

Merriman was able to relieve him of one care in his reply, which contained a generous offer from the Rev. H. M. White,¹ a Fellow of New College, to come out and work for five years without stipend.

The Bishop was thus enabled to start the Diocesan College at Cape Town, of which Mr. White was the first Principal. Shortly afterwards the Bishop started on his first visitation, no light task, as he had mapped out for himself a coast journey to Port Elizabeth *via* Caledon, Swellendam, Knysna, and George, to be followed by a visit to the frontier *via* Grahamstown, and a return by Graaff Reinet, Beaufort West, and the Karroo. Mr. Green (afterwards Rector and Dean of Maritzburg) accompanied the Bishop as chaplain. After five weeks' incessant travelling the Bishop writes thus from Port Elizabeth—"I have had much—very much—to cheer me since I left home. But, singularly enough, the most spiritually destitute have given me most satisfaction. Most unfortunately, where our few clergy have been located, my ears have been pained by complaints and grievances, and I fear not without sufficient cause. The clergy generally in this diocese do not understand parochial work; at the same time they have very difficult duties to fulfil. These things, however, oppress me not a little, but I am not, I trust, cast down; for I have had so many signs of God's Good Spirit being with us, that it would be sinful to despond. I have now travelled 900 miles, and this (Port Elizabeth) is the first place where I have found an English Church

¹ Archdeacon of Grahamstown from 1871 till his death in 1892.

since I left Cape Town." Throughout his journey the Bishop laid the foundations of future Church work. Sites for future churches, subdivisions of existing parishes, and fresh stations for clergy were one by one marked out, the ignorant were taught, and the neglected sons and daughters of the Church sought out and encouraged by the loving counsels of their Chief Pastor.

On Michaelmas Day the Bishop confirmed fifty-two candidates in S. Mary's, Port Elizabeth, the first time that this holy ordinance had been ministered there, and he writes hopefully of the prospects of the Church in the then rising seaport. His journey had brought him in contact with existing Missionary Institutions, but, while he admired the work of the Moravians, he was constrained to say of the others, that "right-minded and religious men cannot altogether uphold them." Speaking of the colonists calling them "nests of idleness," the Bishop further expressed his opinion, "that as the parochial clergy increase, these institutions ought to be and will be broken up. They keep the coloured and white population too widely apart, and the capital and land of the country are deprived of the labour essential to the prosperity of the colony."

The Bishop wrote wisely upon this difficult problem. Settlements of native Christians under the strict control of a European missionary are apt to become exotics, and subsequent events have clearly proved that the system adopted by the London missionaries at the Kat River (to take a prominent instance) cannot but

result in disastrous failure. Leaving Port Elizabeth we find the Bishop continuing his journey towards the frontier. On his way up, whilst resting at a lonely outspan, he writes thus of himself and his work—"I daily feel more keenly my own insufficiency for the great charge entrusted to me. God give me wisdom, faithfulness, zeal, meekness, humility, patience, firmness, that I may be enabled to exercise my high office aright. I often think that when the rough work shall be over, and there may be a call for one possessing higher qualifications than myself, I shall be laid aside, and another better qualified to exercise the higher and more important functions of the Episcopate be raised up." The humility of all truly great men shone forth brightly, as the leading feature of the Bishop's character, and none can understand him without realizing that his work owes its permanence to God's Blessing upon the lowliness and true gentleness with which it was begun and continued. He passed rapidly through Grahamstown to King Williamstown, where he found Sir Harry Smith busied with a meeting of Kafir Chiefs.¹ The Bishop was introduced to them by the Governor as the Great Father of the Christians and Chief Minister of their religion, and though nothing practical came of the interview, it was noteworthy as being the first contact of the Kafir nation with our Church in its fulness of system; and furthermore as a contact

¹ The Bishop met Sandilli, the Chief of the Gaikas, who was killed in battle in the war of 1877, and Umhala, and also the renegade Jan Tshatshu, who went "on tour" in England as Dr. Philip's "model Kafir," and afterwards rebelled against the Government and became a renegade and apostate.

fraught with a great future, for the idea of Episcopacy, as a government developed from Apostolic authority, is allied closely enough with the Kafir notions of chieftainship to cause the system of the Church to be readily apprehended by them. A ministry deriving its authority from the congregation alone, which is more or less the keynote of rival systems, when compared with the limited monarchy of the Catholic hierarchy, can never influence the Kafirs *as a nation*, however favourably it may act in the case of individual converts. On his return to Grahamstown the Bishop held an Ordination, and ordained Mr. Long, afterwards of Mowbray, to the Priesthood. Visits to Bathurst, Southwell, Sidbury, Fort Beaufort, Somerset, and Cradock, with confirmations, church consecrations, and Church meetings, tried his powers of mind and body, and caused him to feel terribly the lack of means at his disposal to enable him to avail himself of the openings for Church work which were daily before him. He writes—"It is almost a mystery to me to see what a field there is before us after our long neglect of this colony." At Colesberg he held another Ordination, admitting Dr. Orpen to the Diaconate, and at Graaff Reinet he spent a Sunday, and writes—"So long have our people here been deprived of Holy Communion, that very many do not seem to know how it is administered in the English Church." At Beaufort West letters reached him announcing the arrival of Archdeacon Merriman and his party of seven clergy and catechists. This welcome reinforcement must have cheered the Bishop's heart, for his down-

ward journey through George, Riversdale, Swellendam, and Worcester afforded him fresh instances of fields ripe unto harvest with no labourers to meet them. At length he reached Stellenbosch, and after visiting the Paarl and Malmesbury, he arrived safely at Bishops-court, after a visitation journey of nigh 3000 miles over our roadless wastes, during which, besides stablishing and settling the infant Church, he had administered the Holy Rite of Confirmation to 900 persons.

Whilst Archdeacon Merriman was at Bishops-court, a Synod was held attended by fifteen clergy. The clergy of the west had previously met, and the Bishop had convened a similar meeting of the Eastern clergy whilst in Grahamstown, but this Second Synod was more important on account of its numbers, and because the tone of its debates strengthened the Bishop's hands in his line of absolute independence from all State control and interference. It was the seed of future Synodical action, which germinated in the lawful autonomy of the English Church in South Africa as a Province of the Catholic Church of Christ.¹

On February 22, 1849, the Bishop set sail for S.

¹ The protest of this Synod of Clergy against the interference of the Colonial Government in Church matters was needed. The Governor of the Cape Colony was styled "Ordinary," and one Governor threatened the Colonial Chaplain of Grahamstown with suspension because he declined to marry an uncle to his niece, although the Governor had granted a special marriage licence to legalize the proposed incest. The Table of Kindred and Affinity was accounted as nought when it clashed with the Governor's *sic volo, sic jubeo*. But the Chaplain was brave enough to carry his point, and the Governor had to give way.

Helena, which was then a place of some importance. The area of the island is forty-seven square miles, and it was uninhabited until it became a victualling station for the English East India Company in the early part of the seventeenth century. Charles II. declared war with Holland, and in 1672 a small Dutch squadron from the Cape captured S. Helena, but in 1673 it was retaken by a British fleet under Sir Richard Mauden, and granted by charter to the East India Company, in whose possession it remained until 1834, with the exception of the period during which Napoleon I. was imprisoned there.

The natives of S. Helena compose a small body of English settlers of pure English blood, and a mixed race of half-castes. The Rev. C. Masham was sent there as chaplain by the East India Company, and the S. P. G. in 1704, and subsequently in 1706, made him a grant of books. The island continued to be served by a chaplain, and in 1847 Bishop Gray sent the Rev. W. Bousefield to assist the Colonial Chaplain, Mr. Kempthorne. The island had 5000 inhabitants, and at his first visitation the Bishop confirmed over 400 people, consecrated five burial-grounds and the church at Jamestown. The Bishop ordained Mr. Frey deacon, which supplied a fourth clergyman for the island, and left Church matters in good order. On the Bishop's return to Cape Town, after six weeks' arduous toil, he found the whole colony in a tumult of justifiable indignation against the Imperial Government, on account of the iniquitous attempt of Earl Grey to turn South Africa into a penal settlement.

The colony had been in existence for nearly 200 years, and had always been free from the convict taint. The people of South Africa were determined that it should remain so.

Petitions and memorials from the British settlers of the East, and from the inhabitants of Cape Town and the Western districts poured upon the Government. The very idea of escaped felons and bushrangers haunting the frontier districts and mixing with the natives as firebrands of lawlessness, disorder, and crime, was enough to stir every right-minded colonist to indignant protest. The Bishop summoned his clergy, and joined in the memorials and protests. "On every ground," the Bishop wrote, "there cannot be a greater mistake than sending convicts to this colony."

The Anti-Convict Association was formed, with its executive in Cape Town, and branches all over the country. Sir Harry Smith was a military man. He told Downing Street that it was unwise to make the Cape a penal station, but the blow had fallen. The obnoxious proclamation was issued. He was bound to obey orders. The convict ship *Neptune*, with 300 convicts on board, had already sailed for the Cape. But the leaders of the Anti-Convict Association were determined patriots. They did not yield to proclamations, or to the Governor's threats to employ force. They addressed both Houses of Imperial Parliament, and appealed to the justice of the English people. They signed a solemn "pledge" not to supply the Government, or the garrison, or the convict ship on

its arrival, with any of the necessaries of life. They anticipated the invention of "boycotting" with a "boycott" more thorough and complete than any devised in Ireland. The Banks declined to transact business with Government officials or their supporters. The Insurance offices denied them their policies. Auctioneers declined to sell goods for them. The unofficial members of the Legislative Council resigned their seats, and Sir Harry Smith's nominees, who attempted to fill their places, were pelted with mud and burnt in effigy. The Government, the commerce, and the whole business life of the country were at a standstill. The *Neptune* arrived in September 1849. Sir Harry Smith dare not allow the convicts to land, and the "pest-ship," as she was termed by the people, remained at anchor in Simon's Bay. Earl Grey was amazed at the stern resistance of the Cape Colonists. Sir Harry Smith again and again urged him to yield. But he was a stubborn autocrat, who regarded the free colonies as "dependencies" to be ruled by the *sic volo, sic jubeo* of a Downing Street official. The struggle continued for nearly a year, when Sir C. Adderley (afterwards Lord Norton) took up the cause of the colonists in the Imperial Parliament, and moved in March 1849 that the obnoxious order should be rescinded "out of consideration for the honourable pride and moral welfare of the people of South Africa." He partially gained his point, but Lord Russell said that if the *Neptune's* freight were landed and received, no more convicts would be sent.

But this did not satisfy the colonists, and the agitation continued with unabated force. At last Earl Grey gave way. The *Neptune* was ordered to Tasmania, and the Order in Council which made the Cape Colony a penal station was rescinded, and its withdrawal published in the *Cape Government Gazette* of February 12, 1850. The grateful citizens of Cape Town re-named their oldest and principal street after the man who had fought their battles in the Imperial Parliament. The "Heerengracht," which had borne this name for about 170 years, was re-named "Adderley Street," after Sir Charles Adderley.

After the anti-convict agitation had ended so triumphantly for the colonists, Bishop Gray girded himself for the toils of an overland visitation through Bloemfontein to Natal, and back again through Pondoland and the Transkei to Grahamstown. He had much encouragement from Church people, and found that Mr. Green (afterwards Dean) had made an excellent start in Church work at Maritzburg. But the Bishop saw that his huge diocese must be subdivided, and his nine months' visitation proved to him the impossibility of working it single-handed.

As he came out of Cape Town Cathedral after the early celebration on January 1, 1851, the news met him that the Eighth Kafir War had broken out, and surprised Sir Harry Smith and his troops. The Governor himself was shut up in Fort Cox, and after the first attempt to relieve him failed, he disguised himself in a Cape Corps trooper's uniform, and with 250 of the same corps cut his way out through the

enemy, and safely reached King Williamstown, which was a four-and-twenty miles' ride.

The military villages of Woburn, Auckland, and Johannesburg were destroyed, and forty-seven of the military settlers were killed. The Kafirs did not touch the women and children. The Kafir police, about 300 strong, deserted to the enemy with their arms. Willem Uithalder, a Hottentot pensioner of the Cape Corps, gathered 1000 armed Hottentots about him, and joined the Kafirs. He called himself "General," and gave out that he meant to establish an independent Hottentot nation.¹ This war dragged on its tedious length after Sir Harry Smith's recall in March 1852. He was succeeded by Sir George Cathcart, who afterwards fell at Inkerman.

Sir George attacked Kreli and Syolo, and eventually concluded the war in April 1853. But before he patched up a so-called peace, he met with a serious reverse, at the close of 1852, in another part of South Africa. The Basutos, under their able Chief Moshesh, had become a great power. Commandant-General Pretorius, who had been proscribed by Sir Harry Smith after the battle of Boomplaats, showed his power as a leader in drawing the emigrant farmers around him, and exercising such influence as eventually compelled the Government to make terms with him.

Moshesh had made hostile movements in the

¹ Uithalder became a fugitive and a wanderer at the close of the war. He still held to his ideal of an independent Hottentot nation. He asked Kreli for help and for land. When Kreli refused, he committed suicide.

Orange River Sovereignty, but Major Warden at Bloemfontein was too weak to take active measures, and the peace of the territory depended on an alliance with Mr. Pretorius and the Transvaal emigrants. On January 17, 1852, Major Hogg and Mr. Owen, as British Commissioners, met Mr. Pretorius, and signed the "Sand River Convention," in which the British Government acknowledged formally the Republic formed by the emigrant farmers in the Transvaal. Mr. Pretorius desired to mediate between the British and Moshesh, but his offer was rejected. Sir George Cathcart marched against Moshesh with 2000 infantry, 500 cavalry (the 12th Lancers), and ten field-guns. But the General did not understand native warfare. He attacked the Berea Mountain, and a party of Lancers were cut off by the Basutos whilst in pursuit of cattle. The forces were scattered. The Basuto horsemen boldly charged Sir George Cathcart's division, and he was hardly pressed to hold his own. The Basutos won a victory, though the British discipline prevented a disgraceful defeat, and saved the lives of Sir George and his staff. The wily Moshesh immediately wrote to Sir George a polite letter asking for peace. "You have shown your power, you have chastised, let it be enough, I pray you," wrote the victorious chief to the British General. Sir George was only too glad to withdraw the troops, and conclude a treaty of peace with Moshesh. The Chief's letter enabled him to write creditable despatches to England, and the bitter protests of his own officers were silenced by the General's order to march back

to the colony. But this withdrawal cost England the Orange River Sovereignty. The people well affected to British rule saw that they had no protection against Moshesh. Those who were disaffected could point to the successful establishment of the Transvaal Republic by their kinsmen and friends. The end soon came, notwithstanding the protests of Cape Colonists and Englishmen who had settled in the Sovereignty.¹ Sir George Clark was appointed British Commissioner to abandon the Sovereignty, and on March 11, 1854, the British flag was hoisted for the last time on the Queen's Fort, Bloemfontein, and after being saluted, was replaced by the flag of the Orange Free State Republic, which still waves there, and has proved the symbol of order, progress, and good government.

We must glance briefly at the condition of the Colony of Natal at this period. The forcible annexation of the country, and the consequent ending of the Republic of Natal, was followed by the retirement of most of the emigrant farmers into the Transvaal. A

¹ Sir G. Clark called the loyal persons, who objected to the withdrawal of British rule, the "obstructionists," and the Republican party the "well-disposed." He reduced the number of the "obstructionists" by paying them handsome compensation for past and prospective losses, and they became Republicans. The Civil servants of the Sovereignty were also freely compensated. This miserable and impolitic withdrawal of British rule cost the British tax-payer £48,691 in hard cash. This large sum was euphemistically termed "expenses connected with the abandonment of the Sovereignty." The only parallel expenditure in English history is to be found in the money spent in procuring the union between England and Ireland in 1799.

few of them remained under British rule in the Umsoti district and Weenen County, but the European population of Natal was very small indeed. Mr. Byrne organized an emigration scheme from England, and in 1848 and 1849 thirty-five vessels arrived bringing 3792 emigrants. The officials and several leading men in the country came from Cape Town,¹ and this combination of experienced colonists and new-comers laid the foundations of the present prosperity of Natal. The colony was governed as a Crown colony, and the English population increased so much that Bishop Gray saw the necessity of making Natal into a separate diocese. He was also convinced that the Eastern Province of the Cape Colony must form a separate diocese, with Grahamstown as its centre. In January 1852 he set sail for England to carry out the subdivision of his diocese, and to raise funds to endow the proposed new Sees.

During the Bishop's absence a most important constitutional change took place in the Cape Colony. A Constitution was granted and Parliamentary Government was established in the place of the autocratic rule of a Governor and a Council which did not represent the general feeling of the country. Responsible government was not yet established, but the Governor had to govern in future with the advice of the Cape Parliament. The first Parliament of the Cape Colony was opened by Lieutenant-Governor

¹ The late Mr. Justice Buchanan, in a recently published paper, has shown how Cape Town men took a prominent part amongst the early settlers of Natal.

Darling on July 1, 1854. Sir G. Cathcart had in the meantime resigned, and his successor had not arrived. South Africa has every reason to remember with gratitude the man who now took over the onerous duties of Governor and High Commissioner at the Cape. Sir George Grey was no ordinary man who would be content to govern in South Africa with a sole eye to pleasing his official superiors in Downing Street. He brought to bear upon South African problems the ripened experience of an independent judgment, and he governed the country upon lines of peaceful progress and development that would have saved thousands of invaluable lives and millions wasted on war expenditure if he had not been thwarted by the ignorant jealousies of Imperial Ministers.

It is not too much to say that South Africa would have been united to-day, instead of being severed into four distinct governments, if Sir G. Grey's confederation policy had not been abruptly checked from Downing Street. There would have been no Zulu War, and therefore no Isandlwana, no Boer War, and therefore no Majuba Hill, if Sir G. Grey had been allowed to work out his policy unmolested. His munificent gift to South Africa of the Grey Library, his deep interest in education, his firm and wise native policy, and above all his sincere devotion and active aid to the cause of religion, mark him out as one of the foremost men who have built up our colonial empire.

The Bishop and Sir G. Grey became firm friends, and worked together heart and soul to further the Christianity and civilization of the native races.

CHAPTER V.

THE SUBDIVISION OF THE DIOCESE OF CAPE TOWN,
AND THE FOUNDING OF THE DIOCESES OF
GRAHAMSTOWN AND NATAL UNDER THE BISHOP
OF CAPE TOWN AS METROPOLITAN, THE BEGIN-
NINGS OF PROVINCIAL ORGANIZATION, SYNODI-
CAL ACTION, AND MISSIONARY WORK.

The Founding of the Dioceses of Grahamstown and Natal—The Letters Patent of Bishop Gray as Metropolitan—Bishops Armstrong and Colenso consecrated on S. Andrew's Day, 1853, taking Oaths to See of Cape Town—Bishop Colenso's Ten Weeks in Natal—His crude views on Polygamy—Bishop Armstrong's Work and Difficulties—His Death in 1856—Intrigues with regard to his Successor—Consecration of Bishop Cotterill in 1856—Troubles of the Metropolitan with Bishop Colenso—First Synod of the Diocese of Cape Town in 1857—Natal Church Council in 1858—Retirement of Dean Green and others from Church Council—Bishop Gray founds the Universities Mission, and consecrates Bishop Mackenzie as its first Bishop in 1861—Erastian Difficulties with regard to Missionary Bishops—See of S. Helena founded in 1859—First Provincial Synod of Bishops in 1861—Beginnings of Missionary Work—in the Diocese of Cape Town—and in the Diocese of Grahamstown—The Cattle-killing Delusion and Famine amongst the Kafirs in 1857—Mission Work in Natal.

BISHOP GRAY'S two years' absence from his Diocese was fruitful in results. He had procured the sub-

division of his Diocese by resigning his original Letters Patent as Bishop of Cape Town, and the two new Sees of Grahamstown and Natal were constituted under Letters Patent. Bishop Gray received fresh Letters Patent as Metropolitan of South Africa and Bishop of the reduced Diocese of Cape Town, but these Letters Patent were dated a fortnight after the Letters Patent of the Bishop of Natal. This circumstance was afterwards taken advantage of by the law courts when Bishop Colenso was deposed for heresy. Bishop Gray was not always happy in his choice of men. The appointment of the Rev. John Armstrong to the See of Grahamstown left nothing to be desired. He was the founder of Church Penitentiary work in England, and a devoted and loyal Parish Priest. But with regard to the choice of the Rev. J. W. Colenso for the See of Natal, the Metropolitan made a serious blunder. Mr. Colenso was a distinguished Cambridge mathematician who took an interest in missionary work.

He was recommended by Dr. Hills, afterwards first Bishop of British Columbia; and Dr. Hinds, Bishop of Norwich, who was a Churchman only in name, joined in the recommendation. Mr. Colenso had published a volume of sermons of the ordinary Broad Church type, and some criticism was raised at his selection. If Bishop Gray had inquired into Mr. Colenso's views, he must have discovered that he was hopelessly out of touch with historical Christianity.¹ But on S. Andrew's Day, 1853, both Bishops were

¹ A careful perusal of Vol. I. chap. i. of the *Life of Bishop Colenso*, by Sir G. W. Cox, is quite enough to prove this point.

consecrated at Lambeth by Bishop Gray and other Bishops, the usual oath of canonical obedience being taken by both Bishops to Bishop Gray as their Metropolitan.¹

On December 1, Bishop Colenso sailed for Natal. He remained ten weeks, and returned to England, when he published his impressions of his new Diocese in a little volume called *Ten Weeks in Natal*. He was sincerely desirous of doing a sound missionary work, but he formed crude views as to the toleration of polygamy, which did much mischief. He had no idea whatever of the corporate life of the Church, or the responsibility laid upon him as a Bishop to administer

¹ Archbishop Sumner at this date had not discovered that marvellous interpretation of the Rubric which dawned upon Archbishop Tait in later years, and caused him to imagine that no Bishop could be consecrated within his Province without taking a Suffragan's oath of obedience to himself as Primate. Hence the confusion arose of a South African Bishop, consecrated in England, not being permitted to take the oath to his own Metropolitan, and the further anomaly of the South African Metropolitan taking with legal reservations an oath to Canterbury in 1874. Lord Blachford's Colonial Clergy Act of 1874 did away with the supposed legal difficulties, but since the passing of that Act we have seen two successive Primates of Australia take an ordinary Suffragan's oath to Canterbury. The anomaly of one Metropolitan taking a Suffragan's oath to another Metropolitan is unknown to Canon law and Church history, and is an unwarrantable stretching of that "Primacy of Honour" which the See of Canterbury undoubtedly possesses, and which, without yielding one jot upon the points we have mentioned, the South African Church has expressed in the resolution of the Provincial Synod of 1876, which acknowledges the "Primacy of Honour" of the Archbishop of Canterbury as "Primate of Primates, Archbishops, and Metropolitans."

the laws of the "Visible Society" in accordance with the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship. It never apparently occurred to him that such matters were not left to the judgment of an individual Bishop, and he had not the least notion that the common law of Christendom, based on Catholic consent, had any binding authority over him.

Bishop Armstrong's departure was delayed from various causes, so that he did not arrive in his Diocese until October 12, 1854, when he was warmly welcomed by the Church people of Port Elizabeth, and received an address from S. Mary's Vestry. On his arrival at Grahamstown he soon saw the necessity of providing a sound Church education for the sons of colonists. He founded S. Andrew's College, Grahamstown, which is now one of the leading educational centres in South Africa; and built Bishopsbourne, which is still the official residence of his successors in the See. He was an able administrator, with a firm grip of Church principles; but from the very first he suffered from ill-health, which made him ill-fitted to battle with difficulties peculiarly trying to a man of sensitive temperament. There were Church troubles in Port Elizabeth, caused by the secession of a handful of Protestant partisans from S. Mary's Church, owing to the introduction of the surplice in the pulpit and the weekly offertory. Archdeacon Merriman had been bitterly attacked by these unreasonable persons, and the Metropolitan had openly rebuked them before Bishop Armstrong arrived.

The seceders from S. Mary's hired a building, and

held lay services in open defiance of the Bishop, and the then Rector of S. Mary's, the Rev. W. H. Fowle,¹ a devoted and loyal Churchman. The Bishop was unable to find any solution to these troubles, which were presently added to by a further difficulty with Mr. Copeman, the Colonial Chaplain of Uitenhage, and subsequently of Alexandria. Mr. Copeman posed as an Evangelical; but, to use Bishop Gray's words, he had been "an utterly careless clergyman ever since he has been here."² His people protested against him again and again, and at last Bishop Armstrong withdrew his licence. He petitioned the Cape Parliament in language most offensive to the Bishop, taking up the ground that he had been appointed from England before the foundation of the Sees of Cape Town and Grahamstown. The Parliament was foolish enough to summon the Metropolitan to the bar of the House. He naturally declined to appear, and the Attorney-General, Mr. Porter, told the Metropolitan that the Parliament had acted wrongly in supporting Mr. Copeman by sanctioning the payment of his Government salary.

¹ After beginning a devoted and earnest work in Port Elizabeth, Mr. Fowle resigned S. Mary's in 1858, because Bishop Cotterill acknowledged the seceding congregation, and licensed a clergyman to officiate for them, which resulted in the establishment of a Proprietary Chapel, with a trust-deed intending to sever it from Episcopal control. Mr. Fowle returned to England, and held successively the livings of Milverton and Langton Budville, to which he was presented by Archdeacon Denison, until his death in 1894.

² See *Bp. Gray's Life*, Vol. I., p. 402.

Bishop Armstrong absolutely declined to permit his conduct to be defended before Parliament, and took a thorough Church line during the proceedings. But the mental anxiety produced by this trouble proved too much for the enfeebled constitution of the Bishop. After a brief illness he died on May 16, 1856, deeply beloved by all who had known him during his brief Episcopate.

The Metropolitan very soon visited the Diocese of Grahamstown, and received from the Cathedral Parish an address, thanking him for vindicating the memory of Bishop Armstrong from the aspersions cast upon him with regard to Mr. Copeman's case. This spontaneous tribute of loyalty showed the true feelings of Churchmen in the Diocese. At this time Archdeacon Merriman was in England. His devoted and indefatigable work as Archdeacon had endeared him to the whole Diocese. His manly and vigorous frame enabled him to walk hundreds of miles on his Archidiaconal visitations. His firm Churchmanship, his noble manliness of character, and his great gifts of organization had naturally marked him out as the successor of Bishop Armstrong. In fact his name had been prominently mentioned as the future Bishop when the See was first founded. Archdeacon Merriman's appointment as Bishop of Grahamstown was all but settled when Archbishop Sumner altered his mind under the influence of a petition against his appointment emanating from the Port Elizabeth seceders. The Archbishop was urged to make a party appointment in order to thwart the policy and

wishes of the Metropolitan. Archdeacon Merriman's just claims were ignored, and the Rev. Henry Cotterill, who was selected as a strong Evangelical, was consecrated Bishop of Grahamstown by Archbishop Sumner on November 23, 1856. The Metropolitan wrote a strong protest to the Archbishop, concerning which he says—"I do feel very strongly that the appointment is a wrong and an injustice to many, and that I am the person who, from my position, is marked out as the proper channel of communicating to his Grace the feelings of others. He has allowed himself to be made the tool of violent partisans." (*Life of Bishop Gray*, Vol. I., p. 409.)

Bishop Cotterill began his Episcopate badly. He encouraged the seceders at Port Elizabeth, and licensed a clergyman for them in the teeth of repeated protests from the Rector and Vestry of S. Mary's, within which parish the schismatic services were held. He made Archdeacon Merriman's position in the Diocese a very difficult one for some time, and he wrote foolish letters about the position and claims of his Metropolitan, which Bishop Colenso subsequently used against him when he found it convenient to do so.¹ But Bishop Cotterill was a man of great intellectual power. The circumstances of his Diocese,

¹ Bishop Colenso quotes letters of Bishop Cotterill to himself, denouncing Bishop Gray's claim to Metropolitan jurisdiction over parts of his original Diocese, as yet unincorporated in the Sees of Grahamstown and Natal, as "preposterous and absurd." (*Life of Bp. Colenso*, Vol. I., pp. 338—341.)

and the atmosphere and conditions of the Colonial Church, had a great influence upon him. He found that Church principles meant something, and his acute and legal mind soon began to grasp truths which his early training had caused him to ignore.

He ceased to suspect the Metropolitan's views and policy. He gave Bishop Gray that firm adhesion and support which comes of slowly matured convictions. He became one of the most powerful and loyal supporters that the Metropolitan ever had, and his support was more valuable to him in the troubled times to come, because he had originally been sent out to oppose the Metropolitan's policy.

Bishop Colenso soon began to manifest signs of unwisdom and rashness in the discharge of his episcopal duties. Complaints reached the Metropolitan in 1856, and he writes as follows—"The Bishop of Natal has got into great trouble. (i.) By bringing out too many not over well-chosen labourers to a work scarce begun. (ii.) By mistaking the extent of a Bishop's power, altering services, omitting portions of the Liturgy, *e.g.* Psalms, Lessons, Litany, and introducing others, *e.g.* a new offertory and prayer for the Church Militant, a prayer for the heathen, etc.; in fact, acting as the sole legislator of the Church. (iii.) By giving way as soon as opposition met him. Matters are in a great mess just now, and it is difficult to advise usefully. He has startled people by the rapidity of his conclusions (polygamy amongst the number, with reference to the baptism of the heathen with more wives than one,

upon which he has written a pamphlet), and shaken confidence. They ask, 'What next?' If he will only learn caution and deliberation, this will do no harm. His fine, generous, and noble character will triumph over all difficulties." (*Bp. Gray's Life*, Vol. I., p. 395.)

Bishop Gray looked upon the unbalanced self-will and theological ignorance of his suffragan from an optimist point of view. He did not realize that Bishop Colenso's untheological bias was united to a lack of humility that in after days led him to think himself virtually infallible, and caused him (after his deposition and excommunication) to compare himself with the Apostles, "who were cut off from the orthodox Jews at the first, together with their Head, Who 'had a devil' and 'deceived the people.'" (*Life of Bp. Colenso*, Vol. II., p. 579.)

The mental attitude of a man who could dare thus to compare himself with the Apostles, and with our Lord Himself, can only be excused upon the basis of egotistic monomania. There appears to be no other solution. But Bishop Gray, in 1856, seems to have surrendered his better judgment to a generous estimate of Bishop Colenso's character, which was soon destined to receive a rude awakening.

The Metropolitan summoned the clergy, and elected Lay Representatives of his Diocese to meet him in Synod, and the first South African Diocesan Synod met on January 21, 1857. The real origin of Provincial and Diocesan Synods in the Colonial Church must be traced to the memorable Conference

of the Bishops of Australia and New Zealand held at Sydney in 1850. The Bishops placed on record their conviction that Provincial and Diocesan Synods were necessary to the well-being of the Colonial Church. The Diocesan Synod of Toronto was formed in 1853, and the example was followed by the Diocese of Melbourne in 1854, and Adelaide in 1855. Bishop Gray had therefore no lack of precedent. The Synod did sound work. It provided an Ecclesiastical Court for the Diocese, and took measures for the appointment of future Bishops of the Diocese. Mr. Lamb, the extreme Evangelical Incumbent of Trinity Church, Cape Town, and Mr. Long, Incumbent of Mowbray, led a factious opposition to the Synod and its doings which manifested the usual Protestant dislike to all Church organization apart from the trammels of the Civil power. But they did very little harm, and met with no sympathy from the majority of the clergy and laity.

In 1860 the first Synod of the Diocese of Grahams-town was held, and did useful work. The Diocese of Natal had no Synod. A Diocesan Conference of Clergy and Laity had been summoned by the Bishop on April 20, 1858, but it immediately got on wrong lines. The Bishop's hostility to Church principles was utilized by an ignorant laity, and a "Church Council" was formed, over which the Bishop presided, and in which the Clergy and Laity voted as one body, no vote by Orders being allowed. Dean Green and three other Priests immediately withdrew from

this nondescript and un-Catholic assembly. It was the only course open to them, as the fundamental principle of a Diocesan Synod is that it is constituted with three Orders, namely, the Bishop, the House of the Clergy, and the House of the Laity, each order voting separately, when occasion arises for a vote by Orders.¹

On January 1, 1861, Bishop Mackenzie was consecrated in Cape Town Cathedral as the first Missionary Bishop of the English Church. The discoveries of Dr. Livingstone in Central Africa had caused deep interest in England in a new and untried field of missionary labour. Bishop Gray centred this interest in a practical way, and was the virtual founder of the Universities Mission in Central Africa. He was in England for a visit, and he strenuously urged the appointment of a Bishop to head the Mission. The English Bishops met, and Dr. Tait, then Bishop of London, was aghast at the audacious proposal. To him the idea of a pioneer Bishop was little short of monstrous. Priests were to be Pioneers, and

¹ The questions raised by Dean Green and others with regard to the constitution of the Church Council came ultimately before Archbishop Sumner, who upheld the Dean, and recognized the unchurchly character of this *soi-disant* Church Council, which has proved itself to be a fruitful legacy of mischief in Natal. It was continued by a handful of ignorant partisans after the excommunication and deposition of Bishop Colenso. After his death it arrogated to itself a fresh outcrop of usurped privileges and powers, and it was finally discredited in 1894, in its attempts to dictate to Bishop Hamilton Baynes, and prevent his restoring unity in Natal.

Bishops were to come in at the finish, on the principle of "finis coronat opus."

The Crown lawyers were hidebound by precedents. Their idea of a Bishop could not rise above the low level of a seat in the House of Lords, a palace, and a large income. No consecration of such an ecclesiastical monstrosity as a Missionary Bishop, to go forth outside the Queen's dominions into the dark places of heathenism, was legally possible. But the bold Metropolitan of South Africa cut the knot by the memorable consecration in Cape Town Cathedral, and thus laid the foundation of our Missionary Episcopate, which has been glorified by the martyrdeaths of Bishop Patteson and Bishop Hannington, and the noble labours of Bishop Steere, Bishop Smythies, Bishop Tucker, and Bishop John Selwyn. The action of the South African Metropolitan eventually reacted upon the Mother Church, and several Missionary Bishops have since been consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the English Bishops.

During his English visit the indomitable Metropolitan founded the See of S. Helena, as well as the Universities Mission. On Whitsun-day, 1859, he consecrated Dr. Piers Claughton in Westminster Abbey, as the first Bishop of the new island Diocese. The Bishops of Natal and S. Helena assisted the Metropolitan at the consecration of Bishop Mackenzie. Bishop Cotterill of Grahamstown was detained, but arrived later on when the Metropolitan and his two suffragans had held the first Episcopal Synod in

South Africa, and the Bishop of Grahamstown subscribed to its conclusions. Here was the beginning of Provincial action, and here too was the beginning of Bishop Gray's enlightenment upon the dangerous views of the Bishop of Natal. His advocacy of the right of male polygamists to be baptized, and retain their wives after baptism, was based upon views he had learnt from a German Lutheran Missionary, who told him that "the best man of his flock, the most devout and spiritually-minded, was also a polygamist."¹ No wonder Bishop Gray wrote on Nov. 20, 1860—"Natal is a very wilful, headstrong man, and loose, I fear, in his opinions on vital points. We shall have to fight for Revelation, Inspiration, the Atonement, and every great truth of Christianity ere long." Coming events cast their shadows before.

It is important briefly to notice the beginning of our missionary work in South Africa. In the Cape Diocese the remains of the Hottentot races survived as the labouring population of the western districts of the colony. They had adopted a *patois* of Dutch for their language, and had entirely lost their own tongue. They had also lost their nationality by intermarrying with slaves brought from the West Coast, and there was also a large half-caste population intermingled with them. Most of them were nominally adherents of the Moravians, or the Independents of the L. M. S., and the English Church had practically left them untouched. But Bishop Gray's clergy looked upon

¹ *Life of Bishop Colenso*, Vol. I., p. 122.

these semi-civilized coloured races as their parishioners. Mission chapels and schools for them were rapidly built, and the foundations of that strong work were laid, which, at the census of 1892, showed that 46,142 of these half-castes and Hottentots enrolled themselves as members of the English Church.

The work in the Dioceses of Grahamstown and Natal was of a totally different character. There the Church was face to face with the strong and powerful nationalities of the Zulus and Kafirs, and, as we have previously noted, she had to face the terrible disadvantage of being last in the field. The beginning of native missions in the Diocese of Grahamstown was made by Bishop Armstrong, when the foundation of a mission church was laid at Fort Waterloo on S. Luke's Day, 1854. The station was afterwards moved about fifteen miles from its original position, and is now S. Luke's, Newlands, in the East London district. In January 1855 Bishop Armstrong visited the station and introduced the Rev. W. Greenstock and Rev. J. Hardie to the native Chief Umhalla as his missionaries.

The Governor, Sir George Grey, urged the immediate establishment of missions in Independent Kaffraria, as the Transkeian districts were called before their annexation to the colony, and in March 1855 Bishop Armstrong visited Kreli, the Paramount Chief of Kaffraria, and Sandilli, Chief of the Gaikas, and obtained their consent to establish mission stations. The Rev. H. T. Waters founded S. Mark's Mission in Kreli's territory in 1855. S. John's

Mission was planted in Sandilli's country by the Rev. J. W. T. Allen, and S. Matthew's Keishama Hoek, by the Rev. W. Smith. Sir G. Grey gave the Chiefs a fixed salary instead of allowing them to raise money by fines, which opened the door to abominable cruelties and tyranny. The Chief wanted money, or had a rich subject whom he feared. The witch-doctor was summoned, and the unhappy victim was falsely accused of bewitching the Chief. His goods were confiscated, and he was "smelt out" (to use the native phrase), or, in other words, barbarously tortured to death. The abominations of Kafir witchcraft are checked by law at the present time, but cases even now occur from time to time. Sir G. Grey appointed European magistrates to dispense justice, and thus broke the power of the Chiefs. But a deep-laid political plot was devised to put an end to the new state of things. The difficulty in previous Kafir wars had been to unite the tribes in one determined effort to drive the white man into the sea. Kreli encouraged a native girl, who claimed to be a "prophetess." This Kafir "Joan of Arc" repeated the prophecies of Makana, and foretold the resurrection of their ancestors to aid the Kafir warriors in the destruction of the white men. As a token of faith the Kafirs were to slay their cattle, and plant no corn, but they were to collect arms and ammunition.

The prophetess fixed February 18, 1857, as the day of resurrection. Thousands of Kafirs had destroyed their corn and cattle, and were waiting the fulfilment of the prophecy amidst the pangs of famine.

The day dawned, and nothing happened. The maddened, famine-stricken people were too weak to fight. The Chiefs had overreached themselves. A few isolated outbreaks occurred, which were speedily checked. Twenty-five thousand Kafirs perished from starvation, and nearly 100,000 had to leave their homes as destitute wanderers. They had killed no less than 200,000 head of cattle, besides destroying all their crops. The colonists came to the rescue with prompt measures of relief. Public works gave employment to some of the starving people, and the farmers took others as servants. But the Kafir nation had destroyed its power by its own suicidal action, and it has never since been a real public danger to the colony. It remains for us to indicate briefly the commencement of mission work amongst the Zulus in Natal. The proclamation of British rule in Natal brought a vast number of Zulu refugees into the colony, who had fled from the tyranny of the Zulu King Panda. Bishop Gray's visitation of Natal was mainly concerned with the organization of European work. He appointed Mr. Green to Maritzburg, and Mr. Lloyd to Durban, and in 1853 Mr. Fearn was appointed to Richmond. When Bishop Colenso began work he established a native industrial institution at Bishopstowe, which was six miles distant from Maritzburg, the capital of Natal. Dr. Callaway (afterwards first Bishop of Kaffraria) and Mr. Robertson were the first missionaries to the Zulus, and mission work was commenced at Maritzburg, Durban, Ladysmith, under Mr. Barker (now Archdeacon of

Maritzburg), Springvale, and Richmond. But the mission work in Natal received a severe check owing to the events which resulted in the trial and deposition of Bishop Colenso, which we must reserve in their order for the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CONFLICT WITH ERASTIANISM AND HERESY, AS MANIFESTED IN THE TRIALS OF THE REV. W. LONG AND BISHOP COLENZO, WHICH RESULTED IN THE ULTIMATE FREEDOM OF THE COLONIAL CHURCHES FROM THE TRAMMELS OF THE CIVIL POWER.

Colonial Churches tied by Letters Patent to all the Disabilities of Establishment without its Endowments and Privileges—The Erastian Jurisdiction of the Privy Council—The Gradual Establishment of Synods in the Colonial Churches—Inevitable Battle between Synods and Fictitious Royal Supremacy—*Regina v. Eton College*—No Church of England out of England—Rev. W. Long refuses to give Notice of Cape Town Diocesan Synod—He is Cited and Suspended, and ultimately Deprived for Contumacy by the Metropolitan—Mr. Long appeals to the Supreme Court of the Cape Colony—The Metropolitan gains his Case—Appeal to Privy Council as a Civil Court, Lord Kingsdown's judgment—Technically a Defeat for the Metropolitan, but really the Charter of Freedom of all Colonial Churches as Voluntary Religious Bodies—Bishop Colenso's Sermons on the Eucharist—The Metropolitan's lenient Judgment upon them—Bishop Colenso and Professor F. D. Maurice—Their Friendship, and Separation owing to Bishop Colenso's Heresies—Bishop Colenso's *Commentary upon the Romans*—His subsequent Heresies and Hostility to Orthodox Chris-

tianity—Bishop Gray visits England in 1862 to consult Archbishop *re* Colenso—Bishop Colenso's Work on the Pentateuch—Its Heresies—S. P. G. asks the Archbishop for Advice about Bishop Colenso—Meeting of English Bishops—Document signed by forty-one Prelates calling upon Bishop Colenso to resign his See—He declines to do so—The Metropolitan resolves to try him at Cape Town—Trial in 1863 before Metropolitan and Assessors—Condemnation of Bishop Colenso and Deposition from his See—He denies Validity of Proceedings and Repudiates his Oath of Canonical Obedience by Appealing to the Privy Council—Judgment of Privy Council that Sentence was Legally Null and Void, because Dr. Colenso had not legally Contracted to Obey his Metropolitan—Dr. Colenso's Return to Natal in 1865—Enters Cathedral at Maritzburg forcibly—and is subsequently Excommunicated—Questions put by the Metropolitan to the Convocation of Canterbury with regard to the Colenso Case—Answer of Convocation approving the Appointment of a Successor to Dr. Colenso in the See of Natal—Subsequent Action of Convocation—Election of a Successor to Dr. Colenso by Clergy and Laity of Natal in 1866—Mr. Butler of Wantage, as Bishop-Elect, places himself in the Hands of the Archbishop—Dr. Colenso's Erastian Following—The Lambeth Conference of 1867—Fifty-six Bishops sign Declaration accepting Validity of Sentence on Dr. Colenso—Mr. Butler declines, and Mr. Macrorie becomes Bishop-Elect—The Metropolitan desires his Consecration in England—He is Consecrated in 1869 in Cape Town Cathedral—Lord Romilly's Judgment—Judgment in the case *Bishop of Cape Town v. Bishop of Natal*—Prosperous Beginning of Bishop Macrorie's work as Bishop of Maritzburg.

WE have already briefly indicated the fact that the movement for extending the Episcopate to the Colonies was complicated by the traditions of Church and State in England. The fact that the American Church had flourished and expanded marvellously in its absolute freedom from any connection with

the State had not yet sunk into the minds of the English Churchmen.

The insularity of Englishmen, and their rooted belief in the perfection of their own institutions in Church and State, blinded good men to the manifest anomalies and restrictions which hampered the Church of England "as by law established," and they fondly imagined that they were doing the Colonial Church a good service in reproducing in new countries as much as they could of the Church system in which they had grown up. Bishop Selwyn of New Zealand and Bishop Gray foresaw the danger of allowing the fetters of the English Establishment to be bound upon the necks of the growing Churches in the Colonies. The fiction of the Royal Supremacy as manifested in the un-Catholic and Erastian jurisdiction of the Privy Council, which was a Lay Tribunal of Appeal, was supposed to bind the Churches of the Colonies by means of the "Letters Patent" of the Colonial Bishops. The Colonial Churches were thus by implication bound to all the disadvantages of the English Establishment without any of its advantages of prestige or ancient endowments. The Colonial Churches were told that they had to accept the decisions of the secular tribunal which dominated the Mother Church, in the teeth of the protest of her Bishops, who in 1850 endeavoured to carry a Bill providing a Spiritual Tribunal of Appeal. They were also discouraged by timorous counsels against the holding of Synods, or taking any active measures of self-government. The ideal set before them was to accept the decisions of

tribunals in matters of faith and doctrine before which they could not legally appear, to defer to the decisions of English Convocations in which their Bishops and clergy could not sit, and to renounce absolutely all legitimate independence of action in matters of faith, doctrine, and discipline. The chains of the Mother Church were gilded by her endowments. The chains of the Colonial Churches were rusted with un-Catholic precedents, utterly inapplicable to the conditions of life in new countries, and they galled all the more because they enforced the timorous servitude of poor relations of the Mother Church instead of freedom and liberty of action. But the Canadian Bishops in 1851 followed the example of the Bishops of the Sydney Conference of 1850. Synods were established all over the Colonial Church. Colonial Churchmen began to look to America, and examine the Constitutions and Canons of the American Church. It is not too much to say that the influence of the American Church has been paramount in the drafting of the Constitutions and Canons of the Colonial Churches. A careful comparison of the existing American and Colonial Canon law will prove this point.¹

But a battle was imminent. No one knew exactly how Colonial Synods could be made to fit in with the shadowy fiction of ecclesiastical Royal Supremacy which was supposed to be conveyed under the Royal Letters Patent of Colonial Bishops.

¹ I may be perhaps permitted to refer to Chap. V. of my book on the *Church and the Civil Power*, which deals with the historical development of the Free Churches of the Anglican Communion. (Wirgman, *Church and the Civil Power*, p. 59.)

In 1841 Bishop Selwyn complained that the terms of his Royal Letters Patent were "Erastian and profane," and he insisted on the withdrawal of a clause precluding him from appointing his own Archdeacons, upon the assumption that the Queen was the "fountain of honour," and that ecclesiastical titles in the Colonies must come from her just in the same way as civil titles.

We have seen already Bishop Gray's opinion of Letters Patent, and it fell to his lot to take legal action that ultimately proved their worthlessness in law, and caused their discontinuance.

In 1857 the famous case of *Regina v. Eton College* had shown that the Letters Patent of a Colonial Bishop did not enable him to carry with him to a colony the legal privileges of a Bishop of the Church of England. In 1856 Mr. Harper, who held an Eton living, became first Bishop of Christ Church, New Zealand, under Royal Letters Patent.

When an Incumbent in England becomes a Bishop of the Church of England, the Crown claims the presentation of the living he vacates.

The Crown claimed to appoint to the Eton living vacated by Mr. Harper. Eton College resisted the claim, and pleaded that the Diocese of Christ Church did not form part of the Church of England, and that the Letters Patent did not make Bishop Harper a Bishop of the Church of England. Lord Campbell gave judgment in favour of Eton College, and thus gave the *coup de grace* to the theory that the English Establishment could exist in fettered and unendowed poverty in the British Colonies.

It was finally laid down that the Church of England *quâ* establishment *had no legal existence out of England*. Subsequent judgments have confirmed this position, which frees the Colonial Churches from the fiction of the Royal Supremacy. Of course it is possible for a schismatic congregation here and there to take up the position of the *soi-disant* "Church of England" congregations who are in schism from the Scottish Episcopal Church. There are similar instances in South Africa of isolated congregations voluntarily accepting the disabilities of the Royal Supremacy, and binding themselves, as Dissenters do, by Vestry resolutions and trust-deeds, to accept Privy Council law, instead of the freedom of spiritual organization of the Church to which they naturally belong.

These congregations, however, are virtually schismatic, and whatever resolutions they may pass, they have no legal status as part and parcel of the Established Church. But this lesson took many years to learn, and at the time of the Long case, the consequences of Lord Campbell's judgment had not been realized. We have seen that Mr. Long objected to the first Diocesan Synod held at Cape Town.

He was not a man of any prominence or ability, and the resistance organized under his name was really led and guided by others.

He declined in 1860 to give notice of the meeting of the Diocesan Synod, and refused to summon a meeting of his parishioners to elect a lay repre-

sentative. He wrote to the public press accusing his Bishop and the clergy and laity who had taken part in the last Diocesan Synod of having "seceded from the English Church." The discipline of the Church was at stake, and Mr. Long was tried in the Diocesan Court before the Bishop, who had the Dean, two Canons, and two other Priests as Assessors. He was sentenced to three months' suspension, which, on contumacy, was followed by deprivation. Mr. Long appealed to the Supreme Court of the Cape Colony, and Bishop Gray defended his case in person with a consummate ability which drew forth encomiums from the legal profession. The Bishop said that the legal dictum, "There is no Church of England out of England," arising out of Lord Campbell's judgment, would be confirmed in our Courts of law. But he argued that the intention of the Letters Patent was to give him coercive jurisdiction, as Ordinary, to administer discipline in his Diocese. He contended that he had legally ministered discipline in Mr. Long's case by suspending and afterwards depriving him for contumacy, as Mr. Long had taken the oath of canonical obedience to him and accepted his licence. In February 1862 the Supreme Court decided that the Bishop's Letters Patent gave no coercive jurisdiction, because they had been issued since the colony had become possessed of a Constitution and a Parliament, but they held that Mr. Long was bound by his oath of canonical obedience to submit to the sentence of the Bishop. The matter was carried to the Privy Council as a Civil Court on appeal from the Supreme Court of

the Colony. Lord Kingsdown delivered judgment on June 24, 1863.¹

He held that the Supreme Court was right in holding that Bishop Gray's second "Letters Patent" as Metropolitan conveyed no coercive jurisdiction, but he also held that since Mr. Long had been ordained deacon, and appointed before Bishop Gray's arrival, and before the constitution of Synodical Government in the Diocese of Cape Town, his oath of canonical obedience did not bind him to obey his Bishop in the matter of Synodical Government. Although this judgment was technically a defeat for Bishop Gray, it laid down clearly that the Church in the Colonies was unestablished, and in the same position as any other religious body, and that it had full liberty to make its own Canons and govern itself by its own Synods and its own tribunals, provided that the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity concerned entered into a mutual contract to abide by certain rules of organization and discipline.

In stating that Mr. Long had not so contracted with his Bishop, the Judgment pointed out the way to organization and discipline by suggesting a system of contract between Bishops and Clergy, which the American Church had adopted many years previously,

¹ It is important to note that in all the cases in which the Privy Council has dealt with South African Church matters, it has acted purely as a *Civil Court of Appeal*, either from Colonial Civil Courts, or when directly approached by petition. In no case has the so-called "ecclesiastical branch" of the Privy Council dealt with South African Church questions, because it can only deal with cases from the Church of England.

and which has since been adopted in one form or another by all the free Churches of the Anglican Communion.

The wording of this part of his Judgment is so important that we give it *in extenso*—

“The Church of England, in places where there is no Church established by law (*i. e.* in all colonies having legislative institutions), is in the same situation with any other religious body, in no better, but in no worse position, and the members may adopt, as the members of any other communion may adopt, rules for enforcing discipline within their body, which will be binding on those who expressly, or by implication, have assented to them. It may be further laid down, where any religious, or other lawful association, has not only agreed on the terms of its union, but has also constituted a tribunal to determine whether the rules of the association have been violated by any of its members or not, and what shall be the consequence of such violation, the decision of such tribunal shall be binding, when it has acted within the scope of its authority, has observed such forms as the rules require, if any forms be prescribed, and, if not, has proceeded in a manner consonant with the principles of justice. In such case the tribunals so constituted are not in any sense Courts; they derive no authority from the Crown; they have no power of their own to enforce their sentences; they must apply for that purpose to the Courts established by law, and such Courts will give effect to their decision, as they give effect to the decisions of arbitrators, whose jurisdiction

rests entirely upon the agreement of the parties."—
(Phillimore, *Ecc. Law*, Vol., II. p. 2245.¹)

The Bishop accordingly reinstated Mr. Long, who survived him for many years, and who afterwards made his parish a sort of centre of opposition to the synodical organization of the Province and Diocese, although he was unable to cause any real trouble.

We now come to the case of Bishop Colenso, which caused a controversy which was felt in every Diocese of the Anglican Communion. We have

¹ We may here note that the Church in the Colonies is in the position of a voluntary religious body, like the Church in America. The Synods of the Colonial Church can "adopt rules for enforcing discipline, which will be binding upon those who expressly, or by implication, have assented to them." They can establish ecclesiastical tribunals whose decision shall be binding upon those who have assented to be bound by them. Every American, and Irish, and Scottish, and Colonial clergyman now enters into a *contract* to obey the Canons of the Province and Diocese to which he belongs, and to submit to the decisions of the Church Courts of the Province. The Church Courts have no "coercive jurisdictions," but the Civil Courts, in question, concerning temporalities, will enforce the sentences of the Church Courts, "as they give effect to the decisions of arbitrators." All that the Civil Court demands is that *the contract be proved* between the clergyman and the Church he serves. The *merits of the case* are not examinable by the Civil Court, which only has to deal with the contract to obey the Church Courts. The Supreme Court of Illinois decided this point in the case of the *Bishop of Chicago v. Cheney*, where the decision of the Ecclesiastical Court was enforced upon the basis of contract without entering upon the merits of the case. The House of Lords dealt similarly with the case *Forbes v. Eden*, which arose from a clergyman of the Scottish Episcopal Church refusing obedience to the decision of the ecclesiastical authority he had contracted to obey.

already seen that the opinions of Bishop Colenso afforded just ground for alarm, and in 1858 Dean Green and Canon Jenkins formally presented him to the Metropolitan for heretical doctrine contained in two sermons upon the Holy Eucharist. Bishop Gray took a wide and liberal view of the case, and although Bishop Colenso had taught what appeared to be the barest Zwinglianism, his decision was that "he thought that the Bishop's language, however unguarded and unsatisfactory, was capable of being construed consistently with the formularies of the Church." "My object throughout," writes the Metropolitan, "was to support the Bishop where and so far as I fairly could. In my efforts to accomplish this, I know that I made the hearts of faithful men sad." (*Bp. Gray's Life*, Vol. I., p. 433.)

Bishop Gray has been represented as a tyrannical autocrat, ready to condemn his Suffragan in the spirit of a Hildebrand.

His action in this matter is sufficient disproof of the charge made against him. Bishop Colenso at this time was united by ties of close friendship with the Rev. F. D. Maurice, whom he looked upon as his teacher in matters of theology. But pupil and teacher were soon to be separated by a vast and impassable gulf. The theology of Maurice, with its grand breadth of positive teaching, was severed as wide as the poles from the narrow negative criticisms of Bishop Colenso, which stripped Christianity of its living essence and power.¹

¹ Writing to Mr. Llewellyn Davies on Colenso's work on the

Bishop Colenso published his two Sermons on the Eucharist, which denied the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, and sent them to Mr. Maurice. Mr. Maurice published a Sermon on the same subject, in which he expressed his disagreement with Bishop Colenso's views.

Bishop Colenso wrote to Mr. Maurice expressing dissent from his view that the Eucharistic Presence is "of a *different kind* from that which a faithful

Pentateuch, Mr. Maurice uses the following strong expressions—"The pain which Colenso's book has caused me is more than I can tell you. I used nearly your words, 'It is the most purely negative criticism that I ever read,' in writing to him. Our correspondence has been frequent, but perfectly unavailing. He seems to imagine himself a great critic and discoverer, and I am afraid he has met with an encouragement that will do him unspeakable mischief. He says I have only appealed to his pride in my argument. I fancy I wounded his pride even more than I ought. He even threw out the notion that the *Pentateuch* might be a poem; and when I said that to a person who had ever asked himself what a poem is, the notion was simply ridiculous, he showed that his idea of poetry was, that it is something which is not historical. And his idea of history is that it is a branch of arithmetic." (*Life of Professor F. D. Maurice*, Vol. II., p. 423.)

In a letter to the Rev. S. Clark, Mr. Maurice wrote as follows—"You know of course 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 me." Mr. Maurice had an interview with Bishop Colenso on Sept. 6, 1862, at which he said plainly to him—"Well, I think the consciences of Englishmen will be very strongly impressed with the feeling that you ought to resign your Bishopric." (*Life of Professor Maurice*, Vol. II., pp. 422—424.)

Christian may expect in ordinary prayer," and condemning Mr. Maurice's phrase, "this Sacrament transcends all other modes of intercourse." Bishop Colenso writes—"I distinctly assert that if there be in the Lord's Supper a communication of our Lord's Manhood, or whatever may be the mystical blessing expressed by eating His Body and drinking His Blood, we have no Scriptural warrant for saying that the *same kind* of blessing is not given in other modes of communion with Him." In the postscript to his letter he deals with a Sermon by Mr. Maurice on Confession, and reiterates his disbelief in any special commission to a priest either to absolve or to consecrate the Eucharist. He writes—"What do you understand by Priests? Do you mean an episcopally ordained minister with the Apostolical Succession only, or would you say (as I certainly should), that the absolution which came from the lips of a 'discreet and learned' old Dissenting Minister was just as valid to the sin-burdened conscience as that which might be pronounced by some young curate full of his notions of priestly authority?" (*Life of Bp. Colenso*, Vol. I., pp. 112—115). A Bishop who could thus deny the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood and of the Holy Eucharist was manifestly unfit for his office.

In June 1861 Bishop Colenso published his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. The Metropolitan wrote and urged him to withhold its publication, as it contained unbalanced statements which amounted to positive heresy.

Bishop Colenso declined to do so, and in his reply to the Metropolitan stated that all men from their birth-hour are partakers of the grace of Baptism and the Eucharist, and added, "You have long been aware that I do not agree with those who hold what is called the 'Sacramental system,' and that I regard their views as unsound and unscriptural." As a specimen of the untheological confusion of Bishop Colenso's speculations, we quote the following passage from the same letter—"I do hold that *all* men are justified before God, using the word in the sense in which S. Paul uses it throughout this Epistle, not in that which modern theologians may perhaps assign to it. I do *not* hold that our justification depends on our faith, because that would make it a matter of works, in direct opposition to S. Paul's teaching."

The same letter also contains the following passage : "I have no doubt whatever that the canonical books of Scripture do contain errors, and some very grave ones in matters of fact, and that the historical narratives are not to be depended upon as true in all their details."

In thus attacking the truth of the Scripture narratives, Bishop Colenso fastened his attention on figures and dates, and appeared never to consider the standpoint of the writers, or to discriminate between what may have been meant to be drama, or allegory, and what may have been meant to be an historical record. The tone and temper of Bishop Colenso's treatment of the Old Testament is manifest from his own subsequently written words—"Who can in these days believe in

the stories of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge? Why do not intelligent men, laymen, clergy, and bishops, admit the absurdity of teaching any longer such old wives' fables, or rather the sinfulness of teaching such *lies in the Name of the Lord*, whatever else they may hesitate to admit?" (*Life of Bishop Colenso*, Vol. II., p. 265.)

His attitude towards orthodox Christianity was one of absolute hostility. Dealing with Sir G. W. Cox's book on *Aryan Mythology*, he wrote as follows— "We want some one to say boldly that sun-worship is at the basis of popular Christianity (I do not say of Christianity as Christ taught it). I am certain it would be a most interesting and instructive study if somebody would pursue thoroughly the connection between the ancient solar worship and *Church Christianity*, of which Romanism and orthodox Protestantism are only different developments." (*Life of Bishop Colenso*, Vol. II., p. 234.) Bishop Colenso had a sublime confidence in his own infallibility, or else he could not have penned the following words— "On the Sabbath question I take new ground, namely, that the Fourth Commandment was never binding on anybody, for it was neither Divine nor even Mosaic. There is no ground for supposing that the adoption of the Christian Sunday, in place of the Jewish Sabbath, rests upon Apostolical authority." (*Life of Bishop Colenso*, Vol. II., p. 20, and p. 92.)

The expression of these crude opinions in this dogmatic shape was never before the Metropolitan formally and officially. We quote them to show the

final conclusions formed by the man with whom the Metropolitan had to deal. In 1862 Bishop Gray went to England to take counsel with the Archbishop and the English Bishops upon the subject of the heresies of the Bishop of Natal. In the same year Bishop Colenso arrived in England and published the first two parts of his work on the *Pentateuch*. Before Bishop Gray arrived in England, Archbishop Sumner called the Bishops together to consider Bishop Colenso's *Commentary on the Romans*. All the Bishops (except Bishops Tait and Thirlwall) agreed to inhibit Bishop Colenso if he did not agree to the suppression of the book.

When the Broad Church Archbishop Whately read Part I. of the *Pentateuch*, he wrote to Bishop Colenso—"I suppose you will now leave the Church." (*Life of Bishop Colenso*, Vol. II., p. 180.) If the Archbishop of Dublin wrote thus of Part I., he must have marvelled more at Part II. Bishop Colenso (in Part II.) charged the clergy with hypocritical falsehood in using the words in the Baptismal Office which refer to the Deluge, and invited them "to omit such words, to disobey the law of the Church, and to take the consequences."

Bishop Colenso further affirms that the clergy "are required to hush up the *facts* which they know, and publish and maintain in place of them—by silence at least, if not by overt act—transparent *fictions*."¹ Dean Green and Archdeacon Fearne of Maritzburg had formally presented Bishop Colenso to the

¹ Colenso's *Pentateuch*, Part II., p. 21.

Metropolitan for heresy contained in his *Commentary on the Romans*. But the Metropolitan was reluctant to take action. He suggested that Bishop Colenso should confer privately with some of the English Bishops in a brotherly way to see if his difficulties could be removed. But Dr. Colenso curtly declined any private conference. He believed himself destined to convert the Church of England to his views. Not long before his death, Archbishop Sumner wrote to Bishop Gray—"I am greatly struck with the mildness and conciliatory spirit which you have united with the firmness and decision exhibited in the whole of your distressing correspondence with the Bishop of Natal." In September 1862 Archbishop Sumner died, and was succeeded by Archbishop Longley.

On February 4, 1863, the Archbishop summoned the English and Irish Bishops to consider the formal appeal made to him by the S. P. G. as to the continuance of their grant to Bishop Colenso. Twenty-seven prelates were present, and the following resolution was agreed to and carried by twenty-six to four votes, the dissidents being Archbishop Thomson of York, and Bishops Tait, Thirlwall, and Prince Lee, who, however, were careful to guard themselves against expressing any sympathy with Bishop Colenso's views—"That having regard to the grievous scandal to the Church, occasioned by certain books published under the name of the Bishop of Natal, and not disavowed by him, we, the undersigned, express our own resolution not to allow the said Bishop to minister in the Word and Sacraments within our several Dioceses until the said Bishop shall have cleared himself from such

scandal." A few days later the Bishops met again, and forty-one prelates, English, Irish, and Colonial, signed the following letter, calling upon Bishop Colenso to resign his See—

"TO THE RIGHT REV. J. W. COLENZO, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF NATAL.

"We, the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, address you with deep brotherly anxiety, as one who shares with us the grave responsibilities of the Episcopal office. It is impossible for us to enter here into argument with you as to your method of handling that Bible which we believe to be the Word of God, and on the truth of which rest all our hopes for eternity. Nor do we here ask the question whether you are legally entitled to retain your present office and position in the Church; complicated, moreover, as that question is by the fact of your being a Bishop of the Church in South Africa, now at a distance from your Diocese and Province. But we feel bound to put before you another view of the case. We understand you to say (Part II., p. 23, of your *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, critically examined*) that you do not now believe that which you voluntarily professed to believe as the indispensable condition of your being entrusted with your present office. We understand you also to say that you have entertained and have not abandoned the conviction that you could not 'use the Ordination Service,' inasmuch as in it you 'must require from others a solemn declaration that they unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which

with the evidence now before you, 'it is impossible wholly to believe in.' (Part I., p. 12.) And we understand you further to intimate that those who think with you are precluded from using the Baptismal Service, and consequently (as we must infer) other Offices of the Prayer-Book, unless they omit all such passages as assume the truth of the Mosaic history. (Part II., p. 22.)

"Now it cannot have escaped you that the inconsistency between the office you hold and the opinions you avow is causing great pain and grievous scandal to the Church. And we solemnly ask you to consider once more, with the most serious attention, whether you can, without harm to your own conscience, retain your position, when you can no longer discharge its duties, or use the formularies to which you have subscribed. We will not abandon the hope that through earnest prayer and deeper study of God's Word you may, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, be restored to a state of belief in which you may be able with a clear conscience again to discharge the duties of your sacred office, a result which, from regard to your highest interests, we should welcome with unfeigned satisfaction.

"We are your faithful brethren in Christ,

C. T. CANTUAR. (LONGLEY).

W. EBOR. (THOMSON).

M. G. ARMAGH (BERESFORD).

R. DUBLIN (WHATELY).

A. C. LONDON (TAIT).

C. DUNELM (BARING).

C. R. WINTON. (SUMNER).

H. EXETER (PHILPOTTS).