

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.

MARCH, 1926.

No. 3.

Exposition of the Sedes Doctrinae of the Lord's Supper.

REV. W. J. SCHROEDER, Bonduel, Wis.

The words of institution of the Lord's Supper have, in the history of the Christian Church, been the subject of much controversy and dispute. Although it would appear that any one who peruses these words with an unbiased mind cannot fail to arrive at the one true intended meaning, nevertheless these words have been subjected to various interpretations, with the result that much scandal and dissension have thereby been perpetrated within the Church and that the minds of many Christians have been bewildered and confused. It strikes one as being rather strange that, in connection with these clear passages of Holy Writ, there has been such wanton deviation from the safe and sane rule of interpretation, *viz.*, that, in expounding Scripture, one must not depart from the plain, simple, common, and established meaning of the words in question unless there be sufficient grounds to warrant such departure. The reason for all such deviation in interpreting the words of institution of the Lord's Supper, however, lies in the fact that reason has ever been consulted as to the comprehensibility of the simple import of these words; and finding that the simple meaning of the words lies beyond the grasp of human reason, this meaning has been rejected, and the words have been interpreted according to the dictates of reason. Reason, however, does not furnish sufficient grounds for departing from the aforementioned rule; Scripture itself must make the deviation imperative. And thus, in seeming keeping with this requirement and in a vain endeavor to give a human fabrication the appearance of a Scriptural doctrine, other passages of Holy Writ have erroneously been regarded as the seat of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. As the Baptists have sought to give their false doctrine of Baptism Scriptural support from Rom. 10, 14: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" just so the Reformed church-bodies

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

“The modesty of Falstaff is quite as interesting as the modesty of the shrinking violet. There is, however, a distinction — a subtle difference, which is hinted at by the letter which Mr. Clinton Howard, of Rochester, N. Y., has addressed to the Holy Father. Not many men rise to fame on the strength of a single epistle; but the style of Mr. Howard is so individual that it could not escape its destiny of immediate immortality. There is an epic note in these lines: ‘Our people, wishing to be a sober nation, have put into their fundamental law a decree forbidding the manufacture, sale, and distribution of intoxicants used for beverage purposes.’ What an image is here of a noble, puissant nation spanking itself to sobriety with the help of a decree and an army of retainers — in which Mr. Howard is a kind of supernumerary and unofficial corporal! But the Iliad has its Cassandra, and the letter in question its moment of retrospect and prophecy: ‘As a friend of Catholics, as well as spokesman of many patriotic citizens, I am filled with deep regret in bringing to the attention of Your Holiness the fact that the seeming indifference, if not opposition, on the part of so many Catholics to the enforcement of our prohibition law has created a great deal of opposition to the Catholic Church and did much to call into existence the Ku Klux Klan.’ There is perhaps no effrontery like that of friendship, and, like the queen of France, most of us pray for protection against the inexhaustibly amiable. But the letter has a point, though not precisely the one emphasized by Mr. Howard. What right have the blurbs of partisanship to assume that Catholics are of one mind, either positive or negative, on a subject so wholly independent of patriotism as the Volstead Act? Many a prelate, cleric, and layman of the Church is outspokenly opposed to the manufacture and sale of liquor. But their reasons for this stand are quite different from the motives which have inspired that aggregation of the elect which Mr. Howard has codified for us under the name of the Klan. We ourselves hold that the time has come to distinguish, as intelligent men in all groups are distinguishing, between the constitutional amendment and the Volstead Act. We feel that the United States should not be hounded into legalized labyrinths, which are as absurd as they are baneful. But after all, no length of boot-straps will make Mr. Howard tall enough to insult the Catholic body. Having lectured and rebuked President Coolidge just before he assumed the rôle of adviser to the Pope, to-morrow probably he will address another letter to the President of the Modern Language Association, protesting the antiprohibitional mentality of scholars and professors. And before the week is over, he may remember to advise Santa Claus, in an ornate epistle, to avoid houses wherein the collars are not ‘soberly’ dry.” (*The Commonweal*, Dec. 16, 1925.) Here is sarcasm to the saturation point. The pity is that this whole miserable business has been made a church issue by Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, and others. The Protestant champions of the Volstead Act

do not seem to feel the shame of an appeal to the Pope to help them achieve what they have failed to achieve even with the aid of the anti-Catholic Klan. This episode must have been a rare treat for the Pope. The worst enemy of Protestantism could not have devised a more effectual means for letting Protestants make fools of themselves and then exhibiting them to the world in their plight than this scheme of making America bone-dry with the aid of Protestant churches. But if the outcome of this latest and humiliating episode should be, as the best men in the Church hope it will be, to take Protestantism out of politics, and especially out of this piece of politics, the price that has been paid for the lesson every Protestant has learned by this time will not be too great. Protestantism has a far greater battle to fight (and that may be soon) than with the poor "critters" who cannot keep away from liquor. The police can deal with them; the Church has greater tasks before it. DAU.

Three theories are offered for proving the end of the world as scientifically inevitable: 1. The atmosphere surrounding the earth is being exhausted, rendering life impossible. 2. Radioactivity accumulates heat that becomes lodged in the non-conducting crust of the earth and ultimately shatters our globe. 3. The entire solar system will coalesce into two stars: one, the sun as it now is; the other, all the rest of the planets, which, together with the earth, will be attracted by the Red Patch in Jupiter. This patch, observed some thirty years ago, is a new continent on that planet, which has come into existence with voracious and imperialistic proclivities. The last theory is by Prof. MacMillan of Chicago University. Before making a choice of these three, it is well to defer action, as more interesting and pleasing theories may be in the process of forming. In the mean time a study of the *μηδὲν ἐπιστάμερος* in 1 Tim. 6, 4 is in season.

DAU.

"*Del Beneficio di Giesu Christo Crocifisso Verso i Christiani*" is the title of a *trattate utilissimo* — so it presents itself — which is commonly mentioned as *The Benefit of Christ's Death*. It was distributed in thousands of copies in Italy about the middle of the sixteenth century and translated into different languages. It is mentioned in almost all trials for heresy conducted by the judges of the Inquisition and marked as the *liber perniciosissimus*. The owners and readers of it were at once suspected of cherishing the hated doctrine of justification by faith alone. Guericke, in his *Kirchengeschichte*, Wernicke, in his *Weltgeschichte*, McCrie, in his *History of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy*, p. 132, and others name Aonio Paleario, of Siena, as the author of this message of glad tidings. The *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, Vol. VI, p. 68, calls Paleario its probable author, but in Vol. VIII, p. 307, the title of his real book appears to be correctly stated: *Della Pienezza [= perfection], Sufficienza ed Satisfattione della Passione di Christo*. (We might remark here that the references do not agree as to orthography.) The authorship of *The Benefit of Christ's Death* is thus traced in Herzog's *Realenzyklopaedie*, Vol. IX, p. 542: "Aber

Ranke hat recht, wenn er nach dem *Compendium Inquisitorum* des A. Caraccioli vielmehr 'un monaco di San Severino' in Neapel als den Verfasser bezeichnet, wie dieses auch Carnesechi im Prozess tut unter Nennung des Namens seines Verfassers (Don Benedetto de Mantova) und wie dieses der Maertyrer Giovanni Francesco d'Alois aus Caserta bezeugt." Paleario may have unwittingly led historians astray by referring to his tract as his *Libellus de Morte Christi*. The Benedictine of San Severino, Benedetto, of Mantua, the author of *Del Beneficio di Giesu Christo*, was a disciple of Juan de Valdés, of Naples, who did much for the spread of the Reformation in Italy. Thus we are confronted with the agreeable fact that not only Benedetto bore witness of the Gospel in that Pope-ridden country, but also Paleario, who relates the following incident: "Being asked one day what was the first ground on which men should rest their salvation, I replied, 'Christ'; being asked what was the second, I replied, 'Christ'; and being asked what was the third, I still replied, 'Christ.'" He was martyred June 3, 1570.—The thousands of copies of Benedetto's tract were so thoroughly extirpated by the Inquisition that after thirty years none could be found in the original Italian. A single copy was finally found in Cambridge in 1853. Compare Kurtz, *Kirchengeschichte*, § 142, 23; Herzog, *Realenzyklopaedie*, Vol. XIV, p. 603; Williston Walker, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 423; Meyer, *Grosses Konversationslexikon*, sub "Paleario." B.

In view of the increasing lawlessness among the youths of our land, Dr. Chas. M. Sheldon, contributing editor to the *Christian Herald*, has proposed that in some form religion must be introduced into the public schools. In answer to this proposition the *Lutheran Church Herald* of December 15, 1925, says editorially: "It is to be a religion without theology, to which all men can subscribe. The only trouble is that such a religion does not exist and cannot be invented by any man. It is possible to agree on the main principles of ethics, and these are, in a way, taught in the schools and from a pagan point of view may be considered a religion; but it is not the Christian religion, which demands, without compromise, the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the only Savior and makes the claim that there is salvation in none other. The Christian religion is exclusive; it condemns all other religions and is absolutely unwilling to compromise with Jew or Gentile. It ought to be clear to any one that, if we are to maintain complete religious liberty and abide by the First Amendment to the Constitution providing that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,' we cannot adopt a state religion for the public schools. This Constitution is a contract we have entered into with all people in the United States, including the Jew, the Mohammedan, the Buddhist, and other religionists, not to infringe upon their liberties by forcing them to pay taxes to a school which, if the Christian religion were put into the public school, would condemn their religion and form of worship. We may say we are in the majority, and we are right, and therefore let us use our power

to force the true religion upon these benighted heathens. By so doing we would break our contract and agreement with them and also act contrary to the spirit of Christianity, which does not believe in using force and compulsion. That system has been tried, and we thank God that we finally have reached so far that we have discarded the Inquisition and also all attempts to make people religious by state law, enforced by military power and the police. Either we have to change our Federal Constitution, or, as long as this remains, we must look for some other solution of the educational problems confronting us. We believe that the Constitution, which guarantees religious liberty, the first one in the world to do so, should be defended, because it is right and safeguards for us and our children religious liberty. Let us thank God for our Constitution and be governed by it also in this respect. We cannot shift the responsibility of giving our children religious education over to the state. The Christian home and the Christian Church have this duty and responsibility. The state has given us freedom to build our religious schools and our churches and does not interfere with our exercise of this freedom. We have lately, in some States, asked that the public school give up some of its time for religious instruction, and this has been granted; but the churches have not availed themselves of this opportunity as much as they should. If some of our writers would discontinue holding up before the people the false hope that we can shift religious instruction over to the State (it would be cheaper, of course) and place the responsibility upon the Church, where it belongs, there might be some hope of arousing the churches to their duty and responsibility. In one of the current numbers of the *Lutheran*, in an editorial under the caption, 'Is Religion in the Public Schools Impossible?' the editor answers the question in the affirmative and proves his statement. He writes: 'In our free country and our free public school system we have inherited a condition that makes it impossible to give religion an adequate and proper place in our public school system. We may lament it and shed tears over it, but the fact remains that, if religion is to be taught, the Church, and not the State, must be charged with that responsibility. But it also follows that, if religion cannot be taught in the public schools, neither should the State permit anything to be taught that undermines faith in religion. However churchmen may differ as to his method and manner of argument, there is where the late Mr. Bryan stood on solid ground.'" Prof. J. Bodensieck, of Dubuque, Iowa, writes on this question in the *Lutheran Herald* as follows: "According to an Associated Press dispatch of October 25 [1925], President Coolidge declared in an address before the International Convention of Young Men's Christian Associations that control of the nation's youth from the home is preferable to attempting in some way constantly to increase the Government's responsibility for rearing children. This statement certainly is one of the President's wisest utterances. Every one knows that the present state of child-training is extremely precarious, that crimes committed by youths are increasing at a fearful rate, that vice and immorality taint many of America's young people,

and that we are drifting toward disaster. It has often been said that a course in religion introduced into the public school curriculum would undoubtedly help to remedy our present ailment. Large numbers of misguided, though well-meaning, enthusiasts insist on such a procedure, making every effort to influence state legislatures and municipal school boards in this direction. All these enthusiasts should note the presidential warning. The effort to introduce religious instruction into the public school tackles the problem at the wrong end. It shifts the responsibility for the breakdown of our youth from the home to the Government. The home is in the process of breaking down, hence the deplorable condition of our youth. The home must be reformed, and only when the home is doing its duty, will our youth recover. But the home will not recover unless the Church performs its share of the duty. When the churches neglect their own duties — and in this respect nearly all American denominations have most shamefully sinned — and calmly announce that it is the Government's business to train youth morally and religiously, is it not a sign of grave decay or spiritual weakness? Does not history teach us that churches which enter the political field do so when spiritual life is at low ebb? Are the churches of America really so impotent that they need a governmental subsidy to carry out their God-given program of child-training? Let the Church, also the Lutheran Church, awaken to its tremendous responsibility to its youth, and a reformation will come.”

DAU.

The American Legion, at its recent convention at Omaha, passed a series of resolutions which show that this body, too, once the paragon of martial patriotism of the type that disdains to ask any questions (“My country, right or wrong”) has come under the sobering influences of the ever-growing chain of facts which *post bellum* investigations are bringing to light. We in America especially are supposed to have gone into this war from a pure sense of justice; for since we were not attacked and did not mean to get anything out of the war, our only motive for entering the war was our highly developed and exalted love of right. Even at the time of our entering there was indeed much in the state of our home affairs that might have furnished a basis for discounting our disinterestedness in this undertaking, but there can be no doubt that among the rank and file of our promptly conscripted army there were not a few who honestly believed that they went forth to fight embattled tyranny and moral monsters. The whole world rushed to arms first and postponed thinking until later. The Legion, too, is in the contemplative stage now. The men at Omaha visualized once more the horror of what they had gone through and deprecated the war enthusiasm of parlor warriors and the heroic sacrifices of childless ladies, who were fervently offering up every American mother's son on the altar of our country. The “buddies” who came back from Flanders Field found that they were not considered as noble after the armistice as before; that their altruism was questioned or pitied; that their cause went begging in a nation which a few months previously had declared: Nothing is too good for our boys. Many of them found their fortunes

wrecked upon their return and themselves and their dependents billeted upon the charity of their fellow-citizens. They saw that, while they had staked all and lost a good deal, thousands of others had not only lost nothing, but grown enormously rich — so rich that they were able to finance another war soon, and were willing for it too. The scandals of war profiteering filled the hearts of the men at Omaha with bitterness. One almost hears them muttering in their resolutions: Never again. If another conscription is ever attempted, we shall see to it that the draft is made universal. — The strangest utterance, however, in these Omaha resolutions is this: "We urge writers and teachers of the youth of our land to inculcate in their pupils an appreciation, not only of our own national virtues, but also of those of other nations and races, and an understanding with, and sympathy for, their glories and ideals." One hardly believes his eyes while reading this — from the American Legion. Sanity has returned at last. The days are over when the old German couple could not go to service in safety; when they were told by Councils of Defense that they ought to be ashamed of worshipping a German God; when the agents of the Department of Justice bobbed up in congregational meetings, and no one really was certain that his neighbor was not watching him by order of the Government; when Krause pined over the fault that he could never correct, *viz.*, that his name was not Hamilton or O'Rourke; when everything must be made English as rapidly as possible. Lutherans in the Middle West, in particular, will not easily forget those days, nor that other Lutherans were ready to act as informers against them. Many will say to the American Legion: Forget it; the less you think of it, the better you will feel. It's a question though whether, with the lessons of the past that were drilled into him, one can forget and be a true American patriot and plan wisely for his dear old Church. DAU.

Santa Claus. — Catholics have not lost the opportunity to claim this saint and a rather corrected activity for him. In an article by A. J. Beck, in *America*, of December 12, 1925, we read: "Among the most popular of the early saints of the Greek and Latin Church is St. Nicholas, whose feast is celebrated on December 6. While venerated by various classes, the saint became the special patron of children. In Germany, Switzerland, and Holland he figures to this day as the purveyor of gifts to children on his feast-day. . . . He acts as a sort of advance courier for the *Christkindlein*, examining into the conduct of the children, questioning the parents, warning some of the little ones, and then distributing goodies and promising to the boys and girls with good records a further reward which the Christ-child will bring them at Christmas. . . . The American child now attributes the tree to Santa Claus, while German Catholic children expect it from the Christ-child. Some of us use the term 'Kris-kringle' as a synonym for Santa; in reality a corruption of *Christkindlein*. . . . Santa is perfectly unobjectionable — but in his place. That place is not the center of the Christmas-feast. He should be in the background, a minor actor in the great drama. The feast is Christmas, named for Christ, not 'Santa-mas.' . . . Here is a grand

opportunity for thoughtful, practical Catholics. They can 'Christianize,' as it were, this agent of materialism and secularism by telling the children of his Christian antecedents, by narrating the story of St. Nicholas, by using and calling for truly Christian Christmas-seals and -cards. . . . This will be a practical way of observing Advent, which is intended by the Church to be a preparation for the coming of the Christ-child. . . ." It would appear to us that the most practical way of really celebrating Advent, and the most effective method of keeping Christmas from becoming the "birthday of Santa Claus" and a festival of worldly gifts instead of the festival of the heavenly Gift, is to banish the "agent of materialism and secularism" entirely. The Christ-child can best be given His rightful place in the children's Christmas celebration if He is given the only place.

MUELLER.

Sacramental Wine and the Eighteenth Amendment.—The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue have issued a new set of regulations concerning the sale of wine for sacramental purposes. Although general in scope, the force of the regulations is directed against the sale of wine to Jewish users. Significant is the fact, which has often been commented upon, that wine for the Sacrament is not a beverage and therefore not subject to the restriction of the Eighteenth Amendment; and these new restrictions, as well as others and in other phases of the prohibition enforcement, are, furthermore, projected by a subordinate department of government which has not legislative power. Thus it is that we can share the concern of *America* (December 12, 1925), which writes editorially: "It is not well to subject our religious rights, with which the Constitution forbids the President, or the whole Supreme Bench, or the 531 members of the Congress to meddle, to the hazard of control by a group of underlings, who, as the usage goes, hold their office as a reward for partisan political prowess. That the Jews may have consented to the new arrangement does not alter the fact that it was made for them in a matter not included in the Eighteenth Amendment by officials who have no right whatever to rule on questions of religious duties and requirements."

MUELLER.

"Science and Health."—The cardinal principles of Christian Science, or Eddyism, dispense with, and oppose, the functions of the physician and all manner of therapy. As we read in *Science and Health*: "The ordinary practitioner, examining the bodily symptoms, telling the patient that he is sick, and treating the case according to his physical diagnosis, would naturally induce the very disease he is trying to cure." (p. 161, 24.) "The seeming disease, caused by a majority of human beliefs that man must die or produced by mental assassins, does not in the least disprove Christian Science." (p. 164, 18.) "Christian Science rises above the evidence of the corporeal senses." (p. 448, 12.) "A Christian Scientist never recommends material hygiene." (p. 453, 30.) "Man is not matter; he is not made up of brain, blood, bones, and other material elements." (p. 475, 6.) The appalling results of this teaching in many instances

are well summarized by Riley, Peabody, and Humiston, the psychologist, lawyer, and physician, who have recently published an effective refutation of the cult; *Faith, Falsity, Failure, of Christian Science*: "Let it never be forgotten that, to many thousands, Christian Science has meant the tragedy of needless suffering and premature death; and when helpless children have been similarly victimized, the crime is one that calls for retribution, swift and sure." (p. 262.) "From the medical standpoint, Christian Science, as a system of treating human ailments, is thus seen to be cruel *failure*. . . . The worst that should be said of it cannot be uttered, as mere words are wholly inadequate to depict the iniquity of this nefarious traffic in human life. Christian Science, shorn of its mask of religion, stalks forth the arch-demon of the medical underworld. The nearest to a true estimate of the value of this fake therapeutic agent is recorded only in the church-yard. Christian Science is an assassin of humanity. To every form of human misery it brings its one offering — arrogant, boastful, criminal ignorance. It obtrudes its hateful presence between suffering humanity and the only known means of relief. It supplants surgery with sorcery and tender solicitude with brutal neglect. With hostile mien it stands guard against curative medicine at the bedside of childhood while death strikes down the helpless babe. Christian Science is the advance agent of scourge and pestilence, the ally of smallpox and consumption, the confederate of appendicitis and typhoid fever, and the executioner for cancer and intestinal obstruction. Against every victory of scientific medicine, Christian Science makes angry protest." (p. 403.) Coming from authorities in their respective professions, this indictment of the external danger of Christian Scientism is noteworthy.

MUELLER.

Hesitating to Confess Christ. — In his sermon on this theme, in his new volume *Soul-winning Sermons*, Dr. R. A. Torrey, the noted evangelist, presents his treatment of those who hesitate to confess Christ; and the passage is worth quoting in these pages. After stating that he has "yet to find the first honest skeptic, infidel, atheist, agnostic, Unitarian, or Spiritualist who really wished to know and obey the truth, whom I could not show a way to find out that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Bible the Word of God," Dr. Torrey proceeds to give his method in an illustration: "There was a man in my congregation who was a constant attendant, but who had not publicly confessed Christ before the world. His wife and his daughter were members of our church, but he was not. One Sunday night as I was going out of the building, he stood between the two doors, and I stepped up to him and said, 'Mr. B., why are you not a Christian?' He instantly replied, 'Because I don't believe anything.' He went on to say, 'I do not boast of it as so many men in this town do, but I don't believe anything.' I said to him, 'Do you not believe there is a God?' Hesitatingly he replied, 'Yes, I believe there is a God; I have not quite given up faith that there is a God. I believe there is a Supreme Being.' 'Well,' I said, 'if there is a God, a Supreme Being, as you call Him, you ought to surrender your will to His. You ought to take your stand upon His will to follow it

wherever it carries you. Have you done that?" He replied, 'I am trying to live just as near right as I know how.' I replied, 'That is not what I asked you. I asked you if you had taken your stand upon the will of God to follow it wherever it carried you.' He answered, 'I have never put it just that way.' I said, 'Will you put it that way to-night?' He said, 'I will.' 'Now,' I said, 'do you believe God answers prayer?' 'No,' he said, 'I do not. I have lain awake nights thinking about that, and I have about come to the conclusion that God does not answer prayer.' 'Well,' I said, 'I know He does, but that will not do you any good. But you can find out for yourself. Will you pray this prayer, "O God, show me if Jesus Christ is Thy Son or not, and if Thou showest me that He is, I promise to accept Him as my Savior and confess Him as such before the world"?' He said, 'Yes, I will do that too.'" The speaker continues to say that within a week the man, who had honestly fulfilled his promise, made a public confession of his faith, united with the church, became active in its work, and fell asleep in faith. The passage concludes: "Do you doubt that story? Well, try it yourself; then you will have one of your own to tell. It has been tried by a countless multitude. It has never failed, and it never will; for Jesus Christ Himself says, John 7, 17: 'If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching whether it is of God or whether I speak of Myself.'"

MUELLER.

"The Revolt of Modern Youth."—This is the title of a new book by Judge Ben. B. Lindsey, of Denver, Colo. The famous judge, who is one of the originators of the Juvenile Court idea, is representative of the most advanced sociological ideas, which find expression also in this book. The author realizes the dangers threatening modern young people and speaks sound words in regard to the laxity of home influence, which is the foundation of most of these dangers. But the gist of his solution for the problem of the "revolt of modern youth" is: loosened standards and restrictions; more tolerance toward divorce, youthful indiscretions, and the breaking down of sexual morality; as *America*, of December 12, 1925, has it: "Briefly, his theory is that sin and disorder can be effectively checked by terming the one virtue and the other liberty." The author can do this because it is no longer necessary to gain moral sanctions from a higher law, but the individual case is the only guide for behavior; right and wrong are not absolute terms; in fact, they do not exist. God and His Ten Commandments are out of date for the modern social worker. The fruits of such teaching are already becoming evident. It behooves us to guard jealously our dependence upon our "objective standard of morality," as the above-mentioned editorial calls it, and be thankful that we may be dependent upon it.

MUELLER.

Bryan and the Bible.—The new biography of William Jennings Bryan which has recently appeared from the pens of G. F. and J. O. Herrich prompts us to cite a few more direct testimonies of Bryan which he made under fire on the witness stand to the sureness of his faith in Bible-truth. There were several points of weakness in

that testimony, such as the admission that the six days of the Creation were not six days of twenty-four hours, but "periods," of whose length he had no idea, Creation continuing "for millions of years." This instance was an unfortunate inconsistency in view of the general force of Mr. Bryan's replies to the caustic Darrow. To the sneering question concerning the story of Jonah and the "whale," Bryan said: "I believe in a God who can make a whale and can make a man and make both do what He pleases." *Question*: "You believe that the big fish was made to swallow Jonah?" *Answer*: "I am not prepared to say that; the Bible merely says it was done. The Bible says so. The Bible doesn't make as extreme statements as evolutionists do." Questioned with regard to Joshua and the standing still of the sun, whether "the men who wrote it thought that the day could be lengthened or that the sun could be stopped," he said: "I don't know what they thought. I think they wrote the fact without expressing their own thoughts. I believe the Bible is inspired and written by inspired authors. Whether the one who wrote as he was directed to write understood the things he was writing about, I don't know." *Q.*: "You believe the story of the Flood to be a literal interpretation?" *A.*: "Yes, sir." . . . *Q.*: "About 2400 B. C.?" *A.*: "That has been the estimate of a man that is accepted to-day. I would not say it is accurate." . . . *Q.*: "Do you believe that the first woman was Eve?" *A.*: "Yes." *Q.*: "Do you believe that after Eve ate the apple or gave it to Adam, — whichever way it was, — God cursed Eve and at that time decreed that all womankind henceforth and forever should suffer the pains of childbirth in the reproduction of the earth?" *A.*: "I will believe just what the Bible says. . . . I believe the Bible as it is, and I do not permit you to put your language in the place of the language of the Almighty. You read that Bible and ask me questions, and I will answer them. I will not answer your questions in your language." Other examples could be cited from the court record. In the words of the biographers: "Bryan's faith had been submitted to a test of fire. Men will judge according to their views as to which of the two mighty contestants won the advantage. Suffice it that the champion of revealed religion had had the courage of his conviction, that he had submitted readily to an inquisition by one of the keenest legal minds in the country." The purpose of this submission Bryan stated: "It is to keep these gentlemen from saying I was afraid to meet them and let them question me; and I want the Christian world to know that any atheist, agnostic, unbeliever, can question me any time as to my belief in God, and I will answer him."

MUELLER.

Another testimony against Higher Criticism has recently been published by C. C. Taylor, A. M., B. D., Professor of Historical and Systematic Theology in Phillips University, in his Old Testament study *The Purpose of God*. In a sensible and logical manner he summarizes, in the chapter on "Criticism," the flimsiness of the critical theory: "The basic principle in the critical theory, and the one that gave rise, seemingly, to the whole critical procession, is the claim that two documents can be traced in Genesis by the use of

the two names 'Elohim' and 'Jehovah,' and that this documentary hypothesis is further supported by differences of style even to the use of different vocabularies. The truth is that the word 'Elohim' is repeatedly found in the sections attributed to J, where only Jehovah ought to be found; also, Jehovah is found in sections attributed to E, where only Elohim ought to be found. The critics explain this by saying that at times the author used both names as occasion demanded. They thus surrender their own most vital contention; for this is the true explanation, that *Moses* used both words as occasion demanded. 'Elohim' was the name used for God in the most general sense — God of all the nations, Creator of heaven and earth. But as the God of Israel He was known as 'Jehovah.' In identifying Jehovah as the God of all the world, the words were combined in the phrase 'Jehovah God.' According to the argument of the critics, if a man was to write an article to-day, using the words 'God,' 'Lord,' 'Jehovah,' 'the Deity,' and like terms, the article would be declared to be composed of as many documents, written by as many different persons as there were terms used in reference to God. This, of course, is absurd. That almost any narrative can be divided into different documents has been illustrated by William Henry Green, by dividing the well-known parables, the prodigal son and the good Samaritan, each into two parts. On the similar ground of difference in style the Epistle to the Romans has been dissected into four parts as an illustration of the futility of this argument of the critics. Since any brief, simple narrative, whose unity is not questioned, can be similarly dissected, the argument based on this contention falls." (p. 282.)

MUELLER.

Archeological References to Joseph.—The new edition of Dr. Ira Price's book *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, among much other interesting material on practically every phase of the Old Testament, presents several interesting facts concerning Egyptian conditions, which shed light on the unusual and much-maligned story of Joseph. We see that the story of Joseph, even in its dramatic features, is possible and that the narrative is written with exact knowledge of Egyptian customs and practises. "The fact that Joseph shaved himself before appearing before the great monarch betrays the Egyptian origin of the story; for this custom has always been abhorred by Semitic peoples. . . . In accordance with known Egyptian court proceedings, he is formally installed as prime minister over Egypt. The seal-ring, or signet, presented to him was a stone, or flat surface, of gold, engraved for stamping upon soft material. . . . Tomkins calls attention to a remarkable one in the collection of M. Allemant. It is of black jasper, graven in intaglio on both sides. On the front there is a winged serpent and two Semitic signs; on the back a *Hebrew* inscription, dating from the Hyksos kings of the seventeenth dynasty. . . . Tomkins quotes de Rouge's description of Antef, prime minister (= first deputy of the king). Joseph's authority seems to be almost paralleled by that conferred on this prime minister. . . . The collar of gold with which Joseph was decorated was one of the marks of distinction among Egyptian

officials. He was also to ride in the second royal chariot of the king, and in his progress through the land a word, *abrek*, either Babylonian *abaraku*, 'ruler,' or Egyptian, 'attention,' was called out before him by a runner. . . . It is eminently plausible that a foreign Semite could have been promoted to the position of prime minister, if the ruling sovereigns were Asiatics and Semites, as the Hyksos probably were. That a foreigner would be promoted to a high position in Egypt during the Empire (1580—945 B. C.) is already attested. A similar case to that of Joseph is related in the Amarna letters, in which a high Egyptian official by the name of Jauhamu, a Semite, was made commissioner of grain storehouses at Jarimuta, which was available for Phœnician harbor cities." (pp. 177—179.) Concerning the famine: "Periods of distress of this kind had occurred on account of the failure of the annual rise of the Nile from prehistoric times. . . . There is a record of one famine which many, among them Brugsch, have identified with the time of Joseph. In a tomb at El-Kab an inscription of the governor, named Baba, states that he, in the great famine which came upon his people, dealt out to them grain which he had stored away in times of plenty. Brugsch says Baba lived about the time that Joseph exercised his office, under one of the Hyksos kings, holding office under the native king Ra-Sekenem Taa III in the old town of El-Kab. The only just conclusion is that the many years of famine in the time of Baba must precisely correspond with the seven years of famine under Joseph's Pharaoh, one of the Shepherd-kings."

MUELLER.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — "That unconscious hypocrisy which enables the Englishman to further his own ends and call it serving God," this is what Joseph Krutch says is the net result of Bernard Shaw's study of British character. It is to be feared that the trait extends beyond the confines of the British Isles.

Two instances of justice administered by a court: Spite of dexterous pleading the jury refuses to believe that the union between Rhineland and his wife, in whom faint traces of Negro blood had been discovered, is "unnatural" and refuses to grant a decree of separation. — At the Matteotti murder trial the Italian Court of Public Prosecutions, in advance of the actual trial in January, exonerates all the accused in advance of the charge of premeditated murder and thus rules out evidence that would be submitted at the trial.

The movement against military training at our high schools and colleges is nation-wide, now that a revolt has broken out at the University of Washington.

The plea for entering the World Court by the United States strikes some as a case of getting married with reservations and as being just as perplexing: you do not know whether the reservations are as binding as the marriage.

Alcide Ebray, a doughty Frenchman, who has written two books: *Le Crime de 1914-18* and *Chiffons de Papier*, in which he demolishes the once popular theories of war origins, now is out in a third book, *La Paix Malpropre*. An American reviewer renders the title of the last-named book "The Unclean Peace." "Unclean" is a fine euphemism.

It is suggested that the further publication of William Edward Hall's *Treatise on International Law*, now out in its eighth edition, be stopped, because the book has been filled with so many "patriotic" footnotes as to lose its scientific value. Says the *Nation*: "One could hardly gather from

the text or from the notes that a very considerable number of the so-called laws of war for the protection of neutrals were egregiously violated by the British Government in the late war, to the permanent injury of international law as a moderator of unrestrained force."

Histories for use in schools are now written as "intended for adolescents." The "unknown powers" within the animal man are exhibited in these histories.

"The net was cast into the vast sea of humanity, and I may say here that it fell to my lot to sit down on the shore and inspect it when John Alexander Dowie drew it to shore. Much of my time for years has been spent in separating the good and the bad." (From a sermon of Wilbur Glenn Voliva on June 14.) This is rather rough on poor Dowie, who cannot "talk back"; but it must have been highly edifying to the present members of the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion, who may consider themselves hand-picked.

The Dutch legation at the Holy See has been suppressed, because, says the *Commonweal*, "it placed a Catholic label upon a predominantly Calvinist people."

The Golden Rose has just been bestowed upon Queen Elizabeth of Belgium. When the late Empress Eugenie of France received it, she remarked that the gift, as a rule, did not bring happiness to crowned heads, and she may have been thinking of Queen Isabella of Spain, the Empress of Austria, the Queen of Naples, Queen Isabella of Portugal.

An extensive "Report of the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work," covering nearly four pages, partly in close print, in the *Lutheran* for December 17, 1925, gives a very illuminating digest of what actually happened at Stockholm and of the impressions which were made upon the reporters of the *Lutheran* by the action taken at Stockholm. It appears that in a retrospect the Stockholm Conference loses considerably in the estimation of some who attended it. The early period of gush and enthusiasm seems to be over, and the period of soberly viewing realities is beginning. This is a good sign. But it is no guarantee that some good Lutherans will not fall for the next deception that may come along.

Rev. C. H. Bernheim, concerning whom the *Lutheran* on December 17, 1925, says that he organized the Bethlehem Ev. Luth. Church in 1859, and that this was the oldest congregation in Florida belonging to the Georgia Synod, is the same person that became instrumental in introducing the Missouri Synod at Conover, N. C. He died a member of the Missouri Synod.

A native newspaper, under Catholic auspices, has been started in China to counteract Soviet influences. Two more are to follow.

At a meeting of college presidents the "prexy" of Dartmouth, famous in football, brought down the house when he said that he could avoid the subject of Dartmouth athletics because they spoke for themselves. . . . "Red" Grange has been sighed over, pitied, and denounced. But we doubt if any of the college presidents noticed a little item which appeared in an Eastern newspaper: "Mr. — is home with his parents from — college, where he is a stellar half-back. Having wrenched his knee in the game with —, he feels it would not be worth while going to school until next fall, when he can get back into the game." We wondered a little at the singular indifference of this hero to professors and credits until we showed the item to a friendly sports-writer. He told us he could get a hundred clippings to match. We really are most interested in seeing how long our *alma maters* are going to float the biggest bluff in academic history. We are scanning the horizon for an honest president who will say: "Gentlemen, the amount we expended this year on football was so much; the receipts were so much. The balance is therefore very encouraging." Nothing would be more likely to make a favorable impression upon the trustees. (*The Commonweal*, January 27.) It is common knowledge that the mainstay of athletics at our American colleges and universities are not the athletes among the students. These are always in an overwhelming

minority, and not infrequently they are imported and carry only a light schedule of studies to give them standing as students. But they are 1) the idle rich — a public nuisance in any place they infest —; 2) the alumni; 3) the boards of trustees, who want fame for their school at any price and from any source. With these people the real power of the university is the coach.

The *Osservatore Romano*, the official Vatican organ, is beginning to feel sorry for the Pope's "beloved son," Benito Mussolini, who wants to restore Rome to its ancient grandeur, with himself as the modern Caesar Augustus.

The forces opposing compulsory military training in our schools and colleges have been increased by the Interdenominational Student Conference at Evanston, Ill., the Cleveland Board of Education (against the advice of Newton D. Baker), the Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, in convention at Atlantic City, and by Prof. W. B. Otis, of the College of the City of New York. His resignation has been called for by the National Securities League. Militarists and "patriotic" organizations are becoming increasingly indignant.

DAU.
