

From the London Times.

THE BISHOP OF JERUSALEM.

The unfortunate Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem, it appears, is beginning to experience the realities of his position. The mission seems to have been undertaken in a somewhat precipitate, or at least sudden way, by one or two of our own prelates, in order to meet the wishes of the king of Prussia, who made a liberal offer of furnishing half the endowment, to improve in some rather indefinite manner, the various discordant communions of Christians, and to convert the Jews (we forget whether Turks also) now resident at Jerusalem. Many objections were started to this scheme among those who took interest in such projects. A large body of our own clergy looked with suspicion on an indefinite alliance with continental churches just recovering, if indeed recovering, from a degree of rationalism amounting to unbelief, and held by our more learned divines to be at present bodies of very suspicious doctrine and unsound constitution. Moreover, it did not very distinctly appear what was to be, or could be done, to form the king of Prussia's designs, or what those designs exactly were—or why we should send out to Jerusalem to further them, or what chance there was of converting the Jews of Jerusalem more than any other Jews in the whole world—that we should on their behalf, intrude an English bishop into a place where there was no—or no *bona fide*—English congregation, and which was under the civil dominion of the Turks, and within the ecclesiastical authority of other Christian bishops too sadly numerous and discordant to be enumerated; finally, it was doubted whether this kind of intrusion would be either a proper or a politic opening to such “improving” intercourse as might be hoped for between such bishops and ourselves.

To meet some of these objections, a circular was put forward by authority, informing the objectors, that no hostile intrusion was intended upon the corrupt Oriental, or concession to the “less perfectly constituted” German communions, but only the establishment of a centre of attraction and model for imitation for all such as might wish to unite or conform themselves to the pattern of a church neither corrupt nor imperfect; and that the existing Syrian churches professed the most amicable feelings towards the coming bishop. In other quarters, a kind of ecclesiastico-political motive was urged. Russia had its partisans in the orthodox Greek—France in the Roman Catholic, communion in these parts. England, a more efficient protector than either, might, if she only chose to put forward a religion, organize a body of allies among the various heretical sects of these countries, some Jews, (it would appear) and the Druses, who manifested “improving” tendencies, which might give most efficient assistance to her political movements. These Druses, we may repeat, are gentry whose real religion is a mystery, which no one yet has been able to penetrate, but who are understood outwardly to adopt the religion of the strongest. So it is probable that their Protestant tendencies were considerably hastened by,

if they do not date from, the result of British operations on the coast of Syria.

Amid these various hopes and objections, Bishop Alexander was launched in the *Devastation* steam-frigate, with letters commendatory to his various other brother prelates of the Syrian and adjacent churches.

The report of our movement, however, and the exact shape it had taken, began to alarm other countries. Protests against our encroachment appeared in the French Chamber of Deputies. The Porte refused, and has not yet consented, to grant the firman necessary to place our bishop on the same civil footing as those who are already located at Jerusalem. The German clergy heard a report that they had been called “less perfectly constituted” by the English authorities, and declined any further concurrence in the government proceeding till this part of the matter was satisfactorily understood. Bishop Alexander, meanwhile, happily now at sea, pursued his way in the *Devastation* steam-frigate, strong in his expectations of greeting to be received from Greek, Turk, Jew, and heretic, and was landed at Jaffa, peaceably ignorant of the breezes which were springing up behind him.

Our readers may have observed in our paper nearly a month since, an account, written by an eye witness, of the bishop's almost triumphal entry in Jerusalem, “in a procession,” he says, “which will be remembered by those who saw it to the latest day of their lives. On approaching the town, the cavalcade, which already consisted of fifty or sixty persons, was swollen by the junction of the Bey, second in command of the troops, who, accompanied by a guard of honor, and the Janizaries of the Pacha, had been sent to compliment Colonel Rose on his arrival, while all the loungers of Jerusalem turned out for the occasion. Not the least interesting object in the throng was Mrs. Alexander, the fair partner of the right revd. prelate. Being in that state which ladies wish to be, it had been considered by the physician of the mission inadvisable for her to attempt the journey on horseback. Accordingly, a large tatterwan, or oriental litter was constructed, which, supported before and behind by stout mules, conveyed Mrs. Alexander and the younger portion of her family, over the rocky and precipitous tracts which leads from Jaffa to Jerusalem.”

While the procession, which now consisted of about 100 persons on horseback, entered Jerusalem by the Bethlehem gate:

“The wildly accoutered and unearthly looking Bedouin irregulars, who had been playing the djereed, and gambolling round the procession at the full speed of their desert horses, contented themselves with firing off their muskets, being now hemmed in by the motley throng of citizens and fallyheen—Muslimans in their furred pelisses and well-folded turbans, down to the filthy old Polish Jew in the last stage of wilful hydrophobia.”

And as the cavalcade left that spot—

“The guns thundered forth the salute for the eve of the Courban Bairam. Thus, by an odd chance, the Protestant bishop

made his public entry into one of the four holy cities of Islam, (the others are Mecca, Medina, and Damascus,) on the occasion of one of the greatest festivals of the Mahomedan kingdom.”

Tahir Pacha received the bishop with “great politeness,” and on the whole nothing could be more prosperous, or promising, or impressive. We ourselves, indeed, should have questioned the wisdom of anything quite so striking. The British power is perhaps too generally identified in the East with Turkish ascendancy; and the sight of an English prelate “entering one of the four holy cities of Islam,” “on the occasion of one of the greatest festivals of the Mahomedan religion,” with a bey, and a guard of honour, Janissaries and Bedouins in his train, the guns firing at the moment of his entry, and the Pacha receiving him “with the greatest politeness,” might produce an impression in the very unenlightened and bigoted Christian population of that country of a greater affinity than was quite desirable between the English and Mahomedan religions. There is another subject, which we touch with reluctance, because it is delicate. The prominence given to “not the least interesting object in the throng,” we must confess, seems injudicious. No one reverence, more than ourselves the holiness of domestic relations; but it is wise to respect prejudices; and Greeks, as well as Roman Catholics, have a strong prejudice—mixed, perhaps—which makes it more painful—with a kind of of sarcastic contempt for bishops' families. We remember a story of an Italian, who, recounting to his countryman the sights he had seen in London, told them that in Bond-street he had been shown a carriage in which sat a bishop—“un Vescovo, una Vescova! e—e Cielo!—dei Vescovini!” Nor can we think it wise to have begun by obtruding on the rude notice of the populace those members of the episcopal party which not a man of the assembled crowd would hesitate to stigmatize by such deprecating and profane appellations as “bishoppers” and bishopplings—and which at least would, in the present state of opinion, be very far indeed from approving themselves, as they should, to the popular notions of propriety.

Whether these, as we must consider them, faults of judgment had anything to do with the result of Bishop Alexander's preaching at Jerusalem we do not know.—But certain it is that these amicable feelings which our authorities believed in and premised, do not seem at present to exist in the minds of the native Christians.—The tide has set, we are sorry to say, strongly against the bishop in all directions in Asia as in Europe.

“Janque facis et saxa volant.”

The last accounts stated that he had broken with Tahir Pacha, because that functionary refused to recognize him as any thing more than an English traveller; and his relations with the Christian population seem yet more unsatisfactory. The *Augsburg Gazette* tells us, “It appears certain that the English Bishop of Jerusalem was pelted with stones by the Christians whilst he was preaching a ser-

mon. The Mussulmans remained neutral” (and no doubt much edified) “on the occasion.” And from another source we hear, that of many reports prevalent in Constantinople with respect to Syrian affairs, “the only one which has obtained confirmation from the mouth of an ambassador is the attack on the Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem; and it is added, that his life was actually in danger.”

What is to be the result of the bishop's troubles, we do not pretend to foretell; but we cannot admire the foresight or management of those who have exposed him to the peltings of the communions which he comes to conciliate; and would earnestly desire his withdrawal from a position where, with the credit of the English Church and nation depending on him, he can hardly tell whether it is his business to avengo or to suffer—to make himself respected as a representative of our state, or embrace the crown of martyrdom as the missionary of our Church.

THE BISHOP IN JERUSALEM.—The *Leipsic Gazette* of the 23rd has an article from Constantinople of the 2d, confirming the personal dangers incurred by Bishop Alexander at Jerusalem, and the insults to which he was exposed from both Jews and Christians whilst preaching in the open air. The bishop appealed to Sir Stratford Canning, and represented that if his person was not in safety he should be under the necessity of quitting the country. The ambassador immediately addressed the Divan on the subject. Negotiations went on for eight days, when the Porte at last decidedly refused to acknowledge the new bishop, declared that the Turkish government would not risk creating discontent among a vast number of its subjects who hold the Greek and Roman faith, and whose privilege it is not to admit into Jerusalem what they term a heretic prelate.—Izzet Pacha persisted in this resolution; and after some more representations from Sir Stratford Canning, the Porte gave the following final answer:—“As we cannot, without evident danger, acknowledge by a special firman, your Anglican bishop, we, however, out of respect for her Majesty Queen Victoria, grant to the said bishop the protection and toleration which we allow to all other Christian ecclesiastics who make a temporary residence in our empire. Instructions to this effect will be sent to the Tahir Pacha, to whom we will recommend the bishop in Jerusalem.”

THE EVANGELICAL SEAL OF THE BISHOP IN JERUSALEM.—On the right of the escutcheon is a lion, standing erect, holding a flag, with the device in Hebrew—*Juda*. On the left, the arms of Prussia and of England, marked with a star. Underneath is a dove with the olive branch, and the device in the Hebrew text—*Peace—Peace to Jerusalem—L'Univers*.

The *Leipsic Universal Gazette* quotes a letter, dated Berlin, 19th ult., mentioning that the Syuod of Prussia persisted in its opposition to the establishment of an evangelical bishopric at Jerusalem in conjunction with England.