enable him to face death with fortitude. The courage of the ancient Britons was sustained by thoughts respecting their future destiny, of the same kind, perhaps even identical with, those displayed by Krishna before the mind of Arjoon in the very ancient poem alluded to. It is an episodical extract from the Mahabharat, which together with the four Vedas are the most authentic original scriptures of the religion of Brahma. So at least we are told by C. Wilkins, Esq., the translator and editor of the Bhagvat-Gita; the copy in my possession bearing date the year 1785.
The skill of the author of this very ancient poem consists in bringing before us his hero involved in troubles, which practically prove too trying for unassisted human nature. He is ready to sacrifice the renown of his own fame, the glory of his house, and his impressions of duty (if such a term may be allowed), to weak and almost feminine sentiments of pity and compassion. This gives his supposed celestial friend the opportunity to strengthen his mind, by educating him in the whole compass of Hindoo philosophy. It is remarkable that all this is effected in connection with the knowledge of friendship and intimate communion with the one supreme god (Krishna), who promises eternal felicity to those only who worship him; a subordinate and temporary paradise being the sufficient recompense of those devoted to the lower manifestations of divinity.

The whole work, together with the remaining poems, of (supposed) divine inspiration, held sacred for ages past by the men of the East, are in so far an attestation of the need felt by mankind for religion, in the sense of trust in the friendly assistance of a Power superior to their own; in fact, that something beyond the help that Science can afford, or the self-reliance that Secular Education can impart, is needed by man in the midst of the sorrows and calamities of life. In contending for the claims of a better philosophy, and in seeking to establish the true knowledge of God, as alone adequate to the education of the human race, I am also conscious of the need of seeking wisdom and guidance from above. This philosophy sustains me whilst exposing myself to criticism, such as it is not the part of a wise man needlessly to court; nor yet to be thereby deterred from the prosecution of a truly worthy enterprise.

In some sense I find myself between the two camps, and that my sympathies are by no means all enlisted for one side of the hostile combatants. I would desire, therefore, to put in a plea for increased charity towards those whom, for convenience sake, I will call Rationalists, amongst whom may be found some who sincerely desire a more true knowledge of God than they at present possess.

In the first place, then, let it be remembered, that one of the chosen disciples of Christ was a Rationalist; * and that from whatever source the peculiar characteristics of his nature were derived, these did not in the least shut him out from the love of Christ. Thomas, the sceptic, was as near to his heart

* So Olshausen, quoted in Alford, *Greek Test.*, vol. i. p. 825 (3rd edit.).
as Matthew the publican (tax-gatherer), and much nearer (how much nearer!) than Judas, the disciple who had charge of the money. Now it is painful to those who have been necessarily brought into contact with scientific study, to be told that all men of science are infidels.

I freely grant that the tendency of this peculiar training of the mental faculties (if I may judge from more than fifty years' experience) is to produce, or to foster, exactly that state of mind in which we find this disciple; but I could wish (in order to illustrate the observations I shall make) that it were in my power to bring before your view the celebrated painting by Rubens, of the appearance of the risen Christ to his sceptical follower; and to bid you mark the wonderfully beautiful expression which this painter (not painter merely, but poet, παντρήτης) has succeeded in throwing into the face of the Saviour. I had this privilege recently; and its remembrance mingles with my meditations as I write. But you will allow me to turn to the Scripture, for it is, after all, by the words of the truth of the Gospel, and not by sensible representation, that our faith is to be established. I find that the reproof of our Lord to Thomas is of the mildest and most loving character, and wholly different from the stern denunciation which wilful and obdurate hardness of heart drew from His blessed lips.

In the next place I remark that Christ does not meet the demand of Thomas as if it were unreasonable; but, on the contrary, offers to him at once the fullest demonstration of the fact of His resurrection, and of the identity of His Person. We see how the foreseeing wisdom of God could provide thus for the instruction of believers in all generations. The proof of ocular inspection is very strong, but there is more than this, for the Master says, Reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side,—into the great gash from which all the remaining blood in that blessed body must surely have escaped. No question then of the certainty of death having taken place. This privilege of ascertaining by actual touch the reality of that wondrous risen life was not accorded to the unquestioning, unreasoning faith of Mary; neither did her confession rise to a loftier altitude than that of Rabboni, “My teacher, at whose feet I have so long sat.” As regards Thomas, on the other hand, it has been well remarked, that his “is the highest confession of faith which had yet been made,” and this drawn, be it observed, from the ranks of the Rationalists —’Ο Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου—somewhat feebly rendered, “My Lord and my God!”
It will be observed that I totally disregard the gloss of a certain class of religionists. The simple narrative speaks for itself, and especially does it speak to the hearts of those who not having seen like Thomas, have yet become blessed in believing.

And how are they blessed? Surely that they have begun to know God with an ineffable knowledge. He has revealed Himself to them, not so much in His attributes, and not according to the grasp of their intellectual capacity—the finite never can comprehend the infinite—but according to His nature, for "God is Love." Thus the foundation of Christian philosophy is laid rather in the heart than in the head. Those who believe His love, love Him in return; for by love only can love be comprehended and embraced.

What, then, did the Apostle do with this newly-found knowledge? Did he embody it in a string of merely intellectual propositions? Did he remove the scientific difficulties attending the question how life could animate a resurrection body? I judge not; I believe that with the zeal of a glowing heart of love this Apostle went forth, perhaps even as tradition points out, as far as to remote India, to bear witness to the risen Saviour, who had thus revealed Himself to him. He would show that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." The Holy Ghost giving power to his word, he would gain the hearts of men, and not simply their heads. He would instruct them in philosophy that would avail for their guidance amid the rocks and shoals of life, leading them to a haven of everlasting rest.

I plead that "all our things should be done with charity,"* more particularly the special work in which (if I understand it aright) the Victoria Institute is engaged. We must not forget that the mere removal of stumblingblocks, however desirable, will not give a paralyzed man the power to walk, and will not renew his exhausted energies. Charity should lead to the source of real strength.

We have to show that we are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. It is this that gives power to walk in the right way, to the freethinker as much as to the disciple of hereditary dogma. Difficulties may remain and prove a salutary discipline to the believer, but he is furnished with "hind's feet," to overleap all these obstacles, and to hasten home to

---

* Πάντα ἐν ἡμῶν ἐν ἡγάπῃ γινόμεθα.—1 Cor. xvi. 14.
his Beloved. The beauties and the glories of the revelation afforded us in the sacred books, come out more fully the more we study them, especially in the originals; but there are many things yet on which we wish to gain instruction, and about which we are still profoundly ignorant. I scarcely expect to see the solution of all difficulties, or, as the Jews would have said, the untangling of all the knots. Christian philosophy does not rest on these obscurities, but on well-proven historical facts.

In the sketch above presented of the formation of the character of Thomas, I have touched upon some of the leading characteristics of Christian philosophy. In the first place, there is absolute certainty in the revealed knowledge of God,—a firm foundation on which to build Christian life. This certainty is presented to the world on such evidence as renders its rejection inexcusable, whilst it is confirmed to those who receive it, in a manner wholly ineffable and divine. Christ says, "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine, as the Father knoweth me and as I know the Father" (καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ, κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα).*

In the next place, this knowledge is not of an abstraction, but of a Person.† Connected with this, is the very important fact that Christian philosophy presents us with a perfect pattern,‡ according to which it is expected that a Christian should walk; and, not only so, there is a power of transformation in this pattern rightly beheld, which moulds into the same image the character of the believer.§ In contrast with the character of faith, and personal trust and obedience, thus formed by the reception of the revelation which God has given us of Himself, let us examine the pretensions of philosophy to a knowledge of God, derived from her own resources; and the bearing which this spurious profession has on the formation of character.

It has been shown, in a recent paper communicated to this Institute, that "all the motions of which we have, or can have, any experience, are relative motions only. That relative motions might be turned into absolute, if the absolute motion of any one body, with reference to mere empty space, could be ascertained. But this discovery is impossible."

* See Alford in loco.
† In the Indian poem the hero is overwhelmed by the display of the glories of the Almighty, but reassured when he resumes a human form, exclaiming, "Having beheld thy placid human shape I am again collected, my mind is no more disturbed, and I am once more returned to my natural state."—Compare Keble's Poem for Quinquagesima Sunday.
‡ 1 John i. v. 1-3.
§ 2 Cor. iii. 18.
It appears to me that the same truth holds good with reference to all our thoughts about Being and Existence. We must have the absolute knowledge of some one Being, as our stand-point from which to measure the relationships of other beings to this one Being, and as a standard with which to compare the relative proportions and qualities of other existences.

If, for example, we could comprehend the conservative principle of the operations of which we are conscious, and which has been termed by physicians the *vis medicatrix naturae*, we might proceed in our reasoning, as starting from this point of ascertained knowledge, to assign the relative value to the manifestations of the same force in the lower animals; as in the lobster, which can reproduce its claw when occasion requires; whilst we, who are possessed of so much more brain-power, cannot even reproduce a little finger. We might then continue our inquiries as to the exact effect of the higher concentration of nerve-power in the brain. We might learn much of the secrets of nature in connection with what I may be permitted to call the living soul, and its modifications in transmission from generation to generation. We could solve all questions of "fixity of species" and of "unity of type," where all is at present uncertain speculation, or presumptuous dogmatism. But the fixed starting-point is wanting. We do not absolutely know ourselves!

But if this is the case in reference to our lower nature, how much more evident is it that we are destitute of all proper appreciation of our spiritual nature. We are forced to the conviction that there is a wide difference in this respect between ourselves and the animals with whom we associate. They look up to us as their supreme point of reference. We, on the contrary, have an irresistible tendency to look up to something superior to ourselves. And what is this Something? The Arabian chieftains tried to answer it in that celebrated discussion which took place in the land of Uz, over 3,000 years ago. The speeches were all very much to the point, giving a singular pre-eminence to this philosophical discussion; but the challenge of the Naamathite remained unanswered, and remains so to the present day:—"Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know?"* When the narrative in-

* Job xi. 7, 8.
roduces to us the Lord as speaking out of the whirlwind, it is in the sense not of describing Himself, but His works; not so much revealing His own nature, as confounding the pride of man.

The fixed and certain knowledge of God was wanting to the Greek philosophers. This is well shewn by Justin Martyr in his Address to the Greeks; who also contends that Plato was prevented by fear of sharing the fate of Socrates from giving full utterance to the truth which he himself approved in the writings of Moses. Justin quotes a saying of Socrates which is remarkable enough in this aspect of things.* I translate it thus: "It is not easy to find the Father and Creator of all, neither is it safe to speak of Him, when found, to all mankind." This mental condition is very graphically described in the Platonic dialogues. Socrates is made to say that in his youth he was "wonderfully taken with what they call natural philosophy. It seemed to me," he says, "an admirable thing to know the cause of everything, why it is produced, and why it is destroyed, and why it exists. I was vastly curious about such inquiries as these: whether heat and moisture by fermentation give birth to animals, as some said; whether that by which we think be the blood, or air, or fire; or whether none of these, but the brain be the organ by which we have our sensations—hearing, seeing, smelling—and whether memory and opinion arise from these, and when these acquire fixity they become knowledge. And in the same way looking at the causes of destruction and at the phenomena of the earth and heavens, at last I appeared to myself to be as stupid at these matters as it is possible to be." In fact he had not Darwin’s writings to guide him, or he would doubtless have extracted much information by his habit of asking questions, and expecting answers. "I see no difficulty in believing" would scarcely have afforded satisfaction to a mind of so much power and originality. Socrates could never have become a Darwinian.

* Ὁ πάντων δὲ αὐτῶν εὐπονώτερος πρὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος Σωκράτης, τὰ αὐτὰ ἥμιν ἐνεκλήθη. Οἱ γὰρ ἔφασαν αὐτὸν καὶνὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν, καὶ οὐς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς, μὴ ἡγείσαθαι αὐτῶν. Ὁ δὲ δαιμόνιας μὲν τοὺς φαίλους, καὶ τοὺς πράξαντας ἄ ἔφασαν οἱ ποιηταί, ἑξάλων τῆς πολειτίας, καὶ ὁμηροῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητὰς παρατείνεθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐξίδαξε, πρὸς θεοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἀγνώστου αὐτοῖς ἔπαυ λόγου ζητῆσις ἐπιγίγνει πρὸς τρέπετο εἰσάγον. Τόν δὲ Πατέρα καὶ Δημωνικόν πάντων ὀθὰ εὑρεῖν ράδιον, οὐδὲ εὐρύντα εἰς πάντας εἰπεὶν ἁσφαλέας.—Justinī Martyris Apol. II. pro Christianis, § xi.
We need not wonder that Socrates* was dissatisfied with such inquiries as these. He sought, he says, for some other line of speculation. And he happened to hear some one read from a book of Anaxagoras that Mind or Intelligence was what had ordered everything, and was the cause of everything. With this notion he was delighted.

But when he inquired further, "I was dashed down," he says, "from these lofty hopes, when, as I went on, I found that my author made no use of his 'Mind,' nor referred to it as the source of the arrangements of the world, but assigned as causes, airs, and ethers, and fluids, and the like. It seemed to me as if any one after saying that Socrates does all that he does in virtue of his mind, and then proceeding to assign the cause why I am sitting here, should say that my body is composed of bones and muscles; that the bones are solid and separate, and that the muscles can be contracted and extended, and are all enclosed in the flesh and skin; and that the bones, being jointed, can be drawn by the muscles, and that this is the reason why I am sitting here."

"And as if again he were to assign the like causes for the fact that I am now talking with you" (i.e. his friends on the day of his execution) "making the causes to be air, and voice, and hearing, and the like, and were not to mention the true cause—that the Athenians thought it best to condemn me, and that I thought it best to remain here and to suffer the sentence which they have pronounced. For most assuredly these bones and muscles would long ago have carried me to Megara, or to Boeotia, moved by my opinion of what was best, if I had not thought it more right and honourable to submit to the sentence pronounced by the State than to run away from it. To call such things causes is absurd. If indeed any one were to say that without having bones and muscles, and the like, I could not do what I wish, he would say truly; but that I do what I do because of these, and not because of my choice of what is best, would be a gross abuse of language.

"For there is a great difference between that which is the cause and that without which the cause would not produce its effect. And yet many men, groping in the dark, call this,† which is a mere condition, a cause. And hence one man surrounds the earth with a vortex which revolves while the earth is at rest; another puts a large bowl over the air; but they never attempt to show that it is best that it should be

† [E. g. "Force," or "Laws of Nature." ]
so. They do not place their universe upon this, the strong foundation, namely the greatest good, but seek for some Atlas stronger still, to bear it up upon his shoulders."

This "strong foundation," which Socrates vainly sought for, is realized in the Jewish scriptures, in the revelation which God makes of Himself to Moses, and through him to His favoured nation, "I am that I am." Which, according to the laws of the Hebrew language, is also, "I shall be that which I am," or "I am that which I shall be," or, as formulated in the name which we know not how to pronounce, but which we call Jehovah, θεον και ἡν και θεοφανεος, well rendered in French by l'Eternel.

We have, then, an eternal and unchangeable Being, in whom the Archetypal ideas are, so to speak, inherent. It is also essential to our conception of Him, that He has power to embody his ideas in creation, and to maintain them in existence when so embodied.

Thus speaks Sir Isaac Newton in his "creed," given us in the Gentleman's Magazine, in 1731:—"This Being governs all things, not as a soul of the world, but as Lord of the universe, and upon account of his Dominion, he is styled Lord God, supreme over all. The supreme God is an eternal, infinite, absolutely perfect Being. But a Being, how perfect soever, without dominion is no Lord God. The term God very frequently signifies Lord, but every lord is not God. The dominion of a spiritual Being constitutes him God; true dominion, true God; supreme dominion, supreme God; imaginary dominion, imaginary God.* He is not eternity, and infinity, but eternal and infinite. He is not duration and space, but has duration of existence, and is present; by existing always and everywhere He constitutes duration and space, eternity and infinity. Since every part of space and every individual moment of duration is everywhere certainty, the maker and Lord of all things cannot be said to be in no time, and in no space. He is omnipresent, not by His power only, but in His very substance, for power cannot subsist without substance. God is not at all affected by the motions of bodies, neither do they find any resistance from his Omnipresence. He necessarily exists, and by the same necessity He exists always and everywhere. Whence also it follows, that He is all similar—all eye—all ear—all brain—all arm—all sensation—all understanding—all active power; but this not in a human

---

* [E.g. Darwin's Natural Selection.]
or corporeal, but in a manner wholly unknown to us, therefore not to be worshipped under any corporeal representation."

This whole truth seems to be embodied in the declaration of Christ. "God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

Πνεύμα ὁ θεός, God is Spirit, not, I presume, a Spirit, but absolutely the Spirit; which truth removes the knowledge of His essence from all cognizance of our senses, and consequently from all scientific inquiry.

I have said that the Greeks had no exact knowledge of God; but there is a certain sense in which they and all mankind are responsible in this matter, "for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse." If men choose to assume a bestial character, and to put away this knowledge from them* (τὴν ἄλληθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων), they do so at their own responsibility, and in the exercise of their own free will.

At the same time, as we are instructed in the celebrated speech of the Apostle at Athens, men are so set in this world as that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him. The word τραφόσευν exactly describes the "groping like a blind man, or in the dark" † which results in worshipping, after all, "an Unknown God," though He be not far from every one of us, for we are also His offspring; and the darkness in which we find ourselves arises from the condition of our own hearts.

To this condition both of mind and heart I can revert with much appreciation and sympathy. I look back with no regret to the somewhat austere discipline of my youth, and to the innumerable hours of enforced silent meditation required by my then religion; which, together with its outward indications, was relinquished when I found something better. It appears that Justin Martyr did not lay aside his philosopher's cloak when he became a Christian; and it is not difficult in studying his writings to find that his Christian philosophy, though it enabled him to die manfully for the faith, was less ritualistic, less mixed up with Judaism, and certainly more simple and more philosophical, than that of some of his successors.

My education has, I find, in like manner indisposed me to some prevalent views, and has predisposed me to sympathize with those who are under the teaching of the philosophy of

* Rom. ch. i. † See Liddell and Scott, Lex. in loco.
the East; I also compassionate those Rationalists who are repelled, by manifest error in popular Christianity, from the teaching of Christ and His Apostles.

If any one has fathomed the depths of mystical philosophy as presented to us, for instance, by the Archbishop of Cambrai, or that more able expositor of the mysteries of pure love, the amiable and devout Madame Guion, he will understand that silence does oftentimes teach more than words can eloquently express; and such will be prepared to appreciate all that in Buddhism is so imperfectly apprehended, and which appears so incomprehensible to the shallow “thinkers,” whether of the German or the English school, and they may perhaps agree with me, that but few of these have even waded knee-deep into the great ocean of profundity; much less have they lost themselves in Nirvana.

In the assembly in which the great “Apologist”* of the religion of my education was convinced of “the truth” nothing was spoken but these three sentences:—

“In Stillness there is fulness.
“In Fulness there is nothingness.
“In Nothingness there is all things!”

This, I take it, is pure Buddhism, and these apothegms certainly defy all attempts at explanation by words. Speech in this case may be silvern, but silence is golden!

Instead of raising a smile, these ought to be regarded as the entrance into the vestibule of the solemn old temple of mystical philosophy; a philosophy which I have forsaken, and which I account a failure, but which nevertheless presents us with some pleasing flowers, if the fruits are not altogether such as are those of Christian faith.

This most ancient religion of Buddhism, as we have recently been taught, is more full of promise than any other of the forms of false religion. But when brought into contrast with Christian philosophy, it fails entirely in all the principal points I have noticed. It is ignorant of God. “Inasmuch as Buddhism declares Karma to be the supreme controlling power of

---

* Robert Barclay was born in the year 1664, of a good family, in Scotland. He was sent to France for education, and became much imbued with the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith. On his return home he found that his father had embraced the views of the “Friends,” and his attendance on their meetings followed. “One of his most intimate friends asserted that he was reached in the time of silence.” In J. Barclay’s Jaffray and the Friends of Scotland, 2nd edit., p. 271, will be found “those few words, attributed to some minister who was present at the first meeting Robert Barclay attended, and which are said to have had considerable effect on his mind.” His Apology for the true Christian Divinity is dated 1675.
the universe, it is an atheistic system. It ignores the existence of an intelligent and personal Deity. It acknowledges that there is a moral government of the world; but it honours the statute-book instead of the lawgiver; and adores the sceptre instead of the king." If I am asked to explain Karma, I must decline, for "no one but a Buddha can tell how Karma operates, or how the chain of existence commenced. It is as vain to ask in what part of a tree the fruit exists before the blossom is put forth, as to ask for the locality of Karma."*

The cleaving to existing objects is upādāna; and this at all events is intelligible. As it is the grand tenet of Buddhism that all existence is an evil, it thus becomes consistent with right reason to seek the destruction of upādāna, which alone can secure the reception of nirvāna, or the cessation of being.

It would seem to English minds that the deduction from this proposition is that death is better than life, but this is as far as possible from the meaning. Death does not destroy the Karma, nor prevent the rewards and punishments being felt in a future life or lives. Death is not nirvāna.

It may be said that all this is very inconsistent with the renunciation of the idea of a personal God. It appears so, but it must be remembered that the same Buddhist who renounces the personality of God, disbelieves also in his own personality. The Ego is not one person, but the expression of a Karma, and this is unchanged by death—a truth much to be borne in mind!

Buddhism is not, then, the gospel of suicide. The unenviable distinction of promulgating this last effort of the powers of darkness has been reserved for some advanced German "thinkers"; even as the gospel of immorality is the speciality of some of our more practical English, some of whom have done themselves no credit by their most recent lucubrations on these subjects.

I think the philosophy of Buddha worthy of much more careful examination than has yet been given to it by the Institute. Its influence on the formation of character is the alone aspect which I dwell upon in this Address. The view which it presents to us of the misery of creation, the denial of the very Being and existence of God, as well as of the creative power and goodness of the infinite Nothing which

* Hardy, Manual of Buddhism, p. 392. IX. The Ontology of Buddhism. Karma is, however, defined by Krishna, the Supreme God in the Hindoo poem, as "that emanation from which proceedeth the generation of natural beings"; but this is not Buddhism.
takes His place, marks out its origin as from beneath—welling up like the bitumen from the bottom of the Dead Sea. Nevertheless, it aims at being a highly moral religion.* The favourable side of the influence of Buddhism has been sufficiently presented to the Institute.

The influence of the philosophy of the Hindoo sacred writings must be appreciably different. It is evidently at once hardening and corrupting. The devotee has no fixed rule of morality. He is exhorted to disregard the consequences of his actions, and to preserve a sublime indifference, even considering the actions of his body as fixed by fate, and for which he is in no sense responsible.

My argument as to the necessity of Christian philosophy for the formation of character might be greatly strengthened by the contemplation of the practical results of Mahometanism; which has no philosophy but that of fate, and has no favourable feature except, in some sense, what I may call its corrupted Judaism.

Let us now consider, in the light of the experience of mankind, as far as I have been able to gather it up in this brief

* The ten obligations binding on the priests forbid,—
1. The taking of life.
2. The taking of that which is not given.
3. [Prohibits the continuance of the species.]
4. The saying of that which is not true.
5. The use of intoxicating drinks.
6. The eating of solid food after mid-day.
7. Attendance upon dancing, music, and masks.
8. The adorning of the body with flowers and the use of perfumes and unguents.
9. The use of seats or couches above the prescribed height.
10. The receiving of gold or silver.

I have not space to give any account of the degree to which its precepts are obeyed, although I have in my possession details which might illustrate the subject. “The first four are called the panchasil. They are repeated by some persons every day at the pansal, especially by the women” (Hardy’s Buddhism, p. 488). Thus we have an attestation, on the part of a vast multitude of mankind, of the importance of a fixed standard of morality. Of this our philosophers who reject the Ten Commandments of Scripture are entirely destitute. These precepts of Buddha, binding on the priests (though not always observed by them), may also be kept in their degrees by the laics: 1. They may be kept inadvertently without any intention of acquiring merit thereby. 2. They may be kept at the recommendation of another, or to please another. 3. They may be kept from free choice, from having seen their excellence or advantage.

This last is the way to obtain real merit, for “he who would attain to Nirvana must not trust to others, but exercise heroically and perseveringly his own judgment.” This is the advice said to have been given by Buddha.
and necessarily fragmentary and imperfect survey, what is likely to be the effect of the substitution of secular for religious education, of scientific training for traditional belief.

Christian philosophy is the only ground on which we can rest for the firm inculcation and the steadfast practice of the love of truth. And yet, the importance of this state of mind cannot be overlooked. Even Buddhism commends "truthfulness of speech, that which avoids the utterance of that which is untrue, and seeks to utter the truth, like the husbandman who, by the act of winnowing, drives away the chaff while he retains the grain."

But secular philosophy can afford us no guarantee for this in its teachers. Even the celebrated Galileo could not find in himself the power to adhere to his knowledge, and denied the truth that he knew; though he afterwards could not help re-asserting it. Those who have characters to maintain may be trusted to show us the truth they discover, at all events under ordinary circumstances; but it is otherwise with those who do not come before their fellow-men except as anonymous writers; and who may have the strongest possible interest in disguising the truth, in suppressing what is opposed to their favourite theories, or in warping and modifying the facts which they do present to their readers.

To separate the chaff from the wheat cannot be expected from such teachers, whose passions and prejudices are enlisted on the side of retaining the chaff rather than the wheat. Let me explain more clearly. It is a common and a fatal mistake to confound science with philosophy, to attach importance to the hypothesis which we find it necessary to assume equal to that of fixed and proven science. The scaffolding we employ in rearing a building may be found so defective that it must be arranged anew; and, under any circumstances, it is of temporary and transitory utility—it is not the building itself.

The Buddhist philosophers (in comparison with whom our modern atheists are but children) declare (on the authority of Gotama Buddha) that "all beings exist from some cause, but the cause of being cannot be discovered."

We think we know better, and we form hypotheses to account for the origin of being by evolution or otherwise. These hypotheses, one after another, prove to be founded on nothing solid. They disappear, to make room for others in endless succession; but whatever benefit they may meantime yield by increasing the activity of research, they are not

* Hardy's Buddhism, p. 417.
science, but philosophy. They are not the pure grain, but the husk cleaving to it; and all experience shows that bigotry, and all the bad passions of man, cleave not to the certain and undeniable, but to the apocryphal and uncertain, whether in science or religion. So that, in the end, our teachers of science may prove teachers of science falsely so called; and, through their opposition to the dogmatic teaching of religion, those who are committed to their charge may be shipwrecked at the outset of the voyage of life.

This would seem to be the very object of some of our "scientists," who even hang out false lights, as the wreckers on our coast did of old, to lure the vessel on to her destruction. Falsehood is as welcome as truth, if only the too credulous public may be prejudiced against revelation. One recent instance may suffice. I noticed in one of our scientific journals an attack on the account of the creation of man in Genesis, showing that Moses was entirely mistaken in describing man as formed out of clay, seeing that clay (alumina) does not enter into his composition. This was a false light calculated to mislead the unwary. The simplest Sunday scholar may see that Genesis never says anything of the kind. "Jehovah Elohim formed man out of the dust of the ground"; 'aphar (אַפָּר) implies neither clay nor alumina in a chemical sense, but simply the earthly materials out of which the atomic structure of a man's body is built up. The word is used about a hundred times in Scripture, and never in the sense of clay; but, on the other hand, it is said all are of the dust, and shall turn to dust again; a very simple fact, which the process of cremation would make manifest to the most sceptical scientist; or interment in quicklime, changing water into dust (hydrate of lime), would still further demonstrate.

Of course I esteem it too great nicety of expression to object to the term clay as used in common language, and in the poetical diction of Job; but in Genesis the Scriptural expression of the fact, however explained, is, that God formed man out of the dust of the earth.

I am reminded of this evidence of the animus, not of science, be it observed, but of "Scientists," by what I read in a recent address in Paris of the great "father" Hyacinthe Loyson, to the effect that "it mattered little, after all, whether we have had for an ancestor a monkey—when Genesis gives us an ancestor more vile still—the slime (limon) of the earth." In an address on "Le respect de la vérité," it would have been better to verify the quotation from Scripture, for Genesis does not give us as an ancestor "the mud of the
earth," but expressly shows that we are "the offspring of God." The account of the creation of Adam is given in Genesis as a fact. If not a fact, it must be a fiction.

But let the talented "father" choose which. He cannot combat on both sides. He does not himself believe in Darwin's theory, and to attempt a compromise is to mingle in the tumult of discordant voices described by Dante as filling an atmosphere* of no definite shade of colour, but obscure, like a London fog.† Here are collected on the banks of the Styx the souls of those who lived in the world in a state of neutrality and compromise; and they have for their companions the angels who were neither faithful to God, nor yet rebellious against Him. The position is described as one of such extreme discomfort that they would willingly change it for any other lot.‡

The highly popular orator to whom I allude will pardon me for saying that I should be sorry to see even a tendency in this direction, either in his case or in that of others, whom these remarks may concern.

"Fama di loro il mondo esser non lassa,
Misericordia e giustizia gli sdegna,
Non ragioniam di lor, ma guarda e passa."

In the Utopia, in which alone I shall ever desire to become an active citizen, I should seek the enactment of stringent regulations, to the effect that no public instructor should be allowed to teach anything that he does not know. The man of science should explain facts, and give us the theories necessary to bind the facts together, and to give them their logical import; but he must distinguish between what is proven and what is unproven. If he goes beyond his ordinary province and ventures on philosophy, he should do so under peril of having his claims to the fair title of philosopher subjected to the searching of such courts of equity as we have here in England. If he cannot do this, and if he fail to describe and to make manifest to all, his perfect familiarity with and knowledge of that portion of "the infinite azure" which he claims as peculiarly his own, he should be adjudged by a jury of his countrymen a spurious claimant, and treated accordingly.

I should also endeavour to avoid the practical inconvenience

* "Senza tempo tinta."
† "Come 'l arena quando 'l turbo spira."
‡ "Che invidiose son d'ogni altra sorte."
which, at all events in the education of the young, attends upon
the working of a really scientific mind. Such a mind would find
the necessity of holding even that which seems proven, in some
sense in a state of uncertainty, admitting the possibility of the
whole ground having to be gone over again, resulting in the
subject being viewed in some new and perhaps truer light.
I am no astronomer, but I inquire of one who truly is such, the
exact distance of the sun from the earth. The astronomer gives
me an immense amount of most valuable and correct infor-
mation, but the dogmatic reply is not forthcoming. What
then have I to teach my children? Of course I cannot send
them to the great astronomer, but am fain to let them take
their chance of instruction from those who are the more
fitted for the office of teacher by cherishing no doubts on the
subject.

In the practical application of scientific research, I have
always found that facile belief in authority is the characteristic
of feeble minds, and that in mastering any subject, it is
necessary to begin ab ovo, and to prove the ground step by
step, without relying too implicitly on the information given
by those who have preceded in the path.

But what would be the effect of such teaching on the
masses of mankind?

It seems to me a great misfortune that science should ever
have sullied her fair fame by attempts to soar into regions
of philosophy. She thus incurs the blame of being an enemy
to religion, and disqualifies herself from the task of instructing
the rising generation.

If science had limited herself to her own department,
her title to the good office of expanding the mind might have
been generally admitted. But when we have the claims of
science set forth as if she really could educate the heart, the
common sense of mankind instinctively revolts from the
presumption involved in these dogmatic assertions of her
advocates.

In order to bring this Address to a profitable conclusion, I
am compelled to draw on the resources of my own experience.

Most especially, then, I must say that a more cheerful and
a far more Scriptural view of Christian life and duty has very
extensively driven away the clouds of puritanical gloom which
had settled down in what was in my youth called the
“seriously” part of the Christian world. As I was (though not
religious) naturally “serious,” I never could see this to be
the proper definition of the believing portion of mankind, who
have more right to be called the “cheerful” section.
I may have my thoughts about the possibility of an extreme in the opposite direction, but, in the mean time, am thankful that the age above alluded to has passed away, since untold mischief has resulted from the attempt to imprison young minds in its embrace.

I never approved of this course, but rather of the endeavour to win the citadel of the heart, and to gain over the garrison there to the side of truth and right principle. Still judging from my own experience, I know no way to open the gates of this citadel other than the way of love.

First* Christian faith, and then liberal education to the fullest extent, is that adjustment of the claims of secular and religious education which alone can meet the real need of the rising generation, and which parents, at any rate, can adopt, whatever difficulties may be experienced in a wider sphere of application.

The heart being first regarded, I hold that the head should be well furnished likewise, and, to the best of my ability, would advocate this principle also, both with respect of scientific and of literary instruction.

This may seem a trite observation, but it is nevertheless one which I may be permitted to bring into prominence. For there is amongst many well-intentioned people a great jealousy of science, and consequently of scientific teaching. They forget that the young mind thirsts after information, and that if the prospect of legitimate gratification be excluded, and the desire for it constituted a malum prohibitum, if not a malum in se, they will probably burst through all restraint to eat of the forbidden fruit for themselves.

What, then, is the effect of the teaching of science? Surely if science be indeed scientia, knowledge, the effect must be good. Has it not been said of old time, and does not all experience confirm the saying, that "for the soul to be without knowledge is not good"?

My father† instructed me, to the best of his ability, in the knowledge of scientific facts, and sought to impart those habits of observation of the phenomena of nature, whether of the earth or sky, which proved a fund of enjoyment to himself

* See an inscription in this city, "now seldom pored on," obscured somewhat, but still legible, and remaining as an attestation of the views of our forefathers: SCHOLA CATECHIZATIONIS PVERORVM IN CHRISTI OPT. MAX. FIDE ET BONIS LITERIS.

even in extreme old age. I owe his memory hearty thanks that he trained me to think and to observe—in a mundane sphere, it is true; but the observation of and delight in this present creation hindered neither him nor me from becoming acquainted with a higher creation, and with a more abiding spring of consolation.

I plead, therefore (whilst deprecating compromise with error), for continued and increasing interest in the work of the Victoria Institute, in as far as it upholds Christian Philosophy.

Those who embrace this philosophy are happy in that which they know, for “they know in whom they have believed; and that He is able to keep that which they have committed unto Him against that day,” so that they can view without dismay the approaching storm which is about apparently to beat with increasing violence on the good ship, for the safety of which the Captain is understood to have engaged His word. I seem to see much of the cargo encumbering the decks, the accumulation of successive generations for well-nigh eighteen centuries—choice rarities of many pagan lands—swept overboard by the fury of the tempest, and in the meantime the good mariners almost ready to say, “Master, we perish!” yet taking fresh courage by His assurance, “Be of good cheer, for I have overcome the world!”

In conclusion, I would place before you the following estimate of Spurious Philosophy by one who had full opportunity of deciding on its merits, and chose for himself a better path, which has now led him to a fairer inheritance.

“Meanwhile, what means that laurel on the brow
Of fair philosophy? Has she achieved
Illustrious deeds, and in the realms of thought
Made lasting conquests? From the ancient days
When that Phoenician who first bore the name
Of sage,* and left the busy ways of men,
Their noise and fickleness, for Nature’s book
Of solemn laws, to meditate therein,
And found the general origin of things
In the moist element the first and last,—
Down to our age of transcendental terms
And ‘Understanding’s’ German categories,

* Thales.
What truths have we obtained? what golden ore
Of certainty—to weigh the balance down
With priceless value? Look around and see
How still they wander in the labyrinth,
In the old mazes, jaded and perplexed
With puzzling tracks, which bring them round again
To paths already tried—and no escape!
Or mark them working hard at Time and Space,
Substance, Causality, the External World,
Ego and Non-Ego—the Absolute
Being and Non-Being—'A priori' grounds
Of synthesis,—Abstraction pure, and store
Of subjects—Accident, Phenomena:
With these they build a crazy bridge, to span
The dark, deep chasm, yawning wide between
'Thought Absolute'—and on the other side
'Absolute Being'—and essay to cross
With all their company, and all their weight
Of words—a ponderous baggage—so to reach
Ontology, who sits enthroned in mist,
The hazy ruler of the opposite coast.
But scarce their feet have pressed the middle beam
When the false fabric cracks, and
prone
is hurled
A hideous ruin; headlong, too, fall they
With all their dogmas rattling round their ears,
And seized by whirlpools, underneath are rolled
In rapids far away, to sink in depths
Of dark Nonentity and Unbelief."

By R. M. Beverley, M.A.

Mr. J. BateMAN, F.R.S.—I have much pleasure in moving a vote of thanks
to Mr. Howard for his most able, interesting, and varied Address, to which I
am sure you all listened with very great pleasure. I do not know, Sir, where
I should go to hear a better address; but I do know that at the Victoria
Institute I can sometimes hear one as good. Holding, as I do, a very high
opinion of the value of this Institute, I am glad to find that it is appreciated
not only in the three kingdoms, but in other and far more distant portions of
her Majesty's vast empire. It was only the other day that I received a letter
from India, from one of my sons, who is a missionary there, in which he
requested that two of his friends might have an honour on which they had set
their hearts—that of being elected members of the Victoria Institute. This
is only one of many illustrations of an appreciation of this Institute having
penetrated into very distant parts. And here I may, perhaps, also mention,
without offence, a little incident connected with your indefatigable secretary, to whom I am indebted for a hint upon which I have now acted. I received from him a few days ago a letter, saying that he hoped I would say something this evening. In consenting, I added that I was undecided as to a subject to comment upon, and communicated to him that letter from my Indian friends, asking him to take the necessary steps. Next morning I was somewhat surprised to receive my Indian letter back again; but with it I found one suggesting that the letter seemed most opportunely to afford a subject for remark. I have now great pleasure in moving that the thanks of this meeting be given to Mr. Howard for his most admirable address. (Cheers.)

Mr. H. Cadman Jones.—I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution. Although a comparatively idle member myself, never having read a paper before the Institute, yet I am very much obliged to those who do labour in our interests.

The resolution was then unanimously agreed to.

Mr. Howard.—I thank you very much for your patience in listening to an address on a subject which, although treated rather seriously, could not have been dealt with otherwise than in the light of my own experience; and I have done this in the hope that it might be useful to others.

Rev. Prebendary Irons, D.D.—I am glad to have the honour of moving a vote of thanks to you, Sir, for your services as Chairman to-night, and, I am justified in adding, for the great service you have rendered to the Institute ever since its foundation. We are all grateful to you for having endeavoured to preserve throughout the real character of this Institute. Your papers have been philosophical, but they have not been put forward in advocacy of any special aspect of Christianity. We recognize very strongly that though you had views of your own and did not attempt to conceal them, you did not give them that undue prominence which, in this Institute, would be wholly unfair to others. Now, that I apprehend to be our duty. We feel as members, and particularly as philosophers, that we should do much harm to the Institute if we allowed it to be thought that we met here in a spirit of antagonism to science. Undoubtedly our object is to ascertain the truth, whatever that truth may be. We accept it, not reluctantly, but cheerfully and thankfully. We love it because it is the truth; and if, for the time being, it seems to clash with what we thought to be our Christianity, we are willing, either to wait until we know better, or, perhaps, to doubt whether our notion of Christianity may not have some flaw in it. Unless we meet in that spirit of entire fairness, we shall not be able to hold together. We are all aware that in this Institute there is a vast variety of Christian opinion. It would be entirely wrong to conceal the fact, that we are all here on a philosophical and scientific basis common to us all, and that we are not here to fight for any
particular aspect of Christianity. There are many, I do not know how many, different forms of the Christian religion to be found among our members, but I am sure that there is a sufficient variety of Christianity among us to justify what I am saying. I am sure we shall all feel that the Council have done us good service in keeping us as far as possible from becoming a mere religious debating society. That is the very last thing we should wish to be. (Cheers.) We can respect one another here without going into the details of individual opinion. I acknowledge that from time to time I have heard assumptions and sometimes statements and arguments of a religious character here, and I have taken part in them myself; but I have no doubt that my brother members, who have done exactly the same, have patience with me as I have with them; and it is only in that spirit that we can at all hold together as a scientific and philosophical society. There are other societies which are engaged in the defence of the evidences of the Christian religion. I am not a member of any of these societies, though I have sometimes been asked to be; for I do not think Christianity needs any defence at all. I think it is strong enough to hold its own; and if it were not so, I should be sorry for it as a Divine Revelation. But I think there is very great need that we should constantly watch the progress of all knowledge around us of a scientific kind, in order that the contrary aspects of science may not be found to be a hindrance to young minds, which may thereby be hopelessly injured in their education, and especially in the early periods of it, by accepting for scientific truth that which we know is frequently founded, after all, on scientific error. The examples which have been mentioned this evening are sufficient to make us feel that there is abundant need, and always will be, of an institution to cherish, and at the same time to watch, Science, so that it may not have a dangerous effect on the morals and religion of those who are beginners. For instance, the subject which has been referred to of the supposed immense antiquity of man, is at this time undergoing a new examination, with results entirely opposed to those which, a few months ago, were supposed to be scientific conclusions. We must recollect that science is incomplete. A few years ago there was a great stir made about a book called Essays and Reviews, and there was one scientific essay, the main features of which are not considered to be scientific now. This exhibits what is not a proper attitude of mind. Professor Huxley and some others should understand that we are not here as the antagonists of science, but simply as asking them not to be the antagonists of moral and religious truth, to which they have not given sufficient attention. Let them be fair; they may be quite sure of our fairness. If our papers diverge on to the theological track, our Council will be on their guard to keep them from straying, or from opening up an arena of discussions or debates on religious points, which in this room must be regarded as open questions. With these remarks I have to propose that the thanks of this meeting be given to you, Sir, for your kind and able conduct in the chair.

Rev. J. W. Buckley.—I have much pleasure in seconding this resolution.
I have attended many of the meetings when you, sir, have been in the chair, and I know that you have done us great service. In one point of view the office of Chairman is not an easy one, for speakers sometimes fail; but when you have been Chairman I have noticed that, when others have not spoken, you generally threw yourself into the gap. Again, you always insist on keeping us to the point of the discussions. Very often—and I must plead guilty to this myself—we are apt to digress, or fix only upon some particular point of the subject not very closely connected with its main issues, and you then very properly call us to the main question. It affords me very great pleasure to second this resolution.

The resolution was then carried with applause.

The CHAIRMAN.—Lord Shaftesbury, the President of the Institute, is not often able to be amongst us, but when we have the pleasure of seeing him here, that pleasure dwells long in our minds. We know not only his benevolence and fondness for good, but he has that tact of the real English nobleman—though I am happy to say that it is not confined to them—of saying exactly the right thing at the right moment. I have been much pleased at hearing him say just the very thing we wanted to hear. A great part of your thanks really goes to our noble President, but several expressions have been uttered which are so personal to myself that it is impossible for me to transfer them to another. I feel that those remarks of Dr. Irons and Mr. Buckley are something like the second half of a return ticket, stamped with the very legible expression, “not transferable.” (Laughter.) The point which Dr. Irons brought out most especially as a reason for thanking me is that I have always endeavoured to keep polemics out of the Society. It is satisfactory to find one’s work recognized. I have always desired and intended, so far as I could take part in its affairs, that the Institute should be a scientific institute, and not a society for discussing differences in matters of religion; and I rejoice in the thought that this Institute has been the means of saving a great waste of power. We Christians, unhappily, occupy a great deal of our strength and time in contending with one another. I suppose it cannot be helped; and that there must be a great deal of controversy even among those who hold the same fundamental truths in matters of religion; but there are times, places, and occasions when and where controversy must bring about a great waste of power, which it would be better to prevent. Now, all Christians have a common interest in the Holy Scriptures. If those Scriptures are attacked, not one school of thought alone is wounded, but everyone receives a wound, and therefore we are all equally interested in defending the Holy Bible. Therefore, I am glad to think that we have here a society in which persons differing on other points can meet together and fight together, shoulder to shoulder, for that book which is their common inheritance and their common faith, in the face of the enemy. Here, then, we must not contend with each other, but we must all pull together. On the other hand, I am glad to find it laid down that we are a scientific society, and not a society
opposed to science. As a matter of fact, we are intensely scientific; and all we want is that science should go deeper than it has ever done before. For my own humble efforts, I must say, as I have said before, that they have been given as a labour of love. I am reminded by Captain Petrie that, owing to the vacancies caused by death, he and I are the only two members of the Institute who remain from the original organizing committee which was appointed by the founders of the Institute to draw up its objects and rules. I think that he, at all events, has certainly fought manfully to carry out these objects, and to keep the Institute close to its own rules.

[The Annual Meeting being concluded, the Members, Associates, and their friends assembled in the Museum of the Society of Arts, where refreshments were served.]