

representative missionaries than to the statements made by officials.

In considering our subject one general distinction must be observed. Evangelical and educational work among the Oriental churches is looked upon by the government as natural enough. Prior to the Protestant movement the Roman Catholic missions had been recognized as establishing a separate Christian sect. There was thus a kind of precedent for permitting the formation of an evangelical church. But wherever the preaching has attracted Mohammedans the government has resorted to various schemes for the exile or punishment of the converts. And even to-day the government would not tolerate any organized movement for openly teaching the New Testament to Moslems.

In the villages there is practically no government. I may say in passing that it is for this very reason I believe that gospel work may be done more freely in the villages than in the cities.

The collections of taxes by the central government resemble depredations from outside. And in general the villages are governed by local customs, by the will of the chief (who is often a hospitable old man) and by the exhortations of the mulla who is usually respectful and courteous to educated visitors. If any difficulty arises, it is likely to be from the mulla who may imagine that his rights are being assailed. But the government very largely ignores what is going on among the peasant population.

Another distinction to be kept in mind is in the attitude of the government towards European and American missionaries. Whereas European missions, such as those of the Jesuits, have secured more privileges and immunities through diplomatic interference, the Americans are recognized as coming from a distant country which