

OF INTEREST TO ALL ASTROLOGERS

ASTROLOGY QUARTERLY

ISSUED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE ASTROLOGICAL LODGE OF LONDON
AND DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF ASTROLOGY
IN ALL ITS BRANCHES

First published in 1926 by Charles Carter

EDITOR NICHOLAS CAMPION

VOLUME 63 No. 2

SPRING (MARCH) 1993

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	1
THE FIRST NATIONAL ASTROLOGY CONFERENCE	Nick Campion and Caroline Gerard 9
THE TRIALS OF MAURICE MESSÉGUÉ	Wanda Sellar 15
WILL WE GET LACOURT?	Lee Lehman 20
LILLY'S METHOD: A RESPONSE TO MAURICE McCANN	Sue Ward 22
A CASE OF COLIC	Gary Price 32
THE ASTROLOGER AS MILITARY ADVISER IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND RENAISSANCE, PART 3: GUIDO BONATTI'S TRACTATUS SEXTUS	Trans. by Robert Zoller 35
PARTICIPATORY PURSUITS FOR PERSPICACIOUS PEOPLE	Olivia Barclay 46
CORRESPONDENCE	47
MUNDANE DAY	49
REVIEWS	50
DATA SECTION	53

LILLY'S METHOD A RESPONSE TO MAURICE McCANN

Sue Ward

(Maurice McCann's study of Lilly's methods appeared in Vol. 63 no 1).

Definitions

Stricture: a censure (1)

Rule: that which is established as a principle, standard, or a guide of action or procedure (2)

Astrology has a set of established principles which act as a guide to action and procedure and set a standard for interpretation. In this sense the Considerations before Judgement, which traditionally precede interpretation of the horoscope, are rules. On the other hand, the word 'stricture' implies disapproval. So, a stricture in a chart is like a rebuke and is usually treated as making a chart unreadable, suggesting that an incorrect answer will be obtained.

These strictures have been a bone of contention for some considerable time and have become an established feature of horary interpretation during the modern period. Even when an established principle seems to be restrictive or redundant, great care and thorough investigation are required before discarding it.

My objective here is to deal with these 'rules' with reference to Maurice McCann's examination of Christian Astrology (3). Furthermore, I have had access to Lilly's workbooks for parts of the years 1647 and 1649, so the points raised by Maurice regarding Christian Astrology can be investigated in relation to Lilly's daily practice. Hopefully, this both will clear up some of the misunderstandings associated with these procedures and clarify Lilly's use of them. In the first place, though, I have not found any reference to the term 'stricture' in any text I've consulted up to, and including, Christian Astrology (1647).

A few words about Lilly's workbooks might be in order for those who are unfamiliar with them. These take the form of very large ledgers, which he stamped with chart squares as required. There could be up to six on a page. It was not unusual for him to undertake eight consultations per day, beginning at around 7.00 am. These were mainly horaries, but also included event and natal charts. He was a very busy man and would see clients personally as well as dealing with questions by post.

The pages are crammed with charts and scribbings; sometimes there are notes about the querent, the question and, occasionally, the answer. Sometimes he calculated the planets' positions roughly, sometimes more accurately, although in general significators were dealt with more carefully. He would have

been acutely conscious of the planetary hour and restrictive phenomena, such as a void of course Moon, early and late degrees rising, Moon in the Via Combusta or late degrees of a sign. His charts were often separated by only a few minutes of time, so it would have been impossible for him to have been unaware of these things.

The importance of Christian Astrology, and that of its author William Lilly, to this discussion, is that in drawing together the work of so many ancient writers he presented a body of knowledge which, I suspect, is unavailable in any form anywhere. He presented astrological principles which had been established for many hundreds of years and tested them in his own practise, which was huge. He rejected those precepts which could not be substantiated, and simplified those which were overly complicated. He thus presented his method and his attitude to ancient rulings.

Maurice McCann advised use of his article as a reference guide only, and not as a study of Lilly's method of judging horoscopes. This is not possible, since Lilly's manner of addressing the so-called strictures is an integral part of his method of judgement. To separate the two is something like trying to assess a car with no engine.

Students of traditional astrology soon find that Lilly's attitude is surprisingly modern. He is very frank when he disagrees with ancient authorities, but then Christian Astrology would never have been written if he had blindly followed his predecessors. Maurice McCann has, quite correctly, brought apparent inconsistencies in Lilly's method to our attention. But Lilly did not take a laissez faire attitude to astrology, far from it. The quote with which Maurice opens his article continues, 'and yet I was never to seek a sufficient reason in Art, whereby to give a good and satisfactory answer to the Proponent, etc.' (5). In other words, whilst he detaches himself from established principles in this case, he still uses rigorous astrological reasoning to obtain an answer. His method was rigorous and he did not manipulate the rules to suit his convenience.

Before judging a chart Lilly ascertained the physical description of the party or parties concerned. He was meticulous in this respect, and in his workbooks there is supporting evidence of his using this method of testing a chart for radicality. He advised the use of common sense and astrological reasoning when judging, keeping in mind the context of the question.

It can sometimes appear that Lilly judged all charts no matter what, but that is an unsafe assumption, as I will try to demonstrate. The Considerations, as Maurice calls them, are there for a reason and, in my opinion, should never be ignored.

Planetary Hours

If there is no accord by the three methods Maurice mentions, then the chart is not radical and is unsuitable for judgement - or so says the ancient rule. Maurice has checked Lilly's charts in Christian Astrology and found that eleven

are non-radical according to these criteria. In fact, only ten can be counted since one is an event chart (page 472, regarding the Earl of Essex). None of these considerations applies to event charts.

Of his list of non-radical charts I found only two had no mitigation (pages 238 and 395). While not strictly radical in the ancient sense, there were three instances of the ruler of the hour being angular (pages 219, 286 and 385), two of the hour ruler in the house of the quesited (pages 392 and 419), one of it being the natural significator (page 417), one of it being the accidental ruler of the matter (page 468), and two of it being involved with trines to the ascendant and/or triplicity ruler (pages 177 and 219).

From information supplied to me by C.J.Puotinen (6), who has calculated the hour rulers from the data supplied by Lilly, I was able to check those charts which do not show a planetary hour. These are not necessarily those which he used - the lack of clock time standardisation causes problems with this kind of exercise. However, of the nine I checked (not ten, the chart on page 397 is of an event) only two complied with the radicality criteria. The rest, though, had the hour ruler angular, or it was the natural ruler of the matter, or it was placed in the house of the quesited or a combination of these. The trines between the hour ruler and the ascendant or triplicity ruler were less in evidence.

It would be incorrect to suggest that Lilly ignored the planetary hour, since it is included in so many charts. The fact that it is not included in all of them is not material - none are shown in his work books. I would suggest that Lilly knew what the planetary hour was at all times, but lack of strict radicality did not prevent him from judging these charts. To my mind Maurice has misunderstood the purpose of the consideration concerning planetary hours, and in my opinion there is no evidence here to support Maurice's assertion that there is no good reason for retaining it. This technique is very ancient and may derive from ancient Egyptian mythology. The ruler of each hour guarded a door and entry could only be gained by supplying the correct password. This was particularly the case with the Sun God's journey through the Underworld at the end of each day. He could only proceed into each hour, and thus to rebirth at dawn, by permission of the hour ruler (8). This suggests to me, and this is unsupported by any written evidence, that planetary hour agreement in a horary chart gives permission to the querent and/or astrologer to proceed with the matter under examination.

Early Degrees on the Ascendant

The chart on page 417 has an early ascendant, but Lilly explains that this is acceptable if 'the Querent be very young, and his corporature, complexion and moles or scarres of his body agree with the quality of the sign ascending' (7). He is at pains, though, to provide a detailed physical description of the querent and of the conditions of the quesited. There are also examples of the early ascendant in his work books.

Late Degrees on the Ascendant

I found only one or two charts in the workbooks like this, one of which was entitled, One at Twickenham, of her sweetheart. The chart is generally afflicted, so whatever the exact question, the outcome would not have been good.

The Moon in late degrees

Although there are no charts in Christian Astrology with the Moon in late degrees in Gemini, Scorpio or Capricorn, there are examples in the workbooks. Again, this does not mean that Lilly disregarded this rule, but perhaps judged accordingly. In life and death questions a chart would not necessarily be thrown out on account of late degrees. These areas of the signs are the terms of the malefics and so afflict the Moon when it is so placed. However, this can be very relevant and descriptive. Again, much depends on the context of the question. I ought to mention that there was a significant gap in the workbooks after Lilly had judged three charts with the Moon in late Gemini. He restarted work after the Moon had changed signs, implying that in this instance he refused to judge a chart with the Moon in a late degree.

Via Combusta

Lilly wrote on page 122, 'as some say, when she [the Moon] is in the Via Combusta', suggesting disagreement among other writers about this matter. He does not allow this to prevent him judging a chart. The Moon in the Via Combusta can show many things: fear, illness, death, hidden matters and imprisonment being some. Therefore, it is not unusual to find this position in charts about these topics. The first chart Maurice quotes (from page 415) is a question about which marriage partner would die first. Lilly says that there were many serious reasons why the question was asked. He uses the Moon to show the wife's conditions, which are commensurate with those of the Moon; she died soon after.

The second chart (on page 468) is that of bewitchment. The querent was very ill and the Moon in the Via Combusta showed the tremendous fear felt by that person of being attacked by witchcraft. Both charts would fall under the heading of describing the conditions of the querent and would therefore be radical in Lilly's opinion.

The Seventh Cusp or its Ruler Afflicted

In my opinion this rule deals directly with the safety of the astrologer, but not, I would say, when the astrologer asks the question. This rule may be applied when the question is not a seventh house matter.

Page 196: The Moon (7th ruler) is certainly in fall and is therefore unfortunate. In this case - remembering that this is dealing with the astrologer's position - the Moon is trine the seventh cusp, as is the Sun. The Moon is also in a trine with an exalted Jupiter. Protection enough, I think.

Page 200: This chart is about a report and is therefore really an event chart, so these rules do not generally apply. However, this is also a chart regarding war and as such is a seventh house matter, so the rule does not apply in any case.

Page 415: Again, a chart about a seventh house matter.

Saturn in the First House

Lilly comments on this consideration, 'The Arabians ... doe deliver these following rules, as very fit to be considered (9). He included in this statement the considerations concerning Saturn in the seventh house, the ruler of the ascendant combust and the ruler of the seventh unfortunate, but it is not clear whether he is in agreement here or merely reporting.

The chart Maurice mentions on page 437, has Saturn retrograde in the first house. This question (If he should obtaine the parsonage desired?), was rather distasteful to Lilly, since he disliked the priest and his reasons for asking. Nonetheless, he judged the chart and used this placing of Saturn to describe the querent's conditions: Saturn is impeded in the ascendant, and by his presence 'infortunates the question, causing the querent to despaire in the obtaining of it'. Lilly agreed that Saturn afflicted the chart as a whole; we hear that the priest did not obtain the parsonage and was advised by Lilly not to proceed. The matter ended unfortunately, in that the priest did proceed and was subsequently reported anonymously for a liaison with a woman, ruining his chance of getting the post.

In this case the outcome was unfortunate and ended badly for the querent, but that doesn't mean that it should not have been judged. If Saturn was representing a lost or stolen item, found in the first house and retrograde, it could be said that the item would be found or returned. Saturn is often found in the ascendant in charts about kidnap and other serious crime, where it can show someone in fear for their life. Also, it can describe worry and old age, so any of these descriptions can be useful in finding radicality rather than denying it.

Saturn in the Seventh House

This falls under the same heading as the above, in that it isn't clear whether Lilly actually advocated the use of this rule or not. It is my view that each of these seventh house considerations can only apply when it is not a seventh house matter under scrutiny and each of the following charts falls into that category.

Page 200: A report that Cambridge was taken by the King's forces; if true? This is an event chart, so Considerations do not apply. In any case, it is a seventh house matter being a chart connected to war, and a malefic in the seventh of your enemies would be greeted with delight. However, it is true that this matter did go from one misfortune to another; in 1649 the King was beheaded!

Page 395: Money lost, who stole it? If recoverable? Saturn is in the 7th but theft is essentially a 7th house matter and it is obvious from the outcome that Lilly's judgement was not faulty. Whether the matter went from one misfortune

to another or not, there is no way of knowing. One thing is certain: Lilly disliked the querent and this person did try to persuade Lilly to make an erroneous judgement.

Page 415: Whether man or wife shall dye first? This again is a 7th house matter, and it is a question about death, of which Saturn is the natural ruler and placed in the house of the wife. The woman did die soon after, so Saturn's position is relevant to the question.

Ruler of the Ascendant Combust

The chart on page 219 (If I should purchase Mr. B his houses?), was Lilly's own question. His significator is combust in the 7th house. However, these are the two primary significators and it was the perfection of the conjunction of his significator and the Sun which successfully closed the deal, though not after some difficulties.

Page 238: If the querent should ever have children? Although Mercury and the Sun can be considered as conjunct, this cannot be viewed as combustion since they are in different signs (page 113 Christian Astrology).

Ruler of the Seventh Unfortunate

Maurice listed twenty two charts as having the seventh ruler unfortunate, although there simply is not space here to look at all of them. I would suggest that since this Consideration is more or less the same as Maurice's Considerations 7 and 9, the same arguments apply, especially since many of those charts cited in the earlier paragraphs are included in this one. Therefore, further investigations would be superfluous.

Equal Testimonies

It would be too tedious to check thirty five charts to see if the arguments were equal and I have followed Maurice's in this. However, his assertion that Lilly suggests the astrologer is free to choose whether to judge the chart or not, is incorrect. Lilly actually instructs his readers to ask another question if this equality is found, which casts doubt over the stricture, (the source of which is unknown to me) that a question may only be asked once.

Void of Course

Most of us follow the same method of deciding when this rule is in effect, that is when the Moon has no more major aspects to perfect before leaving its sign. So, at first glance the five charts which Maurice mentions certainly seem to have the Moon void of course. Lilly has, in fact, used the next aspect the Moon will perfect after it changes sign in each of these charts. This, of course, is nothing new, I was aware that Lilly did this and others must have been, too. But there is more to it than that.

Lilly wrote that 'A planet is void of course, when he is separated from a planet, nor doth forthwith, during his being in that sign, apply to any other'

(10). Contrary to what most of us understood, this does not mean that the aspect has to perfect while the Moon is in its current sign. What it does mean is that the application has to be in effect while the Moon is in its current sign. Application operates only when the Moon (or planet) is within orbs of the planet it next meets by major aspect. It doesn't matter, from this point of view, that it has to leave the sign before perfecting the aspect. So, to be void of course the Moon (or planet) has to be out of orb of the next major aspect, even if it will eventually perfect this aspect within the current sign.

This matter largely depends on the definition of application in Lilly's terms, and perhaps those of the authors he drew upon, and it meant to be within orb: 'The application happeneth when as the circles or beames of the planettes come to joyne together by a corporall conjunction or by aspecte of the one half of their deamiters' (11). This definition is clear: a planet cannot be said to be applying until it is within orb of another. The meaning of application has altered to that of 'moving forward in the sign', but Lilly deals with this separately: applying to aspect means to be within orb of that aspect. In interpretation, this might show that the event promised by the perfection is already a possibility.

The evidence in Christian Astrology supports this almost exclusively and leads me to conclude that the Moon is not void of course if it is within orbs of an aspect, whether it perfects in or out of its current sign. Therefore, the Moon (or planet) can be void of course even when it is in early degrees, if the next planet it meets in major aspect is out of orb (12).

The crucial point about this is the definition of 'application' and having checked all the charts in Christian Astrology to see just how Lilly uses this term, I found only three which are dubious in this regard:

Page 156: Mercury at 17° Cancer is said to be applying to a square of Jupiter at 27°15' Libra. This application is .5° out of orb.

Page 399: The Moon at 8° Taurus is said to apply to Mercury at 21° Pisces. This is 2° out of orb.

Page 468: The Moon is at 6°20' Scorpio and he says it is applying to the opposition of Saturn at 15°30' Taurus and then to Mercury at 23° Pisces. The trine to Mercury is out of orb by 7°.

I have no explanation for these discrepancies, but I think that having only three charts at variance with the rest of the evidence, does not necessarily invalidate that evidence. Besides Lilly would not have been very concerned about a 5° difference. He himself says that he used whichever orb he remembered at the time (Page 107, which shows the variety of orbs offered.)

The most telling example of how application was used and, perhaps, an explanation of how it became confused, is the well known horoscope for the question, 'If Presbytery shall stand?' (page 439). Venus, ruler of the ninth house, is at 9°16' Aries, of which Lilly wrote, 'but before she fully get out of this movable signe Aries, she first hath occurre to the sinister square of Jupiter, then of Mars'. Jupiter is at 28°54' Cancer and Mars is at 25°40' Cancer and are out of

orb, so Venus is not applying to aspect. He is registering this by using the word 'occurse', meaning that Venus has to make these aspects before leaving the sign. He is not saying that Venus is applying to aspect these two.

This is further supported later in the same judgement: We have the Moon separating from Venus in the eighth, then going to be vacua cursus [void of course] afterwards she squares with Mars, then with Jupiter: ... The Moon is at 13°37' Libra, Mars is at 25°40' Cancer and Jupiter is at 28°54' Cancer. Mars and Jupiter are out of orb of the Moon and so the Moon is not applying, but because he feels that these aspects are relevant he mentions them as occurring later. This chart has been judged with the Moon void of course in Lilly's terms.

The following charts, cited by Maurice, are good examples of the rule in practice and show that Lilly did not ignore it.

Page 152: The Moon is at 26°43' Pisces and the Sun is at 7°03' Leo. These two are within orbs of a trine and so the Moon is not void of course.

Page 238: The Moon is at 29°53' Virgo and is within orbs of a square to the Sun at 0°31' Cancer.

Page 385: This is a good example, because Lilly has noted the Moon's progress as a vac [from void of course] and opposition Sun [to the opposition of the Sun]. The Moon's last aspect was an opposition with Mercury over 12° before. The Moon has a moiety of around 6° and Mercury has a moiety of around 3.5°, therefore at about 9° or 10° before, they were in aspect. Since then the Moon has been within the orbs of no other planet and so was void of course. The Moon is at 28°09' Sagittarius and the Sun is at 5°31' Cancer. It is in these cases that the usual interpretations of the void of course Moon would apply.

Page 401: Another example of his stating that the Moon is separating from void of course, but in this case its application is to a sextile of Mars. The Moon's last aspect was by trine to Jupiter, but that was more than 17.5° ago and their combined moieties are about 11°. The Moon is at 27°33' Leo and Mars is at 5°14' Cancer and is an applying trine.

Page 471: The Moon is at 28°10' Aquarius and applies to sextile Saturn, which is at 0°36' Taurus and then to a trine of Jupiter at 5°53' Cancer. Both are counted because both are within orbs, in fact, if you needed to, you might also include the applying trine to the Sun which is at 6°30' Scorpio.

So, it seems that it was rare for Lilly to judge a chart when the Moon was void of course. The one example that I have mentioned (If Presbytery shall stand?) had great descriptive value. It was also an afflicted chart in other ways, one being the Moon in the Via Combusta, but that is hardly surprising considering the nature of the question and its implications. He gives several interpretations of the Moon void of course suggesting that these charts were readable in certain circumstances (13).

Conclusion

Lilly's judgement of charts which strictly speaking are not radical, does not show that he disregarded the rules of radicality. Several of these were, what

would now be called 'afflicted' charts, that is, those which have unfavourable configurations in them and under the stricture regime would be discarded. These types of chart are often about very serious matters: kidnappings, murder, war - it would be surprising to find them wholly radical in the ancient sense. However, in almost every case where he has not adhered to the strict sense of the Considerations, the outcome was bad, or was brought about with difficulty. A certain amount of discretion and common sense, applied within the context of the question, would seem to be part of the answer.

The evidence seems to support Maurice McCann overall, in that these rules, or considerations, were not seen by Lilly as strictures. To say that any of them should be discarded, though, is unwise. Radicality must be found, but I think that the methods of establishing it allow a little more scope than the strictures would admit. The evidence, as far as I can ascertain, shows that Lilly did acknowledge the rules. It is clear that he spent a considerable amount of time finding description in the chart, and this must be the ultimate test of radicality. Henry Coley verified the use of description in this respect. He wrote that 'when the sign ascending, and his lord represent the querent, or a planet in the ascendant signifies him truly, you may safely venture to give your judgement' (14). If any of these rules are in operation with no descriptive reason, then it probably would be better not to give judgement to a client. It is here, I think, that the strength of the rules lies: they protect the astrologer. We no longer have to fear for our lives if we make an incorrect judgement or give the querent an unattractive answer. However, we still have our reputations to protect (and our pride!).

Maurice found only four charts out of the thirty five to adhere to the rules, but this number has now been substantially increased, although I haven't counted them. Lilly did not reject a chart simply because one or other of these rules was in operation, but appears to have made a careful appraisal of the situation before proceeding to judgement.

I think that I have demonstrated that Lilly certainly did not ignore the rules. He applied the spirit of the rule rather than the letter, using them to help and advise, not to restrict. This is so in all of astrology, not just in considerations before the judgement of a horary chart. More importantly, Lilly found a method that allowed him to assess radicality in a broader sense than had ever been used before. In his words, 'and if my Judgements doe vary from the common Rules of the Ancients, let the Candid Reader excuse me, sith he may still follow their Principles if he please; and he must know, that from my Conversation in their Writings, I have attained the Method I follow (15). Therefore, each must make their own decision, but it would seem unwise to deal with the rules as he did and then not to follow his method.

The rules are there to guide us in our judgements and were ratified by William Lilly - a better astrologer than any of us is ever likely to be.

Notes

1. New English Dictionary, Odhams
2. Op. cit.
3. William Lilly, Christian Astrology, 1647, Facsimile edition by Regulus Publishing, 1985.
4. Ashmolean Ms 210 and 420
5. Christian Astrology, p 452
6. C J Puotinen, coeditor of The Horary Practitioner
7. Christian Astrology, p. 122
8. As the Sun passed through the night, he encountered the rulers of the hours in succession, and each could only be passed with the knowledge of a special password. See V. Lons, Egyptian Mythology, Hamlyn 1965, p 41 - 2. I am grateful to Deborah Houlding for this information.
9. Christian Astrology, p. 122
10. Christian Astrology, p. 112
11. A Breffe and easie Introduction to Astrology ... by Claude Dariot (1583?), Chapter 7
12. I am aware that authorities up to Ibn Ezra insisted that conjunctions have to occur within the current sign and that void of course was dealt with differently.
13. Christian Astrology, pp. 190, 192, 299, 310, 377 and 448
14. The Key to the Whole Art of Astrology by Henry Coley, p. 127, Facsimile by Ballantrae
15. Christian Astrology, p. 142

CLASSES AT THE ASTROLOGICAL LODGE OF LONDON **1993**

MONDAY EVENINGS

ELEMENTARY BEGINNERS' CLASS CHESTER KEMP

Every Monday night during term from 6.15-7.00 pm (open to all)

SUMMER TERM

8.30 pm-9.30 pm

SYNASTRY WANDA SELLAR

10th May-14th June 1993 (5 weeks)

INTRODUCTION TO ESOTERIC HELENA DRAMCHINI **ASTROLOGY**

21st June-12th July 1993 (4 weeks)

AUTUMN TERM

8.30 pm-9.30 pm

PREDICTION BERNARD ECCLES

27th September-25th October 1993 (5 weeks)

HORARY ASTROLOGY REVIEWED . . . MAURICE McCANN

1st November-29th November 1993 (4 weeks, not 8th Nov.)