

that which we gain from our knowledge of what a human parent may or ought to be." ¹

The subject of the Lord's Prayer led the Bishop directly to a subject on which a great deal of angry feeling has been roused, especially among those who find satisfaction in the use of phrases which, whether capable of justification or not, cannot be found in the formularies of the Church of England. The Bishop felt himself bound to maintain that reverence for the words of Christ Himself would withhold us from addressing prayer directly to Him.

"Our Lord teaches us," he insisted, "to pray always to God, to God our Father—not to the Virgin Mary, not to the saints, as the Roman Catholics do—not even to Christ, as many Protestants do, departing thus from the direct teaching of Jesus Himself and the example of His apostles." ²

An examination of St. Paul's epistles brought him to the conclusion that

"in not a single instance does St. Paul pay worship to Christ either by ascriptions of praise or by offering of prayer." ³

As an exposition of the actual practice of Christendom, the Bishop's sermon is unanswerable. That he was justified in speaking as he spoke, the tone of modern devotion leaves little room for doubting. For altering the formularies of the Church of England there has been no opportunity; but the lack of this power has been to a large extent compensated by the introduction of hymns which, like the collection known as *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, contain,

"Many expressions which," the Bishop says, "would have been utterly condemned by our Lord and His apostles, expressions in which not only is adoration paid to Jesus

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 136.

² *Ib.* p. 144.

³ *Ib.* p. 145.

instead of to 'our Father and His Father,' to 'our God and His God,' but the very thorns and cross and nails and lance, the wounds, the vinegar, the gall, the reed, are called upon to satisfy our spirits, to fill us with love, to plant in our souls the root of virtue, and mature its glorious fruit. But, indeed, the whole book overflows with words of prayer and praise, directly addressed to Jesus, such as find no example or warrant in the lessons of our Lord Himself, nor in the language of His apostles."¹

"The whole spirit of our Prayer Book," he insisted, "is opposed to the practice which has rapidly grown up in our day, . . . of offering direct worship to our Lord Jesus Christ."

On this point the Bishop was met by many vehement contradictions. Thus the *Spectator*, commenting on "The Bishop of Natal's New Heresy," took upon itself to declare that

"The whole service of the Church of England, the whole Liturgy which expresses her devotional frame of mind, is founded on prayer to Christ ;"

and that the assumption of direct prayer to Christ is

"an essential assumption of the worship of the English Church, an assumption which penetrates it from end to end, litany, collects, everything."

We are thus brought sharply to the question of fact, severed wholly from the regions of opinion ; and with reference to the Prayer Book the facts are these :—

(1) With the exception of a few sentences in the "Te Deum," and the solitary invocation "Christ, have mercy upon us," once used, the order for morning and evening prayer, which constitutes the daily devotion of the Church of England, contains no prayers to Christ, for, if it be open to any to

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 150.

suppose that the prayer of St. Chrysostom is addressed to Christ, it is equally open to anyone to entertain the opposite opinion.

(2) Of the litany, by far the greater portion is not addressed to Christ.

(3) Of the prayers and thanksgivings for various occasions, not one is addressed to Christ.

(4) Of the collects, not very far short of one hundred in number, three are addressed to Christ ; and one of these in its original form was not addressed to Christ.

(5) In the Communion office, with the exception of the sentences in the hymn known as the "Gloria in Excelsis," there is not one prayer addressed to Christ.

(6) In all the occasional offices, with the exception of a solitary invocation in the Visitation of the Sick, there is not one prayer addressed to Christ.

Thus the assertion that prayer to Christ penetrates the devotion of the Church of England "from end to end, litany, collects, everything," resolves itself into this, that prayer to Christ is to be found in about three collects in one or two canticles and hymns, and in a few suffrages of the litany. That this, however, is not all that is to be said on the subject, is shown by Dean Stanley in a postscript to the chivalrous speech delivered by him in Convocation, June 29, 1866. This speech exhibits, throughout, the native and indomitable courage of the man ; and it exhibits also his habit of making admissions for which there seems to be no special need. Without these admissions the chivalry of his speech would have been perfect. It is somewhat marred by the sentences in which he declines to defend the course taken by the Bishop.

To accumulate controversy on controversy in a community already sufficiently distracted, or to endeavour to fight out questions of abstract theology on the uncongenial field of

poetical works embodying sentiments of practical devotion, will appear to most persons in a high degree incongruous and inconvenient. This ought not,” he added, “to affect the abstract doctrines or customs in dispute.”

But to this the reply would be that the doctrines and customs are not abstract, and that these poetical works are compositions which cannot fail to have an immense effect for good or for evil on those who use them, and that, in fact, many of these hymns set forth the traditional mythology of Christendom in its most corrupting form. So again the Dean flings a sop to the Bishop’s opponents by saying that

“Bishop Colenso’s mode of dealing with the matter may be dry, narrow, and misplaced ;”

but it also may not be ; and in the opinion of an immense majority of those who may read the sermon carefully, in all likelihood it will not be.

Amongst his opponents many probably would like well to be told that

“doubtless in the Cathedral of Maritzburg they would hear much that we might lament ;”

but this, too, is a matter of opinion, and Dr. Stanley’s own remarks make it abundantly clear that the Bishop was more than justified in his contention. With these exceptions the Dean’s speech was a defence of the Bishop’s position as vigorous as it was righteous. He showed, in short, that the “new heresy” mooted a question which had long ago been discussed and answered in his favour. It has been the rule, not only of the English Church, but of Western Christendom generally,

“to address prayers and praises directly to the First Person in the Trinity, through, and not to, the Second.”

This is a fact stated openly by Renaudot, Bishop Bull, and Waterland ; and

“the question of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of the Second Person in the Trinity, does not enter into the matter at all.”

The debate should have been closed at once by the frank admission that the Bishop was quite right, and that the phraseology of many of these hymns is wrong and offensive. But the tone assumed towards him was, as the Dean urged, only too like that of the persecutors of the Jansenist Arnould,

“Ce ne sont pas les sentiments de M. Arnould qui sont hérétiques. Ce n'est que sa personne. Il n'est pas hérétique pour ce qu'il a dit ou écrit, mais surtout parcequ'il est M. Arnould.”

Having thus shown the real drift of the language addressed to the Bishop, Dean Stanley went on to pay one of those noble tributes to his work and his motives which will not lightly be forgotten. He spoke of his transparent sincerity as unquestionable.

“It is this,” he said, “which has won for him an amount of support and sympathy of the laity which has very rarely fallen to the lot of an English Bishop. ‘I would go twenty miles to hear Bishop Colenso preach,’ was the remark made by an artisan in the north to a missionary clergyman, ‘he is so honest like.’ The overflowing congregations of his own church in Natal . . . show how he is regarded by the bulk of the laity in South Africa. . . . The very complaints which have reached this country against those congregations show their importance: ‘infidels, men who never entered a church before, working-men in their shirt-sleeves.’ That the picture is extremely overcharged is now known from the indignant denial on the part of many members of the congregation itself. But even if there is any foundation of fact for those statements, it surely would be a cause for

rejoicing rather than lamenting. How gladly should we hail in London congregations of such men. How welcome would be the sight, in our Cathedrals, of even twenty artisans in their working dress.”

The sum of the whole was in brief this, that

“the doctrines of the Bishop of Natal are such as the Universal Church has never condemned ; such as within the Church of England are by law allowed ;”

and for doctrines which are allowed the liberty of maintaining them must be conceded to all. The Church of England is not like the Church of Rome. The latter may be able to impose silence on its priests even on those subjects on which in theory they still have the power of free speech. The true voice of the Church of England in this matter

“is such as becomes a Church which never was infallible, and is now reformed,”

and which, therefore, we may add, may be reformed again.

There remain to be noticed yet two or three points on which the *Natal Sermons* are especially instructive, when viewed in the light of the experience gained since the time of their publication. While the ecclesiastical party are using language which seems to pledge God to the maintenance of particular forms of Church government, others are coming to see that the Divine kingdom is not dependent on any outward organizations. But no words in which their convictions may be expressed can be more forcible than those in which the Bishop clothed his own thoughts on the same subject twenty years ago.

“How surely,” he said, “does that notion of a Church in which the Almighty is *interested* (*His* party being one amidst the many parties into which civilized society is split) lower the thoughts of all who entertain it towards the Great God our

Father. How does it also lower the characters of those who persuade themselves that they are His partisans ; embitter their feelings towards all who oppose them ; tempt them to think that lying, evil-speaking, and slandering, suppression of the truth, distortion of fact, watching for the stumbling of their enemy, . . . and making a man an offender for a word,—that any baseness is sanctified by so great and holy an end, as to entice or drive men into that Church of theirs, out of which there is no salvation.”¹

The Bishop's thorough truthfulness is not less shown in his resolution to leave no room for interpretations not warranted by the original documents, even though these interpretations may have been supposed to inforce lessons of supreme value. When, in the Balaam story, the prophet is said to express the hope that he might die the death of the righteous, the context, he very rightly insists, shows that the writer here contemplated the righteous people, as they called themselves, “Jeshurun,” the chosen nation, and that the phrase was used with a very vague notion of what it was to be righteous. But, however this may be, it is clear that the Old Testament writings furnish us with no materials for the painting of such a picture as that which Bishop Butler has drawn of his character.² If we are to believe the story in Numbers, Balaam does not deserve the judgement passed on him in the Epistle of St. Jude. He resisted from first to last the temptations thrown in his way by Balak, and went home as poor as he came. There is no reason for charging him with the seduction of the Israelites ; there is even less ground for attributing to him a monotheism approaching even to that of the great Hebrew prophets, and therefore none, it would seem, for setting him up, after Bishop Butler's method, as a signal example of a man spiritually ruined by self-deceit. The Bishop of

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 180.

² For the date of this episode, &c., see Vol. I. p. 659.

Natal makes no reference to this sermon of Butler's; but there can be little doubt that it was present to his mind.

These sermons also did great good service in protesting against views of human life which make not even a pretence of accounting generally for its phenomena.

"From early times, it has been a human instinct to worship the saviour, the deliverer, of the nation. . . . It is hard, doubtless, to forbear to ask, 'Why does not He who has the power set all things right?'¹ Why do the oppressed still groan? Why, above all, are such masses of the human race left in their degradation?'—or to answer with courage and cheerfulness, 'In God's own time, which must be the best, all shall be set right.' But we must do so, or what is the alternative? If we let go our trust in the goodness of God, we must disown, or give the lie to, our own spiritual being, its most deep and living convictions, its plainest utterances. We must shut our eyes to the whole spiritual world. We must forget that we ever loved or revered anyone, that any character in history or fiction ever won our admiration, that we ever said 'Well done' to the generous, the self-sacrificing, the patient warrior. We must set down man as only the most cunning animal. And how much in the history of the race and the individual will then remain unexplained and inexplicable!"²

Not less wholesome was the rebuke which he gave to the temper of those critics who seem to take pleasure in sowing broad-cast charges of forgery and deception, where these charges have little meaning or none. The second epistle bearing the name of St. Peter may be regarded as coming with the sanction of that apostle's authority. It was not so regarded in the days of Origen or of Eusebius. All that is said of this epistle may be allowed to be true.

¹ This passage may be compared with Mr. Maurice's strangely mistaken impressions. Vol. I. p. 208.

² *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 189.

“It professes to be a sequel to the first epistle. It speaks of the writer as having been an eye-witness of the majesty of Christ ; it personates the apostle speaking throughout.”

Eusebius and Jerome were perfectly aware of all these facts, but for all this they express no horror of the document as being a manifest cheat, and they nowhere characterize it as an imposture or a forgery.¹ We have not far to seek for the explanation.

“Such practices—which we in our days should utterly condemn—were very common in the early Church [as they were also beyond its limits] : and many of the apocryphal books of the New Testament were put forward in the names of the apostles or apostolic men, evidently with devout intentions, for the purpose of gaining greater authority for the matters contained in them.² There were doubtless, some ‘impostures,’ gospels, and other writings falsified for the very purpose of maintaining and propagating certain doctrines. And Jerome himself can hardly escape the imputation of having disgracefully lent the honour of his name to support and spread such incredible falsehoods as those which [may be found in] his *Life of St. Anthony*.”³

As valuable as any in the series are the two sermons which deal with the nature of prophecy. Here, again, the Bishop falls back, as he is fully justified in falling back, on the words of Dr. Irons. The declarations of a sacerdotalist who sees the uselessness and the falsity of the traditional theories and position, are really decisive of the question.

“It has been doubted,” Dr. Irons frankly allows, “and it becomes a fair matter of inquiry, whether there is in all the Hebrew Scripture one such distinct prediction of the remote future which concerns us, as the natural mind would ask. As to the carnal, and frequently immoral, idea

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 197.

² See Vol. I. p. 199.

³ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 198.

of mere prognostic, that, at all events, is not the Christian idea."¹

This idea is fostered by the fatal habit of isolating a passage from its context, and of looking at it not with reference to the writer, but as the utterances of an unconscious oracle. The multitude generally suppose that they know the meaning of certain prophecies, because their teachers speak of them as Messianic, although this itself is a term on which they never pause to bestow a thought. In a greater degree than perhaps with any others this is the case with the passage which speaks of the Child and the Son on whose shoulders the government shall rest, Wonderful, Counsellor, the Prince of Peace.

"So accustomed," says the Bishop, "are we to hear these words applied to the birth of Christ, that it has scarcely occurred to us, perhaps, to ask if they were ever meant to have—if they ever could have had—another reference. And yet the context, which speaks of the rod of Israel's oppressor being broken, as in the day of Midian, will remind us that here also we have to do with those present realities which belonged to the actual condition of Israel at the time when the prophet was writing."²

The traditional interpretation was as strained, as groundless, as impossible, as is that of those words from the Book of Job which are included among the opening sentences of the Burial office of the English Church. In truth, so long as the fashion of wresting passages from their context prevails, we must be at sea and in the dark everywhere. The prophet speaks with rapture of a time "when Israel shall be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land; whom Jehovah of Hosts shall bless, saying, 'Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 221.

² *Ib.* p. 247.

Israel mine inheritance." Of this passage the "orthodox" commentator Thomas Scott says candidly,

"I apprehend that the grand accomplishment of these verses, and of the latter part of this extraordinary prophecy, is still to be accomplished ;"

that is, as the Bishop adds, he admits that it has not been fulfilled,

"though how *Assyria* can now be joined with Egypt and Israel in a common worship must seem to most persons inconceivable." ¹

One more subject only remains on which the Bishop's remarks need to be noticed, and for these his hearers must have felt grateful to him. So much is said of the extraordinary gifts and powers of the early Church, that many nowadays become disheartened and depressed ; and it is certain that the whole tone of thought which regards the Christendom of the present century as a deterioration or debasement of that of the first is altogether unwholesome and false. Among the most astonishing of these early gifts is supposed to be that of the gift of tongues. On the one side we have the statement in the Acts that without learning, without preparation, a small band of persons were suddenly endowed with the power of speaking a multitude of languages of which, before, they knew nothing, and of speaking them articulately, grammatically, and fluently, to the perfect comprehension of those for whom these languages severally were their mother-dialects. On the other we have a number of statements which scatter to the winds the story in the Acts, or the writer's assertions in reference to that story. It is easy to remark, with Erasmus, that this power did not much improve the Apostles' mastery of Greek, as their mode of writing in that language is

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 252.

"not only rough and unpolished, but imperfect,—also confused, and sometimes even plainly solecizing and absurd! for we cannot possibly deny what the fact declares to be true."¹

It is unnecessary, however, to go off into debate. We have St. Paul's words that these utterances, whatever they were, were to all except the interpreters absolutely unintelligible. The tongues were indeed "unknown," so far as the functions of articulate speech are concerned; nor do they seem to have been heard of except at Corinth. Except in writing to the disciples there it is very noticeable that in none of his epistles does St. Paul make any reference whatever to this faculty. . .

"Nor does any other of the epistles of the New Testament, those of James and Peter, John and Jude, make the slightest reference to any such power existing in the early Church. Nor is any mention whatever made of such a gift by any of the earlier Fathers of the Church till we come to the time of Irenæus, who died in the year 202, and who says that there were brethren in his time who had prophetic gifts, and spoke through the Spirit in all kinds of tongues."²

After this brief appearance these strange gifts vanish away again; and the few later notices bearing on the subject have reference to wild cries, unmeaning sounds, and convulsive gestures, such as those which called forth the sternest possible rebuke from St. Chrysostom. In other words, the gifts had nothing whatever to do with that mastery of known articulate languages which is ascribed to the disciples in the Acts. What inference is it possible to draw except this, that the writer of the Acts of the Apostles³ must as an historian be

¹ *Annot. in Act. X.* 38.

² *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 296.

³ For the explanation we have probably not far to go. Acts ii. 13, belongs to that representation of the gift of tongues which is given by St. Paul. The sounds were unintelligible, therefore the men who uttered them were not sober. Acts ii. 11, goes on the supposition that the various visitors at the feast (the strangers from the several countries) had no

placed on much the same level with the Hebrew chronicler? Whether the utterances of which St. Paul speaks were related to the manifestations of more modern times, is a question which may have interest for those who think that some good purpose may be answered by excitement, rapture, or ecstasy. What the latter may be we may gather to some extent from the accounts of those who profess to have experienced them; and of these reports the Bishop gives a specimen,¹ adding that we have no difficulty in concluding that the whole of these developments

“were due to a state of religious excitement, unnatural and undesirable,—very hurtful indeed to the true spiritual life.”

With his usual carefulness in the measurement of his words the Bishop remarks that the reports of what took place at Corinth, when carried to St. Paul?

“caused him much anxiety, though he would not undertake to pronounce it an entire delusion.”

In truth he could not do so, because by some means he had convinced himself that he could speak with tongues more abundantly than all the rest; and that in some way or other he was the better for being able to do so, as otherwise he could scarcely have thanked God for the difference. From the very nature of the case it was impossible for St. Paul to explain the meaning of the unspeakable words which he had heard in Paradise: but meaningless sounds are for human beings unprofitable sounds. On this point the Bishop contents himself with saying that St. Paul had

“a great deal of mystical enthusiasm in his character.”²

common speech, therefore the speaking with tongues must have meant the mastery of foreign languages. The two notions are blended, the latter being of decidedly later growth.

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 297.

² *Ib.* p. 299. The whole sermon deserves to be very carefully considered.

This "mystical enthusiasm" has been one of the many influences which can scarcely be said to have worked for the good either of Eastern or of Western Christendom; and it must have worked yet more mischief, if his periods of rapture and ecstasy had really disturbed the balance of his sober judgement. That they should not have done so is one of the most remarkable characteristics of this most wonderful man. After all, we are concerned with facts, and not with visions, and we have to ascertain what the facts of the first century of the Christian era may have been. According to Gregory the Great,

"the Church does daily in a spiritual manner what it did then by the Apostles in a temporal sense. When the priests lay their hands upon believers by the grace of exorcism, and forbid malignant spirits to dwell in their minds, what else do they do but cast out devils? And all the faithful who now abandon the words of this world, and utter forth sacred mysteries, these speak with new tongues; they who by their good exhortations take away ill-feeling from the hearts of others, these take up serpents."

This, with more which the Bishop quotes,¹ may attest the goodness of Gregory's heart, as well as his sound sense; but his method is either of that risky kind which may make anything mean anything (as when he himself speaks of the three daughters of Job as representing the Trinity, or else the faithful laity), or is one which may justify a conclusion vastly wider than his own. The uprooting of evil feelings by means of good exhortations is a taking up of serpents. If one injunction or promise may be so interpreted, so may all. It is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that the commissions given to the Apostles at the beginning and end of the ministry, as also to the seventy, were couched in the same form. In each case they are charged to deal with physical conditions to

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 301.

which we may attach allegorical or spiritual meanings. All are susceptible of the interpretations of Gregory the Great ; and it is only through such interpretations that they can be reconciled to our moral sense. It is, then, perfectly probable (or, rather, is it not certain ?) that a strictly spiritual commission charging them with spiritual duties has been translated into the language of outward marvel and prodigy. When in his answer to the Baptist's disciples Jesus is said to have referred to the healing of the sick and the raising of the dead, He was most assuredly speaking of those who were sick to death morally, "dead in trespasses and sins," and it was the mere casual gloss of a later scribe which inserted the parenthesis in the third Gospel, asserting that in that same hour he exhibited a number of outward signs and wonders such as could satisfy none, teach none, and benefit none. Of the outward signs the first Gospel makes no mention, and the narrative in this Gospel comes with a force of which it is almost wholly deprived in the other. To do battle with superstition is one of the very first of Christian duties ; and superstition has been the hydra of the Christian Church from the earliest ages. It was full blown in the days of Tertullian, who could gravely speak of ecstatic sisters to whom

"the Spirit appeared, but not of an empty or shapeless quality, but as something which gave hope of being held, tender and bright and of an ærial hue, and altogether of human form."

Of such gross superstition the Bishop reminds us that we may find abundant instances in the *Journals* of John Wesley ;

"for that excellent man, amidst all the good which he undoubtedly was the instrument of doing, has done this evil, to make cries and tears, sighs and groans, disordered vision and diseased imagination, rank with many as undoubted evidences of true conversion, true turning of the heart to

God, true turning of the soul's eye to the light of the Sun of righteousness."¹

At the time during which these series of sermons were preached, the Bishop was morally bound to justify and make clear to his English fellow-countrymen the course which the cause of truth had compelled him to take in the criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures. He had also to vindicate his action as one which was, under the circumstances, the most suitable to his office as a missionary Bishop. The survey which has now been made of some of these remarkable discourses may suffice to show how thoroughly he succeeded in both these tasks. The critical portion of his work becomes the means of enforcing moral and spiritual lessons of supreme moment. The history of the Levitical legislation serves to exhibit with startling clearness the righteous teaching of Jeremiah and the other great prophets in their battle with a sensual and cruel idolatry. But, in dealing with subjects referring to the Old Testament or the New, there is everywhere the same earnest effort to bring men to see the holiness of the Divine law and to pray for the quickening power of the Divine love.²

¹ *Natal Sermons*, II. p. 307.

² The readers of the *Natal Sermons* will notice the frequency of quotations from the poems of Tennyson, especially from "In Memoriam" and "The Two Voices," and the enjoyment which the Bishop manifestly derived from the wisdom and truth of their teaching. It was his habit to take a volume of "In Memoriam" with him as a pocket companion during his long and solitary rides through the colony.

CHAPTER III.

THE ROMILLY JUDGEMENT.—WORK IN NATAL.

1867.

THE celebrated judgement of Lord Romilly (Bishop of Natal *v.* Gladstone and others) was delivered November 6, 1866. This judgement, it is scarcely necessary to say, has never been appealed against, and it remains law. Nor need we add that it is law so clear, precise, and full, that it must be regarded as closing every question relating to the subject, until the decision itself has been reversed. As to the special point at issue, the judge ruled that the plaintiff retained his legal *status* as Bishop of Natal notwithstanding the assumption of fact made in the judgement of the Judicial Committee (who, as we have seen,¹ were in reference to the history of the Natal colony, misinformed as to facts); that though the letters patent might not confer upon him any effective coercive jurisdiction over his clergy, he could still enforce obedience by having recourse to the civil courts, and that, as no allegation was raised in the pleadings against the plaintiff's character or doctrine, he was intitled to the income of the endowment.

The decision, however, is not less important now² than when it was delivered. The defendants pleaded that the letters patent had failed to create a Bishop of Natal. Lord

¹ Vol. I. p. 260.

² September 1887.

Romilly ruled that Dr. Colenso was Bishop of Natal, and would remain so until he died, or resigned, or was legally removed. The Bishop has ceased from his long toil, and the members of the Church of England in Natal have unanimously elected another to fill the see, which the adherents of Dr. Gray in the so-called Church of South Africa wish manifestly to suppress. With exhaustive foresight, Lord Romilly dealt with the whole question thus raised, and if the election of the Church Council in Natal is to be rejected by the Crown, the decision of the Master of the Rolls must first be formally reversed. There is not a single argument urged by Bishop Gray's followers which is not anticipated and set aside by Lord Romilly. It has been contended that the Church of South Africa and the Church of England are one and the same thing. Lord Romilly lays it down

“that where there is no State religion established by the Legislature in any colony, and in such a colony is found a number of persons who are members of the Church of England, and who establish a Church there with the doctrines, rites, and ordinances of the Church of *England*, it is a part of the Church of England, and the members of it are, by implied agreement, bound by all its laws. In other words, the association is bound by the doctrines, rites, rules, and ordinances of the Church of England, except so far as any statutes may exist which (though relating to this subject) are confined in their operation to the limits of the United Kingdom of England and Ireland. Accordingly, upon reference to the civil tribunal, in the event of any resistance to the order of the Bishop in any such colony, the court would have to inquire, not what were the peculiar opinions of the persons associated together in the colony as members of the Church of England, but what were the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England itself obedience to which doctrines and discipline the court would have to enforce. . . .

“But if a class of persons should, in any colony similarly circumstanced, call themselves by any other name—such as, for instance, the Church of *South Africa*—then the court would have to inquire, as a matter of fact, upon proper evidence, what the doctrines, ordinances, and discipline of that Church were; and when these were made plain, obedience to them would be enforced against all the members of that Church. But the fact of calling themselves in communion with the Church of *England* would not make such a Church a part of the Church of *England*, nor would it make the members of that Church members of the Church of *England*. . . .

“Any Church established by voluntary association may call itself in union and full communion with any other Church. A Lutheran Church, established in *South Africa*, might call itself in union and full communion with the Church of *England*; but the truth of the assertion is a distinct matter. But if certain persons constitute themselves a voluntary association in any colony as members of the Church of *England*, then, as I apprehend, they are strictly members and brethren of that Church, though severed by a great distance from their native country and their parent Church.”

The question had been already raised and considered by the Judicial Committee in the case of *Long v. the Bishop of Capetown*. Mr. Long had professed to submit himself to the discipline and ordinances of the Church of England. A so-called Synod, convened by Dr. Gray, had laid down rules not in accordance with that discipline, and the imposition of those rules on Mr. Long, or on any one else who had not consented to them, was declared illegal. It was not questioned that the Bishop of Capetown possessed the authority of a Bishop of the Church of England; but

“it was because the Bishop had exceeded that authority, and because the Lords of the Privy Council could not find

anything in the evidence to show that Mr. Long had assented to anything more than this, that they declared the sentence of the Bishop of Capetown to be null and void."

Lord Romilly further asserts that the principle involved in this ruling is one which quickly commends itself to the mind of English colonists generally; and speaking of the consequences which must flow from this principle when put into practice, he says,

"that as soon as this matter shall have become clearly understood by the English residents in the colony, there will be a rapid and large secession from the Church which was only in union and full communion with the Church of *England* to the Church of *England* herself, which even in those distant colonies would receive and foster her brethren as part and parcel of her own peculiar flock."

To bring out into still clearer light certain contingencies which might arise, and which in fact have arisen, Lord Romilly adds:—

"That any number of persons, if they so pleased, might, though holding the doctrines of the Church of *England*, reject, either wholly or in part, the discipline and government of that Church, though they preserved still the creed, faith, and doctrines of the Church of *England*, is unquestionable. . . . But this association would not be a branch of the Church of England, although it might call itself strictly in union and full communion with it. By the law of the Church of *England* the Sovereign is the head of the Church; and in substance (for the *congé d'élire* is nothing more than a form) no Bishop can be lawfully nominated or appointed except by the Sovereign, nor, as I apprehend, would any person be legally consecrated a Bishop of such Church except by the command of the Sovereign."

Lord Romilly attacks, further, the plea most of all urged in favour of the Church of South Africa, viz. that the Chris-

tian life will best be fostered by societies independent of the law of the Church of England as interpreted by the decisions of the Sovereign in Council. He says :—

“This object will be far better accomplished by securing a uniform administration of the same law throughout the colonies instead of founding separate and independent Churches, each framing its own rules of discipline. . . . The judgement of the Privy Council has declared, in the case of Mr. Long, that the Bishop of Capetown has an effective ecclesiastical jurisdiction, provided it be administered in accordance with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of *England*, and in a manner consonant with the principles of justice ; that, if it be so administered, it will be enforced and carried into execution by the power of the civil tribunals, but that if it be not so administered, it is a nullity ; and that whether it be or be not so administered is a question to be determined by the civil tribunals of the colony, with an ultimate appeal to the Sovereign in Council.”

Lastly, he had to deal with the question of the endowments of the see.

“If no portion of the funds of which the defendants are trustees can be applied towards the payment of the salary of the Bishop of Natal, no portion of these funds can properly be applied towards the payment of the salary of any other colonial Bishop similarly circumstanced. Are no more Bishops to be appointed in colonies having an established Legislature, and having no established Church ? Are the ministers and congregations of the Church of England in such colonies to be left without the advantages which are found to flow from the superintendence and watchful care of a Bishop ?

“Another difficulty, and one which would seriously affect the defendants, is this : If the suit of the plaintiff were dismissed, what is to be done with the money dedicated for the endowment of a Bishop of *Natal* and the accumulated income since 1864 ? Is it to go on accumulating ? Is it

to be retained by the trustees for their own benefit because no *cestui que trust* exists? Can it be returned to the subscribers? and, if not, is it to be applied *cy près*? The mere statement of these propositions shows that it is impossible that any one of them should be adopted. In my opinion, the truth is shortly this: These funds were subscribed to induce the Crown to appoint a Bishop of *Natal*. The Crown acceded to that wish of the subscribers, and by letters patent appointed the plaintiff Bishop of *Natal*, and the Archbishop of Canterbury has duly consecrated him Bishop of *Natal*, in compliance with the directions of the Sovereign, and accordingly the plaintiff is Bishop of *Natal* in every sense of the word, and will remain so until he dies, or resigns, or until the letters patent appointing him are revoked, or until he is in some manner lawfully deprived of his see."

Lord Romilly then proceeds to deal with the notion that, under these circumstances, Dr. Colenso must be irremovable. Far from this, he says:—

"I entertain no doubt that if he had not performed his part in the contract entered into by him, that if he had failed to comply with 'the covenants of his trust,' he could not compel payment of his stipend. The contract he has entered into is involved in the words 'Bishop of the Church of England as by law established.'"

But he goes on to say that

"not a word in the pleadings and evidence before me is breathed against either the moral character or the religious opinions entertained by the plaintiff. Of course, it would be foolish in me were I to pretend ignorance of what has been at the root of the proceedings against the plaintiff in Capetown, and of the refusal of the defendants to pay to the plaintiff the income attached to the bishopric of *Natal*; but judicially, in this case, where I am bound to proceed *secundum allegata et probata*, I am bound to ignore this matter altogether. Whether, if the case had been raised,

I should have suspended my judgement on it until proceedings had been taken by *scire facias* in the courts of common law, or until recourse had been had by petition to the Sovereign, whom the members of the Church of England in *Natal* might, as I apprehend, have petitioned on this subject, it is unnecessary for me now to speculate. This I hold certain, that if no other court could have been found to try the question I should have been bound to do so. . . .
 "I must therefore pronounce a decree in the terms of the plaintiff's bill."¹

So was drawn up what may be regarded strictly as the charter of the Colonial Church; and so was laid down a system which, if carried out, would have extinguished at once that bitter contention of antagonistic bodies, of which, by the action of the Bishop of Capetown and his adherents, South Africa has been made the scene.

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 8, 1867.*

. . . "And now let me return your kind congratulations on Lord Romilly's magnificent judgement. I need hardly say that it completely satisfies all our wishes, and much more than satisfies our best expectations. As far as the colony is concerned, my position is now, I think, impregnable, and, of course, has been greatly strengthened by the decision, though it was so strong before that a churchwarden, who mixes freely with both parties, told Messrs. Newnham and Callaway, a week or so before it arrived, that 'out of eight men there would be seven for the Bishop, one for the Dean, and none for them.' . . . N— tells me that he shall make one last attempt to stir up some influential persons in England to bring me to account, and, if he finds they will not, he shall withdraw all semblance of opposition, and treat me as an

¹ The principles laid down in Lord Romilly's judgement are insisted upon with, if it be possible, greater force, and more fully in detail, in the judgement of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the appeal of Merriman (Bishop of Grahamstown) *v.* Williams (Dean of Grahamstown), delivered June 28, 1882.

English clergyman would his Bishop. This is very gracious and condescending, truly ; however, it is a good deal from one of his crotchety spirit. . . . By next mail I shall be able, I hope, to give you more definite information as to our doings in consequence of the judgement, which has really taken away our breath on both sides of the theological camp. I shall not act under it until the next mail arrives, which will show whether they mean to appeal or not. It seems hardly possible that they should, though I have quite made up my mind to be brought to account myself for my books. On further consideration, however, I see so much reason for the Bishops shrinking from the consequences of such a trial, whether they succeed or fail, that I am by no means sure they will attempt it. If they fail, of course their discomfiture would be most complete. If they succeed, it will only be to fasten an intolerable yoke upon the necks of the English clergy, who are just beginning to awake from their long slumber, and will not, I imagine, endure to be *compelled* to say that we are all descended *from* Adam.

“ My Cathedral case comes on the day after to-morrow. . . .

If we succeed, as I think we must, especially after the recent judgement, my first act will be to notify to F—— and R—— that they are no longer to officiate in the Cathedral ; and, if they persist, I must get an interdict to compel obedience to my orders. This will raise the question, perhaps, whether F—— is, or is not (as I maintain that he is), *ipso facto* excommunicate, under the Seventy-Third Canon, for what he has done in electing a Bishop. Then I shall give notice to Green that at the end of February he must quit his house, the Deanery, and must cease to hold his schismatical services in the Cathedral. The cry of ‘ martyrdom ’ will be raised, of course ; but it will only be echoed by a few here, or, I should suppose, anywhere, after all his past career, and the recent decision. . . .

“ I expect that by the next or the following mail our laity, and probably some of the clergy, will send home an address to the S.P.G., thanking them for past favours, pointing out that their present Committee consists of five, of whom four

are seceders from the Church of England, and whose principles in distribution of their funds are notorious, and suggesting that in future they should be placed in the hands of a Committee, consisting of all the duly-licensed clergy, and all the duly-admitted churchwardens, with the Bishop as President. Probably also Dr. Callaway, who is the only non-seceding member of the Committee, will address the Society himself upon the subject, declining to act any longer on the present Committee. . . .

“I often feel, we both do, that I have never half expressed to you the deep sense which I entertain of all your kindness. I can only hope that you will understand what may never be expressed, and that you may find some reward in the delight of seeing the great work going forward by the combined action of different fellow-workers, each in his own line, of whom you yourself are one of the first and foremost.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *January 20, 1867.*

“The Cathedral case was heard at last, ten days ago, and the judges will determine it on January 31. My lawyers *expect* the decision to be in my favour, and indeed I cannot conceive how it can well be otherwise. But I should not be surprised if they do not give me costs against Bishop Gray. The fact is that the second judge is a thorough partisan of the opposite faction. . . . Although we had had Lord Romilly’s judgement a fortnight, he asserted that the Queen could not make a diocese, that the Bishop of Capetown may have exercised his lawful power as trustee in obstructing an unsound teacher; whereas our argument, of course, was that the present Bishop of Capetown never was trustee. . . . Offy Shepstone (as we call him to distinguish him from his father, both being Theophilus), on my side, spoke, they say, remarkably well, so as even to draw an encomium from Mr. Connor, who seemed to have fresh light thrown upon his mind, and begged a copy of the Romilly judgement to take home with him. We have had it reprinted

and circulated freely here, and it is universally admired, except, of course, by some of the extreme right."

The Bishop goes on to speak of the measures to be taken with Mr. Green.

"My intention is to set forth his various offences, concluding with his participation in the election of a new Bishop, . . . and call upon him to show cause before me why his licence should not be withdrawn. He will probably not appear, or appear under protest. I must try to get our acting Attorney-General . . . to sit with me as assessor, and so pronounce judgement. Then comes the question, 'Must I now allow an appeal to Capetown?' as my own lawyer advised me to do under the Privy Council judgement. Lord Romilly seems to determine the contrary. At any rate I must bring the case before the Supreme Court, and get their opinion about it. This will be done by my withdrawing my licence, when he will no doubt still go on officiating, or keep the registers, &c., and then I must apply for an interdict, to which he may reply that he has appealed to the Metropolitan under the patent. It is to be hoped our court will set aside this plea. Otherwise Bishop Gray will, of course, overrule every decision of mine. In fact, if they allow the appeal, instead of determining upon the lawfulness of my act themselves, it does not seem to me that they can revise *his* judgement, and they would only have to say that, as my superior has (whether justly or not) set aside my decision, there was an end to the matter. In that case, it would be useless for me to remain here, unless I presented a petition to the Queen to call Bishop Gray to account for his proceedings against me. I see, indeed, that this case *may* open up some very grave questions."

Speaking of a meeting held at Richmond, the Bishop remarks:—

"Mr. Tozer had at first refused to call the meeting by my direction. So my registrar wrote to the churchwardens,

and they called it, and *he* delivers himself as you will see. He declares that he holds no licence from me, that I have no power over the clergy, and that he will still refuse to acknowledge me as his diocesan. As soon as it appears that there will be no appeal against Lord Romilly's judgement, I must, I think, call him to account for his words. . . . But could not you get Dean Stanley to move in this matter with the S.P.G. ? That Society will be guilty of the most gross breach of faith with its subscribers, if it supports this downright rebellion, and, as I see, tries to raise £1,000 a year to send out clergy here to resist my authority, though confirmed by the highest authority in the land. . . . If they would withdraw from the diocese altogether, I should manage well enough. But their present course is monstrous."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *February 8, 1867.*

. . . "We have gained our Cathedral case, with costs, by the decisive judgement of two judges. But the third, Mr. Connor, . . . delivered a lengthy judgement against me, which will, I think, excite some amusement among English lawyers. He says that the patents are worth *nothing*, and that Bishop Gray is possessed of the property as a private individual. I hope that Mr. Stephen or some one will expose the absurdity of his proceedings. The mischief of it is that it just emboldens the Green party to give notice of appeal to the Privy Council, which they have done, and so I suppose we shall sink another £2,000 into the abyss. However, they surely have not a leg to stand on in this matter, and we must get a judgement with costs, as it seems to me.

" . . . I see that S.P.G. has published, *after* and in plain defiance of Lord Romilly's judgement, a scandalous set of resolutions with respect to this diocese. (1) They agree to pay the expenses of a Bishop visiting Natal at any time at the request of Bishop Gray—that is, they support him in introducing a Bishop into this diocese. (2) They approve

- of Mr. Green's turning one of the first laymen in the colony . . . out of their Committee, . . . and substituting a 'faithful,' *i.e.* a subservient, layman. (3) They remodel their Committee to give it an appearance of not being merely Mr. Green and Co.; but practically it will be simply his Committee still. (4) They sanction the appropriation of the Natal grant by their Standing Committee. (5) 'Resolved to issue and circulate, subject to the approval of the President of this Society, the Archbishop of Canterbury, an appeal for additional clergy in Natal;' that is, they are going to swamp this diocese with their rebels.
- "Well! this manifesto of theirs only makes it more necessary for me to see whether I have power to exclude these men from the buildings of the Church of England. . . .
- "The Bishop of London's Charge is very trimming. But St. David's comes out manfully. They both sent me copies of their Charges.
- " . . . Lord Carnarvon's letter to the Bishop of Montreal does not seem to do more than confirm, on the authority of the law officers of the Crown, a point which we had no doubt about, *viz.* that colonial Bishops could 'consecrate' without a Royal mandate. I took part in such a consecration some years ago when Bishop Mackenzie was consecrated, and had not the slightest doubt as to our liberty of action on that occasion. But can we make a colonial Bishop, *i.e.* appoint a Bishop to a see within the British Empire? 'Bishop of Niagara' is only a title, as Bishop of Maritzburg would be. The former may no doubt be called to help the Bishop of Toronto, just as Bishop Anderson is at this time called in to ordain for the Bishop of London. And so I might call in the Bishop of Maritzburg to help me. But without my licence I apprehend he could not lawfully minister within any of the churches in this diocese. I am still waiting to hear from Mr. Shaen that there will be no appeal. Not having had a line from him since the decision itself, I take it for granted that there is some reason or other for his delay in communicating formally what the papers have stated freely enough. But of course I cannot

act merely upon their information. Up to this time therefore I have taken no steps whatever against any of the disorderly clergy, except to intimate, in the letter I published immediately after the election, that by that act the seven electors seemed to fall under the Seventy-third Canon, and were become '*ipso facto* excommunicate'—that is, as I explained, not separated, as Bishop Gray profanely says, 'from the Church of the Living God,' but merely 'from the United Church of England and Ireland as by law established.' I see the Church papers talk of my having threatened to excommunicate them. Please to contradict this, as I should be sorry to be thought such a goose as to do anything of the kind. But it seems to me that under the Seventy-third Canon they have excommunicated themselves by their own act—that is, in other words, have seceded from the Church of England. . . . If Mr. Butler comes, he will find things here very different, I expect, from what he imagines. And perhaps his coming, which Mr. Green says is certain, will bring matters to a crisis, and make my position here stronger than ever."

The history of the legal proceedings which the Bishop was compelled at this time to take will be sufficiently given in the letters which follow. The principles by which he was guided are set forth with the greatest clearness in an address to the clergy and laity, dated March 25, 1867.

"Whatever I may trust to receive from some, at least, of my clergy, I only require from all that obedience which is legally due, and which is indispensable for the general good. The clergy well know that I have never at any time during my episcopacy shown any desire to restrict them in the free utterance of their own religious sentiments, within the wide limits allowed by the laws of the Church of England. . . . I shall assume, therefore, that all the clergy who have formerly received my licences to officiate, and who, after this notice, decide to retain them, intend to act under them, and pay to me, as Bishop, due canonical obedience—

except in three instances—where the rights of the laity are concerned.”

These three instances were those of the Dean, of Mr. F. S. Robinson, and Archdeacon Fearn.

“In two of these cases,” the Bishop said, “the laymen aggrieved have appealed to me, as Bishop, to maintain their just rights, and I am bound to do so. . . . If any of the clergy are not willing to comply . . . with the plain demands of the law, but will still persist in declaring the Bishop of this diocese, appointed by Her Majesty, to have been lawfully deposed and excommunicated, in defiance of the repeated decisions of the courts of law, both in England and in this colony, and will therefore still refuse to pay him that canonical obedience which is legally due to him, while assuming to minister within the churches under his authority, it will be obvious to all of you that they can have no right any longer to be regarded as clergymen of the United Church of England and Ireland. And I am sure that you will feel that the sooner such an anomalous and disorderly state of things is brought to a close the better for all.

“If, however, anything more were needed to make my duty at this time plain to me, it would be offered by the recent acts of the Bishop of Capetown, and the Gospel Propagation Society.

“The Bishop of Capetown declared in his recent Pastoral, issued after the reception of Lord Romilly’s judgement, and with express reference to it, that he and others ‘feel constrained to resist, at all costs and hazards, be they what they may, the imposition of the Privy Council yoke upon the necks of colonial churches;’ that he ‘will adhere to’ the system which ‘subordinates the priest to the Bishop, the Bishop to the Metropolitan, and the Metropolitan to the Archbishop of Canterbury,’ and according to which ‘all appeals end there.’ . . . In other words, he distinctly repudiates the fundamental principle of the Church of

England—that is, of the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established in the mother country—to which we all belong; and he rejects openly the decisions of its Supreme Court of Appeal. He uses, in fact, the phrase ‘Church of England’ in a sense of his own, to denote an imaginary Church, an ‘Ecclesia of England,’ as present to his mind’s eye, in which the Supreme Governor shall be, not the Sovereign, but the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the administration entirely in the hands of ecclesiastics.”

TO SIR CHARLES LYELL.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *March 27, 1867.*

- “Thank you very much indeed for your kind letter which reached us yesterday, and especially for the note about Dean Milman’s argument with reference to the notices about Egypt in the Pentateuch. On another paper, inclosed, I have put down my thoughts in reply to it, and have also made one or two quotations from an eminent German critic (whose work only reached me yesterday) which may interest the Dean, though in direct contradiction to his notions about the age of Deuteronomy. The fact is, the Dean has not mastered the criticism of the Pentateuch, and at his age it was not to be expected that he should. The only thing to be regretted is that he should throw the weight of his great name into the scale of the opposition, without having made sure of his ground, and even help them to throw ridicule upon some of us who are slaving in no very pleasant work, underground, in dark dreary mines of labour, in the hope by God’s help to get some day at the real truth as to the composition of the Pentateuch, as Kepler did at last, after much toilsome effort spent in vain, in respect of the three great laws of planetary motion.
- “You will see by the printed papers which I send you by this mail that I have at last called three of my recalcitrant clergy to account in a *forum domesticum* before myself and two legal assessors. These latter have taken time to consider their judgement, which I have to give on May 9. It was

impossible to do otherwise. Within the last month another opposition clergyman has been borrowed from Bishop Twells in the Free State, and set up under the Dean in my own Cathedral, without the slightest regard to my authority, under Bishop Gray's licence. And as Mr. Butler, in the letter published here from him to the Dean, evidently says in effect *volo episcopari*, and as it is plain that the Bishop of Oxford means, if possible, to send him, I am compelled to take the necessary steps for maintaining my own position, in respect of the Cathedral and other Church property of this diocese. Things, however, are going on very well here. One of the opposition clergy, finding that his people will not follow his leading, has resigned, and is going to England. Another has begged me to allow him time to communicate with S.P.G.; but has promised to prepare children for my approaching confirmation. Another read prayers for me lately, as of old, receiving me at his house as in former days. . . . So upon the whole we are quietly progressing here. But by the mail just arrived, the Dean has had some private letter which says that the Bishops at Lambeth have agreed 'to petition the Queen to cancel Colenso's letters patent.' What this really means, it is impossible to conjecture at present. But as they can hardly be such geese as merely to ask the Queen to chop my head off, I suppose it must mean that they are going to try at last to bring the *merits* of the case into court, and are in fact going to ask for a Commission to try me. Well I shall be ready for that, I hope, when necessary. Only I suppose I should be dragged to England for it, and that would give the enemy some advantage in my absence. By this time, you, no doubt, know in England all about the Bishops' kind intentions towards me."

The following is the paper referred to in the preceding letter :—

"According to my view *none* of the notices about Egyptian affairs in the Pentateuch were written by the Elohist of

Samuel's age; though even then, as Samuel's sons were made judges at Beersheba, on the very confines of Egypt (1 Samuel viii. 2), and there was, I believe, a considerable traffic from Egypt through Canaan, there would be nothing unreasonable in supposing the Elohist acquainted to some extent with Egyptian customs.

“But he who writes about Egypt is the Jehovist, writing in the latter part of David's reign and the beginning of Solomon's. If Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, it is clear that there must have been for some time a friendly intercourse between the Egyptian king and David, whose conquests must have made him famous in those parts. Solomon had done nothing to attract attention. In the time of the Jehovist, then, even put as early as I put it, there was nothing to prevent such a writer having a tolerably accurate knowledge of Egyptian affairs. But I confess I can see very little in the Pentateuch which required any such knowledge, except perhaps in Genesis xlvii. 22-26, and that I have assigned to the *latest* period of his writing, in Solomon's reign.

“I received yesterday by this mail a very able German critical work by Dr. K. H. Graf, Professor at Meissen, published last year at Leipzig, from which I quote one or two passages singularly in accordance with some of my views. He begins at once in p. 1: ‘Among the most generally admitted results of the historical criticism of the Old Testament may be reckoned, for all who do not turn away with aversion from those results in general, *the composition of Deuteronomy in the age of Josiah.*’

“And he considers this so certain that he takes it for granted without another word, and starts with it as the basis of his whole investigation in a most laborious work of 250 pages. Then on p. 110 he writes:—‘I leave for the present unsettled the question whether the *Deuteronomist is identical with the prophet Jeremiah* (who in that case would be the writer of Deuteronomy), since this has no further bearing on the results of my present inquiry. But to the reasons alleged by Hävernick’ (an orthodox writer) ‘for Jeremiah's

having been the writer of the *Books of Kings*, may be added this also, that Jeremiah *is never once named in them*, and even then, when we might have expected him to appear, mention is made only of the word of Jehovah "through his servants the prophets" (2 Kings xxi. 10, xxiv. 2; compare xvii. 23); whereas any other writer than Jeremiah himself would surely have given us some particulars about his activity and fate under Josiah and the following kings, as is the case with respect to Isaiah and the earlier prophets."

"But if Jeremiah is to be regarded as the author of the Books of Kings (and so Lord A. Hervey says, *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. pp. 28, 29: 'The Jewish tradition which ascribes them to Jeremiah is borne out by the strongest internal evidence, in addition to that of the language'), Dr. Graf also identifies the author of the Kings with the Deuteronomist, saying, on p. 108, 'That the author [of Kings] in his judgement of religious matters takes the same stand-point as Deuteronomy and the reformation in Josiah's time needs not to be remarked. We must, in fact, recognise in him the Deuteronomist himself.'"

The Bishop had been for some time expecting Mr. Gray, Canon of St. Helena, to join him in his work. In a letter to Mr. Domville, dated March 20, 1867, he speaks of him as having landed at Durban on the 15th, and as being likely to prove a valuable fellow-worker. Mr. Gray had lived on terms of intimate friendship with Bishop Welby, and his name stood high in the estimation of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Bishop now felt himself bound to take action in accordance with the judgements which had really determined every point of importance connected with the position of the Church of England in the colonies generally. He therefore sent to Mr. Green, to Archdeacon Fearn, and to Mr. Walton, the following letter:—

"March 28, 1867.

"As you have plainly shown by numerous acts during the past year that you do not desire to be bound by the laws of

the United Church of England and Ireland, and as it will become my imperative duty to take such action in reference to those acts as my position seems to require, I have thought it best to offer you an opportunity of preventing the public scandal which the measures I shall be obliged to take against you may cause, by resigning the licence you hold to minister within this diocese as a minister of the United Church of England and Ireland, unless you are prepared to conform yourself in all points to the laws of that Church in future."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 9, 1867.*

"I am afraid that this will be the only letter that I shall be able to write by this mail, for I am overwhelmed with business. . . . This is Tuesday, and on Thursday three of my refractory clergy are summoned to appear before me and two legal assessors. . . . We think it best to take no further action in that matter till the Supreme Court sits again on May 1, when we shall apply for the possession of the church (of which I am trustee), and my lawyers have no doubt about getting it. The only question will then be, if Bishop Gray, as Metropolitan, would have any lawful power to license a clergyman to that church in my absence from the colony—an absence caused by himself—when the commissary, whom I had left to represent me, had also resigned and gone to England. If so, I may have to take proceedings against Mr. R—also, instead of being able, as I hope, to get rid of him by simply saying that he holds no licence. . . . Mr. Green, I hear, has said at Durban that they quite understand that they have separated from the Church of England; that they mean to give up the churches, &c., and have their own quiet body by themselves; that Dr. Colenso will not live for ever, and Mr. Butler will by and by be Bishop in his place, and then they will get the churches back again, &c. But I must say they do not show the least sign of vacating the

churches. By this mail they are bound to send home the papers for the appeal to the Privy Council about the Cathedral. . . . If they do not, to-morrow when the mail goes their time for appeal will be exhausted, and we shall get possession and our costs. But I suppose they will hardly do this. I take it for granted, therefore, that Mr. Shaen will get instructions by this mail to defend the action."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 20, 1867.*

"Since my last I have tried the three clergy. They made no appearance. Everything went off quietly and satisfactorily. Some of the other camp, as well as of ours, were present during the proceedings, which took one day and a half. I think the two lawyers are satisfied that everything charged was duly proved, except the first charge against Green, which rested upon an insertion in the *Mercury* (no doubt put in by himself), which we had not the editor at hand to bring home to the writer. The assessors have taken time to consider what judgement they will frame for me, and notice has been given that it will be delivered on May 9. What then will Green and the rest do? They will take no notice, I expect, of my judgement, if (as I expect) it deprives them; but will go on ministering as before. Then, of course, I must apply to the Supreme Court for an interdict, which will, no doubt, be granted; and then I suspect they will appeal to the Privy Council against such a decision. This is their policy, I hear—to wear me out, by putting every possible obstruction in the way of restoring order. . . .

"We cannot learn anything about the names in the address to Butler, about which Mr. Green was so busy when I last wrote. He is said to have got about 300 signatures altogether,—men, women, and children,—only fifteen in Durban (population, *whites* of all denominations, 3,000, and the Church comprising its fair share of them), the rest partly in Maritzburg, and partly about the colony. I heard

yesterday that the address from my friends in Maritzburg alone had about 300 names attached."

With Dr. Pusey it is unnecessary to say that the Bishop of Natal had no personal acquaintance. But it may be well to give some extracts from a letter which the Bishop addressed to him, June 6, 1867. Dr. Pusey, if he was not unfairly judged, was seldom unwilling to avail himself of accidents of law in claiming the sanction of the English Church for his own dogmas or beliefs. It is only right that the nature of his position, as compared with that of the Bishop, should be clearly understood.

"In the *Guardian* of March 13, which has reached me by this mail, you are stated to have written as follows, in an appendix to your sermon preached before the University of Oxford on the fourth Sunday after Epiphany, after putting forth your own views on the Holy Communion, which are not those generally held by the members of the Church of England :—

" 'These truths I hold not as "opinions" but as matters of faith, for which, if need were, I would gladly suffer the loss of all things. These truths I would thankfully have to maintain, by the help of God, on such terms that if, *per impossibile, as I trust, it should be decided by a competent authority*, that either the real Objective Presence, or the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or the worship of Christ there present (as I have above stated those doctrines), *were contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England, I would resign my office. Extra-judicial censures, or contradictions, or opinions, if directed against faith or truth, condemn none but their authors. Censures and criticisms of Bishops, in 1841-45, have passed away, except in mournful effects upon individuals. The system which they criticised has lived, strengthened, rooted deeper, through adversity.*'

"Again, in the *Guardian* of March 27, at a meeting of the English Church Union, you are reported to have said :—

“ ‘There is another reason why we should the more readily be quiet, and that is, that storms in England soon pass away. . . . England will acquiesce—it is the temperament of Englishmen to acquiesce—almost in anything. *Our countrymen have been stirred up, and the marvel to me is, that, considering the instruments which have been used,—the falsehoods, the misrepresentations, and the suppressions of the truth, even while the truth has been partially told,—I say, the wonder to my mind is, that they should not be stirred up a great deal more. For it seems to me, though we must not boast too soon, that this attempt to excite the people has proved an almost entire failure. Then, one trusts, too, that the real state of things may be seen by the opposing party, or at least by a portion of it.*

“ Once more, in a letter to Mr. Golightly, reprinted in the *Guardian* of April 3, you have written as follows :—

“ ‘A paper has been sent to me with the signature of “A Clergyman of the Diocese of Oxford of more than thirty years’ standing,” in which mention is made of me. The words, I am told, are declared by a good legal opinion to be “clearly actionable.” I am not, of course, after having had all sorts of things said of me for thirty-three years, going to seek redress for myself. But what occasions me to write is, that I am told the paper is yours ; and then I wish to remonstrate with you about the words, “Dr. Pusey *professes* to belong to the Church of England,” for this involves a charge of insincerity, *which one Christian ought not to bring against another. . . . I have heretofore challenged eminent persons to substantiate charges of this sort in a court of law. . . . There must be some means of impleading one who would be glad to be impleaded. . . . I think that the churchwardens of the diocese of Oxford would not think it an English proceeding for a “person to make charges which, when challenged, he cannot substantiate.”*

“ I need hardly say that I heartily adopt every word of yours which I have italicised, substituting only ‘criticisms on the Pentateuch’ for ‘the real Objective Presence,’ &c., and perhaps moderating a little the language which speaks

of the 'falsehoods, misrepresentation, and suppressions of the truth' by which you have been assailed, though I have had my share of these also.

"But now I must remind you that the conduct which you so justly condemn, as unworthy of a Christian and an Englishman, in your opponent's letter to the *churchwardens* of the diocese of Oxford, is precisely the same as that which you have pursued towards myself, in your communications with reference to the *clergy* of this diocese. You were the first, after the judgement of the Privy Council in my case, to prompt them to a course of active disobedience to their lawful Bishop, and to tell them that 'the Church of England is freed from all complicity with Dr. Colenso.' If *you* wish to stand on clear ground with those among whom your lot is cast, so do I. And I call upon you either to 'substantiate any charges' which you may have to make against me 'in a court of law,' or to abstain henceforward from a proceeding which you yourself pronounce to be unworthy of an Englishman, viz. that of 'making charges which, when challenged, you cannot substantiate.' 'There must be means of impleading one who would be glad to be impleaded.' If you cannot bring me before a 'competent authority,' recognised as such by the laws of the Church of England, in your own person, you can, at least, move the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishop of Oxford, to do so—the latter of whom is so extremely sensitive for his own reputation that he can call the editor of the *Record* to account for speaking of him as a 'Romanising prelate' while professing to be a Bishop of the Church of England, though he can yet publicly stigmatize a whole congregation, professing to be Christians, as 'almost all infidels,' and then, when asked to give his authority for such a statement or else to withdraw it, can shrink behind a pretended privilege of Convocation, and suggest that his words *may* not have been correctly reported.

"You yourself, though Regius Professor of Hebrew, have not made, I believe, any public attempt as yet to disprove the main arguments of my work on the Pentateuch." . . .

The letter went on to speak of the long delay which had occurred in the publication of that portion of the *Speaker's Commentary* which was to deal with that part of the Hebrew Scriptures.

. The feeling roused in some, both of the clergy and laity in England, by the action of the S.P.G. with reference to the diocese of Natal, finds a clear expression in the following extracts from a sermon preached to his parishioners by the Rev. J. D. La Touche, Vicar of Stokesay (May 5, 1867). The rule of the Society, that "every missionary selected in England proceed without delay to the country in which he is to be employed, and be subject when there to the Bishop or other ecclesiastical authority," expresses, he says,

"a most important principle, for it places the conduct of the Church in foreign countries on a level with the Church here. To forego this rule would be to sanction insubordination and disorder; and yet such a step—a most suicidal step as it seems to me—has this Society taken. . . . They have, in flat contradiction to their most important rule, which requires that missionaries in foreign parts, like the clergy at home, should yield obedience to their lawful Bishops, virtually freed them [in Natal] from this obligation. . . . Henceforth it is impossible, in contributing to this Society, to know whether or not we are supporting a Church in accordance with our own. For all that appears, we should, on the contrary, be helping to propagate dissent, schism, and insubordination in foreign countries, wherever the opinions of the Bishops did not coincide with those of a party in the Church. In consequence of this, I beg to propose that the sum which we have been in the habit of contributing to missionary work be sent directly to that Bishop who has so bravely fought the battle of freedom, and whose most earnest claim is that he is on the side of law and order against unjust oppression and tyranny. . . . The sum we have been able to spend in promoting missionary work has not been large, and it may

appear that it is hardly worth while saying as much as I have said about it, and that the action, too, of obscure persons like ourselves cannot have much weight; but I cannot think so. If you stand by me as you have hitherto done, . . . the effects of our united action may be quite as great as those of more important places. . . . At any rate, it is our plain duty to act according to right, be our means great or small: we must be faithful in the least, if we would be faithful in much."

In Natal the action of the S.P.G. after the delivery of Lord Romilly's judgement awakened feelings not less warm. Not a few protested against the attempt of the Society, to support the opponents of the Bishop with funds intrusted to it for very different purposes, as a flagrant breach of the order and discipline of the Church of England, and that, too, in open defiance of this decision of one of the highest courts of the realm, pronounced by a judge of unimpeachable integrity, who, by his experience as one of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the appeal of the Bishop of Natal, as well as by the care which he had manifestly bestowed on the formulating of his judgement, gave assurance that his decision would be found to be as sound in law as it was clear in expression. That decision could not fail to have momentous results, unless something should be done to hinder it; and it was manifest that nothing could be done except to put the machinery of the S.P.G. in motion. This was done by a series of resolutions, the first of which pledged the Society

"in compliance with a request of the Bishop of Capetown, to reimburse the expenditure which *any* Bishop visiting Natal under the Society's resolution of May 18, 1866, may incur."

But that resolution had been carried at the express instance of the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Wilberforce, at the public meeting

packed with clergy summoned from all parts of England, before Lord Romilly had given his judgement ; and now this defiance was given *after* the delivery of this judgement, in opposition to the wishes of more than half the clergy, and almost the whole body of the laity, of Natal.

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *May 8, 1867.*

“ My assessors have sent in an excellent judgement. . . . The main point is that they advise me to deprive all the three clergy, which I shall do to-morrow, but shall . . . suspend the operation of my sentence for two months under the following circumstances.

“ I mentioned in my last that Mr. Wills, a clergyman from the Free State, had been intruded here by Bishop Gray . . . as curate in my own Cathedral. . . . When I first heard of his being in Maritzburg, I supposed it was merely an accidental thing. . . . But after disappearing for a Sunday or two, he returned as permanent curate, and was publicly introduced by Mr. Green, as sent with Bishop Gray’s licence. Of course, I directed my registrar to serve him at once with a notice of prohibition, and I think I told you that, as of course he did not attend to it, I was going to apply for an interdict, but thought it best to wait till May, when the Supreme Court would sit again. Accordingly, I waited patiently about three weeks, and in May applied, never dreaming there would be any difficulty in obtaining it, in *this* case at all events, as Mr. Wills was an utter stranger to the diocese. Unfortunately I had reckoned without my host. It appears that Mr. Justice Connor is a most thorough-going partisan, and is doing his utmost to obstruct my obtaining my lawful rights. . . . You will see that he actually began by recommending Mr. Shepstone to ‘prove that the petitioner was Bishop of Natal.’ And so, in the most captious manner, he proceeded to interrupt my advocate all through. Yesterday the case came on again, and Mr. Connor was as partisan as

ever, insisting upon it that I must bring a *regular action*, instead of applying for an interdict. However, the other two judges are with me. But the result of Mr. Connor's conduct is that they have not granted the interdict *at once*, but fixed the first day of next term (at Mr. Wills's request) for arguing the question, as they say it is a serious one, involving other clergy. My friends are confident that it will then be granted, and that both Harding and Phillips have in reality quite made up their minds about it, but wish to give elaborate judgements, stating their grounds for acting as they will in the matter, and in fact laying down their view of my position. . . . But as the first day of term does not come till July, here is another heavy delay of nearly eight weeks, and meanwhile Mr. Wills is allowed to do what he likes! . . . I feel very indignant at this delay, if not denial, of justice; and it was very plain yesterday that the Chief Justice was very angry. . . . We must try to get good out of the delay, by considering that the decision when it does come will not take the public by surprise, but will be a deliberate act of the court, intending, if necessary, to support it by further action. Under these circumstances, I shall suspend the operation of my own sentence until the day after that on which the decision of the Supreme Court will be given.

“As it is possible that Mr. Robinson may hold some licence from Bishop Gray which might raise a discussion in a court where Judge Connor sits, I shall in the meantime call him to account also, and no doubt deprive him like the rest; so that five will be involved in the decision of the court.”

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

“BISHOPSTOWE, June 8, 1867.

“You will see by the printed papers which I send you that the enemy means to *die hard*; and so far from giving up the buildings, &c., as they promised—making a great parade of their imaginary self-sacrifice—they hold on with the utmost tenacity, putting me of course to fresh expense at

every step, though their own expenses will be far greater. In the first week of next month, the judge will, I hope, grant an interdict against Mr. Wills. . . .

“Now for the proceedings about Butler. No doubt some report has been already sent to England about the matter without the possibility of our correcting its misstatements. You know that, disappointed by the result of the ‘election’ in November last, Bishop Gray wrote a private circular to the clergy who had voted *against* a new Bishop, trying thus to get them, under secret influence, to retract the votes which they had given publicly in November. After two days of solemn deliberation, he seems to have succeeded with two of them (Tozer and Jacob), and with another (Baugh) who was not present on that occasion, but wrote strongly in opposition to the election. At all events, the Capetown *Church News* of April 25 tells us that out of the twenty clergy in Natal three cannot be recognised by the Church (Gray, Tönnesen, E. Robinson), and of the remaining seventeen, *twelve* have now agreed to receive Butler. Now I believe this statement to be false; but as they have published nothing here, we cannot be certain. I *know*, however, that of the twenty clergy the following refuse to receive Butler: Gray, Tönnesen, E. Robinson, Lloyd, Callaway, Newnham, Nisbett, seven presbyters, permanently settled in the diocese. I feel sure that Elder has refused; he wrote originally against a new Bishop. If not, it is a piece of dishonesty for them to reckon him, as he has actually left for England last week, . . . without any idea of returning. I set him aside altogether, as also Tozer, who has a living, I believe, in Lincolnshire, and who only came out here on leave of absence for two years, which have nearly expired, and will expire before Butler could come. Omitting these two, we have only eighteen clergy, of which (as above) seven presbyters, settled at work in the diocese, are decidedly *against* a new Bishop, and another (De La Mare) is waiting the S.P.G.’s reply to a letter of his asking them to tell him what he is to do. Thus there are seven presbyters against Butler, and one doubtful; while

for him it seems there are ten clergy (omitting Tozer and Elder), viz. the original seven, and two gained over, and Wills just imported from the Free State. Of these ten, five have been introduced by Bishop Gray, three of them being deacons ordained by himself, and one of the two presbyters (Wills) having only just been introduced to swell the number of presbyters for Butler to eight, while against him there are seven and one doubtful. . . .

“Then again the report in the *Church News* goes on to say that of the lay communicants (men, women, and, as we know, even children) ‘292 express their hope that Mr. Butler will become their Bishop, fifty do not desire to express any opinion on the subject, and *twelve object to Mr. Butler.*’ This last statement *in italics* convicts the whole of dishonesty. For it is added, ‘Those in some measure acquainted with the condition of this small and enfeebled diocese do not think that including all Dr. Colenso’s communicants, a very small body, there can be a hundred communicants in the whole diocese who would object to receive Mr. Butler as their Bishop.’ And yet only twelve have objected! How plain it is that the others have not been consulted. At Durban alone there are about a hundred communicants, of whom almost all would oppose a new Bishop. At Berea and at Addington are a great many more, and of course at Maritzburg and other places. But you know the stress which the Ritualists lay upon the sacrament, and how they bring up children to it, so that it is no wonder they number a good many communicants who are not better Christians than many who would not be reckoned such. . . .

“I have been out on visitation lately at Estcourt and Ladismith, and met everywhere with very hearty welcome and great kindness. Our new Governor, Mr. Keate, . . . came to my service last Sunday morning, the first time of his attending church in Maritzburg, and heard me preach. Green had sent him on Saturday evening a list of *his* hours at St. Peter’s and St. Andrew’s, and asked if he should keep seats for him at the latter in the morning. ‘Ah!’ said Mr.

Keate, I hear, 'they want to catch me ;' and he and Mrs. Keate came to our service, and went to the Dean in the afternoon. This I do not mind, as he is still Dean, and holds my licence till the day after the judges pronounce their decision in July.

"Bishop Gray begins his letter to my clergy thus :—

" ' REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—

" ' In consequence of the counsel given by the Primate of All England to the Rev. Mr. Butler, and contained in the letter a copy of which I inclose, and *the declaration of his Grace's views respecting the deposition of Dr. Colenso*, I am desirous to obtain from the clergy of Natal their matured and ultimate decision as to whether they are prepared to receive Mr. Butler for their Bishop in case he shall be consecrated to that office. I shall therefore be obliged by your signifying to me your intention in the matter, to be laid before the Bishops of this province and the sacred Synod of the Church of England.'

" So the Archbishop's private opinion is now the fulcrum with which to move the clergy from their solemn decision in November. To talk about now giving their *matured* and final decision, when they discussed the matter together for two whole days, and the Dean began with saying, 'I have been in constant correspondence with the clergy and others for several weeks, offering and receiving suggestions from them !'

TO THE SAME.

" BISHOPSTOWE, *May 25, 1867.*

" I have written a letter to the *Spectator* by this mail, giving a direct contradiction to a statement which Bishop Gray has made in his last pamphlet (in answer to the Dean of Ripon, the Archbishop of York, and Bishop Browne), to the effect that I am 'gathering around me men who have been *constrained to leave other dioceses.*' That statement is without a shadow of foundation in truth, and is another of the many instances of *unveracity*—I cannot honestly say *inaccuracy*—which this theological strife has witnessed. There

are only two clergymen whom I have received from other dioceses, . . . both coming with unexceptional characters as clergymen. . . .

“ But I have experienced so much dishonesty in the treatment which I have received from Bishop Gray and others—of which indeed the Bishop of Oxford set the example when he spoke of my congregation as ‘almost all infidels’—that I am anxious, if possible, to guard against a trick to which my adversaries may have recourse, and which I should not be able to expose till the whole was forgotten at the end of four months, the slanderer meanwhile having done his work. Bishop Gray may have in his mind two clergymen, whom I have employed under the following circumstances. (1) The Rev. E—— was *not* received by me from another diocese, but was found here by me on my return from England. I ordained him deacon about a year before I went home, but for certain reasons I hesitated to ordain him to the priesthood. Those reasons I submitted at full length to the Bishop of Grahamstown, who wrote to me about him, and he was satisfied, and ordained him, and gave him the charge of a parish where he ministered for two years, and then returned to Natal, bringing with him a *perfectly satisfactory testimonial* from Archdeacon Merriman in the Bishop’s absence. On the strength of that testimonial, I suppose, he was employed there by Mr. Green, as Vicar-General of the Bishop of Capetown, but had been dropped by him just before my return. As I knew that his views, being strongly Evangelical, were in direct opposition to those of Bishop Gray and Mr. Green in ecclesiastical matters, and his presence amongst the clergy was likely to thwart their plans, I did not wonder at this. And when he presented himself to me for employment with the testimonial of Archdeacon Merriman, and with the fact before me that Mr. Green himself had employed him, I saw no reason for rejecting him merely because his views were very narrow. I felt, moreover, that as he had been accepted, approved, and ordained by the Bishop of Grahamstown, and had ministered for two years in his diocese with the entire

approval of his superiors, I might have judged him too severely, and was glad to give him, as a good and earnest man, a post of usefulness in a field where there was great need of such labourers. For many months he did minister, I fully believe, faithfully and devoutly, to the entire satisfaction of his flock. At last, about three months ago, I became for the first time aware that Archdeacon Merriman had written *privately*, negating in effect his former testimonial. I need not say any more than that for this and other reasons I withdrew my licence from him. You will observe, therefore, that it would be false to say that I 'gathered' round me a man who had been 'constrained to leave another diocese.' Far from this, he had left his former diocese with the full approval of the authorities; and, relying on the testimonial which he brought, I received him. (2) The other case is the Rev. F. T. D., whom also I did *not* receive from any other diocese, but who was *sent here by S.P.G.* to oppose me, who was intruded by Bishop Gray into one of my principal churches, and ranked among the fourteen clergy who met to elect a new Bishop, as renouncing *my* authority, though he voted against the election. . . . Later than this, the Bishop of Winchester, on January 17, 1866, writes to accept him for the curacy of Emsworth, and finally, in May 1866, he lands in Natal as a missionary of S.P.G. Here, then, was a clergyman thrown on my hands by the Society.

" . . . You will now, I think, be in a position to meet the enemy if he should insinuate that I have gathered about me the rejected of other dioceses, in reference to these two cases. There is no shadow of pretence for Bishop Gray's assertion in any other case, though his words really apply only to Canon Gray and Mr. Mason, whom I did receive from other dioceses. . . . Bishop Gray told Mr. Lloyd that Canon Gray had not Bishop Welby's testimonial on leaving St. Helena. Certainly he had not, because he was too delicate to put his old friend, Bishop Welby, in an awkward position with Bishop Gray by asking him for a testimonial when he was going to join me. But he has since written

and obtained from him a perfectly satisfactory letter on this point, and except in relation to his union with me they are on the best of terms, as I have seen by Bishop Welby's language in his letters."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

" BISHOPSTOWE, *June 29, 1867.*

" I have so much matter of importance to communicate by this mail that I must begin at once to put down my facts, as it is desirable that these should be clearly and fully stated for the satisfaction of my friends, the Dean of Westminster, Sir Charles Lyell, and others, as well as yourself. First, let me say that I have duly received yours, in which you so strongly dissuade me from any unnecessary litigation with the clergy here. I think you will see, from the contents of this letter, that the course of events and the conduct of my opponents have left me no alternative but to pursue steadily the course which I am taking. . . . Having an opportunity of being driven down, I went down the coast as far as the Umkomazi, from which Mr. Tönnesen was driven last year by Mr. Moodie (the Dean's brother-in-law, and resident magistrate) and Mr. Wyld Brown, his clerk (who also has married one of Mrs. Green's sisters). These two, and (I think) three more, formed the important body of Churchmen who rejected Mr. Tönnesen. Of course, he would have continued his ministrations without any regard to them if I had not wanted him at Maritzburg. . . . About a fortnight ago, however, he paid his old neighborhood a visit, and met with the warmest reception. The magistrate and his clerk have been removed to a place lower down the coast. . . . Mr. Tönnesen will now be settled at his old place on the Umgababa, where Messrs. Savory and Co. are engaged in important sugar work. . . . We have let so much of the land for sugar-growing that we shall be able to maintain Tönnesen entirely, and allow him help for building himself a house. He will teach the natives to grow coffee, of which we have some thousands of plants there already. It is a

satisfaction to me to know that he has lost nothing and gained much by his faithfulness, though he bravely *hasarded* the loss of all. As it is, he has had £250 per annum instead of about £200, which he had before and will now have again—only free henceforth from any dependence on S.P.G., from whom he drew £180 of his former income. He will have acquired many excellent friends, and greatly raised his own position in the colony, and he will have pocketed one year's extra income from S.P.G. (£180), and a half year's from me (£125). I mention this because, of course, my friends would like to know that he has been liberally dealt with. . . . I returned through Durban again to Verulam, which Mr. Elder resigned about three months ago. He left the place in the most offensive manner possible. At a large vestry meeting, where the most influential people of the neighbourhood had assembled, he told them that he was sorry he could not address them as fellow-Christians. . . . As soon as he had fairly sailed, Dr. Blaine wrote to me to come down and settle their affairs, and this was the real reason for my leaving home at this time. . . . I mention this that you may see, with reference to other matters to be mentioned presently, that my absence from Maritzburg at this particular time was not intentional on my part—I mean, was not contrived beforehand with any view to be *out of the way* under certain circumstances which were likely to happen. . . . I returned home, stopping on the way at the oldest American missionary's, Mr. Lindley, who was exceedingly friendly, and, in fact, has made some progress in the study of my books. . . .

“Meanwhile affairs had been taking place at Maritzburg of which I knew nothing till I reached home last Tuesday evening, June 25. . . . Some weeks ago we saw by one of the Free State papers that Bishop Twells had informed his congregation that he had received an invitation to the Pan-Anglican Congress, but was unable to attend it, and had written to decline it. On the Sunday, however, before I left home, a notice was given in the Cathedral, at Mr. Green's service, that a Confirmation would shortly be held