

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVI.

JULY, 1912.

No. 3.

PRACTICAL RESULTS OF MONISM.

A current definition of monism runs thus: "The doctrine of cosmology that attempts to explain the phenomena of the cosmos by one principle of being or ultimate substance."¹⁾ Arthur Drews, a monist, defines monism as "that view of the cosmos which admits but one principle or one ground of reality." In a recent brochure, Superintendent Repke has sketched the various types of this philosophical theory.²⁾ There is a materialistic monism, which reduces every phenomenon in the universe to a basis of matter. Then there is an idealistic monism, which claims that matter has no independent existence; it is a mere conception of the mind; every phenomenon is a product of the spirit. Lastly, there is a pantheistic monism. Its chief apostle is Eduard v. Hartmann, who observes that there is a parallelism between nature and spirit: in nature he finds force and law, or a principle of energy and of order; the counterparts of these two elements in the realm of the spirit are: will and mind. Force and will represent the unlogical, law and mind the logical, in the two hemispheres which monism assumes for its cosmos. But these four elements: force, law, will, mind, are not four different substances, but manifestations of the same, in fact, of the only substance. The multitude of volitions which individuals put forth are but movements of the absolute will; and the host of ideas, or ideal distinctions, become concentrated

1) Standard Dictionary.

2) *Pantheistischer und deistischer Monismus*, in *Bibl. Zeit- und Streitfragen* VII, 8.

CURRENT EVENTS.

AN UNUSUALLY LONG and singularly blessed pastorate came to a close when Rev. J. H. Schroeder of St. John's, San Francisco, Cal., died April 16. He had been assigned to this charge upon his graduation from Concordia, St. Louis, in 1886, and it was the only one he ever served.

THE RESERVE AND CALMNESS of Christian faith is expressed in these words of Rev. John H. C. Fritz, who, writing in *The Lutheran Witness* concerning the *Titanic* disaster, says:—

“It is not for us to pass judgment upon the 1,600 souls who went to their watery grave in mid-ocean, when the *Titanic* ‘sank as lead in the mighty waters.’ God has already judged them. Those who put their trust in God and their Savior have lost nothing. They have gained immensely; they are now with their God, and are forever spared all the misery of sin in this evil world, and are delivered from all disease which would also in course of time have cut off them from the earth. Those who had become hardened in their sins and who had persistently despised the grace of God, spurning His love and refusing to be at peace with God, have been overtaken by God's righteous anger and stern justice. They have no reason for murmuring against their God; they are reaping the evil fruits of their evil sowing, and must suffer in the place prepared for Satan and his angels.”

REV. SCHROTH OF MAYVILLE, WIS., communicates the following from *Harper's Weekly* for March 30, which requires no gloss nor comment either to make its meaning plain or to increase its impressiveness:—

“AS TO CARDINALS.

“Marconi Wireless Dispatch to the *Sun*.

“Rome, via Glace Bay, March 21. — Major Archibald Butt, *aide-de-camp* to President Taft, accompanied by Bishop Kennedy, rector of the American College here, had an audience with the Pope to-day, and presented a letter from President Taft thanking the Pontiff for the creation of three new American cardinals. The President wrote that this action was acceptable to Americans irrespective of their faith, as Catholicism contributes to the welfare of the country.”—

“Well, well! Supposing all that is true, whom is our President speaking for?

“Not altogether for us, certainly.

“It is not as our President that he sends his aide to thank the Holy Father for making some American cardinals. No doubt it was sensible for the good Pope to do it, but it is not a matter that concerns more than a fraction of the people of the United States, nor one, as we see it, that our President was in any way called upon to return our thanks for.

“It is true enough that the appointment of the American cardinals was generally acceptable. There is no objection to American cardinals if they behave as Cardinal Gibbons has behaved this long time. His red hat has never made the least trouble, so far as we ever heard. These new hats that have come may not be so unobtrusive. Our Roman Catholic brethren seemed to be extremely pleased at their coming, and to feel somehow that rank had been conferred on their Church. They seemed to feel that the gentlemen, previously archbishops, who had been promoted, are greater men, and should be generally recognized as greater men, since they received this new mark of papal approbation. The story came from Boston the other day that Cardinal O'Connell, being invited to a public dinner, replied that if he went he must sit on the chairman's right, since his rank as a prince of the Church entitled him to the seat of honor, and he could not consent to yield it to the Governor of Massachusetts.

“That was extraordinary, wasn't it? If the story is true, it is to condole with Cardinal O'Connell for attaining so inconvenient an altitude which will compel him to decline dinners at which the Governor of Massachusetts will be present.

“Except, perhaps, among some of the Catholics, cardinals will not have official rank as princes in this country. We do not know

the rank of 'prince' here. It means nothing except, perhaps, in a visitor. The cardinals are distinguished and representative men, and will be honored as such, and they are doubtless good and useful men, and will be honored for that, but they won't take rank as princes in the United States.

"And as to Governor Foss and Cardinal O'Connell and the seat of honor, displeasing as it must be to any gentleman to claim for himself a seat that some other gentleman prefers, Governor Foss was right, of course, in feeling that in the State of Massachusetts the seat of honor always belongs to the Governor of Massachusetts, except when it is occupied by the President of the United States.

"There is no example the new cardinals can better set than the example of humility and meekness. It is a Christian example, and always needed. Princes or not, they are very eminent men whom all conditions of men will be ready to honor. But they will be apt to be honored inversely to their claims. Precedence will be thrust upon them except where it is demanded; but when it is demanded, it will be found to rest solely on courtesy and good will, and it will be refused when it seems necessary to refuse it."

HIS SUSPENSION OF MR. VALENTINE'S "NUN-GARB ORDER" has brought an avalanche of protests down on President Taft. The protests of the brethren of the Atlantic District, of the South Texas Pastoral Conference, two that were circulated in St. Louis, and several others have been forwarded to us, presumably for publication. But for lack of space we must forbear. Besides, an effort is being made to duplicate one of these protests and supply every member of our organization with a copy, suggesting to him the advisability of signing it and have his fellow-citizens sign it, and forward it to the President.

DR. BENSOW has published, at Stockholm, a new edition of the Book of Concord in Swedish. He has improved R. R. Broocman's edition of 1730 by giving his rendering in modern Swedish, without, however, sacrificing fidelity to the original text or to the peculiar character of the confessional form. So says Dr. N. Forsander, his reviewer in *Tidskrift*, the theological quarterly of the Augustana Synod. The Augsburg Confession and the Apology have been translated from the Latin, all the rest from the German. Dr. Forsander rightly deplors that, at least, the Augustana was not translated from the German, which was read at Augsburg. The new edition of the Swedish Concordia embodies, of course, the special Swedish confession, the *Uppsala mötes beslut*. The customary historical and textual explanations are given at the end of the book.

A SYMPOSIUM ON "INTERSYNODICAL RELATIONS" appeared in the March issue of *The Theological Magazine* (Columbus, O.). The contributors were Pres. Dahl of the United Norwegian Church, Prof. Voight of the Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C., Prof. Gerberding of the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Prof. Jacobs of Mount Airy Seminary, Pres. Richter of the Iowa Synod, Pres. Schmauck of the General Council, Profs. Loy and Stelhorn of Columbus. The symposium discusses three points:

"1. What should be the mutual relations of these synods? 2. What should these synods view as the goal of their mutual relations? 3. What steps should be taken in the present to reach this goal? Editor Gohdes, in commenting upon the symposium, expresses his conviction that the time is ripe for 'the establishment of a joint tribunal to decide charges of usurpation; and secondly, the holding of a free conference.'"

Some of the writers appear greatly exercised over the Missouri Synod. Inasmuch as Missouri is not considered in this federation, the excitement displayed is amusing. We assure all the parties concerned that no Missourian will disturb the contemplated union. There is no reason why it should not be effected. We stand ready to publish the coveted result,—but we fear that the ardent federationists will not produce anything more tangible than words—words—words, and the fine symposium may illustrate the old saying: *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus*. (The mountains were in labor, and brought forth—a mouse.) The chief unifying element seems to be antipathy to Missouri. The gentlemen can indulge in that without a federation.—Prof. Singmaster of Gettysburg comments thus on the symposium:

"We wish these brethren God-speed in their effort to come to a better understanding. We are sorry that the discordant note had to be introduced by Dr. Richter of the Iowa Synod who speaks of the 'unionism of the General Synod' and of 'the fanaticism of Missouri.' Prof. Dr. Loy of the Ohio Synod is also not yet satisfied that the General Synod has learned 'to recognize the Lutheran faith in all its distinctive features as the one pure faith of the Gospel.' Moreover, the General Council, he says, is 'not yet prepared to declare itself in agreement with us [Ohio] on the "four points"'—Chiliasm, mixed communion, exchange of pulpits with sectarians, and secret societies."

WALTER KOENIG clearly and forcibly states the insufficiency of the Sunday-school and impossibility of Christianizing the public schools, so often advocated in our day, in the *Christian Herald*, May 8:—

"One thing is needful—there are many things valuable, but just one needful. A Christian who is such not merely in name has

no doubts about what that one thing is. Christian parents are theoretically unanimous that to neglect the moral and religious training of the child which has come into our home is inconsistent with our avowal that there is just one all-important thing in all the world; indeed, they agree that such neglect is fraught with dire consequences. Yet we need a reminder such as is given by the Rev. Richard Braunstein in the article alluded to, which is really worth reprinting.

“But how is this training to be done? Parents come in first for consideration. Does the little the parents can do meet the demands of the case? Many parents there are who feel their responsibility. They appreciate that to make a living is important, but to make a life is still more important. However, in the stress and swirl of the hurried days and the insistence of vocation, they can hardly find the time and leisure for systematic work on these lines, and many lack the ability. Then there is the Sunday-school. Yes; and it is the only religious instruction some children get. But what idea of the importance of the matter will be raised in the mind of the child who receives systematic instruction in secular studies for five or six hours five days in the week, and hears religious matters discussed just once during this period? The study of the Word of God is crowded into one corner of the week. Thirty hours for secular studies and one hour, or, rather, thirty to forty minutes, if the opening and closing exercises be deducted—one hour, let it be, for the study of religious truths, which are revealed truths, unknown to natural man. The sense of proportion is disturbed by such an arrangement.

“About a year ago, I spent some time at the Child Welfare Exhibit. There I saw—I couldn’t help seeing it—a large placard with the superscription: ‘A Short-Weight Education.’ Then: ‘Thirty minutes a week for religious instruction in Protestant churches. Instruction in mathematics offered in elementary and high schools, 1,067 hours, equivalent in time to 41 years of Sunday-school instruction. Instruction in writing, 364 hours, equivalent to 14 years of Sunday-school instruction.’ Then followed in large, bold lettering, ‘What Is to Be Done?’ With regard to Sunday-school, we cannot forget that, even with all the zeal our workers show, they themselves often lack the training that we require of our secular instructors.

“Can we look for help to our public schools? They are maintained by a general tax. All taxpayers, therefore, must have equal rights. What form of religion should there be taught? Immediately the warring factions are upon us. Jews, agnostics, Protestants, and Romanists, all have equal standing before our law, and there surely cannot be religious coercion of a minority. If anything is un-American that certainly is. The equality of all religious beliefs is

also evidenced by the fact that there are teachers in our public schools of all shades of belief and unbelief. There is not, and cannot be, any religious test. But as a father, I want to *know* under whose guidance my boy is during the greater part of his waking hours. Some urge that we should let our public-school teachers preach a creedless religion and morality; but as soon as you make a statement concerning God and righteousness, in fact, any manner of statement, you are voicing a creed. 'I have no creed,' said a woman, and thereby uttered the shortest of all creeds.

"The one deduction that came to me after reading Rev. Mr. Braunstein's forceful article was that under present conditions the only solution is found in the church-school. There seems to be no other way of giving our children, in the way of education, not only a lunch, but a dinner, a full-weight education! In my city, there is such a school with twelve teachers and a building worth \$20,000, maintained by our Holland friends of the Christian Reformed Church, the same denomination which responded so nobly to the plea for the China Famine Fund. The Episcopalians at some places also have such schools. The Lutherans have a still greater number — thousands of them throughout the land. A unique feature of the Lutheran schools is this, that about 80 per cent. of the teachers are men who have made teaching their life-work. The children of these schools have all the secular instruction that is afforded in the public schools, and, in addition, the study of the Word of God; and all instruction throughout the day is permeated by an avowed Christian spirit. I am acquainted with such a Lutheran school in this city, where, because the congregation is not rich in worldly goods, the building is very unpretentious, but where the results of the work of the two male teachers are simply grand, the scholars upon graduation entering the public high school without further examination, and where they easily rank with the best in their classes. The parents who send their children to this school say, 'We know that they can get instruction at other schools; but our children — God bless them! — ought not to be exposed to instruction that is totally divorced from the Word of God. Give them the best possible preparation for their citizenship in this world *and* the next! For a complete education, let there be a union of religious and secular work.'

"What a blessing it would be for the Church and the State, as well as for the individual, if, from the time when our children grapple with the intricacies of the A, B, C to the days when questions of Greek syntax and the fourth dimension loom up, they would be under the guarding and guiding influence of the Word of God and Christian inspiration!"

THE WELL-KNOWN EPISODE during Luther's visit at Rome, while he was mounting Pilate's staircase, has not been considered well authenticated. Preserved Smith, in his recent work on Luther, says: "If one may trust the story which Luther's son Paul remembered hearing his father tell," etc. (p. 19), and in a footnote he adds: "This celebrated story was first published in its original form in 1903. Köstlin-Kawerau I, 749. Paul was only eleven years old when the story was told (in 1544), and he wrote it down thirty-eight years later." Now G. Buchwald has found in an unpublished sermon of Luther, in the Ratschulbibliothek at Zwickau, the following remark: "Romae wolt meum avum ex purgatorio erlosen, ging die Treppen hinauf Pilati, orabam quolibet gradu pater noster. Erat enim persuasio, qui sic oraret, redimeret animam; sed in fastigium veniens cogitabam, quis scit an sit verum," *i. e.*: "At Rome I wished to redeem my sire from purgatory; I mounted the stairs of Pilate, and recited the Lord's Prayer at each step. For a belief prevailed that a person doing this would redeem his soul; but arriving at the top, I thought: Who knows whether it is so." The record does not say whether the text: "The just shall live by faith" flashed upon Luther while he was going up the stairs.

TAKING UP THE DISCUSSION begun by *The Lutheran* on the subject of popular Lutheran literature, the Augustana Synod's English periodical says:—

"We should not forget that the average church-member is not a college graduate nor a theological student. His mind is not trained along these lines. His interests are practical rather than theoretical. He needs and wants something that he can reach without a step-ladder, something that appeals to his affections and stirs his emotions. His intellect must be reached through his heart. And we need 'middle men,' as *The Lutheran* calls them, 'who will create a literature that lies between our standard books of doctrine, history, and biography, and the worthless writings of superficial men.'

"What difference does it make what Reverend A., or Professor B., or Doctor C., says or thinks? It is not they who need what we aim to bring. They are provided for. It is the *people* of the church. Cherish a brotherly love for this neighbor. Be prompted by the motive of doing him a real service. Say the things he needs to know. And say it in the language of his own daily life and thought. Then we shall have a literature that will really instruct and edify our Church."

A HUGUENOT ANNIVERSARY.—The recent celebration of the two hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the

Huguenot or French Protestant church of Charleston, S. C., was an occasion of unique interest. This church was not only the first church organized in the colony of South Carolina, but is the only Huguenot church remaining on this continent. Those who have seen its unpretentious structure have not failed to feel its historical interest and significance. It is a kind of Westminster Abbey of the Huguenot movement. Rev. Dr. Charles S. Vedder, who for forty-six years has served as its pastor, may be called the foremost citizen of Charleston. He is now in his eighty-sixth year. At the historic commemoration he gave an eloquent account of the founding of the church, sketching its progress and emphasizing the loyalty to faith of the early Huguenots, their power of sacrifice, their spirit of cooperation, and their devotion to the work of their church.—*The Lutheran Companion*.

DOODLEBUG.—This word is not yet in the dictionaries. It is what A. G. Miller of Asheville, N. C., proposes to call any one who is not a socialist and will not believe that the government can guarantee every man happiness and a competence.

AT A METHODIST GATHERING at Toronto, Ont., “almost every speaker upheld Higher Criticism as a valuable asset and a most distinct help to the understanding of God’s Word.” This drew from Robert Franklin, of Owen Sound, Ont., a protest published in the *Montreal Weekly Witness*, and forwarded to us by one of our students serving as a supply in the vast field of Alberta. From this reply we quote the closing words:—

“Now, what I want to know is this: If the Holy Spirit of God is our divinely appointed Teacher, to teach us all things, and to lead us into all the truth, where does science come in? I cannot find anything about science in the Bible, except where Paul warns the Christians about ‘The oppositions of science falsely so called.’ And that’s the truth in a nutshell. Modern science is opposed to the Word of God. The path for the Christian to-day is very difficult. Men of education to-day are blind to the eternal realities. They say they are seeking for the light. Well, the light is now at the right hand of God in heaven. God fully revealed Himself in that blessed Man whilst He was on earth. The Scriptures abundantly prove it. In John 1, we read, ‘He was the true Light, which, coming into the world, lighteth every man.’ (R. V.) His own words are, ‘As long as I am in the world, I am the Light of the world.’ Man made an attempt to extinguish that light by nailing Him to the cross, but it is shining all the brighter, and with far greater glory now; for has He not conquered death and all its powers? Any person that desires

light must look away from this earth to where the man Christ Jesus is. He is the Mediator now; soon He will be the Judge.

"The Christian should ask himself, not if science agrees with a certain passage, but rather, 'Hath God said and shall He not do it? He that believeth not maketh God a liar.' In the epistles we get the characteristics of this age: 'Men heaping to themselves teachers having itching ears, who obey not the truth,' etc. By and by the 'strong delusion' will be sent, and the whole world worshipping Antichrist. But before that happens, Christ will have come again for His beloved people, according to John 14, 1. 3 and 1 Thess. 4, 13, both dead and living. Beloved child of God, don't be shaken in your faith because some educated men with the title of Rev. Sir disbelieve God's Word; for the apostle speaks of 'Satan himself being transformed into an angel of light, and his ministers as ministers of righteousness.' 'Prove all things; hold fast that which is good!'"

It appears that Mr. Franklin is a layman.

LOVE VS. TRUTH? The book of President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, *From Epicurus to Christ*, has appeared in its sixth edition (since 1904), and under the new title *The Five Great Philosophies of Life* (= "the Epicurean Pursuit of Pleasure," the "Stoic Self-Control by Law," the "Platonic Subordination of Lower to Higher," the "Aristotelian Sense of Proportion," the "Christian Spirit of Love"). Hyde's reviewer in the *Princeton Theological Review*, Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr., says: "Our author misconceives the relation of love to truth. Love does not determine truth, but it should itself be according to truth. Orthodoxy may be loveless, (?) but Christian love must be orthodox. As Francis Bowen taught, 'Feeling must justify itself to some idea.' Hence, f. e., creeds are more important than President Hyde would seem to allow. It is in the truth which they define and guard that Christian love is rooted; and were they to pass, or in their essentials be modified, Christian love, while it would for a time continue, would begin to starve and at last would die."

LYMAN ABBOTT'S TRINITY.—In "Letters to Unknown Friends," in *The Outlook*, Lyman Abbott says:—

"No; I do not believe that there are three Gods. There is only one God. And they who imagine, as some seem to do, that the doctrine that there are three persons in one God means, or is thought to mean, that there are three distinct divine individualities or personalities, totally misunderstand the doctrine of the Trinity. I do not propose to try to tell you in this letter what is the doctrine of the Trinity.

I propose only to try to tell you how I think of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

"A friend of mine who knows much more about church theology than I do tells me that I am not an Orthodox Trinitarian, but a Modalistic Monarchian. I am quite indifferent to the labels which are given to me, and I make no attempt to label myself.

"There are three ways, and only three, in which any person can manifest himself to other persons: by his works, by the story of his life, and by his personal companionship. I ask a musical acquaintance of mine, 'Do you know Elgar?' 'Oh, yes,' he says; 'very well. I rank him as the first of living English composers.' 'Tell me about him,' I say. 'Is he a Protestant or a Roman Catholic?' 'Oh, I know nothing about that,' he answers; 'I know him only as a musician.' 'Have you ever seen him?' 'Never.' He knows Sir Edward Elgar by his musical compositions.

"Stirred by my inquiry, he goes to a musical library, takes down from the shelves a cyclopaedia or a book of biography, and learns about the life of Sir Edward Elgar—that he is a Roman Catholic; that he began his career as an organist in a Roman Catholic church; that he later became conductor of an instrumental society; that his later work has been that of a composer. Now he has a new acquaintance with Elgar, an acquaintance which throws light also on Elgar's music.

"Later he goes abroad. He gets a letter of introduction, presents it, is received at Elgar's house as his guest. The two are congenial, and he becomes Elgar's intimate friend. Now he has obtained a third and still better acquaintance.

"But neither of these methods of acquaintance alone is sufficient. If the maid in Elgar's house knows nothing and cares nothing for music, she does not know Elgar. If the writer of Elgar's biography has never seen him, he does not know Elgar. If the performer of his works has neither read the story of his life nor made his acquaintance, he does not know Elgar. To a real acquaintance with Elgar a knowledge of his music, acquaintance with his life, and personal companionship are essential."

This illustration Abbot uses in explaining the revelation of God by means of His works, the incarnation of His Word, and the companionship of His Spirit with man's spirit. The entire illustration breaks down before those texts of Scripture in which one person of the Godhead is introduced as speaking to, or about, another. Comp. John 5, 20; 15, 26; 17, 5. According to Abbot, the incarnate God

would there be speaking to the creating God concerning the witnessing God. In other words, A is speaking to A about A, or God engages in a soliloquy concerning Himself.

“*NE TEMERE*” APPLIED IN AMERICA.—*The Protestant Magazine* (vol. IV, No. 2), of Washington, D. C., publishes a facsimile of a baptismal certificate, the attending circumstances of which are related as follows:—

“A Roman Catholic Hungarian, of Perth Amboy, N. J., named Stephen Dagonya, was married on August 4, 1909, to Mary Csoma, a member of the Hungarian Reformed Church of the same city, by the pastor of her church, Rev. Louis Nanassy. In November, 1910, they took their little girl, Anna Susanna, to the Roman Catholic priest, Rev. Francis Gross, for baptism. When the father asked for the certificate of baptism, the priest declared their marriage was not a marriage, and that they were living in concubinage, but that it would become a marriage if the parents would pay him a fee of fifteen dollars and be remarried by him. The father replied that his marriage was valid and lawful according to the law of the State and his conscience, and he refused to remarry. The priest then wrote out a certificate of baptism in which he stated that the child was illegitimate, and that the parents were living in concubinage. A reproduction of the original certificate and the translation of the same appear as a double frontispiece in this issue of the *Protestant Magazine*. The translation of the vital part of the certificate follows:—

“On the sixth day of the month of November, in the year of our Lord 1910, in the church of the Holy Cross of Perth Amboy, Middlesex County, New Jersey, Diocese of Trenton, according to the rite of the Roman Catholic Church, I baptized Anna Susanna (illegitimate), born on the fifth day of the month of November, A. D. 1910, in Perth Amboy, New Jersey, of the father, Stephen Dagonya, Roman Catholic, whose place of birth was Kis-Varda (comitat Szabolcs), and whose place of living is ———; and of the mother, Mary Csoma, Reformed, whose place of birth was Patroha (comitat Szabolcs) and whose place of living is ———. The sponsors were Emericus Szlatenji, Anna Kecskes. Remarks: The parents are living in concubinage.”

The same periodical cites the following comment on the *Ne Temere* decree from the *Continent* (Chicago):—

“Protestant antipathy to the decree has been wrought up by something very different—by the meddlesomeness of priests who use the church’s law to break up homes in which Catholic wife or husband

has been married to Protestant husband or wife by Protestant minister or civil magistrate. Where care for morals exceeds zeal for formalities, such unions would be recognized as honest marriages making honorable homes. The sincerity of the contracting parties is the paramount consideration. Attempts to charge immorality upon such wedlock merely because it does not conform to technical church rules are socially disintegrating, and therefore intolerable from the viewpoint of the impartial citizen. The question becomes at this point not a religious, but a civic matter; and the state has the right, as is now proposed in Canada, to make it a criminal offense for any one to advise a husband or wife to desert a marriage duly legalized by the state."

It is time that an agitation be begun throughout the length and breadth of our commonwealth against this insulting piece of dago diplomacy from the Vatican. Any priest who dares to carry out the *Ne Temere* decree should be prosecuted for slander and sedition. The *Ne Temere* decree is revolutionary.

REVIEWING THE CATHOLIC CONTRIBUTIONS to the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, Willis J. Beecher says: "Whatever we may think of all the sweetness and light which Dr. McCarthy attributes to the Spaniards and the ante-Protestant English and others, in the part they took in early American history and in the founding of American institutions, this at least is true: that it is laudable for our Roman Catholic friends to busy themselves in looking up their history; that it is natural for them to interpret that history favorably, and from their own point of view as American citizens, and to go as far as possible in taking pride in it. They are doing this, and doing it effectively, and they deserve to be commended for it. They have schools through which to propagate their view, and bright, attractive authors who are infusing it into current literature. They are covering the country with monuments to early Roman Catholic missionaries and explorers. Meanwhile we Protestants are indifferent to our early American forefathers. We have no schools in which we can give instruction concerning them without first eliminating the distinctively religious factors that made them what they were. We leave them to be written up mainly by men and women who are agnostic in regard to the truths which were most potent in the minds of the Puritans and the Pilgrims and the Friends and the others who came early to our shores. We have ourselves to thank for it if the common opinion of the next American generation shall be that most of the early heroisms of the country were the deeds

of Roman Catholics, and that our distinctively American ideas and institutions are really, in the main, mostly of Roman Catholic origin. Our friends do not need to make any misstatements in order to make this impression. All that they need to do is to set forth in the light what is fine in their history, while we continue to treat ours with neglect, leaving it to the tender mercies of persons who are out of sympathy with it."

Catholic zeal along the lines indicated above deserves no praise, for it is not loyal to the truth. Protestant indifference may deserve to be scored, but even here allowance must be made. The facts of history are on the side of Protestants, not of Catholics. Protestants can afford to look on with calm composure, even with amusement, at the frenzied efforts of American Jesuits who are "writing up" their church: they cannot "write down" those stubborn things—facts. We admit, however, that this forbearance, begotten of self-conscious strength, has a limit. The Jesuits are poisoning the wells of public information in America. If they are allowed to continue, it will be impossible in fifty years to obtain true accounts of historical events from cyclopedias and text-books of history. Much perverted history has been printed in America, much good history has been suppressed during the last twenty-five years. The nation is being systematically duped by Catholic orators and writers when they cite history. The blindness of Protestants who do not see, the cowardice of Protestants who fail to resent, this assault upon truth, is even more deplorable than the indifference of Protestants who care not what becomes of them or their children when Rome will have won its wily game; for these latter would lose nothing, and might, for all practical purposes, belong bodily to the Roman Church now, without causing a great loss to Protestants or bringing great gain to Romanists.

"THERE IS ONE WAY TO PURIFY THE SCHOOLROOM, and that is to put Christ there; there is one way to keep pure the child mind, and that is to put him under the care of Mary, the Blessed Mother, with the Christ-child as his companion and friend. There is one education to-day which is complete, and the only one, and that is religious education, and it is that education that to-day we include in the group of Catholic charities."

The speaker was the Roman Archbishop of St. Louis, at the Conference of Catholic Charities on May 5. Christ—Mary—Rome! the ideal guardian triad of the child's school, yea, the only effectual one! This combination is as irreverent as it is bigoted. Christ only, and Christ all and in all,—this is the Scriptural rule. But a

collocation of incongruous elements, such as in the Archbishop's assertion, exhibits the cunning of Jesuitism. Christ is put in the foreground with great *éclat* and a fine show of truth; and then the lie is attached to it, and the old dragon's tail comes trailing after. *Mundus vult decipi; ergo.* The superficial listener is impressed with the first statement and fails to note that the second and third statements neutralize and annihilate the first. All the canons of the Council of Trent, now the supreme law of faith for Catholics, are constructed after this Christ-Belial fashion.

AT RABBI JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF'S BROAD STREET TABERNACLE (Philadelphia) a class for the study of the life and times of Jesus of Nazareth had been organized. Philip Sidersky, Superintendent Emmanuel Mission to the Jews of Baltimore, was attracted by a notice of the Rabbi's class, and, while on an official visit at Philadelphia, attended one of the meetings. The Rabbi had on his desk Thomas Jefferson's New Testament, a book by Arthur Drews, who was lately repudiated at a mass-meeting at Berlin, another book by Prof. Foster of Chicago University, who was expelled from the Baptist Church for heresy, and a book of Nathaniel Smith of Cornell, the critic of the New Testament. For an hour and a half the Rabbi regaled the Jews present with excerpts from these books. Then he invited any one present to put questions if they desired. None of the Jews putting a question, Mr. Sidersky asked the Rabbi what his personal belief regarding Jesus was. The Rabbi gave a very copious answer, the gist of which was that Jesus might have existed and gathered around Himself a number of uneducated people, like Coxie's army. Another question, whether the Rabbi's authorities were not contradictory, since Prof. Drews held that Jesus had not existed at all, while Prof. Foster held that a man by that name had lived, the Rabbi parried by saying it was getting late.—In introducing his books of reference, Rabbi Krauskopf made it a point to state what each had cost him. For Prof. Drews' he said he had paid \$3.50, which made a perceptible impression on the audience.

PASTOR JATHO, of Cologne, Germany, was declared heretical some time ago by his ecclesiastical authorities. He had been a friend of Harnack, and claimed that he had published Harnack's views. Harnack discredited the report, and in reviewing the sentence passed on Jatho's case, he now equivocates. This leads the humorous *Klad-deradatsch* to say: "Prof. Harnack has expressed his opinion of the finding of the committee that sat on the case of Jatho. He has expressed himself in such a comprehensive way as to represent Jatho's

friends afore and Jatho's enemies aft. He has expressed himself *protra* Jatho, namely, *pro* Jatho afore and *contra* Jatho aft. He has pramed the committee, namely, praised it afore and blamed it aft. He intends to inaugurate a torch-concert for the committee, namely, a torch-light procession afore and a cats' concert aft. In offering a toast for the committee, he will call for a *viveat*, namely, for a *vivat* afore and for a *pereat* aft. For he is an adhponent of Jatho, namely, an adherent afore and an opponent aft. He is a Jatho-crier afore and a Jatho-deerier aft." To appreciate the humor, the above must be read in the original:

"Er hat sich *protra* Jatho ausgesprochen, naemlich vorne *pro* und hinten *contra* Jatho. Er hat das Spruchkollegium gelodelt, naemlich vorne gelobt und hinten getadelt. Er will ihm eine Fackelmusik bringen, naemlich vorne einen Fackelzug und hinten eine Katzenmusik. Dabei will er dem Spruchkollegium ein *viveat* ausbringen, naemlich vorne ein *vivat* und hinten ein *pereat*. Denn er ist ein Anhegner von Jatho, naemlich vorne ein Anhaenger und hinten ein Gegner. Vorne ist er ein Jathorufer und hinten ein Neinsager. Darum ist er, was er sagt: Ja-nein."

These remarks are accompanied by a cartoon representing Harnack as a rope-walker. His balancing-pole is inscribed at the left end, "Liberal Theology," at the right end, "Orthodoxy." Bassermann, the Liberal member of the Reichstag, is represented as an interested spectator, and as saying, "As a rope-walker Harnack, after all, surpasses me."

LESSING'S FAMOUS "BREITER GRABEN" is thus reproduced by Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr.: "A supernatural and, therefore, historical and special revelation could not be accepted if it conflicted with the intentions and conclusions of our own reason; and yet if it merely agreed with them, it would be superfluous." This is the fatal dilemma which Lessing constructed against Christianity and the Bible. This old argument is reproduced in Robert Eucken's *The Truth of Religion*, the book that was awarded the Nobel prize in 1908. Dr. Greene considers Lessing's and Eucken's "broad ditch" an absurdity, and says: "To see it, we must stultify ourselves." He constructs this counter-dilemma: If there were not a sphere of truth that goes far beyond our reason, "man's mind would be 'the measure of all things.' In a word, the supernatural would be compassed by that which by its very nature necessarily presupposes the supernatural." This might also be expressed thus: If the Bible were not given by God, it could not be given by men. For men could not give what they do not possess.

THE WAR OF ITALY AGAINST TURKEY was sanctioned by the Pope. Norman Angell, writing in *International Conciliation*, says:—

“We know what preceded this war: if Europe had any moral conscience left, it would have been shocked as it was never shocked before. Turkey said: ‘We will submit Italy’s grievance to any tribunal that Europe cares to name, and abide by the result.’ Italy said: ‘We don’t intend to have the case judged, but to take Tripoli. Hand it over—in twenty-four hours.’ The Turkish government said: ‘At least make it possible for us to face our own people. Call it a Protectorate; give us the shadow of sovereignty. Otherwise it is not robbery,—to which we could submit,—but gratuitous degradation; we should abdicate before the eyes of our own people. We will do anything you like.’ ‘In that case,’ said Italy, ‘we will rob; and we will go to war.’ It was not merely robbery that the Italian government intended, but they meant from the first that it should be war—to ‘dish the Socialists,’ to play some sordid intrigue of internal politics. The ultimatum was launched from the center of Christendom, the city which lodges the titular head of the Universal Church, to teach to the Mahomedan world what may be expected from a modern Christian government with its back to eighteen centuries of Christian teaching.”

The last clause implicates the Pope, else it is meaningless. The censure is doubly just: 1) because the Pope has no business, if he is no more than a minister of Christ, to help start a war; 2) least of all, such a war.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA has rejected the Bill of the Hon. Mr. Basu, which legalized marriage between persons of different castes and religions. The *Harvest Field*, of Mysore City, deplors this action, and illustrates its reason by the following instance:—

“*The Indian Social Reformer* gives an example of how the law works at present. Some fifty years ago, a Sudra married a Brahman widow of sixteen, and she bore him eight children. In 1901, he repudiated the woman, who sued him for maintenance since he cast her off. The lower court maintained that according to Hindu law the marriage was illegal, and dismissed the suit. The High Court of Bombay has pronounced the marriage, if any, to have been sinful, and dismissed the appeal that had been made to it. Under existing circumstances it is impossible for persons of different castes or religions to become legally married unless one or both of them renounce

the religion to which they may belong. The injury generally falls upon the woman, who has no redress."

THE RELIGIOUS CENSUS OF INDIA, 1911, shows that since 1901 Christians have increased from 2,923,241 to 3,876,203; Hindus, 207,147,026 — 217,586,920; Sikhs, 2,195,339 — 3,014,466; Jains, 1,334,148 — 1,248,162; Buddhists, 9,476,759 — 10,721,453; Zoroastrians (Parsis), 94,190 — 100,096; Mussulmans, 62,458,077 — 66,623,412; Jews, 18,228 — 20,980; Animists, 8,584,148 — 10,295,168; minor religions, and religions not returned, 129,900 — 37,101. The total population increased 294,361,056 — 313,523,981, or 6.5 per cent. The Christians have reported the second highest increase per cent., as the following table shows:—

Jain	decrease of 6 per cent.
Hindu	increase of 5 "
Muhammedan	" 6.6 "
Buddhist	" 13 "
Animist	" 20 "
Christian	" 32.6 "
Sikh	" 37 "

THE OTHER REVOLUTION which has taken place in China may be inferred from these words: "The reputation of Christian missions is growing every day, and the prejudice and the misunderstanding which formerly existed between the Christian and the non-Christian have gradually disappeared, which will surely prove to be for the good of China." The speaker was V. K. Wellington Koo, a Columbia student, who has sailed for his native land to become "English-speaking" Secretary to Yuan-Shih-Kai. He was interviewed by clergymen in the interest of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational China missions.

PROF. DAVID S. CAIRNS, writing in the *International Review of Missions* and reviewing the political tension between Germany and Great Britain, points out what a European war would mean for missions. "There is no aggressive project of our missionary societies that would not feel the effect." "Everywhere throughout Asia and Africa men would be compelled to wait idly and see the great flood-tide that might have carried them into the harbor sweep past them and turn again to the fatal ebb."