

doubt, genuine ; and we may give Bishop Gray and his colleagues credit for thinking that the danger was not wholly confined to the side of the so-called rationalistic school. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had acquired, in greater or less degree, the reputation of dealing out even-handed justice, without respect of parties ; and the Synod of Capetown had no special wish to invite, or to submit to, judgements which might not square with their own convictions. Archdeacon Denison, it is true, had defeated his assailants by virtue of merely technical objections ; but this imperfect victory was a poor set-off against the decided success achieved by Mr. Long in his appeal from the Bishop of Capetown, and still more against the judgements which closed the case of *Essays and Reviews*, and allowed to Mr. Gorham's teaching a place as definite as that which was conceded to the teaching of Dr. Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter.

Unless, then, Bishop Cotterill could make up his mind to submit to the Queen in Council, as the ultimate court of appeal in all ecclesiastical causes, a change of front had become imperatively necessary, and this change was made with sufficient completeness in his Charge of 1864. His examination of the whole subject is, it must be admitted, marked by great ability ; but his perceptions had been not less clear and vivid in 1858 on the other side. All this, however, was now a thing of the past. The matter for present consideration was the actual condition of the Church of South Africa. Had it been, or was it now, "a society lawfully established by the authority of the Sovereign, governed by rules which are the laws of the Sovereign, and with ecclesiastical tribunals which are the courts of the Sovereign" ? The Sovereign in Council had decided that

“ whatever other value the letters patent [of the Bishops] possess, in this very point of forming the Bishops and

clergy of the Church of England here into an organized body they have no legal force. It followed that 'the supremacy of the Sovereign in legislating for the Church is not in exercise here,' and again, 'that the tribunals for determining whether these rules are violated are not here courts of the Sovereign'; in other words, that the judicial supremacy of the Sovereign in the Church has no force in our communion."

But what should be the extent of the organic disconnexion, since disconnexion there must be?

"We must not," said Bishop Cotterill, "allow our freedom from external restraints to lead us into paths of our own. We must not suffer those who come to us from England, attached to the Church of their fathers, to feel that in South Africa they are brought into a different atmosphere, and that we avail ourselves of our disconnexion from the State to imprint some new features upon the Church according to our own particular views of that which is expedient for its welfare. The Englishman who leaves his native land does not carry with him the exact form of its civil polity; . . . but he may justly expect to find here the same constitutional principles, the same civil liberty, and, though under different laws, the same substantial rights of a British subject."

But, he says, the question has arisen, how in things ecclesiastical the substantial rights of the English clergy could be maintained in South Africa. At present, apart from the "unhappy exception" of Bishop Colenso, there might be much harmony, or practical unanimity, in the province which might some day become a patriarchate. But men who agreed with Mr. Long, or with Mr. Gorham, might, if they came within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Capetown, fear, and have just cause to fear, that they might find themselves sooner or later under sentence of condemnation for offences which in England would not be offences at all. The tendency of the

Judicial Committee seemed to be to cast a shield over unsound theology generally. The deprivation of Mr. Voysey was, indeed, still a thing of the future ; but without this Bishop Cotterill felt it

“impossible to conceal from our minds the unwelcome fact that the relation of the State to the Church in England, to which, undoubtedly, in past generations we owe so much, and which we are still fully convinced is in itself the ordinance of God, is yet now, through the peculiar nature of its exercise in the present day, threatening to enfeeble the testimony borne by the Established Church to the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>1</sup>

This confession was no doubt sincere, as no doubt also the expressions of his letters to the Bishop of Natal six years before had also been sincere. But his argument was vitiated by the common blot of undefined terms. For him the teaching of Mr. Gorham or Mr. Long would be opposed only in a less degree than that of the Bishop of Natal “to the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

In short, what is this faith? Is it a living principle, or is it a multitude of propositions for which any one or every one may assume the sanction of this august title? Is it that vast body of conceptions, always fluctuating, always undergoing modifications amounting in the end to changes in kind, which cluster around the undefined terms, *salvation, redemption, inspiration, atonement, election, propitiation, justification, sacrifice*, and the rest, terms which too often serve as weapons in the ecclesiastical armoury for carrying on warfare not sanctioned seemingly by Him for whose cause they profess to be fighting? The Church of South Africa would have done well to define these terms at starting ; and then the followers of Calvin or Melancthon, of Jeremy Taylor or Hugh Peters, might

<sup>1</sup> P. 17.

have satisfied themselves as to the sort of treatment which they might expect to receive in that Church. But the definition of terms had become a task not very congenial to Bishop Cotterill. He had no longer any liking for the system which so construed the letter of doctrinal standards "as to give every possible advantage to the accused" (p. 18). He had discovered in the interval since 1858 that

"it needs no argument to show that, although such a use of the standards of the Church may be good in law, its effect must be that the sanction of these standards will be given to very unsound theology."

The language of Bishop Cotterill is here not quite ingenuous. His sentence might seem at first sight to imply a desire for what he would have called orthodox judgement given at the cost of a little, or a good deal of, injustice; that in short, it might be well for the Church if the practice of the Court of Appeal deflected slightly in the direction favoured by Dominic or Torquemada. But while we acquit Bishop Cotterill of entertaining such thoughts as these, we may fairly charge him with one-sidedness in this statement. The question is one not of the unsound theology of any given writer, but of the expressions in a given Article, and of their general meaning. It may be true, or not true, to say that every narrative in the Old and New Testaments is throughout historical, that every precept contained in those books is right and wholesome, that the descriptions of physical facts are always correct, and that the philosophy and theology found in them is always self-consistent as well as in harmony with the first principles of morality. But on every one of these points the Sixth Article is absolutely silent; and the questions put to deacons at the time of their ordering throw no further light upon them.

In short, the contention is for narrowing the limits of freedom.

“It is the necessary connexion by law, in England, of the spiritual office with the temporalities, that renders such principles as are adopted in these judgements peculiarly oppressive to the Church there. That the Church should be constrained, through its union with the State, to recognize as its own ministers those who retain their offices only through the extreme leniency of such proceedings as are adopted . . . is a result which would not only justify the Church in taking measures, out of its ordinary course, to protect and vindicate itself, but which imperatively demands that it should do so, unless it would receive the sentence from its Divine Head, ‘Because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spue thee out of my mouth.’”

The citation from the Apocalypse is ominous indeed. Here are words from a book as to which the opinions or judgement of theologians of every age and every school exhibit contradictions as astounding as they are innumerable;<sup>1</sup> and here is Bishop Cotterill applying these words, seemingly on his own sole authority, for the repression of inquiry into the date of the prophecies of Balaam, or of the directions for the planning and decorating of the Tabernacle. No declaration could be less ambiguous; and it is the declaration of a claim to enforce on every clergyman (however it may be with the laity) the general mass of propositions which are supposed to formulate the opinions or the belief or faith of the Church of South Africa. It is enough to say here that such men as Mr. Gorham and Mr. Long, Dean Stanley and Mr. Bennett, Bishop Wilberforce and Bishop Ryle, Mr. Maurice and Dr. Pusey, have all been or are priests and incumbents in the Church of England, bound to tolerate each other, and no one of them regarded as having a better title to his position than

<sup>1</sup> See p. 289.

the rest,—the only point of vast moment being this, that the conceptions of Christian truth entertained by these men are in almost every particular radically divergent. The notions set forth by Dr. Pusey and Mr. Maurice on the subjects of sacrifice, mediation, redemption, punishment, baptism, and many others, were, it must again be said, contradictory. If, then, the difference is to be measured by considerations of technical theology, these two men would be professors of two wholly different religions. But both called themselves Christians. It is hard to see how the title can be conceded to both except by virtue of that “class of principles,” which, in the words of Dean Stanley, underlie

“the sentiments and usages which have accumulated round the forms of Christianity,—a religion, as it were, behind the religion—which, however dimly expressed, has given them whatever vitality they possess.”<sup>1</sup>

Further, they were both clergymen holding office in the Church of England, and holding it by the same undoubted right. One or other of them the Church of South Africa would most assuredly have cast out.

But Bishop Cotterill could not, it seems, shake off altogether the old misgivings.

“That theologians should be disposed at times to over-value the importance of traditional interpretations of Divine Truth; that sometimes the additional bulwarks which human wisdom or, it may be, human ignorance, has thrown up, should be held by them with as much tenacity as if they formed a part of the Divine original, is no more than the analogy of human science and its students would lead us to expect.”

Is there, then, no danger in this short-sighted and irrational zeal? Was not Bishop Cotterill, at the moment when he

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Institutions*, 5.

wrote, full of indignation at what he termed the apostasy of his brother of Natal, who had actually "denied the Lord" ? and did not the denial consist merely in this that he questioned or denied the accuracy or truthfulness of the story which recounts the wanderings of the Israelites in the wilderness, or their settlement in the land of Canaan ? Further, is not the idea of the value of these narratives a bulwark thrown up rather by human ignorance than by human wisdom, and indeed not worth the fighting about ? Was not then Bishop Cotterill doing, even as he spoke, the very thing which he deprecated in others ? He speaks indeed of Bishop Colenso as having "flagrantly and avowedly contradicted the formularies of the Church," but if by the Church he meant the Church of England, there is not one of her formularies which bears in the remotest degree upon the subject ; and not one single word in the Bishop of Natal's work goes counter to the language of the Sixth Article, which alone deals with it. Dr. Cotterill professes to regard it as impossible that Bishop Colenso could escape condemnation, "even by the lenient construction of 'temporal courts' ;" but the true nature of the contention is betrayed by the proposition (here suppressed, but indispensable for the right understanding of Bishop Cotterill's position) that the Metropolitan of Capetown and his suffragans were debarred from seeking his condemnation at the hands of a tribunal where they could not fail, with adequate evidence, to secure it, by the fact that they could not resort to this court without compromising or betraying the spiritual rights of the Church of South Africa. Bishop Cotterill was pronouncing judgement on himself and his fellow suffragans as maintaining a society or a Church separated root and branch from the Church of England.

It thus becomes plain that the so-called trial of the Bishop of Natal was a matter of importance, in reference not only to the defendant in the case, but to the interests of all English-

men taking up their abode in the colonies. It cannot be insisted on too strongly that the characteristics peculiar to this prosecution were the result of accident. The Bishop of Natal's books were thrown into a form which would render them singularly galling to a mind like that of Bishop Gray. Even where they did not set forth convictions which the latter regarded as subversive of Christianity, they treated the question of ecclesiastical order and government as of an interest altogether subordinate to the abiding and present work of the Divine Spirit. By the publication of the volumes on the Pentateuch the whole aspect of the discussion had been changed not so much by the gravity of any of the results attained as by the laying down the principle that the date, the authorship, the composition of any given book (as of all books) are simply subjects for inquiry. There was enough in the position so taken up to account for the outburst of indignation and wrath in those who believed themselves to be members of a practically infallible society, and the possessors of an absolutely infallible book. But all this was merely accidental. Not many years before, utterances of a very different kind had given rise to fierce controversy in England, and Dr. Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, had used in reference to the heresies of Mr. Gorham language scarcely less vehement than that in which Bishop Gray denounced the method and conclusions of the Bishop of Natal. There was, and there is, no reason for supposing that Mr. Gorham would be dealt with more leniently in Capetown than in England; but condemnation at Capetown would most assuredly, according to the theory of Bishop Gray, have deprived Mr. Gorham of the appeal which ended in his victory. For the present, a clergyman who might be charged, as Mr. Bennett was charged, with setting forth the Tridentine doctrine of the Eucharist, might look with more or less confidence either to acquittal or to some condonation



of his offence by the Metropolitan of Southern Africa ; but times might come when such a man could look for no mercy, or even to any fairness in his trial ; and for him also there would not be that appeal to which every clergyman in England is entitled. In short, Bishop Gray had rejected the *fundamental* principle of the Church of England, and he was resolved that no one should have the benefit of it. Thus determined, he could not bring himself to see that the firmest opposition to his procedure might come from those who had no sympathy whatever with what was, or what was supposed to be, the theology of the Bishop of Natal. All who felt called upon to fight the battle for the rights of Englishmen everywhere were regarded and spoken of as aiders and abettors of Dr. Colenso in the dissemination of an infidel theology and philosophy.

In the discussion which followed the so-called Capetown trial, Bishop Gray strove always to show that his procedure insured full justice to every one who might be brought before his tribunal. He never failed to maintain that he had granted to Bishop Colenso whatever appeal he had a right to claim. In *A Statement relating to Facts which have been Misunderstood*,<sup>1</sup> in connexion with the trial, Bishop Gray declares that he had given the defendant the option of submitting the case either to the Archbishop in person, or to the Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, or to a national Synod, including colonial Bishops. The offer, he adds, was declined, and the proposed alternative he pronounces to be an impossibility. From his own point of view it was so. But there is just this to be said, and we need say nothing more. The appeal to the Archbishop in person, to the Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, to a national Synod including colonial Bishops, is not an appeal to the Sovereign in Council, and it is to this appeal that every clergyman

<sup>1</sup> London, Rivingtons, 1867, p. 67.

holding office in England is entitled. If it was "impossible" for Dr. Gray to allow this appeal, it was not less impossible for Dr. Colenso to dispense with it.

If, therefore, the case was never tried upon its merits, the responsibility for this, and for the proceedings involved in the attempt to carry out a sentence pronounced to be null and void in law, rests with the Metropolitan of the Church of South Africa, and his advisers. The plain issue is that Dr. Gray did not like this appeal, and that in hindering it he withstood the law of the Church of England. It becomes idle, therefore, to speak of any other appeals which he proposed to allow in its place.

To Dr. Gray it was thus a matter for amazement that any should presume to call the legitimacy of his acts into question and still more that they should do so while they disclaimed sympathy or agreement with the views of Dr. Colenso. Such a position as this was to him unintelligible; and as he could not imagine it to be sincere, he resolved to put the subscribers to the Durban Protest to what Bishop Colenso charitably describes as "undue pressure." These memorialists had expressed no more than the wish to await the decision of the Queen in Council; and for so saying they were warned that if they did not openly disclaim the imputation of sympathising with Bishop Colenso's views, they would be "generally and fairly considered as having adopted them."

A more striking instance of extra-judicial tyranny and oppressiveness it would be impossible to find in the ecclesiastical history of the present century. Bishop Gray was, however, speaking the strict truth when he declared that he could not regard their protest without stultifying his whole proceedings and acknowledging the right of appeal to the Privy Council, "which," he said, "I had formally repudiated." We need no further confession. It was unfortunate for the Bishop of Capetown that he had not been able by this device

to arrest the interference of the Crown in the case of Mr. Long.

But for those who regarded the proceedings of Bishop Gray as sheer usurpation the way was perfectly clear; and the Bishop of Natal had not a moment's hesitation in taking it. Dr. Gray had declared that if the Metropolitan could not remove an unfaithful officer from his office, no power on earth could. The Archbishop of Canterbury could not. The Crown could not. The Bishop of Natal at once rejoins, and his words dispose of the whole matter:—

“Let us stop here for a moment and consider the statement, . . . in which lies the Bishop's whole misapprehension of his position. He asserts that the Crown cannot remove a Bishop; I am advised that the Crown can remove a Bishop, and that no other power in the Church of England can. Here, then, is the true remedy for the present supposed grievance. . . . If, then, as it is asserted, I have transgressed so grievously—nay, if I have transgressed at all—the laws of the Church of England, it is perfectly competent for the Bishops of Capetown and Grahamstown, or any Bishops of England, my accusers, to make their complaint to Her Majesty, and seek redress at her hands. They may present, as I myself have done, a petition to be heard before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or any other court which Her Majesty may see good to appoint. . . . *I call upon them solemnly to do this*, and not to persist in the unjustifiable practice of uttering abusive and, in fact, libellous invectives against me. I will put no obstacles in the way of such an inquiry: I will raise no technical objections, nor interpose unnecessary delays. But, if they refuse to do this, then let them hold their peace as to my having broken faith with the Church of England and violated her laws. Or, if they reject Her Majesty's supremacy, and desire to shake off the control of these wholesome laws, which protect the clergy of the Church of England from the grinding oppression of mere

ecclesiastical domination, then let this purpose be distinctly avowed, and so we shall understand more clearly the end which is aimed at, and the nature of the conflict in which we are engaged.”<sup>1</sup>

Nor can the distinction drawn by Bishop Gray between temporal and spiritual jurisdiction be described as anything but a groundless and mischievous fallacy. The Crown unquestionably claims and exercises the power of allowing or disallowing the judgements which may have been passed by Bishops upon their clergy, and knows nothing of the distinction on which Bishop Gray lays stress. Dr. Gray had himself seen Dr. Rowland Williams restored to his spiritual functions by the decree of the Privy Council, in direct opposition to the wishes of the Bishop of Salisbury. It was, therefore, open to Bishop Hamilton to declare that if Dr. Williams should presume to exercise priestly functions in the diocese of Salisbury after the spiritual sentence of the Bishop had been notified to him, without an appeal to Canterbury, and without being restored to his office by the Bishop, he should be *ipso facto* excommunicate, and it would become the Bishop's duty to pronounce sentence accordingly. Bishop Colenso adds :—

“Of course, the Bishop of Salisbury, though feeling so deeply on this question, has never attempted to carry out such a measure. The notion of such a proceeding would not now be tolerated for a moment in England.”<sup>2</sup>

It is a mistake to suppose that the theory of the Royal supremacy is confined to Great Britain and Ireland. The King's power is declared in the first Canon of the Church of England to be the highest power under God within his realms of England, Scotland, Ireland, and all his other dominions and countries ; but if a distinction not known to English law

<sup>1</sup> *Remarks on the Proceedings of the Bishop of Capetown*, 1864, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 25.

can be drawn in South Africa or elsewhere, the experiment, as the Bishop of Natal has warned us, will be tried at no distant day at home. It must be so, if a mass of literature or volumes of dogmatic declarations are to be forced as being *de fide* on the clergy of the Church of England or any other Church. According to Bishop Gray,

“What the Catholic Church, while yet one, during the first thousand years of her history, under the Spirit’s guidance in her great Councils, declared to be, or received as, the true faith, *that* is the true faith, and that we receive as such. More than this we are not bound to acknowledge. Less we may not.”

Such is the doctrine of Bishop Gray. By means of it any one may be crushed. Why are the Councils held before A.D. 1000 to be held infallible, and later Councils to be unanimously rejected? How are the decrees of any of these Councils, whether of the first or the second Christian millennium, to be imposed on the clergy of a Church which emphatically declares the fallibility of all these Councils and the actual blunderings or errors of some of them even in things pertaining to God? But it is not on the authority of the Church or of general Councils alone that Bishop Gray imposes his yoke upon us.

“It is the office of reason to examine the grounds, to weigh the evidence, of there being a revelation from God. Prophecy and miracles are the grounds upon which revelation rests its claims. Through them an appeal is made to the reason of man, in support of the truth of God’s Word and the Divine mission of our Lord. . . . When the understanding is convinced that the Bible is the record of God’s revelation . . . the functions of reason end.”

It is at least conceivable that the reason may declare emphatically that there is, and there must always be, a

revelation (an *Apokalypsis*), but that this revelation does not rest its claims on either prophecy or miracles. The sentence just cited is, indeed, one of those wonderful utterances of Bishop Gray, of which we can only say, as we have said already, that they bristle with assumptions and undefined terms. Like Bishop Butler, in his melancholy and fallacious chapter on miracles as an evidence of the truth of Christianity, Bishop Gray has forgotten that diabolical miracles are denounced as a snare in the Old Testament and in the New. It was not of Bishop Gray that Mr. Goldwin Smith was speaking in the following sentences; but his words apply strictly to his whole argument and position:—

“You go to a heathen whom you wish to convert, and say, ‘You must not judge of my religion by its contents, for they are beyond your judgement, but by its evidences, which are the miracles.’ May not he answer, ‘My religion is said to be attested by miracles as well as yours, and the questions of historical criticism, on the one side and on the other, are such as I have neither time, learning, nor capacity to solve. Besides, according to your own Scriptures, Egyptian sorcerers and false prophets can perform miracles, so that I do not see how miracles by themselves can establish the truth of a religion’? Or, rather, supposing him to have any notion of religion, would he not say, ‘If your religion is to be judged, not by its contents, but by its evidences, it must be the lowest and vilest religion in the world’?”<sup>1</sup>

It was, then, for the sake of such a position as this that Bishop Gray was prepared to set aside the law of the Church of England, and to place an intolerable yoke on the necks of its members. Carrying out this purpose, he had ruled that the Church of England holds, and requires its clergy to hold, two doctrines (on the subjects of inspiration and punishment)

<sup>1</sup> *The Study of History*, p. 86.

which the judgement of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has declared that the Church of England does not maintain; and, if fresh hindrances should be placed in his way by later decisions, he was ready to go still further. I was for the sake of this position that he deliberately and repeatedly charged Bishop Colenso with dishonesty in the course which he was pursuing, as

“teaching directly contrary to what she [the Church of England] holds on fundamental points, and directly opposite to what he undertook to teach when she gave him his commission, and for the teaching of which he faithful children have provided for him a maintenance.”

To this charge the Bishop replied calmly and patiently. He had, he said, resigned his preferment in England, and accepted from the Crown the appointment to the see of Natal, knowing that he would be a Bishop of the Church of England, and, as such, would still be under the protection of her laws, whatever those laws might be. For the sake however, of what he believed to be the truth, he had been prepared to resign his see, if he had found that the laws of the Church of England forbade the publication of his view on the Pentateuch. He now challenged his adversaries to point out a single passage in his works which is condemned by the existing laws of the Church; or else, if they are in doubt on any points, to bring them at once to an issue before the only lawful authority. He was ready, also, even now to resign his see, whenever he should be satisfied that he cannot hold it conscientiously; or that it would be better for his fellow men and for the truth itself, that he should resign it—which he does not feel to be the case at present.<sup>1</sup>

But, although the Bishop of Natal would not avail himself of the retort open to him, it was impossible for him to shu

<sup>1</sup> *Remarks, &c.*, 1864, p. 58.

his eyes to the fact that the retort might be made, and he candidly said so. In the following sentences, written by Bishop Gray in condemnation of Bishop Colenso, only those words have been changed which make the charge applicable to the former. These words are italicised.

“What we have to consider is, whether one, who undertook an office of great honour and dignity, *at the hands of the Crown, as Bishop and Metropolitan of the Church of England,* and received the emoluments *and honours* thereof, upon a distinct understanding that he would *acknowledge the Royal supremacy in the Church of England, and act according to the laws and constitution of that Church, which the Queen of this Protestant nation, who appointed him,* deemed to be of the very deepest importance *for the repression of ecclesiastical domination and the promotion of true religion among her people,* is to be allowed, now that he has changed his mind, and holds and teaches *independence of State control—a principle* the very opposite to that which he undertook to teach, and at first did teach—to retain his position in the *Church of England,* and to enjoy the emoluments of his abused office and violated trust.”<sup>1</sup>

And again :—

“She (*Her Majesty the Queen*) has no wish unduly to interfere with *Dr. Gray's* liberty of thought or teaching, but she says that, if he teaches directly contrary to what she, *in her constitutional office as head of the Church of England,* holds on fundamental points, *inforcing, as doctrines of the Church of England, dogmas, as to the Bible and endless punishment, which she has authoritatively forbidden to be enforced within the Church of England,* and directly opposite to what he undertook to teach, *in respect of the Royal supremacy,* when she gave him his *appointment,* he shall not do so *in her name,* or as a Bishop of the *Church of England.* He must do it outside the Church of England.”

<sup>1</sup> *Remarks, &c., 1864, p. 59.*



Bishop Gray had in like manner spoken of Bishop Colenso as a fanatic. But the latter asks whether any fanaticism can exceed that with which, shutting his eyes to the realities around him, Bishop Gray

“appears to surrender his whole being to the worship of his own ideal of a Catholic Church, which in defiance of the known facts of history, he assumes to have continued one and undivided ‘during the first thousand years of her history,’ and of which he seems to consider himself, by virtue of his ‘Apostolical succession,’ the infallible representative and exponent in South Africa.”

But for Dr. Gray the yoke of the Catholic Church was perfect freedom, so long as he was the interpreter of her will ; and his whole attitude of mind involved a danger which must excite alarm in all who could not share his faith. It was this alarm to which Dean Stanley gave emphatic utterance in a speech before the Lower House of Convocation, June 29, 1866, when without previous warning an attempt was made to commit the House to an approval of the course of action for the intrusion of a strange Bishop into Natal, then contemplated by Dr. Gray.

It is hard to see how the tactics thus employed can be regarded in any other light than that of indecent stratagem. Anything, it would seem, was thought fair in the fight against the Bishop of Natal. In the previous year (1865), without any specification of the object aimed at, an address had been brought from the Upper to the Lower House of Convocation, and in an assembly in which only 17 out of 140 members were present, was carried by a majority of 11 to 5, and then sent out to the Cape of Good Hope as representing the sentiments of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury on Bishop Colenso's heresies. The resolution which the Lower House was now (1866) asked to approve was that

the Church of England held communion with the Bishop of Capetown and the other Bishops who had excommunicated Bishop Colenso. With quiet sarcasm Dean Stanley expressed his agreement with the motion, adding that, much as he disapproved of Bishop Gray's proceedings, they did not appear to him to be offences of so grave a character as to justify a refusal to hold communion with him. But the case was altered by the proposal pledging the House to hold communion with any Bishop whom Dr. Gray might put in Dr. Colenso's place, and against this proposal Dean Stanley entered his emphatic protest.

The issue of the theological controversy between the two prelates in South Africa, and even the personal fate of either of them, is of little moment compared with the importance of preserving intact the existing liberties of the English clergy throughout the British Empire, and of maintaining inviolate, for all branches of the Church of England, a right to the protection of the same laws and standards of appeal which guard the freedom and regulate the teaching of the Church at home.

It was precisely this freedom which was endangered by the action of Bishop Gray. He had sentenced, and proposed to deprive a Bishop, in a Synod composed entirely of Bishops, without presbyters, without laymen, without legal assessors,—a Synod called together without the consent of the civil power, either of the colony or of the mother country; and from this sentence he had offered an appeal which no Bishop and no clergyman could accept. This course, if not hindered, must involve the entire ruin of our whole ecclesiastical system, for it could not fail to establish an arbitrary tyranny. Bishop Gray had, indeed, spoken of certain principles as guiding him to his decision; but this could not do away with "the fundamental injustice of his proceedings because he chose those principles for himself. He might just as well have chosen

either the principles of the Puritans or those of the Continental Reformers.”<sup>1</sup>

His course was, indeed, one of plain defiance of the law.

“The Supreme Court of Appeal in this country has determined that it is legal for every Bishop and every clergyman to hold the hope that there may be found some means in the infinite mercy of God to restore His erring creatures. This is the proposition which the Bishop of Capetown has declared to be intolerable in South Africa, and which the Supreme Court of Appeal in this country has declared to be tolerable in the Bishops and clergy of the Church of England. Therefore, by accepting this ground of the Bishop of Capetown’s judgement, you place yourselves in direct antagonism to the law of this country.”

For the other counts on which the Bishop of Natal had been ‘tried and sentenced,’ Dean Stanley showed that in Bishop Gray’s decision there was the same direct antagonism to the rulings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that his procedure had been throughout reckless. He had been playing with edged tools. The Bishop of Natal might have spoken now and then in a somewhat disparaging manner of parts of the Prayer Book and of parts of the Articles ; but if he was to be deposed for this, the principle must be extended to the excommunication and deposition of many persons both in high and low station within the Church of England. The Archbishop of Canterbury had declared in the House of Lords

“that in consequence of the charitable and universal hope of mercy which the Burial Service pronounces on the departed there were circumstances under which nothing could induce him to read it.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Speech before the Lower House of Convocation, 1867, p. 28.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 55.

If it was competent for the Primate to speak thus, the language of the Bishop of Natal in reference to the Baptismal Service was not less excusable. If the Convocation should approve the judgement of Bishop Gray, they would condemn large numbers of clergy who hold the same principles as those which had been denounced by the Metropolitan of South Africa,—numbers against whom they had not proposed, and dared not to propose, to institute proceedings.

“I might mention one,” the Dean added, “who . . . has ventured to say that the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses ; who has ventured to say that there are parts of the Sacred Scriptures which are poetical and not historical ; who has ventured to say that the Holy Scriptures themselves rise infinitely by our being able to acknowledge both the poetical character and also the historical incidents in their true historical reality ; who has ventured to say that the narratives of those historical incidents are coloured not unfrequently by the necessary infirmities which belong to the human instruments by which they were conveyed,—and that individual is the one who now addresses you. . . . I am not unwilling to take my place with Gregory of Nyssa, with Jerome, and with Athanasius. But in that same goodly company I shall find the despised and rejected Bishop of Natal. At least deal out the same measure to me that you deal to him ; at least judge for all a righteous judgement. Deal out the same measure to those who are well befriended and who are present, as to those who are unbefriended and absent.”

Many years later Dean Stanley addressed with equal fearlessness an assembly of Bishops and clergy gathered together in the Jerusalem Chamber (January 16, 1880) at a meeting of the S.P.G. :—

“Speaking to you as a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel I am ashamed that these questions should occupy

your attention, relating as they do to one who, as a propagator of the Gospel, will be remembered long after you are all dead and buried. I know that everything I say will be received with ridicule and contumely. Nevertheless, I say that, long after we are dead and buried, his memory will be treasured as that of the one missionary Bishop in South Africa who translated the Scriptures into the language of the tribes to which he was sent to minister ; the one Bishop who, by his researches and by his long and patient investigations, however much you may disapprove of them, has left a permanent mark upon English theology,—yes, though you may ridicule, I say the one Bishop who, assailed by scurrilous and unscrupulous invective unexampled in the controversy of this country, and almost in the history, miserable as it is, of religious controversy itself, continued his researches in a manner in which he stood quite alone, and never returned one word of harshness to his accusers ; the one Bishop who was revered by the natives who asked him to intercede for them with the Government, and that without reference to any other Bishop in South Africa ; the one Bishop to whom the natives came long distances to place themselves under his protection, or even to have the pleasure of looking upon his countenance. I say there will be one Bishop who, by his bold theology—(interruption)—there will be one Bishop who, when his own interests were on one side and the interests of a poor savage chief on the other, did not hesitate to sacrifice his own ; and with a manly generosity, for which this Society has not a word of sympathy, did his best to protect the suppliant, did not hesitate to come over from Africa to England to plead the cause of the poor and unfriended savage, and when he had secured the support of the Colonial Office, (unlike other colonial Bishops) immediately went back to his diocese. For all these things the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appears to have no sympathy ; but, you may depend upon it, in the world at large, wherever Natal is mentioned, they will win admiration ; and posterity will say that, among the propagators of the Gospel in the

nineteenth century, the Bishop of Natal was not the least efficient."

The Charge of Bishop Gray delivered to the diocese of Natal in his primary Metropolitanical visitation in 1864 calls for no further criticism. There are classes of minds which seem to have no affinity with each other, and intellects to which everything seems to present itself through a different medium. It is not so much that they differ on leading principles as that there are no two points even of detail in which they seem to be agreed. Whatever be the subject with which they deal, their methods of approaching it seem hopelessly antagonistic, and their conclusions express themselves in diametrically contradictory propositions. Such a contrast will be forced on all who compare, it matters little on what topic, the utterances of Mr. Maurice and of Dr. Pusey. A gulf not less vast seems to intervene between the mind of Bishop Gray and that of the Bishop of Natal. We need not doubt that in this Charge the former expressed his real convictions; but we may be very sure that he never analysed them or sought to test them by the realities of the world in which he lived. We may be tempted to think that for himself it was happier thus. Into such a mind the entrance of a single doubt would, in the words of Bishop Wilberforce, have been like a loaded shell shot into the fortress of his soul; and it must have been so, because with him honest doubt was a thing which had no existence. But in those who, whether by training or by self-formed habit, have learnt to try the spirits and to test facts, or rather statements of facts, the utterances of Bishop Gray cannot fail to excite a feeling of profound astonishment. They build on different foundations; and their methods are therefore mutually repulsive. But except for such as share his faith in the "Catholic Church," the productions of Bishop Gray will be monuments chiefly of a wonderful intellectual

perversity. For all others this Charge, written with the purpose of branding the Bishop of Natal as one who had deliberately fouled the very fountains of morality and religion, will be a sickening document indeed.

The methods of procedure adopted by the opponents of the Bishop are not rendered more attractive by lapse of time. Further thought only makes it more clear that the question might without difficulty have been settled on its merits, if the Bishop of Capetown had submitted himself frankly to the decision which might follow the appeal of the defendant to the Crown. To this necessity Bishop Gray declared that no consideration would ever induce him to yield ; and although his influence might carry a certain amount of weight in South Africa, he was only giving strength to influence of a very different kind in England. An address drawn up and signed by laymen affirmed it

“to be of the utmost importance to the Established Church, and to the nation at large, that there should be within the Church itself men of mark and influence who desire to bring its working into conformity with the highest knowledge and the best aspirations of modern times.”

But in using the words “within the Church” they declared that, as they were well aware, the clergy, though an important, are still but a very small portion of the Church, and they added :—

“We certainly have as deep an interest in the full and free examination of theological dogmas, and the exposure of theological errors, as we have in the discussion of dogmas and the exposure of errors in political science. And it is of the utmost importance to all of us who desire to find the truth, that the Bishops and clergy of our Church should, with honest boldness, use the freedom of opinion and freedom of expression which the highest ecclesiastical

tribunal has decided that they may lawfully use. . . . Much as we should admire the sincerity and self-sacrifice of any clergyman who might abandon his preferment in the Church from difficulties arising from scientific and critical investigations and conclusions, we venture to think that those take a more enlarged view of their position as ministers of the national Establishment, who feel able to retain it with a good conscience, and that they aid the cause of religious truth by so remaining at their post."

Nor were the laymen of Natal less explicit in the utterance of their opinions. In an address to the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury they referred to the letter addressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Longley) to Dean Green, urging the clergy to withhold their obedience from the Bishop of the diocese, as a letter inciting the clergy to the offences of schism and perjury (February 24, 1866). They also complained that the rights of members of the Church of England in the colony were systematically encroached upon by the Bishop of Capetown's assertion of a jurisdiction which, as loyal subjects, they could not in any way recognise. They protested, further, against the action of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in departing from its rules on the plea of proceedings all of which the highest legal tribunal had pronounced to be null and void ; and also against the assumption that those clergymen in Natal who gave allegiance to Bishop Gray, and who, from the fact of his having the disbursement of the Society's funds, are necessarily exposed to an unscrupulous exercise of power, might yet be held to represent fairly the general feelings of members of the Church of England in the colony. They asked, in short, for justice. They knew that this justice could be attained only by a settlement of the question on its merits ; and this demand for justice implied a further protest against the assumption of Archbishop Longley and Bishop Gray that the paying of due



obedience to the Bishop of Natal involved either approval or disapproval of certain opinions. You cannot, the Archbishop said to Dean Green, submit yourself to Bishop Colenso without identifying yourself with his errors. These errors had not been formulated in any legal court, still less had they been condemned. But the doctrine of the Archbishop was one which could not be maintained in England; and the idea that the clergy or laity of an English diocese would make themselves responsible for, or partakers in, the real or supposed errors of the Bishop of the see before his legal trial or condemnation, would be scouted as an egregious and monstrous absurdity. From the Bishop of Natal they would, of course, receive only a clear exposure of this false insinuation. In his reply to the Durban address (November, 1865) he spoke of their recognising as the

“grand foundation-*principle* of the Church of England, that the Queen, not, of course, in her personal capacity, but as representing the whole nation—the State, and not the clerical body—is the one only legislator and supreme arbiter of all causes which may arise within her pale, spiritual as well as temporal; that the Archbishops and Bishops in England itself exercise jurisdiction in the Church, as it is delegated to them from the Crown, and hold their courts in the Queen’s name; that all their authority, except only what comes by force of moral persuasion and convincing argument, by the power of the holy life, and the influence of the truth spoken in love, emanates from the common Head of the Church and State. This principle seems, no doubt, to many most excellent persons, very objectionable; it is styled ‘Erastian,’ and condemned as ungodly. I am not now called upon to justify or maintain it. I merely assert that it is the fundamental principle of the Church of England.”

With this decisive statement the language used at the time by Dean Green stands out in ludicrous contrast. He took

credit to himself for disregarding the charge of speaking against Cæsar as one which "was brought against our Saviour, who fulfilled all righteousness." He was thankful that there remained still enough of the Divine love "to make him shrink with horror from the teaching of Dr. Colenso" whose words "make light of the unutterable sufferings of Christ upon the Cross." "Fallen spirits," he added in his letter to Mr. Tonnesen (February 9, 1866), "may use their subtle intellect to cavil and condemn the Bible, whilst in heaven we believe it is read with ineffable and deepest adoration." We need not cite more of this gross mixture of nonsense and falsehood.

It is impossible to understand fully the significance of the great conflict provoked by the publication of the Bishop's work on the Pentateuch, unless we mark every step taken by the prelate who undertook to beat him down, or to get rid of him. It is necessary to see how at every stage of the combat the weapons employed are undefined terms, or terms which Bishop Gray well knew that he was using in one sense while the Bishop of Natal was *openly and confessedly* using them in another. This is in a marked degree the characteristic of a letter written by Bishop Gray, when the time which he had fixed as the limit for recantation drew nigh. It could not be known except from the subscription at the end that it was addressed to the Bishop of Natal, for there were no words of greeting or naming at the outset. The letter, it is said, was meant to be informal; and this was Bishop Gray's notion of friendly informality:—

"As the time draws near," so the letter began, "in which I feel that I must take the most painful step I have ever taken in my life, my heart yearns over you; and I make this last, I fear ineffectual, attempt, to lead you to adopt one or other of the two only courses which can spare us

both the pain and distress of a formal severance. My own feeling, since you entered upon the course which you have of late followed—and, I think, at first, your own also—has been, that having consciously departed from the faith of the Church of England, the true line for you, as a religious-minded man, was openly to admit this, and retire from a post which not only implied that you held that faith, but required you to see that others under you taught it. I think you must be conscious that you do not believe what the Church teaches. If you really held what it holds, you would, I am persuaded, have been shocked, and deeply pained, at what has been said of your supposed views, and at your having given any real grounds for the imputations cast upon you ; and you would at once have eagerly pointed out that you had been misunderstood—misrepresented—and have declared what your real convictions were, and given to the world a full confession of your faith. You have not done this, and it leaves the impression on my mind, that you know and feel that, on the very gravest subjects and doctrines, you differ from the Church. If so, surely you ought, as a true man, to say so, and save us all the pain, anxiety, and many troubles, which your not saying so is entailing. Unless you are very much changed from what you were when we had free, confidential, and loving intercourse with each other, you will not be content to hold on to your position and endowments upon the miserable plea that the measure of the legal is the measure of the moral obligation.

“But if your own judgement leads you to think that you have not departed from the truths which you have undertaken to teach, ought not the general voice of the Church on this matter to convince you? That voice has been, I need scarce tell you, clearly expressed—not in England only, but by the Synods of many colonial Churches, and of Churches in Scotland ; and, as you will learn by this mail, by the unanimous vote of the first Provincial Synod of Canada, and the equally unanimous vote of the General Convocation of the Church in America, which is one in

faith with ourselves. These conclusions are, in each place, the act of the whole Church, consisting of Bishops, clergy, and laity. As, then, through a great many constitutional organs, the Churches of our communion throughout the world have spoken with one voice, ought you not to 'hear the Church,' and cease to trouble and disturb its peace, by withdrawing of your own accord to lay communion ?

"But if you are not prepared for this, and think that it is through misapprehension that the Church has denounced your teaching, a door is still open to you. You can plead your opinions, or explain your views, if you so will, before the nearest approach to a national Synod which we can obtain, and, after striving to show their conformity with its faith, leave yourself in its hands. Such a Synod has been asked for by the Province of Canada, and by myself very earnestly. To the decision of such a body I shall cheerfully refer everything. To civil judges you know that I could not, as a matter of conscience, refer the decision of a spiritual question.

"Consider, I pray you, what the result must be of your refusing this, and forcing yourself upon the Church."

This result, Bishop Gray added, would be his excommunication, and the consecration of another Bishop in his place.

"I think that your heart must recoil from the strife and confusion you have already occasioned. Build up the Church in Natal in one communion you never can. Another may do this. You only can weaken and disturb. . . . With very deep sorrow that we should ever have been brought into the relationship in which we now stand to each other,

" I am truly yours,

" R. CAPETOWN."

To this letter the Bishop sent the following reply. No one who reads it with unprejudiced mind will deny its singular calmness, dignity, and beauty.

## TO THE BISHOP OF CAPETOWN.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 1, 1866.*

"MY BROTHER,

- "Your letter reached me on Christmas Day, just after I had come in from publishing to a crowded mass of native Christians and heathens the 'glad tidings of great joy,' and from commemorating with some of them at the Holy Table the dying love of our Lord. Though not properly addressed to myself—for it begins without even a common formula of courtesy—I read it at once and considered it; and I need not say how painfully its contents contrasted with the tenor of the Christmas song, 'Peace on earth, good will to man,'—and how soon it recalled to me the truth of our Lord's own words, 'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I come not to send peace but a sword.'
- "It must be so, then. I give you credit for doing what you believe to be your duty before God and man. I claim, in the name of Christian charity, that you shall think the same of me; that differing wholly, as we do, from one another—doing each what we think to be right—pointing out what appear to be the grave defects in each other's conduct—taking action, if need be, against each other, as we seem driven to do—we shall yet refrain, as far as possible, from judging one another with harsh and angry judgement, remembering that to one common Master we must each of us stand or fall.
- "As this is probably the last time that we shall communicate before what you call a 'formal severance,' I feel it to be my duty to reply to your letter—not to your official one, which you say I shall receive, as you have 'given conditional instructions,' upon the subject of my 'being separated by open sentence from the communion of the Church,' for I cannot recognise your right to address to me any 'official' letter on such a subject; but I shall reply to this communication, which, though intended to be private, I feel justified under the circumstances in publishing. . . .
- "I cannot doubt that, as a *man*, you must feel pain, as you

say, while about to take a step which, if it had the result which you anticipate—of severing me from the whole English Church and ‘all the Churches of our communion throughout the world,’—would affect so seriously me and mine, after many years of hard labour in the Church at home, and in the missionary work of this diocese. That pain, I think, must be deepened by the consciousness that you have judged and condemned me *unheard*; that, when I refused to defend myself before you, believing that the jurisdiction which you claimed to exercise in the Queen’s name was unlawful, as it has now been pronounced to be, you proceeded, however, to ‘try’ me undefended, and pass ‘sentence’ upon me—in that very ‘sentence’ refusing to allow me any *right* of appeal whatever, such as is allowed to the humblest deacon by the laws of the Church of England. But, before doing so, you had agreed with your two brother Bishops, who sat as assessors in judgement with you, and who also condemned me unheard, to refuse me such right of appeal; and you had also all three agreed that, if I did not submit myself to the ‘sentence’ issued under these conditions, I should be *ipso facto* excommunicate. . . . I repeat, I think that, to a manly and honourable mind, like yours, the reflexion upon the injustice of the course to which you have committed yourself—now that it has been brought to your notice by the strong comments made upon it by Englishmen of all religious persuasions—must give additional pain.

“But the *man*, alas! has too frequently, in the history of the Church, been sunk in the *theologian*; and such language as yours might be used—has been used repeatedly—by some pitiless inquisitor, while dooming a victim to the stake, and claiming for himself, and for his ‘Church,’ Divine authority, and the most absolute infallibility.

“You must suffer me to say that I cannot allow your ‘thoughts’ and ‘impressions’ about me to be the measure of my duty. If you do ‘think’ as you say, doubtless I shall forfeit your esteem and that of those who think with you, by the course which I consider it right to take at this time;

and while I shall regret this loss, it is only a part of the sacrifice which is required of me by present circumstances, and which I am prepared to make. We have only now to do with facts. And I say again, as I have said in my first volume on the Pentateuch, and repeatedly since, that I am not conscious that in any of my published writings I have transgressed the limits allowed to the clergy of the national Church, by whose laws only I am bound, to whose authority only I will be responsible, and not to that of the 'Church of South Africa,' or of what you understand by the expression 'the Church,' which you substitute instantly in your letter for the 'Church of England,' with which you began.

"I have been, as you rightly imagine, 'shocked and deeply pained' by very much that has been said of my 'supposed views' by many of my adversaries, more especially by yourself, whether speaking as a fellow Christian, as a brother Bishop, or as a judge. Whatever 'supposed' heresies you might detect or deplore in my writings, yet I consider that the tone of every one of my books, from the *Commentary on the Romans* to the last volume on the Pentateuch, ought at least to have protected me from being publicly charged by you—in the house of God, in my own Cathedral church—with 'reckless arrogance like that which marked the infidels of the last century,' with 'using the language of the boaster and the scorner,' with 'being led captive by the Evil one,' with 'having forsaken the Living Words of God.' I utterly deny that I have given any 'just ground for these imputations.' And I do not feel called upon, because I have been, not 'misunderstood,' but 'misrepresented,' calumniated, reviled, by many, to make any 'full confession of my faith,' beyond that which I have already made in my various writings already before the world, so as to save you and others the 'pain, anxiety, and trouble' of examining my books themselves, of considering carefully their actual statements, and judging righteously a righteous judgement, according to the truth, and not according to foregone conclusions and violent prejudices.

- “When, however, you say ‘you should have at once eagerly pointed out that you had been misunderstood and misrepresented’ and add ‘you have not done this,’ I beg to say that I *have done* this more than once, and with the result that might have been expected from what usually happens when strong theological prejudices are entertained on any subject. My explanations were at once set aside, or explained away. . . . I will give you an instance of this.
- “When my book on the Romans was published, you wrote to me a private letter, in reply to which I said (among other things) as follows:—
- “‘I am sorry that you have so much misjudged what I have written about the Athanasian Creed as to suggest that I did not hold the essential part of it, more especially the doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord, than which from the first moment of my ministry up to the present hour, in all my preaching and teaching (as any one who knows them well must witness), no doctrine of the Church has been maintained by me more strenuously, though I have taught also the doctrine of His perfect humanity more fully and prominently than many, and not lost sight of it practically to a great extent as some do. I say this to you as a dear friend and brother; though, after all that I have written, even in this book on the Romans, I feel that I should be justified in declining to say it to you as Metropolitan. Nor do I think that you had any just ground, from anything that I have said, or omitted to say, in my *Commentary*, for the remarks which you have made on this point as on some others.’
- “But what was the use of this explanation? A charge was brought against me at my (so-called) ‘trial’ of having ‘contravened’ the Second Article of our Church and certain statements of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. This charge was founded *on one sole passage* out of all my writings, though the corresponding ‘proposition’ alleged against me in the Report of the Committee of Convocation, who examined my books on the Pentateuch, was



characterised by the Bishop of St. David's as 'incomparably' the most important of all that they cite. My words, on which this charge was based, were as follows:—

“‘Lastly it is perfectly consistent with the most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's Divinity to hold, as many do, that, when He vouchsafed to become a “Son of man,” He took our nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited. We are expressly told that Jesus increased in wisdom as well as in stature. It is not supposed that in His human nature He was acquainted, more than any educated Jew of the age, with the mysteries of all modern science; nor, with St. Luke's expressions before us, can it be seriously maintained that, as an infant or young child, He possessed a knowledge surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch.’

“The Committee of Convocation, under the chairmanship of Archdeacon Denison, reported upon this that the proposition ‘questions our Blessed Lord's Divine knowledge;’ upon which Bishop Thirlwall very justly pointed out that the Committee appeared to have mistaken my obvious meaning. He says:— ‘The question which he raises does not properly concern our Lords Divine knowledge—that is, the knowledge belonging to His Divine nature. It is whether His human knowledge was co-extensive with His Divine omniscience.’<sup>1</sup> And this is perfectly true. It is plain that my argument assumed that one who had ‘a most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's Divinity,’ who believed, therefore, that He had, as the Eternal Son of God, ‘certain Divine knowledge,’ might yet hold, as many excellent Christians do, that, as the Son of man, though possessed as God of ‘Almighty Divine Power,’ yet He hungered and thirsted, was weary, weak, and faint, suffered and died as man. Bishop Thirlwall further

<sup>1</sup> See p. 309.

showed that Bishop Jeremy Taylor was 'inclined' to this view ; and a clergyman has proved, in a letter published in my third preface, that it has all along been fully shared by a host of great divines, ancient and modern. . . . But this moderation did not suffice for yourself. . . . You had evidently made up your mind on the subject, in opposition to the view of so many great authorities ; and whereas the Bishop of St. David's deprecates any attempt of the Church of England to promulgate a new dogma for the settlement of the controversy, you pronounced at once a peremptory judgement upon the point in question and decided that, 'in imputing to our Blessed Lord ignorance and the possibility of error, the Bishop of Natal has committed himself to a most subtle heresy, destructive of the reality of the Incarnation, and has departed from the Catholic faith, as held in the Church from the beginning, and expressed in the Second Article and the Creeds.'

"What, then, has been the use of my having 'at once eagerly pointed out that I had been misunderstood and misrepresented' ?

"As to my 'differing from the Church' on this and other of 'the very gravest subjects and doctrines,' my being 'conscious' of it, and my 'being bound as a true man to say so, and save you all the pain, anxiety, and many troubles which [my] not saying so is entailing,' there can be no doubt whatever that I *do* differ very materially from the views which you lay down as the 'doctrines of the Church,' and which I assume, therefore, to be the doctrines of that body which you call 'the Church,' but whose authority over me, as a Bishop of the National Church, I do not in any way recognise. For, besides the difference above considered—where you, in the name of *your* Church, have 'promulgated a new dogma' which *our* Church, the Church of England, has not laid upon the necks of her clergy—*your* Church, as you have said, holds all her officers bound to teach at least two dogmas, viz. that 'the whole Bible is the unerring word of the Living God,' and that 'the punishment of the wicked in hell is endless,' upon which our

Church does not dogmatise, but leaves her clergy free to think and speak the truth on these points, as God may have enabled them to see it. *Your* Church, again, maintains, as you have also said, that 'what the Catholic Church, while yet one, during the first thousand years of her history, under the Spirit's guidance in her great Councils, declared to be, or received as, the true faith, that *is* the true faith, and that we receive as such. More than this we are not bound to acknowledge ; less, we may not.'

"Whereas *our* Church says of the same 'great Councils' in her Twenty-first Article,—"when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.'

"As I do intend most assuredly to use, to the full extent which my own sense of duty will allow, the liberty wherewith the good providence of God has made us free in the Church of England ; and as my own views on all the above points, and no doubt on many others, do not at all accord with yours, it is certain that I 'differ' on very grave questions from the views which you assert to be the only 'true faith,' the 'doctrines of the Church,' but which the Church of England does not inforce upon the consciences of its ministers.

"Further, I do maintain the soundness of the principle—though you speak of it as a 'miserable plea'—that for the clergy of an Established Church, which notoriously tolerates such extreme views as are expressed within it by well-known opposite schools of theologians, whose laws are made and inforced, or, as the progress of the age in knowledge and charity may seem to require it, having first become practically relaxed by disuse, are from time to time (as in the recent case of clerical Subscription) rescinded and remodelled *by the State*—for the ministers of such a Church the measure of their legal is the only measure of their moral obligations, which others from without have a right to apply ; while doubtless each clergyman, in the sanctuary

of his own soul, will judge for himself how far his continuance in the active discharge of his ministerial office is consistent with his own sense of truth, and a due regard to those great objects for which, in the eyes of enlightened men, a National Church exists.

“As a Bishop of the Church of England, I thank God that at my consecration, when I was examined publicly ‘in certain Articles, to the end that the congregation present might have a trial, and bear witness how I was minded to behave myself in the Church of God’—I undertook to teach—not a system of doctrines, a dead body of dogmas, but that which I believe to be the truth of the Living God.’<sup>1</sup> As you yourself have said, ‘The Bishop’s only contract with the Church at his consecration, is to teach or maintain nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which he shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Holy Scriptures’; though, in order to restrain this liberty within just bounds, our Church requires me to submit myself to an authority which she regards as supreme in her affairs, ‘in all causes, spiritual as well as temporal’—an authority which I gladly recognise, but which you repudiate.

“You ask, ‘Ought not the voice of the Church in this matter to convince you?’ ‘Ought you not to hear the Church?’ I answer, most assuredly not, when I know by what processes that voice has been elicited; when I know that everything has been done, in England as well as here, to raise a storm of prejudice against me, without any fair attempt having been made to examine and answer my arguments; that not only the flocks, but even the clergy, have been frightened into expressing condemnation of my works without having made any personal acquaintance with them; that these Synods have simply indorsed your proceedings, well knowing that I have never been heard in my own defence, and not caring to know what my defence would

<sup>1</sup> See the remarkable statement of “strange doctrines to be banished and put away” made in his ordination papers by Mr. Maurice (*Life of F. D. Maurice*, i. p. 159).

be ; when I see from their expressions that even his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Oxford, and others of my brethren who have condemned me, have read my works very partially—nay, that Archdeacon Denison himself, when moving, in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, for a Committee to sit upon my works, did not hesitate to say, ‘ I have no doubt, at all events I hope, that there are many here who have not read the First Part of this work ; and I am sure there are many who have not read the Second.’

“No! I have no confidence in any of these judgements, and feel in no way bound to defer to the ‘voice of the Church’ expressed under such circumstances, even if it had been more unanimous than it really is. For, when you speak of the ‘general voice of the Church’ having condemned me—‘not in England only, but by the Synods of many colonial Churches, and of Churches in Scotland—by the unanimous vote of the first Provincial Synod of Canada, and the equally unanimous vote of the Convention of the Church in America’—I must remind you that these different bodies do not in any sense represent the Church of England, with which alone I have to do. And you are aware that a very large body of the most intelligent members of *that* Church, including not a few of the clergy, second to none in learning and piety, have not joined in that condemnation, and do not in any way share in those sentiments. I repeat, the ‘Synods’ on which you lay so much stress, and to whom you ascribe so much authority, have no pretence to represent the National Church, any more than those other bodies which you have enumerated in a letter recently published in the *Natal Mercury*, as presenting addresses to you, ‘The English Church Union, do. Oxford Branch,’ &c. ; . . . which latter bodies, as you well know, represent only one party in the Church of England—the party which is most anxious to shake off the Royal supremacy, and to exalt the priestly order, and the sacramental system.

“Still less do they represent the ‘Catholic Church,’ the true disciples of Christ in every land, the pure in heart and true

in life, whatever be their form of Church government. It is my comfort to know that I stand supported by the wishes and prayers of very many earnest and devout souls such as these, who form an integral portion of the 'Church of the Living God.' But were it otherwise, were the whole religious 'world' apparently against me, the examples of the past, even in Church history, would suffice to support and strengthen me for the maintenance of that which I believe—rather, which I know—to be true, in spite of the temporary opposition of my brethren, and in the assurance that the truth will ultimately triumph.

"You put before me two alternatives, as the 'two only courses' which are open to me, by adopting one or other of which I may 'spare us both the pain and distress of a formal severance'; though I confess I do not see how the 'severance' can be more complete and 'formal' than it is now, when you have publicly denounced me in my own Cathedral as an 'infidel' and 'heretic,' 'led captive by the Evil one.'

"The first of these alternatives is to resign my office, and 'withdraw of my own accord to lay communion'; though it is difficult to see how one who, according to your views, is so notorious an 'infidel' and 'heretic' can be allowed to exist even in 'lay communion' with your Church, without some 'recantation' on his part, of which you say nothing. I need hardly say, after all I have said already here and elsewhere, that I am *not* 'prepared for this.' On the contrary, I feel that it would be a dereliction of duty for me to do so—a cowardly forsaking of a post in which God's Providence and the will of my Sovereign have placed me; in which, however little such strife is congenial to my own feelings, I am called to maintain the sacred cause of religious liberty against the incroachments of the priestly system; in which I have been adjured to remain by not a few of the clergy and laity of the Church of England, men of devout mind, of deep thought, and far-reaching insight, who foresee clearly the dangers which threaten the Church at home from the growing extension of ecclesiasticism in the

colonies—dangers, I may add, foreseen by none more clearly than by the present Bishop of Grahamstown in former days.<sup>1</sup>

“The only other ‘door’ which, you say, ‘is open to me,’ is to submit myself to the judgement of ‘the nearest approach to a National Synod which we can obtain,—such a Synod ‘having been asked for by the Province of Canada,’ and by yourself ‘very earnestly.’ ‘To the decision of such a body,’ you say, ‘I will cheerfully refer everything. To civil judges you know that I could not, as a matter of conscience, refer the decision of a spiritual question.’

“Doubtless you would ‘cheerfully refer everything’ to such a body as you propose ; for you have already told me, almost in the same sentence, that the very judges to whom my books would, in that case, be submitted, have already ‘unanimously’ approved of what you have done. I need hardly remind you that it is not necessary that Her Majesty, for the consideration of my case, should nominate merely a body of laymen,—that a Commission might be appointed, composed in part of learned and unprejudiced ecclesiastics, not already committed, by violent extra-judicial denunciations of my books, to foregone conclusions about them, as well as of laymen learned in the law,—and that in all the past history of the Church of England, whenever such Commissions have been appointed in spiritual cases, they have always contained a majority of laymen. This, I believe, is a fact which the recent inquiry into the subject, published with the authority of the Bishop of London, has placed beyond all doubt.

“I appeal to you once more, as a loyal subject and professedly a Bishop of the Church of England, not to overstep the bounds of Church order, and not to violate the law of the land. I appeal to you, as I have lately appealed to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to address a humble petition to Her Majesty, praying that a Commission may be appointed to examine and report upon my books, if you think they deserve to be condemned ; but, at all events, to

<sup>1</sup> See p. 339 *et seq.*

resign the patent which you hold from the Crown, *before* you proceed to take the steps which you threaten. If, however, you feel it to be a 'matter of conscience,' not to 'refer the decision of a spiritual question' to that authority which, to use your own words, you 'solemnly swore before God to recognise when you received your commission as a Bishop and Metropolitan of the United Church of Great Britain and Ireland,' on the other hand I feel it to be on my part a 'matter of conscience' to submit myself to that authority which I am bound on oath to obey, and a matter of loyalty not to admit the jurisdiction which you claim to exercise, but which the Privy Council has declared it would not be *lawful* for me to recognise.

"But I will on my part make a proposition, with which I think you should be willing to comply. I am quite ready to submit my writings, in accordance with the provision in your own letters patent, to the Archbishop of Canterbury—not, of course, to the Archbishop in person, for that would be a mere idle form, since his Grace has repeatedly, and even within the last month, condemned me unheard, and evidently, as I have said, without having even read my books. But I am ready to submit them to the Archbishop of Canterbury, sitting in his Ecclesiastical Court, before which the case of any clergyman of his province, and of every dignitary below a Bishop, might be brought by appeal. But your own counsel, Sir H. Cairns, admitted that there must be from the Archbishop a further appeal to the Crown; and as you are also aware, the Privy Council laid down the law that for us to make an agreement with one another to ignore the supreme authority of the Crown in such a case would be an *illegal* act on our part. I am not prepared to violate the law of the land for the purpose of supporting ecclesiastical authority. I reserve, therefore, my right of finally appealing to Her Majesty; and surely, as I have said, you cannot be justified in assuming beforehand that in such a case as this, involving questions of doctrine, a Commission would be appointed consisting only of lay judges. The duty of a loyal subject would seem to be to



await and see what would actually be done, and then, if felt to be necessary as a 'matter of conscience,' to protest against the *constitution* or the decision of such a court, and to disregard and disobey it, taking the consequences.

"In default of my complying with either of your two suggestions, you say that you will 'separate me with open sentence from the communion of the Church,' and you add that 'that separation will, you have no doubt, be formally recognised by the English Church and by all the Churches of her communion throughout the world.' I cannot believe that you have any authority for this statement as regards the Church of England. If you mean that the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, under influence of Bishop Wilberforce and Archdeacon Denison—the latter himself condemned for 'heresy' upon the 'merits' of his case, and deprived of his preferments, by one lawful ecclesiastical tribunal, though absolved upon mere technical grounds by another—may adopt by a *majority* in both Houses a resolution expressing approval of your proceedings, that indeed is possible: only then it is well known that the Convocation of one Province does not in any sense properly represent even the clergy of that one portion of the Church of England, and not in the least the laity. If you mean, however, that the Bishops in England will issue—as they did three years ago, following the lead of the Bishop of Oxford—a series of manifestoes, adopting your act, and 'formally recognising' its justice and validity, then I do not believe that in *every* diocese this will be done, and sure I am that, whenever such documents may be issued, there will be found multitudes of Englishmen, both clergy and laity, even of those who do not sympathise with me, who would utterly dissent from such unwarrantable and unlawful proceedings, who would regard these 'admonitions' as not 'godly,' and would refuse to 'follow' them.

'But, however this may be, it is certain that you hold your office, as Metropolitan in the Church of England, solely by the Queen's appointment, and that under that authority you have no power whatever to pronounce such a 'sentence,' any

more than to deprive me, as you suppose yourself already to have actually done, of all power 'in any way to minister in divine offices' or 'to exercise any sacred offices whatever in the *Church of God*,' pretending thus to an universal jurisdiction. It is true that in this age of the world such 'sentences' have lost their terrors for earnest and thinking men, who, believing in the presence of the Living God in the world, and not in the existence of a spiritual caste to whom the Supreme King has delegated his power, will remember that 'the curse causeless shall not come,' and go about their work as calmly as ever, content to say 'Let them curse, but bless Thou.' Your 'sentence of excommunication' would fall as lightly on me as that of 'deprivation,' or as that which is annually launched by the Bishop of Rome on both of us.

"But if you really *believe* in these spiritual powers which you profess to wield, and desire to show the world that you trust in *them*, and not in the arm of flesh, then let the battle be fought out, if it must be, openly and fairly between us. I declare that I belong to the Church of England, and that to her laws I will submit myself, by her decisions I will be bound. You declare that you do not belong to the Church of England—that you will not recognise the Queen's supremacy, nor accept the decision of her Supreme Courts of Appeal—that you belong to the Church of South Africa. Let it, then, be distinctly understood that we represent two utterly discordant principles—on the one hand, that of *State* supremacy, maintained as a part of the very Constitution of our National Church, the safeguard of her liberties, the pledge that, from time to time, as knowledge advances, her system shall be modified (as it has so lately been) to meet the demands of the age; and, on the other hand, that of *Clerical* supremacy, which secures that certain dogmatic teachings—'what the Catholic Church, during the first thousand years of her history, declared to be or received as the true faith'—shall be bound as a yoke upon all future ages, as Infallible, Divine, Eternal Truth.

"But, if this is the case, may I not say in your own words 'Surely you ought as a true man to say so,' by giving up

at once your patent, and laying aside all the power and influence which you now exercise, by virtue of your *apparent* subjection to the Crown, and your *apparent* organic connexion with the National Church? It is true this would involve a great sacrifice of 'worldly' power—not only of 'position and endowment,' but of lands, houses, schools, churches, which have been set apart by the Government and others expressly for the purposes of the members of the Church of England. It would involve also, I imagine, the loss of that strongest of all 'worldly' means of coercion, which, while professing to use only 'spiritual' weapons, you have wielded with great effect, and, in the case of one clergyman of my diocese, most unsparingly, and, I must add, in a way which I cannot justify, by means of the funds of the Gospel Propagation Society; for these, I presume, could hardly be granted to support the claims of a Bishop of the 'Church of South Africa' in opposition to another lawful Bishop of the 'Church of England,' who might be nominated by Royal mandate as Bishop of Capetown. But your position would then be at all events consistent with your avowed principles, and intelligible to many who are now beguiled by the double appearance of things. And it is obvious that any 'sentence' of excommunication, which you might think it necessary to issue, might then be issued, if not without breach of Christian charity, yet at least without the scandal of disloyalty and disregard of the conditions on which you received from the Crown your appointment and dignity as Bishop of Capetown and Metropolitan.

"You go on to say that the endowments of this see were 'obtained by you for far other teaching than mine.' If you mean by this that they were raised with the express design of promoting, with the help of the incumbent of this see, the ecclesiastical system of the Church of South Africa, with a view of its reacting at some future day, in common with that of other colonial Churches, on the system of the mother Church at home,—then I say, as I have said before, that the gatherer and donors deserve to be disappointed;

that I utterly disclaim having ever been a party to such an arrangement ; that I should deem it then, as I should deem it now, to be a treasonable conspiracy against the very life and well-being of our National Church. But, if nothing of this kind is meant, then I say that these funds were raised, as I suppose, from all quarters, from persons of very different views in the Church of England, from High Church, Low Church, and Broad Church, Tractarian and Erastian ; by donations and subscriptions, at meetings and after sermons, for the express purpose of founding a Bishopric which should be subject to the fundamental laws of the Church of England ; and, in many cases, from those who would heartily rejoice in the work which I am doing, or trying to do.

“As regards those who may choose to join the threatened South African ‘schism’ in this colony, I do not see any reason for supposing that they would find it necessary to meet with their Bishop in ‘dens and caves,’ while building their own places of worship. It would be easy to hire rooms both in Maritzburg and Durban ; though I doubt if the number of worshippers in each place would be so large as you suppose—mised, it may be, by too zealous and sanguine informants. But when you say ‘You know that all earnestness and all deep religious conviction would be against you,’ I cannot but think that you have lost sight for a moment of what is due to the conscientious feelings of multitudes who differ from you, and who have placed themselves by my side in this controversy. It is the same kind of language as that which you employed before in my Cathedral church, when you told my flock that all good people were ‘avowedly on God’s side,’ and therefore stood aloof from me ; ‘all that would be respectable in the world, ignorant and careless though, some be,—all but the scoffer and unbeliever.’

“I must be allowed to say that I do *not* ‘know’ this ; that I know the very contrary ; that, among those who are *with* me in England and Natal, among those who read my works with interest and approbation, . . . there are many most

excellent and estimable persons, of 'earnest and deep religious conviction,' who share with me the feeling that such work as you are now doing, so far as it is effective, must tend to destroy the true life of any Church ; and that the work which I am trying to do is that which must be done—may it only be done by more powerful agents !—to secure the permanence and prosperity of the National Church. . . .

" I am, my brother,  
 " Yours faithfully in Christ,  
 " J. W. NATAL."

The informal letter of Bishop Gray, to which the Bishop thus calmly and conclusively replied, was certainly a marvellous production. If it betrayed a strange hankering after an ecclesiastical despotism, it betrayed also an ignorant narrowness not less astonishing. Not content with differing from Bishop Thirlwall or Jeremy Taylor—to say nothing of Hammond and Waterland, Chrysostom or Ambrose—on the subject of the human knowledge of Christ, Bishop Gray flatly condemned them all ; and this condemnation of what he, in his haste, regarded as a notion almost exclusively confined to the Bishop of Natal, was practically the pivot on which the arguments in the so-called Capetown trial mainly turned. Bishop Gray was ready to refer Bishop Colenso's case to Synods or Councils of various kinds ; but he forgot that if the Royal supremacy had any meaning or any purpose, it was to *prevent the bringing of ecclesiastical causes for final settlement before any such tribunals.*

The official letter forwarded to Bishop Colenso through his own Dean has in part been noticed already.<sup>1</sup> We need only mark here that one of the reasons now given for refusing to him an appeal to the Queen in Council was the provision, " in the letters patent founding the several sees of this province,

<sup>1</sup> See p. 378.

that the gravest spiritual causes in this portion of the Church shall be finally decided by Bishops only,"—in other words, that English Churchmen were to be under one law, one system, one discipline at home, and under a wholly different law, system, and discipline in the colonies; and here again are spiritual powers derived from a civil instrument, and exercised by an officer who protests against and disavows that subordination to the State which is the necessary condition of every clergyman in England, from the Archbishops downwards. Another reason was the absence of any law, either of the Church or of the State, empowering the Queen, either in person or by deputy, to hear and decide spiritual causes for colonial Churches, which were declared to be purely voluntary religious associations. In other words, by the mere fact of leaving England, members of the Church of England, on this theory, exchanged their condition of freedom for one of slavery. But no real effort was made to bring the case before the Crown, or into a court from which it could go by appeal to the Crown; and the plea, moreover, was thoroughly disingenuous. Had such a law been forthcoming, Bishop Gray must have protested against it, and found some means of evading it. He had said as plainly as possible that he could not recognise the jurisdiction of the civil tribunal of the Privy Council; and it was at least superfluous to say that he could find no law requiring him to do that which he was steadily resolved in any case not to do. Dean Green was only a trifle more extravagant than his Metropolitan when he compared the submission of Churchmen to the authority of the Crown with the litigation of Corinthian Christians in heathen courts, which St. Paul vehemently denounced.

But of misrepresentation and distortion of facts on the part of Bishop Gray and his supporters there was no end. The Bishop of Natal was constrained to address himself to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to call his attention simply to

such matters of fact. The clergy of Natal had been warned that "if any one of them communicated with Dr. Colenso, they would thereby be excluded from any cure in England"; and it was hinted or asserted that this statement came from the Archbishop himself.

TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *November 30, 1865.*

. . . "I cannot and do not believe it possible that such a hint can have been contained in your Grace's letter. Yet I cannot forget the fact that Bishop Gray's course of proceeding has been publicly indorsed with your Grace's full approval, though I do not suppose your Grace is aware that part of that proceeding was 'to advise by letter the clergyman of Durban to commit a brawl in the church by reading the Communion Service while the Bishop preached,' and another, 'to tell one of the churchwardens at Durban, when informed that steps might be taken by the laity to prevent the reading during Divine service of the illegal document deposing Bishop Colenso, that, if all the devils in hell were to appear next day, nothing should prevent his having the document read.' . . .

"I have applied for a copy of your Grace's letter, and have been informed by the Dean that it has been sent for publication to the *Natal Mercury*, but that the extract which I require is as follows: 'I do not see how you can accept Dr. Colenso as your Bishop without identifying yourselves with his errors.' Your Grace has thus distinctly and publicly advised the clergy of this diocese, professing to be clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland, receiving their stipends as such from the colonial Treasury and from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and ministering within buildings set apart for that Church, to rebel openly against their lawful Bishop, on the ground of certain 'errors' of which your Grace pronounces me to be guilty. . . . I feel that I have now a right to ask your Grace, before my fellow-countrymen, to point out as

publicly and distinctly, what those 'errors' are of mine to which your Grace refers, if any such have been already condemned by the existing laws of the Church of England. Or should your Grace not be able—as I venture to believe you will not—to produce any passages of my works, for which the humblest deacon could have been ejected from his cure by any of the Bishops in England, upon the principles by which the Church of England is governed, as laid down in any judgement hitherto given, then I feel that I have a right to demand, in the name of common justice, that your Grace should present a petition to the Queen, specifying those parts of my writings which you deem to be 'errors' of such kind as to justify my deposition, and praying that Her Majesty would be pleased to appoint a Commission to examine into the justice of the charge.

"I am a Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, and not one of the Church of South Africa, with which, in common with the great body of the laity of Natal, I neither have, nor wish to have, at the present time, any very intimate relations. And I desire for them and their children, as well as for myself, the right to enjoy the liberties, and be judged by the laws, of that Church to which it is our privilege and our pride to belong. . . . We count it no evil, as your Grace implies, but a great advantage, to be ruled by the decisions of her Supreme Courts of Appeal, and to be saved thereby from the arbitrary and prejudiced proceedings of irresponsible ecclesiastical judges. So long as the Church of England is maintained as the National Established Church in England, so long do we desire of our own free choice to maintain our connexion with it, and submit ourselves voluntarily to its laws, which are made by the State and by the Queen, and not by the clergy."

Of the Archbishop's reply to this letter this much at least must be said, that it reveals Dr. Longley's absolute unfitness for the office of a judge. He knew perfectly well that if the *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch* had been the work of the Bishop of London instead of the Bishop of Natal, the



course, if any, taken with regard to it must have been extremely different. He may also have felt that in all likelihood a time of bluster would in that case have been followed by a tacit agreement to leave matters alone. Anathemas and condemnation by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury would have availed nothing towards the deposition of a Bishop of London; and the promoter of any suit against him would probably have been advised that the chances of conviction before the Queen in Council were very small, and possibly that no passages were forthcoming on which any penal charges could be grounded. As to the vast mass of accusations brought against Bishop Colenso by the prosecuting clergy at Capetown, almost every one of these would have been swept away like cobwebs on the first breath of judicial inquiry in England. It was worse than useless, therefore, for the Archbishop to refer to the indictment in that so-called trial as furnishing the least warrant for supposing that such an indictment could be preferred against any clergyman in England. Yet this is what Dr. Longley, as Primate of England, did not scruple to do.

“I have no hesitation,” he said (February 10, 1866), “in avowing that, according to my belief, you have been duly and canonically deposed from your spiritual office, according to the common laws of the Church of Christ, as set forth in the concluding paragraph of the Twenty-sixth Article of the Church of England; and I must decline to hold myself responsible to you for entertaining such a belief. I have never obtruded this opinion upon others, in my capacity as Primate of the United Church of England and Ireland; but I have not hesitated to avow my private opinion when it has been sought for. . . . I never expected that my letter would have been given to the public, nor am I responsible for the fact; but as those to whom I addressed it have thought fit to publish a portion of it, I do not disavow the sentiment therein expressed. At any rate, I could not have objected

to the course they thus took from any apprehension that I might one day be called to sit as a judge in your case, because I have high legal authority for saying that there appears to be now no mode of proceeding by which I could be called upon to act in this capacity. The censure, therefore, which you would impute to me on this ground proves to be entirely without foundation.

“As you ask me to point out the errors to which I have alluded, I have merely to refer you to the reasons for your deposition, as stated in the judgement of deprivation passed upon you, and to state my belief that for such errors in doctrine an English clergyman could be ejected from his cure.”

That Archbishop Longley might not have been called upon to act in a judicial capacity, had Dr. Tait instead of Dr. Colenso been the author of the *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch*, is not so certain as the Primate supposed; but assuredly if his private opinion had been put forth before such a trial as a public declaration of his state of mind he must have insured his own exclusion from such a tribunal, as entirely as any juryman who should avow his belief in the guilt of a prisoner before his trial was begun. He could not fail to know that the propositions charged against Bishop Colenso at Capetown might be penal errors, and yet it was possible that they had not been proved, and perhaps could not be proved against him. It is hard, indeed, to see how he could, further, fail to know that a large number of these charges had been cleared away by recent decisions of the Judicial Committee, and therefore were no longer admissible in future indictments. Yet, in spite of this, Archbishop Longley could speak thus confidently of the ejection of English clergymen for charges many of which could not be even formulated against them. In fact, Archbishop Longley had said deliberately what he either knew, or ought to have known to be not true.