

And the Bishops of Chichester, Lichfield, Ely, Oxford, S. Asaph, Manchester, Chester, Llandaff, Lincoln, Salisbury, Bath and Wells, Ripon, Norwich, Bangor, Rochester, Carlisle, Worcester, Sodor and Man, Meath, Tuam, Ossory and Ferns, Cashel, Down, Connor and Dromore, Derry and Raphoe, Cork, Kilmore, Montreal, Sydney, Tasmania, Jamaica, and Bishops Spencer and Chapman.

A more weighty and temperate address had never been issued by the Anglican Episcopate. The fact that it was headed by the four Archbishops, and that Bishop Tait, who had been adverse to action, had felt himself bound to sign it, ought to have weighed with Bishop Colenso. But he treated the address with utter contempt, and declined to resign.¹

During the debate that preceded the issuing of the address, Bishop Tait reproached the Metropolitan for bringing the matter before the English Bishops at all, and urged him to proceed against Bishop Colenso himself at Cape Town. The Metropolitan defended himself by stating that he felt it his duty to consult with the Archbishops and Bishops in England before taking proceedings in South Africa, as the case of the trial of a Bishop involved so many difficulties, but that he intended to take proceedings when Bishop Colenso was presented to him for trial in due form. Bishop Tait's eagerness in urging Bishop Gray to take action and try Bishop Colenso, formed a strange contrast to

¹ The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel immediately removed Bishop Colenso's name from its list of Vice-Presidents, and entrusted the administration of its Natal grant to a Committee presided over by Dean Green of Maritzburg.

his line of action in deprecating and disavowing the consequences of the action which Bishop Gray felt ultimately compelled to take.

On February 11, 1863, Convocation held an inquiry on the work on the *Pentateuch*. The report of the Committee of the Lower House was considered by the House of Bishops, who resolved that the book on the *Pentateuch* "involved errors of the gravest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God," but inasmuch as they believed that the book would shortly be submitted to the judgment of an ecclesiastical court, they declined at this time to take further action in the matter. The final responsibility of action was thus laid upon the Metropolitan. The judgment in the Long case had decided that the Metropolitan could not rely on his Letters Patent as giving him authority to try the Bishop of Natal. The sole authority left to him was the spiritual authority inherent in his office, which the Bishop of Natal had acknowledged by taking the oath of canonical obedience to him as his Metropolitan authority, which was formally repudiated by the accused Bishop, upon the plea that his oath of canonical obedience was conditioned by the legal effect of the same oath taken in England by a Bishop of the Establishment to an Archbishop of the Establishment. Even if this ground be taken up, the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln showed that a Bishop in England is amenable to his Metropolitan's jurisdiction, and it is impossible to defend upon any principles of right and justice and personal honour, Bishop

Colenso's view that his oath of canonical obedience carried with it no obligations to submit to the spiritual authority of his Metropolitan.

On May 13, 1863, the Bishop of Natal was presented by Dean Douglas of Cape Town, Archdeacon Merri-man of Grahamstown, and Archdeacon Badnall of George to the Court of the Metropolitan upon certain charges of heretical teaching.

The nine Articles of Accusation were as follows—

(i) That in his book on *The Epistle to the Romans*, Bishop Colenso had denied the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement.

(ii) That in the same book he had denied the Catholic doctrine of Justification by Faith.

(iii) That in the same book he denied that the Sacraments are generally necessary to salvation, and that they convey any special grace.

(iv) That in the same book he had denied the endlessness of future punishments.

(v) That in his work on the *Pentateuch* he maintained that the Bible contains the Word of God, but is not the Word of God.

(vi) That in the same book he maintained that the Holy Scriptures are to be treated as a merely human book, and only inspired as other human books are inspired.

(vii) That in the same book the authenticity, genuineness, and truth of certain books in Holy Scripture are in whole or part denied.

(viii) That in the same book it is maintained that our Lord was ignorant, or in error, upon the authorship

and age of different parts of the Pentateuch, thereby contradicting the Catholic Faith.

(ix) That in the same book he deprived and impugned the Book of Common Prayer, especially the Ordinal and Baptismal Services.

The Metropolitan summoned all the Bishops of the Province as his Assessors, in accordance with ancient Canon law. Bishop Claughton had become Bishop of Colombo, and had been succeeded by Bishop Welby in 1862. The Orange Free State had been formed into a Missionary Diocese, to which Bishop Twells had been consecrated in 1863, and Bishop Tozer had been consecrated to succeed Bishop Mackenzie in the Central African Mission.

Bishop Tozer had just arrived at his mission, and was not present. Bishop Welby was also unable to attend (although he afterwards formally concurred in the judgment of the Court), and on November 17, 1863, the trial began in the Cathedral of Cape Town, before the Metropolitan, the Bishop of Grahamstown (Dr. Cotterill), and Bishop Twells of the Orange Free State.

Bishop Colenso sent Dr. Bleek (who was not a Churchman) to protest formally in his name against the proceedings. The Dean and the two Archdeacons delivered able and learned addresses to the Court. The Court adjourned to consider the case, and on December 14 met to deliver judgment. The Bishop of Grahamstown delivered a clear and learned judgment, and stated that unless Dr. Colenso retracted his errors he "cannot consistently, with the laws of our

Church, retain any longer the office of Bishop of Natal." ¹

The Bishop of the Free State next gave his judgment to the effect that all the charges had been proved. The Metropolitan then delivered an elaborate judgment dealing with each of the Articles of Accusation, and declaring them fully proved.² He then promulgated the definite sentence, in which his Assessors concurred, depriving Dr. Colenso of the See of Natal, and inhibiting him from exercising any Divine office within the Ecclesiastical Province of Cape Town.

Opportunity was given to the accused to retract his errors until April 16, 1864, and the Metropolitan permitted an appeal from his judgment to the Archbishop of Canterbury to be lodged within fifteen days. No such appeal was lodged, and Dr. Bleek handed in

¹ Bishop Cotterill further stated that "the Bishop of Natal's arguments are not consistent with any creed that teaches the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, except that which is condemned by the Church as Nestorianism."

² The Metropolitan's Judgment did not close the door on reverent criticism. He said, "Without wishing to limit the proper field and province of criticism, or to restrict the freedom which may be regarded as desirable for the eliciting of the truth, without attempting to define Inspiration, or venturing to say where the human element in the Bible ends, and where the Divine begins, I must deny that the Church does or can permit her ministers without restraint to make such assertions as these," *i. e.* Dr. Colenso's statement that it was impossible for him to retain his Episcopal Office and require Ordination candidates to declare that they unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, "which with the evidence now before me, it is impossible for me to believe."

Dr. Colenso's protest against the judgment, and his intention of treating it as a nullity.¹

Bishop Colenso then appealed to the Privy Council to declare the sentence of the Metropolitan null and void. Judgment was given *in re the Bishop of Natal*, on March 20, 1865. The Privy Council's judgment was absolutely and frankly Erastian. But it cleared the air, and emphasized the freedom of the Colonial Church. It decided that "in a settled colony the ecclesiastical law of England cannot be treated as part of the law which the settlers carried with them from the mother-country."

For this reason the Letters Patent of the Metropolitan were once more declared null and void, and Dr. Colenso's Letters Patent fell under the same category. The judgment carefully avoided stating that the Metropolitan had no ecclesiastical status in the English Church in South Africa as "a voluntary religious body." Dr. Colenso had entered into no voluntary contract as Bishop of a "voluntary religious body," with his Metropolitan as its head, and so his oath of obedience was not binding in law. The Privy Council carefully abstained from defining the

¹ The Metropolitan and Bishops also held a Provincial Synod of Bishops, and confirmed the proceedings of the Court by a Synodical Act. This Synod passed the following resolution, which afterwards took form as the third Proviso of the Constitution of the South African Church—"While the Church in this Province is bound by, and claims as its inheritance, the standards and formularies of the Church of England, it is not bound by any interpretation put upon those standards by existing ecclesiastical courts in England, or by the decisions of such courts in matters of faith."

moral and spiritual value of Dr. Colenso's oath of obedience. All it declared was that the Cape Town sentence was civilly null and void so far as the civil position and status of Dr. Colenso was concerned. Dr. Pusey and Bishop Wilberforce both thought that the judgment would clear up matters instead of complicating them. The result proved that they were right. A repetition of the Colenso and Long cases is now impossible in South Africa, owing to the voluntary contract to obey the discipline of the Province which is entered into by both bishops and clergy.

The Natal clergy met and resolved that the spiritual jurisdiction of the Metropolitan was untouched by the judgment, and that they accepted the sentence deposing Dr. Colenso.

On November 6, 1856, Dr. Colenso returned to Natal, and forced his way into the Cathedral at Maritzburg in the teeth of a formal protest from the Dean and churchwardens. The Metropolitan formally warned him that he should proceed to excommunication. Bishop Gray had held a thorough Visitation of the Diocese of Natal before Dr. Colenso's return, and had delivered a most admirable and lucid Charge dealing thoroughly with the whole question.

The General Convention of the American Church and the Provincial Synod of Canada had forwarded resolutions to the Metropolitan endorsing his proceedings in the deposition of Dr. Colenso. After a last personal appeal to the deposed Bishop to cease from officiating, the Metropolitan reluctantly issued the formal sentence of excommunication, which was

read by the Dean of Maritzburg from the altar of the Cathedral at Maritzburg on Jan. 5, 1866. The Metropolitan then applied through the Archbishop to the Convocation of Canterbury for its opinion on three points.

“I. Whether the Church of England holds communion with Dr. Colenso and the heretical Church he is seeking to establish in Natal, or whether it is in communion with the orthodox Bishops who in Synod declared him to be *ipso facto* excommunicated?”

“II. (From the Dean of Maritzburg.) Whether the acceptance of a new Bishop on our part, whilst Dr. Colenso still retains the Letters Patent of the Crown, would in any way sever us from the Mother Church of England?”

“III. Supposing the reply to the last question to be that they would not be in any way severed, what are the proper steps for us to take to obtain a new Bishop?”

The full reply of the Convocation of Canterbury was as follows—

“It is the opinion of this House that the Church of England holds communion with the Bishop of Cape Town, and with those Bishops who lately with him in Synod declared Bishop Colenso to be *ipso facto* excommunicated.

“It is the judgment of this House that the existence of the Letters Patent would not cause the acceptance of a new Bishop to involve any loss of communion between you and the Mother Church, and if it should be decided that a new Bishop should be con-

secrated, that a formal instrument declaratory of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa should be prepared; that a godly and well-learned man should be chosen by the clergy with assent of the lay communicants, and presented for consecration either to the Archbishop or to the Bishops of South Africa." The Lower House added that "they are further of opinion that Dr. Colenso, having been not only excommunicated by the aforesaid Synod, but also deposed from his office of Bishop, if a Bishop shall be duly elected and consecrated for the See of Natal in the place of Bishop Colenso, the Church of England would of necessity hold communion with that Bishop."

Although this declaration was not quite so emphatic and clear as it might have been, it is still clear enough, and has a ring of boldness in it, when we reflect how the English Bishops and clergy have been trammelled in their conceptions of Church discipline and order by the fetters of the Establishment.

In January 1868 the Convocation of Canterbury spoke out more plainly with regard to the deposition of Dr. Colenso. It was resolved by both Houses—

"I. That substantial justice had been done to the accused.

"II. That though the sentence can claim no legal effect, the Church, as a spiritual body, may rightly accept its validity."

On October 25, 1866, the clergy and laity of Natal met under the presidency of Dean Green to elect a Bishop to succeed Dr. Colenso.

In the *Pall Mall Gazette* for April 3, 1866, Dr. Colenso had written a letter stating that "he objects to prayer to Christ on Scriptural and Apostolical grounds." Canon Liddon dealt with this heresy in the appendix to his well-known *Bampton Lectures*, and the Natal Conference began its proceedings by the following declaration—

"We believe with firm and unhesitating faith that our Crucified Lord, Very God of Very God, is adorable, and worthy of all adoration; ever has been and ever is to be adored both in heaven and earth. Amen."

The election of Mr. Butler of Wantage to the vacant See was carried by a majority of one amongst the clergy, and a large majority of laity assented to the election. Failing Mr. Butler, the Conference left the selection of a Bishop in the hands of the Metropolitan and the Bishop of Grahamstown, with the concurrence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Mr. Butler placed himself in the hands of the Archbishop and the Bishop of Oxford, at whose wish the Metropolitan made further inquiries of the state of feeling amongst the clergy and laity of Natal.

The result of the inquiries was that out of seventeen clergy twelve would receive Mr. Butler as Bishop. Of the laity 300 communicants desired to receive Mr. Butler, twelve refused, and fifty were neutral. Dr. Colenso had deeply instilled in all who would listen to him that he was the "Queen's Bishop," and that all who accepted his successor were separating themselves from the Church of England. He thus got an

Erastian following who professed to reject his heresies, and yet own him as their Bishop because of his Letters Patent.

The Metropolitan went to England to attend the first Lambeth Conference of 1867. Archbishop Longley was induced to give a pledge to some of the English Bishops that the Colenso case should not be discussed. But the American and Colonial Bishops resented this timorous line of action, and eventually the Conference formally endorsed the line taken by the Convocation of Canterbury as to the appointment of an orthodox Bishop for Natal. But no vote was taken on the validity of this sentence passed on Dr. Colenso. In consequence of Bishop Gray deferring to the Archbishop's wish on the point, fifty-six of the Bishops present signed the following declaration—

“We, the undersigned Bishops, declare our acceptance of the sentence pronounced upon Dr. Colenso by the Metropolitan of South Africa with his Suffragans, as being spiritually a valid sentence.”

This declaration was a great support to the Metropolitan, and so was the report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference, which stated that the validity of the sentence had been formally accepted by the Convocations of Canterbury and York; by the Episcopal Synod of the Scottish Church; by the General Convention of the American Church, and by the Provincial Synod of Canada. Archbishop Longley after the Conference advised Mr. Butler not to accept the vacant See, because of his being an advanced High Churchman. This timorous action compelled

the Metropolitan and the Bishop of Grahamstown to exercise the powers of delegation committed to them by the Natal Conference.

The choice fell upon the Rev. W. K. Macrorie, and the Archbishop approved his nomination. The Metropolitan endeavoured to procure his consecration in England under Royal Mandate, but difficulties were fortunately thrown in his way. The better course prevailed, and the consecration of Bishop Macrorie took place in Cape Town Cathedral, on the Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul, in 1869. The Metropolitan was assisted in the consecration by the Bishops of Grahamstown, S. Helena, and the Orange Free State, and the consecration took place as the free spiritual action of the Church of the Province of South Africa, which was far preferable to a consecration in England.

The new Bishop took the title of "Bishop of Maritzburg," from the Cathedral City of his Diocese, which is more in accordance with ancient precedent than a title, such as Natal, taken from the name of the country in which the Bishop resides.

The trustees of the Colonial Bishopricks Fund withheld Dr. Colenso's stipend as Bishop. He brought an action against them to compel payment, and Lord Romilly, Master of the Rolls, in giving judgment, appeared to upset previous decisions, and stated that the jurisdiction of the Letters Patent could be exercised through the Civil Courts of the Colony. This monstrous decision was never upheld, although civilly it secured Dr. Colenso's stipend.

The Privy Council subsequently examined Lord Romilly's judgment in the case of Mr. Jenkins, a Bermuda clergyman, who brought the Bishop of Newfoundland into court for refusing to institute him. The Privy Council decided that they could not express an opinion as to the possible reconciling of Lord Romilly's judgment with previous decisions, and it was in consequence discredited in its bearings upon the position of the Colonial Church.

Dr. Colenso got his income, and the empty title, "Bishop of Natal," which had no more spiritual validity than the hereditary title, "Bishop of Osnaburgh," which was held by the Duke of York, son of George III. But Dr. Colenso was able to claim Church property in Natal which had been bought by Bishop Gray himself before the See was created. The case came before the Privy Council in 1869, and Bishop Gray's own statement explains it thoroughly—"I, Robert Gray, bought or had given to me by private individuals, or by the Government in Natal, certain lands which I had vested in 'R. Gray, Bishop of Cape Town, and his successors in that See.' Colenso calls upon me to appear before the Natal court to show cause why that court should not declare that that property was vested in J. W. Colenso, 'Bishop of Natal.'" The Supreme Court of Natal (Judge Connor dissenting) gave judgment in favour of Dr. Colenso. The Privy Council confirmed this judgment, basing their decision on the fact that Dr. Colenso's Letters Patent were issued a short time before Bishop Gray's second Letters Patent as

Metropolitan. They decided that the resignation of Bishop Gray's first Letters Patent had the effect of invalidating his trusteeship, and that it lapsed to Dr. Colenso in his stead. By this *summum jus, summa injuria*, the orthodox clergy in Natal lost several Church buildings and much Church property.

Dr. Colenso was not scrupulous in his dealings with the Metropolitan. Bishop Gray had been in the habit of subscribing privately £100 a year towards Church work in Natal, and he had paid this sum to Dr. Colenso until he was deprived of his See. Dr. Colenso sent him a lawyer's letter of demand for this subscription (with arrears). Naturally the Metropolitan took no notice of such conduct, except by a private expression of sorrow that Dr. Colenso could have brought himself to act in such a manner.

The orthodox clergy and their friends soon built the new Cathedral of S. Saviour's, Maritzburg, to supply the place of the building appropriated by Dr. Colenso, and the new church of S. Cyprian's, Durban, was built under similar circumstances. The work of the Diocese grew and prospered under the wise, tactful, and conciliatory rule of Bishop Macrorie, whose subsequent most successful Episcopate left an indelible impress for good upon the Diocese.

The beginnings of this good work were plainly visible in the next few years, and cheered the brave heart of the Metropolitan before the close of his days. Good came out of evil. The Long and Colenso cases had freed the Colonial Church from the fetters of State control.

CHAPTER VII.

SOUTH AFRICA UNDER SIR GEORGE GREY, SIR PHILIP WODEHOUSE, AND SIR HENRY BARKLY—THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD OF 1870, THE CONSTITUTION AND CANONS OF THE PROVINCE, AND THE DEATH OF BISHOP GRAY, THE FIRST METROPOLITAN OF SOUTH AFRICA.

Sir G. Grey's able Native Policy—His Action during the Indian Mutiny—His Confederation Policy and its Rejection by Downing Street—His Dismissal and its Cancelling by the Duke of Newcastle—He is appointed Governor of New Zealand in 1861—Sir P. Wodehouse finds the Colony depressed—Loss of English Market for Cape Wines—The Separation Conflict—The Dead-lock between the Executive and the Cape Parliament—Annexation of British Kaffraria—Bill to abolish Cape Parliament rejected—Sir P. Wodehouse succeeded by Sir H. Barkly in 1870, who in 1871 carried Responsible Government in the Cape Colony—Discovery of the Diamond Fields—The First Provincial Synod summoned for Jan. 1870—Houses of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity—The Constitution and Canons—Digest of the Canons—Title of Archbishop—Contracts of Bishops and Clergy—Consecration of Bishop Wilkinson—The Metropolitan's Protest against Oath taken to York—Consecration of Bishop Webb in 1870 in Scotland—Death of Mrs. Gray—Bishop Cotterill translated to Edinburgh—Consecration of Bishop Merriman in 1871—The Metropolitan negotiates with the Dutch Reformed Moderator on Re-union—Illness and Death of the Metropolitan, Sept. 1, 1872.

THE years of Sir G. Grey's Governorship were prosperous times for South Africa. The burden and unsettlement of native wars was removed, and the country had time to develop its prosperity.

We have already alluded to the measures taken by Sir G. Grey for the orderly government of the natives after the cattle-killing delusion of 1857. The territory of British Kaffraria, with King Williamstown as its capital, and East London as its port, was under a Lieutenant-Governor, and was administered as a separate territory apart from the Cape Colony. This frontier territory was bounded by the Kei River, and must not be confused with the Transkeian districts, which were then termed Independent Kaffraria. During the year 1857 the Indian Mutiny broke out, and it is not too much to say that the prompt action of Sir G. Grey, and the loyal support he received from the colonists, saved our Indian Empire. Sir G. Grey took upon himself the whole *onus* and responsibility of sending the regiments of the Chinese expedition, which touched at Simonstown, to India. If the Home Government had not endorsed his action, he would have been dismissed from the service. As it was, he was bold enough to take the initiative and do what he thought best, and the troops he sent reached India long before other reinforcements. He also sent the whole available garrison at the Cape to India, and the Cape Town Volunteers readily undertook the garrison duty in place of the Imperial troops. The Governor sent no less than 2000 horses to India (including his own carriage horses), and he

also forwarded commissariat supplies and cash from the Treasury. The natives soon learnt all about the Indian Mutiny, and Kreli began to give trouble. But Sir G. Grey ordered a prompt forward movement of the Border Police, and the insurrection was crushed at its outset.

At the same time the Cape Town and Wellington Railway was authorized, which, although only fifty miles long, was the beginning of that vast South African system of railways which now unites the capitals of the two Republics, as well as Port Elizabeth, Kimberley, and the frontier with Cape Town.

The Cape Parliament at the same time, at Sir G. Grey's suggestion, voted £50,000 a year to be spent on immigration. The session of 1858 saw the first Parliament of Cape Colony dissolved. Parliamentary Government had worked fairly well, but the Executive were not responsible to Parliament, and friction was bound to occur sooner or later. Parliamentary Government necessarily involves Responsible Government, if it is to be properly worked, and this was as self-evident in South Africa as in other places.

Sir G. Grey saw that the chief weakness of South Africa was its division into four separate governments. He desired to form a South African Federation. A visit to Bloemfontein, in which he successfully mediated between the Orange Free State and the Basutos, enabled him to conciliate the Republican authorities, and in consequence of his visit the Volksraad, or National Assembly of the Orange Free

State, in 1858 expressed by formal resolution a desire to federate with the Cape Colony. Sir G. Grey formulated his plans for a South African Federation, under a Governor-General and Central Legislature (much on the same principle as the Dominion of Canada), and laid them before the Colonial Office. He also laid the matter before the Cape Parliament, and freely expressed his strong desire for a South African Confederation.

But Downing Street blundered again. Sir Bulwer Lytton, the Colonial Secretary, not only snubbed Sir G. Grey, and declined to admit any overtures from the Free State, but actually dismissed him from office.

The man who had helped to save India, and who could have settled and consolidated South Africa, was dismissed ignominiously from office at the bidding of an Imperial official who knew nothing and cared less about South African affairs. Fortunately for the Colony, the Imperial Ministry went out of office, and Lord Lytton was succeeded by the Duke of Newcastle, who cancelled Sir G. Grey's dismissal, though he did not endorse his policy.

The golden opportunity for a union of the South African Colonies and States had been lost, through the blunders of Downing Street, and in 1894 the one certain factor in South African politics is, that the two Republics will never join a Confederation under the British Flag. A United States of South Africa is more possible, although this would involve separation from the British Empire. But the Confederation

which the two Republics might readily have accepted in 1858, is utterly out of the question in 1894, when they have grown wealthy and prosperous, and when their citizens have learnt to be proud of their flags and of their respective countries, with a more enlightened and far-seeing patriotism than that of the sturdy emigrant farmers of 1836. Sir G. Grey was bitterly disappointed. He left South Africa in 1861,¹ amidst the regrets of the whole community, to become Governor of New Zealand, and settled the Maori war.

In his valedictory address to the Cape Parliament, he foresaw the perpetual expansion of European civilization that was bound to take place by the logic of events. He virtually anticipated the Northward expansion which has been identified with the name of Mr. Cecil Rhodes. He foresaw the necessity of a system of railways to link this ever-advancing forward movement with the ports of the Cape Colony. His educational schemes were directed with a view to enable South Africa to train its own statesmen, lawyers, and divines, so that the descendants of the old colonists should become able and worthy leaders of the perpetual onward movement of further colonization. Sir G. Grey was before his day in his clear outlook into the South African future. Beyond a doubt Sir G. Grey was the ablest statesman

¹ The visit of Prince Alfred to South Africa in 1860 caused much manifestation of loyal feeling to the Crown. Sir G. Grey's tact and judgment in arranging the details of the Prince's tour were gratefully remembered by the Queen.

who ever governed South Africa, and his loss at this crisis has never been replaced. He was succeeded by Sir Philip Wodehouse, a man of good intentions and narrow views. Sir Philip soon got to loggerheads with the Cape Parliament in the matter of supply. The Colony became less prosperous, and the wine-farmers of the Western Province found the English market closed to their produce by the new tariff arrangements of the Imperial Government, which favoured the lighter wines of France and Spain, to the exclusion of the Cape wines, which had previously been largely exported for home consumption.

The wine-farmers had to live, and so they took to making cheap brandy, which had a most pernicious effect upon the natives, and has ever since distracted the Cape Colony with one of the most complicated and perplexing social problems that any country has ever had to face. It has been most difficult for Cape statesmen to hold the balance between the material ruin of the wine-farmers and the moral ruin of the natives, and until a market is opened for the wines of the Colony the problem will always be with us, notwithstanding the efforts of the temperance reformers.

The Colony was also distracted by a bitter political strife between the Eastern and Western Provinces. The Easterns said that their interests were neglected by a Cape Town Parliament, and they demanded a separate government. To satisfy the Easterns the Parliament met in 1864 at Grahamstown, but the experiment was not repeated. Matters grew worse

and worse in the conflict between the Governor and his Executive and the Parliament. Sir Philip Wodehouse disliked Responsible Government, and tried to keep the Colony in leading-strings. He proposed a bill which abolished the two Houses of Parliament, and substituted for them a small Council of twelve elected members, which he thought would be more amenable. The Parliament threw out his bill, and declined to be effaced. The session of 1865 witnessed a bitter strife over the annexation of British Kaffraria to the Cape Colony. Sir Philip Wodehouse got the Imperial Parliament to pass a bill of annexation, and then brought the question before the Cape Parliament, who considered that they had been unfairly dealt with. Sir Philip had certainly strained the Constitution, and the Western members feared lest the Easterns should carry Separation of the two Provinces by using the four additional votes of the proposed Kaffrarian members. Eventually the Annexation Bill was carried, with an increase of Western representation, which left parties *in statu quo*.¹

¹ A devastating border warfare had raged for some years between the Free State and the Basutos. The Free State annexed a large portion of the territory of Moshesh (now known as the "Conquered Territory"). Moshesh and his warriors were short of ammunition, and exhausted by the war. The Free State was determined to break the power of the Basuto Chiefs, and the wily Moshesh asked to be allowed to live "under the large folds of the flag of England." On March 12, 1868, Sir P. Wodehouse proclaimed Basutoland to be British territory. But the Chiefs and people had time to recover themselves before the British Administration got fairly to work. Had prompt measures been taken, the Basutos would have settled down into orderly

The Colony, in the session of 1870, had the definite choice put before it of Responsible Government or a small Elective Council as proposed by Sir Philip Wodehouse. No decision was arrived at, and Sir Philip Wodehouse was succeeded at the close of the session by Sir Henry Barkly. At this time a remarkable change in the prosperity of South Africa occurred through the discovery of the Diamond Fields. The first diamond was discovered in 1867, and was found in the possession of the children of a Boer farmer near Hopetown, who had found it, and used it as a plaything. People were at first incredulous, but prospectors searched the district, and diamonds were found in the alluvial deposits of the Vaal River, where a township called Barkly speedily sprang up. Not long after this the famous Kimberley mines were discovered, which have made South Africa famous as the greatest diamond-producing country in the world. Population and capital were attracted, and Kimberley soon became one of the largest towns in South Africa. The whole of South Africa shared in this flood-tide of prosperity. Sir Henry Barkly was in favour of Responsible Government, and the bill was lost in the session of 1871 by three votes in the Upper House.

But the bill was carried in 1872, and the new Constitution was proclaimed on November 9 that same year. Mr. Molteno, the leader of the party

and civilized life. But the delay caused future trouble. The Cape Colony took over Basutoland in 1871, and administered it until after the Basuto War of 1880, when after prolonged negotiations the Imperial Government resumed control in 1884.

desiring Responsible Government, became the first Premier of the Cape Colony. His Attorney-General was Mr. De Villiers (afterwards Sir Henry De Villiers, Chief Justice of the colony, and one of the ablest jurists in the British Empire). His Commissioner of Public Works was Mr. C. Abercrombie Smith, who was a Cambridge Senior Wrangler.

The colony had reason to be proud of the status and position of the members of its first Cabinet. And we are bound to add that a high level of ability and statesmanship has been maintained in the members of the Cabinets which have since been formed.

We must now turn once more to the history of the Church. The chief care of Bishop Gray, after the close of the Colenso controversy, was to consolidate the Province under its own Constitution and Canons. The Metropolitan summoned the first Provincial Synod of the English Church in South Africa to meet in January 1870. In the previous year a terrible trial fell upon the whole Church in South Africa, owing to the circumstances connected with the sudden resignation of the Bishop of the Orange Free State. The Metropolitan had not filled up the vacant See, and the House of Bishops in the first Provincial Synod consisted of the Metropolitan, Bishop Cotterill of Grahamstown, Bishop Welby of S. Helena, and Bishop Macrorie of Maritzburg. The Houses of Clergy and Laity were composed of elected representatives from each Diocese, except the Diocese of S. Helena. The Metropolitan and his advisers had very carefully prepared the draft of the Constitution

and Canons of the Province. The draft of the Constitution was submitted to Sir R. Palmer (afterwards Lord Selborne) for his revision. He expressed strong approval, and suggested several important alterations. Judge Connor of Natal also rendered valuable help. We may summarize the Constitution as follows—

I. That the English Church in South Africa adopts in its Canons the Laws and Usages of the Church of England as far as they are applicable to an unestablished Church; that it accepts the three Creeds, the 39 Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, the decisions of the undisputed General Councils, the Authorized English Version of the Scriptures; that it disclaims the right of altering any of these standards of Faith and Doctrine, except in agreement with such alterations as may be adopted by a General Synod of the Anglican Communion; that (3rd Proviso) in interpreting these standards of Faith and Doctrine the Church of this Province is not bound by decisions other than those of its own Church Courts, or such Court as the Provincial Synod may recognize as a Tribunal of Appeal.

II. That the legislation for the Church of this Province is in the hands of the Provincial Synod, subject to the higher authority of a General Synod of the Anglican Communion, provided such Synod include representatives from this Province.

That the Provincial Synod consists of three Houses. (i) The House of Bishops; (ii) the House of the Clergy; (iii) the House of the Laity. No proposition can be entertained which involves the altering of the

standards and formularies of the Church, as accepted in the Constitution, and no resolution can be passed which is not accepted by all three orders. The House of Bishops is thus ultimately and finally responsible for all legislation. The Houses of Clergy and Laity act as Assessors to the House of Bishops, and have the right of refusing assent to any fresh legislation emanating from the House of Bishops alone, as is the case in the General Convention of the American Church. The legislation passed by Diocesan Synods is subject to the review of the Provincial Synod, and the position of the laity in Synod is maintained in accordance with primitive custom and order.¹ The Constitution and Canons were formally confirmed by the Provincial Synod of 1876, and some minor amendments to the Canons were made in the Provincial Synods of 1883 and 1891. The following convenient summary of the Canons originally appeared in the South African Church paper, the *Southern Cross*.

DIGEST OF THE CANONS.

Canon 1 treats of the Provincial Synod. It fixes the representation of the various Dioceses, and

¹ The true position of the laity in Synod is clearly set forth in Bishop Moberley's *Bampton Lectures* "On the Administration of the Spirit." I may also be permitted to refer to Chapter VI. of my book on *The Church and the Civil Power*, which gives a *catena* of Patristic authorities to prove that the position of the laity in the Synods of the "Free Churches" of the Anglican Communion is strictly in accordance with primitive and Catholic usage.

regulates the constitution of the Synod, which meets ordinarily every seven years, and includes—

- (a) The Bishops of the Province.
- (b) Clerical representatives elected by each Diocese, in the proportion of one for every ten Clergy or fraction of ten in the total number in each Diocese.
- (c) Lay representatives elected by each Diocese. The Laity are elected in like proportion with the Clergy, on the principle of the basis of representation in the Diocesan Synods, viz. one Layman for each parish or chapelry, and two for Cathedral Parishes.

Canon 2 defines the functions of the Metropolitan. He presides over the Provincial Synods, confirms the election of Bishops, presides over the trial of any Bishop, and visits, when necessary, any Diocese of the Province.

Canon 3 treats of the election of Bishops. If the Diocese includes fewer than six Priests, the Bishops of the Province make the election. But otherwise, the electors are the Priests of the Diocese and one Deacon representing the Diaconate, but the assent of representatives of the Laity is required. Missionary Bishops are chosen by the Bishops of the Province.

Canon 4 requires that the Metropolitan and the other South African Bishops confirm every Episcopal election, in a Court duly convened for the purpose.

Canon 5 relates to the consecration of a Bishop elect. It is considered expedient that the Metropolitan be consecrated in England by the Archbishop

of Canterbury in token of our union with the Mother Church. All Bishops enter into a contract to obey and maintain the Constitution and Canons of the Province.

Canon 6 provides for the appointment of Coadjutor Bishops when needful.

Canon 7 obliges Bishops to reside in their Dioceses, and frames the conditions under which they can obtain leave of absence.

A new Canon (1891) states the course to be taken in case of a Bishop being of unsound mind.

Canon 8 provides for the resignation of Bishops.

Canon 9 provides for the administration of a vacant See until a new Bishop is appointed.

Canon 10 provides for the formation of new Dioceses, which belongs to the Metropolitan and Bishops of the Province in Synod.

Canon 11 sets forth the declarations of obedience to, and conformity with, the Laws and Canons of the Church, which declarations must be signed by all Bishops and Clergy on entering upon their offices.

Canon 12 relates to the Presentation and Institution of Clergy to vacant benefices.

Canon 13 orders that the Clergy shall reside in their parishes unless they have a licence of non-residence.

Canon 14 provides for the (exceptional) admittance of a man under twenty-three to Deacon's Orders.

A new Canon (1891) provides what is to be done in the case of a clergyman of unsound mind.

Canon 15 orders that no Clergyman may make any

alterations in the Services prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, except such as are allowed by the Provincial Synod, or exceptionally allowed by the Bishop. The Hymns used must have the consent of the Bishop of the Diocese. All Public Fasts and Thanksgivings are to be religiously observed.

Canon 16 orders that no Clergyman shall join in matrimony persons, either of whom, not having been admitted as a Catechumen, is an unbaptized person, or who are within the forbidden degrees of Kindred and Affinity. The re-marriage of an innocent person who has obtained a divorce on the ground of adultery is not forbidden, but the Clergy may refuse to perform the service.

Canon 17 provides against ordained persons abandoning the Ministry of the Church, and assuming it again, without evidence of their sincerity and repentance in so doing.

Canon 18 recognizes the offices of Catechist, Sub-Deacon, and Reader, permitting Laymen to help the Clergyman to perform such duties in the Church and Parish, or Mission, as it may be competent for a person not in Holy Orders to fulfil.

Canon 19 provides for the trial of offending Bishops and Clergy, and defines the constitution of the Diocesan Courts and of the Metropolitan Court of Appeal, which consists of the Metropolitan and the Bishops of the Province. A lay assessor (if possible, learned in the law) must be present as well as the clerical assessors. Any person refusing to obey the sentence of a Church Court is to be suspended, or

excommunicated, unless the presiding Bishop decide this to be undesirable.

Canon 20 provides that Bishops shall be tried by the Metropolitan and the Synod of Bishops.

Canon 21 provides special enactments with regard to the trial of Clergy, so that due notice shall be given to the accused, and every precaution taken to ensure a fair trial.

Canon 22 treats of the Court of Appeal, which consists of the Metropolitan and Synod of Bishops, with one or two Lay Assessors. It provides further, that if any three Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion unite in requiring the case to be re-heard or reviewed, this shall be done. Also, it provides for an Appeal to a Spiritual Tribunal for the whole Anglican Communion, when such Tribunal shall be established.

Canon 23 gives the terms under which judicial sentences are inflicted upon offending Clergy.

Canon 24 refers to Vestry Meetings, and prevents a Parishioner's voting at Vestry Meetings in two separate parishes. A Parishioner must be at least a baptized habitual worshipper in his Parish or District Church.

Canon 25 provides that Churchwardens and Sidesmen shall be Communicants.

Canon 26 enacts that no alterations shall be made in Churches without the Bishop's consent.

Canon 27 provides for the due care of all Parochial property, which is to be officially inspected by the Archdeacon.

Canon 28 provides for a Provincial Trust Board

and Diocesan Trust Boards to take charge of the Church property.

Canon 29 guards against hasty legislation in the Provincial Synod, by providing that six months' notice be given for the alteration, amendment, or repeal of any Canon.

Canon 30 guards against divergence from the Church of England by enacting that the general principles of Canon Law shall govern the interpretation of the Canons or Laws of the Church of this Province.

The Provincial Synod of 1870 passed the following very important resolution upon the title of "Archbishop"—

"This Synod is of opinion that it would prevent misapprehensions as to the ecclesiastical *status* of the several Provinces of the Anglican Communion as co-ordinate members of the same Body, and might be expedient for other causes, if all the Metropolitans of these Provinces should hold the same title; and it requests the Bishops of this Province to take such measures as in their judgment may be best calculated to obtain sufficient ecclesiastical recognition of the title of Archbishop for the Metropolitan of this Province."

It is noteworthy that the South African Church anticipated all other Colonial Churches by many years in affirming the desirability of adopting the title of "Archbishop" for Colonial Metropolitans. The General Synod of the Australian Church referred the subject to the Lambeth Conference of 1888, and the

Committee appointed to deal with the subject reported in favour of using the title of "Archbishop."

The Provincial Synod of 1891 reaffirmed the above resolution of 1870, and in 1893 the question found its final solution by the action of the Canadian General Synod in adopting the archiepiscopal title for its Primate, the Archbishop of Rupertsland, and for the Metropolitan of Canada, the Archbishop of Ontario. The Provincial Synod of 1870 dealt very ably with the question of the contracts which the Bishops and Clergy enter into, as members of a voluntary religious body, to obey the rules of that body and accept the decisions of its tribunals. Each Bishop and Clergyman contracts personally to submit to any sentence passed upon him by an Ecclesiastical Court without appealing to the Civil Courts for redress. If a Bishop or Clergyman violated this pledge, the contract is so worded that the Civil Court could only deal with the contract itself, as in the case of enforcing the decree of arbitrators. In an arbitration case the Civil Court only examines the fact that the parties concerned have given their formal consent to the arbitration. The nature of the award, or the subject matter of the decree of the arbitrators, is not within the purview of the Court. So in a South African Church case, the Civil Court could only examine the contract, and see if it were properly made and carried out. It could not deal with the merits of the case, or re-examine the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Court.¹

¹ Bishop Cotterill of Grahamstown took immediate steps to

After this most important Provincial Synod, the Metropolitan was severely tried by the fatal and lingering illness of Mrs. Gray. He went with her to England, and vigorously protested against the line adopted by Archbishop Tait with regard to the consecration of Bishop Wilkinson for the new Missionary Diocese of Zululand, which had been formed as a memorial to Bishop Mackenzie of the Universities Mission. The Archbishop declined to follow the custom of his

resign his Letters Patent in order to enter into contract with the Church of the Province of South Africa. No Letters Patent have since been issued to any South African Bishop. The Bishops of New Zealand took the same course in 1865. Their petition to the Crown is significant in its wording—

“They humbly pray that all doubts may be removed both ecclesiastical and temporal.

“I. By the acceptance of the surrender of their Letters Patent, now declared to be null and void.

“II. By declaring the Royal Mandate, under which they were consecrated, to be merely an authority given by the Crown for the Act of Consecration, and to have no further effect or legal sequence.

“III. By recognizing the *inherent right* of the Bishops of New Zealand to fill up vacancies in their own order, by the consecration of persons elected in conformity with the regulations of the General Synod, without Letters Patent, and without Royal Mandate, in the same manner as they have already consecrated a Missionary Bishop (Bp. Patteson) for the islands in the Western Pacific.”

This document was signed by the Primate, Bishop Selwyn, and the Bishops of Wellington, Nelson, Christchurch, and Waiapu.

The South African Church followed the lead of New Zealand. It has been the custom of some controversialists to represent the action taken by the South African Church as essentially different from that of other Colonial Churches. Here is the answer.

predecessors and allow Bishop Wilkinson to take the oath of canonical obedience to his own Metropolitan. He caused him to take it to the Archbishop of York. Bishop Gray rightly estimated the uncanonical action of the Archbishop. He stated that it broke up the whole order and system of Colonial Provinces and Metropolitans, and when Bishop Webb was consecrated Bishop of Bloemfontein in the Free State, the consecration took place on S. Andrew's Day, 1870, in the Cathedral at Inverness, by Bishop Gray himself, as Metropolitan, assisted by the Primus of Scotland, the Bishop of Aberdeen, and Bishop Abraham, as representing Bishop Selwyn of Lichfield. This was the last public function Bishop Gray took part in, before leaving England for the last time in December 1870.

In April 1871 Mrs. Gray died, and the worn-out Metropolitan was left to end his days in loneliness. Bishop Cotterill was translated to Edinburgh, after a most helpful Episcopate in the Diocese of Grahams-town. The Elective Assembly of the Diocese met under mandate from the Metropolitan to elect a successor. Dean Williams presided, and the first episcopal election under the new Provincial Canons resulted in the unanimous choice of Archdeacon Merriman, who had for a short time previously been Dean of Cape Town. The Metropolitan consecrated his old friend in Grahamstown Cathedral on S. Andrew's Day, 1871, with the assistance of the Bishops of Maritzburg and Bloemfontein. On his return to Cape Town he entered upon a most interesting correspondence upon

the subject of re-union with Dr. Faure, the Moderator of the Dutch Reformed Church. The Metropolitan did not forget past courtesies and kindnesses shown to the English Church by the Dutch Reformed authorities, and also remembered the vast difference between a National Church that has lost the Apostolic Succession owing to the troubles of the Reformation settlement, and the new English-speaking schisms that had invaded South Africa when it became united to the British Empire. Nothing definite resulted from the correspondence except an increase of kindly feeling. But the end of the great Metropolitan's labours was at hand. On August 9, 1872, he was thrown from his horse on riding into Cape Town. He remounted and rode on to Cape Town, where he received a letter with the news of his brother's death. He rode home, and the next day was able to walk to Wynberg, and on Aug. 13 he confirmed for the last time in his Cathedral. He looked very ill, and was hardly able to get through the service. It was his last public ministration, and fitly closed with a solemn *Te Deum*, with the Metropolitan standing before the altar and his clergy grouped around him.

He gradually grew worse, and on the 24th the doctors saw that the end was near. He was able to read and converse, and on the 31st he received the Holy Eucharist, being able to join in the whole service. On Saturday morning (14th after Trinity), September 1st, he died peacefully in his sleep. His funeral was a most touching demonstration of public sympathy and respect. He was beloved by all who

were brought into personal contact with him. The tender and genial side of his character was not known of all men. Any man, who was thrust as he was into the heat of a great conflict for the faith and liberties of the Church, must necessarily meet with misunderstanding and misconstruction of motives. We have purposely omitted to notice or refute the manifold slanders and malicious imputations upon the great Metropolitan that deface the pages of the *Life of Bishop Colenso*, by Sir G. W. Cox. The first Metropolitan of South Africa will be remembered as the greatest and most courageous Prelate of modern times long after the slanders of his detractors are buried in oblivion.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOUTH AFRICA UNDER SIR BARTLE FRERE, SIR HERCULES ROBINSON, AND SIR HENRY LOCH—THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD OF 1876: THE GRAHAMSTOWN CATHEDRAL CASE—THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD OF 1883: THE TRINITY CHURCH (CAPE TOWN) CASE—THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD OF 1891, AND THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THE CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Native Unrest in South Africa—The Transvaal and President Burgers—The Secocoeni War—Sir H. Barkly's Warning—The Annexation of the Transvaal by Sir T. Shepstone—Lord Carnarvon's abortive Confederation Scheme—In 1877 Sir Bartle Frere succeeds Sir H. Barkly—He is sent to carry Confederation—The Ninth Kafir War—The Dismissal of the Molteno Cabinet by the Governor—End of the War—Outbreak of the Zulu War—The Disaster of Isandlwana, and the Defence of Rorke's Drift—Battles of Kambula and Ulundi—End of the Zulu War—Partition of Zululand—Dr. Colenso's Agitation—Restoration and Death of Cetshwayo—The Boers install Dinizulu and found the "New Republic"—Bishops McKenzie and Carter, and Present State of Zululand—Protests of Transvaal People against Annexation rejected by Imperial Government—Meeting at Pardekraal in 1880—Proclamation of Republic, and Transvaal War of Independence—The British Garrisons besieged—Bronkhorst Spruit—Laing's Nek—Ingogo—Majuba Hill, and Restor-

ation of Transvaal Republic—Sir Hercules Robinson succeeds Sir Bartle Frere in 1881—The Scanlen Cabinet—The Basuto War—Sir C. Warren's Expedition and the Annexation of British Bechuanaland in 1884—The Uington Cabinet and the Second Sprigg Cabinet—The Imperial Conference of 1887—The Transvaal Gold Discoveries and the Rise of Johannesburg—The Chartered Company occupy Mashonaland—Successful March of the Pioneer Force—The Rhodes Cabinet of 1890—Mr. Rhodes' Second Ministry of 1893—The Matabele War—Pondoland—General Summary—The History of the Church—Consecration of Bishop Callaway in 1873 as Bishop of S. John's—Difficulties in Electing a Successor to Bishop Gray—Consecration of Dr. W. W. Jones as Metropolitan in 1874—Difficulties at Grahamstown owing to Action of Dean Williams—Provincial Synod of 1876—Trial of Dean Williams before Diocesan Court in 1879—Judgment of the Supreme Court in 1880—Judgment of the Privy Council in 1882—Schismatic Action of Dr. Colenso—His Negotiations with Dr. Williams—Death of Bishop Merriman—The Provincial Synod of 1883—Death of Dr. Colenso—Death of Dr. Williams—The Close of the Grahamstown Cathedral Controversy—The Trinity Church Case—The Provincial Synod of 1891—The Church Ordinances Repeal Act—The Present Condition of the Church of the Province of South Africa.

THE close of Sir H. Barkly's *régime* was marked by a recrudescence of native unrest and threatened disturbance throughout South Africa. The Transvaal had elected Mr. Burgers some time previously as State President. He was a Dutch Reformed minister, who had caused a law-suit and great controversy in the Cape Colony, owing to his holding views akin to Dr. Colenso's, and this fact prejudiced the old-fashioned and Conservative Boers of the Transvaal against his general policy in public matters. He planned a railway from Delagoa Bay to Pretoria, and

he was full of schemes which were in advance of the general civilization of the people of the Transvaal. Some of them "trekked" away from his rule into the unknown interior, just as their fathers had "trekked" away from the British flag. These people suffered terrible privations, and the survivors of the party formed a settlement at Humpata in the Portuguese territory of Angola on the West Coast. The story of their privations led to an organized relief fund being formed in the chief towns of the colony, and when the Transvaalers knew of their kinsmen's privations, their disloyalty to the Burgers *régime* was increased. President Burgers, in the spring of 1876, was involved in war with the native Chief Secocoeni, who had a secret understanding with the powerful Zulu King Cetshwayo. The Transvaal Burghers had no heart for the war, and their efforts to dislodge Secocoeni from his strongholds resulted in failure. Sir H. Barkly, as High Commissioner, warned the Transvaal President of the danger of his proceedings, which might kindle a general native war throughout South Africa. Lord Carnarvon, the Secretary for the Colonies, picked up Sir G. Grey's discarded Confederation scheme, and tried to bring it to bear upon South Africa. But it was too late. Mr. J. A. Froude, the historian, came to Africa, as a sort of emissary of the Imperial Government.

The Cape Ministry very properly resented this interference, and the Confederation scheme lapsed. But Lord Carnarvon thought he would carry it out by other means. Sir Theophilus Shepstone was in

England. This astute diplomatist persuaded Lord Carnarvon to give him a secret Commission to annex the Transvaal Republic.

On his arrival in South Africa, Sir T. Shepstone, with an escort of twenty-five police, proceeded to Pretoria, and found the Government of President Burgers in a state of chaos. The failure of the Secocoeni expedition had produced disorder. The taxes were not paid, and the State exchequer was empty. The Volksraad met, and the President told them that the Republic would be annexed by England unless they supported his Government. But Mr. Burgers had become so unpopular that the Volksraad would not support him. Mr. Paul Kruger, the present President of the Transvaal, said he did not believe that England would forcibly annex the Republic. But his confidence was misplaced. Sir T. Shepstone, on April 12, 1877, proclaimed the Transvaal Republic to be British territory. A more unjust or iniquitous annexation has rarely been made in the history of nations.

Matters went smoothly enough at first, although the area of the Transvaal is nearly as large as France. The Boers were rid of Mr. Burgers, whom they detested, and Sir T. Shepstone, as an old colonist, spoke Dutch fluently, and conciliated them. But President Burgers and his executive made a solemn protest against the annexation, and intimated that they would send a deputation to England to secure the rights of the Republic. The deputation was sent, but Lord Carnarvon ratified the annexation, and the Transvaal was garrisoned by British troops.

In April 1877 Sir H. Barkly was succeeded by Sir Bartle Frere, a most distinguished Indian administrator. His mission was to carry Confederation. But his task was impossible. The Transvaal people were outwardly tranquil, but they were taking secret measures to restore the Republic. In 1878 a second deputation went to England, consisting of Mr. Paul Kruger and General Joubert, carrying a memorial from 6000 Burghers, but their representations were ignored by the British Government.

The annexation of the Transvaal brought upon the British Government the consequences of the boundary disputes between the Transvaal Government and the Zulu King. The natives throughout South Africa were ready to revolt, and the Zulu King's messengers began to incite them to action. On Sept. 27, 1877, the Ninth Kafir War began with a smart action between the Galekas, the tribe of Krelu, the Paramount Chief of Kaffraria, and the Mounted Police. The volunteer forces of the principal towns in the colony were called up for active service. Sir Bartle Frere was on the frontier, and the Molteno Cabinet believed that the war could be ended without the use of Imperial troops. The Governor thought otherwise, and events proved him in the right. Eventually Sir Bartle Frere took the strong course of dismissing the Molteno Cabinet from office, and Mr. Gordon Sprigg formed a Cabinet which brought the war to a successful conclusion in 1878. The Cape Parliament endorsed the Governor's action, and the Sprigg Cabinet held office for several years.

The main incidents in the war were the Battle of Umzintzani, when the Port Elizabeth, Grahamstown, and Cape Town Volunteers intercepted Krel's army on their march to the colony to join the rebel Gaikas, and the Battle of Kentani, which resulted in Krel's final defeat. The Gaika outbreak was dealt with separately, and ended with the death of Sandilli, the Gaika Chief.

But the year 1879 saw the outbreak of the Zulu War, which was the most serious struggle between the natives and Europeans that South Africa had yet witnessed. The Zulu army was well organized and disciplined. It was strong enough to sweep Natal from end to end, and Sir Bartle Frere determined to end the Zulu power. It was part and parcel of his Confederation policy, for the Cape Colony declined to enter into any union with Natal whilst Natal was perpetually menaced by the Zulu power on its exposed eastern frontier. Lord Chelmsford gathered all the available Imperial troops, and a considerable body of Natal Volunteers joined his forces. Zululand was invaded, and the British forces made the usual mistake of despising their enemy. On January 22, 1879, Lord Chelmsford advanced from his camp at Isandlwana, and left the camp in charge of Colonels Durnford and Pulleine. The head-quarters of the 24th Regiment, and some of the Royal Artillery, with Volunteers and Native Contingent, which formed the force left by Lord Chelmsford in camp, amounted to 700 Europeans and 600 natives. Lord Chelmsford missed the main

body of the Zulu army, which fell upon the camp in overwhelming numbers before he could retrace his ground. A force of 14,000 Zulus steadily attacked Col. Durnford's camp. The advancing Zulus were decimated by the artillery, but they rushed on until they captured the guns and killed the gunners. The 24th fought back to back till their ammunition was spent, and then the Zulus rushed in with their assegais and killed them. Only about forty Europeans escaped with their lives.

Lieutenants Melville and Coghill rode out with the colours of the 24th, and carried them across the river Tugela. Both of them were killed, but the colours were found near their dead bodies, and were saved. The Zulu army, flushed with victory, then invaded Natal, and attacked Lord Chelmsford's base of operations at Rorke's Drift. Warning was given just in time to enable Lieutenants Chard and Bromhead to throw up a hasty barricade of corn-sacks and biscuit-boxes, and prepare the company of the 24th that held the post for the coming attack. The Zulus attempted to storm the post with reckless courage. Again and again they advanced to the assault, and the battle raged during most of the night. Eventually they retired, leaving 350 dead in front of the slight entrenchment.

The stubborn and successful defence of Rorke's Drift is one of the most brilliant feats of arms ever performed by British soldiers, and it saved Natal from invasion, besides saving Lord Chelmsford's column, which hastily retreated from Zululand after

the disaster of Isandlwana. Reinforcements were poured into Natal, and the Battle of Kambula inflicted a severe lesson upon the Zulus. Sir Garnet Wolseley was sent out to supersede Lord Chelmsford, but before he could reach head-quarters, Lord Chelmsford had fought the decisive battle of Ulundi, on July 4, 1879, which broke the Zulu power and finished the war. The Zulu King Cetshwayo was captured, and confined as a State prisoner at the Castle in Cape Town. Sir Garnet Wolseley was appointed to supersede Sir Bartle Frere as High Commissioner in Natal, Zululand, and the Transvaal. He ruined Zululand by setting up thirteen petty chiefs, who reduced the country to anarchy. Dr. Colenso violently espoused the cause of the deposed Zulu King, and effected as much mischief as he had previously accomplished by his championship of the rebel Chief Langalibalele in 1875.

The result of Dr. Colenso's interference was the restoration of Cetshwayo in 1883, which immediately divided Zululand into two hostile camps. Usibepu, one of the thirteen "kinglets," gathered an army and fell upon Cetshwayo's forces, who were defeated with a loss of 6000 men. The Zulu King, once more a fugitive, surrendered to the British Resident at Eshowe, and died in February 1884. Meanwhile the frontier Boers determined to put down Zulu anarchy on their border. They marched into Zululand and installed Dinizulu, Cetshwayo's son, as King. In return he ceded them the upper half of Zululand, which they occupied, and founded the

“New Republic,” building a town named Vryheid as the seat of Government.

The British authorities in Zululand passively watched this proceeding, and eventually annexed what was left of Zululand as British territory, with its seat of Government at Eshowe. Bishop McKenzie, who succeeded Bishop Wilkinson as Missionary Bishop of Zululand in 1880, managed to replant the Church Missions in both the Dutch and English portions of Zululand. He died, after a most toilsome and successful Episcopate, on Jan. 9, 1890, and was succeeded by Bishop Carter, who was consecrated on Michaelmas Day, 1891.

We have somewhat anticipated events in order to complete the story of Zululand. We must turn now to the Transvaal, where Lord Wolseley had amused the discontented Burghers by a vapouring speech at Pretoria, to the effect that so long as the sun shone in the heaven, the British flag would wave over Government House, Pretoria. Sir T. Shepstone was withdrawn, and Sir W. O. Lanyon appointed in his place. The selection was most unwise. The new Administrator despised the Boers and could not speak Dutch.

The country was governed virtually by military law. England, the mother of free Parliaments, not only governed the Transvaal by a despotism, but broke the solemn pledge made at the annexation, that the Transvaal “Volksraad,” or National Assembly, should be summoned. The pledge made to continue the Delagoa Bay Railway was also broken by the British Government,

The Burghers, who had tolerated British rule for two years and a half in hope of redress of grievances, determined to throw off British rule as their fathers had done. On December 13, 1880, the members of the old Volksraad met at Pardekraal (not far from the great mining centre Johannesburg), and proclaimed the Republic. Messrs. Kruger, Joubert, and Pretorius were appointed a Triumvirate to carry on the Government, and war was declared against England. Within a week every British garrison in the Transvaal was closely invested.

No one at Pretoria believed that the Boers would fight for their independence, but the spirit of the old Netherlanders was burning in the hearts of their descendants. The Burghers who flew to arms at the bidding of their leaders knew that England could crush them, but they preferred to die fighting for freedom than submit to a military despotism based upon an unrighteous annexation. They knew that the sympathies of their kinsmen in the Free State and in the Cape Colony were with them.

They went forth much in the spirit of Cromwell's "Ironsides," and they conducted their operations with courage and skill. They cut off Colonel Anstruther and the head-quarters of the 94th at Bronkhorst Spruit whilst on the march to Pretoria. The Colonel had fair warning under a flag of truce from the Boer Commander. But he despised the enemy, and had to surrender after a short action, in which he was mortally wounded, and his total loss was fifty-five men killed, and seven officers and ninety-one men wounded.

The Boers treated the wounded with the greatest humanity.

The news of the rising caused Sir G. Colley, the Governor of Natal, to march with all his available force to relieve the beleaguered garrison in the Transvaal. But General Joubert, the Boer Commander, anticipated his movement, and invaded Natal.

He took up a strong position at Laing's Nek, and Sir G. Colley was defeated with heavy loss in an attempt to storm the Boer position, on January 28, 1881. On February 7 the Boer force defeated Sir G. Colley again in the Battle of the Ingogo, when the British losses were again very heavy. Shortly after this Sir Evelyn Wood arrived with reinforcements, and Sir G. Colley attempted to turn the flank of the Boer position by occupying Majuba Hill, which commanded the Boer camp, by a night march. At daylight the Boers saw that their position was turned, and that Sir G. Colley, with about 400 men, was in possession of Majuba Hill. A storming party of Boers scaled the precipitous side of the mountain, and performed one of the bravest feats of arms known to history. As soon as they reached the summit they poured in a destructive fire upon Sir G. Colley's force. Confusion arose, and although the Boers were inferior in numbers, the troops began to give way. Sir G. Colley himself, six officers, and ninety men were killed, and a still larger number were wounded and taken prisoners. The Boer loss was only one man killed, and five wounded.

General Joubert in reporting his victory said, "The

troops fought like true heroes, but God gave us the victory." The last shots fired on Majuba Hill were the last shots fired in a most disastrous and disgraceful war. Sir Evelyn Wood concluded an armistice, and the natives were no longer allowed to rejoice in a civil war between the two European races of South Africa.

President Brand of the Free State exercised a commanding influence on the side of peace. The only just and honourable course open to the Imperial Government was to order the immediate cessation of hostilities that ought never to have been begun.

The Gladstone Government did more to exalt the prestige of England in South Africa by restoring the independence of the Transvaal after Majuba, than by any act done by England in South Africa since the first capture of the Cape. The British reinforcements were within striking distance of the Transvaal. The Boer Triumvirate knew that they must ultimately be conquered by the overwhelming British power. The responsible Boer leaders thanked God for their victories, and did not boast about them. Sir Bartle Frere had just retired from his office, followed by the regrets of all who knew how to value the services of a noble and single-minded man. It was not his fault that he was sent out to carry a Confederation policy which had become impossible. It was not his fault that the disaster of Isandlwhana occurred, which caused Lord Wolseley to supersede him in South-Eastern Africa. If he had been left in power to deal with the Transvaal, most well-informed persons believe that the

War of Independence would not have been fought, and that difficulties would have been settled by negotiation. He was succeeded in 1881 by Sir Hercules Robinson, whose first duty was to sit on the Royal Commission with Sir H. de Villiers, Chief Justice of the Cape Colony, and Sir Evelyn Wood, in order to carry out the retrocession of the Transvaal. The Convention re-establishing the Republic was ratified at Pretoria on October 25, 1881.

Whilst the Transvaal was winning its independence, a serious trouble befell the Cape Colony. At the close of the Kafir War of 1877, the Sprigg Ministry passed a Disarmament Act to restrict the carrying of arms by natives, and to prevent future disturbances. The attempt to apply this Act to Basutoland caused a general rebellion of the Basutos in September 1880. The Basutos in East Griqualand also revolted, and the Kafir tribes in the neighbourhood joined them. Umhlonhlo, the Pandomise Chief, most treacherously murdered his magistrate, Mr. Hope, and two other Englishmen in cold blood. There is a gleam of light in the circumstances of this barbarous murder, for a young Englishman with Mr. Hope was saved by the Chief's orders, because he was a missionary's son. The colony rose to the occasion, and at one period maintained a force of 18,000 men in the field, including native levies, without the aid of a penny from the Imperial Treasury, and without the aid of a single Imperial soldier.

The Pandomise and East Griqualand rising were soon suppressed, but the Basutos were well armed

with modern arms of precision, and fought stubbornly. The Colonial forces lost heavily in several actions, and although defeated over and over again in the field, the Basutos held their own mountain fastnesses and could not be dislodged. In the action at Kalabani nearly the whole of the Grahamstown troop of yeomanry fell in action. The infantry volunteers from Cape Town, Grahamstown, and Port Elizabeth specially distinguished themselves. They stormed positions at the point of the bayonet, and showed all the steadiness of seasoned regular troops. But the Transvaal War had a most disastrous effect on the campaign. A large number of colonial Dutchmen took part in the Basuto War, and directly they heard of the action of the Imperial Government in the Transvaal, they deserted the colonial camp, in too large numbers to be coerced, and declared they would no longer fight under the British flag, against which their kinsmen in the Transvaal were fighting. This desertion virtually closed the campaign. An armistice was arranged, and a peace patched up with the Basutos, and ultimately the colony abandoned Basutoland, which was reluctantly resumed by the Imperial Government. This war cost the colony nearly three millions sterling, and was absolutely barren of results.

In 1884 the Transvaal Republic desired extension of its territory westwards. The native Chiefs of Bechuanaland were at war with one another. Mankaroane and Montsioa claimed British alliance, and their enemies Massouw and Moshette were allies of

the Republic. Volunteers from the Transvaal aided these native Chiefs, and these freebooters formed two Republics, one named Stellaland out of the territories of Massouw, and another called Goschen out of the territories of Moshette. These Republics were destined for annexation with the Transvaal, and would have cut off the "trade route" from the Cape Colony to the interior. General Joubert annexed Montsioa's territory, although he had been placed under British protection. The Imperial Government promptly demanded the withdrawal of the proclamation, and the Transvaal yielded. It was felt that something more was needed to settle these territories.

In 1884 Sir C. Warren with a force of 4000 men, including 2000 irregular cavalry raised in the Cape Colony, marched into Bechuanaland; and in 1885 the British Protectorate was proclaimed over the whole of Bechuanaland and the Kalahari desert, whilst the territory south of the Molapo River became a Crown Colony under the name of British Bechuanaland. No resistance was made to Sir C. Warren's force, and the [expedition restored British prestige, which had suffered owing to the blunders made in the Transvaal War.

The Basuto campaign of 1881 caused the fall of the first Sprigg Ministry, and Sir T. Scanlen formed a Cabinet which lasted till 1884, when the growing power of the Africander Bond (which was a political union of Cape Dutchmen) dominated Parliament, and Sir T. Upington formed a Ministry with Bond support. In November 1886 Sir Gordon Sprigg