

further reinforced by the establishment of the Eastern Church Association in England, which can do many things as a voluntary society, that could not be well done by a committee of Convocation. The visit of the Rev. Dr. Young, Secretary of our Russo-Greek Committee, to St. Petersburg and Moscow, showed that there was a degree of interest in the subject there, and an earnest readiness to co-operate, such as was not dreamed of at first even by the most enthusiastic. All the subsequent information spread before us concerning the doctrine and actual present working of the Russian Church goes far to confirm the prospects of eventual success, though of course a long time will be needed before the quarrels and misunderstandings of a thousand years are cleared up. The universal diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular ought, of itself, to convince a Reformed Church like ours, that the East is willing to undertake any reform that the Scriptures really call for. And the emancipation of the serfs, together with the establishment of schools everywhere throughout the empire, is proof that the *East*, at any rate, is not disposed to take darkness for light and light for darkness. The London meeting, at which Prince Orloff was present, to talk the matter over informally, was an important indication on the part of Russia. The action of a majority of the Patriarch of Constantinople's Synod, sustaining a man who had urged a union with the Church of England as the best means to cure the practical evils of the Greek Church in Turkey, deserves mention in this connection; as well as the degree to which the Church in the kingdom of Greece has been leavened through the instrumentality of our venerable missionary Dr. Hill; and also the reception of the Rev. Mr. Denton to communion in Servia (a fact contradicted, indeed, but never disproved). Finally, at the last meeting of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Committee on the Russo-Greek question requested and obtained permission from the Archbishop of Canterbury to enlarge the sphere of their labours, so that it should include *all* the Oriental Churches.

But what of Rome? Ostensibly including within her Communion a clear majority of the people of Christendom, no scheme of Unity can be worthy of the name that does not include Rome. What then are the signs of an approaching union there? They are worse, and better, than in any other quarter.

They are worse: for in the councils of the Pontiff the most rabid Ultramontanist seems to ride rampant. Pius IX has decreed that to be an article of the faith, which all his predecessors, for hundreds of years, have declined to affirm. His late Encyclical was a re-issue of some of the worst, blindest, and most suicidal blunders of his predecessors, all of which are now sealed with "infallibility"; and free speech, a free press, and civil and religious liberty, are all pronounced utterly incompatible with the religion of Rome:—a true judgment, so far as *that* is concerned; but so much the worse for Rome. Since then, the Holy Father has gone on from worse to worse, until his newspaper organ in Rome has been confided exclusively to the Jesuits, and its utterances are to be received throughout the Roman world as practically the infallible utterances of the Pope himself. When even the most kindly disposed of English Churchmen approach him in a body, with the hope that he will no longer forbid his subjects to *pray* for Unity, the haughty answer is, that there is only one road to Unity, and that is, unconditional surrender to the Pope and the Jesuits. Nothing could well be a *worse* outlook for Unity than *this*.

But we have also said that the signs are *better* in the Romish Communion than any where else. And so they are. For there are signs that the mountain of doctrinal and practical developments which has been shooting up with more and more rapidity in these latter days, is about to fall to pieces of its own weight, and leave the good