

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.

JULY, 1926.

No. 7.

What Is Faith?

REV. O. C. SCHROEDER, Cleveland, O.

In a recent issue of a well-known magazine an article described the faith of Bishop Brown, the Episcopal Modernist, as mental content regardless of its basis. It proclaims the acceptance of such views as a complete separation of religion and dogmatism, giving the freethinker the same standing in the Church as the orthodox Christian. Furthermore, it denies the ability of the Church to define the term "faith."

Such views are in harmony with Modernism. However, religion and dogmas cannot be separated any more than heat and light. Correct dogmas are necessary to create correct faith. If one has an erroneous dogma, false faith and a life displeasing to God will follow as a natural consequence. For example, a Catholic has an erroneous dogma about saints; therefore he has an unwarranted faith in the power of the saints and commits wrong acts in worshiping the saints. To have faith in the mercy of God because of the merits of Jesus and to lead a God-pleasing life, it is necessary to believe in the Christian dogma of Christ's divinity.

Mental content is not a guarantee of a God-pleasing faith. Many people are egoistic enough to live in perfect content regardless of God's Word. Their mental, physical, or material advantages create in them a superiority complex resulting in mental content. They may experience this satisfaction in spite of the fact that they live in error and have ideas of decency which are not even in conformity with social ethics.

Moreover, it is a ridiculous statement to accuse the Christian Church of inability to define the term "faith." Christianity has a definite declaration as to the elements which constitute faith. Our Lutheran Catechism defines it in the following manner: "To believe in God is to know and to accept as true what the Scriptures say of God and with firm confidence to trust and rely in God."

To have faith, it is necessary, in the first place, to know God's

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

With the completion of the July issue the managing editorship of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, by resolution of the editors, temporarily passes over to Prof. W. Arndt, of Concordia Seminary, to whom all editorial correspondence will kindly be addressed hereafter.

DAU.

A most interesting exhibition of the character of the Missouri Synod and the many and varied activities in which this body is continually engaged is planned by the first "Lutheran Exposition" which our brethren will inaugurate at the Sherman House, Chicago, October 9 and 10. Strangers will find it very informing, and our own people will behold in it an excellent publicity effort, that deserves to be studied.

DAU.

A timely warning was expressed to the graduating class of the Pittsburgh Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church, May 6, by Dr. John McNaugher, president of the institution, as quoted in the *Presbyterian* for May 20: "The immediate risk to which you are exposed is the popularized evolutionary view of religion and the subtle and multiplying attempt to rob our creedal Gospel of its root essentials and flatten it into the barren dogmatic and ethic of an attenuated theism. . . . A half-way Christology is outlined, in which the virgin birth of Jesus, His miracle-signs, His vicarious sacrifice, and His physical resurrection disappear, and we are soothed with the deliverance that these and other subtractions can be made, and the residue of the evangel will still have a perfect soundness for moral and spiritual uses,—all of which is equivalent to conceiving that an egg can be good in spots. As for radical, Simon-pure Modernism, it is but a thinly veiled Unitarianism and is rotten from the floor to the roof. Between its bloodless categories and the orthodoxy in which you have been reared there is an unbridgeable gulf, one that no geometry can measure." The *Presbyterian* sees encouragement in this utterance for a union of the faithful members of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and the United Presbyterian Church. MUELLER.

Princeton Theological Seminary, which is well known for its determined stand against Modernism, announces several changes in its faculty, as stated in the *Presbyterian* of May 20, 1926. Dr. Clarence E. Macartney had been elected to the chair of Apologetics and Christian Ethics, but declined. Dr. J. Gresham Machen, at present assistant professor in the Department of New Testament Literature and Exegesis, was thereupon elected to the chair, and he has accepted. Dr. J. Ritchie Smith, seventy-four years of age, who recently celebrated his golden jubilee of ordination in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, has resigned from the chair of Homiletics, and Dr. William B. Greene retired from the chair of Apologetics and Christian Ethics, which he had held for forty-three years. Recent gifts have made possible the establishment of a chair in the field of Christian Education.

MUELLER.

"The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man."—Dr. Cadman, president of the Federal Council of Churches, recently spoke to thirteen thousand people in a week of meetings in Ohio and Indiana sponsored by local Federations of Churches. As he spoke to Jews, Catholics, and Protestants and for the purpose of uniting them religiously, his key-note had to be the above time-worn phrase. The *Presbyterian* of February 25 offers a keen analysis of Dr. Cadman's position: "From a natural standpoint the Bible declares that God made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth. . . . But even in the civil sense, men are not one brotherhood. . . . God did not create the human race to a dead monotony. . . . He offers to save all men to the heavenly home and eternal, glorious brotherhood. But here, in all their earthly relations, He made them to differ. . . . To speak, therefore, to the citizens of the United States as civil or national brothers is sound and true. . . . But he addressed them as religionists, and in that sense they were not brothers. They had not the one God or Father. There is a sense in which men may become brothers regardless of their national or racial distinction, that is, by entering into the kingdom of God. The only entrance into this kingdom is by being born again by the Holy Spirit and the washing of regeneration in the blood of Christ. . . . This brotherhood is found in all nations and kindreds and tongues upon the face of the earth. It is this kingdom Dr. Cadman opposes and ignores, and it is this fatherhood and brotherhood which Dr. Cadman in his address grossly ignores or misrepresents. If Dr. Cadman were speaking for himself, he would not be overstepping his personal and civil rights. But he was not speaking for himself, but as the representative of the Protestant evangelical churches. The Jews do not believe in salvation by trusting in the blood of Christ and through the new birth by the Holy Spirit. They despise them. The Roman Catholics believe in both, but not as final and exclusive. Dr. Cadman was simply declaring that evangelicals believe as the Jews and the Catholics do, or the difference in their faiths is insignificant. . . . Is it not time that the evangelical churches should seek some other organization as a common meeting-place [than the Federal Council]?" Which proves that "aloofness" is not always bigotry. MUELLER.

Executive vs. Prophet.—An article in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* of April 8, 1926, by John C. Leffler, discusses some difficulties and insufficiencies relative to the ministry to-day. The writer points out that, on the average, the American ministry occupies an economically satisfactory position. But he raises the question, "Is there intellectual starvation?" He makes the charge: "We take the new facts of philosophy, economics, sociology, and psychology, and catalog them cleverly and correctly; but we do not seem to possess that mental acuteness and thoroughness that goes deep into the underlying bases of knowledge, testing for truth or fiction, and understanding its meaning for human life." *Especially in gaining new knowledge, in reading good new books, in keeping up with the better and more valuable periodicals, the ministry seems deficient.* "The fact of the matter is that we cannot talk or write of things of the Spirit,

about which we do not know so much. . . . To know the 'Infinite Presence' requires days and years of patient investment in time, frequent moments on one's knees, and many an hour of vision with the Bible before him while God's voice speaks to the soul." "*The sad part is that this spiritual power is the primary thing the ministry ought to be giving to men. . . .* The prophets dealt with social sin, economic conditions, internal politics, and international relations powerfully and timelessly because they started with the sense of God in their hearts and spiritually discerned His will for men. . . . More ministers, that we realize, read their Bibles only when in search of some jumping-off place for the inevitable Sunday sermon." As causes for this spiritual and intellectual insufficiency among the clergy the writer proposes, first, too much organization. "Even the humblest servant of the Church finds himself deep in the burdens of executive responsibility. . . . In the mad whirl of program-planning, what becomes of creative thinking and spiritual insight?" The second reason is given as "*too much talk, too many meetings.*" Meetings discuss much of little positive value. Education is on the plan of "equipping the largest number of men in the shortest possible time," and "thoroughness of study and independence of inquiry and thought" are not taught. The third reason is "overloading the minister," "lay inactivity." "The average church not only expects a man to preach twice on Sunday and call faithfully upon its members; it expects him to be a wizard at finance, a genius for organization, a 'good mixer,' a civic leader, reformer, 'whoop-er-up man,' and general errand boy for all the organizations of the church. . . . *God never meant a man to be a prophet on Sunday and a Jack of all trades during the week.* The early Church soon found that out and specialized thereafter in its ministry." The helpful article concludes with the advice to leave matters of organization and externals to the laymen and give the minister opportunity for *meditation and devotion*. "Only in hours of thought and devotion is born the message of God to men."

MUELLER.

Fosdick's Progress. — When, after the storm of discussion which Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick's liberal utterances created, the Park Avenue Baptist Church of New York City called him to its pastorate, the Doctor made five conditions upon which he would accept: Baptist rites and doctrines should not be insisted upon; the salary should not exceed \$5,000 annually; the professorship of practical theology at Union Seminary should be continued; membership in the church should be open to all who "accept evangelical Christianity"; and a large, new church should be erected near Columbia University. (*Time*, May 25.) The first four of those conditions are not surprising or sensational to those who understand Dr. Fosdick's attitude toward religion; and the fifth also agrees with the knowledge which we have of his business ability. Plans have been announced for the erection of this church at Riverside Drive and W. 122d St. It will seat 2,500; its nave will be 100 feet wide; it will have a bell-tower, 75 feet square at the base and over 300 feet high, containing 53 bells, the memorial of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to his mother. Funds are covered by

the price of the present property, which will net \$1,750,000, and an equal amount guaranteed by Mr. Rockefeller, with various other offers if needed. The congregation preferred a churchly edifice (of Indiana limestone and steel; Allen, Collens, and Pelton architects) to the "skyscraper" type which Dr. Reisner is erecting as his "Broadway Temple."

MUELLER.

Catholic Leaders from Catholic Schools. — The leading editorial of *America* in the number of February 20 vigorously opposes the "somewhat curious view . . . that Catholic leaders of the past have been drawn, for the most part, from non-Catholic colleges and universities, and that in these institutions the leaders of the future must be sought." Arguing from the historical side of the question, it is stated: "If we close the time-period at about 1912, it will be discovered that practically every Catholic leader in this country was the son of a Catholic college. Those who have gone forth from our colleges since that date have not yet had time to prove their leadership or lack of it." From the "*a priori* point of view" the argument continues: "Paul was a persecutor, and Augustine was given to courses which do not ordinarily fit for Catholic leadership; but in the providence of God both became great captains of God's people. However, God does not ordinarily effect His purposes for man by extraordinary means. It follows, then, that we act without reason when we look for Catholic leaders among young men and women trained under a system which at best is not approved, but only tolerated, by the Church. . . . The Catholic leader . . . is something more positive than a man who has not been mortally wounded by the science, literature, and philosophy of a system founded on the principle that education need not concern itself with God and His revelation. . . . The secular school may teach where God's children are not to be led, but that knowledge is not sufficient. . . . No one can be a real Catholic leader who has not learned to know and love genuinely Catholic ideals. . . . Experience and reason alike indicate that the non-Catholic school is a prolific source of Catholics indifferent to the interests of the Church and of Catholics weakened or ruined in faith and morals." The Lutheran Church also needs leaders. And it has also been making some "experiences" with the results of secular schooling. Irresistible logic points to the necessity for Christian training and education, whether elementary or higher.

MUELLER.

A Mason's Worship of God. — "Every one who takes the obligation of Masonry recognizes the need of gaining an understanding of God," writes Herbert Bonham, 32d degree Mason, in the *New Age* for May, 1926, a Masonic organ. "The desire for good is the first response of the human to God. Desire becomes hope, and hope faith, and faith, understanding or knowledge of good, its conscious possession or realization. . . . How are we to know God aright? God cannot be found in matter, for God is a Spirit, and those who truly worship Him must worship Him 'in spirit and in truth.' The fact is that because God is Spirit, man, who was made in His image and after His likeness, must necessarily be spiritual. Therefore, to know

God is to know man. [!] . . . In coming to the knowledge of God, we come to desire that the will and the nature of Infinite Good, Spirit, Truth, Life, and Love may be expressed in us and may be actively manifested in the affairs of daily life. That is why, when once we receive the knowledge of Him, we receive at the same time the power which makes us the sons of God. . . . To see God is to know Him, and to know Him is to experience His reign of harmony. . . . Masonry comes to lead men into the understanding of the one great God, — Life, Truth, and Love, — which unites all in one grand union, where laborer and capitalist are working together; but each one is laboring to protect the other. We can believe anything or hold any opinion we wish, but we can know only one thing, and that is the truth. . . . To declare that man walks with God is identical with saying that man reflects and manifests the divine nature." According to the writer, worshiping God is leading a life of Truth and Love, "reflecting and manifesting the divine nature"; and this is made possible by the brotherhood of Masonry. The logic upon which this deduction is based is precarious, to say the least; the result of the argument certainly brands it as false. History and experience prove that those who have tried hardest to "reflect God" have had to acknowledge themselves sinners the soonest; and those who have been most complacent in their "relation to God" have had the least enviable character. The one element of true worship, the true "worship in spirit and in truth," the writer has forgotten and cannot admit, namely, that it must be worship in Christ Jesus, the Redeemer. Two things, then, stand out clearly: Masonry tries to be a religion, to establish a relation with God, to worship God; and it does this without Christ, "believing anything or holding any opinions," and contrary to Christ, by striving to be righteous and true of man's own power. The article again proves that Masonry is, after all, pure naturalism.

MUELLER.

Doctor. — "Once upon a time the title 'doctor' meant a man who knew his subject so thoroughly that he could teach it successfully. To-day it may mean a person whose chief characteristics are patience and perseverance." Thus *America* (Jan. 16, 1926) introduces an editorial on "Doctors and Teachers." "He has learned many new things, possibly, but now and then a doubt obtrudes itself. What is the value of what he knows, to himself or to any one else? Much of it may be knowledge that no one ever had before. But that is the knowledge of the country lad who overturns an old log in the woods and watches the familiar types of bugs readjusting themselves to the new environment. It is new, but what is it worth? Have the student's years of research broadened his mind? Have they sharpened his power to observe and generalize? Have they enabled him to use new force in rousing in his pupils a love of learning and culture? . . . Reviewing the work of the year, the Dean of the Graduate School at Columbia concludes that many students work for the doctor's cap, not because they love learning, but because without the doctorate they are debarred from the higher positions in the academic world. Colleges ask for doctors and are content when they can present an imposing

array in an academic procession. Not so often do they demand teachers. The doctor was once a doctor primarily because he was able to teach. Now he is supposed to be able to teach because he is a doctor.”

MUELLER.

Jewish Youth. — The *Sunday-school Times* (Sept. 12, 1925) quotes Dr. S. Benderley, Director of the Bureau of Jewish Education, as follows: “During recent years we have begun to realize that the Jewish youth is drifting away from Jewish life. Fear is seizing us lest, when we go, the younger generation will neither be prepared nor willing to assume the responsibilities at present borne by us Jews.” Of half a million Jewish boys and girls in this country between the ages of thirteen and twenty, 450,000 are entirely out of touch with Jewish thought and life, that is, out of the synagog. “In other words, each year they become of age, the Jewish community receives a large number of Jewish young men and women who have no knowledge of Judaism, who have no attachment whatsoever to the synagog, and who are totally ignorant of, and have no sympathy with, any of the Jewish problems confronting us of the older generation.”

MUELLER.

More on “the Revolt of Youth.” — Some sentiments on a recent book by Judge Ben B. Lindsey on the problem of modern youth have appeared in this column. The *Christian Herald* (Feb. 6, 1926) also comments upon the Judge’s discussion of the subject. The editorial says: “The Judge’s hopefulness will hardly seem encouraging when one reflects upon the ease with which crime is accomplished nowadays. The outlook seems to point in another direction. The Church has lost, in part, its former hold upon youth, and the loss of faith constitutes what most thoughtful students of the situation must regard as the greatest of all impediments in the way of proper adjustment. It must be admitted that up to the present time the problem of the “Revolt of Youth” has not been appreciably solved by any of the experts who have undertaken the task. It is too deep and too high for them. It needs another interpreter, one perhaps who takes a wholly different view of the lost sheep and who, with the true spirit of the faithful Shepherd, is ready to face any peril or make any sacrifice to save the straying ones and win them back to the fold.” That means that the youth of to-day needs instruction in the Word of God and true Christian guidance on the part of both parents and pastors.

MUELLER.

A Biologist’s Opinion on Birth Control. — The *Churchman* of March 27 publishes without comment an address given by Prof. Julian S. Huxley, the well-known biologist of Oxford and grandson of Thomas Henry Huxley, on the problem of birth control from the biologist’s viewpoint “in the most dispassionate way possible, as if we were people from some other planet or biologists studying the habits of some lower organism which interested us, but does not concern us directly,” as the speaker states his position. The professor feels that “equalization of the practise of birth control among the different classes” of society is a necessary solution to the problem of

increasing population. The point of view of the biologist is to regard "humanity not old at all, but simply in the adolescent period." It is necessary for humanity, since there is no prospect of changing the deep-rooted instinct of reproduction, "one of the numerous inheritances from our animal ancestry, which we have somehow to cope with," to regulate by "some sort of voluntary limitation" the quantity and quality of its population. "Upper classes should somehow be possibly prodded into having larger families than they have at present," and the slum classes should be given information on methods of limitation. The speaker also faced the moral aspects of the problem, saying that he did "not want to pose as an expert." The biologist tried to balance the racial and the individual side of marriage, the latter with its physical and spiritual sides. Hereditary taints and destructive practises already in vogue were arguments produced for birth control in this connection. The speaker felt that evil conditions, such as promiscuity and indulgence, could not arise, since "the greater frequency of birth control practise will make both the physiological and psychological side of marriage far healthier"; and "what we must do is to inculcate right ideas and right feeling." In general, after birth control is introduced, "the task remains . . . to construct new standards on this basic point of view which shall be adjusted to no less high standards of general morality than those of previous ages."—These principles, ready to undermine race integrity and good conscience, are the things taught our youth in secular colleges and universities.

MUELLER.

Church-Membership of Members of Congress.—We are indebted to the *Watchman-Examiner* of March 25 for this information on the church affiliation of our Congress: Sixty-seven Senators and 273 Representatives are Masons; three Senators and four Representatives are Knights of Columbus. Four Senators and twenty-nine Representatives are Romanists; eighty Senators and 344 Representatives are Protestants. Thirty-two Senators are Methodists; twenty-one, Episcopalians; ten, Presbyterians; seven, Congregationalists; five, Baptists; the others scattering, with twelve unaffiliated. Fifty-four of the Representatives are unaffiliated; ninety-seven are Methodists; sixty, Presbyterians; fifty-eight, Episcopalians; forty-six, Baptists; thirty, Congregationalists; twenty-two, Christians; eighteen, Lutherans.

MUELLER.

On his way home from a political mission and a lecturing engagement in America the Japanese editor Zumoto, at a banquet in Honolulu, related this story: "In Los Angeles, after a very hearty dinner given by the Chamber of Commerce, I found it was hard to speak, so I reached for the Bible which was next to me and opened it at a place which happened to be one of the most beautiful stories in the whole book, where Jesus washed the disciples' feet, a story which inculcates the cardinal virtues of humility and service. I do not think it is possible to find a better example in any other religious book. I merely made a little story out of this in the address I gave at the Civic Club next day. Toward evening that day I had an interview with a local newspaper writer, and before we began to sit down, he

showed me a copy of what he had written about the luncheon, and he showed me the story of this Bible story. He had turned the whole story upside down! He said that Christ had His feet washed by the disciples! I thought that rather strange, coming from a Christian, and told him so. He said, 'Is that so? Well, I did not know it!' He telephoned to his office and found that the story was just going to press. The city editor had not seen anything wrong in it either!"

DAU.

Prof. William Bateson, F. R. S., of Cambridge, died recently. He was a frank advocate of Mendel's theory of the origin of man and maintained that no new thing can ever be added to the living organism and that the changes of the process of evolution are due to the loss of factors which for a time inhibited the operation of others. "His colleagues saw as clearly as he did that this led to a position difficult to hold; and it was said by one wit that, on Mendelian lines, Adam was only a modified amoeba, and by another that the process from the amoeba to Adam was merely that of taking out one safety-pin after another." (*The Commonweal*, March 10.) Nevertheless this scientist rejected Darwinism and Lamarckism. He denounced the attitude of those who preach certainty in science where there is no certainty and "have taken on themselves the responsibility of giving to the ignorant, as a gospel, in the name of science, the rough guesses of yesterday that to-morrow should forget. Truly, they have put a sword in the hand of a child." In his chief book, *Materials for the Study of Variation*, he clinches his argument on the discontinuity of nature by a reference to 1 Cor. 15, 39: "All flesh is not the same flesh; but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds."

DAU.

Smoking and Scholarship.—Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O., has conducted a scientific research, based on investigation and statistics, among its own student-body on the relation of smoking to scholarship. "Of 23 men dismissed from Antioch last year for low scholarship, 20 were smokers. This fact bears upon all the following statistics. As the poorest students are dropped, the average grade of the remainder is higher. If most of those dropped are smokers, then the smokers remaining in college are a selected group who are less affected by the association of smoking with low scholarship. Were it not for such elimination, the scholarship of smokers would appear still more unfavorably. . . . An average grade of 3.2 was required of students. The average grade of 176 non-smokers last year was 3.51; that of 177 smokers was 3.14. . . . Heavy smokers have lower grades than light smokers. . . . Smokers who 'inhale' have lower scholarship than those who do not. . . . Smokers remaining in college steadily fall in scholarship; non-smokers maintain a nearly uniform average. With these figures before us (details have not been quoted), it is hard to avoid the conclusion that smoking is actually a cause of mental inefficiency." (*Sunday-school Times*, Feb. 13.) MUELLER.

An "Astounding" Document.—The German government has for some time been publishing diplomatic documents. In *Die Grosse Politik* (Vol. 19, II, No. 6220) is found the report of the late Ger-

man emperor to the Foreign Office on the Treaty of Bjoerko with Russia in 1905. The *Nation* (May 26) republishes an excerpt from the Kaiser's report under the caption, "The Kaiser's Happy Day," and calls it "one of the most astounding documents that have seen the light since the peace," evidently because of the God-fearing spirit in which the document was written. Anything of the type of old-fashioned faith in the ruling of Divine Providence is "astounding" to papers like the *Nation*. Here is the excerpt:—

"And now that it is done, one is surprised and says: How is such a thing possible? The answer is very clear to me! God has ordered and willed it thus; in despite of all human wit, in scorn of all human intrigues, He has brought together what belonged together! Well, His ways are other than our ways and His thoughts higher than ours! What Russia refused through pride last winter and what she tried to turn against us through love of intrigue, that she has now accepted as a gracious gift, after the terrible, hard, humiliating hand of the Lord has brought her low. I have thought so much the last days that my head is growling in order that I may be certain to do this right, always to keep in mind the interests of my country and no less the monarchical idea in general. Finally I raised my hands to the Lord above us all and committed all to Him, and I prayed that He would lead and guide me as He wished; I was but a simple tool in His hands, and I would do whatever He would inspire me to do, no matter how difficult the task. And finally I also uttered the wish of the Old Dessauer at Kesselsdorf, that if He did not wish to help me, He should at least not help the other party. Now I felt myself wonderfully strengthened, and the will and purpose grew firmer and more determined within me: 'You will put it through, no matter what the cost!' So I awaited the interview with great confidence.

"And what did I find? A warm, amiable, enthusiastic reception, such as one receives only from a friend who loves one heartily and sincerely. The Czar threw his arms around me and pressed me to him as though I were his own brother, and he looked at me again and again with eyes that revealed his gratitude and joy.

"The next morning I opened my book of pious mottoes, and I found the following text: 'Every one shall receive his reward according to his work.' Full of hope I entered the boat, which brought me to the yacht of the Czar, the treaty in my pocket. [The Czar complained about France and England and asked, "What shall I do in this disagreeable situation?"]

"Now I felt the moment was come. . . . 'How would it be if we, too, should make such a "little agreement"? Last winter we talked about it. . . .' 'O yes, to be sure, I remember well, but I forget the contents of it. What a pity I haven't got it here.' 'I possess a copy, which is just accidentally in my pocket now.' The Czar took me by the arm, and he drew me out of the saloon into his father's cabin and immediately locked all doors. 'Show it to me, please.' At that his dreamy eyes shone brilliantly. I took the envelope out of my pocket and unfolded the treaty on the writing-table of Alexander III. . . .

He read once, twice, three times the text you already know. I prayed a short, fervent prayer to the dear God that now He might stand by us and guide the young ruler. It was silent as death; only the sea murmured, and the sun shone clear and happy in the comfortable cabin, and immediately before me lay brilliantly white my yacht, the *Hohenzollern*, and high in the air the Kaiser's flag was streaming in the morning breeze. I was just reading the words on the black cross of that flag: '*Gott mit uns*,' when the voice of the Czar next to me said: 'That is quite excellent. I quite agree.'

"My heart beats so loud that I hear it; I pull myself together and say carelessly: 'Should you like to sign it? It would be a very nice souvenir of our interview.' He scanned the paper again, and then he said: 'Yes, I will.' I opened the ink-well and reached him the pen, and he wrote with a firm hand 'Nicholas.' Then he handed the pen to me, and I signed. When I arose, he clasped me into his arms, deeply moved, and said: 'I thank God, and I thank you; it will be of the most beneficial consequences for my country and yours; you are Russia's only real friend in the whole world. I have felt that through the whole war, and I know it.' The clear water of joy stood in my eyes, — to be sure it also ran down my forehead and my back, — and I thought Frederick William III and Queen Louise, Grandpapa and Nicholas I were close at that moment; undoubtedly they looked from above, and all were surely full of joy!"

DAU.

New Archeological Field Operations. — Dr. Melvin Grove Kyle, of Xenia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., is at present in Palestine, as has been announced to MONTHLY readers, where he is conducting excavations on the site of the Biblical Kirjath-Sepher, or "Booktown," of Joshua. Preliminary work in March determined that Dhaheriyeh, which is customarily given as the site of the historic city, is not the location, but rather Tell Mirsim, five miles from it. A great valley well bearing the marks of great antiquity, such as ropes against the stones, was found a mile up the mountain from the "tell," or rubbish-heap, marking the ruins. Another well, not so large, but equally as deep, still giving water, was found a mile below the tell. Within the circle of these two wells is some of the most fertile land in Palestine. These data are sufficient to establish the location of Kirjath-Sepher, since they correspond exactly to the terms of the marriage portion of Caleb's daughter as recorded Josh. 15, 18. During one visit to these ruins there were seen the tops of pillars sticking out through the rubbish, which appear to be the remains of an ancient "high place"; and further excavations are expected to reveal valuable things. The expedition is now on the ground and is reporting interesting features day by day. — Dr. Kyle, writing in the *Sunday-school Times* for May 22, 1926, comments also on new finds in Egypt, where Dr. Reisner has opened a tomb in front of the Great Pyramid, finding probably a resting-place of a relative of the builder of the Great Pyramid. Another recent find gives a chronological story on a tombstone of a civil official of ancient Egypt. This chronology relates that the man served under Seneferu and Khufu and a king of the Fifth Dynasty,

three men who up to this time had been considered as reigning in three separate dynasties, hundreds of years apart. The importance of deferring the establishment of a final chronology relative to Biblical history is apparent in view of such finds. MUELLER.

Demetra Vaka (Mrs. Demetra Kenneth Brown), in a very instructive lecture on European affairs during and after the late war, stated that the Turks consider Mustapha Kemal a very suitable leader because he combines in his political make-up "the patience of the Jew, the calmness of the Turk, and the perfidy of the Christian." Close contact with the affairs of Greece and with Constantine and Venizelos in particular, her knowledge of Turkey and its people, her presence when diplomats were assembled to discuss ponderous questions regarding the welfare of nations, qualified her in a marked degree to tell about the political maneuvers of representatives of so-called Christian nations and how Turkish diplomats, among them Mustapha Kemal, did not fail to note these machinations. The greed for the Mosul oil-wells played a very important rôle in this soulless drama. And so the Christian name, in the opinion of the Turk, is now associated with the term perfidy. This perfidy of the Turk does not greatly perturb us, but the warped notion of those Christians who insist upon calling the men engaged in the political game of a national or international character representatives of Christian nations does indeed nettle us greatly. Let them bear in mind that, in the political game of poker played with the Turk, these men have attached to the Christian name that term of obloquy. Will they now rise in arms and promptly divorce all politics from the Christian name and Church? No, they are incurably Calvinistic and papistic in their views regarding the relation of Church and State. They are still expecting the dawn of the day when the name of Jesus Christ shall be emblazoned on the banners, and inserted in the constitutions, of the nations. B.

A certain **Mr. M. K. Andrew** perpetrates a beautifully artless piece of criticism in the *Islamic World*. Who this Andrew is is not stated by the reviewer of the *Calcutta Modern Review* (February, 1926), but evidently he is a Mohammedan. Read and snicker: "The dogmatic Christianity of the Church cannot be a true religion from God, because its very teachings imply a suggestion of sin to the pure, innocent minds of the children. To preach Christianity among children means to induce them to commit sin, of which they are so far unconscious. We cannot say to a child: 'You are sinful and a bond-slave to Satan because you have come out of your mother, who conceived you in sin.' These words are sure to upset the simple mind of a child. Hearing these, he cannot possibly have any idea of self-respect or any veneration for his mother." We are not told how it comes about that motherhood is a more exalted state in Christian lands than it is in Moslem countries. But Islam takes a superior view of human nature and believes in the innocence of childhood. We quote the writer again: "Now, in comparison with that let us take the case of Jesus. In the first place, he did not marry, nor did he beget any children. Therefore he had no oppor-

tunity of experiencing the filial love. The life of Jesus is absolutely devoid of pathos and sentiments connected with the family hearth. His mother was the only nearest relative with whom he had to deal; and his treatment of her, as reported in the New Testament, is not commendable. He is said to have addressed his mother with these words: 'Woman, who art thou? What have I to do with thee?' This mode of speech is surely far from being polite and civil. I do not know how Jesus would have treated his children had he got any. But from his treatment of his mother he seems to be a man of very peevish and irritable nature."—Bibles and New Testaments are making their way into Islamic countries in large numbers nowadays, but the author of the above evidently has not yet purchased his copy in the bazaar street of his native village.

Communicated by *Rev. E. H. M.*, Vadakangulam, South India.
