

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

Louis Napoleon has not, as yet, given any sign of what his intentions are, whether to violate or obey the Constitution. The uncertainty that prevails interferes sadly with business, and the contending parties are so nearly balanced, that it is impossible to predict, with any confidence, the ultimate result. M. Lamartine publishes in the *Pays* a long article, in which he calls earnestly upon Louis Napoleon to renounce all idea of re-election, and to retire from office with the abnegation of a patriotic citizen. He says—

"A single word from you frees the situation, and relieves the approaching candidature to the presidency from the embarrassment of your name. The day after, you would conquer the greatest popularity of the times—that of democracy and society reconciled by the probity of the Government. The day after, you would cease to be the President of the Republic, to become President of the National Assembly and of public opinion. The day after, four or five million votes would be given to the candidate whose name you might have allowed to be seen on the voting paper you would drop into the urn. The day after, the Republic would be re-established, and society reassured by confidence in a future of five years. The day after, the Constitution might be revised by the coming Legislature."

The *Presse* publishes an anonymous proclamation of the most violent description, signed by "The Committee of Resistance," which, it says, has been extensively circulated among the working classes of Paris, and sent to the departments by post, with the Batignoles post-mark, and insinuates that it is the work of the police. The proclamation in question is certainly too absurdly violent to have been issued by even the most insane of the democratic party. It has all the appearance of having been concocted with the view of alarming the public; and, as the *Presse* says, might easily be suppressed by the police, and its authors punished, if it be not the work of the police themselves. There seems much reason to believe that the incendiary bulletin is the invention of some zealous agent of power, rather than a serious emanation from a club of conspirators.

The alarms which prevailed as to an outbreak on the 4th May seem greatly calmed, if not entirely vanished. Serious disorders are, however, expected on this occasion in the southern departments, which exhibit most riotous tendencies.

ITALY.

Letters from Naples of the 15th state that King Ferdinand has an attack of dropsy, which threatens to become serious. By the advice of his physicians he is going to reside for some time at Portici.

The Grand Duke of Tuscany was still at Naples, where the Duke and Duchess of Aumale were daily expected. It was currently reported that England and France had demanded the evacuation of Tuscany by the Austrian troops. The Grand Duke was exerting himself, in consequence, to complete his political and military alliance with the King of Naples, in order that the Neapolitan troops might be allowed to occupy Tuscany instead of the Austrians.

According to the accounts from Turin, M. Nigra having given in his resignation, M. de Cavour was appointed *ad interim* Minister of Commerce.

The *Piedmontese Gazette* of the 21st, announces that it has received by express the intelligence that the Viceroy of Egypt, has definitely sanctioned the construction of the Alexandria, Cairo, and Suez Railway.

The *Risorgimento* of Turin, of the 21st, contradicts the rumor, which had gained some credit, as to the probability of Massimo d'Azeglio retiring from office.

A letter from Rome, of the 15th, states that the ceremonies of the Holy Week were performed there with extraordinary pomp. The Bishops of Dijon and Beauvais took a part in them, and an immense number of foreigners attended.

M. Lavalette, envoy extraordinary of the French Republic to the Sublime Porte, arrived at Rome on the 12th.

SPAIN.

The Minister of Grace and Justice has issued a circular to the judges and magistrates throughout the country, desiring that, in strict observance of the impartiality which should guide their judicial proceedings, they will carefully abstain from using any influence at the coming elections in obtaining votes in favor of this or of that candidate. This conduct forms a remarkable contrast with the proceedings of the Narvaez-Sartorius Administration at the recent elections last August, when magistrates were threatened with dismissal if they did not become electioneering Government agents.

PORTUGAL.

A telegraphic despatch from Lisbon via Paris, states that the garrison of Oporto joined the Duke of Saldanha's insurrection on the 24th ult. Saldanha, who was on his road to Vigo, where he intended to embark, was recalled by the insurgent troops and inhabitants of Oporto.

PRUSSIA AND AUSTRIA.

The day after the opening of the Germanic diet is definitively fixed for the 12th of May. The first sitting, which will be inaugurated by a speech from the President, Count de Thun, will, it is believed, be limited to the mere form of registering the names of plenipotentiaries, and to some other preparatory forms. It is understood that the plenipotentiaries will enter into the same engagement to maintain discretion that was observed by the members of the ancient Diet, and promised, but not strictly performed, as it would seem, by those composing the Dresden Conferences. The Prussian Cabinet has definitively fixed upon Lieut.-General de Rochow, Envoy to the Court of

St. Petersburg, as its plenipotentiary to the Diet. It is stated that Lord Cowley's credentials will not be required to be renewed, the British mission having continued to act without the old credentials having fallen into abeyance, or without its having received new credentials.

ANGLICAN DIVISIONS—THE BISHOP OF EXETER'S CHARGE.

(From the London Catholic Standard.)

Further reflexion strengthens our first impression of the Bishop of Exeter's pastoral address, from which we laid before our readers copious extracts in our last number. Considered intrinsically and extrinsically, it must be admitted to be a most extraordinary document. An elaborate official charge to his clergy, by a Suffragan Bishop of a Church which lays bold claim to divine origin and apostolic authority, in which the Primate is openly denounced as "a *favorer of heresy*,"—in which the other Archbishop is held up to reprobation as an accomplice in the work of sin, and in which the remonstrant Prelate deliberately repudiates all communion with his Metropolitan—cannot be looked on as an ordinary or trivial affair. And that the Right Reverend Prelate himself was fully impressed with the seriousness of his subject, is evident from the circumstance adverted to by him, that he had taken the precaution of framing his pastoral so as to make it harmonious with the *statute law* "in such cases made and provided," and reducing it to writing.

This prudence on the Bishop's part does not, certainly, surprise us. The circumstances of the time are such as to superinduce caution and reserve in the ranks of an Episcopacy which springs from Royal favor, and draws its aliment from Ministerial smiles. That the Prime Minister, to whose patronage the Archbishop of Canterbury is indebted for his promotion, would willingly lay heavy hands on the contumacious Bishop of Exeter, had he but the opportunity, admits of little doubt. The Minister made Dr. Sumner Primate for the manifest purpose of crushing every germ of High Church feeling in the Anglican Establishment. The repudiation of every elementary principle of Christianity is the bond of union between the Ministerial patron and the ecclesiastical protégé. Lord John Russell having renounced, on becoming a disciple of Dr. Cumming, the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, very naturally selected, when the death of Primate Sutton left Lambeth Palace vacant, a successor to the See of Canterbury from among those Low Church prelates whose antecedents pointed them out as the fittest instruments for working out his views; and the conduct of Dr. Sumner, since his translation from Chester, certainly reflects credit upon the sagacity of the Premier. Had Mr. Sumner himself filled Cranmer's chair, he could not more efficiently have discharged the duty assigned to him. Ignoring the *first* sacrament, without which man cannot become a Christian, and playing such a part in the great controversy which rends the Establishment in twain, as places the Church of which he is the chief Bishop in the most abject position under the feet of the State, demonstrate the aptitude of the Protestant Primate for the end for which he was chosen, and the discrimination of the Calvinistic Minister in the selection of his tool. Against such odds the sole energy of the Bishop of Exeter will prove of little avail, however closely he may adhere to the Statute Law, and however firmly he may adhere to the rubrics. Opposed by the Methodists, Sabellians, Socinians, Calvinists, and Free-thinkers, who compose the great majority of the Bench of Bishops, and basely deserted by the High Church minority, who have bent to the Evangelical storm, and endeavored to propitiate the Premier and Lord Ashley by flagrant abandonment of their professed principles, the Bishop of Exeter, with his unclouded understanding, must clearly perceive the fatuity of his attempts to uphold an ecclesiastical system which is palpably built upon sand. No pen can more vividly depict the rottenness of "the Church by law established in these realms," than his own has done. If it were the Church of Christ, could its Hierarchy present the deplorable spectacle they now exhibit? Teaching false doctrine, admitting the supremacy, not only of a laic, but of a woman, tied to the wheels of the State—bound, even in its ordinances and discipline, by laws enacted by laymen of every denomination of professing Christians—without one bond of union among its clergy save its temporalities—isolated from every other form of ecclesiastical government—recognized by no other Christian Church—its canons a dead letter, and its discipline a mockery; its chief pastors the nominees and creatures of the Prime Minister of the day, although ostensibly chosen by the capitular bodies, under a penal pressure, however, which makes the mode of election one of the most disgraceful, humiliating, and disgusting exhibitions that can be imagined—its adownsons the inheritances of families who may or may not be Christians of any sect, and its "cures of souls" marketable commodities, which are daily the subject of marriage settlements, trust deeds, appraisers' valuation and auctioneers' puffing;—and these are not mere opinions of ours, but a plain enumeration of incontestable facts—now, we ask the Bishop of Exeter, can he, with his principles as declared in his recent Pastoral, consistently continue in an establishment which himself proves to be no church? The Committee of Privy Council—a merely lay tribunal, emanating from the mere pleasure of the Prime Minister for the time being—set aside, with the sanction of the Protestant Primate, a decree pronounced in that Primate's own Ecclesiastical Court by his own judicial delegate, upon a purely ecclesiastical question; and the astounding doctrine is promulgated under the sanction and with the authority of the Royal and Supreme Head of the Church, that it is perfectly optional with the members, clerical and lay, of that church to believe or disbe-

lieve a tenet which is the basis of Christianity; and to admit, or altogether repudiate, a right which the Articles of that so-called church in plain terms assert to be an indispensable sacrament? To call the Anglican system; after this, a church, is to admit the greatest violence on our language, and an outrage upon common sense. The truth is one—and the Church *must* teach the truth. There no latitude is allowed. The Archbishop of Canterbury cannot repudiate the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, without one or the other being grossly in error; and assuredly both cannot be faithful members of a true church; nor can that church be true which allows both to hold their high offices.

What, then, will follow? Will the Bishop of Exeter be prosecuted for gibbeting the Primate as an abettor of rank heresy? or will the Primate be required to recant or to resign? If Anglicanism were not a monstrous imposture, either of these events would inevitably occur. In no other semblance of a Christian church would such glaring diversity of doctrine upon a principle which was declared by any such church to be fundamental, be tolerated. Even the Methodist cobblers who lay down the lapstone to expound the Scriptures, would not permit such divergent theories in their conventicles.

The Low Church is, however, more "tolerant," more "expansive." Like Wombwell's menagerie, it has room for all manner of monstrosities. There is only one crime against Anglican orthodoxy; and that is, charity to those who maintain the supremacy of the Pope. The Anglican minister who avoids this heresy, may retain his "cure of souls," his tithes, his prebendal stall, his mitre, even though he ignore the Trinity or blaspheme his Redeemer. Mr. Gorham may with impunity and in open and contemptuous defiance of his Bishop, scout the church sacrament of Baptism, provided he shout "No-Popery!" while Mr. Blew, who upholds the Articles of his church, is suspended by the Bishop of Rochester, merely for daring to assure Cardinal Wiseman that he has not joined in the blackguardism with which other members of the cloth have bespattered his Eminence. If London, or any other wealthy see, were vacant tomorrow, we have no doubt whatever that Lord John Russell, if he thought it inconsistent with his duty to his family to postpone the interest of the Dean of Bristol to those of his Crown Court teacher, might, without remonstrance or inconvenience either from the Anglican Bishops or laity, pitchfork the Presbyterian Cumming into the vacant diocese. The same malevolent feeling of jealousy and hatred of Rome, which induced the Greek Bishops, when an infamous emperor deposed the virtuous Patriarch who refused to countenance his vices, to consecrate a layman—the civil governor of Constantinople—Bishop, and accept the schismatic intruder as their Primate, this same feeling would, at this day, sway the Anglican Bishops, and induce them to consecrate Mr. Cumming—whom they consider to be a mere layman—and accept him as their Metropolitan, if the Queen were advised by her Minister to issue her *conge d'elire* for that purpose.

This truth must be manifest to all those who are really imbued with a feeling of what a Christian church ought to be, and unquestionably must be, within the Establishment. And whether they will, as some imagine, separate in a body from the wretched State engine, and found a "Free Church," or, as we hope, through God's mercy, abandon their errors and become reconciled to the one true Church in which they behold unity of faith, consistency of doctrine, holiness of discipline, and marvellous homogeneity of parts,—it is clear that in the Establishment, with the undoubted ascendancy of heterodox principles therein now exhibited, they cannot with any regard to their own honor and religious character, much longer remain. They admit that we hold the whole body of the true faith; they maintain that the Anglican institution is now become heterodox and heretical:—can a reasonable doubt remain as to the safer side to choose? In any event, their exodus from the Establishment is now as surely unavoidable, as that the fate of the "Church of England" is sealed. The stakes the Dissenters played for so ambitiously and well nigh successfully in 1689, are now within their grasp. The Anglican Primate is one of themselves in the theory: what is to prevent their assimilating to him in practice? If, as the law is now laid down and promulgated, belief according to the Thirty-nine Articles be optional—if every man who subscribes to that test of orthodoxy is at perfect liberty to put his own construction upon the words—if churchmen may believe what they like, and only what they like,—what tangible obstruction is there in Mr. Bunting's path to the Anglican Primacy when vacant, or to Dr. Fletcher's translation from the chapel in Bloomfield-street to Bloomfield's Palace when Charles James is gone? In truth, the decision in the Gorham case and the recent address of the twenty-four Bishops, have by one operation subverted the Church of England, as established in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, and virtually abolished Dissent. There is no longer anything to Dissent from in the Law Church. Dr. Sumner's "Doxy" and Mr. Binney's "Doxy" are one and the same; and we anticipate seeing, at no remote period, a new edition of the Zenonian Heno-ticon, published by Royal authority, under the influence of the modern Aacius.

EASTER 1851 IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

(From the Spectator.)

If there is one period of the revolving year at which more than any other the sense of a common benefit from a common source ought to impress upon the earnest Christian, the duty of implicit obedience to the charge, "Love one another," it is Easter. Yet, throughout the Anglican section of the great Christian Church, the Easter of 1851 dawns with dark augury of fierce dissension and dissolution. The

professed followers of Christ almost exceed the callous levity of the Roman soldiers: the latter only rent and divided his garments, the former threaten to rend and divide his mystic body the Church.

The symptoms of impending disruption are indeed alarming. On the one hand, we see a memorial or petition addressed to the Crown by upwards of three hundred thousand laymen of the Evangelical or Low Church party, urging the condemnation of certain doctrines and the suppression of certain observances cherished by a numerous portion of their fellow Churchmen. This petition is recommended by the Queen's Ministers to the favorable attention of the Prelates, and is by them favorably entertained. On the other hand, the Bishop of Exeter, champion of the opposed or High Church party, no longer confining himself to protests and declarations of non-intercourse with his Primate, convokes a Diocesan Synod of his clergy, to invite their concurrence in a declaration that they "adhere, and by the blessing of God will continue to adhere, faithfully and at every hazard," to one of the most essential doctrines from which the petitioners dissent. The Bishop also seeks to obtain the counsel of the Synod on "other matters" affecting the Church at large and their diocese in particular.

The champion who organizes this opposition to the party represented by the petitioners, and, to say the least, favored by the Archbishop and the Ministers of the Crown, is of a very different calibre from most of those who have been conspicuous in the ranks of Tractarianism. It is perfectly consistent with a sincere respect for their earnestness and amiability to admit that they appear to lay most stress upon the outward observances—the symbols and sentiments of ritual worship. But the Bishop of Exeter, without giving up these outward shows, waives their consideration, as of comparatively minor moment, and takes his stand upon the doctrinal differences which lie beneath them; bringing to the support of his own peculiar views the accumulated learning and dialectical experience of a long life and a character of active unyielding resolution.

It cannot be denied that the discrepancies between the doctrines maintained by the Bishop of Exeter and those of the Low Church are irreconcilable; that if both or either insist upon agreement in these points as the condition of communion, one church cannot contain them. The Low Church concurs with the Helvetic Churches in regarding the sacraments as simply commemorative, and the office-bearers in the Church as mere ministers; the Bishops of Exeter attributes a mystic efficacy to the sacraments, and claims for the office-bearers in the Church a priestly character—in other words, as the Lutheran stands mid-way between the Romanist and the Calvinist, the Bishop stands mid-way between the Romanist and the Lutheran.

The Prelates appear to be only half sensible of the extremely critical state of the Establishment. They do not estimate at its full force the propagandist zeal and fervor that have been kindled. Timid if not indifferent themselves, they seem incapable of conceiving the reckless John-Knox impetuosity which animates many of the Low Church party, or the Thomas-a-Becket spirit which inspires many of its opponents. They stand by as inert spectators, or feebly uttering tame recommendations of forbearance, when there is a call for their most strenuous exertions to arrest a struggle which threatens to shake the fabric of the Church into fragments.

If disruption and *dis-establishment* are to be the doom of the Church of England, it will be due mainly to the apathy and cowardice of the dignitaries, who shrink from placing themselves with decision at the head of this the overwhelming majority of the Church's members.

The Bishop of Exeter's movement is dangerous because it brings more combatants into the field than have hitherto taken an active part in the controversy, and because it divides the Church into two nearly equal parties. The leading Tractarians are subtle logicians, and men of refined taste; but they are book-men, and their followers are too much taken up with mere externals; the party has little hold on public sympathy.

The success or failure of his attempt will probably decide whether the present heats are to end in a secession from a disruption of the Church. Committed as the leading Tractarians are, one or the other seems inevitable. Both are to be deprecated, but especially the latter; for disruption would inevitably lead to dis-establishment. Neither party would be sufficiently numerous to have a claim to the title of national, or to maintenance from a national fund.

CHRIST BEFORE PILATE—THE CHURCH BEFORE BRITISH STATESMEN.

We (*Shepherd of the Valley*) take from the *Rambler* for March the following comparison between the treatment which Our Divine Saviour experienced at the hands of the Synagogue and the Roman Governor, and that which His Church is experiencing at the hands of Heresy and State craft in England, at the present moment:—

"Now turn to the whole history of our Blessed Saviour's condemnation by Pontius Pilate. The one sole charge brought against the Incarnate Son of God was, that He called Himself a King, and *that whosoever made himself a king, spoke against Caesar*. The infuriated Jews would have murdered our Lord on purely 'religious grounds,' if they had been able. The priests hated Him, not because He came to abolish their tyranny over the souls of men; and when the Roman Government—the temporal power which they were compelled to obey—refused to take cognizance of a question between mere speculative creeds and superstitions (as it deemed them,) the Jews gave a new color to the accusation, charged our Blessed Saviour with setting up a claim to temporal sovereignty, and cried to Pilate, 'If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar's friend.' Such, to the very letter, is the present state of things in England and Ireland. Protest-