

intended, in the *Sunday Magazine*, to set forth his views some of these days about the Liturgy, when it would be found that they were more in conformity with those of Lord Lorne than some people might suppose. He had long held that the perfection of a Church system would be something between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism. After enlarging on this topic, the Rev. Doctor alluded to the union movement. He expressed his delight at the prospect of a speedy union between the English Presbyterian Church and that portion of the United Presbyterian Church south of the Border, but was grieved to think of the obstructions which had been placed in the way of that cause in Scotland. In noticing the homœopathic character of the points of difference, he caused great amusement by touching on the distinctive peculiarities of the Cameronian, United Presbyterian, and Free Churches. He strongly deplored the opposition which had been made to the union in Scotland, and could not understand it unless upon the supposition that some very good men, unknown to themselves, had brought to the discussion of the question strong passions and prejudices rather than principles. He could not understand the atrocious language used by the anti-unionists. He could not understand the vile imputations which were to be found in the pamphlet, "The Watchword," or "The Watchdog" as it had been called, and a mangy cur it was. It might growl, though it could not bite. The terms "traitors," "tyrants," and "apostates," had been applied to the leaders of the Free Church, to Dr. Candlish, Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Brown, Dr. Rainy, Sir Henry Moncreiff, and others; and he never read such vile imputations, whether made use of in Church Courts or in the press, without his indignation being stirred within him. The only blunder that the Free Church Union leaders had committed, was when speaking of its consummation, saying that not a hoof was to be left behind. It was absurd to suppose that 1600 Scotch ministers could all be got to agree about this matter, and he would have the leaders come forward and say that it was the duty of the negotiating Churches to unite and leave the consequences to God. They had hoofs left behind in the year 1843, and they were not much the worse of that, but a great deal the better, and he would have the same course adopted here. If men would not agree better, then they should separate. Abraham and Lot separated."

[The above speech of Dr. Guthrie has brought down on his head outpourings of wrath from his brethren in Scotland who are opposing the Union of the Free and the U. P. Churches. Dr. Gibson, in the Free Presbytery of Glasgow, accepted his nickname for their periodical, for, said he, with caustic humour, "the 'watch-dog' has often saved the premises, but certainly not against honest men." The two parties in the Free Church are now prepared to go any lengths in carrying out their views, if they can be depended on as meaning what they say. The majority seems to have made up its mind to force on the Union, and the minority do not hesitate to table protests before beginning their discussions, declaring that they do not mean in any event to allow Free Church principles to be ignored or Voluntaryism encouraged, even if they have to appeal to the Civil Courts. The minority comprises very able leaders, such as Drs. Forbes, Miller, Gibson, Begg, J. J. Wood; and earnest godly men such as the Bonars, Moody Stuart, Main and many others; but one gets a little bewildered as he reads of those determined 'spiritual independence' champions looking out for relief from the decisions of their own chosen Church Courts to the terrible Parliament House with its worldly-wise Law Lords.]

PROSPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA.

THE following article is from the "*Indian Mirror*," Keshub Chunder Sen's paper, and is interesting as showing that the native writer is much more sanguine—we might say hopeful—that Christianity might leaven India, than is the English Reviewer whom he reviews. Mr. Beveridge would have all