A NORWEGIAN SUNDAY SERVICE.

The following description of a Norwegian Sunday service, extracted from "Norway in 1848 and 1849," by Thomas Forester, Esq., will be found interesting in reference to the scheme, promulgated in our columns, for establishing friendly intercourse with foreign Protestant communities, with a view to the restoration of Episcopacy amongst them. It will be observed that Mr. Forester—not a theologist, but clearly a sensible, observant, and religious-minded man—does not appear to have considered the question of Apostolical succession, to which we believe the titular Episcopate of Norway, so long under the Danish Crown, lays no claim. But the uncontroversial character of his testimony rendered its accession more acceptable; and the passages which we extract prove that a high degree of ceremonial worship, and the desire of manifesting by external signs particular reverence in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, are not, as it has been ignorantly or maliciously represented, incompatible with a Reformed Church. Mr. Forester's candid criticism moreover shows, in an unstudied way, what is the genuine feeling of a sincere English Churchman unwarped by Puritan prejudice. We are in the habit of being able, on this head, to furnish our readers with most valuable information upon Norwegian ecclesiastical matters, from a native source of the highest authenticity.

On the following morning the village green was enlivened by groups of peasants waiting for the arrival of the prasten, for the performance of Divine service. Cars and cabriolets brought in others from the neighbouring districts; and about 11 a.m. the bell, hung in a belfry in the form of a Greek cross, with a belfry and spire in the centre. There were galleries in each of the transepts, which were filled by the gentry of the place. The rest of the congregation sat below—the men on one side, the women on the other. The clerk, who occupied the desk of the eastern transept, was divided from the rest of the church by a screen reaching to the roof. It contained only the baptismal pew on the left, the minister's on the right, and the desk for the choir, consisting of men and boys, and their *klokkonger*, or precentor. The altar was covered with a white cloth, and above it rose an embellished screen of wood, all beautifully carved and gilded. It presented in several compartments, first, on the lowest, the Lord's Supper carved in high relief; then a wide space with the Virgin and Child on each side, and St. John on the other. In a niche above was our Saviour ascending, and, in the highest compartment, sitting in glory with his feet resting on a globe. On each side were images of the Apostles. No part of the church was painted or ornamented but the altar, except that which divided the English Church commencing a mission to the Jews in Jerusalem, who seem to be neglected by the Christians of the East, nor is there any wrong in this mission being superintended by a bishop, still less is there any positive evil in this bishop having control over the members of the English Church by necessity resident in the East. It therefore follows, as a matter of course, that so long as he is simply regarded as such, there is in itself no actual harm in there being a Bishop *of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem*. But this, the legal designation of Dr. Gobat, is unfortunately too long to be used on common parlance, and hence it is ordinarily abbreviated into "Bishop of Jerusalem," or, at most, *English Bishop of Jerusalem*—titles, I need hardly say, which are not known, and yet no more have they become, that we find even the University of Durham adopting the latter in its calendar, and Bishop Gobat assuming it in his correspondence with the Prussian Court.

The political and schismatical intrigues of Lord Palmerston and the Church Missionary Society are but the development of the notion embodied in the Royal Mandate of Bishop Gobat's title, namely, the doctrine that the object is to be regarded as the head of a new English or Protestant religion in the East.

Of course, I do believe that much of this evil would be remedied if Bishop Gobat had a title such as that which Bishop Tomlinson has in a see very similarly circumstanced.

I may ignore all reference to the Church of Abyssinia, in the Red Sea, it or is not under the jurisdiction of Dr. Gobat. In fact, as I have never heard mention made either of church or chaplain with reference to the Church of Abyssinia, it would then become his whole territorial diocese, and he could have a title from it as Bishop of Aden, such as Dr. Tomlinson has from the rock of Gibraltar. This act would at once show to the Catholics of the East that no schism was intended by the British Church.

I may just say with reference to this suggestion that there would be in the arrangement I have mentioned no breach of faith with Prussia; for the Bishop of Aden might still continue to reside chiefly in Jerusalem, which was all that Prussia bargained for when she offered her moiety of the endowment.

I may further add, that if Aden became the seat of the bishopric, it might possibly suggest a new opening for the spare energies of the Church Missionary Society. The whole continent of Arabia has yet to be brought under the dominion of Christ, and for such a conquest Aden would form a most valuable starting point. Surely an effort like this, to reclaim from the land of the false prophet the children of faithful Abraham, would be a far nobler enterprise for the society than the attempt to lead a few ignorant Greek Catholics into schism!

I would only further suggest that the instructions to the *Bishop of Aden*, while permitting him still to reside in Jerusalem, should limit his ministrations exclusively to Jews and Arabians, after attending to the wants of the English residents there; and, since, as I see no reason why our Jerusalem bishopric should not become a blessing to the Church and the world.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

W.

NAVAL EXPENDITURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR—As you have at various times called public attention to the profuse expenditure in our Naval Department, you will, perhaps, forgive me for asking, through the medium of your columns, if it be the public money should be expended in fitting up a frigate to convey Lord Frederick Fitzclarence and his family to Madeira?

It was only a few weeks ago that a Government steamvessel was placed at the disposal of Sir George Grey, to make a tour round the Irish coast, for the benefit of his health; and various other instances might be mentioned which would go far to explain the extravagance of our Naval Estimates.

I trust you will think it right to call public attention to the subject; and perhaps you will have the kindness to point out why a steamer under the vessels of the State are placed at the disposal of private individuals.—I remain, your obedient servant,

M. P.

ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR—In your notice, in this day's *Chronicle*, of the performances of M. Lassaigne and Mdlle. Prudence last night, at the Hungerford Hall, you seem to imply that any person can get up a tour round the country with the vessels of the State as