

MISCELLANEOUS.

—"Altho the heathen, who become Catholic Christians, commonly rise only from a religion of form to another religion of form, whose contents, however, are infinitely better, yet they for the most part experience so much of it that cannibalism, infanticide, concubinage, etc., can no longer remain the prevailing rule; morally, therefore, they are extricated from the coarsest of their former excesses, and every philanthropist and Christian must desire that where the Evangelical Church cannot win them they should rather become Catholic Christians than remain heathen."—Herr PETRI, in *Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift*.

—"Are the missionaries the agents or servants (?) of the societies, or are they the messengers of the churches? Is there a sufficiently close connection between the churches at home and their brethren abroad, for whom they are asked to pray and give? Do not societies sometimes act as a barrier to separate rather than as a link to unite? A great step in advance would be taken if the societies not only allowed but encouraged churches to support missionaries of their own, with whom they might be in direct communication."—*The Christian*, quoted in *The Bombay Guardian*.

—"Is it true, as some have affirmed, that missionaries meet for conference and prayer in India or China, decide upon certain modes of procedure in connection with their work, but are powerless to act until their proposals have been sent to the home committee and considered by them? Is it also a fact that not unfrequently the home committee rejects the proposals of the missionaries, and dictates an entirely different course? . . .

"If so, we venture to suggest the need of a change. . . . The churches generally would trust the decisions of the men doing the work rather than those of brethren at home, however wise and experienced.

"We plead for an increase of confidence right through our missionary work. No men ever realize their highest possibilities until they are trusted."—*Ibid*.

—"Are means lacking for the work of missions? Sound the bell of prayer rather than the bell of the mendicant."—Pastor GOSSNER.

—"We notice not unfrequently the statement that the Persian Shah, as successor of the prophet, is the spiritual and temporal chief of his subjects. This, however, appears to be an error. It arises from transferring to the Persian monarch the attributes of the Turkish monarch. The latter, however, is Caliph Mohammedan Pope, not as king of the Turks, but as having, in his ancestors, obtained from the heirs of the Bagdad caliphs a cession of their claims in his favor. His Turkish and his Moslem, his temporal and his religious, dignity are distinct and separable. Thus, when it was determined, in 1876, to depose Abdul-Aziz, it was held necessary that he should first abdicate the caliphate, under the form (tho certainly not the reality) of a voluntary act. This left him still sovereign of Turkey; but as he had now lost the sacredness of his person, he was then dethroned outright. The Persians, it is known, are regarded by the Mohammedan world at large as schismatics and heretics. They deny the succession acknowledged by the Sunnites, and have one of their own, whose incumbent, however, is not the Shah, but resides within the Turkish territory, and whose religious authority is said to be sometimes as embarrassing to the Persian Government as the papal authority has often been, sometimes for good and sometimes for evil, to the civil governments of Europe.

The Persians, however heretical, are intense Moslems. Mr. Benjamin declares, what is certainly not true of the Sunnites, at least in most countries, that no Christian, however exalted his rank, would dare to enter a mosque in Persia if he valued his life.