



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

**Conversion and conflict in Palestine : the missions of the
Church Missionary Society and the protestant bishop
Samuel Gobat**

Leest, C. van der

Citation

Leest, C. van der. (2008, June 18). *Conversion and conflict in Palestine : the missions of the Church Missionary Society and the protestant bishop Samuel Gobat*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12957>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12957>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

The Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem

Introduction

After the Ottomans, with the support of Britain and Prussia, defeated Egypt in 1840, the climate seemed favourable for both countries to combine their religious and political interests in Palestine into a joint enterprise. In 1841 a Protestant British-Prussian bishopric was established in Jerusalem. The arguments in favour of its establishment were a mixture of religious interest and (church) political motives. As stated earlier, the establishment of the Protestant bishopric forms the entry into this study, since this brought the rivalry between the Protestants and the other Christian denominations to the surface. Although over the years the history of the genesis of the bishopric has often been examined,¹ this chapter will review the establishment from the perspective of this rivalry, focusing on questions such as: What were the reasons behind the decision to establish this bishopric? What was the attitude of its founders towards the other denominations already present in Jerusalem? What agreements were made between Prussia and England, and how did the general public in both countries and the Ottoman authorities react to the project?

¹ Among these, the studies by Kurt Schmidt-Clausen and Martin Lückhoff are the most thorough and recent. Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*. See furthermore: H. Smith, *The Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem; its Origins and Progress. From the Official Documents Published by Command of his Majesty the King of Prussia, and from Other Authentic Sources*, London, 1847; P. Cassel, *Das Bisthum von Jerusalem: (Aegypten und Palästina)*, Berlin, 1882; W.H. Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric. Documents with Translations*, London, 1883; R.W. Greaves, "The Jerusalem Bishopric 1841", *The English Historical Review* 64, London, New York, Toronto, 1949, 328-352; P.J. Welch, "Anglican Churchmen and the Establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 8, London, 1957, 193-204; Tibawi, *British Interests*; R. Blake, "The Origins of the Jerusalem Bishopric", A.M. Birke and K. Kluxen, *Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert. Ein deutsch-englischer Vergleich. Church, State and Society in the 19th Century. An Anglo-German Comparison*, München, New York, London, Paris, 1984, 87-97; F. Foerster, *Christian Carl Josias Bunsen. Diplomat, Mäzen und Vordenker in Wissenschaft, Kirche und Politik*, Waldeckische Forschungen. Wissenschaftliche Reihe des Waldeckischen Geschichtsvereins 10, Bad Arolsen, 2001 (hereafter *Bunsen*), 149-162.

Christian Bunsen and the development of the 'Jerusalem bishopric plan'

Three men were closely involved in the development of the plan for a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem and its establishment in 1841: the well-known Prussian diplomat Christian Carl Josias Bunsen (1791-1860) and his friends Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper (1801-1885), the seventh earl of Shaftesbury, and the Prussian King Frederick William IV. Of these three, it was Bunsen who played a central role in the development of the bishopric plan and the negotiations leading to the Protestant bishopric's foundation.

Bunsen's Roman years and attitude towards Roman Catholicism

In his youth Bunsen was already interested in religion. His interest was stimulated and influenced by his parents' deep piety. He went to study theology and oriental languages at various universities in Germany and abroad.² In 1817 Bunsen joined the Prussian diplomatic service and was sent to Rome as secretary to the German envoy, Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776-1831).³ Through his British wife, Frances Waddington (1791-1876),⁴ Bunsen made the acquaintance of many eminent Britons, and their house became a meeting place for diplomats and Rome travellers from all over Europe. His wife's family and his British friends drew Bunsen's attention to the ecclesiastical and liturgical reform efforts in Britain. When Niebuhr left Rome, Bunsen succeeded him as German ambassador. During those years Bunsen became interested in the history and archaeology of Rome and the history of the Roman Catholic Church. He also organised Evangelical services and developed a liturgy and a hymn book for these services.⁵

² For their daily edification the family used the pietistically inclined hymn and prayer book by the Lutheran minister and hymn writer Benjamin Schmolck (1672-1737). Bunsen's religious interest was influenced especially by his half-sister Christiane, to whom he was very close. She had been moulded by Reformed Pietism and brother and sister often discussed questions of faith in their correspondence. Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 21; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 50; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 7-8, 10-11. For more information about Bunsen, see also W. Höcker, *Der Gesandte Bunsen als Vermittler zwischen Deutschland und England*, Göttinger Bausteine zur Geschichtswissenschaft, Göttingen, 1951; E. Geldbach (ed.), *Der Gelehrte Diplomat. Zum Wirken Christian Carl Josias Bunsens*, Leiden, 1980.

³ Barthold Georg Niebuhr was a famous German historian and diplomat. From 1816 until 1823 he was German envoy to the Holy See. Afterwards he was Professor of the University of Bonn.

⁴ Frances Waddington came from a wealthy family from Llanover, South-Wales. She was an educated woman, who also influenced Bunsen's religion. She possessed an extraordinary knowledge of the Bible and they often studied the Bible together. Foerster, *Bunsen*, 41-43. For more information about Frances Waddington, see Foerster, *Bunsen*, 40-50.

⁵ The 'Capitolinian congregation' was the prototype of a universal-Evangelical congregation. Although it was a Prussian establishment, people from other countries, such as Britain and the Netherlands, also joined the

In 1838 Bunsen's Roman period came to an end because of a major conflict between the Prussian government and the Roman Catholic Church about 'mixed weddings', i.e., the recognition by the Roman Catholic Church of marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics, and the matter of the upbringing of children from such marriages. In the western provinces of Prussia, Roman Catholic priests only performed mixed weddings if both parties promised that any children resulting from the marriage would receive a Roman Catholic education. In the Eastern provinces of Prussia, however, the arrangement was that children from mixed weddings must be raised according to the denomination of the father. In 1825 Frederick William III (1770-1840) ordered that this rule would also apply to the western provinces of the country. However, this practice did not correspond to Roman Catholic canon law, which in fact prohibited all mixed weddings because they were incompatible with the sacramental character of marriage. The Roman Catholic Church protested against the Prussian rule, which brought its clergy into conflict with the State. In order to resolve the conflict, Bunsen negotiated with Rome on behalf of the Prussian government.⁶ Although the negotiations resulted in a Papal brief, the matter was not solved, because Frederick William III did not agree with the Pope's verdict.

In 1834 Bunsen tried to settle the conflict in a secret agreement with the Archbishop of Cologne, Ferdinand August von Spiegel (1764-1835). The proposal was to follow the wishes of the government, but at the same time to assure Rome that the Papal brief was observed. However, the archbishop died in 1835 and Bunsen's negotiations with his successor, Clemens August von Droste-Vischering (1773-1845), failed. The conflict worsened when the archbishop was imprisoned in 1837 on Bunsen's advice.⁷ Bunsen's behaviour in the mixed-marriages conflict, also called the 'Kölner Wirren' or 'Cologne Troubles', became subject to increasingly severe criticism from the Pope and his curia. When the Pope and his Cardinal Secretary of State refused to

congregation. K. Schmidt-Clausen, "Der Beitrag Bunsens zur Gründung des Bistums Jerusalem", Geldbach (ed.), *Der Gelehrte Diplomat*, 45-47; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 51-52; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 159.

⁶ The negotiations started with Pope Pius VIII and were continued with Pope Gregory XVI after the death of Pius VIII in December 1830.

⁷ Droste-Vischering wanted to follow the Papal brief instead of the agreements with the Prussian government.

negotiate with Bunsen any longer, the situation became untenable. In 1838 Bunsen was removed from his post.⁸

The conflict about mixed weddings influenced Bunsen's opinion of the Roman Catholic Church. During his Roman years he had made an effort to understand Roman Catholicism. After this conflict, however, he felt humiliated and frustrated, and was full of negative feelings towards Rome, the Pope and the Curia.⁹ According to Schmidt-Clausen and Lückhoff, Bunsen's ecumenical view had changed; Christian unity now meant to him unity without or against Rome. In their opinion Bunsen's preparation and carrying through of the Jerusalem plan can only be evaluated correctly against the background of his experiences and disappointments in Rome.¹⁰ This view is based on various anti-Roman Catholic utterances made by Bunsen in which he himself connected the Jerusalem plan with his experiences in Rome. Foerster, on the contrary, argues that Bunsen's anti-Catholic statements should not be overrated.¹¹ Although the mixed-weddings affair made Bunsen turn away from the strict, centralist Roman Catholic Church, he did not hate the Catholic Church in general or seek revenge for his Roman experiences; according to Foerster, there are many personal statements and Roman Catholic acquaintances to prove this.¹²

Nevertheless, the 'Cologne Troubles' and his lack of success in Rome must have left Bunsen with a bitter aftertaste. Undoubtedly, these feelings will have influenced his view of the Roman Catholic Church and Christian unity, which was to become an important theme in his concept of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem. His anti-Catholic sentiments may have intensified his dedication to the Jerusalem project. In Catholic

⁸ D.E. Barclay, *Frederick William IV and the Prussian Monarchy, 1840-1861*, Oxford, 1995, 78-79; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 52-53; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 131-133. For more information on this matter, see also Schmidt-Clausen, "Der Beitrag Bunsens", 48-49; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 104-134.

⁹ Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 85; Schmidt-Clausen, "Der Beitrag Bunsens", 49-50; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 54.

¹⁰ Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 85, 88; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 54.

¹¹ Foerster states that Schmidt-Clausen's and Lückhoff's view that Bunsen's admiration of the Roman Catholic Church had turned into hate was based on a statement of Alfred von Reumont, the secretary of the Prussian embassy in Bunsen's latter Roman years and himself a Roman Catholic. According to Von Reumont Bunsen was filled with hatred against Roman Catholic Rome after 1838 until his death. Foerster, *Bunsen*, 159.

¹² Foerster, *Bunsen*, 158-159. Foerster claims that the image of Bunsen in history is on the whole superficial and negative. He mentions various (mostly Catholic) authors who created an image of Bunsen as someone who hated the Roman Catholic Church and the Pope. F. Foerster, "Bunsens Bild in der Geschichte. Forschungsbericht aus einer Biographie über Christian Carl Josias Bunsen", *Geschichtsblätter für Waldeck* 87, 1999, 42-71.

circles Bunsen was seen as a fanatic anti-Catholic, and this anti-Catholicism was thought to have influenced the establishment of the bishopric. Louis Poyet (1815-1893), for instance, who worked for the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem, connected the establishment of the Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem directly with Bunsen's anti-Catholicism. According to him Bunsen was "well known for his hate of Catholicism" and it was he who was behind the bishopric's foundation.¹³

In the idea of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem Bunsen saw an opportunity to create a Protestant ecumenical unity. Under the roof of the Protestant bishopric the national Protestant churches of Britain and Prussia, which historically differed from each other, would be united as a universal or 'truly Catholic' Church. This should create a contrast with the more centralist Roman Catholic Church.¹⁴ Besides the desire for ecumenical unity Bunsen was filled with eschatological hope regarding his plan of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem. Through his contacts with the Evangelical movement in Britain and the *Erweckungsbewegung* in Germany and Switzerland, the diplomat was familiar with the millenarian idea of the restoration of the Jews or the *Wiederbelebung Zions* and eschatological expectations.¹⁵ With regard to the Jerusalem project Bunsen was convinced "that it would be the Church thus founded [i.e., the Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem] which would meet the Saviour at his second coming."¹⁶

¹³ Poyet, "Mémoire sur la Terre Sainte", Jerusalem, 20 October 1872, Rome/ASCPF, SCTS, 24, 827. Georges Goyau also states that Bunsen had devoted his diplomatic life to creating trouble between Prussia and the Holy See, and to uniting the Evangelical Churches in a union across the borders. According to Goyau, Rome knew few enemies as dangerous as Bunsen in the nineteenth century. G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne Religieuse. Le Catholicisme (1800-1870)*, 3 (1848-1870), Paris, 1909, 275-276, n. 5.

¹⁴ Bunsen did not aim at a complete union or assimilation of both national churches. Foerster, *Bunsen*, 159-160, 295.

¹⁵ Foerster, *Bunsen*, 150, 154. According to Foerster, Bunsen was a convinced Evangelical and may be seen as an awakened Christian, although he never had an overwhelming conversion experience. Most characteristics of Evangelical piety can be found in his writings. For instance, in the letters to his sister Christiane Bunsen repeatedly wrote about several typical themes of the *Erweckung*, such as penance and conversion, sin and guilt, faith in Christ etc. Foerster, *Bunsen*, 58-60; F. Foerster, "Der Gesandte Bunsen-zum Briefnachlass eines Vormärz-Politikers. Forschungsbericht über eine Biographie", M. Vogt and D. Kopp (eds.), *Literaturkonzepte im Vormärz*, Forum Vormärz Forschung, Jahrbuch 2000, 6. Jahrgang, 295.

¹⁶ Note from the theologian Julius Charles Hare, quoted in Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 97.

Bunsen's British ally: Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper

After Bunsen had left Rome in 1838 he first went to Prussia and then to Britain, where he stayed from August 1838 to late 1839.¹⁷ In Britain Bunsen met several friends, from whom he did not hide his anti-Catholic feelings. He wished to inform his “good friends under the Tories about the papal disturbances” and about his “campaign against the Pope and his liars – with Britannia as my ally!”¹⁸

Among Bunsen's British friends were such prominent men as Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), William Ewart Gladstone (1809-1898), and Lord Ashley. Of these three the passionate Evangelical Lord Ashley was especially important for the development of Bunsen's thoughts concerning the bishopric.¹⁹ Ashley was very concerned with the mission, which was reflected in the various positions he held: he was president of the British and Foreign Bible Society for many years, member of the board of the LJS (from 1848 until his death), and very interested in the work of the CMS.²⁰ As a staunch millenarian Ashley shared Bunsen's eschatological hopes. He directly connected these eschatological expectations with the restoration of the Jews,²¹ and thought everything seemed ripe for the return of the Jewish people to Palestine.²² Ashley also shared Bunsen's anti-Roman Catholic feelings. No wonder that both men detested the influence of Tractarianism,²³ which in their opinion was too much fixed on Rome, creating a rift between the Church of England and the Protestant Churches of the continent and invalidating the Reformation.²⁴ Besides Bunsen's personal reasons to cherish anti-

¹⁷ The family stayed in England until Bunsen was appointed Prussian minister to Switzerland late in 1839. He was Prussian envoy to Switzerland for only two years. In November 1841 he heard that he had been appointed Prussian minister to England. Schmidt-Clausen, “Der Beitrag Bunsens”, 50; Barclay, *Frederick William IV*, 80.

¹⁸ Bunsen to Frederick William IV, 9 December 1838, in Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 88.

¹⁹ For Arnold's and Gladstone's reception of the Jerusalem bishopric plan, see Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 124-190; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 104-106.

²⁰ Among the characteristics of Ashley's Evangelicalism Geoffrey Finlayson mentions Sunday observance, his thrust towards mission enterprise, concern for the restoration of the Jews and staunch advocacy of Protestantism, resulting in a fierce anti-Catholicism. G.B.A.M. Finlayson, *The Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, 1801-1885*, London, 1981 (hereafter *Shaftesbury*), 109-135.

²¹ Greaves, “The Jerusalem Bishopric”, 333; Blake, “The Origins”, 89; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 150.

²² Ashley in his diary, 24 July 1840, in E. Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.* 1, London, Paris, New York, Melbourne (hereafter *Life and Work*), 1886, 310.

²³ In Ashley's view the Oxford Movement was more sinister than overt Catholicism, since it was crypto-Catholicism masquerading as Anglicanism; he thought it aimed at a reconciliation with Rome. Ashley in his diary, 12 October 1841, in Hodder, *Life and Work*, 376; Finlayson, *Shaftesbury*, 117, 166.

²⁴ Greaves, “The Jerusalem Bishopric”, 332-333.

Catholic sentiments, their anti-Roman Catholic feelings might also have been caused by the apocalyptic view in millenarian circles at the time, which saw the Pope as the anti-Christ and the Church of Rome as Babel.

According to Bunsen, it was Ashley “who set the Jerusalem plan a-going”; they had made their plan “in the night of the 10th December, 1838 – the anniversary of the Allocution of 1837”.²⁵ Here again Bunsen expressed his anti-Roman Catholic feelings. The ‘Allocution’ refers to the Allocution of Pope Gregory XVI (1765-1846) on 10 December 1837 concerning the imprisonment of Droste-Vischering, in which the Pope also declared his refusal of further negotiations with Bunsen about the ‘mixed-weddings’ affair.²⁶ Two months earlier, on 8 October 1838, Ashley had already wondered in his diary whether a Protestant bishopric could be established at Jerusalem.²⁷

In letters to Ashley and Gladstone, dated 3 August 1840, Bunsen said that he saw the hand of God in the events in the Ottoman Empire. When Britain’s influence in the Empire had increased as a result of the Egyptian defeat and the Quadruple Alliance in London between Russia, Prussia, Austria and Britain in July 1840, the diplomat had conceived the idea that Britain should use its new position for the benefit of the Christians in the Holy Land.²⁸ To reach this purpose, Britain might further develop the LJS’ mission station. Bunsen elaborated this idea and wrote that it surely was

impossible not to see the finger of God in the foundation of an English Church and congregation of Christian proselytes on the sacred hill of Jerusalem. [...] You may now without an effort obtain for Christianity in the Sultan’s dominions, not only liberty and privileges [...], but even territorial property, indispensable for the maintenance of the first.²⁹

The next day he provided Ashley with further arguments in favour of Britain’s establishing a bishopric in Jerusalem. These arguments were both religious and political in

²⁵ Bunsen to his wife, 13 July 1841, in Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, London, 1868, 608.

²⁶ For the ‘Allocution’ of Gregory XVI, see Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 83-84; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 53. Although Foerster admits that this quotation can be read as an expression of anti-Catholicism, he qualifies this, stating that Bunsen had a liking for the use of anniversaries in other contexts as well. Such days seemed to Bunsen signs of hidden “weltgeschichtliche zusammenhängen” (historical connections). Foerster, *Bunsen*, 159.

²⁷ Ashley in his diary, 8 October 1838, in Hodder, *Life and Work*, 235.

²⁸ Bunsen to Gladstone and Bunsen to Ashley, 3 August 1840, in Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 583; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 58-59; Foerster, *Christian*, 151-152.

²⁹ Bunsen to Gladstone, 3 August 1840. In Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 583. Cf. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 58; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 151.

character: missionary zeal, care for the oppressed Jews, benefits to British trade in connection with the overland route to India, and the possible threat from other powers. As Bunsen saw it, Britain would be able to secure freedom, privileges and territorial property for the Christians in Palestine.³⁰

Frederick William IV: Bunsen's kindred spirit in Prussia

In a letter dated 17 September 1840, Bunsen informed the Prussian King Frederick William IV of his private considerations.³¹ He referred to the “signs of the time” which should be recognised and used. By disclosing that Ashley had passed his proposal to Lord Henry John Temple Palmerston (1784-1865), the British Foreign Secretary, Bunsen hoped to persuade the King to join in his project.³²

In Frederick William Bunsen found a kindred spirit. The King was strongly influenced by the *Erweckungsbewegung*. According to his biographer, David E. Barclay, it is almost impossible to “exaggerate the importance of the Awakening for an understanding of the personality of Frederick William IV”.³³ From his ‘awakened’ faith, the King understood and interpreted ideas as ‘church’, ‘state’, ‘nation’, ‘people’ and ‘king’.³⁴ The King and Bunsen had become acquainted in late 1827, when Bunsen visited Berlin for consultations. A year later they became friends, when Frederick William, Crown Prince at the time, visited Rome and Bunsen was his guide.³⁵ Both men held similar ideas and ideals on church reform and the independence of the established church, which in their opinion had fallen into decay.³⁶ The King had “from early youth cherished the idea of amending the condition of Christians in the Holy Land; where, as throughout the Turkish Empire, the position of all Christians is altogether ignominious,

³⁰ Bunsen to Ashley, 4 August 1840, see Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 59; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 152. According to Schmidt-Clausen, combining political and religious elements was characteristic for Bunsen, who could never separate his diplomatic behaviour from his religious beliefs. Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenommene Einheit*, 95; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 59.

³¹ Frederick William IV had by then been King for only a few months, succeeding his father Frederick William III who had died on 7 June 1840.

³² Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 59; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 152. According to Lückhoff, by writing to Ashley and Gladstone Bunsen had already started without having been ordered to do so. Foerster, however, thinks that Lückhoff is overrating the British correspondence here.

³³ Barclay, *Frederick William IV*, 34. Barclay thinks Hans-Joachim Schoeps’ characterization of Frederick William IV as an “Awakened Christian on the throne” very appropriate. Barclay, *Frederick William IV*, 34.

³⁴ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 66.

³⁵ Barclay, *Frederick William IV*, 45, 78.

³⁶ Schmidt-Clausen, “Der Beitrag Bunsens”, 53.

and that of Protestants doubly so".³⁷ He saw the work of God in the events in the Ottoman Empire, just as Bunsen did. From this conviction he wanted to improve the condition of all Christians in Palestine.³⁸ His wish is reflected in several memorandums in which he evaluated to what extent the European Powers might act as protecting powers for all Christians in Palestine at the time. In previous years the idea to improve the conditions of the Christians in Palestine had already been in the mind of many Prussians. The idea had been translated into political terms by the *Regierungsrat* Ernst August Kasimir Derschau, who had proposed a plan to King Frederick William III (1770-1840) aimed at the establishment of a Christian state in Jerusalem. The King, however, turned the proposal down, stating that although this was an important issue for Christianity, Prussia was not in the position to carry out such a plan successfully, even if supported by half of Europe. When, however, Frederick William IV ascended the throne, he gave his full support to the ideas and plans concerning Palestine. Moreover, the time seemed right to discuss the position of the Christians in Palestine, since at the time the situation in the Orient was being discussed in London by Austria, Russia, Britain and Prussia.³⁹

On 6 August 1840, the court in Vienna received a memorandum written by the Prussian ambassador in London, Heinrich von Bülow (1792-1846), and the Prussian minister of Educational and Religious Affairs Johann Albrecht Friedrich Eichhorn (1779-1856). In this memorandum the possibility and necessity was discussed of securing the Holy Places for the Christians as well as free devotion at the Holy Grave. Jerusalem was referred to as a city of ecumenical activity. Austria, however, did not answer. In February 1841, the British government was approached by means of a new memorandum concerning the situation of the Christians in Palestine, which did not have any effect either.⁴⁰

In March 1841, Frederick William IV made another attempt to improve the position of the Christians in Palestine. By his order, an "Address to European Christendom" was written by his confidant Joseph Maria von Radowitz (1797-1853), a Prussian military attaché and Prussian ambassador at the Courts of Karlsruhe, Stuttgart

³⁷ Bunsen to Frederick Perthes, London, 12 October 1841, in Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 599.

³⁸ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 72.

³⁹ Sinno, *Deutsche Interessen*, 17-18; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 35-36.

⁴⁰ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 36-37.

and Darmstadt from 1842.⁴¹ With this “Address”, which was sent to Britain, France, Austria and Russia, the King wanted to create a union of these powers for the benefit of the Christians and the Holy Places in Palestine. He wished “all the Christian Powers” to act together so that the Holy Places might be given into Christian hands “without interfering with Turkish supremacy”. Unfortunately for the King his attempt was in vain. All four countries rejected his proposal. Austria and France feared that a joint protectorate over the Holy Places might cause immeasurable problems between the super-powers. Britain considered carrying out the *Hatt-ı Sherif* of Gülhane the main priority of the European Orient policy. Russia thought such a union unnecessary for the sake of the situation of the Greek Orthodox in Palestine. Moreover, it would weaken the Russian influence on the Ottoman Empire.⁴²

It is remarkable that Frederick William IV did not seem to distinguish between the various denominations in the countries he approached. He sent a memorandum, first to Austria, then to ‘Protestant’ Britain.⁴³ In his address of 1841 he also approached France and Russia. This shows that the King, in his desire to improve the conditions of Christians, in principle wanted a better position for *all* Christians. Furthermore, it shows that, unlike Bunsen and Ashley, he was not driven by anti-Roman Catholic sentiment.⁴⁴

After the non-committal reactions to his memorandums on the part of the European countries, the Prussian King decided to restrict his efforts to the position of the Protestants in Palestine. Just as Bunsen, Frederick William IV saw an opportunity for cooperation between Britain and Prussia in the LJS’ mission to the Jews in Jerusalem

⁴¹ According to Bunsen and Hechler, Frederick William IV had dictated the Address to Von Radowitz. Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 595; Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, 26. Cf. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 37.

⁴² Bunsen, *A memoir* 1, 595, 599; Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, 26; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 37-38.

⁴³ Both Frederick William IV and Bunsen considered the Church of England unconditionally as Protestant. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 302.

⁴⁴ In Germany there were even rumours that Frederick William IV was a closet Roman Catholic, and that he was under the influence of his Roman Catholic wife Elisabeth, although she converted to Protestantism in 1829. A reason for these rumours was the King’s attempts to reconcile the Prussian Crown with the Roman Catholic Church after the ‘mixed-weddings affair’. Goyau, *L’Allemagne* 2, 233; J. Mehlhausen, “Friedrich Wilhelm IV. Ein Laientheologe auf dem preussischen Königsthron”, H. Schröder and G. Müller (eds.), *Vom Amt des Laien in Kirche und Theologie. Festschrift für Gerhard Krause zum 70. Geburtstag*, Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann, 39, Berlin-New York, 1982, 197-198. For Frederick William IV’s attempts to resolve the ‘Cologne Troubles’ after his accession, see also Barclay, *Frederick William IV*, 80.

and its efforts to build a Protestant Church on Mount Zion.⁴⁵ The King considered this private institution an opportunity for a united and undenominational Protestant Church; the only way to achieve such an institution was for the Church of England to establish a bishopric.⁴⁶

Frederick William IV was less interested in the mission to the Jews than in the improvement of the condition of the Protestants in Palestine and the creation of a united Protestant Church. In a letter to Bunsen dated 26 August 1841 the King stressed that, despite his positive feelings about the restoration of the Jews, this was not part of his plan. He did not consider the restoration of the Jews an objective of the bishopric. The aim should be to obtain recognition and an equal status of the Protestants to that of the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Church in the Ottoman Empire.⁴⁷

After his memorandums had been turned down, Frederick William summoned Bunsen to Berlin in April 1841 for a “temporary mission to England, ‘which would be explained to him in person’”.⁴⁸ Bunsen assumed that the King had called upon him in order to do something in Palestine.⁴⁹ He was right: Frederick William sent him to England to negotiate with the British government and the Anglican bishops about a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem. Bunsen arrived in London on 19 June 1841. He soon contacted Lord Ashley about the plan. The latter was overjoyed with the news:

My friend Bunsen has just called, and has brought me a most honourable and gratifying message from the King of Prussia. May the blessing of God’s saints of old,

⁴⁵ In the ecclesiastical foundations on Mount Zion by the LJS Frederick William IV saw a duty “of every Protestant prince and community to attach themselves to this foundation as the starting point of combined efforts.” Fredrick William IV’s instructions to Bunsen, 8 June 1841, in Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 12-13 (English and German).

⁴⁶ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, 27; Tibawi, *British Interests*, 45; Schmidt-Clausen, “Der Beitrag Bunsens”, 54.

⁴⁷ Frederick William IV to Bunsen, 26 August 1841, in Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 174-176. This letter is a reaction to a memorandum written by Bunsen, which, according to the King, might give the impression that he (Frederick William IV) saw the restoration of the Jews as the bishopric’s chief aim. Bunsen’s memorandum will be discussed later. Cf. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 91. When nearly three months later an official announcement was made in Prussia about the establishment of the Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem, there was no mention of any connection with the mission to the Jews. This announcement will be discussed later in this chapter.

⁴⁸ Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 593.

⁴⁹ Bunsen believed “that it might be the will of the Lord, and probably would be that of the King, that in Jerusalem the two principal Protestant Churches of Europe should, across the grave of the Redeemer, reach to each other the right hand of fellowship”. Bunsen to his wife, 26 April 1841, in Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 594.

of David, of Hezekiah, be on him and his for ever! But all things are now wonderful. The mission of Bunsen is a wonder; God grant that its issue may be a wonder!⁵⁰

The establishment of the Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem

After extensive discussions between Frederick William IV and Bunsen about the bishopric, the King had sent Bunsen to London as his special envoy,⁵¹ providing him with detailed instructions on how to negotiate with the British government and the principal leaders of the Church of England. First of all, Bunsen was to talk with the British government about “the protection which should be afforded to the subjects of both powers in the Turkish dominions, without distinction of creed”. Furthermore, he had to try and ascertain “how far the Church of England, which is already possessed of a minister’s residence on Mount Zion, and has begun to build a church on the spot, would be inclined to grant the Evangelical National Church of Prussia rank, as a sister-Church, in the Holy Land.”⁵²

The King had instructed Bunsen to keep two principles in mind while negotiating. The first consisted of “the greatest possible unity of action” between the churches of England and Prussia throughout the Ottoman Empire, particularly in Palestine. For the King, “unity in the outset” was a principal condition to obtain full recognition of and equality with other (recognised) ecclesiastical communities in the East. It was very important for the various Protestant churches to present themselves as a united body. Frederick William IV considered the ancient churches in the East to be a perfect example of such a united body. These churches might be divided among themselves, but appeared to be a “firm and compact body”. If the separate Protestant churches, such as the United-Evangelical, Episcopal-Anglican, Reformed, Lutheran, Scotch-Presbyterian churches and others, insisted on being recognised as such, the Turkish government would hesitate to grant them recognition. The Protestant church “must exhibit herself *as one in unity of faith*”. According to the King, the first step towards unity of action

⁵⁰ Ashley in his diary, 24 June 1841, in Hodder, *Life and Work*, 370.

⁵¹ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 73; Foerster, *Bunsen*, 153. Bunsen had written four memorandums for the discussions about the bishopric. For these memorandums, see Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 73-77.

⁵² “The Instructions of King Frederick William IV to his special Envoy, the Privy Councillor, Dr. Bunsen”, 8 June 1841, in Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 2-3 (English and German).

was the establishment by the Church of England of a Jerusalem bishopric. He did not intend to set up an Anglo-Prussian episcopate, but a Protestant bishopric.⁵³

The second principle Bunsen was told to keep in mind concerned the King's wish to secure the independence of the Protestant Church of Prussia, and preserve the individuality of the German people.⁵⁴ At the end of the instructions the King looked ahead: the establishment of a Protestant bishopric might increase the number of Prussian Protestants in Palestine. If their number indeed increased, the King wanted to establish an independent Prussian Palestine Mission and a Prussian bishopric in Bethlehem which would cooperate with the Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem.⁵⁵

After Bunsen had arrived in London on 19 June 1841, he started to discuss the Jerusalem bishopric plan with several church leaders, particularly the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Howley (1766-1848), and the Bishop of London, Charles James Blomfield (1786-1857), and also with the British government, which was mainly represented by the Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston. In 1839 Palmerston had become Lord Ashley's father-in-law because of his marriage to Lady Emily Mary Cowper (1787-1869), Ashley's mother-in-law. Ashley regularly discussed the Jerusalem project with Palmerston. He considered his father-in-law chosen by God "to be an instrument of good to His ancient people". Although Palmerston was positive about the Jerusalem plan, he did not share Ashley's religious motivations. In his diary Ashley confessed that he was forced to use political, financial and commercial arguments to convince Palmerston.⁵⁶

The establishment of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem was thought to offer possible political, commercial, and religious benefits for Britain. Political benefits could consist of more power and prestige in the Middle East. As to the commercial benefits, British presence in Palestine could be beneficial for the British commercial route to India, an important British colony at the time. With regard to the possible religious advantages opinions varied. The millenarians saw in the Jerusalem plan the starting point of the restoration of Israel. Most conservative Anglican churchmen who supported the

⁵³ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 4-9, 16-17 (English and German); Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 78.

⁵⁴ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 16-17 (English and German).

⁵⁵ In the King's view the independent Prussian Palestine mission would consist of a church, independent from Britain, a hospice and a school. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 81, 95, 102. Hechler does not mention this part of the King's instructions.

⁵⁶ Ashley in his diary, 1 August 1840, in Hodder, *Life and Work*, 310-311.

bishopric plan saw it as a possibility to introduce episcopacy in Prussia. On the other hand, Evangelicals such as Lord Ashley wanted to strengthen Protestantism in England against the Tractarian threat.⁵⁷

Although for sometimes conflicting reasons, Howley and Blomfield as well as Palmerston were interested in Bunsen's proposal. Only one month after Bunsen's arrival in England fundamental principles were formulated which all negotiators accepted as the "governing principles for the arrangements at Jerusalem", and which formed the basis for further negotiations. The principles stated that the two main features of a "truly Christian and efficient union among churches" were, first, "Catholicity", *or a lively sense of the internal unity of the universal Church*, and secondly, the "*National independence*" of the churches that would ensure the "vitality and full development" of the churches' branches.⁵⁸

With regard to the financial aspects of the bishopric, Frederick William IV declared himself "willing to contribute one moiety of the sum necessary for the endowment of a Protestant Bishopric at Jerusalem". It was agreed that the King would donate a sum of £15,000 for the endowment of the Jerusalem bishopric. The interest on this amount, which came to £600 per year, would be paid once a year. This would cover half the annual income of the Protestant bishop in Jerusalem. The money would be paid to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London, as Trustees of the Jerusalem bishopric.⁵⁹ On the British side, the LJS had reserved £3,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the "necessary outfit of the [...] Bishop and the Endowment of the bishopric". Furthermore, money would be raised by voluntary contributions. Various Britons had already donated money for the bishopric and others were "expected to contribute divers sums".⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Greaves, "The Jerusalem Bishopric", 347; Welch, "Anglican Churchmen", 195.

⁵⁸ "Fundamental Principles", London, July 1841, in Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 28-29 (English and German).

⁵⁹ In the Prussian Deed of Endowment the opportunity to invest advantageously in landed property in Palestine was taken into account. "Royal Prussian Deed of Endowment" (this is the Prussian *Dotations-Urkunde*), 6 September 1841, in Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 46-47 (English and German); also printed in Smith, *The Protestant Bishopric*, 133-134.

⁶⁰ The money from the Prussian King, the LJS and the volunteers should be invested in "the purchase of Stock in the Public Funds of Great Britain" in the names of the Trustees of the Funds. Five men, among whom Lord Ashley, were approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury as Trustees. These arrangements were all laid down in the "English Deed of Endowment of the Jerusalem Bishopric", 15 November 1841. For a copy of this "Deed", see Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 76-85. Cf. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 94-95.

The speed of the negotiations regarding the bishopric was extraordinary. In retrospect Ashley wrote in his diary that Lord Palmerston:

went forward with the zeal of an apostle ('howbeit I fear, he thinketh not so'), did in three weeks what at another time, or, as it seems, under any influence but mine, he would not have listened to in twelve months, fanned the weak embers of willing but timid spirit in the Bishops, and made that to be necessary and irrevocable which his successors would have thought the attribute of a maniac, even in imagination.⁶¹

Ashley also stated that "had Bunsen arrived a month later we should not now, humanly speaking, have reached even the point of stating the case".⁶² The reason for this was a forthcoming change in the British government after the dissolution of Parliament in June. With this change of government some change of foreign policy was to be expected.

On 6 September 1841 Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850) succeeded Lord William Lamb Melbourne (1779-1848) as Prime Minister, and Lord George Aberdeen (1784-1860) became Palmerston's successor as Foreign Secretary. The new government inherited the Jerusalem bishopric plan from the previous administration. Compared with Palmerston, Peel and Aberdeen were less enthusiastic about the Jerusalem project.⁶³ Ashley describes a meeting with Peel that shows the new Prime Minister's obvious dislike of the Jerusalem project, sharing "the opinions and feelings [...] of his friend Aberdeen". Ashley continues to say that Peel was afraid of exciting the French and "thought we might appear as making 'a crusade against the Roman Catholics'".⁶⁴ Nevertheless, in the end the new government was willing to support the plan as a solely religious rather than a partly political project. Therefore, when the first bishop was to be consecrated, the British government warned the British ambassador in Constantinople that the character of the bishop's work was purely spiritual.⁶⁵

⁶¹ Ashley in his diary, 12 October 1841, in Hodder, *Life and Work*, 375-376.

⁶² Ashley in his diary, 12 October 1841, in Hodder, *Life and Work*, 375. Cf. Greaves, "The Jerusalem Bishopric", 346-347.

⁶³ Greaves, "The Jerusalem Bishopric", 346-347.

⁶⁴ Ashley in his diary, 22 October 1841, in Hodder, *Life and Work*, 377.

⁶⁵ Greaves, "The Jerusalem Bishopric", 349.

Nomination of the first bishop and the Jerusalem Bishopric Act

By now a candidate for the office of bishop of the Protestant bishopric had materialized: the Jewish convert Michael Solomon Alexander (1799-1845). At first, Bunsen and the Bishop of London thought of Alexander McCaul (1799-1863), a scholar of Hebrew and Judaism, and like Ashley one of the principal members of the LJS. However, McCaul turned down the appointment stating that the office holder of the “Episcopate of St. James⁶⁶ ought to be a descendant of Abraham”.⁶⁷ The bishop had to be a Jew, as a sign that the restoration of Israel had really started.⁶⁸

Lord Ashley agreed with McCaul and suggested Michael Solomon Alexander. For those who held millenarian views, Alexander’s nomination for the Jerusalem bishopric was too good to be true. As Bunsen wrote in his diary, Alexander was “by race an Israelite, – born a Prussian in Breslau, – in confession belonging to the Church of England – ripened (by hard work) in Ireland – twenty years Professor of Hebrew and Arabic in England”. Bunsen enthusiastically concluded that a beginning had been made with the restoration of Israel.⁶⁹ After some hesitation, Alexander accepted the office of bishop of the Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem.

Before Alexander could be consecrated and leave for Jerusalem, a special Act of Parliament had to be passed. This Act empowered the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consecrate British subjects and foreigners to episcopal sees in foreign countries. This Act of Parliament, called “The Jerusalem Bishopric Act”, was passed on 5 October

⁶⁶ According to Stock, St. James the Just was the Apostle of the Circumcision *par excellence*. Stock, *The History of the CMS* 1, 420.

⁶⁷ Gidney, *The History of the LJS*, 207. Alexander McCaul wrote a number of books, of which *The Old Paths* was one of the most important. G.H. Anderson (ed.), *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Cambridge, G.H., 1998, 446.

⁶⁸ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 84-85. Many LJS members held millennial views. Tracts, annual reports, and monthly journals also reflected this millennial position. See Kochav, “Beginning at Jerusalem”, 93. According to Kochav, in contrast to the majority of the LJS members, many among the large and varied body of supporters on which the LJS was dependent held no millennial views. Kochav, “Beginning at Jerusalem”, 94.

⁶⁹ Bunsen in his Diary, 19 July 1841, in Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 608-609. Cf. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 85. According to Patrick Irwin, Bunsen is “merely echoing” the enthusiasm of his millenarian friend Ashley in his diary, because neither Bunsen nor Frederick William IV were much interested in the Jews in the Jerusalem plan. Irwin, “Bishop Alexander and the Jews of Jerusalem”, Sheils, W.J. (ed.) *Persecution and Toleration. Papers Read at the Twenty-Second Summer Meeting and the Twenty-Third Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, Studies in Church History 21, Oxford, 1984, 318-319. I do not agree with Irwin, as it seems that Bunsen’s hope for the conversion of the Jews and the restoration of Israel was part of Bunsen’s eschatological hopes. Cf. Foerster, *Bunsen*, 295. Bunsen even became vice-patron of the LJS during his years as Prussian Minister in London. Tibawi, *British Interests*, 96.

1841. The Act also stipulated that the bishops were allowed to exercise spiritual jurisdiction over the Ministers of British congregations of the United Church of England and Ireland, and over Protestant congregations willing to place themselves under their Episcopal Authority. For the performance of such a consecration the archbishops had to obtain a royal licence.⁷⁰

The necessary royal licence was given by Queen Victoria (1819-1901) on 6 November 1841. Already the next day, 7 November 1841, Alexander was consecrated as “Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem”.⁷¹ It was deliberately decided that the bishop’s title would be ‘bishop *in* Jerusalem’ rather than ‘*of* Jerusalem’, as the last formulation would question the authority of the Orthodox bishops in Jerusalem and might cause conflicts.⁷² Now that Alexander had been ordained, he was ready to go to Jerusalem.⁷³

Concluding negotiations: The “Statement of Proceedings”

Since both sides had agreed that in terms of canon law the bishopric would be Anglican, there was no need of a treaty for its establishment. However, Bunsen and the Archbishop of Canterbury both made declarations of intent which outlined the framework for the future joint project.⁷⁴ Although the British declaration of intent would be the guideline for the functioning of the bishopric, it is interesting also to discuss Bunsen’s memorandum, because it sheds light on the Prussian point of view regarding the bishopric. As early as July 1841 Bunsen had written the memorandum “The Church

⁷⁰ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 48-53 (English and German); Welch, “Anglican Churchmen”, 194.

⁷¹ The date of Alexander’s consecration given by Corey and Perry is 11 November 1841. However, in the “English Deed of Endowment”, a copy of whose original is recorded by Hechler, as well as in a letter of Bunsen to his wife, the consecration date is given as 7 November 1841. See M.W. Corey, *From Rabbi to Bishop*, London, n.d., 56; Perry, *British Mission*, 57; Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 77; Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 626. For the Queen’s Licence for Consecration, see Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 56-61 (English and German).

⁷² Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 95. Bunsen also mentioned other titles for the Bishop in letters to his wife. On 15 October 1841 he wrote that “the title [of the Bishop] will be ‘Bishop of the Church of St. James at Jerusalem’, in which all parties are understood.” On 4 November 1841, he wrote that the title of the Bishop would be “Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem”, in Bunsen, *A Memoir* 1, 624, 627. It is unclear whether they realised that there already was a Cathedral of St. James in Jerusalem of the Armenian Church, and changed the bishop’s title for that reason.

⁷³ For Alexander’s episcopacy, see the next chapter.

⁷⁴ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 296.

at Jerusalem”, which he presented to his British discussion partners in August. The memo contained practical regulations for the bishopric’s structure. Britain and Prussia would share the expenses, both countries would alternately nominate the bishop until a Prussian bishopric was founded in Bethlehem, etc. etc. In the memorandum Bunsen had declared himself in favour of the mission to the Jews, although he mentioned that this was not the only aim of the bishopric. The cooperation with other national churches was another important purpose.⁷⁵

Bunsen’s memorandum was criticised by Frederick William IV, partly because it gave the impression that the King aimed at the restoration of the Jews, which he did not. The King was also annoyed because Bunsen had mentioned a possible future Prussian bishopric in Bethlehem (“this indefinite project”). He further criticised the memo for suggesting that he intended a complete union of the Church of England and the Evangelical Church of Prussia. As he had already stated in his instructions to Bunsen, he aimed at a “unity of faith”; under the roof of the Protestant bishopric both churches would be united, but would at the same time remain independent. The King stressed that it was an Anglican bishopric; the Church of Prussia did not know about the Jerusalem plan and remained neutral.⁷⁶

In November 1841, Archbishop Howley presented Bunsen with the draft of the Anglican declaration of intent. This draft finally resulted in the “Statement of Proceedings relating to the Establishment of a Bishopric of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem”, signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London on 9 December 1841.⁷⁷ This may be considered the conclusion of the negotiations about the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric.⁷⁸ As both Prussia and Britain had agreed that the see would be a bishopric of the Church of England, this “Statement of Proceedings” was considered the guideline for the actions of the future bishops.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 87.

⁷⁶ The King’s criticism was expressed in several letters. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 86-91. For one of these letters, dd. 26 August 1841, see also Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 174-176.

⁷⁷ For the “Statement of Proceedings” or “Amtliche Bekanntmachung des Erzbischofs von Canterbury und Bestimmungen über die inneren Verhältnisse des Bisthums in Jerusalem”, see Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 104-113. Cf. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 97.

⁷⁸ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 97.

⁷⁹ Bunsen’s memorandum “The Church at Jerusalem” in itself did not seem to have affected the actions of subsequent bishops and the development of the Protestant bishopric.

The statement consisted of eight general proceedings together with several arrangements regarding the congregations within the German Protestant confession. One of the eight general proceedings stated that the Crowns of England and Prussia would alternately nominate the “Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem”, though the Archbishop of Canterbury had an absolute veto. Arrangements were made concerning the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop in Jerusalem. It was to be exercised according to the laws, canons, and customs of the Church of England, and extended to British clergy and congregations and those other clergy and congregations who wanted to place themselves under the bishop’s authority in his diocese, which included Palestine, the rest of Syria, Chaldea, Egypt and Abyssinia (present-day Ethiopia). Even though Frederick William IV had stressed that he did not aim at the restoration of the Jews, the British declaration did proclaim that the bishop’s “chief missionary care” would be “directed to the conversion of the Jews, to their protection, and to their useful employment”. The importance of the idea of the restoration of the Jews for the British was apparent from the “statement” mentioning that it was impossible not to recognise the hand of Providence in the events that had taken place in the Middle East lately “opening to Christians [...] a door for the advancement of the Saviour’s kingdom” and for the restoration of the Jews.⁸⁰

With regard to the churches then present in Jerusalem, the statement declared that the bishop would

establish and maintain [...] relations of Christian charity with other Churches represented at Jerusalem, and in particular with the orthodox Greek Church; taking special care to convince them, that the Church of England does not wish to disturb, or divide, or interfere with them; but that she is ready, in the spirit of Christian love, to render them such offices of friendship as they may be willing to receive.⁸¹

However, the tone in which the statement referred to the Roman Catholic Church was anything but friendly. It stated that the bishopric might be a “means of establishing relations of amity between the United Church of England and Ireland and the ancient Churches of the East, strengthening them against the encroachments of the See of Rome”. Further on it stated that the Church of Rome was constantly “labouring to pervert the members of the Eastern Churches, and to bring them under the dominion of

⁸⁰ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 106-111 (English and German); Schmidt-Clausen, “Der Beitrag Bunsens”, 60.

⁸¹ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 110-111 (English and German).

the Pope". The statement blamed the Roman Catholic Church for sparing "no arts nor intrigues" in this endeavour and for sowing "dissension and disorder amongst an ill-informed people". Moreover, it asserted jurisdiction over the Eastern churches, which these churches had "always strenuously resisted". The statement declared that, unlike the intentions of the Roman Catholic Church, the bishop of the church of the "two great Protestant Powers of Europe", i.e., England and Prussia, was charged not to "entrench" upon spiritual rights and liberties of the Eastern churches. Instead, the bishop would take care of them and would maintain friendly relations with them.⁸²

This anti-Catholic part of the Statement reflects a resistance to the expansion of Rome's power. Consequently, from these utterances one might conclude that it was an explicit aim of the bishopric's establishment to counterbalance the growth of Roman Catholic influence in the Holy Land. Furthermore, this part of the statement demonstrates that both denominations were interested in the Eastern Christians. However, whereas the Roman Catholics directed their energies towards making converts among the Orthodox, the Protestant bishop was allowed by the statement only to assist these churches, if they wanted. The document did not allow the bishops to make converts among the Orthodox; they just had to maintain friendly relations with them, which then, according to the statement, would be a means of preparing the way for their purification. This particular part supports the view, held by many Protestant missionaries at the time, that the Eastern churches should be reformed by Protestant teaching and preaching rather than be converted.

The statement ended with several regulations regarding the possibility of congregations of German Protestants willing to submit to the bishop. These congregations would be "under the care of German clergymen" who would be ordained by the bishop for that purpose.⁸³ These clergymen would officiate in German according to the forms of their national liturgy. The liturgy had to correspond with the liturgy of the Church of England on doctrinal points and was intended for the special use of these congregations only. The German clergymen were required to be ordained according to the ritual of the Church of England, and were required to sign the Thirty-Nine Articles; in addition, they had to subscribe to the Confession of Augsburg before some competent authority. Prior to their consecration the German clergymen had to provide the bishop

⁸² Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 106-109 (English and German).

⁸³ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 112-113 (English and German).

with proof of their subscription to the Confession of Augsburg in order to be qualified by German law to officiate in German congregations.⁸⁴

British, Prussian, and Ottoman objections to the bishopric

In both Prussia and England the establishment of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem was severely criticised. In addition, the Ottoman authorities also opposed the Prussian-British plan.

In Prussia the opposition to the bishopric plan was fuelled by the fact that the announcement of the bishopric came rather late. The *Allgemeine Zeitung* was the first one to pay attention to the bishopric plan, on 24 October 1841. However, not until November 1841, after Bishop Alexander was consecrated, was the German public officially informed by means of a circular from Eichhorn.⁸⁵ The circular stated that the Evangelical Church was “destitute of all legal recognition in Turkey”, in contrast to the Greek Orthodox and Latin Churches in the Ottoman Empire. As Britain possessed a “preponderating influence” on the Porte,⁸⁶ because of her fleet and commerce, a union with Britain “whose Church, in origin and doctrine, is intimately related to the German Evangelical Church” would be the best way to obtain recognition of the Protestants. Eichhorn continued by stating that “by a cordial co-operation” a bishopric had been founded in Jerusalem in which all Protestants might find a “centre of union”. The document stressed that “at the same time, the German Protestants, especially, may assert the independence of their Church in respect of their own particular Confession and Liturgy”. After discussing the bishop’s nomination and the bishopric’s expenses, the circular mentioned plans for the establishment of a hospice for Protestant travellers. Two circular rescripts from Eichhorn referred to this foundation, also mentioning the erection of a Church for German Protestants in Jerusalem and the foundation of a

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Published in the *Allgemeine Preussische Staats-Zeitung* on 16 November 1841. M. Lückhoff, “Prussia and Jerusalem: Political and Religious Controversies Surrounding the Foundation of the Jerusalem Bishopric”, Ben-Arieh and Davis (eds.), *Jerusalem in the Mind of the Western World, 1800-1948*, 174-175; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 111.

⁸⁶ Whereas the Porte knew “Prussia only as a great power of Europe, which, by its harmony with the other great powers, guarantees its security”. Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 66-67 (English and German).

school. For the realization of these projects Frederick William IV had ordered a general collection in the Protestant Churches in Prussia.⁸⁷

There were three important reasons for the Prussian objections to the Jerusalem bishopric. The first was the fact that there were no Protestants in Jerusalem. Therefore, there was no real need for a Protestant bishop to reside in Jerusalem.⁸⁸ Although it was not entirely correct to state that there were no Protestants in Jerusalem, this criticism is understandable. Over the years LJS missionaries had made only few converts, so that the Protestant community in Jerusalem was very small. The second objection was that Frederick William IV had better send a state representative to Jerusalem instead of a bishop, if he wanted to protect the (political) rights of the Protestants there. A third argument raised by the opponents was that the money used for this bishopric had better be used for the improvement of social conditions in Prussia itself.⁸⁹

The Jerusalem project also raised questions among its supporters. One of these concerned the question whether the project was not political rather than religious. Some of the supporters also wondered if the real aim of the bishopric was to introduce the Episcopal system of the Church of England in Prussia in order to reform the Prussian Church.⁹⁰ This question is not surprising, since Frederick William valued a church ideal that consisted of a complete reorganisation of the Evangelical communion in Prussia.⁹¹ Although some British supporters of the bishopric did cherish the hope that episcopacy would be introduced in Prussia, in the negotiations about its establishment the introduction of church reforms in Prussia was not an issue.

Prussian Protestant theologians criticised the Jerusalem project, assuming that Frederick William aimed at an actual church union between the Church of England and

⁸⁷ "Circulars of the Prussian minister for spiritual affairs", dd. 14 November 1841, Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, Documents, 62-75 (English and German); also printed in H.J. Schoeps, *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte Preussens im 19. Jahrhundert*, Chapter 14 "Der Widerstand der Berliner Geistlichkeit gegen die Gründung des Bistums zu Jerusalem", 289-294. In further conversations between Frederick William IV (via Bunsen) and the Archbishop of Canterbury after the formal negotiations had ended, the King stressed that his actual object was an independent Prussian Palestine mission. In the spring of 1842 Bunsen informed the King that the Archbishop would recognize the bishop's jurisdiction in case a Prussian bishopric would be established. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 98.

⁸⁸ Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 176; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 112.

⁸⁹ Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 176-177; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 112.

⁹⁰ Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 176.

⁹¹ In his view the United Evangelical Church of Prussia would be divided into sees presided by ten metropolitan bishops, headed by the "Prince-Archbishop of Magdeburg". The Crown would be the connection between Church and State. Greaves, "The Jerusalem Bishopric", 331.

the church of Prussia. Another concern was the unequal status of the Prussian Church compared to that of the Church of England in the British declaration of intent, the "Statement of Proceedings". The Prussian Protestant theologians criticised the ordination of Prussian clergy by the bishop of Jerusalem, and the enforced subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles. In their opinion, the recognition of the Anglican ordination of German clergymen affected the nature of Protestantism and would finally lead to its downfall. The Protestant theologians' negative attitude towards the Jerusalem project was nourished by the fact that neither theological faculties and theologians, nor ministerial officials had been consulted about the plan. Both Bunsen and Frederick William considered the Jerusalem project a private enterprise of the Prussian King.⁹²

In the spring of 1842 the ultra-conservative Protestant minister Otto von Gerlach (1801-1849) wrote a memorandum to the Prussian King. Von Gerlach tried to explain to the King the concern of many Berlin pastors that the Church of England and the Prussian Church would eventually merge.⁹³ The Berlin ministers' fear was further increased by a passage in the "Statement of Proceedings" expressing the hope that the bishopric might "lead the way to an essential unity of discipline, as well as of doctrine" between the Church of England and the "less perfectly constituted" Protestant Churches of the continent.⁹⁴ In Prussia, the Jerusalem bishopric plan was also criticized in Roman Catholic circles. One of its issues was the thought that the bishopric was an attempt to unite Protestant nations in their actions against Catholicism.⁹⁵

In England, too, people opposed the bishopric. Some feared that the main reason for establishing a Jerusalem bishopric was political rather than religious.⁹⁶ Furthermore, a number of bishops were irritated about the behaviour of Howley and Blomfield, because they had acted without taking their colleagues' views into account.⁹⁷ The main

⁹² Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 177-178; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 111, 114-115.

⁹³ Barclay, *Frederick William IV*, 83. For the criticism on the part of the German "konservativen Konfessionalismus" and the memorandum by Otto von Gerlach see also Schoeps, *Neue Quellen*, 279-294.

⁹⁴ Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, 106-107 (English and German). The "Statement of Proceedings", however, did not express the hope that the Church of England would absorb the Evangelical Church of Prussia. Schoeps, *Neue Quellen*, 281. A letter by the Archbishop of Canterbury temporarily ended the discussion by stressing as important aspects of the agreement: the inner unity of the Protestant Churches, the desire to appear as a union to the Ottoman authorities and the security of both denominations' national independence. Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 178.

⁹⁵ Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 177.

⁹⁶ Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 177.

⁹⁷ Welch, "Anglican Churchmen", 196.

criticism, however, came from the Oxford Movement. Many of its leaders openly declared themselves opposed to the Jerusalem project. The Tractarians feared that by this project the episcopal system of the English Church and the structure of the Evangelical Church of Prussia would appear to be similar. According to them it was impossible for the Episcopal Church of England to cooperate with the non-Episcopal Prussian Church. Moreover, they thought that the establishment of a bishopric in Jerusalem was unnecessary, as the Greek Orthodox Church already represented Christianity in Palestine. The establishment of a Protestant bishopric would raise hostility on the part of the Orthodox towards England. The bishop could only be sent out if the Greek Orthodox patriarch agreed to it.⁹⁸

It was especially John Henry Newman (1801-1890) who strongly opposed the Jerusalem project. Newman even considered the Jerusalem bishopric affair the last blow that finally shattered his faith in the Anglican Church.⁹⁹ He criticized the Anglican bishops for fraternizing, “by their act or by their sufferance”, with Protestants of all sorts, “allowing them to put themselves under an Anglican Bishop, without any renunciation of their errors or regard to their due reception of baptism and confirmation”.¹⁰⁰ Parallel to the Prussian criticism about the lack of Protestants in Jerusalem, Newman used a similar argument to criticise the Jerusalem bishopric: the lack of Anglicans in the city. A Mr. Formby, who had visited Jerusalem, had told him that there were no Anglicans there. So a bishop was sent to, in Newman’s words, “*make* a communion, not to govern our own people. Next the *excuse* is, that there are converted Anglican Jews there who require a Bishop”. Mr. Formby had told Newman he did not think there were even half a dozen. For such a small number a bishop was sent to Jeru-

⁹⁸ Welch, “Anglican Churchmen”, 197-198; Lückhoff, “Prussia and Jerusalem”, 177; Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 107-109.

⁹⁹ J.H. Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua. Being a History of his Religious Opinions*, M.J. Svaglic (ed.), Oxford, 1967, 133.

¹⁰⁰ Newman, *Apologia*, 133. According to Newman, these Protestants included “Monophysites, halfconverted Jews, and even Druses”. Newman to his friend John William Bowden, 10 October 1841, in G. Tracey (ed.), *Tract 90 and the Jerusalem Bishopric Jan. 1841-April 1842*, The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman 3, Oxford, 1999, 289. In the same letter Newman added that if this happenend he would not “be able to keep a single man from Rome”.

salem and for them, Newman continued, this man was a “Bishop of the *circumcision*”.¹⁰¹ This he considered “against the Epistle to the Galatians pretty nearly”.¹⁰²

Newman criticized not only the religious motives behind the establishment of the bishopric, but also the possible political intentions, as there were obvious political advantages to the Jerusalem project. If the plan succeeded it “gave Protestantism a *status* in the East, which [...] formed a political instrument for England, parallel to that which Russia had in the Greek Church, and France in the Latin”. The Protestant community would counterbalance the Russian and French influence.¹⁰³ Therefore Newman thought that an episcopate of all sorts of Protestants was actually desired by Britain for the reason that a church in Jerusalem was a “means of political influence, a *resident power* in the country”.¹⁰⁴ If the motivation behind the Jerusalem bishopric were in fact a political one, the church would actually be abused for political reasons. This particular criticism on the part of Newman and others contained an element of truth. As we have seen, the motives for the establishment of the bishopric were a mixture of religion and politics. Bunsen, for instance, used both political and religious arguments in the letters in which he expounded his Jerusalem plan in order to gain British support. Furthermore, the British Foreign Minister Palmerston was interested in the bishopric’s political and commercial benefits rather than its religious benefits.

Finally, in November 1841, Newman wrote a “Protest against the Jerusalem bishopric” which he sent to Richard Bagot (1782-1854), Bishop of Oxford from 1829-1845, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The protest listed all his points of criticism.¹⁰⁵ Looking back on the Jerusalem project, Newman concluded in his *Apologia* that the “great misfortune” of the Jerusalem bishopric became “one of the greatest mercies” as it brought him to “the beginning of the end”, i.e., the end of his membership of the Anglican Church.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ Newman to Bowden, 12 October 1841, in Newman, *Apologia*, 133; Tracey, *Tract 90*, 295. Newman wrote nearly the same to Henry Wilberforce two days earlier, 10 October 1841, I.T. Ker, *John Henry Newman. A Biography*, Oxford, 1988, 234-235.

¹⁰² Newman is probably referring to Galatians 3, 28 which states that there is no such thing as a Jew and a Greek, as they are all one in Christ, or Galatians 5, 6, in which Paul states that “if we are in union with Christ Jesus circumcision makes no difference at all, nor does the want of it; the only thing that counts is faith active in love”. Consequently, it was wrong to nominate a bishop because he was a converted Jew.

¹⁰³ Newman, *Apologia*, 132; Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 234-235.

¹⁰⁴ Newman to Bowden, 12 October 1841, in Tracey, *Tract 90*, 295.

¹⁰⁵ Newman, *Apologia*, 134-135; Tracey, *Tract 90*, 327-328.

¹⁰⁶ Newman, *Apologia*, 136.

During the whole process of establishing a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem, both Prussia and England completely ignored the Ottoman authorities. This was a reason for the Porte to oppose the plan. The fact that the Porte was deliberately kept out of the preparations for the bishopric project becomes clear in a confidential despatch from Palmerston to John Ponsonby (1770-1855), the British ambassador at Constantinople (1832-1841), dated 27 August 1841. Palmerston informed Ponsonby that no special permission for the bishopric plan would be required from the Porte: the bishop would have the right to reside in any part of the Ottoman Empire, like all British and Prussians subjects, and his spiritual functions would not interfere with the Muslim Ottoman subjects. Therefore, Palmerston continued, the Porte would have “no right to take any cognizance whatever”. He concluded that this information was strictly confidential and that Ponsonby was not to talk about the subject with the Ottoman authorities until he would receive instructions to do so.¹⁰⁷

The Ottoman authorities, however, were unwilling to recognize the Protestant bishop. In a memorandum dated 9 October 1841, they turned against the sending of a Protestant bishop and the building of a Protestant Church in Jerusalem, with which the LJS had already been occupied from the mid-1830s. The building of a church was against Ottoman law. Moreover, for the Turks both bishop and church were superfluous, because there was no Protestant community in Jerusalem.¹⁰⁸ The Porte, annoyed with the autonomous action on the part of England and Prussia, also feared that the bishop’s mission would involve the Ottoman subjects. In addition, the Ottoman authorities were not happy with another Christian community in Jerusalem, as there was already enough rivalry between the various denominations in the city. Not without reason, the Porte assumed that a Protestant community would be another reason for the Europeans to interfere in their affairs.¹⁰⁹

The new English Foreign Secretary, Aberdeen, assured the Ottoman authorities that the bishop would not expect special privileges different from those of all other British subjects in the Ottoman Empire. In a letter to the British Consul in Jerusalem, William Tanner Young, Aberdeen repeated what he had told the Porte: the bishop was instructed “not to interfere with the religious concerns either of the Mohamedan, or of

¹⁰⁷ For a copy of the despatch, see Tibawi, *British Interests*, 48. Tibawi dates this despatch to 27 September 1841. Lückhoff disagrees and dates the despatch to 27 August of that year. Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 121, n. 9.

¹⁰⁸ Lückhoff, *Anglikaner*, 121.

¹⁰⁹ Tibawi, *British Interests*, 54; Blake, “The Origins”, 92; Lückhoff, “Prussia and Jerusalem”, 178.

the Christian subjects of the Porte; and not to attempt to make Proselytes to the Church of England from either of those classes". In spite of this assurance the Porte did not formally recognize the Protestant bishop. Nevertheless, the Ottoman government did not seem to have taken concrete measures to prevent the foundation of the see, as the bishopric was established in Jerusalem and its first bishop was on his way.¹¹⁰

In his letter Aberdeen added that Young should give Alexander his professional protection, but should abstain from identifying himself in any degree with Alexander's mission. In addition, Young should refrain "from assisting to promote any scheme of interference with the Jewish Subjects of the Porte, in which Bishop Alexander may possibly engage". He was not allowed to afford any protection to persons who might "associate themselves to Bishop Alexander's congregation" as British dependents, who could not claim protection under other circumstances.¹¹¹ Consequently, Alexander was not protected in his missionary activities by the British government that had sanctioned his appointment.¹¹²

Concluding remarks

The arguments for the establishment of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem were both religious and political in character. This mixture of religion and politics is to be seen in the motivations of three men who were closely involved in its establishment: Christian Bunsen, Lord Ashley and Frederick William IV, all passionate Evangelicals. Christian Bunsen was a central figure in the development of the Jerusalem bishopric plan and its foundation. An important theme in his concept of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem was his theological ideal of Protestant ecumenical unity, or an ecumenical united church. The diplomat was also full of eschatological hope; he connected the Protestant bishopric with the second coming of Christ. Furthermore, the development of Bunsen's Jerusalem plan was also influenced by his anti-Roman Catholic feelings. His anti-Roman Catholic sentiments might have enforced his longing for a 'truly' Catholic Church as opposed to the centralist Roman Catholic Church.

¹¹⁰ Earl of Aberdeen to W.T. Young, 3 May 1842, F.O. 78/501 (No.1), in A.M. Hyamson, *The British Consulate in Jerusalem in Relation to the Jews of Palestine 1838-1914* 1 1838-1861, The Jewish Historical Society of England, London, 1939, 46. Cf. Tibawi, *British Interest*, 54-55; Lückhoff, "Prussia and Jerusalem", 179.

¹¹¹ Aberdeen to Young, 3 May 1842, in Hyamson, *The British Consulate*, 46-47.

¹¹² Tibawi, *British Interests*, 57.

Both Bunsen's anti-Roman Catholicism and his eschatological expectations were shared by Lord Ashley, who, as a devoted millenarian, directly connected eschatological expectation with the idea of the restoration of the Jews. Although Bunsen might not have been as fierce a millenarian as Lord Ashley, he did hope for the conversion of the Jews as part of his eschatological expectation and considered the bishopric's foundation and the sending of its first bishop to be the start of the restoration of Israel.

Bunsen succeeded in getting the support of Frederick William IV for the bishopric plan. In the Prussian King he found a kindred spirit as regards ideas on church reform. With the Jerusalem bishopric Frederick William aimed at the improvement of the conditions of the Protestants in the Holy Land; his religious desire was politically translated into the wish to obtain from the Ottoman authorities recognition of Protestantism, just as that accorded to the Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox in Palestine. In order to gain recognition and an equal position for the Protestants, he stressed the importance of 'unity in the outset'. Under the umbrella of the Protestant bishopric, the Church of England and the Protestant Church of Prussia would be united but remain independent at the same time; his aim was cooperation rather than assimilation. In the Jerusalem project he also saw an opportunity to create a basis for an independent Prussian Palestine mission in the future. The bishopric's establishment would be a way to obtain settlements in Palestine. Unlike Ashley and Bunsen, the King did not seem to be driven by anti-Roman Catholic feelings, nor by a longing for the restoration of the Jews. In the Prussian official announcement about the establishment of the Protestant bishopric, the mission to the Jews was not mentioned at all.

On the British side, the restoration of the Jews became the main object of the Protestant bishopric. Its importance was reflected in the British declaration of intent or "Statement of Proceedings". Consequently, from the start there were different expectations of the bishop's chief missionary aim in Britain and Prussia. However, considering the fact that both Prussia and Britain had agreed that the bishopric would be a see of the Church of England, the British declaration of intent was to be the guideline for the future bishop's actions.

As to the relations with the other denominations in Jerusalem, the "Statement of Proceedings" decided that the bishop would maintain friendly relations with these, especially with the Eastern Churches. However, the document was very negative about the Roman Catholic Church. Its anti-Roman Catholic attitude demonstrates that the Protestant bishopric already contained anti-Roman Catholic sentiments from the start.

It further shows that both denominations were interested in the Eastern Christians, each in their own way.

From the beginning the plans for the bishopric came in for criticism, as demonstrated by the objections to its establishment in both Prussia and Britain, but also by the opposition of the Ottoman authorities. Especially in Britain the criticism would not cease, as became clear during the office of Samuel Gobat, the second incumbent of the Jerusalem bishopric.

