
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



4033

aaa 29



4033.aaa.29.

4633

REPORT

ON THE CONFERENCE UPON

THE ROSENTHAL CASE,

HELD WITH THE

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMITTEE

OF THE

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews,

K

BY

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER,
THE RIGHT HON. LORD CLAUD HAMILTON, M.P.

AND THEIR

COLLEAGUES IN THE CONFERENCE

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER'S REFUTATION OF THE
CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST HIM BY THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY
IN HIS RECENT PAMPHLET.



LONDON :

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1866.

Price One Shilling.

*Members of the Conference appointed at the Bishop of Rochester's Meeting in
April, 1866.*

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER

THE RIGHT HON. LORD CLAUD HAMILTON, M.P.

Vice-Patrons of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

THE REV. CHARLES F. S. MONEY, M.A. Incumbent of St. John's, Deptford,
President of one of the Auxiliaries of the Society.

THE REV. J. W. HAYWARD, M.A. Vicar of Granborough, Bucks; some time at
Jerusalem, and subsequently Chaplain to the English Forces in the Crimea.

THE REV. J. B. M'CAUL, Hon. Canon of Rochester, and Rector of St. Michael
Bassishaw, eldest Son of the late Alexander M'Caul, D.D.

W. T. YOUNG, Esq. the English Consul at Jerusalem, who was Sponsor for Mr.
SIMEON ROSENTHAL and his Wife, when they were received into our Church by
Baptism.

*Members of the Conference representing the Committee of the London Society
for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.*

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, K.G. *President.*

THE REV. JAMES COHEN, M.A. *Rector of Whitechapel, Member of Committee.*

THE REV. C. J. GOODHART, M.A.,
CAPT. H. L. LAYARD. } *Secretaries of the Society.*

J. M. STRACHAN, Esq., *Vice-President, Trustee, Permanent Chairman of Committee,
and Chairman of the Jerusalem Section of the Society.*

W. VIZARD, Esq. *Member of Committee, and Law Adviser of the Society.*

INTRODUCTION.

THIS Report is presented by the Bishop of Rochester and his colleagues to the friends by whom they were appointed to represent them in the Conference, and to all members of the London Jews' Society who have the cause of Israel and the interests of the Society at heart, with the earnest request that they will carefully weigh its contents. Attention is called to the manner in which they have been met, and the way in which, by misrepresentations, personalities, the introduction of irrelevant matters, and, finally, by their departure from their own arrangement, the Managers of the Society have evaded the prosecution of this inquiry into the case of Mr. Rosenthal and its bearings upon their own conduct and that of their officials. In the Conference we established the following facts:—

In 1849 Mr. Rosenthal was dismissed by the London Committee from a post of responsibility at Jerusalem which he filled with credit to himself and advantage to the Society, and the employment of himself and family forbidden, upon charges of embezzlement preferred against him by Dr. Macgowan.

Mr. Rosenthal made repeated efforts to vindicate his conduct. The accusation was inquired into at Jerusalem, and Mr. Rosenthal was acquitted. Dr. Macgowan evaded the consequences of the failure of his accusation by various unworthy means, and went off to London. Mr. Rosenthal followed him, and took legal steps to bring Dr. Macgowan to account. Dr. Macgowan, finding that no other shift would avail him, fled clandestinely to Paris, and thus again escaped for a time. He returned to Jerusalem, whither he was followed by Mr. Rosenthal, who still claimed redress. Dr. Macgowan, unable further to escape investigation, in November, 1853, withdrew the charges in the following terms:—

“ Having read, for the first time, Mr. Simeon Rosenthal's defence before the Sardinian Consul (in 1849), and found on examination that the charges brought against him are not supported by the evidence adduced, and that the answers to them by Mr. S. Rosenthal are satis-

“factory, I feel bound to declare that Mr. S. Rosenthal is acquitted of the said charges, and cleared of the imputations which may have been cast on his character thereby.”

When the London Committee were informed that this man who had suffered such grievous wrongs for four years was declared innocent by his accuser, they neither offered him any compensation for the injury he had sustained, nor withdrew the prohibition against his employment, which had originated in false charges. A modified resolution was indeed subsequently entered upon their books, but it did not restore to Rosenthal what he had lost, nor was it allowed permanently to benefit him, owing to instructions sent from the London Committee, so that even in 1863 the Rev. Dr. Barclay, the present head of the Mission at Jerusalem, felt himself precluded from giving employment either to Mr. Rosenthal or to any of his family, quoting the original unrescinded resolution as preventing him.

The Bishop of Rochester and his colleagues would urge the Patron, Vice-Patrons, and Members of the Society to unite with them in having this matter thoroughly investigated, and in having some redress made by the Society for the grievous wrong that has been done. This the Reporters feel that the Society is bound to do, as its officials interfered to prevent the parties injured obtaining by law that redress from their calumniators to which they were entitled.

5, MONTAGUE STREET, BLOOMSBURY, LONDON.

August, 1866.

REPORT.

THE attention of the Bishop of Rochester and other friends having been directed to the distressed circumstances of the Rosenthal family, which they were painfully convinced had arisen from the conduct of certain officials of the London Jews' Society, his Lordship sought an interview with the Rev. C. J. Goodhart, Secretary of the Society, in the beginning of January last, on which occasion he also met the Rev. Dr. Barclay and Mr. Reichardt. After going into the matter at considerable length, Mr. Goodhart agreed to bring it before the Committee of the Jews' Society, and to lay before them for their adoption the following draft of a resolution proposed by the Bishop of Rochester :—

“ Read a communication from the Bishop of Rochester, on behalf of himself and certain friends who were interested in the past history of the Rosenthal family, in connexion with the Mission to the Jews at Jerusalem, and were seeking assistance for the relief of the distressing and painful predicament in which they are now placed ; and agreed that the Bishop be informed that it is not in the power of the Committee to appropriate any of the Society's proper funds in aid of the purpose recommended to their notice, but they are desirous to further the benevolent object now brought before them ; and, in consideration of the favourable opinion which this convert family long enjoyed from Rev. Mr. Nicolayson, and of their present extreme difficulties, that £ be appropriated out of the Jerusalem Fund as a commencement of the contemplated subscription, and towards enabling Mrs. Rosenthal to establish herself in some business by which she may maintain her disabled husband and two afflicted sons. The Committee hope that by this step the subscription, which the Bishop and other friends have in view, may be raised to a satisfactory amount, and accomplish the desired object.”

Mr. Goodhart, having submitted the resolution to the Committee, wrote, the 12th January, 1866, that he was instructed to say, “ that it was with sincere regret that they could not at once accede to the Bishop's suggestions,” until Mrs. Rosenthal had set herself right with the Committee in respect of her pamphlet.

The Bishop expressed his disappointment, and asked “ specifically ” what passages of the pamphlet were referred to. Mr. Goodhart sent the following reply :—

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

16, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

January 30th, 1866.

MY LORD,

Referring to your Lordship's letter of the 13th instant in reply to mine of the 12th, in which your Lordship expresses disappointment with the Committee's resolution, and requests to know "specifically what passages in "Mrs. Rosenthal's pamphlet are referred to, and what the disclaimer or apology "which it is expected she shall make," I am directed briefly to draw your Lordship's attention to the following facts, which must, the Committee think, satisfy your Lordship that they cannot justly be charged with undue harshness to Mrs. Rosenthal, or as being the cause of the ruin of the family, as expressed by Mrs. Rosenthal in her pamphlet.

In November, 1853, Dr. Macgowan, whose character though dead has been cruelly assailed, while his interposition on behalf of Mr. Rosenthal was fully taken advantage of, was prevailed upon to withdraw the charges made against Mr. Rosenthal, which was notified to the Parent Committee by the end of December, 1853. At this time Mr. James Graham, the newly-appointed Lay Secretary to the Jerusalem Mission, arrived in the Holy City, and employed Mr. Rosenthal in the responsible position of dragoman and agent to the Mission. On the 24th May, on representations from the Jerusalem Committee on the subject, the London Committee saw good to pass the following resolution:—"The Jerusalem Committee having again strongly "urged the removal of the restriction upon Mr. Rosenthal's employment—"that the Committee be authorized to employ him as occasion may require, "under careful supervision, but not in permanent connexion with the "Society," which was communicated to Mr. Graham with the words, "Thus "you see the Committee leave the responsibility of Simeon's occasional "employment with the Local Committee. You will, of course, exercise "all due control over Simeon while employed."

From January, 1854, until the 30th June, 1856, when Mr. Graham's connexion with the Society ceased, Mr. Rosenthal continued to be employed in connexion with the Mission at Jerusalem either as superintendent or dragoman, on a salary of 40*l.* per annum, while at the same time he was employed by Mr. Consul Finn as his official dragoman. On Mr. Nicolayson resuming the office of Secretary, as well as that of the head of the Mission, in July, 1856, having, from his knowledge of the native languages, no need of the services of a dragoman or interpreter, no provision was made for it in the estimates, and Mr. Rosenthal ceased to be further employed in that capacity.

Besides the aforesaid 40*l.* a year paid by the Society to Mr. Rosenthal, from January, 1854, to June, 1856, Mrs. Rosenthal was paid from the Jewish Converts Relief Fund, out of an average income of 50*l.* per annum, the sum of 23*l.* per annum, from September, 1853, to December, 1856, at which time Mrs. Rosenthal's circumstances began greatly to improve, and as she writes at page 20 in her pamphlet, "Her hotel so prospered as to enable "her to pay off some of her debts."

Further, in 1854, a Fund having been raised in England which amounted to 800*l.* to relieve the great distress amongst the Jews arising out of the existing drought and famine, Mr. Rosenthal was employed by Mr. Graham in its distribution, and received the following sums therefrom for his own benefit—

30th June, 1854, grant to himself of Ps. 1,000, or about 9*l.*

25th June, 1855, as remuneration for personal services, 10*l*.

Also a loan of Ps. 8,000, or about 72*l*. of which sum only Ps. 6,000 was repaid by 1857, and of the remaining Ps. 2,000, or 18*l*. only the moiety was received in 1861, and the remaining moiety was remitted him by Captain Layard, as he pleaded poverty and inability to pay.

In addition to which, the late Rev. H. Crawford, one of the Society's Missionaries, in August, 1852, advanced as a loan to Mr. Rosenthal, out of his own pocket, the sum of Ps. 2,000, or 18*l*. of which only Ps. 800, or 7*l*. was ever repaid, the promissory note for the same being now in the hands of the Society; all tending to show that, until the unhappy differences which arose between the Missionaries and Mr. Consul Finn, in the autumn of 1857, in respect to Mr. Rosenthal, there was no disposition wanting on the part of the Mission, or the Missionaries, to help the Rosenthal family as occasion served, without any consideration of the question of their worthiness or the contrary, having respect only to their temporal necessities.

I am also instructed to forward for your Lordship's information, copy of an extract of the Rev. J. Nicolayson's Journal, dated December 25th, 1841, —two years after Mr. and Mrs. Rosenthal's baptism; and in the confident hope that the explanation now briefly given will be sufficient to satisfy your Lordship of the groundlessness of the charges made in Mrs. Rosenthal's pamphlet to the prejudice of the Committee and the Missionaries, the Committee feel that it would not, on their part, be demanding too much of Mrs. Rosenthal that she should withdraw from sale or circulation all the remaining copies of the pamphlet in hand, and that she express in writing her deep regret at having caused the same to be printed and circulated.

I have the honour to remain,

My LORD,

Your Lordship's obedient humble Servant,

(On behalf of the Committee)

CHARLES J. GOODHART,
Secretary.

To the Right Hon. the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, &c. &c.

Mr. Goodhart's communication having been considered at a meeting called by the Bishop of Rochester on the 22d of February, and it having been ascertained by unquestionable evidence that the greater part of the representations made in it by the Committee of the Jews' Society were incorrect, and that all were calculated to mislead, it was resolved, "That the explanation offered by Mr. Goodhart is wholly unsatisfactory, and that the condition with which his letter concludes is unreasonable, under the circumstances in which the writer was placed." And on the 13th of March, the Bishop of Rochester sent to the Jews' Society a Statement of Facts on the subject, with a request that the President and Committee would appoint some members of their Committee to meet an equal number of the Bishop's friends in conference upon it. That statement was adopted as the basis of conference, and is as follows:—

STATEMENT OF FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE CASE OF THE ROSENTHAL FAMILY.

1. The case of Mr. Simeon Rosenthal and his family was brought under the notice of several friends of the Jewish cause, and supporters of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, at a Meeting held at the Bishop of Rochester's House on Thursday, February 22d, 1866, when it appeared, that Mr. Rosenthal had at one time been in the employ

of the Society, that Mrs. Rosenthal opened a shop under the sanction of the Society in Jerusalem; that Dr. Macgowan, the Physician of the Society, became hostile to the family, and endeavoured to ruin them by bringing unfounded charges against Mr. Rosenthal, and especially one of embezzlement, whilst Mr. Rosenthal was in the employ of the Society as Clerk of the Works.

This case being heard in the presence of the Rev. J. Nicolayson, head of the Mission in Jerusalem, a complete acquittal was the result, but before the case was finished in Jerusalem there arrived from London a Resolution passed by the Society, dismissing Rosenthal from the employ of the Society, and forbidding him to be ever employed again by their agents.

2. An order was also sent to Mr. Nicolayson, directing him to turn the Rosenthals out of the house occupied by the mother and her young children. Both Simeon Rosenthal and his family were thus plunged into the deepest distress. At this time, and in fact till his death in 1856, the Rev. J. Nicolayson manifested the truest sympathy, assisted them himself, and at last obtained help for them from the Temporal Relief Fund.

3. This conduct of Mr. Nicolayson's entirely disposes of that part of Mr. Goodhart's letter of January 30th, 1866, to the Bishop of Rochester, in which he refers to the unfavourable opinion expressed by Mr. Nicolayson (25th December, 1841) concerning Rosenthal and his wife, which was subsequently entirely removed.

4. Mr. Nicolayson frequently expressed his perfect confidence in Rosenthal's integrity, and his approval of the patience he had shown. In corroboration of this fact, it may be stated, that Mr. Nicolayson, early in 1853, helped in drawing up a compromise by which Dr. Macgowan was to give Mr. Rosenthal 150*l.* as compensation, and the Rev. H. Crawford approved the compromise and carried it to Dr. Macgowan, who refused to accede to the proposal, which included a full public examination.

5. On the 7th of November, however, in that year, Dr. Macgowan, in the prospect of legal proceedings, withdrew the charges he had made in the following terms:—

“Having read, for the first time, Mr. Simeon Rosenthal's defence before the Sardinian Consul (in 1849), and found on examination that the charges brought against him are not supported by the evidence adduced, and that the answers to them by Mr. S. Rosenthal are satisfactory, I feel bound to declare that Mr. S. Rosenthal is acquitted of the said charges, and cleared of the imputations which may have been cast on his character thereby.”

6. From the above statement, it appears that Dr. Macgowan, in 1853, admitted he had never taken the trouble to read the defence offered by the man against whom he had made very serious charges, although that defence had been made four years before. That Mr. Rosenthal was condemned by the Society at home unheard, and forbidden to receive any employment from any connected with them; whilst the charges against him were so false, that even his inveterate persecutor, Dr. Macgowan, was compelled entirely to withdraw them.

7. At this very time also, and whilst the Society at home, instead of giving him employment as stated in Mr. Goodhart's letter, of January 30th, 1866, was writing to Jerusalem to continue this persecution, there was not only not a whisper against the character of Mr. Rosenthal in Jerusalem, but he was sufficiently respected to warrant the Committee in Jerusalem in recommending him for employment to Mr. Graham, and the Rev. H. Crawford's proposing that he should be appointed sexton to Christ Church.

8. Mr. Nicolayson having died, and Mr. Graham having left in 1857, when this poor family of converted Jews were struggling hard for existence, and beginning a little to prosper, the Chairman of the Society's Committee in Jerusalem, with Dr. Macgowan, now head of the Mission, and two other members of the Committee, Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Bailey, protested against Mr. Rosenthal's being employed by Mr. Finn, the Consul, as one of his three Dragomans, who represented him during his temporary absence, at the same time attacking Rosenthal's character.

9. On his return to Jerusalem, Mr. Finn asked to be furnished with, 1st, All the protesters personally knew to Mr. Rosenthal's discredit. 2dly, all they had heard from others, giving their authority for each case.

10. This request was refused, but Mr. Finn was referred to the Resolution of 1849, passed by the Society, and to a letter of the Prussian Consul. Mr. Finn applied for the Resolution, but this was refused. Mr. Rosenthal then himself applied to know if the protesters were acquainted with anything to his discredit; but neither could he obtain a reply.

11. The Chairman of the Committee at Jerusalem and Dr. Macgowan and the other two protesters then sent the case as a formal complaint to the Foreign Office in London, supporting it by—

1. The Resolution of the Society.
2. A private letter of the Prussian Consul to the Bishop.
3. A letter of Rosenthal's brother-in-law.
4. An unsigned statement in Mr. Hefter's handwriting.

12. The first document forwarded in this monstrous proceeding was the unwarranted, unjust, unrescinded Resolution of the Society at home.

13. The second document was a remarkable letter of the Prussian Consul, which may be really taken as a certificate of Mr. Rosenthal's character in Jerusalem at that time: since nothing more could be urged against him by one who evidently wished to say all he could against this unfortunate man. The Consul states that—

“The Public does not ascribe to him the character of a man deserving confidence.”

That—

“He showed a covetousness bordering on the incredible.”

That—

“He was a being, selfish in the highest degree, sacrificing everything to his own interest.”

That he had

“Great natural cunning.”

In this letter there is not one distinct, tangible charge ventured on, affecting the character of Rosenthal.

14. The third document was a letter of Rosenthal's brother-in-law, a rival hotel-keeper, containing a paltry, unfounded insinuation, which the writer afterwards regretted having written, but which had been extracted from him by Dr. Macgowan and most unfairly used.

15. The fourth document sent to the Foreign Office was worthy of being fastened to the letter of the Prussian Consul. It was in Mr. Hefter's handwriting, but he had not signed it; and feeling, upon further enquiry, that his statement had been made under an erroneous impression, he endeavoured to get it back, but Dr. Macgowan refused to return it, and sent it on with the other papers.

16. Mr. Bailey, one of the protesters, stated that he was most unhappy

at having signed the protest, that he had no peace since his doing so, that he repented the moment he had signed the paper, and that he had been praying that no harm might result from it.

17. In February, 1858, the decision of Lord Clarendon arrived. His Lordship declined to act upon unsupported accusations, and authorized Mr. Rosenthal to go to law for the vindication of his character. Mr. Rosenthal reluctantly commenced proceedings. The Prussian Consul, at the instigation of the Bishop, the Chairman of your Committee in Jerusalem, interfered, and first threatened and then imprisoned the poor man.

18. Mr. Rosenthal was now fast on the way to ruin. His life during these few years was a continual struggle to maintain himself and his family honestly, frustrated by false accusations, unjust resolutions, and illegal imprisonments. His hotel, which at one time was flourishing, now began to fail, a placard, advising travellers not to go there, having been printed at the mission press, and circulated at the neighbouring sea ports. He had no other employment, and could get none, being himself in a feeble state of health from a bodily injury, and suffering mentally from the effect of the stigma which attached to him in consequence of all these proceedings. At this time, when prostrated by all he had undergone, and the treatment he had experienced at the hands of Christians, this unhappy man relapsed into Judaism for a few days; but in 1861 the Rev. J. Barclay, now head of the Mission, re-admitted Mr. Rosenthal to the Holy Communion, and up to this time no charges have ever been substantiated against him; yet the Resolutions of 1849 and 1854 have continued in force.

19. If there is any inaccuracy in the above statement, it most intimately concerns the honour and interests of the Society to prove it. We forbear to enter into the charge made against Mrs. Rosenthal in Mr. Goodhart's letter, of having "cruelly assailed the character" of the late Dr. Macgowan, but we feel that, under the circumstances of the case, she could not have remained silent; and we regret to be obliged to inform the Committee that we have ample and specific evidence to prove that the conduct of their representative at Jerusalem was calculated to injure the cause of religion and the interests of the Society.

20. If, however, the statement above made with regard to the treatment of the Rosenthals cannot be disproved, what is the painful conclusion forced upon the friends and supporters of the Society? viz. that the Committee have acted unjustly and oppressively, through their agents, towards those who had every claim to their sympathy, counsel, and support; that they accepted and acted upon unproved charges; that they refused to take notice of retracted charges, or to do tardy justice to those they had injured; that they closed their ears to the cry of one of their own children, and shut the door in the face of a starving and distracted mother.

21. It is generally acknowledged that men will do in their corporate capacity what they would hesitate to do individually; but surely it must be most damaging to a religious Society to refuse redress for a proved wrong, or to shrink from inquiry lest it should be inconvenient.

22. It is most desirable, if possible, in order to prevent these matters coming again before the public to the prejudice of the Society, to have a Conference of the friends of Israel, of those who are fully acquainted with the facts, and of those who shall represent the Society itself.

With, therefore, a prayerful desire to ascertain the whole truth, to do what is wise and just, to re-establish the confidence of those whose allegiance to the Society has been disturbed, to pave the way to a removal of many

causes of dissatisfaction and to increase the prosperity of the Society, we request the President and Committee of the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews to appoint four or five gentlemen, members of their Committee, to meet an equal number in Conference.

23. It is evident that such an enquiry cannot be satisfactorily conducted without full and free access to Official Documents. We shall, therefore, be prepared to furnish you, in due time, with a list of Documents in the Society's possession which are essential for the elucidation of the truth, in regard to the matters above mentioned.

On the 19th of March Mr. Goodhart wrote to the Bishop, stating that the Earl of Shaftesbury requested him to write at once and ask the Bishop who was the person intended in the nineteenth paragraph of the statement by the periphrase "their representative at Jerusalem."

The Bishop, as had been previously stated to Mr. Goodhart, replied, "Dr. Macgowan."

Mr. Goodhart answered, on 28th of March, that the statement contained some matter new to their Committee, and that without making further inquiries, it was out of the power of the Committee to reply.

At the request of his friends the Bishop reminded Mr. Goodhart that a friendly Conference had been applied for, and that any written answer that might be in the course of preparation would not meet their wishes. His Lordship concluded his letter, dated 31st March, in the following terms:—

"I beg, therefore, for an early answer to the query just stated; do your Committee entertain the request which has been made for a Conference?"

To this Mr. Goodhart sent the following reply:—

"16, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.
April 6, 1866.

"MY DEAR LORD,

"I received, on the 2d instant, your Lordship's letter of the 31st ult. The absence of the President of our Society, Lord Shaftesbury, in communication with whom every step in the matter has been taken, has prevented my writing to your Lordship sooner. Much of the matter in the statement received from your Lordship, as I believe I have before remarked, was quite new to our Committee. It was indispensable that we should communicate with some of the persons who may yet be living, as to the circumstances stated in the document, before we could hold any conference with the parties from whom that document originated. The President and Committee will, however, have no objection to meet the gentlemen your Lordship refers to, as soon as they are in a position to meet them, and of this I will duly apprise your Lordship, confiding, notwithstanding some parts of the statement, that your desire, as mentioned in your letter, is really to meet the parties who may be selected for the Conference, in a friendly spirit.

"I remain, &c.

(Signed)

"CHAS. J. GOODHART.

"Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER."

On the 19th April Mr. Goodhart applied for the names of those who would represent the Bishop and his friends in the Conference. Our names were accordingly sent, and on Saturday, the 28th April, the Conference met in the Society's rooms, 16, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

The Society was represented by their President, the Earl of Shaftesbury ; the Chairman of their Jerusalem Section, Mr. Strachan ; their two Secretaries, Mr. Goodhart and Captain Layard ; their Solicitor, Mr. Vizard ; and the Rev. Mr. Cohen. We at once took special objection to the presence of their solicitor, but that gentleman stated that he was there not in his legal capacity but as a member of the Committee, and the President gave his assurance that the Conference would be *strictly friendly and sacredly confidential*.

The following extract from a Protest, which we felt bound to send in, will show the difficulties we had to contend with from the very commencement of the Conference :—

“Immediately after prayers, and to the amazement of the Bishop and his friends, the President of the Society opened the Conference by charging them, in harsh terms, with constituting themselves the public assailants of the late Dr. Macgowan’s character after he had been six years in his grave, describing the charges he referred to as ‘heinous charges,’ ‘bestial offences,’ and ‘disgusting’ accusations. No charges could have been more groundless than those adduced by Lord Shaftesbury, and no occasion for making them would have been less suitable ; and it could not be otherwise but that this remarkable opening to a ‘friendly’ Conference should cause both pain and astonishment to the gentlemen who had come to meet the Committee.

“The Bishop and his friends had desired a Conference on the basis of the statement which had been submitted to the President and Committee of the Society, and had believed that they had, in good faith, accorded such a Conference on the stipulated basis.

“Had the Bishop and his friends responded to the noble President’s personal attack upon them in the same tone in which unhappily his Lordship indulged, there must at once have been an end to the Conference, for Lord Shaftesbury delivered his attack before *one word* affecting the case had been uttered on the Bishop’s side.

“In mild and suitable language, becoming the gravity and emergency of the occasion, the Bishop, firmly but courteously, on his own behalf and on behalf of his friends, repelled the groundless charge which had been made against them, reminding the Conference that the written statement forwarded to the Committee and acknowledged by them, formed the exclusive basis of its deliberations. And they had hoped, by their conciliatory tone, and by confining themselves strictly to the simple matter in hand, they might have succeeded in eliciting, by sound evidence on both sides, the real merits of the case at issue.”

The President then stated that he would insist that the allegation in the last clause of the nineteenth paragraph of our statement should be disposed of in the first instance ; a course which we altogether deprecated, as we had intended to take up the different points in the statement of facts *seriatim* as they occurred ; and it not only disturbed our whole course of procedure, but it was foreign to our purpose, and nothing was further from our wishes than to bring up unnecessarily anything injuriously affecting the memory of the dead. The President was, however, so peremptory in his requirement that the conduct of Dr. Macgowan should be at once gone into, not only as regarded his treatment of the Rosenthals, but as regarded his private character, that we had no alternative but to comply with the demand of the President. We were thus obliged during the first two days of the Con-

ference to spend most of our time in evidence on this distressing subject forced upon us by the President. Towards the close of the second day's Conference the President remarked that they could not meet the evidence which had been brought forward, and it could not be expected that they should; and we were happily saved from going further into so painful a subject by the President's changing his mind as to the expediency of the course on which he had insisted, and by his subsequently expressing his desire in writing that all which related to Dr. Macgowan should be "consigned to oblivion;" to which we assented, with the reservation, to which his Lordship agreed, "that specific points in which Dr. Macgowan might appear to have injured the Rosenthals would be fitting matter for consideration," and that "the members of Conference should not be debarred from following up a question which might directly affect the Rosenthal case, even if it should affect the character of Dr. Macgowan." His Lordship, in effect, agreed to return to the position which the friends of the Rosenthals had originally taken up. And thus the matter, as it affects the late Dr. Macgowan, now stands. The proceedings having become free from the Macgowan interruption, we expected that the inquiry into the Rosenthal affair would at once proceed; but another irrelevant matter was now introduced by the President's vehemently insisting on bringing in his own short-hand writer, and making a speech on extraneous matter against which we protested in vain. The President has since printed and circulated that speech, notwithstanding his assurance at the first meeting of Conference that all that passed would be SACREDLY CONFIDENTIAL. This we have felt the more extraordinary as the speech so published contains an attack upon the Bishop of Rochester, to which the President demanded a written reply. The Bishop promptly sent in a written statement refuting the charges made.* This we feel Lord Shaftesbury was bound to print, if he thought fit to publish his own attack; but not only has he omitted to do so, but he absolutely refused to receive the Bishop's written reply which he had himself demanded. We are therefore reluctantly compelled to print that statement and the accompanying documents in the Appendix. The following letter expresses what we all felt in regard to this departure from the subject matter of the Conference:—

19, EATON SQUARE, S. W.
June 22, 1866.

MY DEAR LORD BISHOP,

I took early advantage of my release from the Railway Committee that had so long detained me, to ascertain what progress had been made in the proceedings of the Conference which I had been prevented from attending. I have perused a considerable number of documents, including correspondence with Lord Shaftesbury. I regret to find that there has been a departure from the original subject-matter of our Conference, and a lengthened digression in regard to the opinion of the late Dr. M'Caul, in which, I feel, I am not entitled to take any part. The tone and temper exhibited by the noble Earl has, however, caused me much pain. My unfeigned respect for Lord Shaftesbury, and my deep sense of the noble services he has rendered the public, make me regret that the ill-disposed should have such an opportunity of commenting upon the failings of the leaders of the religious world.

I can readily understand how anxious anyone who had undertaken the hopeless task of defending Dr. Macgowan must have felt, to escape from so

* See p. 35.

false a position, and this may account for the extraordinary document just brought under my notice, which purports to be a speech delivered by Lord Shaftesbury.

I don't feel justified in commenting upon that document, further than to say, that the pretext upon which it is founded is wholly devoid of accuracy. I was myself present when Lord Shaftesbury introduced Dr. M'Caul's name, and quoted his intimate acquaintance and unreserved communication with that lamented gentleman, as an answer and refutation to the supposition that Dr. M'Caul was partly cognisant of Dr. Macgowan's infirmities. Thus the introductions of that name described by Lord Shaftesbury as unnecessary (Speech, p. 14), emanated from himself.

The object I had in view, was to obtain justice for a grossly ill-used family, and to remove, if possible, from the operations of the Society, the stain and reproach, that, in the minds of many of its sincere and religious supporters, had been cast upon it by the state and acts of its Mission at Jerusalem. To obtain this end, it was desirable to secure the impartial consideration of a few leading friends of the Society assembled in an amicable but earnest conference. It was especially desirable that persons not already committed, or personally involved, should have been selected. A very different course was, however, adopted, with results that might have been anticipated.

I was quite ready to maintain the cause which we had in hand, on the basis of the document sent in previously for the purpose of defining the limits of the inquiry. I am still ready to attend any meeting for that purpose; but I am not prepared to follow any irrelevant subject, or to submit to the violent language or unworthy insinuations which Lord Shaftesbury has thought fit to make use of, in order to strengthen a position which I presume he deems untenable, if he confines himself to fair argument and courteous language. My respect for your Lordship precludes my being a willing witness of unbecoming treatment, from which your character and position should have protected you.

My sincere admiration for Lord Shaftesbury renders me unwilling to interfere in a phase of this controversy with which I have no concern, and which I consider calculated to injure him in the public estimation.

I trust your Lordship will kindly inform me on what day the original subject of the Conference will be resumed.

I remain, my dear Lord Bishop,

Yours very faithfully,

CLAUD HAMILTON.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

After the first two sittings of the Conference, the Society's Representatives proposed the introduction of a short-hand writer, to which we objected, as the report of our subsequent proceedings, without any report of the evidence which had been given during the first two days of the enquiry, would have been calculated to mislead, and from the use which has been made of the report of the President's speech of the 16th June, we are the more satisfied that we were right in so doing.

On the question of fixing a day for one of our Conferences the following difficulties occurred; the Bishop was engaged to attend the consecration of a church in his diocese, Lord Claud Hamilton was obliged to sit on a Railway Committee of the House of Commons, and Mr. Money had to be present at

the laying the foundation stone of a church in his own parish. On representing the impossibility of meeting in Conference on the day suggested, we received the following letter, which furnishes a specimen of the tone and temper with which we have been met throughout :—

“ May 17, 1866.

“ MY LORD,

“ Mr. Layard has just sent me a copy of a note from your Lordship, to state that the Conference must again be postponed, and that until after Whitsuntide.

“ In the most solemn manner I protest against it. These delays are cruel, and wholly needless. The delay on Tuesday, 15th, was, I fear, intentional. To refuse to attend the Conference, because the question of the services of a short-hand writer had been propounded, was a mere excuse.* I then offered Wednesday or Thursday, but your Lordship fixed Friday, which, at great inconvenience, I accepted.

“ I am now told that Friday is set aside, because your ‘friends are prevented by engagements’—Allow me to say, that when gentlemen, headed by a Bishop, raking up the ashes of the dead, undertake to make charges with such fearful issues, they are in duty bound to make every thing subservient to the completion of the business.

“ They ought not, as honourable men, to plead any but reasons of the most cogent character, and I will not disguise my belief that a conviction of the sad and unmanly position into which your Lordship’s party has been brought, is one main cause of this enforced and unwarrantable delay.

“ Your Lordship’s obedient Servant,

(Signed)

“ SHAFTESBURY.

“ THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.”

The above letter caused us to send in a protest in the following terms :—

“ Nothing can be more unfounded than these insinuations and implied charges. The duties which prevented the attendance of the members of the Conference were not private engagements, but public and obligatory duties which could not be neglected or postponed.

“ The Earl of Shaftesbury’s character for Christian benevolence stands too high in the estimation of his countrymen, and indeed, of Christendom, for the originators of the Conference not to be persuaded that the mind of the President of the Jews’ Society must have been biassed by information from other sources than they themselves had adduced as the basis of their appeal to the Society.

“ Be this, however, as it may, the undersigned friends of the Jewish cause, cannot but feel pained and distressed at being compelled thus emphatically to protest against the language and general bearing which Lord Shaftesbury has been pleased to adopt, more especially in his correspondence with their

* Mr. Goodhart had written, “ Lord Shaftesbury says we *must* have a short-hand writer.” The italics are his. We had declined to alter the whole character of the important evidence which was then being taken respecting Dr. Macgowan, by having part of it in short-hand, and part of it in such notes as had been taken by those present.

Right Reverend Chairman, whose singleness of purpose and dignified forbearance throughout, they cannot but express themselves most grateful for.

(Signed)

CLAUD HAMILTON.
W. T. YOUNG.
CHARLES MONEY.
J. W. HAYWARD.
JOSEPH B. M'CAUL."

On the 23d June, the Society's Representatives again proposed that the remainder of the inquiry should be conducted by the aid of a short-hand writer ; and, on the 29th, we agreed to the proposal under the conditions set forth in the following paper :—

"Friday, 29th June.

"The proposition for introducing a short-hand writer, which was made at the last meeting, being of a nature to alter materially the character of the proceedings, and almost unavoidably to throw a shade upon the evidence which has been already taken, we feel it necessary to state that the consent which we give to the proposition must be dependent,

(1) Upon the nomination of a Chairman of the Conference, to whose impartial decisions both parties can appeal with equal confidence.

(2) Upon our retaining a right, if we deem it needful, in acting under the provisos of June 16th, to recall witnesses whom we have already examined, and subject them to further questions to be then taken down in short-hand.

In claiming these conditions we consider that the office of Chairman has hitherto been practically assumed by the Earl of Shaftesbury, and we deem these conditions to be the more necessary because his Lordship has expressed a decided feeling of sympathy with the chief promoter of the troubles of the Rosenthals, by assuring us, in his letter of June 2d, that *he shall ever retain the opinion* he has expressed of Dr. Macgowan's entire innocence of the charges advanced against him in evidence in order to the defence of the Rosenthals, and of the present transaction in which we have been engaged, which he has described in terms that it is needless to repeat, but which he informs us in a letter of June 14th, he will neither qualify nor withdraw."

To this proposal Lord Shaftesbury and his friends, after a short deliberation, returned for answer—

"Having heard the paper read by the Lord Bishop of Rochester, and having deliberated on its contents, we come to the conclusion to accept the proposition. But we are disposed to think that the ends of justice will be better attained by the constitution of an entirely new tribunal, on which neither functionaries of the Society nor parties connected with the Rosenthal affair should be allowed to sit.

It is desirable that persons impartial, not only in fact but in public opinion, should be selected."

"June 29, 1866."

To which we also agreed in the following terms :—

"After deliberation, we report that we all along felt that the constitution of this Conference was open to objection ; but the names not having been submitted to us, we had no opportunity for expressing our opinion on the

subject. We acquiesce in the proposal. We rest upon the basis of the original statement submitted to the Jews' Society, which is to be the subject-matter for the deliberation of the tribunal to be so formed. The present proposal disposes of the difficulties against which we have protested. It will supply a fair Conference, such as we sought for, from the commencement. A challenge of all the parties selected to act to be allowed on either side. A chairman to be elected, and reference for final decision to be reserved for some eminent person, if needed."

And a paper containing the above was drawn up and exchanged as the basis for the continuance of our inquiry by a reconstructed conference.

Matters having been settled on the above terms, the Committee of the Jews' Society was applied to for the names of those whom they proposed for the Conference, but instead of forwarding these according to the arrangement, Mr. Goodhart sent the following to the Bishop:—

July 5th, 1866.

MY DEAR LORD,—A special meeting of our Committee was convened yesterday, to receive the Report of the Conference from our own members, and consider the proposition on our part, in which, with certain modifications, your Lordship and your colleagues concurred, for the future conduct of the business in hand. After careful and deliberate consideration on the subject, our Committee came unanimously to the Resolution, a copy of which I enclose. This Resolution has been submitted to Lord Shaftesbury, and he entirely concurs in it. Your Lordship will see that the Resolution adopts at once the requirement made by your Lordship and your colleagues, that the ultimate appeal should be to a single individual, if needed.

I remain, your Lordship's very truly,

C. J. GOODHART.

The Right Reverend the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

At a Meeting of the Committee, held at the Society's House, 16, Lincoln's Inn Fields, July 4th, 1866.

The Committee having heard the reading of a Report from the Conference Committee,

Resolved,—That the Conference Committee be requested to confer with Lord Shaftesbury as to the appointment of some eminent legal man, who shall hear evidence and give judgment on the Rosenthal matters; and to take such steps as may be necessary to get the concurrence of the party acting with the Bishop of Rochester; that such appointment, if made, shall be made by both parties, and the decision shall be final.

HENRY LAYARD.

To the Right Reverend the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

In consequence of this communication from the Society, a meeting was held at the Bishop of Rochester's on the 12th of July, when the following resolutions were passed, and immediately forwarded to the Society by the Bishop.

Resolved :—

1. "That in reply to Mr. Goodhart's communications of the 4th* and 5th instant, the Bishop of Rochester be requested to renew his application to the Secretary of the Jews' Society, that he will submit to himself and his colleagues the names of the persons proposed by the Jews' Society as members of the reformed Conference, agreeably to the resolutions of the Conference of the 29th of June.

2. "That the Bishop of Rochester be also requested to ask again for a copy of the Resolution passed upon the reading of Lord Shaftesbury's Statement, at the meeting of the General Committee of the Jews' Society on the 22d of June.

3. "That the Bishop of Rochester be requested to submit the names of the following gentlemen to serve in the new Conference, viz.—

"THE RIGHT HON. LORD CLAUD HAMILTON, M.P.

"THE VEN. ARCHDEACON EMERY.

"LOFTUS WIGRAM, ESQ.

"REV. C. F. S. MONEY.

"REV. JOHN BOWSTEAD.

"JOHN FORBES, ESQ.

4. "With regard to the resolutions of the Committee of the Jews' Society of July 4th, the Bishop of Rochester be requested to inform the Jews' Society that, in the event of the members of the reformed Conference being unable to agree, the whole matter should be laid before his

* *London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.*

16, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

JULY 4th, 1866.

MY DEAR LORD,—I am directed by our Committee to inform your Lordship, that all the papers which accompanied your Lordship's letter of the 29th of June were read to the Committee at our Meeting to-day.

I also enclose the answers which your Lordship requested might be sent to you yesterday, the Committee to-day having instructed me to forward them. They are in the form of an extract from our minutes, which I enclose. Your Lordship's faithfully,

C. J. GOODHART.

I am unable at present to reply to your Lordship's letter received this day.

The Right Reverend the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

I ought to mention that the Earl of Shaftesbury's paper was read at the Committee upon his Lordship's desire, as President of this Society, and that he has concurred in the application for the reading at the Committee of the papers which accompanied your Lordship's letter; but he has desired that, on all explanations concerning the *confidential* nature of matters at the Conference, reference should be made to himself.

GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Society's House,

JUNE 22d, 1866.

J. M. STRACHAN, Esq. V.P., in the Chair.

PRESENT :

Rear-Adm. F. V. Harcourt

T. R. Andrews, Esq.

J. Goldingham, Esq.

J. Hawkesworth, Esq.

C. A. Moody, Esq.

R. Trotter, Esq.

Lieut.-Col. Sotheby

W. N. West, Esq.

W. Tollemache, Esq.

W. W. Willson, Esq.

Secretary—Capt. H. L. Layard.

A paper was read at the instance of the President, being a statement made by the President, the Earl of Shaftesbury, at the last meeting of the Conference with the Right Reverend the Bishop of Rochester and his colleagues. True Extract,

C. J. GOODHART,

Secretary.

“ Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Patron of the Society, for his decision as final referee.

5. “ That the Jews’ Society be requested to arrange that the reformed Conference should commence its meetings early next week, and continue sitting until the matter be finished.”

The answer from the Jews’ Society was as follows :—

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

16, LINCOLN’S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.
July 13, 1866.

MY DEAR LORD,

Your Lordship’s letter of yesterday, with the accompanying Resolutions, was laid before our Committee to-day, and I have since procured our President’s full consent to the enclosed Resolution passed in consequence. I have accordingly to propose to your Lordship, that the enquiry be referred to a lawyer of eminence, and to submit the names of P. F. O’Malley, Esq. J. E. Pollock, Esq., Thomas Chambers, Esq., from whom we would propose that your Lordship and your friends should select one to act as arbitrator. I am at a loss to understand the Resolution by which your Lordship is requested to ask again for the copy of the Resolution passed upon the reading of Lord Shaftesbury’s statement, at the meeting of the General Committee of the Jews’ Society on the 22d of June. I enclose to your Lordship a copy of the minute which referred to his Lordship’s statement. No Resolution was passed.*

I remain,
Your Lordship’s, very truly,
C. J. GOODHART.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

At a Meeting of the Committee held at the Society’s House, 16, Lincoln’s Inn Fields, July 13, 1866.

READ letter from the Lord Bishop of Rochester, dated July 12, enclosing certain Resolutions.

Resolved, that a reference of the subject matter to a conference having already proved wholly unsatisfactory, it is considered that time would be

* We may mention that our Resolution which Mr. Goodhart says he is at a loss to understand, was passed in consequence of the Bishop of Rochester having observed from Mr. Goodhart’s report of the Committee Meeting of 22d June, that Mr. W. W. Willson had been present, had written to that gentleman, inquiring whether any Resolution had been proposed at that meeting of the Jews’ Committee, and received the following reply :—

July 6, 1866.

In reply to your Lordship’s inquiry I beg to state that at the meeting of the London Jews’ Committee on the 22d instant, a statement made by Lord Shaftesbury of the proceedings at the last meeting of the Conference was read and commented upon by the Chairman, and a Resolution thereupon was proposed, and after some conversation generally assented to, expressive of their sympathy with his Lordship under the circumstances he had described, and of entire confidence in him as their representative in the Conference, but that the Resolution was formally put to the Committee by the Chairman I cannot positively affirm, but I fully believe it was; nor can I say whether it was entered on the minutes.

(Signed)

WM. WYNNE WILLSON.

To the BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

uselessly occupied in referring it again to such a tribunal, and that the Secretary be therefore directed, with the consent of the President, to make a distinct proposition to the Lord Bishop of Rochester and his friends, that the inquiry be referred to a lawyer of eminence, and to submit the names of P. F. O'Malley, Esq., J. E. Pollock, Esq., Thomas C Chambers, Esq., with the view of one of these being agreed upon by both parties.

C. J. GOODHART.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

Those present at the meeting at the Bishop of Rochester's on the 12th July were loth to believe that the managers of a Religious Society would have ventured on so evident a departure from an arrangement which they themselves had proposed, and which we had accepted, and accordingly they passed the resolutions of the 12th, which the Bishop of Rochester fully approved of, and forwarded to the Jews' Society, instead of the following letter, which he had prepared in reply, and which was read to the meeting. Though not sent, it is now printed at the Bishop's special request, as conveying an accurate expression of the feelings produced, and of the impression made upon his mind by Mr. Goodhart's communications.

July 11, 1866.

REVEREND SIR,—Diocesan engagements in Herts, following my Ordination, prevented earlier attention to your letters of July 4th and 5th, though I read them, when received, with astonishment and deep regret.

The former was an answer to the application which I submitted to you on 29th June, asking for a copy of any Resolution passed by the Committee of the Jews' Society after the reading of Lord Shaftesbury's speech, directed against certain statements of Mr. M'Caul and myself, *without waiting for the answer*, which he had challenged us to produce and which we had prepared accordingly.

Your reply, July 4th, states that you "*enclose the answers which I requested might be sent,*" and that *they are "in the form of an extract from the minutes."* The extract, however, (in contradiction of this assurance,) contains only an account of the reading of Lord Shaftesbury's speech *without* the information which I had applied for. Not a word is added as to the Resolution respecting it, which I had specifically asked for,—which I know was discussed after the reading of the speech—and which, after some conversation, was generally assented to by the friends of Lord Shaftesbury then present, and was expressive of sympathy with his Lordship under the *ex parte* statement which he had placed before the Meeting. Such resolution, affecting my correspondence which his Lordship declared to contain reflections upon his character, ought, in common fairness and Christian principle, to have been shewn to me, even without the express demand which I made for it. I am amazed that you can assure me that *you "have furnished what I asked for,"* when you have kept back the very thing which I demanded to see, and which must have been in your possession, or within your knowledge.

Your letter of July 5th is conceived in a similar spirit, and is calculated to mislead, while it professes to state truth.

It tells me that your Committee had met to consider the proposition

which had been made on the part of your friends to mine, for the future conduct of the business in hand, in which, with certain modifications, I and my colleagues concurred. It then gives a Resolution which, it says, "adopts at once the requirement made by me and my colleagues, that the ultimate appeal should be to a single individual, if needed;"—and this Resolution resolves the whole proceedings of the newly formed Conference or tribunal, and the Conference itself, into "*the appointment of some eminent legal man who shall hear evidence and give judgment in the Rosenthal matter.*"

Now, you know that the conditions which were finally agreed to, respecting the re-formed Conference, were taken down and copies exchanged on either side by the members of the old Conference; you know also, that by the mention of an eminent individual for reference, if the re-formed Conference under a proper Chairman could not come to a friendly decision, never could have meant "a legal man who should hear evidence and give judgment;" and you know further, that after Lord Shaftesbury and his colleagues had accepted our last conditions, Lord Shaftesbury said he indorsed them, and he requested the Bishop and his friends to send their resolutions to the Jews' Society, and communicate with the Committee in order to the re-opening of the Conference. The first proposal from your side—

Viz.—"*That an entirely new tribunal should be constituted, in which neither functionaries of the Society nor parties connected with the Rosenthal affair is to be allowed to sit,*" was accepted by my side, ON CONDITION that certain provisos which follow should be maintained; and the following conditions should be acted on throughout; they were the following:—

"*That we, the presenters of THE FIRST STATEMENT, should not relinquish, in any manner, the position which we originally took up when we presented the paper which was the basis of the Conference:—and,*

"*That, specific points in which Dr. Macgowan might appear to have injured the Rosenthals should be fitting matter for consideration; and,*

"*That we should not be debarred from following up a question which might directly affect the Rosenthal case, even if it should affect the character of Dr. Macgowan, and in addition to these provisos, it was formally agreed,*

"*That a right of challenge of all parties selected to act on the re-formed Conference should be allowed on either side.*

"*That a Chairman should be nominated for the Conference, to whose impartial decision both parties could appeal with equal confidence; and,*

"*If needful, reference for final decision should be reserved for some eminent person, to be previously chosen for the purpose; and, that a right should be retained on our side, if we deemed it needful to recall witnesses whom we had already examined, and subject them to further questions, to be taken down in "short-hand."*"

You assure me that the Resolution which you communicate satisfies "the conditions first proposed with the modifications which I and my colleagues concurred in for the future conduct of the business in hand," and on the same page you resolve the whole of the arrangements into the "legal gentleman who is to hear evidence, and give judgment."

What such a course of procedure may be designed to accomplish, it may not be for me to affirm, but, looking back on what has passed, I cannot but imagine that your friends desire again, by delay, and the introduction of irrelevant matters, to obstruct the inquiry which the Conference was specially formed to promote. For, at present, after six long months of delay, when we have accepted your own terms for proceeding with it, we

are met by proposals which are entirely new, and an assurance which is calculated to weaken our reliance upon your representations.

I beg to ask whether your Committee will proceed upon the basis referred to and already settled, and whether you will supply me with the names which I asked for on 4th July, in order that they may be approved, and that I may propose the names of different persons to act on our side.

I remain, yours faithfully,
J. C. ROCHESTER.

To the Rev. C. J. GOODHART.

Mr. Goodhart's communication of the 13th July was followed by a letter from Captain Layard :—

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

16, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON,
July 20th, 1866.

MY LORD,

I have the honour to inform your Lordship, that a special meeting of the General Committee of the Society has been summoned for Tuesday next, the 24th instant, at 12 o'clock, to consider matters in connexion with "the Conference."

We shall be glad to receive any communication which your Lordship and your colleagues may have to make in answer to Mr. Goodhart's letter of the 13th instant, enclosing a resolution of our Committee of the same date.

Awaiting your Lordship's reply,

I remain,

Your obedient Servant,

(Signed)

H. L. LAYARD,
Secretary.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

To which the following answer was sent :—

ST. JOHN'S PARSONAGE, UPPER LEWISHAM ROAD, LONDON, S. E.
21st July, 1866.

MY DEAR SIR,

Your letter of 20th July to the Bishop of Rochester has been placed in my hands to answer.

Mr. Goodhart's letter of the 13th instant, forwarding a resolution of your Committee, was considered at a meeting of the members of the late Conference, and the friends with whom they were acting, and the accompanying resolution passed.

I hope, for the sake of the cause we have at heart and the Society itself, it may be possible to form a fresh tribunal of several persons, as proposed by yourselves and assented to by us, and I will take this opportunity of stating my conviction that there is no other way of preventing what is most undesirable, if it can be avoided,—the placing before the public of questions and differences which must tell injuriously upon the interests of the Society. We have really wished to avoid this, and I am grieved to find that not only have our wishes been frustrated, but our motives have also been misrepresented. I address this letter to you for the information of the Committee, and remain,

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) C. F. S. MONEY.

Resolution enclosed in Mr. Money's letter of 21st July.

That we consented to the close of the Conference on the proposition of Lord Shaftesbury and his side of the Conference, that a *new tribunal* "of persons impartial, not only in fact but in public opinion, should be selected;" that we stated at the time this proposition was made that we considered the proper tribunal would be a number of gentlemen, nominated by each side, with a power to challenge, and in case the Conference should not agree, reference to be made to some eminent person agreed to by both sides.

After this it is with great astonishment that the Bishop and his friends received the resolution of the Committee, sending the names of three legal gentlemen, and requesting the Bishop and his friends to select one. This is an unjustifiable departure from the terms of the proposal made by Lord Shaftesbury and his friends, and the understanding upon which the Conference closed; and there now only remains one course for the Bishop and his friends to take, unless, without further delay, the Committee of the Jews' Society proceed to nominate their side of the final tribunal, according to the terms proposed and agreed upon at the meeting of the Conference of 29th June.

The Society replied :—

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

16, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.
July 24th, 1866.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have received your letter of the 21st inst. (which came to hand yesterday), and, in compliance with your desire, I have read it to-day to the Committee.

We shall meet again on Friday next, when I shall do myself the pleasure of communicating to you the result of the Committee's deliberations upon the resolutions of your Committee of the 20th.

I remain,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed)

H. L. LAYARD.

The Rev. C. F. S. MONEY,
St. John's Parsonage, Upper Lewisham Road, S.E.

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

16, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.
July 27, 1866.

MY DEAR SIR,

Referring to yours of the 21st instant, forwarding copy of your Committee's resolution of the 20th I have now the pleasure to send you our Committee's resolution in reply to the same, confirmed by the General Committee of this day.

With Christian regard I remain,

Yours very faithfully,

(Signed)

H. L. LAYARD,

Secretary.

The Rev. C. F. S. MONEY.

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

At a Meeting of the Committee, held at the Society's House, 16, Lincoln's Inn Fields, 24th July, 1866,

Read letter from the Rev. C. F. S. Money, dated July 21, forwarding copy of resolution passed at a meeting held at the Bishop of Rochester's, 20th July, 1866.

Having also read letter from the Rev. Joseph B. M'Caul to the Editor of the "Standard" newspaper, published July 19th,

Resolved—That this Committee having been informed of the last proposal made by their side of the Conference, and accepted by the other side, were desirous of carrying into effect any recommendation of their section of the Conference, and were really anxious to bring the inquiry, if possible, to a speedy and satisfactory termination; but that they felt the utter hopelessness of proceeding by any form of Conference, and therefore superseded, as they considered they had a perfect right to do, the proposal referred to above, and proposed in lieu of it a reference to one legal arbitrator, which has been declined by the Bishop of Rochester and his friends.

That what has transpired since then,—especially the publication, in the newspaper, of the letter of the Rev. J. B. M'Caul, so directly counter to Mr. Money's desire, expressed in his letter, of avoiding publicity, and giving so unfair and inaccurate a representation of what actually occurred at the Conference,—compels this Committee to state, with much reluctance, that they must decline a Conference as proposed to be renewed; and that they feel that there is no other alternative than to leave each side to pursue its own course in the matter.

H. L. LAYARD,
Secretary.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

To which Mr. Money answered:—

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE CLUB,
31st July, 1866.

DEAR SIR,

In reply to your letter of 27th instant, sending Resolution of your Committee, I must beg you to inform the Committee of your Society that Mr. M'Caul's letter to the "Standard" was written without the cognisance of his colleagues, but after having seen a pamphlet which Lord Shaftesbury has printed and circulated. I retain in common with my colleagues the desire to which you refer to avoid publicity, and deeply regret that this pamphlet should have been circulated in violation of the understanding upon which our Conference was constituted. We do not therefore see how Mr. M'Caul's letter can be adduced as a reason for not carrying out the arrangements come to at the last meeting of the Conference, inasmuch as his letter was elicited by Lord Shaftesbury's previous publication entitled "Conference on the case of the Rosenthal Family." We are further informed that this pamphlet is being widely circulated without the replies which were made to the noble Earl's speech, although the publisher states that he is instructed not to sell it.

Yours, &c.

(Signed)

C. F. S. MONEY.

The Society sent the following answer :—

London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

LONDON SOCIETY HOUSE, 16, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.
August 3d, 1866.

MY DEAR SIR,

I AM instructed by our Committee to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 31st July, in reply to mine of the 27th, forwarding you the Committee's Resolution of the same date, and, in reply, I am desired to say :—

1. That, you seem to have forgotten, that when your Committee met on the 20th (your letter conveying their Resolutions being dated on the 21st), that Mr. M'Caul's letter to the Editor of the "Standard" was published on the morning of the 19th of July, when its publication must have come to the knowledge of one, or more, of the members of your Committee. At that time not one word was said in repudiation of Mr. M'Caul's letter, or regret for its publication, which letter did not confine itself simply to a protest against the Earl of Shaftesbury's proceedings in respect to his pamphlet, but enunciated as a fact that which was *not true*—that the Conference had arrived at "the painful conviction that many of the complaints against the management of the Jerusalem Mission were amply justified, and that after two days' searching inquiry many of the graver charges against the late Dr. Macgowan's conduct were conclusively established," &c.

2. That, although you would now appear to repudiate Mr. M'Caul's letter by saying, "it was published without the cognisance of his colleagues," you, nevertheless, proceed to *justify* it by saying, "but, after having seen a pamphlet which Lord Shaftesbury has printed and circulated;" and again, "inasmuch as his letter was elicited by Lord Shaftesbury's previous publication," which you maintain to have been "in violation of the understanding upon which our Conference was constituted."

3. That, while fully satisfied with the noble Earl's ability to defend and justify his own acts, in respect to the statement, which his Lordship has seen good to print and circulate amongst the Members of the Society in vindication of himself, but which he has all along declared to be a *personal* matter, and not in any way affecting the questions under inquiry, the Committee protests in the strongest terms against the unseemly manner, and the unwarrantable statements made by the Rev. Joseph M'Caul (the corresponding Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester, and a member of the Conference), in *direct* violation of the understanding you refer to, and contrary to the facts of the case. *No evidence whatever was produced at the Conference on the opposite side in defence of the Jerusalem Mission, or of the late Dr. Macgowan*, while those questions had nothing to do with the subject of the Earl of Shaftesbury's statement, but which you and your colleagues persevere to urge as "a violation of the understanding upon which the Conference was constituted," and consider, by your letter of the 21st ult. sufficient to justify Mr. M'Caul's letter to the "Standard" of the 19th, condemnatory of Dr. Macgowan and the Society.

Under such circumstances, our Committee feel that it would be useless to waste more time in fruitless conferences and correspondence, and have resolved upon proceeding, without delay, to put before the friends of the Society their reply to the charges brought against them by the Lord Bishop of Rochester and his friends, in Committee, dated February 22, 1866, a copy of which will be furnished to you, when ready.

Leaving the issue of this painful controversy with Him, whose cause it is,

I remain,

My dear SIR,

Yours very faithfully,

HENRY L. LAYARD,
Secretary.

The REV. C. F. MONEY, *St John's Parsonage.*

To which Mr. Money replied,—

ST. JOHN'S PARSONAGE, UPPER LEWISHAM ROAD, S.E.
August 7, 1866.

DEAR SIR,

My letter of 31st ultimo was not written to justify the publication of Mr. M'Caul's letter in the "Standard," nor can such a construction be fairly put upon it. I wrote to show that you were not justified in breaking off from the proposed Conference, on the ground of Mr. M'Caul's published letter, when one of your own side had already published a statement—my letter refers to this fact in order to dispose of your excuse, and I stated that Mr. M'Caul's letter was published without the cognisance of his colleagues. It was, in fact, unknown to us when we sent you our Resolution; and two of our friends were absent, the Bishop of Rochester on the Continent, and Lord Claud Hamilton attending his re-election in Ireland. But in any case, if you had really desired to pursue the inquiry into the Rosenthal matter, you would not have made the individual act of the Bishop's Chaplain an excuse for refusing to continue the Conference according to the conditions agreed upon. In Lord Shaftesbury's Statement or Pamphlet, reference was made to the charges advanced against Dr. Macgowan and his Lordship's opinion of his innocence; you must therefore acknowledge that your letter of 3d inst. is, to say the least, inaccurate, when you state that we repudiate Mr. M'Caul's letter and also proceed to justify it.

I observe that you now for the first time acknowledge that Lord Shaftesbury's Statement had nothing to do with the questions we were met to consider in Conference, and I regret that you did not express this conviction sooner, and assist us in our endeavour to prevent the introduction of that which was entirely irrelevant and backed by personal allusions. I will ask you to lay this letter before your Committee, and remain,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed)

C. F. S. MONEY.

From the above correspondence it will be seen that Capt. Layard, by instructions of the Committee, under date August 3d, wrote to the effect that "no evidence whatever was produced at the Conference on the opposite side in defence of the Jerusalem Mission or of the late Dr. Macgowan." To this we have to reply, that the President of the Society stated in an emphatic manner, "We cannot meet this evidence, it is not to be expected that we should," with other words to that effect; and subsequently he expressed his feelings, both orally and in writing, that with regard to "the indictment against Dr. Macgowan, it would be better, with a view to peace, to consign the whole to oblivion."*

We are further thankful, "for the sake of peace," for the confession that Lord Shaftesbury "all along declared" his statements "to be a personal

matter, and not in any way affecting the questions under inquiry." We accept this as confirmation of the justice of our remonstrances, and we will remind the Committee that Lord Shaftesbury peremptorily insisted in forcing it upon us, and demanded the presence of a short-hand writer in order to give it publicity. It is much to be regretted that the representatives of the Society only now, for the first time, make the acknowledgment that they left us alone to protest against the introduction of "a personal matter in no way affecting the questions under inquiry."

On Friday, the 20th July, the "Record" published an article, with a letter from Lord Shaftesbury, attacking the Bishop of Rochester and his colleagues, to which the following reply was sent, and refused insertion by the Editor :—

ST. JOHN'S PARSONAGE, UPPER LEWISHAM ROAD, S. E.
July 30th, 1866.

SIR,

Having seen a statement, with a letter from Lord Shaftesbury, in your paper of Friday, 20th instant, in which our names are introduced, we appeal to your sense of justice to insert this accompanying statement in explanation and vindication of the course we have pursued, with reference to the distressed family of the Rosenthals, and the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

(Signed)

CLAUD HAMILTON.
C. F. S. MONEY.

P.S.—The absence of the Bishop of Rochester from England, and of others from London, obliges us to send this without waiting for their signatures.

The EDITOR of the "RECORD."

Our attention has been called to a statement in the "Record" of the 20th inst. respecting the proceedings of the Conference held with the President and five other members of the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews on the Rosenthal case.

We fully understood that the Conference was to be a private and friendly one—an opinion fortified by Lord Shaftesbury's statement at the opening of the Conference, that all that passed would be strictly confidential.

As friends of the cause of Israel, we were most anxious that nothing should be done that could in any way injure that cause or weaken the Society. But we are compelled to state, that not only have we hitherto failed in bringing the members of the Conference, who were acting for the Society, to consider the real question at issue, but we have been met in so hostile a spirit, and subjected to such unworthy insinuations, that nothing but a stern conviction that we were bound to bring forward the facts with which we were acquainted, and to exhaust all means to obtain redress for the Rosenthals, could have induced us to persevere as we have. It has been at a great personal sacrifice of time and feelings that we have carried on the matter, and without any other motive than to show how deeply the cause of God and Israel had suffered from the course pursued by the agents of the Society.

We will not enter into any details as to merely personal matters, but at once refer to one charge that may require explanation.

Dr. Macgowan, formerly head of the Society's mission at Jerusalem, has

been dead some years, and many offensive remarks have been made as to our attacking the character of one who could not defend himself. We are therefore obliged to point out that a use has been made of our reference to that individual, which is not only unwarranted, but disingenuous and unfair. Whatever mention of him was made by us, was made to his friends and supporters in a strictly private and confidential Conference. We made it with no ill-feeling, for we could have none; we made it for no other purpose than to show how deeply the interests of religion and the Society had suffered, and how disastrous had been and still were the consequences to a poor Israelitish family. We had no expectation of the matter being made public, and are not responsible for any consequences resulting from a different course pursued by others, which we considered at the time very objectionable.* We felt, and we feel still, that a great wrong had been done to the Rosenthals by our Society, which was bound on every account rather to cherish than to crush a poor family—the first-fruits of its mission in Jerusalem. We were compelled to set forth all the grounds upon which our conviction rested, and the character of the agent who systematically persecuted this family. In our attempt to do this we have been interrupted by the introduction of one irrelevant topic after another. The controversy between Lord Shaftesbury, the Bishop of Rochester, and the Rev. Joseph B. M'Caul had no connexion with the inquiry in which we were engaged. It arose apparently out of a misconception on Lord Shaftesbury's part as to the purport of certain expressions, he regarding them as charges affecting his fitness to act as an impartial member of the Conference; but such meaning was promptly disclaimed by those who used them.

The Bishop of Rochester, addressing Lord Shaftesbury, said, "You have given us an assurance of your perfect impartiality in the Rosenthal matter, and we are entirely satisfied. In my recent letter I denied having made, or intended to make, any such imputation as you refer to."

This disclaimer by the Bishop, in which his colleagues concurred, should, we feel, have been accepted at once. No one ever considered his Lordship to be hostile to the Rosenthals. On the contrary, we knew that Lord Shaftesbury, as well as the Chevalier Bunsen, had applied to the Society on their behalf, and the former had recently subscribed to the Rosenthal Fund. With regard to the other point, upon which Lord Shaftesbury was labouring under a misconception:—the Bishop of Rochester and the M'Caul family knew that, in spite of great differences of opinion between Lord Shaftesbury and Dr. M'Caul about the Society and the state of things at Jerusalem, the latter retained an affectionate regard for his lordship to the last; of this Lord Shaftesbury has been assured by the Bishop and the Rev. J. M'Caul.

We deeply regret, therefore, that these matters should have been so unnecessarily brought before the public, and though obliged to notice the statement, in which our names have been mentioned and our conduct commented upon, we do it with extreme reluctance, and with no desire to prolong a painful controversy.

We have only to add that the attempt to obtain justice for the Rosenthals, and to come to an agreement in friendly conference with the Society, has failed.

* The Bishop of Rochester and his colleagues, in the Conference, in their Report (see pp. 12, 13), and the Bishop of Rochester, in his letter of 14th May to Lord Shaftesbury (see p. 31), have shown that the investigation into Dr. Macgowan's private character apart from his conduct to the Rosenthals, was FORCED upon us by the noble Earl and his colleagues.

At our last meeting, it was proposed by Lord Shaftesbury, and those acting with him, that "A more impartial tribunal should be constituted, on which neither functionaries of the Society nor parties connected with the Rosenthal affair should be allowed to sit." To this we assented, on the condition that the names submitted should be subject to challenge, and we sent in the names of those who were to represent the Bishop and his friends. But the Committee of the Society now made a new proposal, setting aside the proposition of Lord Shaftesbury at our last meeting, and our acceptance of it with conditions mutually agreed upon. They proposed "A reference to one legal arbitrator." To this we objected as we felt bound by the agreement already come to, and also felt that it was not a question to be considered merely on legal, or technical grounds.

Thus baffled in our endeavours to promote peace and to obtain justice, we must express our deep regret that the President and Committee of the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews have viewed this question in the manner they have, and treated us rather as enemies than as friends and subscribers to the Society.

APPENDIX.

Refutation of the Charges brought against the Bishop of Rochester by the Earl of Shaftesbury.

IN the Conference appointed by the London Jews' Society to consider the case of the Rosenthal family, the Earl of Shaftesbury, as President of that Society, at the special desire of the Bishop of Rochester and other members of the Conference, allowed himself to be named as a member of the Commission on the side of the Jews' Society.

Soon after the Conference began Lord Shaftesbury wrote a series of letters to the Bishop of Rochester, in which he attempted in vain to dissociate the Bishop from his colleagues, and to get him to abandon the investigation, by the Conference, into what the Bishop believed to be a case of injustice, oppression, and misrepresentation without a parallel in the history of the Missions of our Church. In these letters Lord Shaftesbury had made imputations which had deeply wounded the feelings of that prelate.

These imputations on the Bishop's principles and conduct caused his Lordship to write, on the 14th May, and submit a defence of the course he was taking, to Lord Shaftesbury. Lord Shaftesbury had, at the second sitting of Conference, introduced the name and weight of character of the late Dr. M'Caul, and urged that his never having spoken to him of Dr. Macgowan's conduct was of itself sufficient to quash and annihilate all the testimony that had been or that might be given against it; the Bishop therefore hoped that, by appealing to the principles and testimony of the late Dr. M'Caul, he should carry conviction to the mind of the noble Earl, and lead his Lordship to view the Bishop's position in a clear and true light.

This letter of the 14th May is, in fact, the basis of all that his Lordship has called "*the articles exhibited against him,*" and yet there is not, from the beginning to the end of the letter, a reflection against his Lordship's personal character. Nor is there, in the whole correspondence which has taken place, a single expression which imputes to Lord Shaftesbury a hostile feeling against the Rosenthals, which unwarranted imputation is nevertheless the alleged ground of the speech which his Lordship made and had reported at the Conference on the 16th June, which he submitted to the Committee of the Jews' Society on the 22d June, and which he has now thought himself justified in printing and circulating as a pamphlet.*

In perusing Lord Shaftesbury's pamphlet, it will be observed pp. 15, 16, that, during his Lordship's speech, the Bishop asked whether his Lordship was "reading extracts, or entire letters?" And that his reply was, "THIS IS AN EXTRACT from the Bishop's letter of May 14th, and the other letters

* Conference on the Case of the Rosenthal Family. London: Dalton and Lacy, 28, Cockspur Street. 1866.

I read entirely." Whereas the letter which should have been read entirely was the very one which was given piecemeal; it was *the letter* on which everything turned! If it had been read in full, it would have appeared that the Bishop was defending *his own course* of conduct, and was not attacking that of Lord Shaftesbury.

Attention is also called to the perversion of the order of things and of dates in the printed speech. Thus, the Bishop's two letters of June 11 and 12 are cited first, p. 11, and then, p. 15, follows the partial and convenient *extract* from the Bishop's letter of May 14th. So again, from the introduction to the printed speech, any ordinary reader would infer that it had its origin in the resolution of the Bishop's colleagues, passed on 29th June; whereas the speech was delivered on the 16th June, *thirteen* days before the Bishop's colleagues in the Conference gave in the paper of the 29th June, which had been rendered necessary by the noble Earl's speech and subsequent conduct in regard to it.

It is also to be remarked that, in desiring his speech to be read to the Committee of the Society on the 22d June, Lord Shaftesbury did so without respect to the challenge which had been given to the Bishop to qualify or answer it, and the assurance made to Mr. M'Caul, that "before publishing it, he should have a copy, with power to criticize whatever had been said"—so that the *ex parte* statement, by itself, was laid before the Committee, commented on by its chairman, and deliberated upon, before a word of the counter-statement from either party affected by it had been seen,—a proceeding which we feel to be the more extraordinary when we consider the Bishop of Rochester's position in the Church, and the many years that he has taken an active interest in the Promotion of Christianity amongst the Jews.

The part of the proceedings in conference which relate to the M'Caul family, and to their alleged attack upon Lord Shaftesbury, had been deliberately declared by the Bishop and his friends at the Conference to have no connexion with, or relation to, the Rosenthal affair, which it was the special object of the Conference to consider.* The Bishop stated this in writing to his Lordship on 15th June. He denied that any such charge as that alleged by Lord Shaftesbury had been made by him, and he affirmed that it was only by an erroneous inference that this could be imagined.

Deeply regretting the necessity occasioned by the publication of Lord Shaftesbury's pamphlet, and by the course persevered in by the Committee of the Jews' Society, we now submit the Bishop of Rochester's letter of the 14th May, and the other documents which follow:—

Letter from the Bishop of Rochester to the Earl of Shaftesbury.

May 14.

MY LORD,—

I acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's letter of May 11th. My deliberate judgment on the chief matters it contains had been expressed to your Lordship previously.

* This is now admitted by the Committee of the Jews' Society in their Secretary's Letter of Aug. 3. See p. 25.

I have always valued highly your Lordship's kindness and your good opinion, and I still desire to do so, consistently with what I deem to be the interests of truth, charity, and the Mission to the Jews. For this reason I request the favour of your Lordship to read the following account of the position which I have been led to occupy with reference to those interests, and to which, in good conscience, as at present informed, I think it is my duty to adhere.

I have been intimately acquainted with the late Dr. M'Caul since about 1840. I cannot yield to your Lordship in the regard and respect I have ever entertained for him.

1. He has repeatedly assured me that the Rosenthals were thoroughly respectable and Christian persons, who had been deeply injured by the Jerusalem Section of the London Jews' Society, and that the position which that section had taken up was a wrong one, and founded on false representations.

2. He has also stated to me, again and again, that, through the influence of that Section, the true system of dealing with the errors and mistaken views of the Jews had been compromised, and the power of influencing them towards the truth, as it is in Jesus, had been materially, if not fatally, impaired as regards the work of the London Jews' Society.

*Dr. M'Caul's letters to the newspapers, after his controversy with the section in their Committee-room, prove such to have been his opinions.** Apart from these, he has alleged to me that their course of conduct in respect of the Operative Institution was another decisive proof of their erroneous judgment; and he has often stated his hopelessness of remedying such evils, because the Bishop of Jerusalem and Dr. Macgowan were determinately upholding the principles in Palestine which the Jerusalem section advocated here.

3. He has more than once expressed to me his deep persuasion that Jewish matters were not brought before your Lordship by the section in their simplicity and entirety, but partially, and by extracts from documents with important omissions, and that you often had no fair opportunity of judging concerning important interests which were at issue.

4. He has further expressed, clearly and fully, his conviction that it was useless for him, or anyone with his views, to make adverse representations to the section respecting measures they had adopted, because he and others had found that nothing which militated against their own system would be received and fairly weighed. On this account, and because of my last written paragraph, he believed that an appeal to your Lordship would be useless.

I have it under the hand of Mrs. M'Caul, his widow, that Dr. M'Caul discontinued his attendance at the Committee of the London Society in 1853 or '4, because, after many similar hints, which no other member of that Committee attempted to gainsay, Mr. Strachan, the chairman, told him "That as the rest of the Committee were so happily unanimous, it was a pity that one dissentient member did not withdraw." I may mention also that after a lengthened conversation on this subject at Palestine Place (after some of the Operative Society's proceedings) with Dr. M'Caul, Mr. Reichardt, and a third person—I think, Mr. Ayerst (whom I never knew well)—

* Jerusalem, &c. a Series of Letters by the late Rev. Alexander M'Caul, D.D. London: Trübner and Co. 60, Paternoster Row.

I inquired why Dr. M'Caul did not take the whole before you. The reply to which was, because it would be of no use, and to this Mr. R. and the third gentleman cordially assented, telling me that my surprise made it clear that I did not know the real state of things.

5. Dr. Macgowan was well known to Dr. M'Caul, as being the chief accuser and opposer of the Rosenthals,—not only of Simeon Rosenthal, but of the whole family, whom he desired to get out of Jerusalem. Many instances in proof of this have been stated to me at times by Dr. M'Caul, but I do not remember him to have mentioned the indiscretions and infirmities recently alleged against Dr. Macgowan. I now know the reason why he did not name them—he was not aware of their existence. His widow has stated to me that Dr. M'Caul's silence respecting Dr. Macgowan's failings existed simply because 'the details respecting them were never communicated to him.' Mr. and Mrs. Finn did not inform him, and he had no other correspondent in Jerusalem. The grave charges were not raised until recently.

In confirmation or illustration of what precedes, I request attention to the following statements :—

As to Mr. Reichardt's position, his own account to me was :

"I have been connected with the Society for forty-two years, and enjoyed their confidence to the fullest extent. It is not a little trying to find that that confidence has in some measure of late been withdrawn."

In support of this may be remembered the unseemly outbreak of Mr. Cohen against Mr. R. the first day of the Conference, when he (Mr. C.) was deservedly reproved, and the following account of Mr. R. by one who always attends the meetings of the Section: "Mr. R. is an excellent, amiable person . . . but he so loves the Jews that, with occasional exceptions, where he has detected them, and sometimes even then, he is blind and lenient to a fault to their shortcomings, and will try to excuse them by every possible or probable explanation."

With regard to the partial view which your Lordship has been forced to take of matters in the hands of the Jerusalem section, I tacitly observed distinct proof of it, when the Conference commenced by your Lordship assuming that we, the remonstrants, were identified with articles and letters from the newspapers, whereas we were of course only responsible for the MS. Statement (see *ante*, pp. 7—11) which we had put into the hands of the Jews' Society. The paper of extracts from newspapers, &c. was then laid open before your Lordship, and was often referred to, and shewed me how the case stood, because I was persuaded that you would never have placed yourself in the erroneous position of charging me and my friends with what we never had affirmed.

That I or others sought to compromise the name of Dr. Macgowan has been so fully met and answered in a paper prepared for the Conference on 8th May, and since sent in, that it is needless for me to refer to it. His name was omitted in my first written proposal for a compromise to Mr. Goodhart, and again in our Statement, and might now be omitted in a settlement of the business by merely acknowledging that information had been brought forward in our Conferences, of which the Society was not cognisant before.

The following statements have been placed before me, not from the clerical members of Dr. M'Caul's family, but from the female branches of his house :—

1. Dr. M'Caul went to Lord Shaftesbury on the Rosenthal* affair. His reception, however, was so cool that he mentioned it on his return, and said he would never go again, except on special business. To this resolution we believe he adhered until his death. It is in vain, therefore, to say that Dr. M'Caul was silent on these matters.

2. Dr. M'Caul was more painfully distressed by the course taken by the Jerusalem section and its consequences, than by any other circumstance towards the close of his career.

3. To this last fact I can testify myself from the most explicit statements which he made to me again and again.

While matters stood as I have described them above, I was of course passive. I had no ground for advancing any charge. I had no special call on me to interfere. But, recently, the statements respecting Dr. Macgowan have accumulated, and have been widely and openly canvassed among the friends of the Jewish cause, and have got into the newspapers. The gentlemen, with whom I am acting, have reported them to me with clearness and detail, knowing the interest that I have always taken in the Jews, and my intimacy with Dr. M'Caul. I was thoroughly satisfied with the truth of the statements. As a member of the Jews' Society I was not disposed to be silent in such a matter, and to abide under a consciousness that I knew much which, for the welfare of the Society, it was proper their General Committee should know, though I have much doubt whether the General Committee of the Jews' Society knows it now. I believe that the knowledge of our statement has been restricted to a section of that Committee only. However, in my mind the question was this, shall I stifle evidence of so great importance which I clearly see can be substantiated, and disregard all the old testimony of Dr. M'Caul in favour of the Rosenthals, leaving their character under unjust reproach, and desert them in their unmerited distress, when I know they are deserving of support? and shall I leave the Jews' Society in what I feel to be its most unsatisfactory condition? Or shall the interests of truth, charity, and the Jewish cause prevail, and I incur the reproach, if need be, of having a want of tenderness to the memory of a public man who is deceased, and of inflicting words of pain upon his widow? I had no hesitation, nor have I any now, as to the course which it was my duty to pursue.

I have nothing further to submit to yourself, except my respectful but earnest protest against your unseemly and inexcusable reflections upon the gentlemen who have acted with me in this painful matter; believing, as I do, that they are actuated by the very same motives, and unselfish, honest principles, and love of the cause of Israel, as I am myself.

I remain, yours, &c.,

J. C. ROCHESTER.

P.S.—I venture to add one sentence, in the hope of bringing the truth before your Lordship in its proper light. * * * * It has not been referred to, nor will she be called forward by my friends. I have myself had conversation with that person. Allow me to suggest that your Lordship should do so also. She appeared to me thoroughly informed, and remarkably free from any party bias in Jerusalem affairs.

* The expression "Rosenthal Affair" is here employed in reference to the imprisonment of Mr. Rosenthal in 1858 by Consul Rosen at the instigation of Bishop Gobat, in order to compel him to withdraw the action for libel which Lord Clarendon had authorized him to institute against the Bishop, Dr. Macgowan, &c.

The above was construed by Lord Shaftesbury into an attack upon himself. But neither in the above letter nor in any of his other communications with Lord Shaftesbury had the Bishop of Rochester the smallest idea of making any such attack upon the noble Earl, and nothing could be further from the wishes of the members of the McCaul family, who all thoroughly appreciated the kindness shown to themselves personally by the noble Earl, and his zeal in the promotion of every good work. It was, therefore, with the more pain that the Bishop of Rochester witnessed the manner in which Lord Shaftesbury's mind had been influenced, and the Bishop in writing to his lordship on the 15th June endeavoured to put the noble Earl right, and denied that any such charge had been made by him, and affirmed that it was only by an erroneous inference that it could be imagined.

The Earl of Shaftesbury, however, persisted in ascribing to the Bishop of Rochester and to the McCaul family motives and feelings which they utterly disclaim, and at the meeting of Conference on the 16th June his lordship, in opposition to our protest (*see ante*, p. 13), made the speech which he has published, and at the meeting of Conference on the 20th June he handed copies to the Bishop of Rochester and the Rev. Joseph M'Caul, demanding that they should give "written answers," and the Conference was adjourned to the 23d to receive the same. The following replies and statement, and Lord Claud Hamilton's letter (*see ante*, pp. 13, 14), were read: *—

Reply read by the Bishop of Rochester at the Meeting of Conference on the 23d June, 1866, in answer to the Earl of Shaftesbury's speech of the 16th June.

THE Speech of Lord Shaftesbury on the 16th, and the demand which he made upon myself and Mr. M'Caul to justify what had been stated as the opinions of the M'Caul family, cannot be taken apart from the case before the Conference, although the matter was not proper for consideration by the Conference. This is *obvious* (1) from the account given in my letter of May 14th,—(2) from the statement sent in by the members of my side of the Conference on 14th June,—and (3) from the concluding words of the speech of June 16th, respecting Dr. Macgowan. And it is *necessary*, because the introduction of the name of Dr. M'Caul into the business, did not arise from the cause which has been assigned,—and the comment which has been made on Dr. M'Caul's alleged statements perverts entirely the sense which his testimony conveys. It is *necessary* also, as will appear, to refer to myself (as the speaker on the 16th did to himself and his acts). The course which I adopted depended entirely upon the position into which I was forced; and my position might have created a *necessity* for bringing forward some matters which *at first* might appear irrelevant.

I have felt aggrieved from the beginning of this business by the course Lord Shaftesbury has taken, and the personalities which have been introduced into these proceedings. I have been forty-four years, as a clergyman, before the public at St. James's, Westminster, with the National Society

* A Special Meeting of the Jews' Committee was held on the 22d June, when Lord Shaftesbury's personal attack on the Bishop of Rochester was read and considered, although neither the Conference nor the noble Earl had yet seen or received the reply which his Lordship had demanded.

there, and elsewhere in positions of responsibility, prior to that which I now hold. I have witnessed strife and ebullition of strong feeling between men of ardent minds, but I never witnessed so unseemly an outbreak as that with which our *friendly Conference* was opened. It has been remarked on by my colleagues in their remonstrance to Lord Shaftesbury. The terms "*heinous*," "*bestly*," "*offensive*," and "*disgusting accusations*," applied to the course which we were pursuing, and that before a syllable had been said by any one else, are the expressions I refer to, and are those which his Lordship says, in his reply, he shall not withdraw, and, it has never been intimated to me before that I was *untruthful*, or that I had the meanness to give a false excuse for evading a meeting because I was afraid of the consequences. Lord Shaftesbury also is the first gentleman who ever has signified to me, during the six years of my episcopate, that I was acting unworthily of the high office I am permitted to hold in the Church. This he has done in writing more than once. The introduction of the name and opinions of Dr. M'Caul *by me*, was owing to these charges, but it was not I or my colleagues *who first introduced* Dr. M'Caul's name.

Such charges are difficult to bear. My colleagues were ready to protest instantly. But it was felt that these were not matters for the Conference. It was clear that we had better bear with them then, till such a tide of angry feeling might turn,—we passed them by, and yielded, as we have on many other reasonable grounds of complaint. Not so the President of the London Jews' Society. Having disturbed the intended course of our proceeding by urgently *demanding* that the charges against Dr. Macgowan should be sifted *first*, and not in the order in which our statement would have brought them, so soon as *by inference* and through inadvertence or a hasty mistake he had *inferred* that a reflection was implied on his conduct as President of the Jews' Society, he arrested the proceedings on account of this. On assurance that nothing of the kind he supposed had been intended, or as far as I know expressed, and that the subject was not one to be dealt with by the Conference, he pressed for an explanation and a comment on the words used, and stopped the progress of business just after an adjustment had been made as to the manner in which it might be pursued with satisfaction to his Lordship's feelings.

A chief part in Lord Shaftesbury's assumptions is that the name and testimony of Dr. M'Caul has been unnecessarily introduced.

Lord Shaftesbury himself first introduced Dr. M'Caul's name when, at the *second Conference*, he tried to upset and annihilate all the evidence to prove that Dr. Macgowan was liable to commit acts of intemperance, as to drink and conduct towards other persons, by alleging the supreme importance of Dr. M'Caul's character and testimony on such matters, his own conviction that Dr. M'Caul would have reported such things to him (Lord Shaftesbury), and Dr. M'Caul's constant silence about such evils through the whole of his continuous and intimate personal communications with Lord Shaftesbury in the latter part of his life.

Dr. M'Caul's testimony and name, therefore, were not first referred to by me or my friends, and they were not introduced unnecessarily, since they were worth, as I fully believe, all that Lord Shaftesbury had said in their favour.

It was in answer to charges against my *veracity*, &c., as above stated, that I appealed to Dr. M'Caul's witness and his opinions, and stated at length the position which I held, justifying the same by the position which Dr. M'Caul had held. It seemed to me hopeful that this mode of acting might find acceptance with Lord Shaftesbury, and make the progress of our

business more easy. In aid of this my object, I had sent Lord Shaftesbury a copy of Dr. M'Caul's published letters, with, important passages marked in it.* The title of that Letter is "The Conduct of the London Society," &c. Its receipt was acknowledged by his Lordship May 11th. Pages 21 and 28 were specially noted in the copy sent.

Notwithstanding this,—and I challenge any intelligent person to read my letter of May 14th, and say that any other object was in my view than the defence of the cause which I had taken, and a desire to justify it in the mind of Lord Shaftesbury—this letter has been treated by his Lordship as if it contained charges brought forward on Dr. M'Caul's testimony against Lord Shaftesbury's personal character and integrity. And yet, while this is done, the pretended charges against Lord Shaftesbury are declared to be so "obscure,"—"the statements so vague,"—"the testimony of Dr. M'Caul so very indefinite," that "I (Lord Shaftesbury) feel embarrassed as to the terms of a reply." Well might he so feel if he regarded them, as he said he did, as an attack upon himself.

But this was his Lordship's conclusion, though my friends had assured him, in their remonstrance, that, so far from charging him with any such intent (as he supposed Dr. M'Caul's evidence to be meant to support), they were convinced "he must be biassed by information from other sources than what they had made the basis of their proceedings."

Nevertheless, in haste and with vehemence, Lord Shaftesbury assumed that my references were so intended, and he has called me in consequence "the organ of the M'Caul family against himself," and has spoken of "Dr. M'Caul's statements made against me," in reference to my conduct in the Rosenthal affair—the M'Caul budget against me,—"the M'Caul family record their testimony to my dishonour," *that is*, not to the dishonour of my *judgment* concerning the policy of the London Jews' Society, *but* my personal honour and character for fairness and uprightness;—a charge which was never intimated, which I had assured him was never intended, and which, if fairly deducible from my expressions, was by a mistake for which I would amply apologise. But they were not open to such construction.

P. 15. In accounting for the position which I had taken up, in the letter referred to, it was said that Dr. M'Caul believed that an appeal to Lord Shaftesbury would be useless, if made upon what he (Dr. M'Caul) believed to be a most objectionable state of things. This is coupled with his opinion that Lord Shaftesbury did not know the true state of things,—that he was kept in the dark. Was this of the nature of a charge from Dr. M'Caul against Lord Shaftesbury's principles or character?

P. 16. I am asked, Can I give the words of such conversations with Dr. M'Caul as I refer to, and the dates? No. I keep no daybook of such matters. But the substance I remember well, and Dr. M'Caul has *published* as much and more than I have attributed to him on these matters. Again, I am asked, "Did Dr. M'Caul mention those things in connexion with the name of the Rosenthals?" "My statement was not clear on that point." Well might it not be clear;—that was not the object I had in view while making it.

P. 16—18. Lord Shaftesbury is "surprised that he is charged with enmity to the Rosenthals *by me*." Where is he so charged? The allegation is untenable; and much less is the exaggerated statement justifiable, that I intimate that "he is a man at enmity with the Rosenthals, and prepared to

* Jerusalem, &c. a Series of Letters by the Rev. A. M'Caul, D.D. Trübner and Co. 60, Paternoster Row, 1866.

do them injustice." I should not have consented to his Lordship presiding over his side of the Conference if I had thought so. I never have said or thought what is set forth in these words.

Lord Shaftesbury's quotation of my name from Mr. Reichardt's letter to him about aiding the Rosenthals, goes far to establish the opinion I have always entertained on this subject. It has never altered.

That I was formerly disturbed in my feelings of allegiance towards the Jews' Society by what Dr. M'Caul had told me from time to time is also proved by the letter last named. Mr. Reichardt writes: "The Bishop of Rochester has lately rejoined the Society." Whether I had actually separated from it or not, is not clear to my mind, but, after I had preached both its anniversary sermons (the Society's and the Operatives'), and repeatedly attended the Operative examinations, and had preached and baptized six of its adult converts in the chapel at Palestine Place, I know that I did then think of leaving it. And I know also that my subscription to the cause has been left unpaid for some years past.

Lord Shaftesbury repeatedly attempted by his letters, to separate and dissociate me from my present colleagues. It may be that his Lordship thinks there is not a sincere principle of alliance which underlies our proceedings. But other tokens besides the above show that we are of one mind, and many other of my friends are intimating to me, from time to time, their warm sympathy in what I have done and am doing in this matter.

P. 25. An attempt has been made twice by Lord Shaftesbury (though the topic is much the same in each case) to confound my testimony by showing that my statements do not hold together and agree; thus

P. 22. I am charged with contradicting myself by stating that "Dr. McCaul was silent as to Dr. Macgowan's alleged delinquencies because of my Lord-Shaftesbury's coolness." "This statement is *withdrawn*," he says, and then I *substituted* another averment, viz. "that Dr. M'Caul was ignorant of the matter." I have done nothing of the kind. Where are the words of *withdrawal*? Where the words which make the substitution?

P. 25. "*Which* of these statements will I take?" he asks. My reply is, I take *both*. They are perfectly consistent.

The coolness of Lord Shaftesbury towards Dr. M'Caul related to his Lordship's judgment on the topic of greatest concern, "*Israel and its Interests*." That topic continued supreme in Dr. M'Caul's mind, apart from all considerations about Dr. Macgowan. But another cause of silence was also in operation, of which I only knew very lately: Dr. M'Caul had agreed with his daughter at Jerusalem that she should not write to him on such subjects any more. She ceased to communicate them.* And so, while Dr. M'Caul's principles and policy as to Jewish matters remained, he really was not in a condition to write or speak with any confidence about Dr. Macgowan.

P. 25. I am then shown to have said,

"The grave charges against Dr. Macgowan were not commonly raised till *lately*," that is, of course, "*of late years*,"—not with earlier manifestations of Dr. Macgowan's infirmities. No, I believe they were not, and they could not be raised publicly *at first*. It was by accumulation of reluctant witnesses that they came out to general view.

* After Bishop Gobat's arrival at Jerusalem Mrs. Finn never wrote to Dr. M'Caul in regard to the Bishop or the Mission. She informed her father that she thought it would be better that she should not do so, and he wrote approving.

Mr. Reichardt said, when he witnessed them first, "I was staggered," they were in antagonism with everything he expected to find or see. He was in no position to bring a substantive charge against their medical officer before the Society in London or elsewhere. This was natural and proper, though he has been called a shuffler, and been otherwise calumniated for the course he took. Then Dr. Simpson saw them. Afterwards Mr. Graham. Afterwards others, who have tendered to me their knowledge of the same things.

All of these might very properly, on their first knowledge or suspicion of such evil, refrain from speaking, and they did so. But intercourse with each other, and natural causes operating on the people around, occasioned the facts to be talked of and brought to light.

But, though it was so at Jerusalem, it was *not* so with Dr. M'Caul in London. This has been explained. The return of Mr. and Mrs. Finn from Jerusalem brought everything before the view of Dr. M'Caul, and stirred up afresh, in the latter period of his career (his last few months), all the painful feelings which had oppressed him before, and haunted him to the last, respecting the failure of that system of dealing with the cause of blinded Israel which he had given his life to promote.

Lord Shaftesbury's statements altogether pass over the great and notorious facts with regard to the policy of the Jews' Society in the conduct of their mission-work on behalf of Israel.

The London Jews' Society has the unhappy peculiarity of having the friends of its cause at issue as to the line of policy which it should pursue.

Dr. M'Caul's policy existed soon after that good man joined it, and, in the days of "*The Old Paths*," and of the *Operative Society*, and of Bishop Alexander (Dr. M'Caul's great friend in respect of this policy), and it then had Lord Shaftesbury's co-operation and cordial support.

That policy was gradually changed after the appointment of Bishop Gobat; foreign and new principles were introduced. Dr. M'Caul openly and continuously by word of mouth and in print protested against the system newly substituted for the old one. Lord Shaftesbury retained his regard and affection for Dr. M'Caul—the feeling was reciprocal. Dr. M'Caul never ceased to speak well or feel well and affectionately towards one to whom on public and on private grounds he was greatly a debtor. But Lord Shaftesbury held on with the Society under the new policy which it had adopted.

The state of things which was so strangely commented upon in the speech of the 16th is owing to the change here referred to. The real grounds of Christian alliance between the two, who had been chiefs and leaders in the cause of Israel under the former state of things, remained. That godly alliance was never disturbed. It was manifested by deeper interest as Dr. M'Caul's removal from this world drew near; but, in the prospect of his departure hence, the distress of Dr. M'Caul's mind increased concerning the great and lasting interests of Israel.

The interview of Dr. M'Caul with Lord Shaftesbury respecting Bishop Gobat, and the result of it, are perfectly explicable when due regard is paid to the preceding remarks. The testimony of witnesses exactly agrees:—

1. The date of the interview for which Lord Shaftesbury specially asked me, is the same as that which his Lordship has subsequently assigned.
2. Lord Shaftesbury says, "Dr. M'Caul *was not pleased* with what I said to him on that occasion."

And Miss M'Caul says: "*My father was dissatisfied and displeased* (no ex-

aggeration of Lord Shaftesbury's words) to find that Lord Shaftesbury was altogether inaccessible to those views of Jerusalem troubles which he believed to be the true ones."

No question was at issue as to personal respect or esteem, but as to policy in the conduct of the Jewish Society's affairs.

The natural conclusion and statement of Dr. M'Caul after such an interview would be of this kind :—

"I did everything in my power to bring Lord Shaftesbury to my view of this policy which is essential for our success. I selected the most important of all the matters at issue; I took the case of Bishop Gobat. I urged this case with a vehemence which I never used towards Lord Shaftesbury before.

"I might as well have uttered my words about it to the winds. His manner was kind as ever, but he was regardless of my reasonings and urging. I will never go to him again *on such affairs.*"

The gist of the matter is unmistakable. [Lord Shaftesbury, interrupting the Bishop, "This is pure imagination. Did Mr. M'Caul say those words?" To which the Bishop replied: "No, they represent the substance of what he said, and give the enlargement for which your Lordship asked me, or rather *demand*ed of me."]]

It was not a lack of confidence in Lord Shaftesbury, *as a Christian man*, but as a leader and guide of those most weighty interests of Israel. It is only by some great fallacy that Lord Shaftesbury can have been led to think that any slur or suspicion was cast on his friendship or his character by what has been stated as the opinions of Dr. M'Caul.

To enter on a discussion as to how far Dr. M'Caul held his purpose, and did not go again on these affairs, or on other Jewish affairs, to Lord Shaftesbury, would be fruitless. It is clear, by Lord Shaftesbury's statement, that Dr. M'Caul was afterwards sent for when his presence was desired.

P. 24. Lord Shaftesbury says: "When Dr. M'Caul was not pleased with what I said, my words were rather in the nature of a gentle remonstrance than of a presumptuous rebuke."

Here his Lordship's entire mistake of the matter at issue appears clearly. It was not the *measure of rebuke* which produced the idea of coolness in Dr. M'Caul's mind; the only question he really cared for was, *the line of policy towards Israel* which the President of the Jews' Society would adopt or follow. When he knew that the modern policy of Bishop Gobat, and those then in power, would be upheld, he retired hurt and disappointed in the extreme, but his feelings of Christian friendship and esteem were no more disturbed then, than a man's feelings are in Parliament, when as a member, he finds himself out-voted on a great constitutional question, and out-voted by the very men whom he loves best.

P. 25. "My dear friend did not resent it," says Lord Shaftesbury. No, not it the least, *then or afterwards*; but he felt their difference of opinion intensely *because* the cause of God and of Israel, as he believed, would suffer in consequence of the failure of this his attempt on their behalf.

Hence it is obvious such expressions as these used by Lord Shaftesbury: pp. 30—35, "I am held up as a *person of this character*, that he (Dr. M'Caul) shrank from intercourse with me,"—"On his death-bed he could not forget the treatment he had received from me,"—"His feelings at that time were feelings of alienation and mistrust,"—"He trembled to see me,"—are simply so many fresh examples of the exaggerated language and mistaken views, which have unhappily characterized the proceedings of Lord Shaftesbury throughout this matter.

Dr. M'Caul's tenderest message to Lord Shaftesbury, consistent with extreme sensitiveness and deep distress, when he was contemplating the condition in which he was about in a few weeks or days, to leave "the seed of Abraham," "the friend of God!" And while the M'Caul family know and freely acknowledge his respect and gratitude and affection for Lord Shaftesbury, they also knew, that when the time of his departure was at hand, he was true as ever to the sound principles of Jewish missionary enterprise—

1. Of which he had spoken to his most intimate friends again and again, and to myself among them ;

2. Which he had maintained openly, at the Committee Meetings, in discussion with those whom he considered to be in fault on this account ;

3. Which he had maintained in the newspapers by letters now collected and printed as a pamphlet ; and

4. Which he advocated once more and for the last time of his life, when he called on Lord Shaftesbury respecting Bishop Gobat's part in the affair.

I will only add—that the charge made against me, p. 36, that "I drag before the *public* a thing so solemn, and without inquiry," as the final testimony of Dr. M'Caul on his death-bed, is just worth as much as the charge that I am untrue to my office as a Bishop, because I dare to stand up for the poor and afflicted, and for the truth and principles in respect to Israel, which I learnt to value from my friend Dr. M'Caul. I did not drag any one of them *before the public*, but I stated them in a letter to Lord Shaftesbury, to be laid, as I had a right to presume, before a private and confidential Meeting ;—a Meeting about which, when I objected to the presence of a solicitor as a member of Conference on Lord Shaftesbury's side, I had his Lordship's deliberate assurance that that gentleman was not there professionally, but in a private capacity, and *that everything which passed would be regarded as strictly confidential*. The same assurance was renewed afterwards at the second Conference, when I inquired as to what might become of the testimony which our witnesses might give.

It is not in any spirit of rebuke, but in hearty desire that past errors may tend to guide us aright through what remains to be done, that I close this statement by giving my view of what has mainly tended to divest our proceedings of the calm, friendly, and confidential character in which I and my colleagues desired that everything should have been carried on.

1. I think it a mistake that the colleagues of Lord Shaftesbury in Conference should have been those only who were members of the Jerusalem section, officers of the Society, and a legal gentleman, appointed to meet me and my friends—one or two officers might have been fairly introduced, but some independent persons might have been introduced also.

2. A great mistake has been committed by the Secretaries in the withholding of extracts of correspondence and papers to which we were entitled by the terms of our first arrangement.

3. The notion that strong and overbearing expressions could in the least advance the business or move the minds of my colleagues towards the opinions of those by whom such language was used, was a great mistake.

4. Much error and precipitancy were shown in the conclusions formed as to our purpose or desire to damage the name and memory of Dr. Macgowan, which we had especially endeavoured to avoid doing.

5. As again there was mistake in the distrust manifested with regard to our desire of promoting the welfare of the Jews' Society, and labouring for its good, provided only we could see its affairs administered on those principles to which it owed its success in its most palmy days.

6 And it has been a grievous mistake, which has produced an undercurrent of hostile feeling throughout the business, to suppose, as has been done, that we did not appreciate the character of the President of the Jews' Society, and his devotedness to every good work ; on the contrary, we firmly believed, and said among ourselves, when acquiescing in the unfair selection of the gentlemen by whom we were to be met, that we cared little who they might be, if we had the presence of Lord Shaftesbury at our deliberations ; we were satisfied that justice would be done to our statement ; we asked for his assistance.

In conclusion of these remarks, which are not written without much pain, amidst very great pressure from an ordination immediately at hand, and which I shall examine again so far and correct (before I give them in) as to endeavour to remove the possibility of their *improperly* creating pain to the mind of any whom they concern, I will only add : May the God of Israel bring good out of the infirmities and errors and mistakes which may have been manifested in the conduct of this business on either side of the members of the Conference ; and may He guide and bless the London Jews' Society, leading them to maintain His truth and nothing else in His own way ; and may He answer this prayer, and hasten the time when Israel shall be converted and saved.

J. C. ROCHESTER.

June 23, 1866.

Letter from the Rev. Joseph B. M'Caul to the Bishop of Rochester, in reply to the Earl of Shaftesbury's Speech, read at the Meeting of Conference, June 23, 1866.

19, PERCY CIRCUS, W.C.

June 22, 1866.

MY DEAR LORD,

The Earl of Shaftesbury, in the course of our second Conference on the claims of the Rosenthal family, endeavoured to invalidate the specific evidence adduced orally and in writing to us, from three of the late Dr. Macgowan's medical colleagues, and others to the effect that they had seen Dr. Macgowan in a condition of intoxication, by stating that my father, the late Dr. M'Caul, had been in the habit of friendly and confidential intercourse with him up to the period of his last illness, but had not alluded to so painful a fact. I replied that Dr. M'Caul was not acquainted with some of Dr. Macgowan's grosser failings until a few months before his death. It has since transpired, in the course of your Lordship's correspondence with the Earl of Shaftesbury, that since the year 1858 my father had rarely, if ever, spoken to the noble Earl upon the affairs of the Jews' Society.

In that year, it appears from the report of the Earl of Shaftesbury's speech of Saturday, 16th June, that my father fruitlessly endeavoured to lay before the noble Earl the unhappy part which Bishop Gobat took in the imprisonment of Mr. Rosenthal by Consul Rosen, and also the unjust and uncondid conduct of certain of the Executive of the Jews' Society. I have no hesitation in stating that* ———, Mr. Strachan, Captain Layard, Mr. Goodhart, and the Rev. James Cohen were those whom my father regarded as the chief obstacles in the way of obtaining an impartial inquiry into the miserable condition of affairs. These members of the

* Now deceased, therefore not named.

“Jerusalem Section” and of the Executive of the Jews’ Society, he considered, were fully acquainted with the more offensive details* of the Jerusalem troubles as they transpired from time to time, and that they so dealt with the business of the Jerusalem Section, that the Earl of Shaftesbury and the General Committee were not in a position to form a correct estimate of the magnitude of the scandals which were being enacted at Jerusalem. Such opinion is printed in the letter addressed by my father to the *Daily News*, and dated May 24, 1858.†

Personally, I entertained the conviction that the survivors of those whom I have named are not unacquainted with the sad details of the evidence which we have laid before the Committee. The selection of these officials and implicated persons to meet us, to the entire exclusion of independent Members of the Committee (some of whom have applied to be present, but have been refused), betokens, to my mind, anything but a desire to conduct the present inquiry in an impartial or fearless spirit.

Such being the case—and the Earl of Shaftesbury having checked my father with some considerable degree of warmth in 1858 (see his Lordship’s speech, p. 23), when he laid before his Lordship his belief in Bishop Gobat’s utter want of veracity—my father ceased to speak to the Earl of Shaftesbury *on the affairs of the Society*. Dr. M’Caul retained indeed, to his last moments of consciousness, a very sincere and affectionate regard for his early friend, but I have frequently heard him deplore the unhappy bias under which the noble Earl was acting *in reference to the conduct of the Jewish Mission*.

That my father supposed that Lord Shaftesbury entertained any personal feeling of hostility to the Rosenthals is ridiculous, and contrary to fact (Speech, p. 12). He was contented to wait until, in the course of God’s providence, the whole case should be laid before his Lordship, and then he felt convinced that the noble Earl would modify his opinions.

As my father lay upon his death-bed in a state of extreme and final exhaustion, the Earl of Shaftesbury most kindly called at St. Magnus’ Rectory to inquire after his health. Had sufficient strength remained, my dear father would doubtless have seen his Lordship, and commended, as a parting legacy, the state of the Jewish Mission to his reconsideration. The effort, however, was too great. Vital powers were well nigh gone. The least disquietude produced terrible fits of sickness, agonising and pitiable to witness; and so my father was obliged to forego the satisfaction of taking leave of his beloved friend, and entreating him to re-establish the Jewish cause, in which, and for which, he had spent his life, upon a more satisfactory basis. He had once regarded the Jewish Mission, especially at Jerusalem, as one of the surest pledges of blessedness to the Church of England. He had the pain of leaving it in a position which he contemplated with grief, as a cause of dishonour rather than of blessedness and strength. Regarding this conviction simply as Dr. M’Caul’s own private opinion, it must have been an unspeakable cause of regret to one whose success in bringing Israelites to Christ had been unexampled since the Apostolic times, thus to

* The Rev. James Cohen writes to the Bishop of Rochester (July 11, 1866), “Except during 1852-3 and 1858-60 I did not see the correspondence at all, except as other Members of the Committee did.” The year 1858 was the very year in which Dr. M’Caul made his last efforts in public and private to obtain a reformation in the affairs of the Jews’ Society.

† “Some three or four gentlemen manage such affairs, and probably the Committee, as such, know nothing at all about the matter.”—“*Jerusalem, &c.*” p. 24.

depart, leaving the one object of his holy life frustrated, as far as human means could reach.

But of Lord Shaftesbury's own personal kindness to himself he never doubted, much as he deplored that there should have sprung up, in later years, a difference of opinion upon a matter so near at heart.

Feeling the greatest repugnance to enter into any relations with the executive of the Jews' Society, I considered the Earl of Shaftesbury's presence *the single element* of hopefulness to the cause of the Rosenthals which we had taken up. In the name of my whole family, I had rejected the proposed attendance of any deputation from the Jews' Society at my father's funeral; but any overture of a similar kind from the Earl of Shaftesbury would have been respectfully and joyfully received. I can say on behalf of my entire family, that we cordially rejoiced when we learned that the Earl of Shaftesbury was willing to preside over the Society's delegates in the present Conference. We trusted that such evidence as has been produced, and we have yet to produce if needful, would have convinced his Lordship that Dr. Macgowan's antipathies and asseverations were no safe basis upon which to proceed against any person whatever, when personal integrity and the means of livelihood were at stake.

I trusted that justice would have been secured for the Rosenthals.

The Earl's earlier letters to your Lordship are full of assertions to the effect, that "an eager public panted" for an explanation of the frightful charges brought against Dr. Macgowan; but now, after two days of the most damaging evidence have been produced, the noble Lord challenges us in writing, and verbally at last Saturday's Conference, to "consign Dr. Macgowan's case to oblivion."*

His Lordship is now strangely forgetful of the "wretched widow's"† claims to a public vindication of her deceased husband.

I can only come to the conclusion, that we have so effectually established our case against Mr. Rosenthal's chief persecutor, Dr. Macgowan, that to "consign to oblivion," or to intimidate by personalities (with threats of the publication of these personalities), is the only (but most mistaken) course remaining to the defenders of a series of oppressive acts, as unchristian as they have been hurtful to the Jerusalem Mission.

Believe me to be, my dear Lord,

With great respect and regard,

Yours very sincerely,

JOSEPH B. M'CAUL.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

Statement read and put in by the Colleagues of the Bishop of Rochester at the Conference with Lord Shaftesbury and his supporters, on Friday, June 23, 1866.

At a Meeting of the Conference in the Rosenthal matter, held on Saturday, the 16th June, 1866, the Earl of Shaftesbury complained that, in a correspondence he had had with the Lord Bishop of Rochester, his fitness to sit as a member of the Conference had been called in question, and he claimed to

* Earl Shaftesbury's Letter, June 2.

† Earl Shaftesbury's Letter, May 11.

make a formal and minute statement, in the presence of his reporter, of his view of what had passed between himself and the Bishop on this matter.

The Bishop, and his coadjutors present, objected to the time of the Conference being taken up in listening to matters extraneous to the purpose for which the Conference had met.

But Lord Shaftesbury peremptorily insisted on being heard after his own fashion.

Out of courtesy to Lord Shaftesbury personally, but under protest, the Bishop and his friends, at great personal inconvenience, listened patiently for more than an hour to his Lordship's statement of matters having practically no bearing on the case they had met to confer upon.

On Wednesday, the 20th instant, the Conference again met, when Lord Shaftesbury handed a copy of his statement to the Bishop of Rochester, and to the Rev. Joseph B. M'Caul. The Conference was then adjourned to the following Saturday at 12 o'clock, that the Bishop and Mr. M'Caul might read over this document, and make such reply thereto, "in writing," as to them, respectively, might seem fit.

The Bishop of Rochester and the Rev. J. B. M'Caul, having read Lord Shaftesbury's statement to their friends engaged with them on the Conference, it was resolved by them unanimously—

That the matters treated of in this document have no bearing whatever on the merits of the Rosenthal case, for the friendly discussion of which the Conference was asked and accorded.

That it is a matter of regret that so much valuable time had been lost at the meetings of the Conference already held in arguing points introduced by Lord Shaftesbury irrelevant to the merits of the case they had met to consider.

That in regard to Lord Shaftesbury's present statement, they are content to leave it entirely in the hands of the Bishop of Rochester and the Rev. Joseph B. M'Caul—to whom it is particularly addressed,—to deal with as they may think proper, since neither in subject matter nor in detail have its points been previously brought under their notice.

C. F. S. MONEY.

*On behalf of those engaged in the Conference,
June 23, 1866.*

In consequence of what took place at the meeting of the Jews' Committee on the 22d June, the above replies by the Bishop of Rochester and Mr. M'Caul, together with Lord Claud Hamilton's letter of the 22d June, and the statement signed by Mr. Money of the 23d, were forwarded by the Bishop of Rochester to the Jews' Society, along with the following resolutions, to which Mr. Goodhart sent the answer in page 18 of the Report.

Attention is here called to the following facts and dates:—

At the Conference on June 16, Lord Shaftesbury made his personal attack on the Bishop of Rochester and the M'Caul family, and demanded a written reply.

At the Conference on June 20, two copies of it were given to the Bishop for his own and Mr. M'Caul's written answers, and the Conference was adjourned to the 23d to receive the same.

Notwithstanding this, on June 22, at a meeting of the General Committee of the Jews' Society, specially summoned for the purpose at the

instance of the noble Earl, a short-hand writer's report of that attack was presented for the approval of the meeting, without waiting for the reply for which the Conference was adjourned to the 23d.*

And on the 23d, in perfect accordance with such questionable antecedents, the noble Earl discourteously refused to receive the very replies which he had so peremptorily demanded.

This produced the following remonstrance :—

June 29, 1866.

WE, the undersigned, are surprised to find that the speech of Lord Shaftesbury, in defence of certain charges which, he stated, had been imported into the case against him, without the written statement in reply of the Bishop of Rochester and the Rev. Joseph M'Caul, had been read, at Lord Shaftesbury's instance, to the Committee of the Jews' Society.

We would, therefore, call for a copy of any Resolution passed in consequence, and also an account of the proceedings of Committee in reference thereto.

We now send copy of the Bishop's reply, and the three papers that were sent with it, with the request that they may be read at the next meeting of the Committee. And we also request that the names of the members of Committee present when Lord Shaftesbury's speech was communicated may be forwarded to us, as this is the first instance known to us of any matter having been made known to others than those who were actually parties to the Conference, the words of the President of the Society having been that the proceedings of the Conference were private and perfectly confidential.

(Signed)

CLAUD HAMILTON.
W. T. YOUNG.
C. F. S. MONEY.
J. W. HAYWARD.
J. B. M'CAUL.

Since the above was in type the following letter has been received by the Bishop of Rochester from the Earl of Shaftesbury, and forwarded by the Bishop with his reply. It gives another specimen of the tone adopted by Lord Shaftesbury throughout this Conference :—

July 21, 1866.

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's Chaplain, the Rev. J. B. M'Caul, has published a letter to the "Standard" of the 19th of this month, containing very defamatory statements against the character of the late Dr. Macgowan.

He asserts that these statements are founded on evidence taken before the Conference.

Your Lordship will remember, no doubt, that I and my friends proposed, "with a view to peace," a cessation of the needless, and, as we urged, offensive, inquiry into the history of the deceased physician.

Your Lordship, after deliberation, assented; and we, on our side, forbore to adduce the strong and abundant testimony that we possessed, both oral and documentary, in defence of the memory of that excellent man.

Your Lordship's Chaplain has now resorted to the public press; and, omitting all mention of what I have just replaced before your Lordship, has given to the world, as the result of the Conference, a one-sided, garbled account of the whole transaction.

This is a cruel and dishonourable violation of our agreement; and your Lordship will not be surprised that I hold your Lordship responsible for the conduct of your Chaplain.

I am, my Lord,
Your obedient servant,
SHAFTESBURY.

THE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

Your lordship will have the goodness to consider this letter as a *public* letter.

To which the Bishop of Rochester replied as follows:—

GENEVA, August 4, 1866.

MY LORD,

I have become accustomed to experience surprise at your Lordship's communications, and regret that this emotion should be again excited by your Lordship's note of 21st July, which has just reached me.

That I should be responsible for what Mr. M'Caul may see fit to do in his *private capacity* is indeed a conclusion to which few but your Lordship would assent. He and his family are probably better acquainted with Jerusalem affairs than any other living parties in England; they uniformly manifested their interest in them publicly before Mr. M'Caul became my Chaplain; they are competent to act for themselves; and I am not aware that, by discharging a particular service in respect of my candidates for orders (which his residence in London makes most convenient for such candidates), Mr. M'Caul is debarred from freedom of opinion or action in matters with which I, as Bishop, have no direct connexion whatever. It has been as a friend of the cause of Israel, and not as a Bishop, that I was led into communication with your Lordship, and Mr. M'Caul has acted in his private and individual capacity in what he has done.

That Mr. M'Caul should be singled out as if he only had acted a one-sided part in this disagreeable business is indeed astonishing, when your Lordship has been the first to have recourse to printing a one-sided statement for the information of the Jews' Society, in which no reference was made to the replies which you had called for from Mr. M'Caul and myself—which you had promised we should have opportunity of making—and which we had made.

I decline to correspond further on this business, for reasons which have been fully assigned to those members of the Conference Committee who will henceforward carry on the correspondence, if further communications are needful.

I am, &c.

(Signed)

J. C. ROCHESTER.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Members of the Conference	2
Introduction	3
Bishop of Rochester's first proposal to the Jews' Committee	5
Jews' Committee's answer of January 12	5
Jews' Committee's answer of January 30	6
Resolution at Bishop of Rochester's, on ascertaining that the representations sent to the Bishop by the Jews' Committee were incorrect	7
Statement of Facts, to consider which the Conference was held	7
Jews' Committee's Letter of April 6 upon the Statement	11
Difficulties on opening the Conference, and Lord Shaftesbury's requiring that, first of all, the private character of the late Dr. Macgowan should be investigated	12
Lord Claud Hamilton's Letter on Lord Shaftesbury's introduction of irrelevant matters	13
Difficulties on the fixing of a day, and Lord Shaftesbury's Letter of May 17	14
Protest given in against Lord Shaftesbury's language to the Bishop of Rochester	15
The arrangement made and agreed to, June 29, for continuance of the inquiry by a reconstructed Conference	16
The Jews' Committee Meeting of July 4 evade the carrying out of the arrangement of June 29	17
Bishop of Rochester's Resolutions thereon, and renewed call on Jews' Committee to carry out the arrangement of June 29	18
Jews' Committee Meeting of July 13 persist in refusing to carry out the arrangement of June 29	19
Bishop of Rochester's impressions on receiving Mr. Goodhart's Letters of July 4 and 5	20
Capt. Layard's Letter of July 20, inviting reply to new proposal of July 13	22
Rev. C. F. S. Money's Letter, July 21, enclosing Resolution of remonstrance against the Jews' Committee's departure from the agreement of June 29	23
Capt. Layard's Letters, July 24 and 27, alleging Mr. M'Caul's Letter in the "Standard" of July 19 as the reason of their not carrying out their arrangement of June 29	24
Mr. Money's answer, July 31, that Mr. M'Caul's Letter of July 19, elicited by Lord Shaftesbury's previous publication, was no excuse for the Jews' Committee's Resolutions of July 4 and July 13, refusing to carry out their agreement of June 29	24
Capt. Layard's Letter, August 3	25
Mr. Money's reply, August 7	26
Letter from Lord Claud Hamilton and Mr. Money to the "Record," in vindication of themselves and their colleagues from the personal attack made upon them in the "Record" of July 20, and refused insertion by the Editor	27

APPENDIX.

Refutation of the Charges brought against the Bishop of Rochester in the Earl of Shaftesbury's pamphlet	30
Bishop of Rochester's Letter to Lord Shaftesbury, May 14	31
Bishop of Rochester's answer to Lord Shaftesbury's personal attack of June 16	35
Mr. M'Caul's answer	42
Statement put in by the Bishop's colleagues, June 23	44
Lord Shaftesbury submits to the Jews' Committee his Speech attacking the Bishop of Rochester before receiving the Bishop's defence	45
Protest of June 29 by Lord Claud Hamilton and his colleagues against Lord Shaftesbury's conduct	46
Letter from Lord Shaftesbury to the Bishop of Rochester, July 21	46
Bishop of Rochester's reply from Geneva, August 4	47

5 0066

