

“I find that the American Church, who have doubtless well considered authorities in this matter, beyond what, with the limited means at my command, I am able to do, have laid it down as a rule that a *bishop*, or two-thirds of the clergy, alone can present a bishop. And this precedent appears to me to be confirmed by a sense of common propriety.”

Another letter, written in December 1858, shows how clearly the Bishop of Natal had already discerned and laid down the lines within which the controversy must be decided. It will be seen, therefore, that, although the circumstances were changed five years later, there was no change in his position, and therefore no room for the charge that he then hit upon a mode of resistance and escape of which before he had not even dreamed. The letter speaks for itself.

TO THE BISHOP OF CAPETOWN.

“December 1, 1858.

“I hope that when the Bench of Bishops meets, they will take into consideration the question of metropolitanical jurisdiction as well as the constitution of Church Councils. . . . So, too, I use the word Province of the South African dioceses ; but only in a popular way. I see clearly Canon Jenkins, and probably the Dean, does not—but looks upon you as an independent Metropolitan. That you would be, doubtless, if you were Metropolitan by Church authority, and not by Royal Patent. But it seems to me that we are really still in a certain sense within the *Province* of Canterbury, by virtue of the clause which makes your proceedings subject, not merely to the supervision, but to the *revision*, of the Primate. To take for example an instance. Suppose that on a clergyman who had signed adherence to our present rules of Council . . . I found it necessary, because of some infringement of the rules, to pass a sentence of suspension, and he appealed to you, and you (as you say you should do) reversed my proceeding, of course I must submit to this, as the Bishop of Exeter to the Archbishop in the case

of Mr. Gorham ; but I imagine that I should do right to appeal to the Archbishop, not to reverse, but to revise, your decision, and that, if he decided against you, you would be bound in conscience to follow that judgement in case of any future appeal of a similar kind. This is the way in which our mutual relation at present presents itself to my own mind. But it would be most desirable that the whole matter should be settled for us by the proper authorities in England."

It follows that no judgement of a South African or any other Metropolitan could be final, whether their patents were valid, or not ; that the appeal from these Metropolitans to the English Primate was to him not personally, but in his official capacity ; and thus that from him there lay the final appeal to the Sovereign in Council. Although therefore points of detail might remain unsettled, the path of procedure was perfectly clear, and the path in South Africa was the same as that in England, with the same precautions for the freedom of all, and the same safeguards against merely ecclesiastical decisions. But this administration was for Bishop Gray intolerable. He had already formulated to himself the constitution of a Church with a discipline far more wide-reaching than that which survived in the Church of England, and appealing to theological standards which could not be imposed upon the English clergy. When the more serious trouble came, Bishop Gray expressed not merely surprise but astonishment at the opposition which he then encountered ; but there was really no reason for either feeling. He had shut his eyes to the warning ; but the warning had been given with unmistakable clearness.

We shall soon see the Committee of the Church Council in collision with Dean Green. This assembly of clergy and laity had been convened, as the Bishop was specially careful to tell them, not as a synod nor as possessing any legislative powers,

but simply as a deliberative conference, summoned not for making laws binding all members of the Church in the diocese, but to determine whether such a synod should be called at some future time. This Council, therefore, could bind only himself, so far at least as this, that, without pledging himself beforehand to adopt implicitly any advice which they might give him, he should feel it his duty to follow any course recommended to him by a decisive vote of the conference, if possible, and as far as possible, in all points.

If such a legislative assembly should be hereafter convoked, the name given to it would be a matter of no moment. It might be known as a synod, or by any other title.

“But the real question that will be before you is simply this.

Is it desirable that at regular intervals a body similar to this should be convened, for deliberating and deciding upon matters properly falling within its cognisance ; that is to say, matters of discipline and not of doctrine, which are of consequence for the progress and welfare of the Church of England in this diocese ? I say, matters properly falling within its cognisance, because the power of such a synod must evidently be limited by the fact of our connexion with the Mother Church of England. And the limits in question are very clearly defined in the Bill which was introduced into the British Parliament about three years ago, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the purpose of giving legal effect and validity to the proceedings of colonial synods.”

This Bill, carried through the Lords, was lost in the lower House, chiefly owing to the opinion that for the management of Church affairs in the colonies statutable aid was unnecessary, and, if unnecessary, highly inexpedient. Colonial dioceses were now left, in matters within their cognisance, to act for themselves. From the subjects within their range the Authorised Version of the Scriptures, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Articles of Religion must be excluded ; but

they would have power to deal with differences arising between the Bishop or clergy and the laity in any part of the diocese ; with the general questions of finance in reference to Church work, whether among the Christian or heathen population of the land ; of the extension of Church work either among towns or villages ; of joining, where it might be practicable so to do, the office of school teacher with the work of the ministry ; of the management of Church schools, and education generally ; of patronage, clergy discipline, the tenure of Church property, and other like subjects. The convening of such an assembly would relieve him as Bishop of an immense weight of care and responsibility which he had now to bear alone, by having to decide points of importance by his own single judgement, assisted only by the counsel of a few of the presbyters.

“ I have longed,” he added, “ for the time when the whole body of the clergy and the laity who should come to my help should together make their own laws, and change the government of the Church in this diocese from an apparent despotism under a single head, or from a state of anarchy and confusion, to one of orderly and constitutional rule.”

There remained the question of the constitution of such an assembly, and this in its turn involved the consideration of parishes, the qualification of parishioners, and of candidates for representing the laity in synod, as well as of the manner of voting (whether in person or by voting papers). But without waiting for the summoning of such an assembly, there was one subject which he especially desired to commend to their attention ; namely, the arrangement of the difference which had arisen between himself as Bishop and the parish of Durban.

“ I would here,” he said, “ place myself wholly in the hands of the conference, assured that you will consider both what is due to my office among you, and what is due to the peace

and welfare of the parish of Durban,<sup>1</sup> and, with it, of the whole Church in this Diocese. Most thankful, indeed, shall I be, if no other good result from this conference but the healing of this one breach, which has been a source of grief,

<sup>1</sup> It is, perhaps, enough to say here that in this parish a good deal of opposition had been offered to arrangements which, for the mere purpose of securing orderly Church government and administration, seemed to the Bishop not merely desirable but necessary. To the request that a revenue might be raised by the letting of all the seats in the church the Bishop had replied that he strongly objected to the pew-rent system; that all the members of the Church of England "have an equal right to share in the privileges of God's House, where rich and poor should be able to meet together in the presence of Him who is the common Maker and Father of all." He refused, therefore, to sanction the mortgaging of the pew-rents in order to clear off the debt on the building; but he expressed his readiness to take the responsibility of the debt upon himself, relying "for the return of the money which" he had "already lent, or may be required to expend for the completion of the buildings, solely upon the voluntary offerings of the congregation." He had directed that Holy Baptism should in his diocese "be always administered, as prescribed in the Rubric, in the time of Divine Service, after the second lesson." He had also urged obedience to the Rubrics relating to the offertory, and expressed his conviction that the people would soon come to value the privilege of giving, be it ever so little, according to their substance, for the service of God, and of having their gifts "laid reverently by the minister on the table of their Lord, and thankfully presented with a prayer for God's blessing upon it" (Sermon at Richmond, Natal, 1856). In this work of Church administration he was aided by Archdeacon, afterwards Bishop, Mackenzie. But the moderation of the Bishop's counsels failed to satisfy a certain section of the parishioners of St. Paul's, Durban, and their opposition took a form which threatened an outbreak of physical violence. The Bishop therefore issued an order for the closing of the yet unconsecrated building, until he should be assured that no such attempts at disturbance would be made, at the same time directing the Archdeacon to hire a room at the Bishop's charges for the celebration of Divine Service. The party of malcontents chose to treat all this as an offensive display of sacerdotalism, and to regard the Bishop's directions as a virtual secession from the Church of England. Their manifesto, April 1856, called upon their brother parishioners to "stand fast to the truth," and to "trample over these efforts at innovation." The clouds seemed for a moment to be rather dark; but the troubles gradually passed away, without committing the Bishop to any departures from the decent order of the Church of England.

---

I doubt not, to others concerned as well as myself: we shall not then have met in vain."

The questions of the intelligent Zulu, which furnished to English journalists an excellent subject for merriment and mockery, were to have serious consequences for the colony of Natal, and for the world which lay beyond its limits. They were to provoke the zeal of the Bishop of Capetown to the illegal exercise of an irresponsible power, which under the guise of making peace introduced only a long and disastrous schism. To a certain extent the seed sown by Bishop Gray after the so-called Capetown trial fell on congenial ground. The elements of division had long been at work on the soil of Natal, and they were furnished not by Protestants and Puritans, but by those who would rather have associated themselves with Thomas of Canterbury or Hildebrand. Among the clergy of the Natal diocese were some who had a very hearty admiration for the method after which Gregory VII. dealt with the emperor at Canossa, and who had every wish, so far as their power went, to go and do likewise. This is the substance of a complaint urged against Dean Green, Canon Jenkins, and the Rev. R. Robertson in the Report of a Committee appointed (1858) by the Church Council, of which more will be said hereafter, to consider the general question of their secession. So far as it affected themselves only, their action was a matter of supreme indifference; but it ceased to be so from the point of view of the general interests and welfare of the Church in Natal. These clergymen, it seems, had withdrawn from the preliminary Church Conferences on pleas which were proved to be mere pretence. Their real ground was a resolution not to sit in any assembly which questioned or denied their right to dictatorship and called upon them to vote along with the laity. The Report stated it as an indubitable fact that Dean Green looked upon himself not as a fallible

human being, intrusted with special spiritual functions, but as an unerring interpreter of Scripture, holding that not only the laity but his fellow-presbyters and the bishops were bound to receive his interpretations, and to bow to his opinions and belief. The Dean, it seems, had expressed surprise that the Church Conference "did not tremble when he told them that they were acting in opposition to the Bible." If he did so speak, the words of the Report were not one whit too strong. In the same Hildebrandine spirit, Dean Green, as we have seen, had at an ordination service refused to communicate with the Bishop because the latter had preached a sermon<sup>1</sup> of which the Dean was pleased to disapprove. His action revealed a remarkable rule which in the Dean's judgement ought to be followed in matters concerning himself.

"He says," the Report tells us, "that in case of any difference of opinion between himself and the laity of the Church, the laity are bound to yield obedience to him, pending an appeal to higher ecclesiastical authority, just as in case of a difference of opinion between the clergy and the Bishop the clergy would be bound to obey the Bishop, pending an appeal to yet higher authority. When the case of difference of opinion between the Bishop and himself arises, he at once, and without hesitation, disregards the authority of the Bishop, while he makes his appeal. He thus wishes for unqualified and unhesitating obedience when it is himself who is to be obeyed. When it is himself who is to be obedient, he thinks it the more convenient, or more correct, practice to ignore the authority of his immediate superior, the Bishop of the diocese."

In such case he could of course discharge in his own person the functions of accuser, jury, and judge. Having thus exercised summary jurisdiction by insulting the Bishop within the choir of his Cathedral, Mr. Green could condescend to summon

<sup>1</sup> One of the sermons on the Eucharist already mentioned, p. 99.

the Chapter to consider the conduct of the Bishop in putting forth heresy. Such conduct, the Report adds, "speaks with an emphasis that additional words could not increase." In the meeting held for the purpose of electing delegates for the Church Conference, Mr. Green, although he declined to oppose this course, yet insisted that the framers of the Constitution of the Church Council had been guilty of altering the Constitution of the Church of Christ, and "further avowed that he held their guilt to be akin to that of those who wounded the natural body of Christ while on earth." The Committee, therefore, declare summarily that while the Dean holds the Council to be guilty of heinous sin, they on their side hold him guilty of insubordination towards his Bishop, of arrogant assumption towards his brother clergymen and the laity of his Church, and of extraordinary perversion of the meaning of Scripture.

Among the settlers in the district of Durban at this time was a clergyman who, in the words of the Committee, "had made himself somewhat notorious by adopting in the church of Pinetown obsolete gorgeous-coloured vestments," and who had been forbidden by the Bishop to minister in his diocese without a licence. Objecting to an order issued by the Bishop with reference to the offertory, this clergyman informed the Bishop that his spiritual authority lay in abeyance, and that he purposed to continue to exercise his powers as a priest of the Church of England. Taking courage, he then wrote to Bishop Gray, presenting the Bishop of Natal as a schismatic, and was informed by the Metropolitan that, if any clergyman in the diocese of Capetown had pursued the same course, he should have deemed it his duty, after sundry warnings, to excommunicate him for disobedience. The clergyman thus rebuked wrote again to Bishop Gray, telling him that he differed from him in this matter, and that he should continue to celebrate the Eucharist after his own fashion without giving heed either



to him or to the Bishop of Natal. This clergyman, the Committee add, Dean Green took into his confidence, and made him his adviser and counsellor.

The conduct of these four "priests," as they loved to style themselves, becomes important as a sign not merely of division but of anarchy, which should have warned Bishop Gray of the dangerous nature of the materials with which he had to deal. In his own subsequent proceedings against the Bishop of Natal he might have these and other such men on his side; but any successor in his metropolitanical see who should follow a Puritan or Protestant model would be resisted by them with fully as much pertinacity as that with which he felt himself bound to withstand Bishop Colenso. The schism effected by Dean Green and his supporters in 1858 was a token of the temper to be exhibited later on in the so-called Church of South Africa.

TO G. S. ALLNUTT, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June 15, 1858.*

"The Governor (Mr. Scott) has made a grant of £300 to this Institution, which I hope he will allow me to use for building purposes. But there is no cordiality whatever on his part towards us—no generosity. I am sure that he would not have given a penny if he could have helped it. He did hold back as long as he could, months after he had promised £200 a year to Mr. Allison; and at last was compelled by force of circumstances—our work staring him and everybody in the face in such a way that it could not be passed over—to grant something; and he has given as little as he could. For when he gives £200 to Mr. Allison, £200 to Dr. Callaway, and £200 to Mr. Pearse, neither of whom has *a single native to maintain* (so that the whole £200 can be used for teachers), and neither of whom stands in any need of buildings to accommodate 40 or 50 children, as we do, it is plain that £300 to us is by no means a proportional grant. Nay, the last two have not even begun

their work ; . . . and our work is well advanced, and tested already by its fruits. We have four good printers, and four young carpenters, and eight or ten agriculturists ; and besides all this *we* have, in addition to all our boys and girls, a station work going on here quite as important as at either of the other two stations,—I mean, a work among adults, which we carry on here, as well as our educational proceedings. So that to have been just, the Governor should have given us £300 per ann. for our schools (which will just pay the expenses of the living and clothing of the children), and £200 (as he has given to the rest) for our station, for obtaining Industrial Teachers ; and then for *building* our Normal Institution, the only one in the colony, and which will train teachers, I trust, for the whole land, he should have given £500. As I have said, all that I can hope is that he will allow his £300 to be spent in buildings. I may thank Mr. Shepstone for getting this grant. I have explained how matters stand to Bishop Gray, and, *as far as I can*, to Sir George Grey. If the former has any influence with our present Colonial Secretary, and if our Church controversies here do not stand in the way, I dare say our Governor may get a hint from head-quarters ; and I feel sure he will if Sir G. Grey gets to England, and his voice is heard in Downing Street. The change of Mr. Pine for Mr. Scott is the old story of King Stork and King Log. We must try to realise that one Ruler is over all, and work on patiently and thankfully with what He gives us. But the trial is to see precious time running away, and opportunities wasted which may never be recovered. Our own natives could now be reached everywhere, and the Zulu nation is quite open to us ; but nothing can be done with spirit as regards either.”

TO THE SAME.

“July 3, 1858.

“Every month makes some important change in our circumstances here, and gets me, I dare say, at S.P.G. the character most undeserved, of changing my plans continually, as if it

were possible that matters could be conducted in such a land as this, where everything is rough and raw, with the order and certainty attainable in older colonies. . . . At this moment Mr. Scott has got himself, I imagine, into a terrible difficulty. He has been giving away land by wholesale in the most unwise and wasteful manner. Nothing could have been more rash and prodigal than his proceeding, by which every third-rate person in the colony was enabled to pick up a valuable piece of land. The result is that all the choice land in the colony, except that which is to be found in the reserves set apart for the natives ten years ago, is given away for *nothing*, before an emigrant lands. Now the emigrants are coming fast ; and one ship has just come, and with it also, by the same mail, a very stringent order from the Secretary of State that he is to give away no more land, but to sell at an upset price of 4/- per acre. This will be a most unfortunate thing for the new comers and the many who are making preparations to come. And all this has arisen from the Governor's rash and hasty measures taken to please the populace ; and without waiting, it would seem, to see whether they would be approved by the Home Government, he has committed himself to bring out these emigrants. Some few voices were raised at the time in the colony against the proceeding. But, naturally enough, they were soon hushed, while every one was looking after his own grant, and scrambling to get a good slice of the colonial cake. But *now* will come the difficulty, and I fear there will be great discontent and disappointment. As to the colony itself, it is almost ruined by these large and wasteful grants, in the hands of persons . . . who are utterly unable to deal with them profitably. But I foresee what the Governor will look to for his escape. The poor natives will be made to suffer ; and the lands reserved for them, which the Europeans have for some time been coveting, will be taken away from them, unless Dr. Hodgkin and other good friends of the Aborigines at home look well after the matter. They have plundered the natives of £10,000 a year in taxes, have done nothing whatever, year

after year, to educate and improve them, and now make their very ignorance and barbarism the excuse for motives to plunder them of their lands also.

“Our Governor unhappily, though a most good-natured, is one of the weakest of men. He has, from the very first, as Dr. Mann tells me, had a very strong prejudice against our work as being ‘unpractical’; and I am not sure that, on his first arrival, the Doctor himself, either from the Governor’s talk or his own inexperience, did not share in, and perhaps assist the prejudice. The fact is the Governor came to the colony about eight months after we began our work with the young savages, when, thank God, we had made considerable progress with them, but yet things were necessarily in the rough about us. . . . The Governor came, but he never made a single inquiry as to what we were doing or had done. He saw a little oasis in the midst of the wilderness of heathen barbarism. And he seems to have taken for granted that it was the most easy thing in the world to effect what we had done,—that, in fact, we had done nothing,—we were not practical. The Governor’s notion of ‘practical’ seems to be confined to the idea of raising cotton, and such-like out-of-doors occupations, which may make a native a better machine for the purposes of his European masters, but not a better or a nobler man. It so happened that during that very year we *had* gathered a good cotton crop, and our boys had been worked daily in that employment. But the season was over when the Governor came. He saw nothing of the labour, and as he cared not to hear or learn any of our proceedings, he went away from the station as wise and as prejudiced as he came. . . . To my surprise, a few months after, I found that he intended to set up Institutions of his own all over the land, taking for granted that what we had done (by patience and hard labour, and ‘practical skill’) he could do, and far more. He tried his hand at an abortive experiment on Zwart-Kop, and spent £600 or £700 most uselessly. The whole thing came to the ground and has been utterly abandoned, and was certainly one of the most absurd

attempts at 'practical working' that I ever heard of. . . . But I feel it to be due, partly to myself, but above all to Mr. Baugh, who really deserves the credit of almost all that has been done here—to let my friends know at all events, whatever the Governor may think or say, that our present state of efficiency in what Mr. Scott calls 'industrial pursuits' is but the simple consequence of adhering steadily to the course we have all along from the very first been pursuing, gaining a step wherever we could, pushing on from one point to another as opportunities enabled us, adding one occupation to another as soon as we had the means of doing so effectually, and so as not to break down and be a laughing-stock at the very outset. . . . I have long thought that I should like to speak out my mind to you and any other dear friends at home on this point. And I feel it to be due to Mr. Baugh, as well as to myself, to say distinctly that our present industrial doings, and the success which by God's blessing has already attended them, are not *in the least degree* due to any stimulus or *assistance* we have lately received (except in sewing), but to the steady developement of the plans we have all along been pursuing, as far as circumstances allowed."

TO THE REV. F. D. MAURICE.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *December 7, 1858.*

"My DEAR FRIEND,

"I have just received the copy of your sermon on the Eucharist, which I have been so long and so anxiously expecting, because I have heard from your sister, and my clergy and laity have heard from the Bishop of Capetown, and through a private letter which the Dean has communicated, that you dissent from the views expressed in my two published sermons, and have in that sermon embodied your own views in distinction from them. I have read the sermon, I need not tell you, with the deepest interest; and time being precious to both of us, and the subject of vital consequence, I will not beat about the bush for words to

express what my impressions are on reading it, but come at once to the point. My conviction, then, is confirmed that you have never *actually read my sermons* (having, I am quite sure, plenty of other work to do), but have been content with hearing from your sister, or from Bishop Gray, some extracts from them, coupled with the interpretations which they from their point of view might very likely put upon the whole. I say this because, from beginning to end with the exception of two short expressions, one at the beginning and one at the end, in which you seem to set forth the *thesis* and the *sum* of the discourse, I do not find a single sentence with which I do not heartily agree, nor any view expressed with regard to the Eucharist and our Lord's presence in it which differs from that which in far feebler words I have tried to set forth in my sermons. I must conclude, therefore, that the two passages I refer to must be interpreted by the intermediate context, and that though I do not think I should use either of them myself without some modification, yet in reality they mean no more than I myself should try to utter in my own way. The first of these passages is that where you say, 'Can we say that the Presence of our Lord, which is promised in the Eucharist, is a presence of a *different kind* from that which a faithful Christian may expect in ordinary prayer?' And you go on to condemn a negative reply. If you really do mean that there is a difference in kind in our Lord's presence at the Eucharist, so that then, and then only, 'can there be a communication to believing souls of our Lord's manhood'—for this is what my Dean asserts—and that this *difference in kind* is caused by the presence of the priest, which is after all the point which lies at the bottom of the whole question, then I must admit that there is a serious difference between your views and mine. Otherwise I have said, as you have, that 'we eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, when we approach in humble faith the holy Eucharist, in order that so we may be able more vividly to realise His presence at all times, and may eat Him, and live by Him habitually and constantly.' I have said that

'it is the *appointed means* for keeping us in mind of the real presence of our Lord with us at all times.'

"The other passage in your sermon is where you say that 'this Sacrament transcends all other modes of intercourse,' and proceed to assume that those who think with me, 'place it on the same level with them, forgetting that it is the specially Christian ordinance,' whereas I have said, 'We must hold that the highest and holiest form of worship, in which we can eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, is when we partake of the one bread and the one cup as members of one body in Him,' in addition to such words as I have quoted before. But would you say that a missionary deacon, because he lives far away among the heathen, and has no *priest* at hand, cannot partake of the *same kind* of spiritual food as his more favoured brother living in town, or that a pious Christian who lives 20 or 30 miles away from town in this land, and thinks it more profitable to himself and his family to hold family worship at home on Sunday than to ride into town in a broiling sun or pouring rain to partake of the Holy Eucharist, was therefore debarred from any share in *the same kind* of spiritual food which the priest alone can offer him? For this, I repeat, is the real point at issue in the conflict which I am engaged in. The Dean has distinctly put in words a statement of his belief that 'in the *two Sacraments* there is a communication (if by believing we are able to receive it) from our Lord's manhood to us' (I do not quite like the expression, but it is his own—I mean the 'Lord's manhood'); 'but in the ordinary assemblies there is *not* a communication to all believing souls of our Lord's manhood.' And I distinctly assert that if there be in the Lord's Supper a 'communication of our Lord's manhood,' or whatever may be the mystical blessing expressed by eating His body and drinking His blood, we have no Scriptural warrant for saying that the *same kind* of blessing is not given in other modes of communion with Him who is our hope, however needful it may be in order to receive that blessing fitly at all times, that we should obey our Lord's

command with respect to the Holy Eucharist, as He shall give us the call and opportunity.

“P.S.—I have also read the Sermon on Confession. And here again the question arises, What do you understand by Priest? Do you mean an episcopally ordained minister with the apostolical succession only? or would you say (as I certainly should) that the absolution which came from the lips of a ‘discreet and learned’ old Dissenting minister, with the experience of age and the ripe savour of a tried and faithful Christian life about him, was just as valid to the sin-burthened conscience as that which might be pronounced by some young Curate full of his notions of priestly authority?”

TO G. S. ALLNUTT, ESQ.

“December 7, 1858.

“... We have not much news to communicate by this mail, being principally interested with the desperate struggle now going on between our Lieutenant-Governor and his Legislative Council. The latter have refused to do any business unless the £5,000 reserved upon the Civil List for native purposes (out of which we get £300 for this Institution) shall be left in *their* hands instead of the Governor's. I do not much fear the result, even if they do get possession of it, as I think, however other Mission Stations may fall short of the requirements, our work here is sufficiently ‘practical’ and successful to obtain their approval and support. But this dispute between the Executive and Legislative Powers is a serious interruption of the welfare of the colony. Our educational affairs especially must all remain in the background for the present.

“I am at present, and have been for some time past, very closely engaged with the Zulu grammar, which has now reached the most difficult part, and requires very close attention.”



TO THE SAME.

*February 5, 1859.*

“We have had by this mail a very kind conciliatory letter from Bishop Gray. His tone is completely changed, and I think his letter will do more to heal our divisions than any severity could have done.”

The following letter, addressed to his brother-in-law, gives the Bishop's thoughts and judgement with reference to the mission undertaken by Archdeacon Mackenzie. The Bishop of Capetown had proposed to the Archdeacon that he should serve as a missionary Bishop, to be placed under the see of Capetown.

TO C. J. BUNYON, ESQ.

*BISHOPSTOWE, May 9, 1859.*

“. . . The real hitch about the Zulu bishopric has, I believe, been all along the difficulty I have felt in recommending a man who has shown in many instances so great a want of judgement, and who within the last month has been visiting Mr. Crompton,<sup>1</sup> an open and avowed rebel, who, having no license, administers both sacraments in his own chapel within a few yards of the Parish Church which he never enters, the altar decked up with all the frippery of ritualism and lighted up with candles at mid-day, and who loses no opportunity of abusing his Bishop and showing an utter contempt for my authority. When the Zulu bishopric was first mooted, I warmly recommended Mackenzie, whose many excellent points no one could more heartily recognise than myself. But then broke out our dissensions, and he has ever since followed the Dean through the mud, wherever he dragged him. I was obliged to say that I could not now maintain my first recommendation of him, and must wait to see him acquire a little more experience before I could say that he was fit for such a difficult post as that of Bishop to the Zulus. After a while I saw that, perhaps, he might be sent for a time as a missionary presbyter, meaning,

<sup>1</sup> The clergyman mentioned already, p. 107.

of course, that he should be sent by me and be under my direction. For, as you are aware, we are here in the closest relations with the Zulus. . . I have always regarded them as an outlying portion of my diocese to be taken in hand on the first opportunity, and, as you know, have made all my arrangements to be able to go among them. Now I feel *very much* the putting of this mission, if it is carried out, under the see of Capetown, to be very undesirable ; and I would much rather have Mackenzie made Bishop at once of the Zulus, though retaining as strongly as ever my distrust of his judgement. He may do better among the heathen than among the white or a mixed population. . . However, if he is to go under the see of Capetown on this mission, or, indeed, if he is to go at all, (as now, it would seem, he must, having been so formally asked and being willing,) he will ultimately be made Bishop, and may as well be made so at once. One of his sisters, Alice, is now staying with us, and is, in every way, an admirable, first-rate missionary. Now so greatly do I object to the notion of his being directed from Capetown, or my acting as mere deputy for Capetown in the matter . . . that I have written to say that I prefer to withdraw my objections to his being consecrated, and recommend him as earnest, devout, and energetic (saying nothing of his judgement). You will hear what course affairs take at S.P.G. But what I want to put you on the guard about is this,—not to let him come out as an S.P.G. missionary, to work in the Zulu country under the see of Capetown. It is a piece of ecclesiastical theory, but a practical absurdity. If he comes out as Bishop with S.P.G. money, well and good. I shall be rejoiced to give him all the help and counsel I can, and he will be then, properly, under the Metropolitan as the other suffragans are. But if he comes out as S.P.G. missionary, then I cannot but hope that the Society will think it right, as I have so often called their attention to Zulu matters, to place him under me ; and, in fact, there is no reason why the Church represented by the Archbishop and bench of Bishops (I suppose) should not request me to regard the Zulu country

as an archdeaconry attached to my See, until a Bishop is appointed."

The Bishop's patience was again tested this year (July 1859) by the misconduct and ingratitude of a man named Ryder, who had served not only as a builder, but also as a general overseer at the Station for nearly two years. From the first this man had shown, with some good qualities, not a little peculiarity of manner, which after a time seemed to point to serious lack of principle. It was not without reluctance that the Bishop parted with prepossessions in his favour for a judgement less severe than that which others were disposed to pass upon him. The story is one of no special interest now, and it may therefore be enough to say that during the last few months of his employment the man seemed to cast off all restraint, and resorted to the law courts for damages against the Bishop who had been faulty, if faulty at all, only in showing him far too much kindness. He had steeped himself in perjury, having sworn, for instance, that he had made 70,000 raw bricks when the total was 37,750; that he had bought forty loads [of wood] to burn them when he had bought twenty-two. But the judge was a popularity hunter; with him the Bishop as a clergyman must be wrong in a matter of business; and in spite of Ryder's contradictions, he obtained from the jury a verdict for a sum which the Bishop could ill afford to lose, and for which the plaintiff had not a shadow of rightful claim.

TO THE REV. F. HOSE, RECTOR OF DUNSTABLE.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *July 4, 1859.*

"I was rejoiced to see your handwriting by the last mail, as a reminder of the past, and a pledge that I am not altogether forgotten by some of my old friends in England. You do not mention the present or future name of the lady about

whom you write. But I shall gladly show her any attention in my power when I get to know of her arrival in the colony. I fear, however, it is but little I can do to show an interest in her welfare. My rule is to visit the white population, or rather the small centres of white population, once a year. But my time is principally occupied with work for the heathen. This is at present, I fancy, the only diocese where the work of preparing grammars, dictionaries, and translations must necessarily fall upon the Bishop. Our work began here with the foundation of the See ; and though other Christian bodies—as usual—preceded us into the field, they had done very little indeed towards laying down the language for other teachers, or preparing books for the use of the natives. Our Church of England missions are far in advance in this diocese in each of these respects. And now, it may be, our Church is about to stretch out her hands for a wider grasp, and to embrace the Zulu people, and the tribes of the Sovereignty and of Kaffraria within her direct influence.”

TO THE REV. T. P. FERGUSON.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *August 9, 1859.*

“ The great drawback here is that the country is already saturated with a corruption of Christianity, and the natives have acquired such a view of the character of God and of the Gospel as keeps them back from desiring to have a much closer acquaintance with it. This they have obtained, partly from the example they have constantly before them in the lives of unfaithful Christians—partly from the mistaken teaching of the missionaries. ‘ God said, Let them be destroyed : the Son rose up and said, Let them be saved, let me die in their place.’ When such a sentence as this is found in an elementary Catechism of the most influential missionary body in the colony (besides our own) as the watchword of Christian teaching instead of St. John’s ‘ Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He first loved us, and sent His Son,’ &c., how hard, and impossible,

humanly speaking, it must be to convey to these converts a true idea of the Gospel, and how must the idea they have received be still for them distorted in its transmission to others?"

TO C. J. BUNYON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *November 8, 1859.*

"Your letter reached me outspanned for breakfast, a few hours from Panda's chief kraal, which I had left the previous evening, after a very pleasant and successful interview with the Zulu King. I had already visited his son Keshwayo, and hope that I have established happy relations with both. Panda has given us a most desirable site for a mission station. . . . You will have gathered from my letters that it was no part of my own *original* purpose to go myself as Bishop to the Zulu country at this moment. I did and do contemplate the going there ultimately if the Church calls me to the task. But I do not think the country is quite ripe at the moment for that step being taken. Until the succession is *settled*—which may be soon or may be delayed a year or two,—I think the Mission work in Zululand can better be overlooked by a Bishop here than by one on the spot. A resident missionary would, I think, be in no danger; but a resident Bishop of *our* Church would be, unless the father can be brought to recognise Keshwayo as the future ruler. . . . I shall, however, do nothing rashly in the matter of the Zulu bishopric. My present feeling is, and my dear wife's also, that I ought to go, if called; and if I ought, I hope I shall be found willing to go, and so will Frances, from no mere blind enthusiasm for black people, but from a simple conviction that we are in this world just to do the Master's work, wherever He or His Providence may see fit to place us, and for no other purpose whatever."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 5, 1860.*

"I daresay that Archdeacon Mackenzie's having accepted (I suppose) the headship of the Zambesi Mission will have set

at rest some of his friends' complaints of which you speak. But, in case of its being necessary for you at any time to defend my character in the matter, I will just set down a few facts respecting it:—

- “(1) It is wholly untrue that he went to England expecting to be made Bishop of the Zulus or to go at all to the Zulus. He knew perfectly well that I was going to offer myself, weeks before he left Natal, and might have stopped here altogether, if he had pleased.
- “(2) It is equally incorrect to say, as perhaps some may say, that he went home to be made Bishop of Natal in my place. He himself told the Bishop of Oxford and Bishop of Capetown that I wished this, and then wrote to me to say that he began to think he had not correctly stated what I said about the matter,—which was true enough, for all I said was that I felt sure the Bishop of Capetown would nominate him, *if* I vacated the See (and that would only be if the funds were forthcoming for the Zulu country, which as yet they are not),—but that I did not at all know what the Archbishop of Canterbury might say to it.
- “(3) Then why did he go home at all? Partly because of the act of the Bishop of Capetown, in writing to offer him the Zulu mission, telling him (what he had not told me) that it would be placed under himself as Metropolitan,—and partly because of Mackenzie's own want (as I think) of proper feeling towards myself, in that, while he heard me stating my very strong objections to that proposal,—so strong, as I told him, that I should use all the influence in my power to prevent its being carried out,—he was still determined to accept the offer of the Metropolitan and set my wishes at naught. Upon this, rather than have a collision with the Bishop of Capetown, which I certainly should have had, if his proposal had been carried out,—having only the time from 10 p.m. on Sunday night till 8 a.m. the next morning, to hear for the first time of the proposal, and decide what advice to give or what steps to take in consequence,—I said he had much better go, *as he was determined to go* under the Bishop of Capetown, and

be made Bishop, than go as missionary. But within a week or so, having had time to deliberate and take counsel with my wife upon the whole matter, I communicated to him my decision to offer myself for the Zulu work, with which he expressed himself, and I cannot doubt sincerely, to be altogether *satisfied*,—I might say, *delighted*.

“(4) But if I said anything definite to him, as to the direct purpose of his going home, it was that the best thing that could be done would be to send him to the Zambesi, which has actually come to pass, I suppose.”

TO FRED. D. DYSTER, M.D.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *February 8th*, 1860.

“I have long had your letter by me, intending to reply to it, but wishing to be able to say something definite concerning my own future movements, as I am sure you will take an interest in our work, and may be able in some way to forward it. With respect to the Polygamy question, all my experience has deepened and confirmed the convictions I have already expressed in print, that a most grievous error has been committed all along by our Missionary Societies in the course they have been hitherto adopting with regard to native converts who have had more than one wife at the time of their receiving the word of life in the Gospel. Lately I have had the pleasure of meeting a very able missionary of the Rhenish Society from the S. W. coast of Africa among the Damaras, who told me that they constantly acted on the principle I have advocated, and that the best man of his flock, the most devout and spiritually-minded, a constant reader of the Gospel and most humble, earnest inquirer after truth, and a regular communicant, was also a polygamist. He told me also that the whole Lutheran Church acts on this principle, and especially that the missions which a section of that body are now vigorously prosecuting in the Zulu country will be conducted upon it. This last is very important with reference to us and our proceedings. You will probably ere

this have met with paragraphs in English papers stating that I had resigned the see of Natal and was about to proceed to the Zulu country. This is not exactly true. I have not yet resigned this see ; but I have offered, and, with my wife's full approval and hearty consent, am now prepared to do so, if the Church at home desires it ; and I am now in monthly expectation of a definite reply from the S.P.G. upon the subject. I expect that the proposal will be accepted, and arrangements made for carrying on a vigorous mission work among the Zulus. My past experience and the acquaintance I have been able to gain with the language, and the body of Christian natives whom I should hope to take with me, are all advantages which I could not transfer to another, and they have led me to conclude that it is my duty to offer myself for this work instead of merely sending a missionary. It may be necessary that I should come to England to raise funds for this purpose, as it would be idle for me to sacrifice my present post of usefulness without the means of putting the experience I have gained into present action. In that case I may hope to see you some day at Tenby. Could you do anything meanwhile to secure a few friends who would take a kind interest in the work and stretch a hand to help, in case I have to make a call upon the Church for aid in the matter? And can you come yourself to help us, with your medical skill, which would be invaluable—indispensable, in fact? We must have a medical man of ability, both for the sake of the Zulu people and the mission party. Now, Captain and Mrs. Barton tell me that your health is not strong in England, and that you have been at the Cape in consequence. Our climate, whether we remain here in Natal or go into the Zulu country, is far better suited than the Cape, I imagine, for persons with delicate lungs. . . . What a glorious work it would be for a really earnest warm-hearted medical man to devote himself to establishing a Hospital and raising up a medical school in connexion with our mission work, either in Zululand or Natal! Your deafness, of which Mrs. Barton tells me, would be of no



consequence. We could talk and interpret for you ; and the first thing I should ask would be that you would put me and the other missionaries through a simple course of medicine, for our own profit and our people's. Please think this matter over. I hope Mrs. Dyster will throw in a word to help you to—shall I say?—the right decision. But God will guide you and us to do right, I trust, whatever we decide on.”

The history of the Bishop's life in Natal shows the impartiality of his devotion to the interests alike of the Europeans and the natives. The latter, from their ignorance and their helplessness, called more especially for his protection ; but he rejoiced to think that their welfare must be promoted by the progress of English civilisation in the colony, if only the powers created by this civilisation were rightly and conscientiously used. When he spoke, June 26, 1860, at the banquet which celebrated the opening of the first portion of the Natal railway, he asked leave to be allowed to regard the event chiefly from a missionary point of view.

“I have had an opportunity,” he said, “of hearing some remarks of intelligent natives upon what they have witnessed this morning, and it may interest you, perhaps, to hear of what kind they are. One who possesses a wagon, and seems to be of a practical turn of mind, is of opinion that if these steam horses are multiplied in the land, they will very much interfere with his wagon business. Another says, ‘Since they can do these things, why, if their hearts were bad towards us, they could tread us down under their feet!’ And a third wonders that, if we can effect all this, we cannot also conquer death. We cannot conquer death in the sense in which the native meant it. But we can tell them of the Lord of Life ; we can remember to connect our country's glory and greatness with her duty and her mission to be, more than any other nation, the messenger of God's mercy to all the ends of the earth ; we can remem-

ber that we have come to this land not merely as Englishmen, but as English Christians, and that the Great King, who has given us such power by land and by sea, who has given to us our great empire, our commercial spirit, our genius for colonisation, has given also into our hands the Book of Eternal Life, and bidden us go forth in His name and teach His Truth to all nations, more especially to those whom He has placed under our sway. We must seek to Christianise as well as to civilise the natives round us. The two works must go on together, or each will be a failure."

TO G. S. ALLNUTT, ESQ.

"February 4, 1861.

"I have returned safely and happily from Capetown, where the consecration [of Bishop Mackenzie for the Zambesi Mission] took place on January 1. We had a conference also of Bishops, which will lead, I suspect, to some discussions in England. The Bishop of Grahamstown was not present, but came after I had left Capetown. He and I are agreed in direct opposition to the Metropolitan (and, I suspect, S. Oxon), who insists upon it that Bishop Mackenzie is one of his *suffragans*. We entirely deny it, and we suppose our statements will become public. We refer also the question of Polygamy to Convocation for consideration. My views are more decided than ever, supported as I now find myself to be by strong Missionary authorities, such as I had not any idea of when I began the controversy. Bishop Mackenzie came up with me in H.M.S. *Lyon*, Captain Oldfield, to Natal. . . . He went on to the Zambesi last Tuesday. The larger portion of his party went on by the *Sidon* about a month ago; and the only fear is that they have been exposed to the deadly malaria of the delta while waiting for his arrival. He was kept behind by the unfortunate necessity of having to wait for the arrival of three bishops to consecrate him at Capetown. I was there first: ten days before any other bishop. Then the Bishop of St. Helena arrived on Christmas Day, having been brought in

a vessel which was chartered for the purpose at an expense of £250 to the Mission. In short, the hobby of having the consecration at Capetown, which was to bear out the notion of the 'South African Church' sending out the mission to the Zambesi, has been a very costly one, and I think the experiment will not soon be repeated."

TO THE SAME.

"March 5, 1861.

'Sir G. Grey seems to have now given up all idea of coming up here, and I am very much inclined to think all his plans for the Zulu country will go to the wall. . . . Mr. Scott, our Governor, has just returned to us with flying colours. I have not yet seen him, but probably shall to-morrow and learn what his plans are, and how far I can throw myself into them.'

Five months later, August 2, 1861, he writes to Mr. Allnutt to say that he has secured passages to England for his family and himself on board a small sailing vessel, which would leave Natal for London in March or April, 1862. A month later he tells his friend that he will soon receive a copy of his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*.

"I fully expect that it will be violently attacked by High Church and Low. I am not sure that Mr. Maurice will agree with all of it. But this is not a time to care for things of this kind. I fully believe that a terrible crisis is at hand for the Church of England, and have tried to do my part to help some to stand firmly, when many props upon which they have been hitherto relying shall be felt to give way under them. The Bishops of Capetown and Grahamstown are both strongly opposed to me, and very probably will take some public action in the matter. However, as I now hope to be in England in the spring, I shall be able to defend myself in person, if necessary.

"I think that our Institution may be considered as drawing

to an end for the present. At the time of the Zulu Panic<sup>1</sup> . . . all our boys were scattered to their homes. It would have been, no doubt, possible to have recovered them, and indeed Mr. Shepstone had given the requisite orders for that purpose. But then several weeks elapsed, and they were getting settled at home. And unfortunately the health of our master, Mr. James, had given way completely. . . Under these circumstances, as I have no other teacher whatever, but the young ladies of my household and Miss Mackenzie, and we are going so soon to leave the colony, Mr. Shepstone and I agree that it would not be wise to require the boys to come back. . . Let us hope that the education which they have received will not be lost upon them in after life."

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop refers to a scare caused by the rumour of an intended invasion of the colony by the Zulus. The alarm was described by Sir Theo. Shepstone in 1871 as a serious one, "which turned out to have no real foundation." One alleged object of the supposed attack was the murder of the refugee prince Umkungo, and Bishopstowe, where he was at school, was considered a point of special danger. "For some time," writes Mrs. Colenso, "the Bishop stood out against all suggestions that he himself should leave the station. At last, on the personal representations of the Governor, he consented to bring his family into town next day. In the dead of night, however, William [the well-known convert] knocked breathless at the door to say that the Dutch owner of the farm beyond Bishopstowe had just passed in flight to the town with all his belongings, saying that a Zulu force was already on our side of Table Mountain. This seemed serious, the word was passed quickly but silently round, and in a few minutes the whole valley was astir and making for the town. William, who had sent on his wife and babies on the first alarm, only joined the party when more than half way to town, having delayed, as he certainly believed at the risk of his life, to inspan his wagon, because, he said, he knew that the "little one," the Bishop's youngest daughter, could not walk so far, and the "Inkosi himself was not strong" (the Bishop was suffering from a sprain). Very clear evidence of the groundlessness of the general panic was afforded in a letter which the Bishop received the next day from the Zulu country, and in which it was stated that the Zulus, so far from intending hostilities, were themselves apprehensive of an invasion from Natal.

## CHAPTER IV.

### “THE COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.”

THE publication of the *Commentary* referred to in the letter of September, 1861, to Mr. Allnutt, preceded by not very much more than a year the appearance of the first part of the Bishop's *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch*. Both works pointed to a condition of thought not much in harmony with the teaching of what, for lack of a better term, must be called the traditional schools of Christendom; and it was not likely that the members of these schools would care to consider the one apart from the other. A perusal of the so-called Capetown trial of 1863 may leave the impression that, if the volume on the Pentateuch roused a keener feeling of indignation for the disturbance of ground regarded as inviolable, the *Commentary on the Romans* awakened a deeper resentment for the rude upsetting of convictions held to be beyond reach of all hostile argument. By far the larger portion of the speeches of the accusers is taken up with the scrutiny and censure of the latter work, which is denounced as virtually leaving scarcely a single distinctively Christian doctrine unassailed, and as practically rejecting most of them.

One fallacy running through the whole of these speeches is the notion that their comments on particular doctrines carry with them somehow the weight of authoritative statements, and that their statements of doctrine are such as must be binding

of necessity on every clergyman of the Church of England. With an uneasy feeling that the ground here was unsafe beneath their feet, they betray their anxiety to draw out that which they are pleased to speak of as the doctrine of the Church of England with a clearness which shall render further misconception impossible, and bring it into a condition not unlike that of the laws of the Medes and Persians. With such a state of mind the Bishop of Natal had no sympathy whatever. With him there could be no growth without thought, and no thought without growth; and when once he felt that the search for truth called on him to follow out a certain track, he was not one who would be deterred from taking this course by any denunciations of men who insisted that the whole truth had been discovered already. He would have admitted, and he did admit, that some of the opinions held by him in past years had been modified; but he insisted not less strenuously that the whole Christian world, nay, the whole family of mankind, are all undergoing a training, and that even the most rigid of sacerdotal systems may, and indeed must, mark only a stage in the religious education of the world. With him theological terms and phrases were valuable only as pointing to eternal realities; and the outward sign was in every case separable from the inward gift.

But the Bishop of Capetown was altogether mistaken when he spoke of what he called Dr. Colenso's revolt against the faith of Christendom as the result of the extreme Calvinism in which he had been trained. He was wrong as to the fact. Dr. Colenso's earlier letters show that he lived in an atmosphere which may be compared to that of the "Clapham Sect"; but there is no evidence that he at any time held those notions of election and reprobation which are, perhaps not unjustly, regarded as the distinctive features of the theology of Calvin. Looking at one of his own children in

the innocence of her infancy, he asked a friend how any one looking on a babe could be a Calvinist ; and the mind set free to work on the thought of the Divine Love as embracing all children, as such, began to work its way onwards into happier and more serene conditions. But he never supposed that his *Commentary on the Romans*, any more than any other of his works, was weapon-proof ; and it is more than possible that he would have modified or even withdrawn some propositions on which he lays considerable stress, in obedience to the pleadings even of his Capetown accusers, provided that these had assured to him at starting the full measure of justice to which every Englishman in England was, and is, beyond all question entitled, and which there he would certainly receive. No one was more ready than himself to allow that the same truth will be expressed by different men in different ages in a very different way, and therefore that the language of such a writer as St. Paul on such subjects as sacrifice, redemption, justification, should not be put forth as the only legitimate expression of belief on those subjects. In later years he felt this more forcibly : and most assuredly there never has been a time in which it has been more needful for those who wrap themselves up in a traditional orthodoxy to face the fact that the religious thought of the age does not adapt itself readily to much of the phraseology current in the early centuries of the Christian era. But his great contention was that when St. Paul was using language from which many at the present time turn with something like a feeling of repulsion, the Apostle was seeking to convey a meaning the very opposite to that which he is often supposed to express, and that to those whom he addressed he succeeded in conveying that meaning.

In short, the Epistle to the Romans was for him a living book, the utterance of a living man dealing with actual conditions of thought differing indefinitely from our own, and seeking to lay bare errors which might be fatal, and to remove

perplexities which must be stumbling-blocks, if they could not be swept away. From first to last, therefore, his task might bring him into collision with the prepossessions of parties or schools which fancied themselves in possession of all truth ; and in fact it did so. The very introduction to the book brought on him vehement charges of heresy, because he presumed to ask who and what the people might be whom St. Paul was addressing. In the eyes of the Capetown accusers there could be no question at all ; and so long as they refrained from forcing their opinion on others, they were perfectly free so to think. For them it was absolutely certain that St. Paul was writing to men whose creed was much the same as that of the Nicene Council, and who might be described as taking much the same view of things with the Bishop of Capetown. But the Bishop of Natal refused altogether the restraints of such swaddling bands. The propositions so vehemently put forth at the Capetown trial go far towards depriving the Epistle of all force and meaning ; and in England every clergyman is perfectly free to say so. It will be a terrible and monstrous thing if this liberty should be restrained in Southern Africa, and if any changes should occur to render the introduction of such restrictions possible in England.

In truth, the condition of those to whom St. Paul wrote at Rome is of the first importance, if we wish to understand his letter. That this letter was sent before he himself set foot in Rome no one, of course, will doubt ; and if we give any credit to the narratives of the Acts of the Apostles, it is not less certain, as the Bishop says, that when he reached the Eternal City, a Christian Church, in any precise sense of the words, had no existence there. There were heathen, and there were believers. The latter had heard of the teaching of Jesus, and felt no decided antagonism towards it, and no prejudice against the Apostle when he styled himself His bondman. The Christian



leaven was working in the Jewish society at Rome ; but it had not yet resolved itself into a force opposed to ordinary Jewish tradition. As in the Epistle, so later when he appears among them in person, he addresses himself directly to Jews, and tells them that he has come on an errand which concerns "the hope of Israel." By them in turn he is requested to say what he thinks, because they know that the party which laid special claim to Christian discipleship was a sect everywhere spoken against. "In other words, they had evidently no knowledge of a Christian Church existing in their very midst at Rome." Undoubtedly in St. Paul's eyes they were all "called ones of Jesus Christ"; but it does not follow that all who are called obey the calling, and at the same time we need not suppose that any purposely or deliberately made light of it. In a certain sense he could address all as Jews, and all as Christians, and have intercourse with them on the same footing of friendship as with Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth. These were Jews, but Jews seemingly

"with a strong tendency to Christianity, which St. Paul himself, by his long and close intercourse with them, was the means under God of fostering into a downright, earnest, genuine profession of the Christian faith."

But the language of the greater part of the Epistle is itself conclusive. It

"assumes in the reader a very familiar acquaintance with Jewish history, and Jewish practices, and Jewish modes of thought, such as no mere ordinary convert from heathenism, especially at a time when there were only manuscripts, and the books of the Old Testament were not in every one's hands, could possibly have possessed. St. Paul passes rapidly from one point to another, as if sure of carrying his readers along with him, without stopping for a moment to explain more clearly to the Roman mind any one of his

allusions. The Jew's 'resting in the Law,' his making his boast in God, his confidence in circumcision, the story of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in some of its minuter details, the destruction of Pharaoh, extracts from the Psalms and the Prophets,—all these are brought in when the arguments require it, without any doubt seeming to cross his mind as to the possibility of his illustrations being unintelligible, and his reasoning failing to take effect, because of any want of acquaintance, on the part of those to whom he wrote, with the main facts of Jewish history."<sup>1</sup>

At once, then, a flood of light is thrown on the argument and purpose of the letter. The condition of thought here treated of may seem unreal or extravagant to us; and in truth, with all the faults of which we may be conscious or guilty, it is not easy for Englishmen generally to throw themselves into the temper of a Pharisee of the Pharisees. If we had not before us the Calvinistic theology, we might find it hard to convince ourselves that the theories of particular election and partial salvation could be entertained by any; that any could look on themselves as having an indefeasible title to mercies and blessings denied to others, and calmly look forward to their own beatification at the cost of the rejection and ruin of all mankind beside. We read of satisfaction in work done, rather than of striving after a life of love, of a supercilious contempt of those who were not within their own charmed circle of covenant and privilege; and we are tempted to think that we are looking on an imaginary picture rather than on a sad reality. The abominations of Genevan theology may surely serve to dispel such a delusion, and in any case the very existence of the Epistle to the Romans is proof that St. Paul had to deal with such a state of feeling, unless we suppose that his description is altogether of his own devising.

<sup>1</sup> *Commentary*, p. 2.

But the title-page of the Bishop's work stated especially that the Epistle was here explained from a missionary point of view ; and in many quarters the announcement was received with a sneer as being little better than a pretence or a mockery. The book, it was averred, contained no instruction for a missionary, and would only fill his head with heresies destructive to every article of the Christian faith. It is enough to say that no one who looks through even half the volume with moderate care can fail to see that the instruction of missionaries was uppermost in his thought. He looked on them as messengers to those who were sitting in darkness and the shadow of death, and the question which he had to answer was, What is the message with which they were charged ? Without moving a step in the inquiry, he was quite sure that the message must be one of good tidings—in very truth, a gospel, and that if it were not such, it must in the long run fail. He did not mean to deny that appeals to men's fears and pictures of arbitrary retribution might make an impression for a time, or that a message of good though in some degree perverted or abused might yet work in some measure for the welfare of mankind.

Of this the history of Christianity furnished abundant proof. But he held that far more than this was needed, if the grace of God was not to be hindered. It was indispensable that the whole counsel of God should be made known, and he believed that this counsel was *nowhere* more vividly set forth than in the Epistle to the Romans. This Epistle dealt the death-blow to all notions of covenant and privilege, to every theory which substituted anything in the place of that one thing with which alone the righteous Father and Judge of men could be satisfied. It maintained that His justice, His mercy, and His love were alike unchangeable and unfailing ; that His Will was absolutely righteous, and that it must work to produce righteousness, in all beings endowed with a capacity

for righteousness. It excluded further all unworthy thoughts of God, all notions which ascribed to Him either partiality or vindictiveness, and still more all those dreadful ideas which led men to suppose that evil would be left to itself in any part of the Creation by a deliberate exercise of His Will.

It would have been difficult, therefore, for him to select a task bearing more directly on the work to which he had given himself ; and it had filled his thoughts from the time of his consecration. Nay, before his consecration his letters to Mr. Ferguson and other friends show that even then his mind had long been working in this direction. There are still some surviving of those who accompanied him to the Cape at the end of 1853, and these will remember how he read with them this Epistle with the express purpose of showing how its general drift and teaching had been misapprehended, and how St. Paul's language had been perverted into a sanction for theological formulæ from which he would have shrunk with horror. But he held that its true meaning could be seized only by bearing strictly in mind the temper and condition of those whom St. Paul was addressing. These were, above all things, convinced that God was a respecter of persons, and that he was pledged to have special respect to the descendants of Abraham after the flesh ; and the effort of the Apostle from first to last was to convince them that no delusion could be more thorough and more fatal. The very key-words of the whole letter were heard, the Bishop maintained, in the first chapter, when he declared that the power of God was unto salvation to every one who believed ; the three points involved in this assertion being : (i.) that salvation is wholly of God, wrought by His power, bestowed by his love, of His own free grace in the Gospel, and therefore to be meekly and thankfully received as His gift, not arrogantly claimed as a matter of right ; (ii.) that it is meant for Jew and Gentile alike, for *all*

that believe; (iii.) that it is to be received by faith alone, by simply taking God at His word, not to be sought by a round of ceremonial observances or acts of legal obedience.<sup>1</sup> The Gospel then was the setting forth of the righteousness of God, that is, the righteousness or state of righteousness, which God gives graciously to man, as He gave to Abraham when He called him righteous who himself was unrighteous, when He counted his faith to him for righteousness.<sup>2</sup>

But all have sinned, and all are daily sinning, and come short of God's glory; and all are, on the other hand, made righteous, justified freely by the grace of God.

"In former days," he asserts, "the Jews were all 'made righteous,' treated as righteous, though many of them individually were unfaithful. They were all embraced in God's favour, and dealt with as children, not for any works of righteousness which they had done, nor for any virtue which they possessed in themselves as descendants of Abraham, but because of God's free grace."<sup>3</sup>

But the gift is now bestowed upon all who

"will be content to be righteous in His sight, not for any worthiness of their own, or any peculiar claim they may fancy themselves to have upon His favour, but simply because He is graciously pleased to call them righteous, to account them as righteous creatures, for the sake of His own dear Son, whom He has given to be their Head and King."<sup>4</sup>

It is obvious that for those who do not take the Pharisaic position these arguments and appeals lose their direct force. But St. Paul was writing to those who did intrench themselves within these barriers; and to them his words came with irresistible power. Where the man is bowed down

<sup>1</sup> *Commentary*, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 245.

simply with the sense of sin, where he despairs of his power of growth in goodness, where the thought of covenant or privilege never enters his mind, where his one prayer is that he may be set free from the evil within him, the pleadings of St. Paul to these Christianising Jews must be, to say the least, superfluous. To many at the present day they may seem unintelligible. In such there is a strong impulse to say that they have no wish to be counted or to be reckoned to be anything but what they are, that they have no desire to be labelled as good when they are not good; and this feeling, there is no doubt, is a natural reaction against the language of theologians like Martin Luther. Emphatic protests have been made against the notions

"that the scheme of salvation should be one of names and understandings; that we should be said to be just, said to have a righteousness, said to please God, said to earn a reward, said to be saved by works; that the great disease of our nature should remain unstaunched; that Adam's old sinfulness should so pervade the regenerate that they can do nothing in itself good and acceptable, even when it is sprinkled with Christ's blood."<sup>1</sup>

But even thus the seeming verbalism is not entirely excluded. The counting or reckoning is said to apply to that state or time which has preceded conversion, and with reference to this state we are told that

"God treats us *as if* that had not been which has been; that is, by a merciful economy or representation, He says of us, as to the past, what in fact is otherwise:"—

the formal statement assuming this shape, that

"our formal justification is not a mere declaration of a past fact, or a testimony to what is present, or an announcement of what is to come, . . . but it is the cause of that being which before was *not*, and henceforth *is*."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Newman, *Lectures on Justification*, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 86.

It is not easy for those who do not care to entangle themselves in theological technicalities to see how this language differs from that of St. Paul. It does not, probably, differ at all; but, if so, the same harmony must be claimed for the words of the Bishop of Natal. Here also there is the distinct assertion that God looks on all men as His children, though they may be disobedient, and that the work of His Spirit is to make them so in truth. But in the Bishop, as in St. Paul, there is the further faith that it is His will to cast out the evil from all, and that that which He wills He is able to accomplish.

Nor is this all. In all these arguments the purpose of St. Paul was to throw down, to cast to the winds, all confidence resting in and grounded on what he called the works of the law. This word "law" is not the only one which St. Paul, with other writers in the New Testament, uses in more than one definite sense. The same remark applies to death, life, and other terms. But it is specially necessary to note the mode by which the law, which he regards as a burden convincing men of sin, was received. Moses is the mediator, the one by whom it is promulgated to the Israelites: it comes to him through angels of whom he seems to speak as the principalities and powers of the Kosmos; and hence that which is received from them is a bondage to which he deplors that the Galatians should allow themselves to be subjected.<sup>1</sup> It would seem that he has these beings in his mind when he warns the Galatians against himself or an angel who should dare to preach any other Gospel than that which had been preached to them.<sup>2</sup> When, therefore, he speaks of the intolerable yoke, he is speaking not of the living and life-giving

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iv. 3, 8. There can be little doubt that the word *στοιχεῖα* is here used in the sense which it bears in modern Greek. Cf. Eph. iii. 10, vi. 12; Col. i. 13, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. i. 8.

law in which the Psalmists found their joy, and rest, and peace, but of the organised Mosaic law—the system of rites, ordinances, ceremonies, outward offerings—the most potent engine ever invented for the oppression of the human spirit. It is this law, the curse of which is said to pass on Jesus Christ;<sup>1</sup> it is the wrath of this law, from which the Apostle tells the Thessalonians<sup>2</sup> that Jesus is delivering them,—not the wrath of God, for he insists in the same letter that the appointment of God is not to wrath, but to the deliverance which shall make them sound and strong.<sup>3</sup> All his writings, in short, point to the one conclusion that the shattering of this yoke, and the dispersion of the monstrous errors which had grown up under its shadow, were the objects nearest to his heart; and this, of itself, would be enough to show that the Epistle to the Romans could not really be animated by the terrible spirit of modern Calvinism.

This spirit, the Bishop insists, is conspicuously absent from all those passages which are regarded as its strongholds. Among the foremost of these is the sentence in which St. Paul speaks of the potter's power of forming vessels for honour and dishonour. Shall the clay say to him that is fashioning it, what makest thou? was a question put long ago by Isaiah; and the question points to clay still soft under the potter's hand, which can be moulded afresh. "May not the Heavenly Father," the Bishop adds, as drawing out the meaning of St. Paul,

"deal with the Jewish nation as He sees fit, fashioning it first, if He sees good, into the shape of a vessel designed for high and honourable use in his service, and then if He sees that the vessel is marred in the making, and will not answer His purpose, unmaking it with a stroke of His hand, and out of the self-same lump making another vessel, for dishonour,

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iii. 13.<sup>2</sup> 1 Th. i. 10.<sup>3</sup> 1 Th. v. 9.



for some lower use, which shall answer His purpose still, and be used in His service, though in another less honourable way?"<sup>1</sup>

That this is the true meaning of the passage he is assured by the words of Jeremiah, who speaks of the potter as making another vessel out of the same lump of clay from which he had shaped one that had been marred under the process.<sup>2</sup>

"So then," he adds, "the Great Potter, when a vessel is marred in His hand in the making, when He sees that a people, or a Church, or an individual, will not answer to the end for which He fashioned it, will make it into another vessel for His use, as it seemeth good to Him to make it. He will not cast it away, but re-fashion it, to serve for a lower and less honourable use in His Kingdom. 'And so,' says the Apostle, 'may it now be with you. You were fashioned, indeed, to be a vessel unto honour; Israel to be the light, and Jerusalem the joy, of the whole earth. But the Potter may see that you have become marred in His hand in the making. He may even now be fashioning you into another vessel, a vessel still for His own use, but for a lower purpose, that even by the loss of those high privileges which you have hitherto enjoyed, by being deprived of that glory for which He designed you, and portions of which have already been vouchsafed to you, you may serve His great ends, as a witness and a warning to others until the time of mercy shall come again for you, and the clay be once more taken in the Father's hand, and fashioned anew at His will.'"

He thus regards it as "indisputable" that St. Paul is not arguing that the Potter has power to make out of the same lump, *at the same time*, two vessels, at His own arbitrary will, one for honour, and the other for dishonour (so as to support the

<sup>1</sup> *Commentary*, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> Jeremiah xviii. 3-6.

Calvinistic view).<sup>1</sup> The idea of such arbitrary action was for him rather unmeaning than merely repulsive. It is absurd, as well as abominable, to ascribe to God anything which savours of chance or caprice; and when St. Paul declares that God has mercy on those on whom He wills to have mercy, while whom He wills He hardens, he insists that this blessing or this judgement goes forth "not by any mere arbitrary proceeding but by an unerring law of righteousness."

"Where He sees a faithful humble soul, following the light already given, . . . there He wills to pour out His mercy. And where on the other hand He sees, as He alone can see, that there is a root of evil within the heart, . . . there He wills to pour out His judgement. And what will the mercy be? Increase of grace to those that are in grace, the softening and subduing, the cleansing and purifying, of the heart, while it grows in the tempers which become the children of God. And what will the judgement be? The loss of that grace already received, the hardening and deadening of the heart, which is the natural and necessary consequence of indulged evil, just as the growth in grace is the natural and necessary consequence of obedience."<sup>2</sup>

But if it is needful to note carefully the passages in which St. Paul uses the word *law*, there is even more need to watch his use of the terms life and death, and especially so when he speaks of the life and death of Christ. Some passages in the *Commentary*, in which the Bishop dwells on this subject, were objected to in the so-called Capetown trial for reasons which it is not altogether easy to understand; but although these objections are worth nothing, it must probably be admitted that his language might be more exact. Thus, of that event, or incident, which we call the death of the body, he speaks as being to Christians "no longer a token of the curse lying heavily upon us," and "no longer a woe inflicted on us by

<sup>1</sup> *Commentary*, p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 238.

the tyrant sin." But from first to last, in the Old Testament and the New, there is not a word to warrant the supposition that it was such a curse, or was even caused or introduced by sin at all; and most certainly we have no other authority for so thinking. There is absolutely no room for the inference that the physical constitution of man has been changed, and that the machine which now wears out was made at the outset capable of resisting all wear and tear. All the evidence at our command shows that wherever on this planet there has been physical life, there has been that which we call physical death. Death, then, is a term which may have for us three meanings. It may denote: (1) the change or incident which involves or brings about the dissolution of the outward and palpable form—a change of which, in Bishop Butler's words, we know nothing beyond some of its phenomena; (2) the consequences of disobedience, the death which is the wages of sin, the death of sin; (3) the death to sin, the total rejection, the absolute renunciation of all sin, of the very principle of disobedience and selfishness.

It is of the utmost importance to keep these distinctions clearly before us, because, if they are lost, a mist is thrown not only over the Pauline Epistles generally, but over almost every other portion of the New Testament. It is the second death (the death of sin, the death which comes of disobedience) which, in St. Paul's words, has passed upon all men, because all have sinned. It is this death of which he says that all die in Adam: it is the death to sin, the absolute rejection of all sin, of which he says that in Christ all shall be made alive. But this death, in full strictness of meaning, none that have sinned can die. It is the work only of One who is absolutely sinless: it is the death of the Eternal Son. It is the death which He died once for all,<sup>1</sup> because it is an eternal renunciation of all disobedience. His whole life, therefore, is this death, and this

<sup>1</sup> ἐφάπαξ, Rom. vi. 10.

death is also His life. We may speak of the consummation of His sacrifice, of His sanctification (or making holy) of Himself on Calvary ; but we cannot speak of this His death as belonging only to the closing scene of His earthly ministry, because, if He did not till then die to sin, then up to that time He must have been under the influence of it. The statement is, indeed, self-contradictory ; but if we bear in mind that the death to sin is in all strictness the death of Christ alone, and that, because He dies this death, we are also partakers of it in the measure in which we offer ourselves, as a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice, to God, the language of St. Paul will become to us, as a whole, luminously clear. We shall, indeed, utterly mistake his meaning, and do him a great wrong, if we regard him as oppressed by any other death than the death of sin, or as rejoicing in anything but that death to sin which is the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole Kosmos. This death to sin is the life of Christ : it is His resurrection. In that He died, He died unto sin once for all ; in that He liveth, He liveth unto God. So reckon ye yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

When, however, we look to the Bishop's language on the subject of the death of Christ, the use made of it by his accusers at Capetown becomes indeed amazing. The only real objection to his language is that it employs terms not all of which seem accurately defined. Thus he says :—

"Though all men are redeemed and belong . . . to Christ, and are even now under His care and government, though they may not yet be blessed to know His Name, yet to us, Christians, the Apostle says, God set forth His Son as a propitiation through faith in His blood. We are privileged to know the great mystery of Godliness, to know in what way, through the wisdom of God, we have been redeemed from the power of evil, to look at Christ Jesus through faith

in His blood, and behold in Him the propitiation for our sins, the object which makes us, the whole human race, of which He is the Head, acceptable to God.”<sup>1</sup>

So again, summing up the Apostle’s argument, he adds :—

“You see, after all, God is righteous. He is faithful in respect of His promises made of old to you and to your race. He has now, by the setting forth of His Son, explained what His dealings of old with you meant, how He *then* regarded you as righteous, called you righteous,—not for any merits of your own, or your forefathers, but for His own mercy’s sake,—in Him in whom He loved you, and not you only but all mankind, from before the foundation of the world. It was in His Son, the second Head of the family of man, in due time to be revealed, that He loved you then, and not for anything in your forefathers. All the righteousness which He gave to them, He gave through Him. All the goodness which He saw in them, He saw through Him, from whom alone it came to them, in whom it existed pure and perfect and undefiled with the consequences of the Fall.”<sup>2</sup>

If we ask here what is meant by blood and blood-shedding, we do not learn much by turning to the passage from Dr. Vaughan, quoted by the Bishop, that the death of Christ was the central and complete act of the whole work of redemption, because the words do not show in what sense the term *death* is here used. It is to be regretted, perhaps, that the word should ever be used without explanation, for the meaning commonly attached to it resolves itself into a revolting superstition. Dean Stanley’s language leaves no room for misapprehension ; and on this language it is quite impossible to lay too great a stress.

‘Looking at the Bible only,” he says, “and taking the Bible as a whole, . . . we cannot go far astray in adopting the

<sup>1</sup> *Commentary*, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 94.

only definition of the blood of Christ which has come down to us from primitive times. It is contained in one of the three undisputed, or at any rate least disputed, Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. 'The blood of Christ,' he said, 'is love or charity.' With this unquestionably agrees the language of the New Testament as to the essential characteristic of God and of Christ. Love, unselfish love, is there spoken of again and again as the fundamental essence of the highest life of God; and it is also evident on the face of the Gospels that it is the fundamental motive and characteristic of the life and death of Christ. It is this love stronger than death, this love manifesting itself in death, this love willing to spend itself for others, that is the blood of the life in which God is well pleased. Not the pain or torture of the cross—for that was alike odious to God and useless to man—but the love, the self-devotion, the generosity, the magnanimity, the forgiveness, the toleration, the compassion, of which that blood was the expression, and of which that life and death were the fulfilment. 'Non sanguine sed pietate placatur Deus' is the maxim of more than one of the Fathers. 'What is the blood of Christ?' asked Livingstone of his own solitary soul in the last moments of his African wanderings. 'It is Himself. It is the inherent and everlasting mercy of God made apparent to human eyes and ears.' The charity of God to man, the charity of men to one another with all its endless consequences,—if it be not this, what is it? . . . It is, therefore, not only from Calvary, but from Bethlehem and Nazareth and Capernaum—not only from the crucifixion but from all His acts of mercy and words of wisdom—that the 'blood of Christ' derives its moral significance."<sup>1</sup>

It is true that Ignatius gives the explanation of the phrase "blood of Christ" which is cited by Dean Stanley. The fact is in the highest degree significant, and it is of vital importance. It shows that the true spiritual tradition still survived

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Institutions*, ch. vi p. 119, ed. 1.

in the fossilising process which was going on, and that the work of St. Paul had not yet come to naught.<sup>1</sup> For, in truth, a vast gulf separates most of the thought and language of Ignatius from the thought and language of St. Paul's letter to the Romans. The former seems to find a special comfort in the fancy that "the ruler of this world was deceived by the virginity of Mary, and her childhood, and in like manner also by the death of the Lord." Here we have the very petrification of the spiritual life, a state of thought in which forms of words become everything, and the mind can lay hold of nothing except through sensuous signs. It is from such a man as this that we have in these words on the blood of Christ the tokens of the presence of a quickening Spirit; and if this were all that we had received from him, this alone might have intitled him to the lasting gratitude of Christendom. The question answered by Ignatius, and asked again, and again answered, by Livingstone, will be asked now with greater frequency than ever, in proportion as men come to feel that such phrases may point to spiritual realities or may be reduced to the state of mere symbols. On these words the whole Sacramental system, as it is called, is made to rest; but for those who wish to preserve their moral balance all that is needed is to mark the parallelism or equation in the language of the fourth Gospel with the language of the General Epistle which bears the name of John.

Without going into questions relating to the origin or choice of these symbols, we have specially to note their equivalents in language which addresses itself not to the outward senses but directly to the heart of men. It is plain matter of fact that in the fourth Gospel the idea of food as indispensable for the maintenance of life leads to a discourse on bread as such a support, and this in its turn to a further

<sup>1</sup> See, further, *Edinburgh Review*, July 1886, p. 135, &c.

discourse on flesh and blood as symbols of the closest union with the Source of all life, the conclusion in reference to nourishment being that "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have no life in you," and with reference to union, "he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." For these phrases we have three equations in the General Epistle of St. John, the first being that "he that keepeth His commandment dwelleth in Him and He in him;" the second that "whoso shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God;" the third that "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him." Thus we have the keeping of the commandments, the confession of Jesus, and the dwelling in love, set forth as precise equivalents to the eating of the flesh and the drinking of the blood of Christ; and a full light is thus thrown on what we may speak of as the sacrificial language of St. Paul in his Epistles to the Romans or to other Churches. We may, perhaps, regret that this key was not systematically applied to it by the Bishop of Natal: but we must remember that the application of this key is extremely disliked, and even the existence of the key denied, by adherents whether of the extreme sacerdotal or of the Calvinistic schools, while the non-theological mind is too apt to think that the interpretation put on these terms by members of these schools must be right.

The Bishop, however, had in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* a special work to do: and this work was the insisting that the benefits received from and through Christ were benefits received for all the world. The Divine work was a work for the extinction of sin, not merely for its punishment; and any theories or doctrines which represented God as resting content with the infliction of penalties must be resolutely encountered and put down. He argues, it is true, from the language of hope to the reality of the great



consummation ; but he does so because the language of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans seemed to him to point rather to hope than to assurance. We may, perhaps, see reason for thinking that the Bishop's words might have been stronger than they were ; but that they are not stronger is no matter for regret. What he said has opened the way for greater clearness of thought and speech, and rendered the tyranny of the Westminster Confession and of all other like utterances impossible for the future. For him, as for St. Paul, the earnest longing of the creature pointed to the final manifestation of the sons of God ; and if the creature was now subjected to wretchedness or vanity, it was because God Himself had subjected it to this wretchedness in hope "that the creature itself shall be set free from the bondage of corruption into the glorious freedom of the children of God." Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, these assuredly will be upon every soul of man that works out evil ; but can we say, the Bishop asks, with these words of St. Paul before us,

"that such chastisement, however severe, may *not* be remedial, may not be intended to work out the hope under which the whole race has been subjected to vanity? . . . . Is there not ground from this text as well as others for trusting that in some way unknown to us the whole race shall indeed be made to share this hope at last?"<sup>1</sup>

Some, perhaps, may see here the influence of old associations assigning weight to the sanction of special texts ; but such remarks are not here to the point. We are concerned with the working and growth of the Bishop's own mind ; and the account which he gives of this growth forms one of the most interesting chapters in the history of his life. He now distinctly clung to and rejoiced in the hope, or, rather, confident expectation, expressed by St. Paul. But

<sup>1</sup> *Commentary*, p. 196.

"there was a time," he says, "when I thought and wrote otherwise. Some years ago—in the year 1853—I published a small volume of *Village Sermons*, which I dedicated to a dear and honoured friend, the Rev. F. D. Maurice, and which was violently attacked in consequence of this dedication,<sup>1</sup> by those who had previously assailed Mr. Maurice's teaching, as containing what seemed to them erroneous statements of doctrine, and, particularly, as expressing agreement with Mr. Maurice's views on the subject of Eternal Punishment. I was able to show, by quotations from my little book itself, that these charges were untrue, and that I had given offence, partly by stating larger views of the Redeeming Love of God in Christ Jesus than the reviewer of my sermons himself thought it fit to hold (though views held by such men as Barrow and Macknight), but chiefly by expressing my cordial sympathy with Mr. Maurice in his noble and blessed labours. . . . Accordingly in the preface to the second edition of his *Theological Essays*, Mr. Maurice spoke of me as 'having proved by my sermons that I believed in the endlessness of future punishments.' I did believe in that dogma at the time I wrote and printed those sermons, as far as that can be called belief which, in fact, was no more than acquiescence, in common, I imagine, with very many of my brother clergy, in the ordinary statements of the subject, without having ever deeply studied the question, probably with a shrinking dread of examining, and without having even ventured formally to write or preach a sermon upon the subject, and pursue it, in thought and word, to all its consequences. There are many who, as I did myself in those days, would assert the dogma as part of their 'Creed,' and now and then, in a single sentence of a sermon, utter a few words in accordance with it, but who have never set themselves down to face the question and deliver their own souls upon it to their flocks, fully and unreservedly. For my own part, I admit, I acquiesced in it, seeing *some* reasons for assuming it to be true, knowing that the mass of my clerical brethren

<sup>1</sup> See 47.