

sional also virtually exists, monasteries abound, and the priests are equally ignorant, and profligate with those of Rome. The Scriptures are practically unknown to the people—indeed, “all Scripture” is forbidden to be “read by the untrained;” infallibility is involved in their dogmas, and they have no less than sixty-seven liturgies. In Russia, as well as other countries, the prayers are uttered in eight tones, and two huge volumes are necessary to prescribe these variations. “It is hardly credible,” says a writer on the subject, “yet a positive fact, that the changes of the services for each, occupy twenty folio volumes, and these volumes render necessary another, called ‘The Regulation,’ as a sort of index to them. The whole system of the Eastern Church is thus minced into endless particularities, or rather puerilities, and it is no easy task to discriminate exactly the measure of its orthodoxy and such encumbering rubbish.” As to marriage, all the priests, except the monks and those promoted from their number to higher offices, are permitted to marry once, but not a widow; on the death of his wife the priest must relinquish his charge and go into a cloister.

Such is, briefly, the religion which holds in subjection sixty-five millions of people—the religion which Russia, with its gigantic power, endeavours to uphold and propagate—the religion in defence of which, professedly, the Czar has called out his embattled legions, and for whose altars tens of thousands are to be slain. Whatever may be the motives which have led the allies into the strife, it can hardly be doubted that their success would argue more favourably to the advancement of the gospel, than the triumph of Russia. Whatever may be the machinations of France for favouring the interest of Rome, England is too wary not to look out for her share of the spoils; and where she plants her standard with all her faults, she will secure an open door for civilization and the Bible. The defeat of Russia, by any Protestant power, cannot result otherwise than in weakening the miserable structure of that Church, whose light to its enthralled millions has for so many generations been darkness.—*Philadelphia Presbyterian.*

Reformation in England.

The Reformed Church of England, as Henry VIII settled it, was a sort of bastard Popery;—popery without the Pope. Its Confession of Faith remained substantially the same as it had been previously to the rupture. Its hierarchy retained all their former power, with much of their original pride and wealth. Its public worship was conducted upon the ancient principle, and in the Latin language. Instead of seeking authority to exercise their functions from the Roman See, the Bishops took out licenses from the Crown, and the king became what the pope used to be—supreme head of the Church upon earth. Such a Reformation satisfied nobody. The papists abhorred it because of the rent occasioned in the veil of the temple: the Protestants were dissatisfied with it as relieving their consciences from none of the burdens under which they had long groaned.

With the accession of Edward VI a new era came in. Born of a protestant mother and educated under protestant guardians, this young prince naturally threw himself

into the movement and pushed forward the work of Reformation with as much earnestness as was consistent with due regard to order in the State. He failed indeed, to keep pace with the wishes of such (and they constitute perhaps, the majority of reformers in all ages) as, in their zeal to accomplish a favourite end, overlook the necessity of caution in the selection of means. But his measures bore the stamp throughout of that true wisdom, which is more intent on achieving a good which shall be permanent than on attaining it quickly. In his day many of the most offensive of the Romish services were abolished. A new book of Common Prayer was compiled, new articles of religion were published; the churches were purged of images and pictures; and the Scriptures freely circulated in an English version. Great efforts were likewise made to promote sound learning in the universities. Heretofore neither Hebrew nor Greek had found far joy in these seats of the muses. Instead the well known proverb “Cayo Græcos ne fias hereticus,” had been religiously acted up to so recently as the times of Collet and Stafford. The Regency (for Edward himself was but a child) took vigorous steps to remedy this evil, and invited over Peter Martyr and Bucer to fill the chairs of Divinity, the one in Oxford and the other in Cambridge. For all this they received the hearty commendation of the leading reformers both of the Continent and Scotland, between whom and our own Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Parkhurst, the correspondence was frequent, and of the most confidential nature. Still the heaven of Puritanism continued to work. At a moment when projects were actually on foot for uniting all the Reformed Churches into one—when the Episcopal Church of England was selecting for its theological teachers, divines ordained to the ministry by Presbyters, when the Presbyterian Churches of Germany and Switzerland were considering of the readiest means of receiving again the Episcopate from England—when all were convinced that it is neither in ceremonies nor in ordinances but in the profession of a common faith and a common charity, that true Church union consists—at this very moment restless spirits were putting in jeopardy not the peace of the Church of England alone but the great cause of the Reformation itself; by their bitter hostility to trifles. These men to whom by and by the nickname of Puritans came to be applied, seem to have borne without impatience a good deal that was really objectionable, both in the national creed, and in the national worship. But the retention of copes, stoles, rochetts, &c., &c.—garments polluted as they expressed it by the idolatrous uses to which they were once applied—was in their opinion, a crying sin; and sooner than be participators in it, they were ready to suffer or to inflict martyrdom according to the turn which the wheel of fortune might take.—*Edinburgh Review.*

THE MONTHLY RECORD.

MARCH, 1855.

The Inner and the Outer Church.

Christ's true Church on earth consists only of the living christians that are to be found scattered up and down in different countries and the different ecclesiastical localities. They form that part of his mystical body which is now in the world. They are united in an invisible, but in the closest sense. They are the branches of one tree. They are compactly built together as living stones in the one glorious temple. They are separate from the world, and joined together in him.

How then should this living unity outwardly manifest itself? If we look at the christian world we find the present manifestation to be thus. The living members of Christ are estranged from each other. They are mingled up in strange combinations with the dead, arrayed against other combinations similarly constituted. The spiritual and carnal are knit together in one sect, which is alienated from another sect made up of the same diverse materials. Christ's soldiers are to be found fighting side by side with his enemies, against other companies made up also of his enemies and friends. His body in its outward manifestation is divided and the separate members of it enter into and form constituent parts of other bodies which, like Nebuchadnezzar's image, are made up of gold iron and clay.

Such is the melancholy aspect that the christian world presents. And the mere statement of it is sufficient to show that the outward church is very far removed from what it should be; that it should mourn over its present state and strive earnestly after something better. What this better is, is very plain. The invisible should be ever striving to make itself visible, the inner unity to manifest itself in an outward unity. As in nature the life in the plant, projects the outward form and shape of the plant, so should the hidden living church project an outward form corresponding to itself. Why should it be that the living are thus allied with the dead, and arrayed against other similar combinations. Why should it be that a christian who agrees with an unregenerate man on the smallest minutiae of doctrine, and differs from another true christian on some nonessential point—should be separated from his fellow member in Christ, and incorporated with him who has no part in the matter. Like should draw to like, the living to the living, the dead to the dead. Other bonds of union are all