

Buildings.—Buildings to a certain extent are necessary to us; and partly from the present disquiet in the East, they have to be taken in hand as quickly as possible. Nearly all our work is going on in rented houses; and any intrigue against the work would occasion what has often happened already—the owner resuming occupation of his house, or selling it over our head. And rent is ruinously high, as has been instanced above in the case of Cairo.

The main buildings which we have in hand are those of the "Anglican College" at Jerusalem. These will offer permanent headquarters for the official work of the bishopric, for training native and other mission agents, and for services fairly representative of our Communion amongst other churches (a matter of great moment at this mother city of Christianity); and these buildings are also to be the centre of what is becoming a considerable Jewish mission. They thus illustrate both aspects of the bishopric representative of our Communion here—its attitude both towards other churches and as a missionary church. The necessity for these buildings is so imperative that we cannot avoid the outlay, and yet we have to keep up, at the same moment, the current work of our stations.

II. But the Church will give us credit for presenting to her aspects of missionary work of no common interest, and will understand that we must have buildings (churches, schools and institutes), if we can show the reality of the claims of such work as ours upon our home parishes, and that we are in fact the working deputies of such parishes; for we claim to be representative of our Communion here, from its mighty aggregate down to its humblest member. We need not surely now explain that a really missionary Church accepts the double commission of our Blessed Lord as He gave it to preach the Gospel to the Jew and to the Gentile; for we must accept the obligation as He gave it. We do not so accept it if we are missionary only to Gentile races. Let us set forward the very peculiar position of Jewish work here, in the Bible lands, and at the present time.

When Titus took the city of Jerusalem he carried away a large portion of his captives to Rome. But that portion was as nothing to the full population of Palestine. The result of the campaign left Palestine still inhabited by millions of Jews, crushed as a nation, and ruined as a church, who were not deported to Rome. But later on in the history of the land, after the revolt of various pretenders, and last of Barcochab, the Romans decided to punish the whole population. And then many thousands were slain in warfare, and many carried into slavery. But there were also vast numbers of Jews (a larger population in fact than that of Palestine), who were settled in colonies in the East; either in lands bordering on their own, or in the ancient settlements where "the Jews of the Dispersion" were already seated, in more or less affluence and civil independence, for purposes of trade and commerce, prior to the final overthrow. Of this character were the large colonies in Asia Minor, Syria, Assyria, Persia and Arabia; and also those in Ethiopia and other parts of Africa, and in Alexandria and other cities of Egypt. And round all these Jewish colonies were gradually formed conquests of the Church; nay, in the very earliest ages many were the converts from Judaism received into Gentile colonies of the Church. In Arabia and beyond the Jordan there are ancient buildings which show the importance of the early settlements of the Church, round those lands in which the Moslem religion spread. Think of the early Church history of Alexandria, and of the African Church, which gave so many noble names to the early rolls of the martyrs for the Faith. It may seem strange that such extraordinary promise died down, that those remarkable churches of Egypt and Africa, and others less prominent in history, but of very bright fame, did not spread the conquests of the Cross over the lands just beyond them, but seemed rather to sink down into apathy and corruption. Had the Arabian churches gone a little farther, and pressed their missions over the tribes of the interior, it would have been impossible that the Moslem proclamation of Monotheism could have found any success there. Faithfulness to their missionary obligation on the part of the four Patriarchates of the East (Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and later Constantinople), would have changed the history of these fair lands. Their faithlessness, discord and apathy in those days of their probation have indeed degraded them.

And this degradation is not the issue only of such causes as were already manifest in opposition in the days of St. John, through which the seven Churches of Lesser Asia and the Churches of Syria, Arabia, Africa, and Egypt, and the Christian Church of Jerusalem (first purely Hebrew, and then of mixed conversions), were destroyed or subjugated. Heresy and schism and slumber are indeed powerful for destruction, but they were not the sole reason why the religion of Mahomet succeeded, where it would have been easier and more natural that the Faith of

Christ should reign and prevail. All these lands were destined to the Church in the promises of God, but there was no second Joshua to lead her to possess them. The reason why heresy, schism, deadness of missionary spirit, and finally the great Infidelity, fell upon the four Patriarchates of the Church in the East, is yet to be sought for.

May not it be found in a neglect and disobedience, the issue of which gives most solemn warning to ourselves, now that we are facing movements of the Jews unparalleled since the days of their fall, and which bear many signs of fulfilment of the promise of their restoration? Christ gave a commission to His Church to evangelize the Jews and the Gentiles; it was given at the time of His institution of holy baptism; it therefore is laid upon the Church because it is individually laid upon Churchmen. But as soon as the apostles were gone (who themselves ever obeyed their double commission), she ceased to put forward the special message of mercy from our ascending Lord to those who had rejected Him; and pressed her conquests over the Gentile world alone (as we are doing to-day); and presently she reigned through the Empire of the Cæsars. The Church then indulged in an unchristian hatred of the Jews, since where the Jews did not receive the Gospel they were bitter persecutors of Christ, and betrayers of the Christians; and they became miserable, uninteresting, and disaffected exiles in the lands of the Church, down-trodden and oppressed by all. They did not see, they were not shown, the special message of mercy left as the legacy of their true Messiah. But Christians branded them with their modern character. The heathen laughed at them, and scorned them; but they were no more to the heathen of the Empire than any other conquered race. It was Christians who scorned them. It was the growing ambition in the Church in Rome which drove them into the darkness and degradation of the Ghetto. It was the rise of power and ambition in the Patriarchates of the East—Antioch, Alexandria, and more especially of the youngest of these sisters, Constantinople, the Patriarchate of new Rome—that kept the Church of the Hebrews down. The Roman conquerors, though they held the rebellious Jews with an iron hand, did not destroy the Christian Church of the mother city. Fifteen bishops of Hebrew descent ruled at Jerusalem, from James the Less to the days when Hadrian devastated the land, and 24 more of Gentile origin succeeded to the bishopric, till the date of the Chronicle of Eusebius ending with Bishop Hermon, who was then in office.

But it was not convenient to Rome, and it was not agreeable to Constantinople, that the mother city should remain, even in name, the metropolis of Christianity; nor that Jewish claims should be magnified in the Church. "To the Jew first" was not an accepted motto for missionary enterprise. Thus for reasons of ambition, and of natural horror against Judaism, the Church overlooked the terms of the commission of Christ concerning the Jews; and it was the Christian, not the Roman warrior, who drove them from their rights. Had the Church, in every colony of their exile, told them faithfully the sweet message of Christ, which He gave after His crucifixion, on the eve of His Ascension, it could not have been in human nature, certainly not in Jewish nature, to refuse the Gospel and its prospects as they now refuse it. Had they been received into the brotherhood of the Church, the gifts of such primacy as they possess must have made them so far prominent in the Church as to render the rise of Papal imperialism an impossibility. Had their defined place in the kingdom of Christ been accepted they must have felt that their duty (whilst exiles for Christ out of Palestine) was to promote the missions of the Church amongst the heathen around them. Backed by Church influence, instead of being persecuted and degraded by Church power, these colonies would have been centres of missionary light and enterprise in those regions where the Moslem power prevails over the Jewish colonies, and over the enfeebled branches of the Church, thus avenging the disobedience and the apathy of Christianity. Missionary spirit would have kept the faith of Christ in living vigilance; and the missions of the Church, instead of halting and decaying on the confines of the lands in which Mahomedan enthusiasm rose up and prevailed, would have Christianized their inhabitants. These would have received the Monotheism of Christianity, rather than that of Mahomet. The Arab tribes are sons of Abraham; by tradition, therefore, inclined to the belief that there is one God; and their present veneration for Jesus the Son of Mary points to the natural object of their faith.

Nor would the benefit of the co operation of Hebrew Christianity have ended there. Had the Church kept alive her missionary spirit and zeal, and had she carried the banner of the Cross forward through the East, and rendered the mission of Mahomet an impossibility, there must have been an entire alteration in the history of the Church. If the great Infidelity had never arisen in the world, the four Patriarchates in the East—Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and

Constantinople—would not have been subjugated, as they have been, by Mahomedan power, for these thirteen centuries. The balance of Church power would therefore not have been overthrown; the Churches of the East would have lifted up their voice in defence of the unity of the Church. Primacy in Councils of the Church might always have been conceded to the Bishop of Rome in virtue of its being the Imperial City. The four Patriarchs of the East now declare that, could a general council be called, in which the Bishop of Rome would preside under the conditions of Primitive Primacy, he would be acknowledged by them as *Primus inter pares* amongst the five great Patriarchs of Christianity.

The subject is one of far-reaching thought. But the practical point before ourselves, in view of the extraordinary revival of Jewish national spirit and power, is the sad lesson of the disobedience of the early Church. The will of Christ cannot be set aside; will the Church of to-day give a whole-hearted or a half-hearted response to the call to missionary duty: will she recognize the equal claim of the Jews to the Gospel of the Saviour?

The question is one primarily for the clergy: for what parish will refuse to respond to the invitation of its minister to take up the cause of Jewish Missions in the Holy Week? The responsibility of giving this invitation lies on the clergy of the Church.

Home & Foreign Church News

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENTS.

NOVA SCOTIA.

FREDERICK COURTNEY, D.D., BISHOP, HALIFAX.

MAHONE BAY.—Rev. E. A. Harris, M.A., rector, has been invited to accept the rectorship of St. George's, Parrsboro'.

Rev. Mr. Bent will assume charge of the parish of Chester after Easter.

Rev. Rural Dean Axford returned from England on Feb. 21st, via S.S. Labrador. His duty was taken by students from the college the last four months.

QUEBEC.

ANDREW H. DUNN, D.D., BISHOP, QUEBEC.

QUEBEC.—The annual meeting of the Church Society was held last month under the presidency of the lord bishop of the diocese, and brought together a fairly large number of interested members. After the confirmation of previous minutes a number of reports were presented, covering the varied work in the diocese during the past year. Speaking generally, these were of a very satisfactory nature, inasmuch as they revealed the fact that the year 1896 had been one of unusual activity in church building and in missionary operations, and that the resources of the diocese were keeping pace with the growing demands made upon them. The aggregate amount raised for general purposes in the diocese last year exceeded by several thousand dollars the total revenue of 1895. This gratifying increase is quite apart from the Jubilee Fund in behalf of Lennoxville University, which the authorities of that institution have had in hand, and which, including Mr. Robert Hamilton's generous gift of \$20,000, now exceeds \$40,000. The work that is being done in this extensive diocese is evidently not confined to the men. A very important share is being borne by the two organizations of women, viz: "The Association of Church Helpers," here in Quebec, and "The Church Society Helpers" in the diocese at large. This is not surprising, for are not women ever found foremost in good works? Several names were enrolled on the list of ordinary members of the Society, and four life members were elected, viz: The Rev. A. G. Hamilton Dicker, Lady Chapleau, Mrs. H. Atkinson, and Miss Robina Hamilton. The vice-presidents of the past year were all re-elected; as also the members of the Central Board, with the additional names of Messrs. Wm. Gunn, G. F. Gibsons, and Walter Henderson. The personnel of the Diocesan Board remains the same, with the exception that Col. J. Bell Forsythe's name was substituted for that of Dr. Robert Hamilton—the latter's resignation having been very reluctantly accepted. The lord bishop referred in grateful terms to the exceedingly valuable and constant services, gratuitously rendered to the Church Society, by their Honorary Counsel, the Hon. Judge Irvine, Dr. James Dunbar, Q.C., and Messrs. George Lampron and Robert Campbell, and a hearty vote of thanks was tendered these gentlemen, as also the auditors of the Society, for their kind services. Considerable business followed, but not of public interest. On the whole, it may