THE BISHOPRIC OF ST. JAMES, AT JERUSALEM.

OBJECTIONS TO THE APPOINTMENT OF A BISHOP. (From the London Times of the 19th October.)

We have taken occasion more than once to express our conviction that the position which recent events have enabled the Government of this country to assume in Turkey may be, and ought to be, taken advantage of for the promotion of the great interests of Christianity; and that the only wise and become way in which Great Britain can interfere for such a purpose, is by exercising ber influence for the protection and conso tion of the ancient orthodox churches of the Oriental communion. The policy of Lord Palmerston and Lord Ponsonby was such, as to leave those churches (constituting, as they do, the great majority of Oriental Christians, and including as well the whole population of the kingdom of Greece, as a most important portion of the subjects of the Turkish empire) no other alternative than to look to Russia as their protectress. This they have done, and still do, in Greece especially, with real reluctance; for the influence of Russia has never been exercised in a manner friendly to their civil liberties. England has it in her power at any moment, by holding out the right hand of fellowship to them, to put an end to the moral influence of the northern autocrat in that quarter. The political advantages of such a change, in the event of any contest taking place be tween England and Russia upon the theatre of the Levant, need not be pointed out. But it is material to observe the benefits which must accrue to the highest interests of mankind from the establishment of such relations between the British Government and the Greek ortholox communion.

When we consider the origin, the history, the constitution and the numbers of the orthodox Greek churches-when we remember that they were undoubtedly founded by the Apostles, or in apostolic times; that they have preserved the Christian faith through many centuries of cruel oppression and perse-cution, under circumstances of trial peculiar to themselves; that their authorities have as clear a derivative title to respect and obedience as the spiritual rulers of any other Christian country; that, whatever their corruptions may be, they resame standards of doctrine, and are under the same system of church government, with ourselves; that no barries of mutual anathemas exists between them and us; that they constitute the natural and only possible centre of Christian unity in the East, unless we admit the supremacy of Rome,when we consider all these things, our minds must be strangely warped by secturian prejudices, if we look to any other quarter for the permanent consolidation and eventual triumph of Christianity in Western Asia. Intercourse with England could not fail to elevate their character, and lead to their purification from abuses, if that recognition and support, which is fairly their due, were accorded to them; and we are convinced that nothing more than this would be necessary for the speedy and effectual extinction of Islamism by moral means. Besides this it may be added, that mere generosity towards churches which have suffered so much and so long at the hands of infidels, for the sake, not of their errors or peculiarities, but of their and our own common faith, would dietate the course which we have suggested. It would be to prove ourselves worse than in-fidels, if we were to use the political influence which we have required with their persecutors, not to restore and reinvigorate, but to overthrow and supplant them at the very moment when they are beginning to enjoy a prospect of better days. It was with such feelings that we, not long ago, expressed our disgust at the conduct of Lord Ponsonby, who on two separate occasions used his influence with the Turkish Government to procure the deposition of the Christian patriarch of Constantinople for merely political reasons. This outrage excited throughout the orthodox churches of the East the deepest resentment and indignation, and created a very unfavourable impression of the moral and religious character of the British people. Since that time the representative of Queen Victoria has taken further steps to separate his country from all sympathy with those churches, by identifying himself with parties who are seeking to found a Protestant sect at Jerusalem. miserable divisions are, it seems, to be added to those which already afflict the Oriental Church; and Protestantism is to be fortified with exclusive privileges, secured by the firman of an infidel sovereign, in order that it may with the better success lift up its beel against the prelate who now occupies by legitimate succession, the episcopal throne of St. James. the part which England takes in the religious politics of the

If this were all it would be sad enough; but we fear there is more behind. We have seen an ominous announcement in the Ecclesiastical Gazette, which appears to proceed from some sort of notherity, and which fills us with serious apprehension that the Church of England may be committed by her rulers to take part in this unwarrantable invasion of her Oriental sister in Palestine. Little did we think, when we lately commended to the support of our readers what was represented to be a design for the formation and endowment of colonial bishopries, that the powers granted by Parliament for that purpose would be employed for one so different as the mission of a Bishop onsecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to Palestin Yet we are told that "arrangements are now in progress for the nediate establishment of a Bishop for Paleatine, to reside chiefly at Jerusalem." And, as if to sweeten the draught, it is added, that " His Majesty the King of Prussia, who takes a warm interest in the religious affairs of the East, has contributed largely to the endowment of the Bishopria of Palestine, so that it will not be chargeable to the new colonial fund." In ant of fact, we believe that the whole scheme is of purely point of fact, we believe that the whole scheme is of purery Prussian origin, and that the King of Prussia has sent M. Brunsen to this country, upon a special mission for the sole purpose of accomplishing it. Certain religious societies have been consulted, and a Mr. Alexander a converted Jew, is reported to have been fixed upon for the Bishop. More than this e do not know; but from this it appears certain that our Bishops have been solicited to identify the English Church with German Protestantism; and at the suggestion of a foreign Lutheran Prince, to organize a rival communion to the Greek orthodox Church within the patriarchate of Jerusalem, where neither Great Britain nor Prussia possesses a single inch of territory. We cannot, and will not, believe that the Birhops of England are prepared to strengthen the handa of the Romanists in controversy, by thus abandoning at a moment's notice the principles and the practice which have hitherto distinguished the Church of England from the foreign Protestant communities. We cannot believe that the present advisers of the Crown are willing, for the sake of obliging the King of Prussia, to alienate irrevocably from Great Britain and fix unalterably upon Russia the affections of all the Christian Churches of Asia and Eastern Europe. We are persuaded either that the announcement to which we have adverted is altogether premature, or that the plan will not be carried into effect unless the consent of the orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem to the establishment of a separato Bishop for Englishmen and other Protestanta within his jurisdiction is previously obtained. We are the rather led to this conclusion, because it is generally understood that offers of amity and co-operation were made, only last year, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to the Greek prelates of Athens and Constantinople; and that the agent through whom those offers were made distinctly repudiated all responsibility on the part of the English Church for any of the schinnutical actions of Protestant wis sionaries in the Levant. Nor, indeed, is it conceivable that our spiritual rulers would attack an inuffensive and persecuted body like the Greek Church by which they are not excommu nicated, while they leave untouched the Roman by which they are. There are very numerous English Protestants constantly residing in Italy, yet we never heard of any proposal to send bishop to Rome. Hitherto it has been a characteristic excellence of the English Church to respect the authority of other Catholic churches within their proper limits, not only when partially differing from her, but even when schismatically attacking her. She has never yet retaliated evil for evil, much less has she been guilty of any act of wanton and unprovoked aggression. We repeat, that we cannot and will not give credence to the suggestion that her bishops have suddenly, without deliberation or consultation, without ascertaining the general sentiments of the Church, without taking time to consider the consequences which may flow from such a step at home and abroad, without any apparent pretext, temptation, or motive, resolved to depart from this peaceful character, and imitate the worst peculiarities of the Romish system.

> THE PRECEDING OBJECTIONS SUSTAINED. (From the London Times of 26th (kt.)

Our article on this day week, upon the King of Prussia's scheme for procuring the consecration of an English bishop to preside over a motley congregation of Protestants in Palestine, elicited from an evening contemporary [The Standard] a statement which we cannot pass over in silence. gether certain," says our contemporary, "that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has consented to consecrate, early in November next, the Hebrew Professor of King's College as the Bishop of the Church of St. James of Jerusalem

"The case," it is added, "does not stand exactly in the attitude in which it has been represented to The Times. Instead of there being one acknowledged Patriarch, or Bishop of Jerusilem, belonging to the Greek Church, and resident there, The Greek patriarch who bears that title there are service. resides at Constantinople. The Roman Catholic prelate, called of Jerusalem, resides somewhere else. In Jerusalem itself there are, as we have said, several persons exercising episcopal authority, of the Armenian and other eastern churches. The Protestant churches are the only section of the Christian world that, to their shame be it spoken, have had no representative in the holy city. Of late great changes have taken place, and greater are at hand. An English consul has been placed there, and Palestine is becoming the centre of many hopes and expectations; both among Jews and Christians there is a growing disposition to settle in that land. With Protestants, however, one paramount want has always been the absence of any known and recognised ecclesiastical authority so that converts to Christianity, or members of Protestant churches, were considered by the Turks as little else than vagu-

nds. This deheiency it is now proposed to supply." Our contemporary proceeds to express his opinion that this arrangement, and the manner in which (according to him) it ias been effected, are to the honour of all parties concerned; and with reference to our objection that the new prelate would be justly regarded by the orthodox Greek church as a schismatical intruder, he thinks it sufficient to repeat his assertion that the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem "resides at Constantinople," has no more exclusive right to call himself the successor of St. James than any of the other six or seven persons whe exercise episcopal authority at Jerusalem."

Our answer to this is simple. We shall abstain from tres-passing upon the limits of theological controversy, and shall content ourselves with observing, that he the merits or demerits of the Greek communion what they may, the church of England, if tried by her own standards, could not adopt the views of our contemporary without incurring the guilt of schism.

There are, not six or seven, but (we believe) fire nomina bishops of different communions at Jerusalem; and it may be asked, why may not the church of England send a sixth, or why should she recognise any one of these five rather than the rest? We reply, because the church of England, whether rightly or wrongly, protests against schism, and makes a difference between what she calls orthodoxy and what she calls Three of these "bishops" at Jerusalem belong seveto the Maronite, the Nestorian, and the Jacobite sects; and we suppose that it will not be disputed that the church of England regards the members of all those sects as heretics .-The fourth is an intruding Roman Catholic hishop; and as the church of England does not acknowledge the authority of the Pope in Ireland, we presume she will be slow to admit it at Jerusalem. Four, therefore, of these "hishops" are what we must needs regard as schisulitical pretenders, and it cannot be hought that the Archbishop of Canterbury intends either to recognise their authority or to imitate their example. It remains to be considered whether the fifth, the or hodox patriarch whose derivative title to his office is, as far as we know, unexceptionalde, and whose exclusive jurisdiction is recognised by the great and influential Greek communion, stands in the sam

The first objection brought against the patriarch is his illeged non-residence; -" he lives at Constantinople." Whether this is true, and if so what may be the reason, we cannot pretend to say; but we have yet to learn that non-residence varates the episcopal office. Bishop Watson, of Llandaff, resided always in Westmoreland; Bishop North, of Winchester, almost wholly in Italy; yet we never heard of the Greek church sending hishops to occupy their sees on that account, nor would such a step, if taken, have been easily justified on church of England principles.

The main point is, what view does the church of England each her members to take of the Greek orthodox communion? We have before us a work dedicated by permission to the Arch bishops of Conterbury and Armagh, and, as we know, strongly recommended by several hishops as a text-book for the use of clerical students. Its title is, A Treatise on the Church, by the Rev. W. Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford. The author is reputed to stand very high in the esteem of some of our most influential prelates.

From this work we shall quote a few sentences, which may show in what light those who have adopted the author's views must have learned (whether rightly or wrongly) to regard such ections as the invasion of the patriarchate of Jerusalem by an

English bishop. In vol. 1, pp. 60, 61 (second edition), we read as follows:-Separation from the church is incapable of justification."---Whoever is separated from any sound part of the church by chism or just excommunication is by that means separated from the whole church. Whence appears the necessity which every Christian is under of maintaining communion with the particular church wherein be lives, in order to his communion with the church Catholic, and with Christ the bead of it."-And in page 63, "The mere existence of doctrinal errors, (not amounting to heresy.) "or the corruption of rites and sacraments in any church, afford no excuse whatever for separation from its communion."

In page 179 we are told, that "The vast and numerou churches of the East are all ruled by bishops and archbishops of whom the chief are the four putitarchs of Constantinople Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. \* \* \* \* I maintain that these various churches form a portion of the Catholic

church of Christ." In page 182 the author says of the same churches, "It is ertain that they reject every hereay formerly condemned by the Catholic church, and if any one presumes to teach novelties they condemn and excommunicate him." In page 184, he forms us that "there have been, at various times, marks of nion between members of the Oriental church and of the British;" and instances Archdencon Basire, who, during is travels in 1653, "at Jerusalem received from Paisius, patriarch of that see, his patriarchal seal (the regular sign of crelence among them), to express his desire of communion with the church of England. He was also permitted to preach frequently in the Greek churches at Constantinople; where, in testimony of his doctrine, he presented to the Patriarch of in the presence entechism of the church of England, which was also highly approved by the other Oriental patriarchs." In the same page are expressly told that "the Oriental churches are included in the Catholic church by all our theologians, though they observe with regret certain imperfections, abuses, and errors mong them, which detract from their perfection, but do not deprive them of the character of Christian churches."

We will extract only one passage more, for the sake of its direct bearing upon the situation of members of the church of England who happen to be in Palestine:-"If members of the Latin churches should find themselves resident, in quest of merchandize or other temporal objects, in the regions of the Driental charches, and should be unable, through ignorance of the language, or from some other inconvenience, to receive the full benefit of administration in the Oriental church, it would not be schismatical in them to call in the aid of Latin priests. WITH CONSENT OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITIES OF

THE EAST." We pronounce no opinion upon this doctrine. If it is admitted to be the doctrine of the church of England (and we know not upon what other view the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London could address the Bishops of Athens and Constantinople, as they did last year, in terms distinctly recognizing their orthodoxy and episcopal jurisdiction), it cannot be true that the Archbishop of Canterbury has agreed to consecrate a bishop for Palestine, without "the consent of the ecclesiastical authorities of the East." If it is not the doctrine of the church of England, all we can say is, that it circulates as such, and (in that case) the sooner it is disavowed by those competent to settle such questions the better.

THE PRECEDING OBJECTIONS REPLIED TO BY THE REV. WILLIAM PALMER. (From the Times).

Sir,-I take the liberty of addressing to you a few observa tions in reference to the appointment of a Bishop for the Anglo-Catholic communion in Palestine—a subject in connexion with which you have done me the honour to introduce my name Having given some attention to the case, and been lately fa voured with opportunities for forming an opinion of the princi-ples which have dictated the design, and which will guide its execution, it seems to me that there are certain misconception affoat on the subject which may without much difficulty be re-

In the first place, then, I am enabled to state, on the highest authority, that the appointment of a Bishop for Palestine is not designed as an interference with the prior claims and juris diction of the orthodox Oriental Churches; it is merely intended to afford to those members of our communion who may be resident in Palestine the benefits of superintendence and spiritual care according to the rites and discipline of the Church. It will be remembered that the venerable prelate who presides over our churches publicly disclaimed (at a meeting for the in-stitution of the fund for endowing colonial bishopries) any intention, on the part of the Church of England, to make prose lytes amongst the Christian Churches bordering on the Medi-The appointment of a Bishop for Palestine is then merely a temporary and provisional arrangement for the benefit of our own people, until the communion which existed for so many ages between our Churches and those of the East is restored.

I may further add, on the highest authority, that the title of "Bishop of Jerusalem" was never for a moment contemplated by the heads of the Church. It was felt that exceptions night be raised against that title, as seeming to interfere with the authority of the legitimate Patriarch; and in consequence with a view to mark the distinction in the clearest manner, the title is to be "Bishop of St. James's Church at Jerusalem." It would be difficult to point out any example of a similar de-signation in ecclesiastical history, except in the case of the annent suffragans of St. Martin's Canterbury; so that the distinction of title seems sufficiently marked, and will carry along with it an acknowledgment of the authority of the Patriarch

The friendly correspondence which exists between the heads admitted than these in all parts of the Church—Greek, Roman, To what superior jurisdiction will be be subject? Who will be be subject? Who will be be subject? in itself a sufficient pledge that the Bishop who is to be sent into Palestine will be provided with such instructions as will tend to promote the union of Churches instead of impeding it. He can be readily introduced to the Oriental Patriarchs as the representative of the Anglo-Catholic Churches, and as com-missioned to prevent, as tar as possible, any intringement on their authority, or any attempts to provelytize their people. Furnished with such instructions, and guided by such principles, studiously avoiding all interference with the Oriental Church, and at the same time aiding in the promotion of all its best interests, the Bishop to be stationed at Jerusalem may impress the most favourable notions of our Churches; may beme the channel of frequent and friendly communications between our chief rulers and the East; and may contribute materially to the re-union of brethren separated for several ages.

Permit me to add a few observations in reference to the questions of principle on which you have done me the honour to quote from a work of mine. It is, then, most true that the Oriental is a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, and it would therefore he wholly inconsistent with sound principle to eparate voluntarily from her communion, or to excite or encourage such separations. But it is a fact that the Oriental Church and our own have, for a considerable time, been esranged from communion by certain misunderstandings which do not render either party guilty of schism. Under these circumstances, various members of our Churches fix their resilence in Palestine; and not being actually in communion with the Patriarch of Jerusalem and his suffragan Bishops, cannot either receive the excraments from the priests of the Church, or obtain license of the ordinaries for the clergy of their own language and rite. They have then no alternative remaining, but to seek from the Church of England clergy to administer the means of grace, and a hishop to preside over them. This is not any interference with the jurisdiction of the l'atriarch of Jerusalem, because he does not claim or exercise jurisdiction over those who are, de jacto, separated from his ommunion. It is, in short, a mere matter of necessity, arising rom the circumstance of separate communions—a circumstance which we must lament, and desire no longer to exist. passage which you have quoted from my treatise, alluding to opriety of obtaining the license of the oriental bishops for the Latin clergy in their dioceses, was intended to apply to a case where there was no separation of communion

Let me further observe, that the schism of the Romanists in this country consists in their assumption of the character of the Catholic Church to the exclusion of our more rightful claims; in their continual and avowed efforts to make converts amongst our people; in the fact of their voluntary separation from our Catholic and Apostolic Churches in the reign of Elizabeth; in their rejection of the nuthority of our bishops; and in their refusal to unite themselves to us. In all these respects their induct furnishes no parallel to the course which is now purming in reference to the design before us.

I cannot conclude these remarks without adding a tribute of nost respectful gratitude to the illustrious person, to whom the Church is indebted for the suggestion of so salutary a design, and whose private munificence has furnished a large portion the funds requisite to carry it into effect. His Majesty the King of Prussia has, in this instance, been guided by principles which must excite the warmest sympathy, and command the strongest approbation and admiration of every sound member of the Church to whom they are made known. The institution of a bishop of the Anglo-Catholic communion in Palestine, under whose juri-diction Prussian, as well as English, subjects will be allowed to place themselves, and to receive orders when duly qualified, promises to be one amongst several causes which tend to the increase of sound religion, and the revival of ecclesinstical government in Germany. In this point of view I can not but think that the design is one which is full of hope for the cause of sound religion; and I would conclude by observing, that while I cannot agree with those who regard this appoint ment with doubt or uncasiness, it is at the same time a subjecof most unfeigned pleasure and gratification to remark the solidity and truth of the principles on which it has been objected to; although those principles do not seem exactly applicable to

the particular case before us. I have the honour to remain, yours, &c., WILLIAM PALMER. Oxford, Oct. 27.

ADDITIONAL REPLIES TO THE PRECEDING OBJECTIONS

(From the Times). Sir,-I am at a loss to conceive how you, writing in defence of Catholic principles, can consider it in accordance with those principles to call the Bishops of our Church to account before he anonymous and self-constituted tribunal of a public journal. I could hardly be tempted by any prospect of advantage to so dangerous a course; but what I would not dure do for purposes of attack, I will venture upon for those of defence. Let this, then, be my own apology for addressing you upon this subject. Now, while I assent to the principles laid down in your articles of this day, and of Tuesday last, respecting the appointment of an Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem. I must demur to the application of them made by you. The gravamen of your charge against the proposed measure is, that it involves the Church of England in an act of schism and hostility to the apostolical and orthodox Church of the East. On this subject I would offer you a few observations, first stating the points on which I agree with you. I will assume, then, that it would be easy to secretain who is the legitimate Patriarch of Jerusalem. Neither Roman nor heretical intruders could the Church of nd for a moment recognise. I grant his rights are no wa affected by his non-residence, if, as I believe, a deputed bishop occupies his place; much more, the fact of there being four or five bishops in Jerusalem is no excuse for our sending another We should rather deplore the disunion which such a fact betokens. With the principles quoted from Mr. Palmer's most valuable work I cordially agree; all I question is, the right

application of them by you in this instance.

And first, as to its being an act of hostility to the Eastern Church to send an Anglican Bishop to Jerusalem. This yo assume in both your articles. I maintain, on the contrary, that it is intended by the heads of our Church as an act of friend ship and protection-of protection which the Church and State of England are, perhaps, alone under God able to yield to the ancient and persecuted churches of the East. You are well aware that the Bishop of Rome, backed by the influence an intrigues of the French Ambassador, is, and has long been seeking by every means which fraud or force can supply to ndermine the independence of the Greek Church throughou the East, and reduce it to submit to his usurpation. To Eng land alone, and to her Church, the Bishops of the East le succour; but they look in vain throughout the East for any one authorized to represent the English Church. They can not treat with Presbyters, inasmuch as, like ourselves, allow the power of government to rest in Bishops only. is, therefore, great need that there should be one of the Episco pal order, to whom they may look as accredited by the English Church, through whom they may make applications to their brothen in England: who may, in short, superintend on ou side that intercourse which it is so desirable should be restore between ourselves and the Eastern Church: and last, not least who may authoritatively clear the English Church from being at all mixed up with the proceedings of dissenting and un ordained missionaries in the Levant, who are at present ready to colour their own schismstical proceedings by her name. then, the act of sending a Bishop to Jerusalem be intended a one of friendship, and not of hostility, why, you will ask, has the assent of the eastern Bishops not been obtained for it? because they are not in a condition to grant it, if they would. It might be made a pretext for their degradation at Within the last two years two Patriarchs of Constantinople (one since the unhappy act of Lord Ponsonby have been summarily degraded. The Armenian Patriarch nomentarily expecting the same fate. It is not uncommon for a l'atriarch, at his appointment, to stipulate what rank he shal hold upon his degradation. The late Patriarch is accordingly simple metropolitan. Under these circumstances, when the Church is overriden by an infidel power, ready at any momen to degrade or bowstring her chief governors, thus depriving them in great part of their free agency, is any one prepared to say that Catholic principles in their utmost rigidity, withou my reference to existing difficultice, are to be followed by ou Bishops to their extremest results? Are they not to consider the secret wishes, together with the helpless condition, of their May they not aid them in the way they know would be most effective, in the way that is most desired though it could not be openly requested, or even sanctioned?-Are they to stand by and see the ancient and orthodox Church of the East sink beneath the treachery and corruptions of Rome, though she call on them for aid, and he ready to embrac armed, lest Rome, and those who would crouch to Rome, and be spurned for their pains, should charge them with

This word "schism" brings me to your second accusation. Now, the ancient law of the Catholic Church, universally acted upon, is undoubtedly one bishop in one city. "Insomuch that Theodoret tells us, when Constantius proposed to the Roman people to have Liberius and Felix sit as copartners, and govern the Church in common, they unanimously agreed to reject the tries by the Bishops to be consecrated. But we cannot seri-motion, crying out, 'Que God, one Christ, one Bishop!'" ously suppose that this parcelling out of jurisdiction by Queet Bingham, h. 2, c. 13. And if Catholic principles will not olerate two bishops of one see by mutual consent, much less , Princes; and if it were, we are at a loss to understand by what will they countenance two or more rival bishops. his flock, is an act of the most inexcusable schism. To ordain in another man's diocese, without his consent, is an act of schism also. There are no rules of order more generally in conformity with their views, by the new Bishop himself.

our Churches and those of the Oriental Churches furnishes Russian, Auglican. And ret you will find in Bingham, b. 2, c. 5, sec. 3, instances where the last, at least, was broken through. Who so constant a defender of truth and order as the illustrious Athanasius? Yet, "when the Church was in danger of being overrun with Arianism, he made no scruple, as he returned from his exile, to ordain in several cities as he went along, though they were not in his own diocese;" because, as the same Bingham says, "in case of pressing necessity, when the interest of God was to be served, every bishop had power to act in any part of the Church; for, though all bishops had their particular churches to officiate in, and were not ordinarily to exceed their own bounds, yet the love of Christ was a rule above all; and therefore men were not barely to consider the thing that was done, but the circumstances of the action, the time, the manner, the persons for whose sake, and the end for which it is done." "From all this, it appears that every bishop was as much an universal bishop, and had as much the care of the whole Church, as the Bishop of Rome himself; there being no acts of the episcopal office which they could not perform in any part of the world when need required, without a dispensation, as well as he." Now the Eastern Church is in great danger of being overwhelmed by infi-lelity, or supplanted by the minious of the Roman Pontiff. And consider the state of Jerusalem in particular. That it is a heathen city, "trodden down of the Gentiles;" that, while the diocese of the legitimate Patriarch in theory may comprehend the city and neighbourbood, it is in fact restricted to the church and convent in which he or his deputy resides; that it would cost him his life to set foot in many parts of Jerusalem; that the Anglican Bishop is sent not to his people, but to ours, over whom he cannot exercise pastoral jurisdiction, while our bishop, being authorized to dwell there by the Sultan, and guarded by the power of the English name, might, in case of necessity, yield him a protession, which no law could gain for him from his own desputic monarch. Perhaps, Sir, you have little notion under what a miserable

ncertainty of continual danger the Eastern bishops exercise their precarious authority. This I can testify from their own letters. It is not enough that the sword of a despot is suspended by a hair over their heads; they have to dread beside the wiles of the French intriguer, and the Romish false brother. Further, Sir, our Bishop would be ready to supply, not only to the Bishop of Jerusalem, but to others, correct information as to our principles, our Liturgy, our worship. He might be the means of communicating to Eastern hishops, without impairing their lawful authority, or violating any ecclesiastical principle that instruction, either orally, by letter, or from books printed in this country, of which they stand in great need, and are no less desirous. He would be looked upon by them, not as ar intruder or enemy, but as a mark of the interest which the English Church takes in their affairs. Is not this a case, then in which our bishops may use that license, which, in the pas sage I have quoted, is granted by Bingham, whose authority will not be disputed? May they not, without schism, send hishop for their own people to Jerusalem, if they judge it to be for the interest of the Catholic Church that they should do so No Churchman can for a moment doubt that they have anx iously and maturely weighed the difficulties surrounding them that they have felt the anomalies and fractions of principle cutsiled upon the Church Universal by her present unhappy state of division; that they have cautiously considered whethe n this matter they should act, or whether they should forbeat to act. I would pray English Catholics to give their owr Bishops some little credit for Catholicism. The result of their leliberation is plain: the Eastern Church has called on them for aid, and they think the most effectual way of answering that call is by sending an Anglican Bishop to Jerusalem-one 100, of Jewish blood, like St. James and his immediate suc cessors. I am, Sir, your faithful servant,

Anglo-Catholicus.

Sir,-The question raised respecting the propriety of the ap pointment of Professor Alexander as bishop over the English residents in Palestine deserves consideration. But I am innclined to think the title given to the bishop elect in the Ecclesiastical Gazette has led to some misapprehension as to his intended position and authority. Bishop Alexander will preside over the missionaries and other English residents in Palestine, but neither his title nor his duties will interfere in any way with the title and the prerogatives of the only true Bisho of Jerusalem-the Patriarch of the Greek Church. Althoug the Latin Church has been in fault in the appointment of a Bisho of Jerusalem, I understand that no breach has thereby been cause between herself and the Greek Church. Therefore it seems unnecessary to suppose that offence will be given by the appointment of an Anglican missionary bishop, not claiming Palestine as his see. This case will be precisely similar to that of Bishop Luscombe, in Paris, against whose exercise of authority no protest has been raised by the Latin Archbishop of Paris.

The advantages of the appointment are great. It will tend o strengthen the hands of the Patriarch of Jerusalem in resisting the encroachment of the Latin Church missionaries in Jerusalem. It will conciliate the prejudices of the Jew, who feels respect for the episcopal authority, perceiving in it a close re-

mblance to his own national hierarchy.

It will afford the British residents in that part of the East iose privileges of which they ought not to be deprived in their long exile from their own country. Other advantageous results might be pointed out, but they will suggest themselves; I shall content myself, therefore, with this rough outline, begging for its admission into your paper. Your obedient servant,

VINDICATOR.

POSITION OF THE ENGLISH BISHOP IN PALESTINE. (From the Times.)

If our remarks on the subject of the proposed mission of an English Bishop to Palestine were to produce no effect beyon eliciting such explanations as those offered in the letter of the Rev. Mr. Palmer which we publish to-day, and in that of an equally well-informed correspondent signing himself "Anglo-Catholicus," which appears in our columns this day, we should have every reason to rejoice that they were made. The sources from which these letters come are such as to leave no doubt upon our minds that the statements which they contain are made upon authority, and that we may receive them as a con-clusive exposition of the views with which the propositions of

the King of Prussia have been entertained by our Prelates. It appears, then, or it may be inferred with certainty, from these statements, that if an English Bishop is sent to Palestine, he will go pledged (so far as our Bishops can pledge him) to recognize and support the exclusive spiritual jurisdiction of the orthodox Greek Patriarch; to seek communion with the ortho dox Greek Church; to oppose himself to all attempts of schismatical missionaries to make conversions from that Church to Protestantism; to use his best exertions for the establishment of strictly Catholic relations between it and the Church of England; and to become a medium, through which the secular in fluence of Great Britain may be brought to bear upon the Turkish Government, in a manner favourable to the extension of the religious liberties of its Christian subjects. "The Eastern Church," we are assured, "has called upon our Bishops for aid:" the "secret wishes" of the Patriarch of Jerusalem and his brother Bishops have been ascertained to be in favour of such an intervention, and the proposed establishment of a Bishop in Palestine is the "way in which it is most desired" that our intervention should take place. The ceremony of making a formal application, and obtaining a formal consent, has been dispensed with, only because, in "the present helpless condition of our eastern brethren," they would be exposed to some unex plained evil consequences, at the hands of the Turkish Govern ent, if they were openly to give their sanction to this plan.

It is impossible to deny that such explanations make a wide difference in the aspect of the whole design, and show that, in the remarks which we formerly offered, we were proceeding upon a mistaken impression of its character. We are free, how ever, to confess, that the project still appears to us to be encumered with very serious objections and difficulties, the nature of which we will now proceed to indicate.

In the first place, we must respectfully inquire, in what nanner the Bishops of the Church of England propose to confer jurisdiction upon their new prelate, and by what sanctions that jurisdiction is to be enforced? It might happen (and, indeed, is far from improbable) that there would be persons, ostensibly members or even ministers of his congregation in Palestine, who would act in opposition to his enlightened and Catholic views with respect to the orthodox Greek communic He would thus, in the absence of any coercive powers, be exhibited in the degrading light of a merely nominal Bishop, with out practical authority of any kind; and if the Greeks did not learn to suspect his sincerity and good faith, by seeing him apparently identified with schismatical individuals, they wou not receive a very exalted impression of the state of discipline in the English Church. We are aware that the act of Parliament under which this consecration is intended to take place empowers the Queen to assign limits, within which spiritual jurisdiction "over the ministers of British congregations of the United Church of England and Ireland, and over such other Protestant congregations as may be desirous of placing them selves under their authority," may be exercised in foreign counously suppose that this parcelling out of jurisdiction by Queen intended to take effect in the dominious of sanctions it could be enforced.

Secondly (which is a still graver objection), we cannot per ceive what security the Bishops of the Church of England can possibly have for the due discharge of the functions of his office,

his primate? How are his acts to be brought under review? How can be be restrained or superseded, in case he should so conduct himself in his mission as to embarrass instead of proving the state of our relations with the Oriental Church? As far as we can see, there will be no power over him retained As far as we can see, there will be no power over him retained in England, except the power of the purse; and that will apparently be lodged, not with our Bishops, but chiefly in the hands of a Lutheran potentate, the King of PRUSSIA. We cannot suppose that the Archbishop of CANTERBURY would, in any suppose that the SPLTAN in aid of his spiritual authories.

suppose that the Arthuruspos of this spiritual authority.

And here we must observe, that if the views of our Bishops a this matter are really such as they have been represented to be (and we cannot doubt it), it does seem not a little extraordinary, that Jerusalem rather than Constantinople should have been selected as the place for the new prelate's residence; that (in combination with that circumstance) a clergyman of the Jewish race should have been selected for the Bishop; and lastly, that the plan should have originated with the King of Prussia. It is obviously incredible, that this estimable Monarch should be actuated by precisely those motives which are assigned by "Anglo-Catholicus" for the English part in the transaction. Mr. Palmer suggests that his Majesty has reorted to this plan, as a circuitous mode of introducing a regasorted to this pian, as a creations about of infroducing a rega-lar Episcopacy into Protestant Germany; but we must really hesitate before we acquiesce in so singular an opinion. Others have alleged, that there exists a design for the establishment in Palestine of a Judeo-Christian community. We mention them things, because we think that no mystery ought to be made of the true character of the plan.

We trust it is needless for us to observe, in conclusion, with reference to the opening remarks of "Anglo-Catholicus," that in what we have suid nothing has been further from our intenion than to depart from the respect which is so eminently day tion than to depart from the respect which is so entinently due to the Bishops of the Church of England, or "to call them to account" before any unauthorized tribunal. We merely deired to express our firm belief, that reports which were in ein culation, attributing to them a departure from the principles of the Church over which they preside, could not be well-founded; and we are happy to have elicited, by so doing, a distinct disa-vowal of the intention to act inconsistently with those principles.

COLONIAL AND FOREIGN BISHOPS.

(From the London Ecclesiastical Guzette, 9th Nov.) In another part of this Gazette will be found an announce

nent of the consecration of the Right Rev. M. S. Alexander s "Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem." We are led to notice this event more particularly here, partly because the statements which we made in our last Jerusalem. number have been made the subject of discussion in the newspapers, and partly because we think that a few words may serve remove some misapprehensions which still exist. Our ecclesinstical rulers have not thought it consistent with the dignity of their office to notice the statements of the newspapers, but surely the notion of there being any intention on the our Bishops to invade the diocese of I Jerusalem, or to encroach upon the rights of the legitimate Bishop, is too absurd to require contradiction. They thought, no doubt, that our Church ins a perfect right to send a Bishop to Jerusalem to exercise jurisdiction over its own members, and to be in friendly comnunication with the Bishops of the Oriental Church. This at least seems to be the view which has been taken by the principal rulers of our Church with regard to the question of right: for the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London have become the trustees of the fund for the mainteance of the new Bishop; and we are informed that the plan for the establishment of this see was made known to the Bishops assembled at the last meeting of the convocation, and was approved by all who were present. Whatever may be the difficulties arising out of the question of jurisdiction, we think that all such matters should be left to the decision of the heads of the Church. We maintain that it is the special right and duty of the Bishops to determine what measures are to be taken for the establishment of new sees, for the regulation of our intercourse with other Churches, and for promoting the general welfare of the Church Catholic: and we feel that it is our duty to acquiesce entirely in their decisions. But surely every one must acknowledge, that in the present state of intercourse with the East, the best way of preventing improper interference with the dioceses of the Oriental Bishops, is to send a Bishop of our own to regulate that intercourse. This, indeed, is becoming daily more necessary from the peculiar circumstances in which the Christians of Palestine, Syria, and the neighbouring countrice are placed. We hope soon to publish some very interesting communications from those countries. In the meantime we may mention this important fact, that no less than free Oriental Prelates, namely, one Patriarch and four Metropolitans, have written to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, requesting protection and assistance.

It will be seen also from the Bishop of London's letter to the Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, that the Druses of Mount Lebanon have applied to England for education, and that this education will be conducted by Clergymen who will of course be subject to the superintendence and jurisdiction of the Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem. The conversion of the heathen tribes of Syris is an object which appears to be sufficient in itself to justify the sending out of a Bishop and Clergy, even if nothing were to be said of the Jews and of the Mahometans.

CONSECRATION.

(From the London Church Intelligencer, 10th Nov.)

The Right Reverend M. S. Alexander, professor of Hebrew "Bishop of St. James's Church at Jerusalem," in the Archiepiscopal Chapel of Lambeth Palace. The rite was performed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Bishops of London, Rochester, and New Zealand. The Rev. Dr. M'Caul preached the sermon on this occasion. It is said that the new bishop will have no authority to ordain any elergymen, unless they previously subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of the "Established Church of England and Ireland."

On Monday evening Bishop Alexander delivered, at the Episcopalian Jews' Chapel, Cambridge-heath, a plain, modest, and impressive discourse from the very appropriate texts, Acts, xx. 22, to 24. The Chapel, which has lately been repaired and improved in many respects, particularly in the arrangement of the reading desk, pulpit, and fout, was crowded to the full for nearly an hour before the commencement of divine service, but the strictest silence pervaded the entire congregation, who joined with much interest, in the various parts of the service. In the course of his sermon, the Bishop spoke with much gratitude and affection of the society with which he had been in connection for fourteen years, of the members of which he now took leave, not knowing that they would see his face again, and with much modesty respecting the providence which had called himself, one of the race of Israel, to a knowledge of the religion of Jesus Christ, and subsequently to the highest the Church's ministry, that he might go as the representative of the English branch of it to Jerusalem. The effect of the exi. psalm, sung in Hebrew by the children of the Instithe close of the service, was sweetly impressive.

The Hymns sung on the occasion were the following,-the Psalm in Hebrew was sung after the sermon :-

BEFORE SERVICE.

Come, thou glorious day of promise Come, and spread thy che When the scatter'd sheep of Israe hall no longer go astray; When hosannas

With united voice they cry. Lord, how long wilt thou be angry? Shall thy wrath for ever burn? Rise! redeem thine ancient people; Their transgressions from them turn; Come and set thy people free.

Oh, that soon thou wouldst to Jacob Thine enlir ning Spirit send;
Of their unbelief and misery,
Make, O Lord, a speedy end:
Lord Messiah Prince of peace, o'er Israel reign.

BEFORE SERMON.

Long has the harp of Judah hung, Neglected, broken, and unstrung, Beneath the willow's shade; Whilst Israel's solitary bands,
By foreign streams, through foreign lands,
In saddest mouth have strayed. But since our God reveals his face,

And smiles upon his chosen ra We'll take our harp again; Tun'd as in former happy days. To notes of gratitude and praise, We'll strike a joyful strain-

Our songs shall be of Jesu's love. Who left the ethereal courts above, To bear our guilt and shame; Th' eternal, uncreated Word, Both Pavid's Son and David's Lord, Jehovah is his name.

So vast the theme, it might inspire An angel's song, a scraph's lyre, Such wondrous grace to tell: Wake, harp of Judah! bear the sound Far as creation's utmost bound; ar as creation's utmost bound; All hail, Immanuel!

She Church

IS published for the Managing Committee, by H. & W. BOW-SELL, Toronto, every Saturday. TERMS:—Fifteen Shillings, Currenty; or Thirteen Shillings and Siz-pence, Sterling, per annum. AGENTS-THE CLERGY in Canada, and Samuel Rowsell, Esty.