captious critic require? "And does it then all come to so simple a question as that?" our critics may ask. Yes, on its practical side it is as simple as life itself is simple, that life which we live every day without understanding its why or wherefore. On its philosophical side, however, to puzzle-minded critics it is high as heaven, deep as hell, mysterious as death itself.

This, very briefly, is an imperfect statement of the place and function of the Bible and Christ's teaching in the minds of thinking men, and it is this that its critics have to meet if they would make an effective attack upon it.

MISCELLANEOUS.

OUR FRONTISPiece.

President Wilson's stay at the residence of the Murat family while in Paris recalls the picturesque career of Joachim Murat (1767-1815), great-grandfather of the present Prince Murat, which is closely associated with the first efforts to create a united Italian kingdom, now at last crowned with success in overabundant measure. The son of an inn-keeper and destined to become a priest, Joachim Murat enlisted in the army when his money was gone. Owing to the political situation, however, his advancement was slow—not at all to the liking of his vain, ambitious, headstrong nature. The storms of the Revolution he weathered in much the same fashion as his future brother-in-law, Bonaparte, to whom he became greatly attached during the Italian campaign (1796-97). The battle of the Pyramids (1798) laid the foundation of his fame as a cavalry leader, in which capacity he served Napoleon in practically all his subsequent campaigns up to the battle of Leipsic. He married Napoleon's sister, Caroline, in 1800, was made Grand Duke of Berg in 1806, and King of Naples in 1808.

At last Joachim Murat was a king, and his vanity might well have allowed him to rest on his laurels. But he was also a son and heir to the Revolution, with its total disregard for historical traditions, its revaluation of all values of social standing, its bold application of common sense to problems that baffled all other solutions; so he seemed to be predestined to undertake more. Napoleon's triumphs over Austria and the old Empire had put the ideal of the Italian patriots within sight and even within grasp, his failure to satisfy the expectations which he had aroused seemed to assign to Murat the historical task of uniting Italy.

When Murat saw that the battle of Leipsic was lost he entered into secret negotiations with Metternich and, returning to his kingdom in haste, obtained
from Austria the signature to a treaty guaranteeing his throne and even promising him territorial aggrandizements. At this time (January, 1814) Napoleon was as yet by no means beaten. The fall of the emperor changed the situation, creating one of the knottiest problems the Vienna Congress had to solve. For if faith was not kept with Murat there was the probability of a general uprising throughout Italy, headed by the revolutionary king. On the other hand, if he was definitely installed as King of Naples, he might at any time become the center of just such a movement for the unification of Italy as everybody dreaded. At last Murat saw what he had to expect from the legitimists in control of the Congress, who thought they could guarantee the future peace of Europe by holding down everything that savored of the Revolution. Things were still in the balance when the news came of Napoleon’s escape from Elba. By clever diplomacy Murat could possibly still have gained all his points without changing front again, but he thought the moment had arrived to attempt more, to march north, drive the Austrians before him, and make himself king of all Italy. The Austrians beat him decisively in the battle of Tolentino (May 2, 1815).

Napoleon, who was preparing his Waterloo campaign, refused to receive the traitor, and Murat finally went to Corsica. But so firmly did he believe in his star and his cause that he decided to make a last desperate attempt to regain his kingdom, thus strangely paralleling Napoleon’s own course of action, en miniature, to be sure. He landed with thirty armed men at Pizzo in Calabria, on the 8th of October, 1815, expecting a general uprising of the people as whose liberator from the reestablished Bourbon régime he came. But the people were indifferent. He soon had to retreat to the coast, where he was overtaken, clubbed into submission, and taken prisoner. He was court-martialed under a law of his own, as a breaker of the peace, and had to face the firing squad (October 13). He was buried at Pizzo.

The present Murat family owes its rank and title to the restoration of the empire under Napoleon III.

JENKIN LLOYD JONES.
(1843-1918)

On September 12, 1918, all friends of a new religious life based directly upon a modern conscience, suffered one of their greatest losses in the death of Jenkin Lloyd Jones. The impressive funeral service, held two days later at Hillside Chapel, Tower Hill, Wisconsin, was described in the daily papers. Somehow, however, it was felt that fuller expression should be given to what was stirring in the hearts of thousands, so that the very death of the leader might become the test of the vitality of his ideals. On Sunday, November 17, a memorial service was held in his own church home in the Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago, where the mourners gathered from east and west to prove their loyalty. The present writer had not the privilege of attending this service personally, but a late November issue of Unity, for decades the expression of Jenkin Lloyd Jones’s thought, presents in an admirable fashion the spirit in which the idea of the service was realized. Under the chairmanship of the Hon. William Kent nearly a dozen addresses were delivered, each one of them characteristic of the deceased in one aspect or another, while that of the Rev. W. C. Gannett furnished his psychological biography as an impressive back-