

for a mass of pseudonymous literature. This literature was not designed to be a pious fraud, and hence it never carried with it the reputation for falsehood. Even if we take the supposition that the book of the law found in the time of Josiah was a book recently composed, we have no more warrant for applying to the writer or writers of it any more than to John Bunyan the charge of wilful and deliberate lying.

The question is so important that it becomes necessary to notice more at length the expressions used by Mr. Maurice in reference to it.

“You know, of course,” he writes to Mr. Clark, “this business of Colenso. You know how he had identified himself with me, and how great a struggle it must be to me to disclaim him, especially when he is putting himself to great risk. Yet I think him so utterly wrong that I must do it at all risks to him or to me. How to do it, and yet not to put myself entirely in the wrong with respect to him, and so to injure the cause of God far more than myself, has been a subject of earnest thought with me. It has obliged me to consider my whole position at Vere Street. I had long perceived that that was put in jeopardy by the recent decisions in Heath’s case and in Wilson’s case. I had prepared myself for a prosecution, and had determined that when it came I would not go into the court, but would rather retire. To plead by help of an ingenious counsel for permission to do what I feel I *must* do to fulfil my ordination vows seemed to me mischievous. But I had meant to wait till the blow came. Now I see very clearly that I ought to anticipate it. If I give up Vere Street, stating my reason for doing so very fully in a letter to my congregation, I can distinguish my position from that of all who wish to diminish the authority of the Scripture. I can show that my only offence is that of adhering too literally to the words of the Prayer-Book and Articles.”

Mr. Maurice was absolutely sincere; and he felt not a shadow of doubt of his own ability to trace the literal meaning of the formularies or Articles of the Church of England; but we shall find that there is not a single argument urged by him, or a single expression cited in support of his conclusions, to which the accusers of the Bishop of Natal at Capetown have not ascribed quite another sense. Mr. Maurice, for instance, laid great stress on the withdrawal of the Article on the subject of the endless torturing of the impenitent. To Bishop Gray and his partisans this fact furnished the most conclusive evidence that the dogma was held and imposed as indubitable by the Church of England as by the Church Catholic in all ages. It was not likely, therefore, that on the purely ecclesiastical or sacerdotal mind his resignation of Vere Street Chapel would produce any impression whatever. Nevertheless, he had no hesitation in taking this step.

“Colenso’s act,” he wrote to Mr. Kingsley (October 1862), “though it clinched my resolution . . . only showed me what would have been best at all events. My mind has been nearly racked this vacation at the thought that the whole family life of England must go to wreck if there is not some witness that the Father of all is not a destroyer. At the same time I have faith and hope, at times most cheering and invigorating, that some of our scientific men and our secularists, if they could be spoken to as husbands and fathers, not as schoolmen, might pass from atheism to the most cordial belief. Arguments about a Creator will fall dead upon them. A message from a Father may rouse them to life.”<sup>1</sup>

Writing to his friend Arthur Stanley (October, 1862), he speaks of himself as lying open to the suspicion that while he partly talked of the Old Testament as the guide to all moral and political wisdom, he partly looked upon it, with Colenso, as a book of fictions and forgeries.

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. ii. p. 428.

“The coincidence of the appearance of Colenso’s book with the re-hearing of Wilson’s case has determined the time of my retirement from Vere Street.”<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Maurice was, happily, brought to see that there was no reason for this step; and he did not resign. Dr. Stanley begged him, as a strong personal favour, to postpone his decision until Dr. Lushington’s recent Judgment in the Williams-Wilson case had been reviewed by the Privy Council; and more particularly Mr. Bunyon, the Bishop’s brother-in-law, had insisted that if he resigned

“as a protest against Dr. Colenso’s book, it would be taking an unfair advantage of Dr. Colenso’s having come to him as a friend and having put the proofs into his hand. . . . You are prepared to betray him by having an engine of attack to be issued simultaneously with his book. . . . I think this involves a question of honour.”<sup>2</sup>

This letter, Colonel Maurice adds,

“was written under a feeling that such a remonstrance was the only means that would stop my father from taking a step which many friends had intreated Mr. Bunyon to do all that he could to prevent. The strong wording was designed to produce the effect which it actually did produce upon a man sensitive to the last degree on the point of honour. Mr. Bunyon had interposed with great reluctance and as a last resource, from attachment to my father, and regret that his brother-in-law should have been the occasion for such action. The blow fell with the effect of a complete surprise upon my father. His action had been largely determined by his dislike to the position of having to oppose an unpopular man, whilst he was thoroughly convinced that it was his bounden duty to oppose the Bishop. The suggestion that his proposed conduct looked a little cowardly, a little like taking the side of the strong against the weak, and altogether unfair, was intolerable to him. It was just

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. II. p. 429.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* vol. II. p. 433.

that against which he had struggled all his life. . . . He gave way at once. He wrote a letter of pained and indignant protestation to Mr. Bunyon, saying that he did not think that any one who knew him would attribute such motives to him. He wrote to the Bishop of Natal to say that he would not at all events act before the book appeared."

In a letter to Dr. Stanley he admitted that he had not at first seen his way to do more than say that he would suspend all his doings for a while, but that he soon perceived that he had been "about to injure Colenso" when he fancied he was only injuring himself.

"Then it became clear to me that people did—as you said they would—utterly mistake my meaning and suppose me to be leaving the Church. This being clear, I had no alternative but to say, 'I have been utterly wrong, my friends altogether right.' I said so to my congregation last Sunday. It was humiliating, but it was a plain duty. . . . I must have been most wilful, but I could not see it till the Bishop of Natal complained of the injustice done to him."

In the same spirit Mr. Maurice wrote to a son then an undergraduate at Oxford:—

"From the moment that I saw that I should not be making a declaration of principles at my own cost, but be casting another stone at him, I knew that I must be wrong. Then I gradually perceived from the comments in the papers and from private letters that my whole meaning had been mistaken,—that I was supposed to be discontented with the Church, when I wished to assert my devotion to it most strongly. Therefore I had nothing to do but to retreat and confess my error. I did so last Sunday before my congregation. I cannot call it eating the leek, except that, being a Welshman by origin, I am bound to like leeks. But it was a humiliation, however much I might rejoice to feel myself once again the minister of a most kind and friendly people."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. ii. p. 435.

With those who have a true faith in the living God of perfect righteousness and perfect love, time cannot fail to deal gently in bringing out into clearest relief the unity which underlies all their superficial differences. In their treatment of the books of the Old Testament as records of events and incidents, the Bishop of Natal differed from Mr. Maurice as widely as one man could well differ from another. But, although Mr. Maurice might suppose it to be otherwise, in their conceptions of the Divine government and work there was a complete and unbroken harmony. Some who may suppose that they are holding the balance of judgement indifferently between both may think that, if in their faith with regard to the eternal world there was this agreement, it was unfortunate that the Bishop of Natal should have raised a controversy of no importance. But we shall find, when we come to deal with the so-called Capetown trial, that the debate was one of no mean significance; nor can it be forgotten that it was not a debate of the Bishop of Natal's raising. There are other errors in Christendom besides those against which Mr. Maurice maintained a persistent warfare; and among the most mischievous and certainly the most oppressive of these other errors is the fetishism which treats a book or a collection of books as an image which "fell down from Jupiter." The criticisms which the Bishop of Natal directed against this idolatry only strengthened him in convictions which none could express more forcibly than Mr. Maurice.

Punishment, the Bible teaches me," said Mr. Maurice, "is always God's protest against sin, His instrument for persuading men to turn from sin to righteousness. If punishment is to endure for ever, it is a witness that there are always persons on whom God's discipline is acting to raise them out of sin. Modern theology—Dr. Pusey's theology—teaches that God sentences men to sin, to go on sinning

more and more, for ever. I hold that that is to say that He is not punishing, that He gives over punishing. I stand to the letter,—the *ipsissima verba* of Christ. They translate them into other and directly opposite words.”<sup>1</sup>

They were translated into directly opposite words by the accusers of the Bishop of Natal at Capetown; and their condemnation of the error imputed to Mr. Maurice was perhaps not a whit less sweeping than their condemnation of the heresy of Dr. Colenso.

We may go a step further, and say that the temporary separation must be laid wholly at Mr. Maurice’s door. He had a full right—nay, he was bound—to proclaim that the whole purpose and course of the Divine work in the world has been and is to convince men of the absolute and unswerving justice of God, and of a love which is stronger than death—

“the eternal death from which they cry to be delivered, the torment of the worm in their conscience, the misery of being left alone with themselves.”<sup>2</sup>

But he took up untenable ground when he implied, or rather affirmed, that the multitude of books (*biblia*) which we speak of as the Bible, instead of as the Bibles, contains nothing that is not inconsistent with the truths which to Mr. Maurice and the Bishop of Natal were dearer than life itself. The result was that he had to treat as antagonists men whom, if he would but have altered his forms of expression, he would have seen to be wholly on his side.

In September, 1864, Sir Edward Strachey, the life-long and devoted friend of Mr. Maurice, invited him to meet the Bishop at his house.

“Your purpose,” Mr. Maurice answered, “is most kind, and your way of putting it kinder still. I will answer with

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. ii p. 473

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* vol. ii. p. 476.

the frankness you desired. There has been an estrangement between Colenso and me since he came to England. I think that the Bible is the great deliverer from ecclesiastical bondage, the great protector for human freedom. That is the maxim I have always tried to maintain when he took up exactly the opposite maxim, when he treated the Bible as itself the instrument of our slavery, and seemed to think that to throw it off would be the great step to emancipation. I felt that he was giving up the ground to the Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Pusey. I saw nothing before us but that fanaticism against criticism, that effort to bind a human tyranny upon us, which these last few years have developed. . . . If I identified myself with those who were called liberal thinkers, who seemed to be, and in many aspects were, pleading for the rights of the clergy and the rights of conscience, I must have abandoned my own position, a position difficult enough to maintain, full of sorrow, involving an isolation from all parties, but, as I think, necessary for the good of all parties. To make Colenso understand why I do this—that I am not a traitor to freedom, and friendship also—is impossible at present.”<sup>1</sup>

In this passage there is nothing said of the Bible with which the Bishop of Natal would have hesitated to express his agreement. These books are, or may be, great deliverers from ecclesiastical bondage, great protectors for human freedom. Luther found them to be so ; but the extent of the deliverance depends on the spirit in which they are applied. Against the system of Latin Christendom, Luther found in them a potent engine of war ; and just because he took, or professed to take, his stand on the *litera scripta* of words on which criticism only of a certain kind—that is, his own interpretation—was to be brought to bear, he made it the bulwark of a bondage quite as severe as that against which he had himself rebelled.

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. II. p. 486. Mr. Maunce concludes this letter with the following words, “I have met the Bishop several times, and there is, I hope, not the least unkindness between us.”

But to say that the Bishop of Natal treated, or spoke of, the Bible itself as the instrument of our slavery, is to say simply that which is not true. He never meant this, and he never said it. The Bible had by many been made a fetish; and Mr. Maurice seemed to speak as though the superstition which had made it a fetish should not be assailed and put down. Had the Bishop, moreover, been really giving up the ground to Dr. Wilberforce or Dr. Pusey, it is strange that they should not recognise or admit their obligation for his good service. This mistake (and lapse of time seems to exhibit it more and more as an absurd mistake) runs through all that Mr. Maurice has to say on the subject.

“I had felt a stronger interest,” he writes to a clergyman in South Africa, “in Colenso’s diocese and mission than in any other. He and his wife were old friends of mine. He had behaved very generously to me. When he avowed his sympathy with my refusal to speak of three-score years and ten as the limit of God’s education of man, I was ready to follow him in any conflicts into which he might enter. When he set himself at war with the Jewish economy, I was utterly struck down.”<sup>1</sup>

But the Bishop had never done, never thought of doing, anything of the kind. What he had sought was to find out, so far as it might be possible to do so, what this economy was. The life of the Old Testament was, he knew, the life of “the prophets which had been since the world began,” and he knew also that to this life the main body of the people with their rulers, ecclesiastical and civil, had been always more or less vehemently opposed. Far, therefore, from setting himself at war with the life of the Old Testament, the Bishop was anxious only to bring it into clearer light. But if Mr. Maurice once took it into his head that any thinker or writer applied the

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. ii. p. 490.



laws of human evidence to realities of another order, the conviction remained immovable. The suggestion that the prophecies of Balaam, for instance, are, to say the least, post-Davidic, implied in his opinion want of faith in the Divine government of the world. Any one who presumes to offer such a suggestion has been dabbling in the school of Niebuhr ; and the school of Niebuhr maintains, it seems, that

“ God has nothing to do with nations and politics. They are to be left to such men as Metternich and Louis Napoleon. Accursed doctrine ; part of that Atheism of our religious world which nothing but a baptism of the Spirit and of fire can deliver us from.”<sup>1</sup>

We shall have to recur to this subject elsewhere. For the present it is enough to say that Mr. Maurice, using the simplest and most familiar words, seems to pass here beyond the range of ordinary human comprehension. The most diligent students of Niebuhr will look with amazement at a charge for which they will discern in all his writings not even the shadow of a foundation. They will remember that, while he insisted on the need of historical evidence for historical facts, he asserted for himself, and for other students who had attained to his own experience, the possession of a divining power which enabled him to recover facts for which historical testimony was really lacking. But they will remember also that his *History of Rome* is indeed not a denial of the truth that God has something to do with nations and politics, but a passionate and most vehement assertion of it, from the beginning of the work to its close. It is singular that in his assertion of this truth the language of Niebuhr is not unlike that of Mr. Maurice. But the unbelief, which the latter finds in Niebuhr he finds also in the Bishop of Natal.

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, vol. ii. p. 510.

“This unbelief about nations, Colenso, I apprehend, shares with his opponents. It comes out equally in both. And it should be observed that Colenso has not the least studied under Niebuhr. He belongs, if he has investigated such questions at all, to the later and merely negative school of Sir G. C. Lewis.”

To this also we must recur hereafter, now noting only that not a line can be cited from the Bishop's writings which lends the faintest colour to the suspicion that he limited the action of the Divine government to individual men. So far as such a notion could have been intelligible to him, he would have shrunk from it with horror; but it resolves itself seemingly into something like nonsense. Mr. Maurice, indeed, knew not what he was saying.

The fact is that the denunciation of unbelief, of want of faith and want of love, was with Mr. Maurice a potent instrument of war; and he used his weapons somewhat recklessly. He never more sadly misused them than when he imputed to the Bishop of Natal the idea that nations do not come within the scope of the Divine discipline. Mr. Maurice did not live to witness it himself; but, had he been spared, he would have seen the singleness of devotion with which the man whom he charged with this unbelief gave himself up to the task of bringing home to his countrymen a long series of acts of national injustice and wrong. Mr. Maurice, however, can scarcely have failed to know that long before his return to England in 1861 the Bishop had won from the Kafir and Zulu people the title of Sobantu, and that this title expressed emphatically the gratitude not of individuals, but of races.

Only three more letters are forthcoming from the correspondence with Mr. Maurice at this time. The two last are given with the address and the final subscription,—sad proof of the havoc wrought on a friendship of many years by an

obstinate refusal to examine or even to look at the evidence for alleged facts.

TO THE REV. F. D. MAURICE.

“WINNINGTON HALL, NORTHWICH,  
“October 14, 1862.

- “In one of your letters you said that you would send me back the copy of my book, which you had, by post next day. It has never reached me ; and perhaps you may have forgotten to send it. I am shortly about to publish the First Part of my book, containing only a small portion of the matter brought together in that volume, and wish, therefore, to recall the copies of my ‘first impressions’ which are in the hands of my friends. . . .
- “I send you a copy of the introductory chapter, as it now stands ; or, rather, I have cancelled this chapter also in order to introduce a few verbal corrections.
- “I have thought it right to state that *you* are in no way committed to the views expressed in this book ; that, in fact, ‘in making and publishing such investigations as these, I am acting neither with your advice nor with your approval.’
- “P.S.—I think, upon the whole, it will be better not to send the introductory chapter. I shall send you the whole book when published.”

TO THE SAME.

“PENDYFFRIN, CONWAY,  
“July 25, 1863.

- “MY DEAR MR. MAURICE,
- “I did not mean to ‘mock you.’ Every word of my letter was written in sincerity, with an unfeigned desire to express the most kind and respectful feelings towards you. I had been told that you thought that I *resented* your former expressions. I thought it might show to you that your estimate of the worthlessness of my labours in a critical point of view was not altogether justified by the reception which they have met with from one, at least, of the most

eminent Continental scholars. But I wished at the same time to convey to you as plainly as I could an intimation that on my side, at all events, there were no such feelings of resentment as (I was told) you imagined to exist. I am sorry that I happen to have failed, though I cannot think that my language deserved the last sentence in your letter.

“ I am, my dear Mr. Maurice,

“ Faithfully yours,

“ J. W. NATAL.”

TO THE SAME.

“ 23 SUSSEX PLACE, *August 17, 1863.*

“ MY DEAR MR. MAURICE,

“ Let me write one line to acknowledge the receipt of your last kind note, and to thank you sincerely for it. I am sorry that I have pained you and other good men by anything that I have written or published. But I am confident with you that our God and Father will make all these things—these strivings after truth, these feeble efforts of His children to know and to serve Him better—turn at last effectually to His own glory and our good.

“ Yours very truly,

“ J. W. NATAL.”

## CHAPTER VI.

### WORK IN ENGLAND, 1863-65. THE BATTLE.

IN spite of all that may be said from any one of the many points of view taken by those who would not have quiet things disturbed, the publication of the Bishop's work on the Pentateuch marks a stage in the progress of religious thought in England. By all who had any vested interests in inaction the work was received at the time with jeers ; and these jeers were repeated on every possible opportunity during the remainder of his life, and were renewed with scarcely less asperity after his death. The fascination of ribaldry must indeed be strong for writers who could affect to feel regret that Dr. Colenso was not allowed to end his days in the recesses of Norfolk, to which wandering Zulus were not likely to penetrate with suggestions of arithmetical difficulties known by all theological students to be stale with the age of centuries. Such writers might feel a solid satisfaction in relating

“how, in a fashion which moved, and reasonably so, the laughter of the profane and the contempt of the robust orthodox, the newly-appointed Bishop went to convert and was converted himself.”

The egregious folly of cynicism was seldom more extravagantly shown than in a sentence which affirms that the mockers

began to laugh and gibe some six or seven years before any cause for laughter or mockery was given. But it was a bolder thing to say, more than twenty years after the book appeared, that

“though many men, and some of them men of the highest honour, if not of the most exalted intellect, might have written the too famous *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*, no man of delicate honour could have attempted to hold the office of bishop in the Church of England one day after writing it, or even one hour after definitely forming the opinions which it was written to expound.”<sup>1</sup>

This is just the point at issue, and the challenge shall be forthwith taken up and dealt with. But the nature of these opinions must be first of all defined. If they are held to be notions about the general estimate of the authority of the collection of writings called “the Bible” as a whole, then it must be said at once that these were not the opinions which the Bishop was desirous of maintaining. His purpose was to examine the first six books in this large collection ; and the conclusions which he reached were that these books contained, with some historical matter, a large amount which cannot be considered historical at all, and more particularly that they contained an elaborate account of an extremely minute and highly wrought ecclesiastical legislation put together many centuries after the time to which they professed to relate. The Bishop would have been basely deserting his post, he would have been doing an irreparable wrong to the coming generations, had he foreclosed the debate by declaring that such conclusions might not lawfully be maintained by any clergyman of the Church of England.

<sup>1</sup> The reference for this extract is designedly withheld. I do not purpose to honour with mention the source of these vile falsehoods. But the reference has been kept, and is producible if it should be needed.

It is childish to say that he was in any way called on to heed the great mass of so-called criticism with which he was assailed. His *Commentary on the Romans* had been attacked in some quarters with violent abuse and scurrilous invective. These onslaughts deserve no notice, and have now little interest except as instances of the readiness with which writers coming forward as champions of traditionalism resort to the potent weapons of falsehood. One of these in the *London Quarterly Review* (1862), affected to regard it as a dire offence that the Bishop, after returning to England in 1854, should presume to express any opinion on anything connected with his diocese after so short a stay as ten weeks<sup>1</sup> only; and then avows his surprise that

“a ruler in the Church of God and a Bishop pledged to uphold the teaching of the Church of England”

should be able

“in so short a time to arrive at a definite opinion *in favour of* polygamy, and to promulgate it, along with his censure upon those who had upheld the doctrine in which both he and they had been brought up.”

The italics are those of the writer, and the statement so emphasized is a lie.<sup>2</sup> The falsehood renders it unnecessary to give further heed to any of his remarks.

In the same fashion some *Familiar Dialogues* set forth under the title *Is the Bible true?*<sup>3</sup> start with the assertion that the Bishop's work on the Pentateuch

“insists on the absolute untruth of all the first five books of the Bible.”

This statement also is a lie.

Such criticisms are pre-eminently dishonourable. But not a little of such unfairness is roused still in some minds after

<sup>1</sup> See 73.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 67.

<sup>3</sup> Seeley, 1863.

the lapse of a quarter of a century, whenever the name of Colenso is mentioned. The word *sat* in Sanskrit, denoting truth, means simply *that which is*. If a man feels that he has reached conclusions which rest on this foundation, he may well dispense with the encouragement or the applause of his fellows. Of such a one Professor Max Muller asserts :

“Whoever has once stood alone, surrounded by noisy assertions and overshadowed by the clamour of those who ought to know better, and perhaps did know better—call him Galileo, or Darwin, or Colenso, or Stanley, or any other name—he knows what a real delight it is to feel in his heart of hearts, This is true, this *is*, this is *sat*, whatever daily, weekly, or quarterly papers, whatever Bishops, Archbishops, or Popes may say to the contrary.”

This sentence would probably have been allowed to pass unchallenged, but for the recurrence of one name in it. But, this name being introduced, an Edinburgh Reviewer found himself constrained to remark :—

“Certainly, if it be true. But does the mere presence of opposition prove it such? Or does it follow because Galileo was so beaten down by ignorant fanaticism, and the reasoning of Darwin for a time opposed by those who, in ignorance of its meaning, dreaded what they regarded as its consequences, that the criticism of Colenso was not exceedingly poor, and the reading of Stanley, in spite of his genius, sometimes discursive, and his conclusions sometimes illogical?”<sup>1</sup>

This is a sample of the fashion in which anonymous journalists, among other champions of traditionalism, shelve a subject with which they have no intention to deal. But the article from which these words are taken illustrates further the fatal temper of mind which has made so much missionary work abortive and against which the Bishop of Natal fought

<sup>1</sup> *Edinburgh Review*, April 1884, p. 473.



most earnestly. The Rig Veda, like the Pentateuch, contains the literature of a time earlier probably by a millennium (it may be more) than the Christian era. It contains much that is pure, beautiful, and touching; it contains certainly some matter to which these epithets could not possibly be applied. But it is the contention of the Reviewer that in this respect there is no comparison between the Rig Veda and the Pentateuch or the Old Testament generally. In the latter the growth is in his judgement always upward; in the former it is uniformly downwards, and he denies absolutely that in the Old Testament we have

“in juxtaposition with that which is pure and elevated about God and man the false, silly, and repulsive elements which we shall find in such abundance in the Rig Veda.”

He professes to be so shocked and horrified with the soliloquy of Indra after drinking the Soma juice that he refuses, as he says, to sully his page by quoting any part of it; and yet the most dreadful part of this soliloquy is in the following words:—

“The draughts which I have drunk impel me like violent blasts: I have quaffed the Soma. . . .  
 The hymn of my worshippers has hastened to me, as a cow to her beloved calf: I have quaffed the Soma.  
 I turn the hymn round about my heart, as a carpenter a beam: I have quaffed the Soma. . . .  
 Let me smite the earth rapidly hither and thither: I have quaffed the Soma.  
 One half of me is in the sky, and I have drawn the other down: I have quaffed the Soma.  
 I am majestic, elevated in the heavens: I have quaffed the Soma.  
 I go prepared as a minister, a bearer of oblations to the gods: I have quaffed the Soma.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, vol. v. p. 91.

Without troubling themselves to analyse the many meanings which the word Soma assumes in the Rig Veda, such writers as these look only with contempt on hymns which speak of Soma as, like Varuna, forgiving the penitent or punishing the guilty, and see nothing but degradation in the prayer—

“ Be gracious, Soma, Rig, for our salvation.  
Be well assured then that we are thine.  
Against us rise both wrath and cunning, Soma :  
O leave us not in power of the foe ;”

or in the intreaty—

“ This Soma, drawn into my inside, I invoke as quite near ;  
Whatever sin we have committed may he graciously  
forgive it.”

Yet these prayers are not without points even of close likeness to the Eucharistic language of Christendom or the Tridentine phraseology in reference to the Real Presence ; and the “ jargon of the inebriated divinities of India ” suggests a parallel with the expressions which speak of Jehovah awaking out of sleep and smiting his enemies in the hinder parts like a giant refreshed with wine. Nor can the poor Vedic worshipper be well blamed for his superstitious dreams about the power of the Soma over Indra, if Jehovah after smelling the sweet savour of Noah’s burnt-offering promises that he will not again curse the ground for man’s sake. The Reviewer was probably not a missionary ; but the missionary who enters on his work with such prejudices, and who condemns the Rig Veda for juxtaposition of pure and gross matter, as though this juxtaposition might not be charged on the old Hebrew Scriptures, will find that he is using a weapon which will recoil upon himself, and will, at least, multiply precisely those difficulties which the Bishop of Natal set to work from the first to sweep away.

It may be well perhaps to take notice of one or two more samples of the many sorts of comments evoked by the Bishop's volume five-and-twenty years ago. Appearing without any date, probably in 1863 or 1864, a volume, intitled *The Bible in the Workshop*, and professing to make short work of the Bishop's criticisms on the Pentateuch, was put forth, as the title-page averred, by two working men, "a Jew and a Gentile." Towards the end of the book the two writers relieve their consciences, it would seem, by thus addressing the Bishop :—

"When you are lying upon your death-bed and your past life is passing in rapid review before you, it may be some small satisfaction to you to know that at least two (the Jew writer and the Gentile writer) of the class to whom your book is calculated to be most dangerous, after careful examination are convinced of its utter groundlessness and folly."

Speaking again as *we*, in their twenty-third chapter—as everywhere else, the Jew workman and the Gentile workman declare that

"we believe that our Lord never uttered a single word that was not strictly true in every sense of the word."

The two broadly hint and broadly state that the Bishop is an apostate from Christianity ; but what has the Jew workman, if he retains at all any distinctively Jewish faith, to do with Christianity ? how, being a Jew, can he speak of Jesus Christ as his Lord and Master ? and if he has abandoned the faith of his fathers, how can he call himself a Jew ? The whole thing looks like a fraud on the public ; and if the title-page only be taken into account it is nothing less than a fraud. But the advertisement informs us that

"every word has been written by one workman, with the advice and assistance of the other in all matters concerning Jewish customs and the Hebrew language."

By this statement a falsehood of one kind is got rid of by introducing a falsehood of another kind. To say the least, the Jew workman, by giving his authority, whatever its weight might be, to a work which fights for a very narrow form of Christian traditionalism, seems to have fairly crossed the borders of apostasy to his own faith. A fight so carried on is not legitimate warfare.

Not much more creditable than this was the method resorted to by Dr. Kay,<sup>1</sup> who denounced the Bishop of Natal as applying to the Pentateuch a disintegration theory, which rests on the principles of "religious unbelief" and "historical Pyrrhonism."

"The question of the authenticity of the book was evidently decided," he said, "long before the critical analysis was set on foot. The muster-roll of phrases has no more real office to fulfil than had the senate of Tiberius or the jury of Judge Jeffreys. Unbelief, the spirit that refuses to recognise any (!) Divine intervention in the world's history, had already settled the matter.

"If Genesis be an authentic document, then it is certain that there is an objective basis for religious faith. God *has* communed with men. Preparation is thus made for the future introduction of Christianity. The Gospel has its roots buried deep in the world's history, for its seed was laid in the Protevangelium, Gen. iii. 15. To get rid of this book of Genesis, then, is a necessary preliminary for any assault on Christianity."<sup>2</sup>

With equal assurance Dr. Kay adds,

"Admit the authenticity of the Pentateuch, and all is solved. Deny it, and all is impenetrably dark. One of the most conspicuous facts of history, namely, the existence of a purer religion for fourteen centuries among a people not less prone than the rest of the world to a sensual idolatry, has *no*

<sup>1</sup> *Crisis Huppeldiana*; Parker, 1865.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* pp. 60, 61.

explanation. Other miracles, which affected the physical world for brief intervals of time, may be got rid of: this enduring miracle in the sphere of spiritual life cannot."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Kay's fact was a mere delusion ; and from it we may pass to the thoughts and words of more sober-minded and careful critics and students. In truth the Bishop of Natal was giving a marvellous impulse to thought in England. But he was not perhaps fully aware that the two currents of belief and feeling which were manifesting themselves in this country might be traced, within the limits and beyond the borders of his own South African diocese, in communities not belonging to the Church of England. These were the Presbyterian and Calvinistic societies, the peace of which had been disturbed by controversies on the personality of the devil, on the duty or the wickedness of inquiry, on the power of man to *will* what he will be, on the arbitrary selection of some as chosen vessels before their birth, all others being rejected. The direction in which the current was flowing, was shown in the election of Mr. Burgers, a "renowned heretic," as President of the Transvaal. On this subject some remarks by the Rev. Henry Rawlings deserve to be noted.

"The story of Colenso's career, as commonly told, does not," he thinks, "throw any special light upon religious progress in South Africa, because the conflict between the Progressive and the Conservative parties here took its origin from other sources, notably Dutch Liberal theology, and received its stamp from the peculiar circumstances of the colony. Of course, I do not mean to say that Colenso did not exercise great influence here. Undoubtedly he did, as he did everywhere,—even in Holland itself, and amongst the most learned and liberal professors there. But the point is that he did not impart the original impulse here, nor did he give to

<sup>1</sup> *Crisis Hupfeldiana*, p. 93.

the struggle its characteristic nature. He only reinforced (powerfully, it may be) tendencies already manifested.

- “When I learnt in the beginning of 1862 that Colenso was occupied with a work upon the Pentateuch, I sent him the then published first part of Professor Kuenen’s now famous work upon the Old Testament. He replied on April 1, ‘I thank you most sincerely for sending me Kuenen’s book, which will be of the greatest use to me. It has compelled me in the first place to read Dutch, and I shall now be able to appreciate *De Onderzoeker* better than I could. But I have now read the first 186 pages of the book, those which concern the Pentateuch, with deep interest, and fully understand what you say about the value of it.’ And he related in the preface to Part I. of his own work on the Pentateuch that, when he was occupied in Natal in preparing it for the press, he was still unacquainted with all other foreign works on the Old Testament, except those of Ewald and Kurtz, of which the first was somewhat liberal and the second wholly and entirely orthodox; and that after becoming acquainted with other works, and especially that of Kuenen, which he calls a work of singular merit, he had to modify his own in some respects.
- “On my advice he visited Holland in September 1863, and wrote to me on October 5 of that year:—‘I have just returned from a delightful visit to Leiden. I discussed with Professor Kuenen at full length every point of difficulty in the criticism of the Pentateuch. The contrast between the reception which I met with from really learned Hebrew and Biblical scholars at Leiden, and that which has been my lot in England from an unlearned and prejudiced clergy is very striking, and not a little humiliating to an Englishman. I saw most of the notabilities of Leiden,—among the rest, Professor Scholten, Professor Van Hengel, Professor Rauwenhof, &c. . . . When I visited Germany, Professor Hupfeld was unfortunately out on his vacation tour.’
- “Later Kuenen visited the Bishop in England, and there arose between them a friendship which had very important fruits for theological science. . . . The readers of *De Onderzoeker*

know how much is now made of Dutch theology in England, and I trust that it will be clear from the foregoing that the first cause of this must be sought chiefly in Colenso's work, and at the same time that there was every chance that Colenso would have remained still for a long time unacquainted with Holland's theological work, if the existence of two languages in South Africa had not been the means of making him conversant with the theological literary work of Holland."

When he left Natal, he did not intend to be absent from his diocese for more than eighteen months or two years at furthest. He was detained in England for a much longer time; but, indefatigable in his work, he availed himself of delays caused by his opponents, not by himself, to do what he could towards making English readers acquainted with the Biblical criticism of the Continent, and especially of that country in Europe with which, in the days of Erasmus, England was more closely connected than with any other. The interruptions caused by the so-called trial at Capetown and its consequences prevented his settling down, during the later portion of his stay in England, with any prospect of being able to complete the Fifth Part of his work before returning to his diocese. He therefore resolved, by translating Professor Kuenen's criticisms on the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, to show how nearly the results attained by a great Continental scholar going independently over the same ground with himself corresponded with his own. Of the book, generally, he spoke as "a splendid instance of clear and scholarly criticism"; and undoubtedly it is so. But its extreme brevity and its marvellous compression of matter detract from its fitness for popular use; and probably for English minds Professor Kuenen's method must be less attractive than that of the Bishop, which places the evidence for each statement before the reader, and leaves to him the responsibility of forming his

own judgement. It is scarcely necessary to say that Professor Kuenen regarded the Bishop's main position as established beyond a shadow of doubt. This position rested on the composite character of the Pentateuch, and affirmed it. If these books are the production of different writers, then only a portion of them can be the work of Moses, and it becomes possible that no part of it may be such. In comparison with this all other considerations have a subordinate interest. The field of inquiry is thrown open to all workers; and the determination of the time at which the several books were written must depend wholly on the evidence. In the method of making this search the scholars of the Continent exhibited a remarkable amount of agreement; and, with the exception of the small minority who still strove to maintain the old traditional notion, they all held that the book of Deuteronomy was the work of a writer living under the later kings of Judah. The time of this writer might be fixed in the reign of Manasseh; or the composition of the book might be ascribed to that of Josiah. This was a matter of quite secondary importance as compared with the great fact that it was written some seven or eight centuries after the Mosaic age. But between the Bishop's conclusions and those of Professor Kuenen it can scarcely be said that there was any substantial difference. Such points of divergence as there may have been are reserved for notice in our survey of the Bishop's examination of the Pentateuch.

Nor does this translation of Kuenen's book make up all the work accomplished by the Bishop before he left England to return to his diocese. Almost on the eve of his departure he published, with elaborate notes by himself, the translation of a treatise by Dr. Oort on the worship of Baalim in Israel, based on Dr. Dozy's volume on the Israelites at Mecca. The subject had for him a deep interest, as indeed it must have for all who really wish to ascertain the true course of religious



developement both in Judah and in Israel. What was the origin, and what was the character, of the religion which Mahomet set himself either to reform or to root up? By whom and when was the sanctuary at Mecca established? and what relation, if any, was there between the worship in this sanctuary and that of the temples of Gibeon, Gilgal, or Jerusalem? Dr. Dozy's researches led him to the conclusion that

“*din Ibrahim*, the old religion in Arabia . . . was a remainder of the religion of the Simeonites, who had founded the sanctuary,”

and that

“the great festival of Islam was originally an Israelitish feast.”

If this be so, then, the Bishop remarks,

“we have here given us a new source of help towards the knowledge of the religious condition of Israel about the time when the tribe of Simeon emigrated.”

With the question of the time of this emigration the Bishop dealt in the first appendix to his Fifth Part, his conclusion being that a small body of the Simeonites emigrated shortly before the death of Saul, the greater migration occurring at some time during David's reign.<sup>1</sup> The fact of the connexion between Mecca and the Simeonites seems to be accurately ascertained; and in the fact itself there is nothing surprising. It is simply the relationship exhibited in the genealogy which makes Isaac and Ishmael brethren.

“In fact,” the Bishop remarks, “the religion of the Israelites in Palestine and that of the Simeonites at Mecca are as twin sisters, who, parted in youth from one another, have experienced heaven-wide differences of education, so that in

<sup>1</sup> Part V., *Critical Analysis of Genesis*, p. 269.

their old age they do not at all resemble each other, while they have both of them merely slight reminiscences of that which has made them what they are.”<sup>1</sup>

But this calm examination of facts and of the evidence for them carried weight only amongst the few who had no other object than to ascertain the truth. The effect of the earlier parts of the Bishop's work on the Pentateuch in this country was to open wide the flood-gates of theological strife and animosity. In almost every quarter in which his criticisms were rejected, they were rejected with a vehemence which showed that the feeling of resentment had been deeply stirred. In many quarters they were denounced with a bitterness and ferocity which revealed how far the iron had entered into their soul. But high above all other sounds rose the cry of anger and indignation at the method which the Bishop had chosen to employ in the execution of his task. He had laid violent hands on the sacred ark of the popular belief. He had sedulously instilled doubts into the minds of the ill-informed and the half-educated. He was like a critic who could do nothing more than point out the flaws of a beautiful picture or the petty blemishes of a splendid building. He had exhibited in some portions of sacred books difficulties, which would or might be found to extend through every other part of them. He had shown a cynical carelessness for the consequences of his destructive arguments, if not a malignant eagerness to bring about a collapse of all belief. The precautions which more exact or more charitable thinkers would feel themselves bound to take he had refused to take. He might have been content to mark the beneficent working of Christianity, and have convinced himself that any imperfections in that work were more than compensated by the vast benefits bestowed by the Church upon mankind. He might

<sup>1</sup> *Worship of Baalim*, p. 4.

have followed the advice given by Horace to some would-be poets, and have left his manuscript in his desk for nine years. If he had not the patience to do this, he might have gone back to the good old fashion, and might, as Dr. Donaldson had done with his *Jashar*, have clothed his thoughts with the decent covering of a foreign tongue. Why could he not write in Latin? and, still more, why should he write at all? He had not come to the conclusion that there is no God or that Christianity is a delusion; and if he had not done so, why should he lead people on a path which must bring them to that conclusion? What need was there of showing that some of the positions occupied by Christian teachers or thinkers were untenable, some of their claims and beliefs groundless, and some of the weapons employed by them against opponents illegitimate?

No single sentence can return an answer to this string of questions. Some of them might come from men who, conscious of the faults of popular methods, were doing their best in other ways to remove them. Others might be asked by men who were resolved to maintain a system which they regarded as perfect, and to inforce their shibboleth on all. Opponents such as these could deserve no mercy. But the best mode of dealing with the Old Testament, as with any other book, might remain, nevertheless, an open question. The thought of England had not been stagnant during the quarter of a century which preceded the publication of the Bishop's book. Many an old superstition had been exploded, many narrow and exclusive notions had been got rid of, many falsehoods exposed and much real progress made, without causing any wide-spread disquietude or creating an alarm which might be easily intensified into panic. Such good service had been done by many writers, by none perhaps more successfully than by Dr. Stanley.

There are more ways than one of doing the same thing ;

and of this no one was more aware than Dr. Stanley, who frankly confessed that he preferred his own method of dealing with the Bible to that of Bishop Colenso. In his candid and generous speech on "The South African Controversy in its relations to the Church of England,"<sup>1</sup> he draws a sharp contrast between the two methods.

"His peculiar style of criticism," he said, "is not such as commends itself to me, nor is his mode of approaching the Sacred Volume that which is consonant to my tastes and feelings. . . . My endeavour has been, in the first instance, to get whatever there is of good, whatever there is of elevation, whatever there is of religious instruction, whatever there is of experience, whatever there is of the counsel of God, whatever there is of knowledge of the heart of man, whatever there is of the grace of poetry, whatever there is of historical truth, whatever there is that is true, honest, lovely, of good report, of virtue, and of praise in the highest degree, as they exist nowhere else in the same degree, in the Sacred Scripture. . . . That I think is the best way of approaching the Bible."

Of the beauty of this method, and of the great benefits to be derived from it, there can be no question. But it has this marked characteristic, that it does its destructive work without calling attention to it; that it generally keeps the process out of sight; and that its destructive effects may be more far-reaching than those of more direct assault. Dr. Stanley saw, for instance, how marvellously Samson differs from all other Jews before or after him: so in a few sentences he speaks of his love of practical jokes and his frolicsome and irregular exploits, thus leaving the impression that a personage so utterly unlike his countrymen in all his essential features must be an importation from the traditions of some other tribe or nation. So, again, to give point to the

<sup>1</sup> Oxford and London, James Parker and Co., 1867.

ceaseless remonstrances and denunciations of the prophets, he remarks that the national religion of the Jews down to the Babylonish captivity was the sensual and bloody idolatry of the Ashera, or "grove," and that the prophets were an insignificantly small minority of earnest and pure-minded men who carried on a vain fight against these abominations. Nothing could be more true; but the implication is that the history of the books of the Pentateuch, of the Kings, and, immeasurably more, of the Chronicles, is inexact and untrustworthy. If the religion of the whole nation was of this sort in the days of Hezekiah and Josiah, then the whole system of the Levitical law, if it was ever carried out at all, must belong to a still later age. That this should be the condition of a people who had heard in the wilderness the magnificent discourses of the book of Deuteronomy, was inconceivable; and in this case, these discourses must have been put together in some later centuries. Dr. Stanley's method, therefore, although it may seem to give only, or chiefly, positive results, is yet to a high degree negative. It is none the worse on this account; and it might be pleasanter to confine ourselves to it altogether, were there not other enemies to be fought with, other barriers to be surmounted, other stumbling-blocks to be moved out of the way. Dr. Stanley's method, always (perhaps) more inviting, is also fully justified, so long as it is addressed to those who are capable of appreciating it. To those who lack the historical faculty, his words might come with a pleasant sound, but they would produce on them no great impression. To those who might be perplexed and distressed by the seeming fact that an infallible book displayed some mistakes, blunders, inconsistencies, and contradictions, his method would seem much like an evasion or slurring over of difficulties,—would seem, in short, not altogether ingenuous. But Dr. Stanley was far too earnest a lover of the truth to allow the notion to get abroad

that he condemned the work of the Bishop of Natal. His own mode of dealing with the Bible was, he knew, not the only mode.

“Although Dr. Colenso’s mode may not commend itself to me as the best, it may do so to other minds; and therefore I could never bring myself to condemn any mode . . . however different from mine it may be, supposing always that it is a *bona fide* honest attempt to ascertain what is the nature of the Sacred Books, and to draw instruction from them. . . . He has thought it his duty to endeavour to ascertain, as far as possible, the dates and authors of those several books, and that by a minute and laborious analysis, which has hardly ever been surpassed by any divine of the Church of England.”

But it was not for Dr. Stanley’s hearers or readers that the Bishop of Natal was writing. Was there, or was there not, throughout the English Church, a state of feeling about the letter of the Bible, the expression of which looked much like an admission of fetish-worship? Was there, or was there not, a self-contradictory teaching with regard to the value and authority of sacred books, which could only bewilder, mislead, and corrupt? Were not thousands mentally and morally weakened by the abject superstition which treated appearances of error as in no way impairing their infallibility? If it was so, how could this deadly disease be arrested by Dr. Stanley’s method? The disease was, in truth, raging.

“The Bible,” Mr. Burgon had said,<sup>1</sup> “is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it (where are we to stop?), every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more

<sup>1</sup> *Inspiration and Interpretation*, p. 89.

some part of it less, but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the throne, absolute,—faultless,—unerring,—supreme.”

Yet the same writer, who could give expression to what is either frantic folly or mere blasphemy,<sup>1</sup> could advise young students to

“approach the volume of Holy Scripture with the same candour and the same unprejudiced spirit with which you would approach any other famous book of high antiquity. Study it with, at least, the same attention. Give, at least equal heed to all its statements. . . . Above all, beware of playing tricks with its plain language. . . . Be truthful, and unprejudiced, and honest, and consistent, and logical, and exact throughout, in your work of interpretation.”

But this freedom from prejudice, this honesty, this truthfulness, must bring them to Mr. Burgon’s conclusions, must leave them convinced that every sentence, every letter of the Bible is as absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme as He whose direct and immediate work it is. Thus we have a pretence of freedom with the reality of an abject slavery. It was more than superstition; it was mere madness. Were there none who would feel it their duty to arrest its progress? Of the nature and extent of the disease there could be no question. Mr. Garbett had declared that

“in all consistent reason we must accept the whole of the inspired autographs, or reject the whole as from end to end unauthoritative and worthless;”

and in a manual on *Verbal Inspiration*, Dr. Baylee, the principal of one of the most important theological colleges in the kingdom, had laid it down that

“every word, every syllable, every letter [of the Bible] is just

<sup>1</sup> If the Bible be the Word of God (the Church of England has never said that it is so), would Dean Burgon apply to the Bible the phrases in which the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel speaks of the Divine Word?

what it would be, had God spoken from heaven without any human intervention.<sup>1</sup> . . . Every scientific statement is infallibly accurate, all its history and narratives of every kind are without any inaccuracy. The words and phrases have a grammatical and philological accuracy such as is possessed by no human composition."

These utterances are not much more than an echo of Dean Burgon's words, and indeed are not worthy of attention, except as evidence of the extent to which these absurdities were gravely maintained at the time when the Bishop of Natal came to do battle with this gross superstition. The character and incidents of the fight will best be described in the Bishop's letters.

"TO JOHN MERRIFIELD, ESQ. (*a friend from boyhood*).

"KENSINGTON, *November 29, 1862.*

"MY DEAR OLD FRIEND,

"I was rejoiced to get your first letter, just as I was starting for Cheshire. I took it with me, meaning to answer it, but brought it back unanswered, and now have received the second. I thank you most sincerely for both, and for all the words of encouragement which you have sent me. Thank God, I am not at all troubled by the storm which rages around me. Perhaps my colonial experience has helped me in this respect. To tell you the truth, it is such a joyous thing to feel the solid rock under one's feet, that I have to guard against being *too* regardless of the feelings of others. *They* cannot see what I see plainly as the sun in the sky. And I must allow for the bitterness and even anguish of spirit which many good people will feel certainly at first, while they think that I am only taking

<sup>1</sup> The words look much like nonsense. If they have any meaning, they affirm that there are not, and that there cannot be, any corruptions of the text in the Old Testament or the New. With many writers the allegation of corruptions in the text is a favourite plea for evading difficulties.



away from them all the light of their life. I do not intend to answer any anonymous writers. I had a particular reason for writing one letter to the *Telegraph*, and perhaps I had better not have written it. Happily, I have several good men at hand to help me in replying to adversaries. I cannot but hope that the cause of Truth is gaining ground daily."

To his friend Mr. Shepstone,<sup>1</sup> in Natal, he writes :—

"September 4, 1862.

"We have now been a month in England, and you may suppose that I am by this time deep in my work, the magnitude and importance of which increases daily in the estimation of others as well as myself. . . . It is true that Lushington's recent judgement would bring me under sentence in two points. . . . But I think I may say that no sensible person in England supposes that judgement will be maintained. . . . It is the most inconsistent and unfortunate judgement that has ever been given. Professor Grote, of Cambridge, a first-rate man, writing from the orthodox point of view in a most temperate manner, has expressed the alarm which he and all other intelligent clergymen must feel at having one, if not two, new articles made for them besides the thirty-nine, by a mere stroke of the pen in a lawyer's study,—for so it really is. The judgement does more than all the Convocation could do by months of discussion ; and, as Professor Grote says, lays the clergy under a yoke the tyranny of which is quite insufferable. Strangely enough, however, the very same judgement allows me free licence to publish my *new* book without fear of coming under Church censure. You may now discuss the authenticity of Genesis and criticise it as much as you please ; only you must be able to say that you 'believe in all the canonical Scriptures,' meaning only thereby that you believe that all things necessary to salvation are contained in the Bible, and that to that extent it has the direct

<sup>1</sup> See *Ten Weeks in Natal*, throughout.

sanction of the Almighty. This, of course, any one could say, who believes that the fear, and faith, and love of God are taught in the Bible, and that, so far as the words of man teach such Divine truths, the writer's heart must have been taught by the Spirit of God to utter them. Now whatever the judgement has given is ground gained for ever. This part will not be appealed against, and therefore it practically stands as henceforward the law of the English Church. . . . My belief is that a strong effort will be made next session of Parliament to procure the repeal of the Act of Uniformity."

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

"6 CRESCENT, BLACKFRIARS,  
"October 2, 1862.

. . . . "I had a very pleasing letter from Magma by this mail. . . . It is quite refreshing to receive such a letter from him, in which he expresses most heartily his deep sense of all the kindness he has received from us and his determination to be my child for the rest of his life. I long to come back to you all, and I am not without hope that I shall."

TO THE SAME.

"LONDON, *November 4, 1862.*

. . . . "Last Wednesday the book, Part I., was published. . . . It is not yet a week from the day of publication, and the fourth edition is in the press, though the second will only be ready for delivery to-day. This fourth edition will complete 10,000 copies."

TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, KENSINGTON,  
"December 29, 1862.

. . . . "I am printing Part II., which I hope will be ready before the meeting of Convocation, when no doubt, a grand discussion will take place. I am in very good heart upon the whole matter,—am still Bishop of Natal, and as far

as I can see at present, am likely to remain so. I shall certainly, as at present advised, not resign; and it seems to be exceedingly doubtful if they can eject me under any circumstances. However, time will show, and I am prepared for anything. One thing I am resolved on, to go steadily forward with my book, whatever may be the consequences. The movement, however, is begun which will end,<sup>1</sup> I cannot doubt, in a revolution of the English Church. . . . The attempt is made, of course, in every way possible to vilify me, and decry my book. A certain Mr. McCaul, son of Dr. McCaul, Divinity Professor at King's College, London, has written to the *Record* and gives out that he has picked a hole in my scholarship. Fortunately I have received very interesting letters from some of the first scholars in England and Europe, which are all that I need desire. . . . I have also a very favourable letter from Professor Hupfeld, of Halle, one of the most eminent German critics. . . . It is hopeless to do anything until I can arouse the laity; and thank God, I am reaching *them*, I hope, effectually. . . . I see no reason to suppose that I shall not return to Natal, as Bishop, with full power to make any reform, not compulsory of course, but when desired by congregations, as may be needed. . . . I do not mean that by that time the law will be altered by Parliament, for it will be a long and slow work to change thoroughly the laws of the Church in England. But the work will have begun, and the very best thing to help it forward would be to see the reformation *actually* in progress, as I hope it may be, in Natal."

"TO THE REV. A. W. L. RIVETT (*one of the clergy of his diocese*).

"KENSINGTON, *January 4, 1863.*

"I have now published another book, of which, of course, some tidings will reach you. I have sent some copies for

<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt that the Bishop did not reckon upon this end as likely to come in his own time. His words will remain true, if the movement should go on for a century.

sale to the care of Mr. Foster by mail-steamer. Perhaps you can aid him in the matter. But I have not made presents of the book to any of the clergy (except my commissary), as I do not wish to press my opinions upon any of them, otherwise I should send a copy to you. Should you hear it said that I am about to resign my see, you are at liberty to contradict it. I have no present intention to do anything of the kind ; but I intend to fight the battle of liberty of thought and speech for the clergy."

"TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

"23 SUSSEX PLACE, *January 26, 1863.*

"It is impossible not to see that the reformation now begun will be of the deepest and most extreme character. The men of science and literature are almost in a body with me. I have seen a great deal of Sir Charles Lyell. . . . He is about sixty-five years old, I should think ; a very pleasing, intelligent, venerable man, in a green and active old age. And he too has just completed, and in a few days will publish, a work on the antiquity of the human race which will entirely support my views and utterly upset the orthodox view of the degradation of man. . . . I have just come from a very interesting visit to an old gentleman (foreign translator at the Foreign Office), Mr. Norris, who seems to know every language under the sun. . . . He showed me a very curious MS. of the Vei language. This is the language of a lost African people. And it seems that a native of that country went once to visit one of our settlements, and there saw an English book. He caught the idea of an alphabet at once, went home, and made a syllabarium for himself, *i.e.* characters to represent not mere letters, but elementary syllables. . . . Accordingly, here was a long MS. written by himself in these characters. It told the tale of a journey made by a native into the interior, and introduced an old story which, Mr. Norris says, occurs almost identically the same in an old Cornish legend. It is to this effect. A man went to serve a master for wages.

. . . At the end of his time the master gave him his choice, to be paid in money or in advice. He chose the latter, and worked on, till he had received three pieces of advice, and no money. Then he went home, taking a cake which his master had given him to eat with his wife, in the middle of which they found all the money. As to the three pieces of advice, he applied them on three several occasions, and saved his life in consequence."<sup>1</sup>

TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *March 2, 1863.*

. . . "The day after I was turned out of S.P.G. [from the list of Vice-Presidents] I was admitted into the Athenæum —by invitation from the Committee. The Governor will know that this is a great victory, as it is the stronghold of the dignified ecclesiastics. Dean Trench violently opposed my admission ; but the Committee carried me in by 9 to 3.

. . . "All sorts of lying paragraphs are inserted in the journals by way of damaging my position,—one that my new book was lying a dead weight on the shelves of the publishers. *Ans.* Nearly 8,000 copies sold in three weeks. Another that nothing is known of my intentions, but the Bishop of Capetown will administer my diocese till I have made up my mind. *Ans.* I fully intend to return to my diocese as soon as I have done the work for which I came to England. . . .

"On Saturday I received a round robin from the Archbishop and Bishops except Hereford (Hampden). . . . My answer is in preparation and will be calm and decisive. I tell them that I have no intention of resigning ; that the 'scandal' they complain of is not caused by me, but by those who maintain a state of things in the Church opposed to the plainest results of modern science. The fact is that these 'round robins' have become ridiculous, through their famous attempts in that line upon the *Essays and Reviews* and

<sup>1</sup> This story appears also in an Irish tale, under the title of "John Carson's Wages."

Sabbath questions. There is not a *man* among them; but they are obliged to flock together, like sheep running through a gate, when one leads the way."

TO SIR CHARLES LYELL.

"KENSINGTON, *February 27, 1863.*

"The *Record* thinks that *you* will be much offended by my introduction to the Athenæum. You will be amused with their leader in Friday's paper. Though such a friend, it seems, to their principles, I believe that you do not take in, as I do, that respectable journal."

TO THE SAME.

"KENSINGTON, *March 6, 1863.*

"I had an hour's talk with the Bishop of London [Tait] by appointment on Wednesday last, about which I will talk to you on Wednesday next, if I have not the pleasure of meeting you before. He then spoke of your book as lying on the table, and seemed to think that it was quite possible to hold both it and the Bible story as *true in some sense.*"

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *April 5, 1863.*

"The Bishops . . . are one by one forbidding me to preach and minister in their dioceses, &c., as if I cared for that when my books enter into so many houses, and are welcomed, thank God, by so many hearts, and when, if I had a desire to preach, God's great House is ever open to me; and the Bishop of London is an example to me of the propriety of open-air preaching. No doubt I shall manage to address my old Norfolk parishioners in this way before I leave England, if the embargo is not taken off."

TO THE SAME.

"*May 1, 1863.*

. . . "The change has been decidedly in my favour since I last wrote, owing to the line of conduct which the Bishops

have adopted . . . viz. to anathematize instead of answering me. This does not satisfy the English mind, and I have numerous letters in consequence from clergy as well as laity. However, my next book will bring matters to a crisis. I am hard at work upon it, and have it more than half printed. . . . Canon Stanley has just printed a letter to the Bishop of London, urging the abolition of subscription to the Articles and Liturgy, which implies more than it says—viz. that the Bishop of London is not averse to some such measure. . . .

“What Bishop Gray is going to do in my case is at present quite unknown to us here in England. . . . Now, as I am entirely protected by Lushington’s judgement for what I have said about the Pentateuch, and as I shall be able to show in my next preface that I am equally supported, in regard to the suggestions which I have made about our Lord’s ignorance of matters of human science, by some of the highest authorities in our Church, I do not believe that he can do anything. . . .

“In one word, I am as strong, and cheerful, and full of hope as ever. . . . The ‘Church Union’ has had a meeting, where they have seriously discussed the following question : ‘Whereas Bishop Colenso’s Part I. was full of errors in Hebrew, and Part II. shows a masterly acquaintance with the language, ought we not to apply to him to know by whom he has been assisted?’ The fact is that the errors in Part I. are all mythical. They took it for granted that I could not possibly know Hebrew, and find to their surprise that I know more about it than they imagined. . . . There are only *two* trivial errors, of not the slightest consequence to the argument, but mere oversights from following the English version without referring to the originals,—one in Part I., the other in Part II.,—which have been brought to light by the most hawk-eyed criticism ; for I need not tell you that every line has been greedily searched for something to throw at me by way of reproach. I am, therefore, quite at ease on this point.”

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

“SUSSEX PLACE, *June 2, 1863.*”

- . . . . “I think you will see that the Convocation have done the very best thing they could for me. . . . If *this* is all the heresy they can find after nine days’ searching by the most eminent divines of England, it will follow that my position is considerably stronger than even I myself had imagined. You are quite right about the necessity of my doing the work completely *here*. . . .
- “You will see that the Bishop of London (Tait) does not act with the other Bishops. *They*, headed by the Bishop of Oxford, have cut me dead. But I met him in Pall Mall a few days ago, where he was walking arm-in-arm with another Bishop, and I was going to pass him with a salutation. But he made a point of shaking me heartily by the hand, and stopping to ask me some friendly question—the other standing mute all the while. I could not see who it was: perhaps he did not know me. . . . A friend told me that after the debate on Lord Ebury’s motion (for abolishing Subscription) he had heard Lord Derby say to the Archbishop of Canterbury, ‘Another such debate, and the question of Subscription will be settled.’ It is felt that Subscription is doomed since the late division. . . .
- “Speaking generally the *cowardice* of men in England is something amazing. The truth will prevail, I doubt not; but it is painful to me how little *love of truth* there is among those from whom one hoped most. I see that the Metropolitan is going to take some measure against me. And it is plain from his reply to his clergy that what I have all along believed is true, viz., that the ‘letters of inhibition’ were part of a concerted scheme, planned by the Bishop of Oxford and others,<sup>1</sup> by which they hoped to get up ‘public opinion’ against me. In this, however, they have signally failed. The only effect of these letters has been to enlist a great deal more of public opinion on my side. . . . An old

<sup>1</sup> We have for this the admission of the Bishop of Oxford himself, see p.175, note.



gentleman writes to me that he has just seen Professor Hitzig, of Heidelberg, probably the best Hebraist in Europe, who said to him: 'Your Bishops are making themselves the laughter of all Europe. Every Hebraist knows that the animal mentioned in Leviticus is really the *hare*. The word is derived from the Arabic, and has the same meaning in both languages. Every physicist knows that it does not chew the cud. But most of all is it ridiculous to assume that there are no physical errors in the Pentateuch.' My *hare* has been running a pretty round since I last wrote, and done excellent service to the cause of truth,—the matter being perfectly within the grasp of every old hunting squire. The following epigram has been going the round of the Clubs, and may amuse you:

“‘ The Bishops all have sworn to shed their blood,  
To prove 'tis true the Hare doth chew the cud ;  
O Bishops, Doctors, and Divines, beware !  
Weak is the faith that hangs upon a Hair ! ’”

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

“ SUSSEX PLACE, *June 24*, 1863.

. . . . “ I think you will see by the papers of this mail that my hopes have been fulfilled, and my Part III. has put me (as Dean Milman says in a private letter which I saw) ‘on much higher ground.’ In reality, there is no difference whatever in the ‘level.’ *He* says that whereas before I was only destructive, now I am constructive; and I dare say that others will say the same. And if they choose to say so, they are welcome for my part to do so.

“ It is their best way, I suppose, of getting out of the difficulty into which their own mistake of the nature of my work has carried them. Nothing, however, could have happened more favourably for my purpose than the course which has been followed under the advice (I doubt not) of the Bishop of Oxford. It is evident that they have entirely misapprehended the whole nature of my undertaking. They took it for granted that a mere ‘arithmetician’ would know

nothing of Hebrew criticism—and the contents of my first volume confirmed them in this, as it contained chiefly arithmetical arguments, although one at all acquainted with the subject would have perceived glimpses of another kind of criticism in the midst of my calculations.

“I have now finished about *half* my work, and hope at the end of twelve months to have completed it. *Then*, as far as I can now see, I shall prepare to leave for Natal, and the sight of the Zulu handwriting which reached me from William, Magema, and Umkungo this morning, makes me feel quite a longing to be back again among them.

“Part III. was published last Thursday, 4,000 copies, and already the second edition of 1,500 is in the press. The two former parts are also selling steadily. A gentleman was introduced to me at the Athenæum two or three days ago, who told me that he had just come from Rome, and the book was producing an immense sensation all over the Continent. At Rome he went into a Jesuit’s room, and found him deep in the study of it. He then went to the room of another Jesuit, and found him similarly engaged. Manning has been preaching at Rome about it, and of course the Romish Church triumphs at the perplexities of Protestantism, and calls on every one to come and put himself under the direction of the infallible Church, which can do without the Bible. . . . Of course I am brought into daily connexion with all the great men of science, who are warmly with me. . . .

“I was invited by the head master of Harrow to the speeches, with Mrs. Colenso, last Thursday. . . . It is usual for the school to take note of their *friends*, when they come out of the recitations, by calling out their names for cheers. And it may show how the tide has turned to mention (though I would only do it to a friend such as you) that the lads gave me a hearty *double* set of cheers, in presence of my arch-opponents, Dr. Wordsworth and Dean Trench. . . .

“Please *keep up the hearts* of my poor people at Bishopstowe.”

## TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *July 23, 1863.*

"My third preface has produced great effect, and almost silenced my adversaries. Indeed, not a word is now said about my *leaving the Church*. It is felt that, if I am to go, then Dean Milman, Canon Stanley, and a host of our most distinguished men, must go also. . . .

"I think that your document leaves you full authority to act for me. If you have not already had occasion to interfere, I now request you to take such steps as may be necessary to carry on the operations at Bishopstowe, the printing of Kafir books, and the preaching at St. Mary's (which, being unconsecrated, is merely a building erected on ground for which I am trustee, and you, therefore, acting trustee). . . . Do not let the Dean take possession of *my* trust property. Better that places should remain vacant till my return, which I shall hasten as much as possible."

## TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *August 26, 1863.*

. . . "I send by this mail a copy of Mr. Wilson's address to the Privy Council, which I think you will pronounce to be a most masterly document. It is generally understood that they, Wilson and Williams, will completely reverse the unfavourable part of Lushington's judgement; and of course the favourable part stands good as ever. Wilson's arguments completely cover my own case. It would be ridiculous for the Bishop of Capetown to pass any judgement on me, if Wilson succeeds.<sup>1</sup> . . .

"Magema has written to me a capital *English* letter<sup>2</sup> this time, saying that he will have finished the New Testament and

<sup>1</sup> This would have been strictly true, if Bishop Gray proposed to exercise a jurisdiction which would be recognised by English courts. So soon as he took to what he deemed spiritual processes and spiritual sentences, he could act in defiance of the English courts. These proceedings were a nullity in English law, and from a nullity there can be no appeal on the merits of a case.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 85—88.

other printing which I gave him to do, by April or May 1864, and he is anxious that I should know it, that I may provide more, as he does not wish to leave the station! Bravo! I am thinking of having some of Callaway's productions printed, though he does not deserve it."

"TO SIR CHARLES LYELL.

"KENSINGTON, *September 13, 1863.*

"I have had a very pleasant trip, and have returned strengthened in mind and body after my intercourse with some of the best critics of Europe. It would be amusing, were it not humiliating, to see what view they take of the state of Biblical criticism in England, more especially among those who sit on the episcopal bench."

"TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *October 18, 1863.*

"Archdeacon Denison, I *hear*, has just, in his monthly periodical *The Church and State Review*, accused the Bishop of London and Professor Stanley of *rank infidelity*, and says that the former is not fit to be a Bishop! So I am in good company." . . .

TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *January 5, 1864.*

. . . . "You will see that Stanley, whom the *Record* and Archdeacon Denison consider a more dangerous heretic than myself, is to be the new Dean of Westminster, notwithstanding Wordsworth's furious fulminations. Behold the consistency of these men. . . . Dr. Wordsworth, the great stickler for Church order, can publish this libellous attack upon the ecclesiastical character of his intended superior; but there he stops short. He neither charges him with his offences before a court of law, nor resigns his own office.

"What would be thought of a major in the army, who, on hearing that some one was appointed to be colonel of his

regiment, published immediately a pamphlet charging him with cowardly or disloyal conduct? Would he not be bound either to bring those charges before a court-martial, or to quit the army himself? . . .

“I hear from Bleek that the rumour at the Cape is that I am to be suspended, and the Bishop to go up to Natal and act for me. Of course, I cannot prevent his doing what the patent allows him to do, viz. to go up in person, and while present personally, assume my spiritual powers. But as to temporalities, I would not give way for a moment. Do not therefore, as I am sure you will not, part with any of the documents in your possession should he demand them.”

Litigation is commonly a costly process, and the steps which the Bishop was compelled to take in order to test the pretensions of the so-called judgement of the Metropolitan of Capetown were likely to involve him in expenses which he could not meet from his personal resources. His friends accordingly resolved to raise a Defence Fund, to which reference is made in the following letter:—

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

“SUSSEX PLACE, *February 2, 1864.*

“The first donation came on Saturday from a gentleman in Yorkshire, a layman, quite a stranger to me, £150, with a promise of ‘five times as much or more, if needed,’ and an earnest exhortation to maintain my ground to the utmost, ‘which is of more consequence at present than the continuation of your work.’ The second was £50 from a Beneficed Clergyman’ who is unwilling to give his name because he lives in a focus of orthodoxy; but this is his *first* subscription.” . . . .

“*February 5.*

“I copy a passage from a letter from a clergyman this moment received: he is a master at one of our great schools. ‘I have spoken of the Defence Fund to several of the masters, all of whom intend to subscribe. Whether

they will give their names or not depends on the course adopted by the masters of other public schools, Rugby, Eton, Marlborough, &c. I have talked . . . to the head master of —, and he thinks it is yet uncertain whether they will subscribe anonymously or openly. There can be no question that the latter is the more honourable course, and I shall use whatever influence I have to get it adopted.'

"I don't think that he will succeed. But even a row of 'anonymous' clergy will tell a tale."

TO THE REV. T. P. FERGUSON.

"KENSINGTON, *February 26, 1864.*

"I am quite sure that your thoughts in the matter of the Defence Fund are only good and kind towards me, and that you have done what you felt to be right. And I do not wish to put any force upon your own sense of duty in the matter. There is one point, however, and indeed a principal point, in your letter, on which in justice to myself I must give you some information. You speak of my 'clergy' being adverse to me, and of my inability to advise or direct them. And you have in mind, I suppose, a protest from eight of my clergy, addressed to me about a twelve-month ago, calling upon me to resign my see, &c. You must remember first under what circumstances that document was forwarded. The 'Bishops' Manifesto' had just reached the colony, and it is by no means improbable that the protest itself was suggested by a letter from the chaplain of some English Bishop to Archdeacon Grubb. It was composed at a time when the Bishop of St. David's had not thrown his shield around me, and the Convocation was expected to grind me to powder. Above all, it was written before the Privy Council had, by its recent judgement, completely legalised my present position."

The Bishop goes on to examine the list of names. Two only were those of University men, one of these being

Archdeacon Grubb, who, knowing that the Bishop was going to England to publish his work on the Pentateuch, accepted the office of commissary during his absence without hesitation, and discharged it until he was frightened by the uproar from England. His signature almost of necessity carried those of the rest, and of these, one, Tonnesen, publicly expressed his regret for having signed it.

“You may have heard that I have received a warm address of sympathy from a large body of the laity of Durban, and that a counter address, which was prepared, has *not* been sent, because, as I suppose, it was not sufficiently signed. Thus you may get a general idea of the state of things in the diocese, and as Mr. Shepstone says (previously to the results of my last volume, with Perowne’s admission and Thirlwall’s judgement of Convocation, and previous of course to the recent judgement) it only needs me to gain the day in England to have all right in Natal sufficiently for all practical purposes.”

TO MISS COBBE.

“23 SUSSEX PLACE, *February 29, 1864.*

“I heartily thank you for your little books. . . . I can say no more than that your words speak to my heart throughout, and that I truly rejoice in the work which you are enabled from above to do, and which, God be praised, you are doing. What my own future course may be, is still uncertain, though I think I see before me the path of duty becoming more clear daily. . . . Should the decision as to jurisdiction be in my favour, as we have every reason to expect, then I shall be in a position to return to Africa free of all ecclesiastical shackles, except the vows made at my consecration. . . . The late judgement of the Privy Council has made a wonderful gap in the fence which protected the old superstition. ‘Take away our hot plates and pincers, and where are we?’ say the dogmatists. The *Saturday Review* compares the said ‘fence,’ which the

orthodox deemed a stone wall, to a mere paling with wide intervals between the pales, so that any clergyman may now go in and out and find pasture for himself and his flock, if only he will take care not to run his head against one of the pales,—add, *until* the said pale has become sufficiently rotten to give way at the least push.”

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

“KENSINGTON, *March 4, 1864.*

“Bishop Cotterill will, I think, be mistaken as to my clergy. The best of them has just written to say that he ‘has now been reading my third volume, and is sorry that he signed the protest.’ Another writes to me month after month in the most dutiful manner, and a third refused to sign anything, and sent his duty to me. Of course I shall have a fight *à l’outrance* with Dean Green, backed by Bishop Gray and Archdeacon Fearne. But they can do nothing. . . . You remember that Denison intimated some eight months ago his willingness to ‘bury’ me with the due honours of the Church Service, as I was not excommunicated. He seems anxious to hurry the ceremony, as he writes upon ‘the late Bishop of Natal’ though, even on his own principle, I cannot be ‘dead’ ecclesiastically till the Cape mail leaves England to-morrow evening, which *might* take my retraction, and he cannot be sure that it won’t go out and be presented to Bishop Gray on April 17.”

TO THE REV. T. P. FERGUSON.

“*March 4, 1864.*

“Thanks for your note and for all your love.  
 “But I do not think that your comparison of a Bishop with a General at all holds good.  
 “In the first place, if a commanding officer becomes unpopular with his officers,—*e.g.* Colonel C——, it may be because his *officers* are bad ; and the remedy may be to remove *them* to other regiments, as in his case has, I believe, been done. The soldiers, you remember, liked him ; and the laity have



addressed me. But at all events, if the Colonel is removed, he is allowed to retire on half-pay, or sell out. What am I to do? . . . But this after all is only a secondary question. Did St. Paul retire from the oversight of the Galatians, when they 'so soon removed from him to another gospel'? Or did he think it necessary to consider whether the clergy of the Galatian churches, who preached that other gospel, would *like* his supervision or not? 'Do I seek to please men? For, if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.'

"As soon as the 'law' deposes me, of course, my office is at an end, and I must bear the consequences of speaking what I believe to be the truth. But till then, it seems to me to be my duty to proclaim the truth, as I see it, though all the clergy and laity of England and Natal were banded against me, and though all possible annoyance and insult might be my lot for so doing; unless, indeed, I have lost all faith in the power of Truth to prevail at last over all opposition."

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

"March 29, 1864.

. . . "First let me quiet your anxieties by saying that *all is going well* with us at present, and as well as we could possibly desire, and that I am now seriously expecting that we shall sail for Natal in the fall of this year.

"The Privy Council judgement [on the *Essays and Reviews* case] has been delivered, and is of infinite importance. On every point appealed against the judgement of the court below has been reversed. . . . The decision goes very far beyond what we had any of us anticipated or hoped for, in all essential points. . . . I need not say that it sweeps away at a stroke the whole farrago of the Bishop of Capetown's judgement. On the very point of 'endless punishment,' on which the three Cape Bishops were so positive, the three English Bishops are agreed in the very opposite direction. And on every single point of the nine (on which they have condemned me) which has been under discussion in the

English courts, either in the Gorham judgement, or Lushington's, or this last of the Privy Council, *I* am justified, and they are condemned."

TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *April 4, 1864.*

"The greatest news of the last month is the 'Declaration' pushed forwards with the utmost vigour by the joint efforts of the Tractarian and Recordite parties. In the face of the judgement of the Privy Council, between 9,000 and 10,000 clergy have declared that the Church of England holds that every part of the Bible is the Word of God, and that the punishments of the other world *are* everlasting. Happily, only about *half* of the English clergy have been got to sign it; and though, of course, a great many of the non-declarants may have withheld their names for various reasons, and not because they differ from the declaration itself, yet it is plain, I think, that the *liberal* party in the clergy is considerably stronger than we ourselves had imagined, and it will, I doubt not, increase daily."

TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *June 6, 1864.*

... "We have not yet got the list of Dr. Pusey and his 11,000 virgins. But the *Record* says that almost all the *Irish* clergy have signed the declaration. If so, it is unfortunate for its *importance*, as the Irish Church stands very low in public estimation in England. Perhaps its clergy may be 5,000; take these away, and then deduct the curates under the screw from their rectors, the deacons, and the literates, and how many will remain of the genuine, intelligent, English clergy?"

TO THE SAME.

"SUSSEX PLACE, *July 3, 1864.*

"It appears from the Bishop of London's statement in Convocation that the whole number of clergy in England and