

'Bunsen's Biblical Researches,' and with having in such article advisedly maintained and affirmed certain erroneous doctrines and opinions contrary and repugnant to the doctrine and teaching of the United Church of England and Ireland. The passages on which it is sought to obtain a condemnation of Dr. Williams are chiefly those having reference to the moral and predictive elements of prophecy; in which the author contends that revelations like those of Christ are not confined to the first half-century of our era, but show at least affinities of our faith existing in men's minds anterior to Christianity, and renewed with deep echo from living hearts in many a generation; and the pages containing these passages are specified. In Article 10 Dr. Williams is charged with maintaining that the portion of the Holy Scripture usually called the Revelation of St. John the Divine, the epistle called the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the epistle usually called the Second Epistle of St. Peter, are not respectively parts of the Holy Scripture whose authority is binding on the Church. In various other articles he is charged with having published doctrines inconsistent with the teaching of the Church, and as tending to imply disbelief in the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures. The trial is likely to be a long one, and to be hardly fought out. A subscription has been entered into in order to indemnify the Bishop of Salisbury against any costs he may incur; and a defence fund has been raised for the purpose of paying the expenses of Dr. Williams, whose case, it is understood, will be conducted by Dr. Bayford." From all that I can learn, the Bishop is likely to be cast. With reference to the doctrines alleged to be heretical, the plea will probably be that they are not condemned by any Article or canon of the Church. The fact is that such doctrines were not dreamt of, when the standards of the Church were framed, and therefore they contain nothing on the subject. As to rejecting parts of the Holy Scripture, besides arguing that these were at one time not received by the Church, it will be maintained that Dr. Williams has not directly and articulately denied the canonical authority of these parts, but has only said what some persons interpreting his words inferentially and constructively, regard as implying a denial, for which he is not responsible. If the Essayists and Reviewers get clear off, the Church of England must receive a considerable shock. For all reflecting persons will see that she has absolutely no doctrines at all. Her worldly safety is, that, as some great man said, there is no person in the country with an income of £400 who is not either receiving, or has some friend or relative receiving, more or less from her revenues.

For a number of years, very large sums have been dispensed by the Privy Council for education in Scotland, as well as other parts of the Empire. The constitutionality of these grants, not coming through Parliament, has always been questioned. The amount has now become so vast, that a resolution has been formed to reduce the donations, and put the whole on a new footing. This has excited great dissatisfaction among the teachers, and also those employing them. The Free Church, in particular, are making a vigorous effort to get the matter reconsidered.

The Congregation of Finsbury Square Chapel, London, in which the late Rev. Dr. A. Fletcher was minister, gave a call to the Rev. A. Wallace, U. P. minister in Glasgow. It turns out, however, that they were willing to receive him only into the same position as Dr. F. occupied, *i. e.*, that he was not to be connected with the Presbytery. He has, of course, declined, and they have resolved not to apply again to our body for a min-