

spiritual independence, which, in my judgment, is incompatible with the acceptance of an invidious monopoly of State patronage and State pay.

Referring to his early efforts to promote Presbyterian union, the honorable Baronet quotes a letter from the late Rev. Dr Chalmers, written in 1846, in which the writer said—"I feel quite sure that the evangelical bodies are not yet in readiness for your proposal. I say this not in disparagement of the proposal, but in disparagement of the bodies. It were well if they could be brought to coalesce in the way that you point out. Your object is excellent, but the immediate accomplishment of it cannot yet be looked for." A letter from the late Rev. Dr. John Brown, dated January 8th, 1852, also quoted, contains the following passage:—"To promote union among Christians without compromise of principle has been one of the first wishes of my heart—one of the leading objects of my life; and in the union first of the two great divisions of the Secession, and then of the United Secession with the Relief Church, as well as in the formation of the Evangelical Alliance, I have had this wish gratified, this object gained, to a greater extent than I could at one time have anticipated. The Disruption of the Established Church was in my view but a step towards further union. The Union of the Free Church with the United Presbyterian Church I regard as an event of the future—it may be not of the very distant future. I am afraid, however, that there is little probability of its being very soon effected, so as to secure peace and permanence to the united body. As to principle, there is nothing to prevent such a union to-morrow, except the Free Church continuing to insist on making the principle of connexion between Church and State, as embodied in the Westminster Confession of Faith, a term of *official* communion. The United Presbyterian Church do not—I trust they never will—make a disclaimer of that principle a term of communion either official or Christian; but the great body both of her members and ministers conscientiously disbelieve the principle, and therefore could not join a body which includes this principle in its Confession, and requires a solemn declaration of belief in it from all its ministers and elders. Were this difficulty, obviously insurmountable while it continues, removed out of the way, still I am afraid those habits of thought, feeling, and action naturally acquired in an Establishment, and those learned in such a body as the United Presbyterian Church, are so different as to lay a foundation for reasonable fear of uncomfortable collisions in church courts composed of those who have been formed to those respective habits."

In closing his communication to Mr. Peddie, Sir George says.—"Grey hairs are upon me here and there, and I know it well; the infirmities of advancing years are upon me, and I feel them much; painful reminiscences connected with the failure of not a few endeavours to benefit the Church or the country are upon me, and my heart is weighed down by their pressure. But I had last year withdrawn from the field of exertion, saddened and subdued. I had already bid adieu to my fond hope of witnessing the union from which I had anticipated such blessed and beneficial results." And he declares his strong aversion to meddling further "in such a hopeless undertaking."

CODEX VATICANUS.

We lately announced the publication of this very ancient manuscript, which all Biblical scholars have been so long desiring and expecting. It is alleged, however, that the publication is totally unsatisfactory. At a meeting of the Royal Society of Scotland, held in Edinburgh on 24th January, the Rev. Dr. Robert Lee, Professor of Biblical Literature in the University, made a number of remarks on the subject, and stated that, for dogmatic and ecclesiastical reasons, certain spurious or doubtful passages, which are wanting in the manuscript, have been inserted, such as John viii, 1-11, 1 John v, 7. The treatment of these and a variety of other passages he strongly condemned, and declared that "The book which costs £9 sterling is, for critical purposes—the only purposes for which it was wanted—not worth nine shillings." It is obvious that the public will never be satisfied without the publication of the original document exactly as it stands. Some have even spoken of having it photographed. But the Church of Rome has the absolute controul.