

The Texas Christian Advocate.

SUBSCRIPTION, PER ANNUM, \$2.00.

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE FIVE TEXAS CONFERENCES OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

TO PREACHERS, \$1.00.

VOL. XXXV.

DALLAS, TEXAS, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1889.

NO. 30.

RICH AND POOR.
JEAN PAUL.

It may possibly be a misfortune but it is certainly not a sin to be rich. Not the possession so much, but the wild chase after riches is attended with snares. It pleases God not infrequently to bestow riches upon persons who make no special effort to acquire them.

Christ has ordained that pecuniary disparities continue. When he asserts that the poor we have always with us, he suffers us to imply that riches will be coexistent. In vain will be the effort to prove that Christ and his disciples had introduced socialism—the panacea of our discontented poor. That the first Christians "had all things common," is readily explained. Conversion is always accompanied with the consecration of ourselves and our means. Nearly every new convert, in his first love, wants to be a preacher. His possessions he lays down at the feet of his Savior. But immediately after Pentecost conversions were very numerous. Thousands presented themselves as laborers in God's vineyard. With themselves they presented their earthly possessions. This apparent socialism, or rather communism, ceased when love's first fervor abated and the ingathering of saints was less multitudinous.

It is illusory to imagine that the opulent are happy because of their vast possessions. Wealth does not afford exemption from the woes to which flesh is heir. Wealth is not the custodian of health; not a promoter of sweet sleep and rest. Are the rich less oppressed, persecuted, hated, slandered, than the poor? The juiciest fruit only wasps claim as their own, even so the rich suffer most from the stings of the envious. Their sufferings from toadstools and sycophants are not insignificant. Truly loved they are but little. If I can see right, the opulent are but like the miller's ass, bearing heavy burdens of grain and flour for the villagers.

Frequently the rich do not even enjoy the love of those who are appointed to watch over their souls. It seems that the latter know exactly what the rich should do with their money. To study the market reports, the possible increase or decline in prices of merchandise, lands, cattle, stocks, bonds, is entirely superfluous. Grats, the preacher will tell them how to invest their capital most advantageously. If his direction is not followed, the javelins of irony and arrows of satire fly thick and fast when the luckless rich are found in the pew.

Poverty is a relative term. We may possess much less than others and be not poor. Have more than others. Many who enjoy a pecuniary competency call themselves poor. There is, however, true, squalid poverty—where the wife wastes away for lack of sufficient nourishment, where the children cry in vain for bread. Tatters constitute the habitment, and wan hunger is portrayed in the face.

Ordinary poverty—possessing less than others—is certainly not an affliction. Its painful sting lies in sinful discontent, in the hungry greed for what God has denied us. When I chafe and fret because my acquaintances own larger mansions, farms, herds, than I, I'm poor, indeed—so poor that alms, by way of sympathy, would be sheer wastage. The poor are often themselves the cause of their chronic unhappiness. What, though, they own not any real estate, their wife and daughter dress not in silk, ride not in elegant equipage, spend not the oppressive summer months in fashionable watering places. These things do certainly not constitute the necessary ingredients of happiness. The so-called poor could be happy if they constrained themselves to be reconciled to their lot. Many declare themselves poor, but would deem it an insult to be thus styled by others. Nor are they willing to yield to the inevitable and curb their own and families' extravagance. Debt, dishonesty and dishonest follow. Doubtly poor are the poor who with all loss lose their good name.

There is no odium attached to honest poverty. Though poor, you toiled, perhaps, as hard as the rich, exercised all the wisdom at your disposal, in order to avert indigence. Now, be satisfied. Teach your children that it is not life's chief end to amass a fortune, but to make ourselves useful. You, yourselves, heed that lesson. Truly nauseating it is when a poor man is ashamed of his poverty; a shoddy aristocrat, whose energy is ceaselessly bent on mere appearances. It is a sad mistake to imagine that a poor man and a gentleman could not be one and the same. There are more gentlemen found in blouses than in broadcloth; more ladies in muslin than in silk. The nightingale is, of course, ugly plumage, but of all birds she sings the sweetest.

Poor relatives are frequently ignored. Their relationship is nota matter of pride. But there is one who was poorer than the poorest whose kinship all Christians eagerly claim. It is our dear Savior who, when on earth, had not where to lay his head. He dignified poverty by being voluntarily poor himself.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

BAPTISM OF THE "UNREGENERATED."

REV. R. ARNEY, D. D.

"Inquirer," in your paper of March 14, wishes to know if unregenerated adult persons should be baptized. And I would like to make another inquiry: When are we likely to get clear of class-baptism? We have some who suffered the doctrine to get large foothold among us that there are two kinds of baptism

taught in Scripture, viz: "infant" and "adult," but I do not see that class-baptism of any sort is taught. Scripture baptism pertains to the race of mankind without restriction as to age, sex or condition. In a Christian country there ought not to be any other baptism than that performed in infancy.

The question of "Inquirer" is virtually this: Whether the baptism of a grown person ought to be further postponed until after regeneration, or until after he is sure of regeneration. That is, in other words, whether a known religious duty ought to be postponed or neglected until some other well known duty is performed.

There is no order of priority in the discharge of religious duty. All absolute religious duty ought to be performed at once, without a moment's delay. If a man is not baptized it is his own fault, and there can be no reason for its postponement beyond the first opportunity. And if a man is not regenerated there can be no reason for its postponement a day or a moment. "Now," is the Bible rule. These rules are imperative and do not admit of question.

But technical and practical regeneration are not always demonstrated exactly in the same way. "New birth" or "regeneration" are the names usually given to a gracious work of the Holy Spirit in the heart of men. This can not always be described in exact terms so as to be certainly recognized by the individual Christian. Nothing but very general terms in by no means vivid outline is practicable. Feeling, or what is called experience, is not exactly describable in words so as to be understood by every one.

For instance, a physician is called to visit two patients affected exactly alike; the one is a man highly versed in language, physiology and psychology, the other a child of two years. Neither can describe his feelings with anything like accuracy; but the former can do it with much more accuracy than the latter, and yet each can state full well that he is sick. Just so of two Christians ten thousand times over. No two Christians have the same religious experience. Nor do any two polemical theologians describe regeneration in the same way.

So what is the test of regeneration as a test of eligibility to baptism? Baptism is the best test I know of. By this I mean that a sane man who wants baptism, in good faith, gives the best evidence of the nature of the case admits of that he is entitled to it, give that want, or uneasy deficiency, any technical name you will.

Some preachers preach that there is no assurance of regeneration unless you can point with certainty to the time and place of its occurrence. We have too much procrustean theology. Some people no doubt do know the time and place, but then it was not the right time or the best time. If men were converted at the most proper time they never could identify the time, for he was only a year old and the sensible impression was very slight.

The character, temperament, idiosyncrasy and general susceptibility of different persons is so various that it is difficult to grade Christians thermometrically. The only safe man is by no means he who was converted, but he who to-day tries his best. This earnest endeavor necessarily puts him into religious association by baptism; that being the prescribed mode of testing the social aspect of religious obligation.

On what grounds a minister would refuse baptism to a person who wanted it, or church membership to one who desired it, I am not able to conceive.

GULF VIEW, MISS.

INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE SOUL.

REV. W. W. PRICE.

Man is a compound being, fearfully and wonderfully made. "He is the crowning miracle of creation," possessing two distinct natures—material and immaterial—or body and spirit. The body was formed of the dust, and its short duration or earthly existence is plainly taught by many facts and figures. "Man that is born of a woman is of few days and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down. He fleeth also as a shadow and continueth not." James, in speaking of physical life, says: "It is even a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." Peter says: "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass." Paul says: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." The aforementioned solemn truths indicate that our bodies will soon "lie mouldering in the clay." In contradistinction to man's earthly body, he has a spiritual body—immortal, invisible and indestructible—which must live from the birth of its creation, coeternal with God. This undying principle is generally called the soul. This word is sometimes used to signify body and spirit. Hence we prefer using spirit in speaking of man's disembodied existence. The body was first formed, after which God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." "The body without the spirit is dead." "The spirit is the life of the body, but when God calls it away in death, eternal bliss or endless misery will be realized in eternity. Every departed spirit exists somewhere, and its locality is fixed on principles of equity—according to the deeds done in the body. Hence, every intelligent man may say: I have a deathless spirit, which will soon be in heaven or hell. The intermediate state of disembodied spirits has been extensively controvert-

ed; and, as we believe, many great men have egregiously erred; therefore, we propose to offer our views on the subject. In doing this, we shall be governed by the teaching of revelation. We concede that there is a particular state between death and the final judgment for saved and lost spirits. Furthermore, we deny the existence of an intermediate locality for either between heaven and hell. The Scriptures clearly demonstrate the fact that the spirits of all "who die in the Lord" go directly to heaven, where they will realize a disembodied state till the resurrection. Vice versa, the spirits of the wicked will sink into the place of endless punishment, and there remain "unto the resurrection of damnation."

Bishop McTear says: "No one has yet been saved in heaven—no one sent to hell. These states and conditions will not be awarded till the judgment; and it will not take place till the resurrection."—Methodist Pulpit, South, p. 373. If the bishop means that "no man"—body and spirit—"has yet been saved in heaven," "was yet like to know where Enoch and Elijah went when they were translated? If he alludes to the souls and bodies of men generally, his testimony is scriptural—otherwise, it is not. If we understand him, he refers to "disembodied spirits." Mr. Wesley says: "It is, indeed, very generally supposed that the souls of good men as soon as they are discharged from the body go directly to heaven; but this opinion has not the least foundation in the oracles of God; on the contrary, our Lord says to Mary, after the resurrection, 'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father in heaven.' But he had been in paradise, according to his promise to the penitent thief: 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' Hence it is plain that paradise is not heaven. It is, indeed (if we may be allowed the expression), the ante-chamber of heaven, where the souls of the righteous remain, till after the general judgment." Sermons, 2 vol. pp. 416, 417. Perhaps Mr. Wesley based his faith on the creed of the Episcopal church. We find the following questions and answers, in the Manual of Christian Doctrine: "What name does the Lord Jesus give to the place of good souls in haste? Ans. Paradise. When did He call it by this name? Ans. When He said to the penitent thief on the cross: 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' (Luke xxiii: 43; compare II. Cor. xiii: Rev. ii: 7). How do we know that He did not mean heaven? Ans. Because after Christ rose He told Mary Magdalene, he had not yet ascended to His Father" (John xxi: 17). We have a high regard for the opinions of wise men. We prefer the truth of God, and hold that it is at war with the forementioned creed and evidence. All things considered, perhaps John Wesley was the greatest man of the church since apostolic times. But few men, if any, have lived and died without error. We are living in the brightest day of the Christian era, and therefore contend that the doctrine of the Bible is understood better than at any former period. We should be governed by its truths, regardless of creeds and faith of men. In all candor, I cannot believe in a paradisaical state of blood-washed spirits as held by the Episcopal church. Mr. Wesley and other eminent authors. We will briefly examine their pro-texts, after which we will argue the negative side. Paradise is only mentioned three times in the New Testament, as follows: 1. "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luke xxiii: 43. 2d. "How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." II. Cor. xii: 3, 4. 3d. "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." Rev. ii: 7. In order to interpret these texts correctly, we will define the word

PARADISE.

If it does not mean the "ante-chamber of heaven," there is no scriptural proof for such an idea. If it means heaven, then, on this ground, we truthfully declare that the spirits of God's children go directly to heaven. Mr. Webster defines the word thus: "Heaven, the blissful seat of sanctified souls after death." Mr. Watson says: "The term paradise is obviously used in the New Testament as another word for heaven." In proof of his position, he refers to all the texts above. In Buck's Theological Dictionary, we read: "Paradise, the garden of Eden, in which Adam and Eve were placed. It is also used to denote heaven."—Luke xxiii: 43. We call special attention to the following extract: "The Talmudical writings cited by Elder Buxtorf (Lex. Chald. et Talm., p. 1802), and John James Wetstein (N. T. Gr. Vol. 1, p. 819), contain frequent references to paradise as the immortal heaven, to which the spirits of the just are admitted immediately upon liberation from the body."—Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature.

With this definition from the best authority, (and we might quote more), we assume that the proof so-called, is decidedly against the affirmative side of the question. Our faith is demonstrated by the word of God. To prove this position, we advert to the Savior's promise, viz: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." It is generally believed that our Lord had reference to his own spirit. Secondly, None will deny that his body was buried. Thirdly, He promised the penitent thief that he should be with him in paradise. Hence, it is evident that the spirits of both were in paradise.

There is a difference of opinion with regard to that particular locality. Is it the "ante-chamber of heaven? We answer that it is not, but do maintain with divine light before us that paradise is a scriptural name for heaven. We have proven what we say by unquestionable evidence; therefore, we conclude that the spirit or soul of Christ, and that of the converted thief were in heaven during the time our Lord's spirit was absent from his body. In opposition to this truth, many believe that he (Christ), in his own personal spirit, went and preached salvation to the lost spirits.

OF THE ANTEDELUVIANS.

In proof of their theory, they quote I Peter, iii: 19, which reads: "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison." We quote the following testimony from the "Speaker's Commentary," as published in the Nashville Christian Advocate, Jan. 12: "We must therefore understand St. Peter to say that after death our Lord in his own human spirit went forth and preached—that is, proclaimed certain tidings to certain spirits specified afterwards who, when he thus came and preached to them, were not in bonds or penal duration as condemned criminals, but in custody, as prisoners awaiting their doom." The author of this commentary did not understand the true import of Peter's teaching. Christ did preach to the "spirits in prison," but no man can prove that his preaching was after his death. There is nothing in the text to prove the correctness of the commentator's position. The preaching done was not "in his own human spirit," because he preached to the "spirits in prison," before his personal advent. The full statement as revealed demonstrates this fact. Read, as follows: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit." I Peter iii: 18. On this point, Paul gives light. He says: "But if the Spirit of him (God) that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Romans viii: 11. We plainly see that Christ was "put to death in the flesh," but was raised from the dead by the Spirit of God. Bear this truth in mind and read, "By which (spirit) also he went and preached to the spirits in prison." (20th verse). The sense is his, He, Christ, by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, preached to the spirits in prison, "while the ark was a preparing." Bible readers generally know that man's body is the soul's prison. The Lord said: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Christ preached to the spirits of the people, and thereby gave them warning and time for repentance. If Christ in his own human spirit preached to the spirits of the antedeluvians whose bodies perished in the flood, we would like to know his object. If they were lost, their destiny was unchangeable—but, if saved, they did not need the gospel. Hence, we affirm that the commentator's exposition is unreasonable, and at war with the truth of inspiration.

MR. ALFORD'S TESTIMONY

is similar to that which we have noticed in the "Speaker's Commentary." He says: "I understand these words (of Peter) to say that our Lord, in his disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce his work of redemption, preach salvation in fact to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them."—[Nashville Advocate, Jan. 12.] Mr. Alford states that "the judgment of the flood was hanging over" the "disembodied spirits" to whom Christ preached. 2. He assumes that He (Christ) announced his work of redemption and salvation. 3. He affirms that "our Lord made his announcement in his disembodied state." Such views can not be proven by the Scriptures. In our judgment, they are untrue, and if so, will do evil. The expressions of Peter, and the facts which he reveals, contradict Mr. Alford's understanding. Referring to the time when Christ preached, he says emphatically that it was "while the ark was a preparing." This truth itself induces us to say—away with the thought, that Christ at any time, ever preached to disembodied spirits. If the above interpretations are correct, we are bound to conclude that there is a probationary state beyond the grave for departed spirits. If Christ preached redemption and salvation to the disembodied spirits of the wicked antedeluvians, we may certainly believe, that he gave them another chance for heaven. The possibility of salvation after death is a chimera of the brain.

SOUTHWESTERN TEXAS.

REV. W. J. JOYCE.

From what has been said of the large pastures, it will be understood of course that the country is thinly settled, and that large hospitality always found in thinly settled countries is fully developed here. Let no man who intends coming here for an honest living have any fear as to a cordial reception. Till recently this county has been for ten years a local option county. The railroad coming somehow brought the saloon. During the local option period no section enjoyed greater peace and tranquility. The jail has been used but little for those of the county. A few

roving vagabonds have occasionally found their way into it. Only one man is in it now, and he is on trial, as the court is in session. A more law-abiding people is not to be found in the State. A more respectful attention to the ministry can nowhere be found; at least this has been my observation. Representatives of all the churches can be found here. The Methodists have a good church in Beeville, and a small but comfortable one in Rockport. The writer is the pastor. The Baptists are building an excellent house in Beeville, and the Baptist people have the ministrations of one of the ablest preachers I have heard of in the State—Mr. Wilson. In Rockport they have a large house of worship, and lately preaching twice a month. The Presbyterians have a small flock of excellent people, and preach in the Methodist Church, both in Beeville and Rockport. The Episcopalians have services in both towns; in the Methodist Church in Beeville, and in their own house in Rockport.

The Christian Church also has a few excellent members here. Our excellent school teacher is a minister of that church, and a more valuable man, religiously, we have not among us than Bro. Taylor. We worship and dwell in peace together. There are many Catholics also.

Let the immigrant know that he is welcome here; but let him bring his religion with him; for the half-hearted Christian is held in the same contempt here as elsewhere. I believe this part of the State will furnish the early vegetables for the great Northwest. I planted my Irish potatoes in January, and had the first ones today, March 28.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

REV. GEORGE CONSTANTINE, D. D., OF FYRANA.

The Greek Church, of which I was born a member, embraces various nationalities and races—namely, Russia, Bulgaria, Servia, Greece, etc., nearly the whole Slavie race and the whole Greek race; in all about 84,000,000 souls. * * *

The Greek Church in its constitution is as evangelical as the gospel, being based upon the Nicene Creed, without the addition of the "filioque," which had been the apparent cause of the separation of the Latin and Greek churches, the latter assuming the title of the "orthodox." The seventh canon of the third ecumenical council decrees that any priest or layman who shall demand anything more or less from either Jew or Gentile than what is contained in that creed shall be anathema. Unfortunately the Seventh General Council opened the gates for much that is denigrating and much that is against both the creed and the Word of God.

The ancient Church accepted the Word of God as the rule of both faith and worship. She accepted all the canonical books of the Bible, and these only, and demanded from her members that they should study and follow them. She taught salvation through faith without the works of the law, and accepted works as the fruit of faith and the evidence of the Spirit's presence. The "Power of the Keys" she accepted as the authority committed to the church to reprove or exclude from its communion the unworthy participant, and to restore the same when penitent and repentant, while her worship was real and spiritual.

The modern Greek Church accepts the seven ecumenical councils and teaches the seven sacraments of the New Testament are seven (the Jewish symbol for completeness or perfection) namely, baptism, the Lord's Supper, chrism, confession, ordination, marriage, and the anointing of the sick; but of these the first two are superior in importance and the last three are not binding on all Christians. She accepts baptismal regeneration. Every child by baptism becomes a member in good and regular standing and is admitted to communion from infancy. She accepts transubstantiation, and gives to tradition equal authority with the Bible, while many of her unscriptural customs are maintained by passages in the Apocryphal books. She rejects images, but she adores pictures, honors the saints and the Virgin, attributes miraculous power to both pictures and saints. She may theoretically deny the doctrine of purgatory, yet she offers prayers for the dead; she uses candles and incense in worship and prides herself on the exclusive apostolic succession of her priesthood, namely, that, by the laying of the hands, the Holy Spirit descends and abides upon the ordained clergy, except in the case of simony (when the clergyman receives ordination by means of bribes.) By this teaching the priesthood, irrespective of moral character, piety, or knowledge of the Bible, makes itself indispensable to the salvation of man. The child, for instance, cannot be regenerated unless the water and the oil are blessed and sanctified by the prayers of the ordained priest. The elements in the Lord's Supper cannot be transubstantiated except by the same influence; the dead cannot be absolved from sin but through the power of his prayer; therefore, the most ignorant priest, yes, even an immoral one, by the repetition of the written prayers can lead sinful men from their birth to the grave, and thence to the kingdom of God. Such practices and inconsistencies have created many contradictory practices and many anti-gospel customs that have disgusted the educated and have flooded the Church with rationalists, agnostics, materialists, and infidels, whose only in-

terest in this Church springs from the mistaken idea that she is the national bond that is to unite ultimately the whole; while the uneducated and the simple remain steeped in superstition and ignorance.

With but few exceptions, the Church is Christian in form and in name, rather than in character and knowledge. Many a one while denying the divinity of Christ, rejecting the inspiration of the Scriptures, ignoring the immortality of the soul, doubting the very existence of God, demands, on national grounds, to be, and is recognized as a regular member of the church. Here is an illustration of the inconsistencies practiced at present: One prayer says, "Almighty Lord, abide with us, for beside thee we have no other helper," while another says, "My entire hope on thee I place, O mother of God." The Bible is recognized as the rule of faith and worship, yet tradition is appealed to for practices that are opposed to it. God is set forth as the supreme object of worship, yet prayers are offered to saints. Repentance is accepted as the condition for the believer's forgiveness, yet fasts and penances, alms and pilgrimages are generally substituted for it. Confession to God and restitution to man for evils done give place to confession to a priest and absolution by him. Portions of the Epistles and the Gospels are read in the churches every Sunday, yet preaching is seldom heard except during Lent. The children are never catechized by the clergy, and whatever they may know of religion is learned at the day-school, while the uneducated remain untaught and neglected.

The differences between the Greek and Latin churches are not less marked than are their points of resemblance. The former denounces the Pope, rejects his supremacy and denies his infallibility, yet she believes in the infallibility of the Church itself; she practices threefold immersion in baptism, and intends that the candidate should be immersed naked, be he young or old, and she ignores confirmation; she uses leavened instead of unleavened bread at the Lord's Supper and administers both the elements to its members; she rejects extreme unction; she allows her priests to marry before ordination but never after, yet she reserves all her high honors for the exclusive benefit of the celibates; she indulges in fasts, feasts, and festivals, also in pilgrimages, monastic life for both sexes, and even in a system of indulgences. Notwithstanding errors of expression and of practice, her doctrinal perversions have never become a part of a deliberately formed system, or made authoritatively by a general council, as has been the case in the Latin Church, but are simply customs, introduced either by ambitious persons eager for authority, or by the ignorance of over-religious devotees in the monasteries.

The Greek Church of to-day is governed according to the spirit of the various nationalities where she prevails. In Russia, Greece, and Bulgaria, for instance, the control is by a national synod over whom the Metropolitan presides, while a representative of the government is always present in their deliberations. In the Ottoman Empire the authority is vested in a synod under the different patriarches; namely, those of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Constantinople. The last of these, as he lives at the capital, is highest in honor and influence.

The worship of the Greek Church consists chiefly in the use of liturgy, with many forms and ceremonies and with much chanting of prayers and hymns. The interior of the church edifice is divided into two sections: the holy place, where the altar stands, reserved for the priests; and the other portion occupied by the people. There is, on the people's side, a double chorus who sing and chant responsively. There are no seats and there is no instrumental music, and that because the Latin Church has both. The priest from the day of his consecration is denied the privilege of cutting either his hair or his beard, while the priest of the Latin Church can do both. The people during the chanting of the liturgy express their assent to the prayers of the priests and to hymns of the choristers by crossing themselves, but in a manner wholly different from that practiced in the Latin Church, in order that they may be seen to differ. The people, through the liturgy, are called by the officiating clergyman every Sunday to come forward and partake of the communion, but no one presents himself, nor does the priest expect any one. The people generally commune three times a year, at the close of the three general fasts. One ends with the nativity, another with Easter, and the third with the commemoration of the death of the Virgin. Much could be added on this subject, but enough has been said to convince the reader of the need of pressing the gospel upon these people, and helping them to see that under the debris of the modern Church lies the glorious Church of their fathers, who not only loved the gospel, but were also instrumental in scattering it abroad, and that the nations which now hold the truth as their fathers did are to-day the hope and the joy of the world. May God's Spirit bring back this noble race to their fathers' God, that they too may prove even a greater blessing to the world than their fathers! This will be the case when the Greeks will follow the Bible and nothing but the Bible as their standard in the world. Amen.—Missouri Herald.

