

1-1-1934

Theological Observer. – Kirchlch Zeitgeschichtliches

Theo. Hoyer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hoyer, Theo. (1934) "Theological Observer. – Kirchlch Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 5 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol5/iss1/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Theological Observer. — Kirchl. Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Luther und die christliche Volksschule. In einem sehr lehrreichen Aufsatz, der in der „Kirchlichen Zeitschrift“ für Oktober 1933 erschien, handelt D. Neu unter der Überschrift „Luther und die Erziehung“ naturgemäß auch von Luthers Bedeutung für die christliche Volksschule. Einige Worte darin sollten mit Flammenschrift der ganzen lutherischen Kirche vorgeführt werden. Wir drucken hier den Paragraphen ab, um den es uns zu tun ist.

„Man sagt wohl, daß unsere amerikanische öffentliche Schule sich letzten Endes auf Luther zurückführe; aber der Satz ist doch recht gefährlicher Natur. Will man damit sagen, daß die allgemeine Schulpflicht, die wir haben, auf Luther zurückgeht, so kann das mit der aus obigem sich ergebenden starken Einschränkung in einem gewissen Sinn gesagt werden. Sonst hat unsere öffentliche Schule nichts mit Luthers Gedanken zu tun, und sein Urteil über sie würde ein scharfes, kritisches Wort sein; denn gerade das, was ihn bewogen hat, den Gedanken einer alle umfassenden Schule ins Auge zu fassen und anfangsweise durchzuführen, der Gedanke an die Pflicht des religiösen Unterrichts, ist in unserer öffentlichen Schule vollständig und prinzipiell ausgeschaltet. Gestehen wir nun auch gerne zu, daß unsere öffentliche Schule unter den Verhältnissen, wie sie nun einmal in unserm Lande sind, religionslos sein muß, und treten wir selber dafür ein, daß sie es bleibt, so erwächst uns daraus nur um so mehr die schreiende Frage an unsere Kirche, das heißt, an uns selber — denn wir sind die Kirche: Geben wir unsern Kindern die Schule, die wir ihnen als Nachfolger Luthers geben sollten? Geben wir ihnen wenigstens den Religionsunterricht in einem Maß, in einer Gründlichkeit und in einem Geist, wie es uns Luther bei unserm Wohlstand und unter unsern allgemeinen Bildungsmöglichkeiten als unsere heilige Pflicht ins Gewissen schieben würde? Es nützt kein Jubiläumfeiern, wenn man nicht wirklich gewillt ist, ins Selbstgericht der Buße hinabzusteigen, Gott um Verzeihung für alles Versäumte zu bitten und im Glauben an seine Vergebung ein Neues zu pflügen.“ A.

Chiliasm in the „Lutheran Companion.“— It was with regret that we read an article in the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod), in the issue of November 18, 1933, entitled „Signs of the Times,” written by Dr. J. H. Ford, which plainly teaches chiliastic doctrine. We quote some of the statements in this article. “From the Word of God we learn also that the present world systems are not permanent, but they are to give way to the theocratic form of government in due time. That time is quite clearly indicated, and it may not be so very far off.” “In the new world order the ideals and principles of Christ will be put into practical application, not only in the lives of individuals, but in the policies of government. Satan will be bound, whereas he at the present time has great power in the shaping of the policies and actions of the nations.” “The new world order is described in many places in the Bible, both in the New and in the Old Testament. It is spoken of by Peter as the ‘times of refreshing and the restitution of all things.’ In the Book of Revelation these times are briefly described as a thousand years of the

reign of Christ and of His saints. Christ Himself says that the times of the Gentiles will end and Israel as God's chosen people will again occupy a place in the sun. These are not theories, but facts, which anybody who will investigate can readily see." "In the mean time we are also watching and waiting for the coming of Christ and the new world order. This expectation was the blessed hope of Paul (Titus 2, 13) and of the apostles and of the noblest spirits in all the Christian centuries."

What lamentable confusion and departure from sound teaching do we not behold here! The writer holds that the thousand years of Revelation are still ahead of us, that Israel as God's chosen people will again become prominent, that the reign of the Gentiles will cease with the coming of the Millennium. Is this in keeping with the plain teaching of Christ when He says that His kingdom is not of this world, John 18, 36; and with that of the apostles, who declare that "we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God," Acts 14, 22? Was Paul looking forward to the millennium when he spoke of "that day" and the "appearance" of the Lord, 2 Tim. 4, 8? Article XVII of the Augsburg Confession here comes to mind, where the statement is made of the people submitting the confession: "They condemn also others who are now spreading certain Jewish opinions, that before the resurrection of the dead the godly shall take possession of the kingdom of the world, the ungodly being everywhere suppressed." How timely is not the warning uttered in the same paper in the issue of November 4, 1933, by Dr. A. Hult: "To add to confusion, Christians speculate more on the date of His coming than they live prepared for His advent, busy more with prophetic curiosities than with the fundamental simplicities and riches of saving Gospel-truth." A.

The Rosicrucians. — Answering the question What is the Rosicrucian Brotherhood? Rev. John P. Milton gives this answer in the *Lutheran Companion*: —

"The question is difficult to answer briefly and concisely, first, because there are several separated groups in this country that presume to use the name Rosicrucian, and secondly, because of the variety of subjects included within Rosicrucian teaching.

"The AMORC (Ancient and Mystical Order of Rosae Crucis), with headquarters at San Jose, Cal., and affiliated with the international order of the same name, claims to be the real organization. It insists on the term Rosicrucian Order and is essentially a fraternal organization. In many respects it resembles the order of Freemasonry, though it denies any historical or present connection. In the *Rosicrucian Manual* (1929) we are told that the order is 'primarily a humanitarian movement, making for greater health, happiness, and peace in the earthly lives of all mankind.' It claims to be a universal movement, including members of all lands and creeds, and therefore broadly non-sectarian in its religious principles. Like Freemasonry, it requires faith in the existence of God as 'the divine Ruler, Architect, Mind, and Father of all men, regardless of creed or doctrine.' It further claims to have members, including clergymen, in all denominations and that nothing in Rosicrucian teachings will affect the personal religious belief of the individual except to strengthen it. It claims that its real teachings are not to be found in book form in any country. In all these things we recognize its similarity

with the lodge religions generally. Yet in the 'Rosierucian Dictionary,' which forms a part of the *Rosierucian Manual*, previously mentioned, we find much that places the movement more definitely. It is a child of the mystery cults of the East, which have influenced all lodge religions and also such movements as theosophy. An essential doctrine is the teaching of reincarnation. It does not believe that there is a distinct created soul in each human being, but that there is only one soul in the universe, God's, of which an unseparated segment reincarnates itself from time to time in human beings. We recognize this for what it is, pantheism. The 'Rosy Cross' does not suggest the Christian cross, the cross of Christ, but is traced back to an ancient Egyptian symbol, a symbol of immortality and reincarnation. It has sanctuaries and sacred teachers in India and in Tibet and terms and teachings which plainly come from the same source. We see, therefore, how far removed it is from Christianity and how it antagonizes Christianity at every essential point. It shares all the anti-Christian features of ordinary lodge religion, with some more added from the mysticism and occultism of the East. How any professing Christian can belong to it would seem to be the greatest mystery of all. In passing this judgment, I am guided solely by what I have read in the *Rosierucian Manual* mentioned, which contains an approving preface by the 'Imperator' of the order, H. Spencer Lewis."

Continuing in a later issue of the *Lutheran Companion*, Pastor Milton discusses the Rosierucian Fellowship as follows: "The Rosierucian Fellowship, with headquarters at Oceanside, Cal., whose chief spokesman was Max Heindel, is somewhat different. It has countless books for sale, mostly by Heindel, and claims to set forth the real Rosierucian teaching in full. AMORC denies that his teachings are those of the Rosierucian Order, although it admits that he was a keen student of both theosophical and Rosierucian teachings under a private teacher. It calls his philosophy essentially Christian and theosophical; how both at the same time is another mystery! It is really a mixture of Christian terms, emptied of their original content, with the teachings of the Eastern occultism. The principal difference which he himself admits to exist between the teachings of the Rosierucian philosophy and the orthodox Church is in regard to reincarnation and the absolute individuality of each soul of man. We find thus that he shares the general Rosierucian teaching of reincarnation and of pantheism. Much more could be said to show how he empties the Christian teaching concerning the cross and the forgiveness of sins, even while using the terms and professing to defend them. Of the whole Rosierucian movement it can confidently be said that it is not Christian in the historical, evangelical sense of that term."

A.

Evangelical Synod Votes for Union with the Reformed Church in the United States.—When the Evangelical Synod of North America held its convention in Cincinnati October 3—10, it discussed the question whether it should, as had been proposed, join the Reformed Church in the United States, which formerly, before 1867, bore the name German Reformed Church. The result was that the convention voted unanimously to merge with this church-body. If the Lutheran element in the Evangelical Synod voiced any protest, it apparently dropped all resistance when the vote was taken.

A.

What does Protestantism Teach on the Seat of Authority in Religion? — Writing in the *Christian Century* of October 4, the Episcopalian B. I. Bell declares: "It is a fundamental principle, indeed the basic principle of Protestantism, that each individual Christian's own soul is the first, last, and sufficient guide and authoritative judge about truth or falsity, wisdom or lack of wisdom, in matters of faith and morals. . . . In consequence upon this principle every true, thoroughgoing Protestant minister is at liberty to believe anything, and teach anything, which he himself happens to think correct and to disbelieve anything, and fail to teach anything, which he does not happen to like. When we listen to a Protestant minister preach, it is the minister himself who is the authority. It is one man talking on the basis of one man's understanding. . . . This is not the conviction about authority on religion that was held by Christians for the first fifteen hundred years of Christian history, and it is not the conviction held by two-thirds of all Christians to-day. It is not the notion held by the Orthodox Eastern churches or by the Roman Catholic Church or by the Episcopal churches. It is strictly a modern, Protestant idea." The *Christian Century* should have added a few footnotes to the remarks of its contributor. It should have reminded him that most men are acquainted with the axiomatic saying: "The Bible, the whole Bible, nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestantism." Protestantism is so named because it protested against the usurpation of authority in religion by the Catholic hierarchy. It recognizes but one authority in religion, the written Word of God. It accepts that authority unreservedly. Did Dr. Bell never read the Smalcald Articles? "The Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel." That "true, thoroughgoing Protestant minister" who assumes "the liberty to believe anything, and teach anything, which he himself happens to think correct" can find little comfort in the Lutheran Confessions, which warn "against the enthusiasts, i. e., spirits who boast that they have the Spirit without and before the Word and accordingly judge Scripture or the spoken Word and explain and stretch it at their pleasure, as Muenzer did." (Smalc. Art.; *Trigl.*, p. 495.) Protestantism repudiates Muenzerism, which makes the individual the seat of authority in religion. Did Dr. Bell never read the Westminster Confession? "The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits are to be examined can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." (Chap. I.) Did he never read the Articles of Religion of the Episcopal Church? "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that, whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." (Art. VI.) In the face of these unequivocal statements a great amount of ignorance is required in order to produce the assertion that Protestantism places the seat of authority in the individual. It is true that many, yea, most modern "Protestant" theologians have superseded the authority of Scripture with their own authority. But these men have forfeited their right to be called Protestants. They are repudiating a basic principle of Protestantism. The Smalcald Articles put them in a class with Muenzer. Dr. Fosdick and his colleagues are

Muenzerites.—As to the Episcopalians, Dr. Bell has not classified them correctly. There are at least three kinds of Episcopalians. There are Thirty-nine-Articles Episcopalians, who believe in the sole authority of Scripture. There are Broad-church Episcopalians, who believe in the authority of the individual. And there are Anglo-Catholic Episcopalians, who believe in the dual authority of Scripture and of the Church. E.

Controversy in the Protestant Episcopal Church Continuing.—In the circles of the clergy of this Church a protest is making the rounds, which now has been signed by 2,112 priests. It is addressed to the House of Bishops and is directed against "celebrations of Holy Communion by ministers not episcopally ordained" in Episcopal churches. The protest reads, as reported in the *Living Church*:—

"We, the undersigned clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, desire respectfully to express to the House of Bishops our conviction that, with loyalty to the provisions of our *Book of Common Prayer* and of our canons and with Christian consideration for the consciences of our brethren in our own Church, our clergy cannot participate in celebrations of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper by ministers who have not had episcopal ordination, and we feel bound to state that, if celebrations of the Lord's Supper by ministers not episcopally ordained are permitted in our churches, this will precipitate a crisis in our own Church, will break the fellowship of our Church with the Anglican Communion, and will endanger the present hopes of Christian reunion."

A strange statement indeed! Not a word about disloyalty to the one rule of faith, not a syllable about endorsement given to erroneous teachings on the Lord's Supper by joining in a Communion service with people who are errorists with respect to the Eucharist. The reasons advanced against such communions are of a minor nature. Was it possibly the lack of unity among the Protestants which dictated such a colorless, feeble appeal?

A.

Modernism in the Protestant Episcopal Church.—One stands aghast at reading the articles which the *Living Church*, conservative Protestant Episcopal weekly, publishes in a series on "Liberal Catholicism and the Modern World" under the general editorship of Dr. Frank Gavin of General Theological Seminary. Before us lies the article written by Dr. F. C. Grant of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill., on the New Testament. Among other things Dean Grant says: "The sources of our faith are manifold and various. 1. Scripture is one source, culminating in the New Testament. 2. Tradition is another—a vital, living, and life-conveying factor, by no means something dead and lifeless, but including, for example, the personal influence of men of faith who hand on the tradition. 3. Still another source is private religious experience—the reaction of the individual to the tradition or teaching of the Church and to the personal handing on of it by those who believe; his response to the knowledge and illumination conveyed by the Scriptures; and then on beyond these the creative inner life of the man himself in a progressive and increasingly close union with God, with the will and the wisdom, the power and the love, of the Eternal. And there are still other sources in the rich and ever-renewed and inexhaustible, fresh, creative life of faith. The Christian religion does not require any one to go

contrary to his own experience either in faith or in conduct, *i. e.*, not contrary to what in popular language is called reason, or the conclusions we draw, the outlook we derive, from our experience. This has ever been God's way with man; else what was reason for, which God implanted in us as a guide through the mazes of conflicting sense impressions and of opinions, the latter but little removed, as Plato said, from the realm of sense impression?" "The question arises for those who have relied exclusively hitherto upon Scriptural authority: What is to take the place of the Bible now that Biblical criticism has weakened the foundations of its authority? For one who shares the Catholic view, even in a measure, the question is by no means as baffling as it is for the traditional Protestant, for the Bible has never occupied for him the supremely authoritative place it has held in Protestant theology and religious thought. The real authority for him is to be sought and found in the life of the Christian society; in the experience of the fellowship; in the long-continued and vitally continuous, and manifoldly various, and all-embracing, and patiently thought-out experience of the whole Church of Christ, reaching back in its origins to the very beginning of the Christian movement in history, back even behind the New Testament and its earliest sources, and reaching out to embrace all men everywhere in its universal appeal, drawing them ever closer to the heart of the Eternal." What more definite renunciation of the formal principle of Protestantism can one imagine? When people search for authoritative truth in the bogs of shifting human experience, it is not surprising to see that they discover as something divine the apostolic succession, the episcopate, and other remnants of Romanism.

A.

Does This Make It Unanimous? — *Our Sunday Visitor* is a Catholic weekly, published at Huntington, Ind. Under its banner head, over the signature of P. Cardinal Gasparri, it carries the Apostolic Benediction of the Holy Father Pius XI. In the issue of November 5 the Rev. John M. Riach, C. S. P., writes under the heading: "The Mass Is the Greatest Drama in All the World": "That 'life is a drama' is a platitude which cannot be denied. . . . Why is life a drama? Precisely, because it embodies the four constituent elements of the drama: conflict, characters, dialogs, and emotion. . . . Those four elements of the drama are all found in life, and it is our interest in the final unraveling of the plot which makes us love to be alive. Instances of this inherent love of drama in all stages of life could be specified galore. The fairy-tales of our children were really infantile plays, projections into the external world of the inchoate inner desires of our being. Who among us has not stood as tense spectator while the absorbing tragedy of *Punch und Judy* came to town? That was the theater of our long ago. All our games, too, are dramas translated into terms of athletics; for a stadium is but the stage for an intensive conflict of character, dialog, and emotion in varying degrees. Thus the list could be extended *ad infinitum*; our examinations at school, our fraternities, sororities, the competition of the business world, our daily intercourse with the world, the warfare of the soul to keep good, the signs, esoteric regalia, and theatrical ethos of secret societies,—all these things express in their own peculiar way the living fact that life itself is a drama and the most thrilling encounter in all the world. Every

one, therefore, is irresistibly drawn to the dramatic. It is the spice of life, and in its enjoyment are satisfied the innate desires of man. . . . It follows from all this that, if a certain religion claims to bear the hall-mark of divinity, it must appeal to the dramatic side in order to satisfy the whole man. This is precisely what the Catholic Church does. It satisfies first of all the intellect [?]; . . . in bodily worship it is no less satisfying, as the postures of kneeling, beating the breast, bowing the head, etc., etc., testify; and finally it gives full play to man's dramatic instinct because its pivotal act of worship, the holy Mass, is the greatest drama in the world. . . . These pages will be confined to a portrayal of the drama of the Mass, in order to show that it is a riot of pageantry, symbolism, and pantomime, in which no word, action, or posture is without meaning."—Yet, if we had said that the Roman Mass is a show, deliberately designed to appeal to the same instinct that seeks satisfaction in a Barnum and Bailey circus, we should no doubt have been taxed with irreverence.

T. H.

Anent the Union of Unitarians and Universalists.—The National Universalist Convention, meeting in Worcester, Mass., voted approval of the plan of affiliation already adopted by the Unitarian Association. Two changes were made. A theistic basis was added to the preamble. It was proposed that some other name than the Free Church should be sought, since this is vague, un-descriptive, and already appropriated by a minor denomination.—*Christian Century*. A.

A Spiritualist Fraud Uncovered.—Without comment, because none is needed, we reprint the account of Marcus A. Spencer, who, as correspondent of the *Christian Century* from Scotland, reports on a sensational trial in Edinburgh in which a medium figured.

"Great public interest was shown in our Edinburgh trial of a spiritualistic medium, who was sued for fraud as the result of one of her *séances*. The charge was that 'she did pretend . . . that she was a medium through whom the spirits of deceased persons were openly and regularly materialized' and that at the given place and time she 'pretended that what was visible and audible in the room was the spirit and voice of a deceased child named Peggy, the truth, as she well knew, being that what she did pretend to be the materialized spirit of the child was in fact a woman's stockinet undervest and that the audible voice was her own voice, and she defrauded the eight persons each of 10s.'

"The testimony was very interesting.

"Five of the eight people who had attended the particular *séance* agreed in their testimony that one of them had grabbed 'Peggy' during the 'spirit's' conversation with them. 'She' proved to be of soft, stretchy material and ripped in the scuffle; the lights were flashed on, and the medium was found behind her curtains, not in a trance, trying to put some article up her dress. She was forced to undress, and the ripped undervest was found on her.

"The defense was marvelous. None of those present at the *séance* was summoned. There were two chief witnesses. A doctor who said he had about sixty sittings with this medium described her as the most remarkable woman in Europe. He remembered an occasion when a piece of cytoplasm six feet long had come out of her mouth like a big snake, had

wobbled about with immense rapidity, slung itself around his neck, and lifted him clear off his chair! Another time he had seen the medium sitting on an easy-chair with no body from the hips downwards! The fiscal (prosecuting attorney) produced the undervest mentioned in the charge and asked him, 'You would not say that was an ectoplasmic garment?' 'No,' he replied; but he hastened to maintain that extraordinary things happened with Mrs. Duncan (the accused) — he had seen her shoes and stockings taken off and thrown at him!

"The other chief witness was a Mr. Oaten of Manchester, president of the International Spiritualist Association, the editor of a paper dealing exclusively with psychic research. He was asked during his testimony how many spiritualists there were in Great Britain just now. He answered that there were 16,000 or 17,000 actual members of spiritualist societies, and he computed that 100,000 to 120,000 people assembled at spiritualist meetings every Sunday evening.

"After a two-day hearing and a week to formulate his opinion, the judge found the charge proved. The crowd assembled to hear the verdict were mostly women who had waited in the rain outside for an hour to gain admittance. They were apparently deeply interested in spiritualism; some of them sat bowed in prayer before the judge came in. The lawyer for the defense asked for a light sentence because the accused had an unemployed husband and a family of eight dependent for income upon her obtaining sitters at *séances*. He reminded the sheriff of the tremendous faith which thousands of people had in Mrs. Duncan and asked him to impose a penalty which would shake the faith of these people as little as possible.

"The sheriff imposed a fine of £10, or a month's imprisonment. On leaving the dock and passing in front of the bench, she turned to him and said, 'God forgive you!'"

Sixty-Five Years' Service in New York Pulpit. — Rev. G. U. Wenner, New York's oldest pastor in active service and holder of the longest continuous pastorate in this country, announces that he has no intention of retiring from the pulpit of Christ Lutheran Church, New York City, which he founded sixty-five years ago, despite the fact that the congregation there has been unable to pay him any salary during the past two years. — *Christian Century*.

Dr. Haldeman Deceased. — "Dr. I. M. Haldeman, eighty-eight years of age and for nearly fifty years pastor of the First Baptist Church, Borough of Manhattan, City of New York, has passed to his reward. Despite his failing health and ebbing strength great congregations constantly waited on his ministry. His amazing primacy in the pulpit was not due to the fact that he pandered to popular taste, for his preaching ran counter to the prevailing ideals of the day and unsparingly condemned every departure from God's Holy Word. His uniqueness as a preacher consisted in his brilliant eloquence, his extraordinary knowledge of the Bible, and his profound and unshakable convictions. New York City being a Mecca for the people of the world, multitudes of strangers sought out this far-famed preacher and carried back to their homes the extraordinary story of his remarkable ministry. While the pulpit was his throne, many books and countless pamphlets came from his busy pen and

threaded themselves to the ends of the earth. Dr. Haldeman was too much absorbed in the deeper things of God to be a good mixer and a hail-fellow-well-met. If he was not active in denominational life, it was not because he lacked the convictions, the courage and the consecration of an old-fashioned and thorough-going Baptist." So writes the *Watchman-Examiner* reporting the death of Dr. Haldeman, which occurred September 27. As we think of this sturdy Fundamentalist, we thank God that even in circles where doctrine is much vitiated by rationalism the divine Savior is exalted.

A.

II. Ausland.

Chinese Government More Favorable to Religious Instruction in Schools. — The usually well-informed *Fides Service* reports a very important statement of the Chinese Minister of Education under date of November 25, 1932, as the *Chinese Recorder* for September, 1933, informs us, by which the former inimical attitude of the Chinese government to religious instruction in educational institutions is completely reversed. In the interest of freedom of conscience and of Christian education one can only hope that the report is well founded. The statement is said to contain the following paragraphs: —

"There is one thing more — the question of religion. Whether or not religion deserves to be fostered is a question apart; however, since religion actually exists in society and wields an influence both universal and profound, it becomes a question most intimately connected with that of education.

"It is evidently impossible, therefore, so far as education is concerned, not to have a definite policy of one kind or another as regards this question. A destructive policy of intervention, such as was formerly adopted, is clearly not a proper way of dealing with the matter. The present *laissez-faire* policy is not good either; for, while it recognizes the religious liberty of the individual, it simply ignores the influence of religion upon education.

"For this reason it is necessary that we adopt, in accordance with the ends and aims of education, a radically different attitude towards religion, so that religion may not only not obstruct the national revival, but may be of actual assistance to it. This Department, therefore, after having reviewed in detail its aims and methods in the readjustment of national education, desires in passing to clarify this point regarding the administration of education and the question of religion."

A.

Development of the Turkish Language. — All friends of Christian missions are interested in everything that will make Turkey more accessible to Christian missionaries. Repeatedly during the last years mention has been made of attempts on the part of the Turkish government to make its language a more fit and pliable instrument, removing difficulties formidable both for natives and foreigners. A correspondent of the *Christian Century* has this to say on the latest developments in this field: "The past few months have brought us nearer a reform which, if it is carried out, will probably count as one of the most remarkable in the world. It is the attempt fundamentally to reform the Turkish language. Every textbook will tell students of Turkish that what is generally understood by

that language is a compound of Turkish proper, Arabic, and Persian. If the text-book is rather old, it will add that Arabic and Persian grammar rules are allowed to interfere. But what in most cases it will omit to say is that to nine Turks out of ten written Turkish is incomprehensible. When the gazi decided to remedy this state of things by clearing the Turkish language of its foreign components, he had two objects in view. One was to sever the connection with the Oriental past, since for the perfect knowledge of Turkish a thorough study of Arabic and Persian has, as a rule, been necessary. The other was to create a really popular language, accessible to all. To this end the whole nation was called to cooperate. For about one year there has been a passionate hunting for Turkish words, both in Turkish folk-lore and literature and, to some extent also, in imagination. The yield has been extraordinarily rich. Over 100,000 words are now submitted for examination, and from these the new Turkish language is to evolve. Like most changes in Turkey the simplification of the national language, too, has been something of a natural progress. The gazi's intervention represents the will to accelerate this evolution and to make it radical. The compilation of the new Turkish dictionary is very likely to be a monument of human work; but much more important and also much more difficult will be its practical enforcement. Meanwhile old expressions are ejected, and new ones are borrowed from the French. The result is that Turkish papers are filled with words which a Turk, according to his knowledge of French, may or may not understand, but which in no case he has the possibility of looking up in any of the existing Turkish dictionaries." A.

Mrs. Besant Deceased.—The *Christian Century* reports: "Annie Besant, who had identified herself with India as perhaps no other Britisher, died on September 21 at the advanced age of 84 at Adyar, near Madras, the world headquarters of the Theosophical Society. The universal tribute paid to her by all classes of people is a recognition of the unique services [?] she had done for India. She first appeared in India as an advocate of theosophy. Though theosophy as such has made but little progress among the religions of India, the able [?] way in which Mrs. Besant defended the religious beliefs and practises of Hinduism against what she and India considered at the time as the onslaughts of Western Christian missionaries appealed to the popular imagination.

"The esoteric practises and associations of Annie Besant culminating in a famous court case about the custody of the Brahmin boy Krishna-murti, who later became the so-called 'world-teacher' of theosophy, brought Mrs. Besant and theosophy under a cloud. From that date, as if to regain the influence she had lost with the people of India, she threw herself heart and soul into Indian politics and worked for India's freedom. She was responsible, before Mr. Gandhi came on the Indian scene, through her home-rule movement for India, for awakening nationalism and directing it along channels of persistent agitation and propaganda. For the earnest and devoted work she did for the political emancipation of India Annie Besant will be ever remembered in this country."

That Mrs. Besant was a bitter enemy of the Christian religion and that she is now facing the Judge whose truths she here denied is something which should be added to complete the account. A.