THE 603rd ORDINARY MEETING,

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

DR. FORTESCUE FOX IN THE CHAIR.

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

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

CHRISTIAN SANITY. By Alfred T. Schofield, M.D., etc., etc.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Before leaving our suggested illustration, we may add that if the loss of equilibrium in the balance is not great, the mental aberration may be slight and harmless (at any rate to others). Such cases abound, and are classed as eccentrics, faddists, extremists, or perhaps as obsessed, ill-balanced or even "not all there."
Official recognition has long been sought for this large army of sufferers as "borderland cases" between sanity and insanity, but so far in vain. Personally I have nothing officially to do with insanity, but am constantly struck with the difficulty of defining such doubtful cases.

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

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

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

Returning to our immediate subject, we find that it is still further complicated in that it is not "Sanity" but "Christian Sanity." We have therefore to study the effects of an influx of a great spiritual force on the mind of man that tends to disturb the pre-existing balance. The fresh power and energy, the changed standpoint of view, and the entire recasting of values, to say nothing of the new and powerful contact with great
forces, that were originally the results in varying degrees of the entrance of spiritual light into the soul of man, at first no doubt produced such a violent and permanent disturbance of the pre-Christian balance, that observers had no option but to declare Christians mad. It will be remembered in "Flatland" that the dweller in Two dimensions when shown by a messenger in Three dimensions the glories of the solidity of the higher sphere, was perforce accounted mad and placed in an asylum, when on his return to Flatland he persisted in proclaiming the wonders he had seen.

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

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

John the Baptist was also declared to have a devil. The first Christians (Acts ii, 13) were believed to be a noisy company of drunken men, if not mad. Later, Rhoda (Acts xii, 12), a Christian maid, was declared mad, because she told believers that their prayers were answered. Festus declared Paul was mad (Acts xxvi, 24). Church assemblies with miraculous gifts might be (and doubtless were) often accounted mad (1 Cor. xiv, 23), and lastly it is stated definitely that there are heights of spiritual life when the Christian is "beside himself" (2 Cor. v, 13) towards God, though towards man he is sober enough.

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

This word "sober" is really a key word that will unlock much of the subject of this paper. It is in Greek "σωφρονιστής" and denotes "soundness of mind" or "sanity." "Σωφρόν" means "wise" and "σωφροσύνη" wisdom. It is the only word used for sanity, and connotes both sanity and wisdom. It
is used twelve times and is earnestly enforced in the New Testament as an essential quality of Christian life.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

How then can we best define the limits of Christian Sanity in view of such a disturbing factor of the pre-existing balance, as the higher spiritual life?
In the first place we may note that nowhere are deviations from the normal less tolerated than in England. Amongst the Latin nations, as we travel East, and in the Far West, and in the South, in Asia, Africa, and America, all sorts of extravagances are tolerated which would certainly be judged to pass the limits of sanity here. But in this paper we must accept the meaning that is current in this country, while at the same time we fully recognize that the word "sanity" does not represent the same condition everywhere; but that the standard which decides doubtful cases varies greatly with country and race.

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

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

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

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

In stating their cases to me both were extremely reasonable. Indeed by comparison I seemed to be almost irrational. The lady explained that this is a dirty world, laden with malignant germs, which swarm everywhere, on every piece of furniture or paper, on every article of clothing and on the skin. If she touched a chair, or indeed any object, her hand was covered with microbes. I could not deny it. "Therefore I wash," said she, "and am always washing with disinfectant soap." She smelt strongly of carbolic, and her hands were like a washerwoman's. She was absolutely useless to anyone, and yet was perfectly reasonable. The barrister no less so. He also found it a dirty world. Micro-organisms everywhere! Whatever you
did you were covered with them. Washing was utterly futile as a protection, etc., etc., therefore why wash? Hence he had given up the unequal conflict—reasonable again. I am indeed informed with regard to washing that Mrs. Eddy had the strongest views on ablutions, and in her monumental work she decrees that babies are on no account to be daily washed, declaring such a practice to be neither "natural nor necessary" (p. 413).

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

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

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

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

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

For instance, with regard to Christian sanity, (1) to believe in a
spiritual world at all is insane to a mere materialist. (2) The ordinary man of the world might, however, pass this as sane, so long as it was confined to an opinion only, but he would judge otherwise if actions followed the belief.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"He will weave no longer a spotted life of shreds and patches, but he will live with a Divine unity. He will cease from what
is base and frivolous in his life, and be content with all places, and any service he can render.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

* These are mainly obtained from Dr. Starbuck's well-known statistics of Christian life.
Over half of the large number of lives investigated have this object first. One-quarter had as ideals Christian perfection and pleasing God.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

My own brother was accounted mad for giving up his eminent
scientific position in England to go as a missionary to China; but he was one of the most sober and sane men I ever knew.

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

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

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

“Trust God, see all, be not afraid.”

Their lives are sane and full of good works.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion.

The Chairman (Dr. Fortescue Fox) commented upon the changes in the standard of sanity of which history bore record. The great process of mental and spiritual development, which some called Evolution, and some preferred to look upon as the gradual fulfilment of the divine destiny of humanity, was marked by many difficulties
and disturbances. Delusions and unnecessary fears and depressions of the mind affected peoples, as well as individuals. In the Middle Ages some of these became epidemic manias, like the Dancing Mania and the barking Manias that went through Europe. In the same way, happier generations might look back upon these times as the strange days of the mania of Militarism. The effects of religion upon the equipoise of the mind was very great—and might operate both ways. It was well to remember that in the long run men needed encouragement. Nothing could be true or healthy that plunged men into fears and apprehensions. And now especially, after the long sufferings of the war, men needed encouraging. They needed to be made to see that life was good and glad, and that there was opening now upon the world a new day of unimaginable possibilities of progress and happiness.

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

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

*Integer vitae scelerisque purus,* etc.

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

“All may you better reek the rede

Than ever did th’ adviser.”

Our Chairman thinks, as I understand him, that we of Britain, of North America, and of Western Europe have grown out of the credulous minds possessed by our medieval ancestors. But like him I would refer to a striking utterance of Macaulay’s: “A very common knowledge of history, a very little observation of life, will suffice to prove that no learning, no sagacity, affords a security against the greatest errors on subjects relating to the invisible world” (Essay on Ranke’s *History of the Popes*). And this sentiment we shall fully indorse if we contemplate the recent amazing dissemination in America, Britain, and Western Europe of Mormonism, Christian science, clairvoyance and spiritism, the last named cult now announcing even weekly “services” of its own in my
suburb of London. I do not, however, allege that Spiritism, in spite of many public exposures, is always mere human trickery: for some who have been its votaries and through Christ's grace have shaken loose from it, have testified that they really saw and heard preternatural sights and sounds, and had knowledge of events in other places that no human being could have given them, but that the aims of their spirit guides were distinctly evil; so that these spirits were not ministering angels or spirits of good men, but quite the reverse, even as the denunciations of witchcraft in the Bible would lead us to expect. And such subjection to unknown and evil spirits has undoubtedly led from time to time to utter mania.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Arthur W. Sutton said that he wished to express his very sincere thanks to Dr. Schofield, and appreciation of the most interesting and valuable paper which he had read, but his special object in rising was to suggest that Dr. Schofield probably wished to
impress upon all those who professed and called themselves Christians the great responsibility of exhibiting "sanity" in their own lives and conduct.

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

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

Mr. T. Atkinson Gillespie: As to the question of "self-control," p. 20 of this most able paper, which has been referred to by the previous speaker, I would like to point out that towards the close of the Lord's ministry there were two missions, the mission of the
masses and the mission of the guest chamber, and without entering into any detail, but to arrive at the point, I wish to emphasize that the owner of the ass was "compelled" to recognize the Divine claim as being superior to his own. Likewise in the case of the owner of the guest chamber. These two missions conclusively prove to my mind the safety of allowing the "compelling" power of the Holy Spirit to take possession of all control, as in the case of conversion.

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

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

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

Professor H. Langhorne Orchard was sure that they would not wish to separate before expressing to the author their hearty thanks.
for a most interesting and valuable paper, especially for the remarks upon self-control and God's control (pp. 20, 21).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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