

will support my letters patent or not ; and the late decision of the Supreme Court will receive very strong confirmation if the Secretary of State is obliged to declare, as I expect that he will be, that my sentence is valid, and that Mr. Green cannot any longer officiate as a chaplain of the English Church in this colony. . . . You will see at a glance that it is of the utmost importance that the Government should not be allowed to shuffle or shirk, as Lord Carnarvon did, even if they wish to do so. The case stands now so plainly before them that it seems to me they must decide in my favour. You will see also the importance of the matter being settled with as little delay as possible, to avoid any complication with the Legislative Council here, about filling up the chaplaincy, should the Duke's reply declaring it to be vacant not reach us before July next. You will observe the importance of my having brought matters to a crisis with Mr. Green, without any further delay, as really the loss of the £100 per annum would be a serious consideration in the present state of the colony. . . .

“Mr. Lloyd is of course on perfectly friendly terms with me now, and he showed me, a day or two ago, several letters from Bishop Gray to himself when I was in England, which showed me what an utter humbug the Metropolitan can be when it suits his purpose. After abusing Lloyd to me, before I came out in 1853, and advising me to get rid of him if possible, he now writes to him ‘My dear Mr. Lloyd,’ and actually advises him, if I landed or proceeded to officiate, to go on reading the service while I was reading !! I had heard of this amazing piece of advice, and I have now read it with my own eyes. But I saw also another passage in a letter dated May 16, 1865, in which Bishop Gray says that *all* the American Bishops have avowed their readiness to stand by and support him, even in the matter of consecrating another Bishop. This is important, as showing that he had already got the consent of the American Bishops, and out of this, no doubt, arose the Pan-Anglican.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *April 9, 1868.*

... “The despatch of the Secretary of State¹ is a tremendous blow for them (Bishop Gray and his friends); and, considering the tenor of Lord Carnarvon’s doings, has taken us completely by surprise. . . .

“What now will Bishop Gray do? The only lawful, honourable, and straightforward course for him to take after all his blusterings, would be to throw up his patent, throw himself upon his spiritual powers, and go on with the consecration, if not of Mr. Macrorie, then of Mr. Green, braving the consequences. If he does this, I have no fear as to the result; he will find himself nowhere in Natal, or I expect in all South Africa.

“I am awake to the *possibility* that this decided action of the Government on my side may be followed by some process for bringing me to account on the ‘merits.’ If not, the victory is complete: if they do bring me to account, I think the Church of England will gain by it, in an immense *legalised* increase of liberty of thought and speech.”

TO JOHN MERRIFIELD, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *May 7, 1868.*

“Your writing at your age is really wonderful, and the sight of it, and the reading of your warm-hearted letters, most cheering to me and mine.

“Thanks for your kind congratulations. I am amused at the idea of the twelve right reverend brethren of mine having to go through my Parts IV. and V., Kuenen, Oort, and my volume of *Sermons*. Much good may it all do them; but one or two of them may be wiser and less confident by the time they have taken their full dose of heresy. It is just possible, of course, that they may find something which the law can touch in my various publications; but, if they do, I fancy it will be as a needle in a bundle of hay, and be so

¹ See Appendix B.

small that it will hardly suit their purposes to move heaven and earth to punish it. Well! we shall see, but in that case it may be that I shall be advised to come to England without delay, and then I may hope to see you again. However, though I face the possibility, I do not see the probability of this, and rather expect that they will lament and sigh that they can do nothing. And then Bishop Gray will soar onward in his course, and we shall see what we shall see next. Really his falsehoods are beyond all measure; he seems to lose all command of his tongue when he gets upon the subject of his 'brother once beloved.' Thus at Bath I find he said 'fifteen or sixteen clergy would be turned by me out of their homes and churches;' when he knew perfectly well, having been 'visiting' my diocese, in my absence, for two months, that there was only one 'home' in the whole diocese; and he might and ought to have known—in fact he did know—that there were only four clergy to be ejected from churches, one of whom had been intruded by himself.

"I quite agree with you in objecting to any *legal* measures to put down 'Ritualism' by coercion. The only way to meet it is to give full room for the utterance of the truth. But our Bishops dare not take this course, which the Ritualists, however, dread more than any other, for they are all banded as a man against me."

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, May 11, 1868.

. . . "It is quite clear, I think, that the eyes of the Government are now fully opened to the nature of Bishop Gray's doings, which is pure Fenianism—an attempt to change by force, and unlawful processes, the government of the Church in South Africa. . . . I send you the *Guardian*, by which you will see that very important debates have taken place in Convocation, and that our judgement got home in the very nick of time, on the last day of the sitting of Convocation, just in time to put a

decisive stop to the Bishop of Oxford's plans—at least for the present. You will read with great interest Dean Stanley's and Canon Blakesley's speeches; and you will see that the majority of the clergy in the Lower House are ready to override all notions of justice, in order to do their part towards supporting Bishop Gray. It must be remembered, however, that he has, no doubt, stopped in England for the very purpose of bringing *them* up to the mark, and I have no doubt that by personal application, by letter, by the influence of the Bishop of Oxford, &c., he has brought up every man he could, to deliver, as he hoped, a deadly blow at me, which the Queen's arm—God bless her!—has warded off for the present, and, I hope, will to the end, effectually. Now I was not in England to look up my friends, and yet the minority was 26 to 41 (I think), and the whole number of members is about 160."

The following letter mentions an accident which occurred at this time :—

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *October 5, 1868.*

. . . "I had a nasty fall from my horse last week, and struck the back of my head, so as to lose consciousness for a few moments, while Harriette and a friend who were riding with me dismounted, and she held my head while he rode for water. But before his return I was on my legs again, and rode home three or four miles. Still, I have not been quite myself since, though I am daily shaking off the effect more and more, and shall be ready to tackle the Bishops when they come next week. . . .

"I had a very pleasant letter by the last mail from Mr. Gladstone, to whom I wrote ten months ago with reference to his language about Bishop Gray and myself at an S.P.G. meeting at Penmaenmawr. He had had my letter before him for four months, as he says; but he begs me to believe that this long interval of silence has not been due to 'any indifference or disrespect'; and, in short, he writes a very kind and courteous letter, administering a little rebuke to

me at the end, 'not so much with respect to particular opinions as to what appears to me your method (technically so called) in the treatment of theological questions,' &c., &c. Upon the whole, I hope the correspondence will help to prepare him for taking some day a juster view of the work in which I have been engaged."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *November 18, 1868.*

. . . "I am hard at work, really in earnest, upon my Sixth and concluding Part of the Pentateuch, which I hope will disturb the calm which is settling down upon the question. It is making steady progress, and to my own mind satisfactory."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *December 11, 1868.*

"I was delighted to see your handwriting yesterday, and to find that you have all returned safely from the other side of the Atlantic. . . . We are still kept in suspense about Macrorie. If he comes without a mandate, he will be a mere nothing; and I fancy he will lose {some of the present body of separatists, who do not wish to become schismatics. . . .

"I dare say you will see a notice in some of the papers of my having very nearly been drowned, which is true enough. Last week I was returning from a visit to the people of the Lower Umkomazi, where Mr. Tönnesen lives; it was not the proper season for travelling, as the rivers are more full than usual, and locomotion may be interrupted by rains. But as the great flood of September prevented my going at that time, and the people wished to see me, I went down; and on Thursday last was on my return home in company with Mr. John Kirkman. We had two thunderstorms in the afternoon, which made the roads very slippery, and our horses were also very tired, as we had ridden eighty-five miles in two days, so that we could not get to the river

which bounds the Bishopstowe lands . . . till dark, and we could not see that the water was much higher than usual, and the *drift*, or crossing-place, in a very dangerous state. Having repeatedly crossed it, I went in first without hesitation, and Mr. Kirkman followed me, and, in fact, his horse pushed on by my side, which impelled mine to go to the right, into the deeper and stronger current, where he was unable either to find footing, or, by swimming, to reach a place where he could get up the bank. He plunged and struggled terribly, and at last I was washed off, and carried down the stream some thirty or forty yards, and should, I believe, have been drowned (for hampered with a mackintosh and riding boots I could do little to help myself, and I cannot swim) but for young Kirkman, who behaved most gallantly, and, having got his own horse up the bank, plunged in after me, and, being a strong swimmer got me to land on the other side; then he went over again, and rode a mile to call some Kafirs, and ultimately I waded through on foot, with one arm round a Kafir man and the other around his sister's shoulders, the young lady (who appeared next day as a stout jolly wench, for it was very dark at the time) being accustomed, with her Naiad sisters, to cross the river at all hours, in sport or on business, and being able to point out the best place for so doing."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 19, 1869.*

. . . "We are delighted at Bishop Tait's promotion. . . .
 "I see that the [Natal] 'Clergy Fund' was commenced in May 1866. If I send you a report by the next mail, it will reach you in time to be circulated at the end of the three years' subscriptions. By that time also we shall know more definitely (1) what will be done as to Macrorie, (2) what may be done about myself; for I cannot help thinking that Archbishop Tait may now be compelled, or even think it right, to bring me to account for my doings. It is undoubtedly the proper thing to do under the circumstances, unless he means heartily to recognise me, as he

does the Bishop of Salisbury, whose views are quite as divergent from the *via media* of the Church of England, in one direction, as mine are in the other. You will have received a copy of the Durban protest against Macrorie, which is very spirited, and entirely their own doing. It really is monstrous that the only congregations here which are deprived of all help from S.P.G. (? from S.P.C.K. too) are those which, however disagreeing with my views, adhere to the system of the Church of England. Surely this state of things can hardly be continued, if Macrorie is consecrated merely by Bishop Gray without a Royal mandate or licence of any kind.

“I am very hard at work on my last Part *On the Pentateuch*.

I need hardly say that this work, in addition to my other duties, leaves me very little time for rest or correspondence ; so that, if you should hear any of my friends complaining of my remissness in answering their letters, or writing to them, please say a word on my behalf. This being our summer, and rainy season, when the rivers are too full and the weather too uncertain for convenient travelling, I am staying at home, and sit at my desk from morning till night, except that, on Sunday morning, I have to go into town to preach, and of course am occasionally disturbed by the arrival of visitors. . . .

“The decision on Bennett’s case may be an important one, whether it legalises his doctrines or not. . . . Now that my boys are going to England, and I have pretty well fought out the fight here, and have another volume to publish, I should not be sorry if any kind of opening occurred in England for which I might suit. . . . Of course I have not the least idea of anything presenting itself immediately. . . . Otherwise, I am quite content to work on here, if God wills, to the end.”

TO THE SAME,

“BISHOPSTOWE, *February 12, 1869.*

“I have been preparing a report for you, but cannot make up my mind to send it, until I can say what course I and the

people are going to take about Bishop Macrorie, who has now come up. . . . As the Clergy Fund began on May 31, 1866, if I send my report by next mail (March 16), you will get it about May 16, and can issue it to wind up the three years. Also, by that time, I shall be able to judge what Macrorie is likely to do. But of course he wields tremendous power against me, coming into an impoverished colony with £2000 to £3000 annually at his command from S.P.G., and £2000 from S.P.C.K., for I suppose that he will have practically the fingering of that grant. . . .

“I inclose an account of the money expenditure of the Clergy Fund, which shows that we have about two years’ scanty supplies in hand, wherewith to fight this great battle. That I have been able to stand my ground so long against such tremendous *worldly* influences shows how strong the cause itself must be. But if these two Societies are to use their funds unsparingly to support the South African schism, I do not see how it is possible for me to resist such a pressure brought to bear upon *needy* men. I inclose a copy of an address, which will go home by this mail, to the Archbishop as to S.P.G. But even if this avails so far as to reduce that Society to the same *formal* appearance of not supporting the schism as S.P.C.K., yet if the Committee privately devote their funds wholly for that purpose, what can I do, with the narrow means at my disposal? However, some applications will be sent home to S.P.C.K. from Greytown, Addington, Camperdown, and Clairmont, and we shall see how they are received. . . . By the next mail also I expect to send a petition of complaint and appeal to the Queen; and I think that the clergy and laity, who are faithful to the Church of England, will do the same. Of course we say nothing about Macrorie personally. *He* may come here as the head of a sect and gather what members he can. But we shall complain of the Bishop of Capetown’s (1) excommunicating me; (2) excommunicating, practically, all who obey the law and adhere to me; (3) sending up Macrorie to disturb this diocese, while still

holding Her Majesty's letters patent, and in defiance of the Queen's Order in Council. . . .

"By next mail our three children, Robert, Frank, and Frances, will go to England, so that they will reach England, we hope, about the middle of May. We have had most kind letters about them from Mr. Graham and Professor Jowett and Miss Bell, so that we have all the comfort we could expect to have in sending them away from us. But after my two recent accidents,¹ I feel that I am beginning to get old for riding about the country; and when I might have looked for some relief from this work, after fifteen or sixteen years of service, here is a young and active man sent up to do what I did ten years ago, but am hardly now equal to doing. Then I foresee financial difficulties, after a time, when our Fund is exhausted, and when perhaps old Mr. Lloyd may pass away and leave a vacancy which S.P.G. may fill up with a nominee of Bishop Gray. Liberal ideas are progressing so slowly in England, or else the liberal clergy are so timid and reticent, that I cannot hope for a sufficient change in the influences brought to bear at S.P.G. and S.P.C.K. to give me even fair play. If they would withdraw their funds altogether, we should soon see who would carry the day. Then, my sixth volume being far advanced towards completion, so that in about six months I may think of sending it to the press, I cannot help feeling that I have fought out this battle sufficiently, and when I see what the Queen may say in answer to my petition may retire honourably from the struggle.

". . . Do not suppose that there is any immediate reason for my apprehending difficulties in the future. The Cathedral was never better filled on Sundays than it is now. The great body of the laity are bitterly opposed to Bishop Gray and his doings. Still, Macrorie, I hear, is a pleasant man, who will make his way with some by his personal qualities, and with more by his pecuniary powers, and with *most* by the incessant action of his clergy going from house to house, repeating his praises and abusing me, and bringing

¹ See pp. 203, 204.

with them promises of gold and silver, which I have not. This must, I think, tell in the long run; and it is hard for me to feel that I am keeping all my friends from receiving any help from the two Societies, at a time when the depressed state of the colony makes them feel so greatly the need of it. As to Macrorie, I do not think that the Queen could appoint him to this see on a vacancy without an Act of Parliament, as he is not a Bishop of our Church, and has not been ordained strictly with the Church Service. Of course, if the Crown abandons the colonial Church to its own devices, the case will be altered. . . .

“With the exercise of the *utmost* economy the amount of the Clergy Fund expended in the past three years has been £627 19s. 6d., at an average rate of £209 per annum, as against the S.P.G. grant of £2000 to £3000.”

Few things show the fatal nature of the course of action followed by the Bishop of Capetown more clearly than the utterances of some of the clergy who, at the outset, had been disposed to follow him. Among these the most prominent, perhaps was Mr. Newnham. When the English courts gave decision after decision adverse to Bishop Gray's schemes, he had no difficulty whatever in seeing that the position assumed by the Metropolitan of Southern Africa was untenable, and he expressed his conviction trenchantly enough in a letter to Bishop Macrorie.

“LADISMITH, *March 4, 1869.*

“RIGHT REV. SIR,

“After our conversation of the other night, I deem it advisable, for the satisfaction of my congregation, and to prevent future misunderstanding, to put into writing a portion of what has passed between us, and to make a few comments thereon.

“You asked me, ‘In what light I regarded you.’ I replied, ‘As the episcopal head of a small Church existing in this colony, as yet undefined, but probably to be acknowledged by the Church of England as independent of, but in full communion with, her.’

- “You asked, ‘In what position do you consider me to stand as regards yourself?’ I replied, ‘In the same as would be held by a Bishop of any other Church visiting the colony.’
- “You asked, ‘Did I not then acknowledge the deposition of Dr. Colenso?’ I replied, ‘Most certainly *not*. I regarded him as the only lawful Bishop of the diocese, and all others as intruders.’
- “You asked, ‘Did I regard you as schismatical?’ I replied, ‘Most certainly, but as having very great palliatives to be urged in your favour,’ and in proof of my friendly feeling to you, I made the offer that if you wished to hold a confirmation here, and would give me notice, I would prepare and present candidates to you ; you entirely declined. . . .
- “You then told me that you regarded Ladismith as being without a clergyman, and myself as being excommunicate, and in a letter since received you state your reasons as follows :—‘If you are ministering weekly without my licence to a congregation in the diocese over which I have been placed, it is plain that you are acting inconsistently with the laws of the Church to which you profess to belong. . . . Thus it is not I who excommunicate you, but you who, by this breach of order, sever yourself from the Church.’
- “I now proceed to make a few remarks in reply to the extract made from your letter. I must first profess my utter amazement at it, and leave the people of Natal to reconcile, if they can, two statements contained in it with facts previously communicated by me to you.
- “First, you say I am here in a position inconsistent with the laws of the Church of England, because I am ministering here without a licence from a Bishop. I reply that you ought to have known better, and to be aware that all army and navy chaplains are without licences from any Bishop. I reply next, that you did know better, and were aware that for four years I ministered weekly to an important charge in the diocese of London, not holding the Bishop’s licence, but with his knowledge. I freely acknowledge the position to be anomalous ; but it is an anomaly known and

allowed at home, and it is better to be anomalous than schismatical. . . .

- “Next, you state that I own no episcopal authority. I reply that you know better, that I told you I have formally recognised the Bishop of Capetown as my Metropolitan, according to the laws of the Church and Realm of England. . . . I ask again, if I were to return to England to-morrow, would not both the Archbishops of the Church of England admit me to a cure of souls in their respective sees, without even asking for letters dismissary from you? And how can you call yourself in union and full communion with the Church of England, and in the same breath cut off from communion with you one of her sons whom she would intrust with a cure of souls?
- “Again, I put to you a case. You know well that your claims to be considered Bishop of this diocese would be held as cheaply by the Archbishop of Canterbury as they are by me; and that, if anything brought him to this colony, he would not ask your permission to hold services in it; if he did so week after week, would you dare to call him excommunicate? If you would not, you show that you venture to do to me, because I am weak and unfriended, what you would be afraid to do to a powerful man.
- “And now I declare that, as by your conduct to my congregation and myself you prove yourself to be as schismatical in heart as you are in position, I hereby retract the offers which I made you in conversation, whilst I ignorantly deemed you true to your principles, and declare that I will not countenance, by any acts of mine, the least exercise on your part of episcopal functions in a diocese where you are an intruder, seeing that such exercise will be schismatical in spirit as well as form.
- “For your language, it will not hurt, and does not move me. When the Bishop of Natal forbids me to minister here without his leave, or sends another clergyman, I will consider the position. But when a schismatical intruder into another man’s diocese declares me to be excommunicate, I simply smile.

- “But I desire now to do more, I desire to give one word of warning to those laymen who, in siding with you, think that they are fighting against heresy, and to tell them, though my words may be as unheeded as those of Cassandra, that they are really fighting for the severance of Church and State—that the heresy of the Bishop of Natal has been made use of as a convenient stalking-horse, for the plans of those who desire to see England priest-ridden, to see the supremacy of the Crown thrown overboard, the Church severed from all connexion with the State, and an arrogant ecclesiastical despotism established.
- “And now, since you have freely told us here your opinion respecting our position, let me tell you a few facts respecting yours.
- “(1) You are here in a diocese which you have every ground to consider as a legal diocese of the Church of England. You are not here as a Bishop of the Church of England. Therefore, be the see vacant or not, you are an unauthorised intruder.
- “(2) You are here in opposition to the wishes of the majority of the laity.
- “(3) You are here in consequence of a motion carried among the clergy by the chairman of the meeting voting once to make a tie, and then a second time to decide the tie of his own making.
- “(4) The election in question, in consequence of which you are here, took place in direct opposition to the wishes of the majority of the Bishops who in Convocation gave us their advice. Therefore it was schismatical, and all its consequences are the same : therefore so is your presence here, and so, I greatly fear, will be your actions.
- “And if none else warn you, I will, that a Church thus begun and continued in a spirit of contention will work no deliverance in the world ; and I will not cease to pray that you may be brought to see the error of your ways, and to heal those wounds in the Church of Christ which you are now rending deeper.
- “This letter I shall lay before my congregation and church-

wardens, leaving them to do with it as they like, and to take any other step which they may deem expedient.

"I shall also forward a copy of it to the Archbishop of Canterbury, begging him, as far as in him lies, to prevent any formal recognition by the Church of England of the body to which you belong, on the ground of its being schismatical and false to its profession.

"I have the honour to remain, Right Rev. Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. O. NEWNHAM."

This was all that the Bishop of Capetown had gained ; this was all that he had succeeded in bringing about : divisions and heart-burnings—a truculent ecclesiastical usurpation on the one side, and a determination to resist it to the uttermost on the other. It must not be forgotten that the strong feelings of disappointment excited by the course of proceedings which ended with the consecration of Mr. Macrorie, and his mission to the so-called see of Maritzburg, were in many, or rather in most, instances, unconnected with any sympathy for any given theological or other views. Soon after the consecration at Capetown, in which Bishop Cotterill, of Grahamstown, had taken part, Mr. W. J. Johnson, incumbent of Trinity Church, Port Elizabeth, addressed to his diocesan, February 2, 1869, a letter, admirable for the moderation of its language, and the clearness with which he dealt with every part of his subject. In the refusal of the Bishop of Capetown to allow the so-called sentence of deposition passed on Bishop Colenso to be reviewed by any tribunal of laymen, while he was willing to submit it to a conclave of Bishops, Mr. Johnson found convincing evidence "that the object pursued by those who sympathise with the Bishop of Capetown is to establish some sort of ecclesiastical authority beyond the control of the State."

"Such," he remarks, "is the opinion I have formed of the nature of the Natal conflict ; and as I thoroughly accept

the doctrine of the Royal supremacy, which is, in fact (to quote the language of the late Prime Minister of England), 'giving the control of ecclesiastical affairs to laymen, and is at present the only security for our religious liberty,' I cannot refrain from publicly recording my respectful protest against the sanction your lordship has given to an assault upon this doctrine, by aiding in the consecration of an intrusive Bishop for Natal, while the legal Bishop still occupies the see."

The letter went on to deal with the reasons urged by Bishop Cotterill in justification of his action. These reasons are examined at length by the Bishop of Natal in a letter to the Mayor of Port Elizabeth.¹ All that we need mark here is that an incumbent, not belonging to the Natal diocese, could see, as clearly as any whose rights were invaded, the real iniquity of the state of things which Bishop Gray was seeking to establish.

"On precisely the same principles," he said, "a clergyman might be deposed from his office in South Africa, who opposed the High Church doctrine of baptismal regeneration, while, as the Gorham judgement shows, he might still hold office in England."

He saw also, not less clearly, the studied ambiguity of the language used in the report of the Convocation of the province of Canterbury. He there read that "the Church as a spiritual body *may* rightly accept the validity of Dr. Colenso's deposition." But, he remarks,

"there is not added, 'and this Convocation hereby does accept its validity,' without which addition, or something equivalent to it, there is no proof that the Convocation of Canterbury does accept it; and if the Convocation of Canterbury refuses to indorse the Bishop of Capetown's

¹ See Appendix C.

sentence, how can Churchmen generally be expected to respect it? Being myself resolved to remain a member of the Church of England, and desiring, as far as in me lies, to be true to its principles, I take this, the earliest, opportunity of disclaiming all participation or sympathy in the consecration of Mr. Macrorie, and the proceedings which have led to it, and I reject all responsibility for the evil consequences to our Church with which it is fraught."

Mr. Johnson's letter reflects the convictions and resolutions which have, from first to last, animated the members of the Church of England in the diocese of Natal, and strengthened them in their resistance to an arbitrary ecclesiastical system, which would deprive them of every safeguard for their liberties as English Churchmen.

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

" March 18, 1869.

. . . " As to Macrorie, I do not at all fear him *personally*; . . . but Macrorie with £2,500 a year is a formidable antagonist. . . . If it is seen that he has large *worldly* means at his command and I have none, I must expect him to make way, more especially as any dolt of a clergyman will do for him—since S.P.G. will pay for him—whereas my clergy, having to be supported by the people, must be superior, or they will not get supported at all. . . . But you and my friends in England must not expect me to do impossibilities. When I left England I gave myself three years of work here, to make good my ground. I have now been nearly four years, and am very well able to maintain the fight for twelve months longer or so, until, as I rather expect, Bishop Gray himself will be disposed of. If the Queen, however, will *not* attend to my petition and support me, of course the colonial Church will fall to the ground everywhere, and the English Church after it; and very much is pointing in this direction at the present moment."

TO THE SAME.

"April 17, 1869.

. . . "As to my escape from drowning, for which I thank God, I have no doubt my enemies will regard it as a *warning* to me. It is a warning to work while it is called to-day, and publish, if possible, my sixth volume while yet life lasts. I am delighted to receive by this mail from Professor Kuenen, the first volume of his *Religion of Israel*, a very important book, one of a series on the great religions of the world, now being published in Holland; . . . and to find that he has entirely abandoned the ground which he took in his *Historico-Critical Inquiry* as to the composition of the Pentateuch, and is now on the most important points substantially at one with myself. . . He now fully adopts the view that the Levitical legislation is post-Captivity work, and, indeed, the evidence on this point is so convincing that I really am sanguine enough to hope that my sixth volume will produce much more effect than anything I have yet published. . . ."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, March 10, 1869.

. . . "Mr. Shepstone is heading a petition from the people to the Queen, and I really hope that Bishop Gray may find that he has gone a step too far. He may perhaps contrive to shuffle out of the mere fact of consecrating Macrorie, but I do not see how he can escape the consequences of a direct defiance of the Queen's Order in Council, in issuing the sentence of excommunication. Fortunately his 'Declaration' gives all the evidence that is needed for our purposes. And now I only want you, Mr. Shaen, and my other friends, to strike while the iron is hot, and, if possible, get Miss Coutts also to move, and I think we shall be able to dislodge *him*, instead of me.

"Newnham's letter¹ is superb. Macrorie must be a thorough

¹ See p. 209.

goose to have so utterly mismanaged affairs when he had the whole game in his hands, as far as Ladismith is concerned—a petty place after all, where, as Newnham told me in a note a few weeks ago, the whole population, men, women, and children, including Dissenters of all kinds, does not exceed 100. But I need not enlarge on Macrorie's folly. Newnham's letter will speak for itself. . . . Macrorie has answered the Durban people, but his letter has not yet been printed. I hear that he says he resigned his English living the day before he left England. His presence has made no difference as yet in the colony, and this step of his, in excommunicating Newnham, has done much, I expect, to make his cause hopeless with the great body of the laity. Even the Roman Catholic priest, and the leading Independent in Maritzburg, I understand, have strongly taken my part, not choosing to see an ecclesiastic holding the Queen's letters patent attempt to override the law as Bishop Gray has done.

“We have nothing else new here. Many parties have gone up to look for the gold, but it is not yet forthcoming, though many still believe in it. I am sorry to say that the *colonists* are still in a terribly depressed condition ; but the *colony* is still steadily improving, and with every reason (I do believe) for expecting that we shall some day get our heads above water again. Our exports are steadily increasing, and our expenditure is being gradually reduced.

“As for me, I have almost completed in MS. my last volume on the Pentateuch, to my own satisfaction. But I don't know what we shall do without our children. I shall sadly miss one of the boys as my companion on Sundays, when I ride in for the Cathedral, and back again. But what must be, must be.”

The two accidents which he had undergone had, it would seem, shaken his health, and predisposed him to acute disease. By the next mail, in a letter addressed to Mr. Domville, May 21, 1869, Mrs. Colenso had to announce that the Bishop was laid up under a severe attack of rheumatic fever.

“It is,” she adds, “a new and sad experience to have him laid by. . . . It is, I think, a warning to us that we must not expect him to be able, as formerly, to travel about this wild country on horseback, and alone, riding fifty miles just to see half-a-dozen people, or to baptize a child. Surely he is wasted, as well as endangered, on such work. He has worked so hard, both at his desk, and in the pulpit here, having so little help for so long in his manifold occupations; and this tells at last upon the health every day, and life goes on faster certainly here than it does in England. . . . If you are a stranger to rheumatic fever, as I was before this experience, you will hardly imagine what the Bishop has had to undergo. . . . At the worst he could hardly bear to be touched, yet required assistance to turn in bed. And even now his daughter or I feed him, as his hands are still stiff and swollen. The doctor used the stethoscope daily at the beginning of the attack, apprehending the heart (the possibility of its being affected), but he assures me he considers there is no longer occasion to fear that.”¹

The Bishop had yet before him fourteen years of work scarcely less arduous than that which he had done already. There were before him still long conflicts, all encountered for the sake of truth and justice, some of which were to break in upon the even course of ancient friendships, but to which those who then felt the anguish of the separation may now, it is hoped, look back as part of a moral discipline leading to higher and higher good.

A month later, June 17, 1869, in a letter to Mr. Domville, the Bishop says :—

“I am thankful to be able to write to you again with my own

¹ All through this illness his native printers were kept steadily at work on the proof sheets of Part VII. ; and every morning, even when he was quite prostrate, he had the proofs held up before him, the corrections being made by his orders, while, when it came to correcting Hebrew letters, he would attempt to take the pen himself, except for two or three days when the disorder fixed upon his eyes, and he became incapable of all exertion, while he was in too great pain to sleep.

hand, though the disease has not yet completely left me, and I am afraid it will be two or three weeks longer before I shall be allowed to return—and then only by degrees—to my duties. . . .

“If the Crown takes up my petition, calls Bishop Gray to account, and annuls his patent, that would strengthen my position greatly; and *effectually*, if they will *appoint* another Bishop in his place, even without a patent, who should recognize my lawful authority. But if Gallio cares for none of these things, it is no use disguising the fact from myself and my friends, I must go to the wall in the diocese at large, though not in the city of Maritzburg, nor in Durban and its suburbs, during the lifetime of old Mr. Lloyd. Everywhere in the rural districts the S.P.C.K. will build their little churches, and S.P.G. will support clergy; and the people, the women and children especially, must be drawn into their net, and will be taught to look upon me and my teaching with abhorrence. You will see at once that the comparison of Macrorie with a Roman Catholic or Wesleyan Superintendent is not a just one, because *he* comes with the same Prayer Book and *apparently* the same doctrine as that which Church people have been used to, and he and his clergy denounce *me* as heretical in very strong terms to any they can get the ear of. *He* can boldly ordain and appoint clergymen where he likes, knowing that an income is sure for them. *I* have several now ready for ordination—three candidates, I may say, for deacon’s orders—whom I dare not ordain, and have been holding back from ordination, because I know they cannot get much from the people, and I have no means of helping them, or rather I *had* none, till you now encourage me to hope for more assistance during the next three years. But, I repeat, I have no *present* intention of resigning, or coming to England; and you may say this publicly, should the enemy state the contrary. . . . But at my age, and after my late illness, I shrink from the work, which I must perform so long as I remain here, of taking long solitary journeys on horseback, and roughing it about the country, and begin to think of rest.”

A month later again, July 16, 1869, he has still to tell the same friend, writing from Durban :—

“I have been here for the last few days for change of air, staying under the hospitable roof of my friend and brother-Cornubian, Dr. Lyle. I have gained in strength much since I came down, and have recovered considerably my appetite and power of sleeping without opium. But the disorder still hangs about me, and my hands and fingers are so swollen that I can make little use of them (except for writing purposes, I am thankful to say); and though I have walked a mile or more even, on the sands of Durban, and have ordained a deacon and a priest last Sunday, I have not yet been allowed to preach, though I expect to do so here next Sunday, and to return home [with Dr. Lyle as a visitor] on Tuesday.”

It will be seen that in his letters at this time the expression of a hope that a way of return to England may be opened to him became more frequent, and the utterance is forced from him, manifestly, by the pressure of bodily weakness. In the same letter he goes on to say :—

“With increasing age and infirmity I feel that my work in this country is drawing, year by year, more nearly to its close. How I shall go about my visitation this year I hardly know. Macrorie would be driven in a carriage and pair, at least upon the main roads. I cannot afford the expense of this, and am glad to go up and down between Maritzburg and Durban in the omnibus. For my weight, and the distance I have to travel, I require a vigorous horse; but I have no power in my hands at present, and dare not mount my own horse, which has carried me hundreds of miles all over the country. I have a vehicle on four wheels, which my old horse Pen (short for Pentateuch, a name which the people gave him while I was in England) drags into and out of town (a distance of four miles); but that is of no use for my journeys. However, I am going home to

rest for a month, and then I must do the best I can on horseback with Jantjee, who had the adventure with me in the Umsunduze [river].”

It chanced to be a time in which many incidents were occurring of a very depressing kind. On August 20, 1869, the Bishop writes to Mr. Domville as follows :—

“Yours of June 20 reached me yesterday with its most unsatisfactory inclosure. The conduct of both Societies (S.P.G. and S.P.C.K.) is disgraceful to them ; but we must try to do without their grants, and by and by, I fully expect, ‘their wickedness will fall on their own pates.’”

“We have been horrified by Bishop Twells’s affair during the last three weeks. Of course you will hear about it in England. He came through this colony in disguise, passing Maritzburg in the night, and hid himself somewhere at Durban until he could get away, which he found it very difficult to do. . . . It is the most amazing occurrence, and, I need not say, has sent a terrible shock through all parts of South Africa.”

A fall so dreadful should be passed over, if possible, in silence. In this instance it cannot be done for the reason which may best be given in the Bishop of Natal’s words :—

“As the judgement passed on me at Capetown was only (even on Bishop Gray’s principles) made canonically valid by *his* presence as one of these suffragans, . . . I should think some compunctious feelings may visit the hearts of some of the Bishops (Llandaff, Ely, Lincoln) who pronounced in Convocation for the validity of the sentence.”

In July, 1869, the Privy Council delivered judgement on the appeal of the Bishop of Capetown against the judgement of the Supreme Court of the colony of Natal, which determined, January 31, 1867, that the Cathedral church of

Maritzburg, with the land on which it was built, should stand vested in Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, and his successors, with costs. For the latter, who was now the respondent, it was contended that he and his successors in the see of Natal became and are the successors in office of the appellant, within the true intent and effect of the deed by which the site of the Cathedral was conveyed to the Bishop of Capetown, Dr. Gray, in trust for the uses of the English Church. The grant is no longer in the appellant and his successors in the see of Capetown, but in the respondent and his successors in the see of Natal. Land vested in any person for pious use is not vested in any particular person, but in the use itself. The court ruled that Dr. Colenso had exercised all the rights of a Bishop and trustee, and had had possession, occupation, and access for all the purposes of his office from the date of his appointment in 1853 to the end of 1863. On all these considerations and having regard also to the former decision of this Board in the matter of the Bishop of Natal, their lordships had no hesitation in stating, with respect to the defendant, Dr. Gray, that he had and has no estate or title as trustee or otherwise, and no right to interfere; and with respect to the plaintiff, Dr. Colenso, that he has the rights expressed by that which is, in their opinion, the order which ought to have been made by the Supreme Court of Natal. Their decree, therefore, was—

“That the plaintiff, the Bishop of Natal, do have free and uninterrupted access to the land and premises in the grant of March 19, 1850, mentioned, for the purposes of enjoying and exercising all rights, privileges, and immunities, which have hitherto been enjoyed and exercised, or ought to be enjoyed and exercised, by the Bishop of Natal, as such Bishop or otherwise, in reference to or within the Cathedral thereon and its appurtenances; and that the defendant, the Bishop of Capetown, and his agents, do abstain from in

any manner interfering with such access, enjoyment, or exercise; saving, however, to any except the defendant, any rights in reference to the Cathedral as they also enjoyed."

In speaking of the costs, the court pronounced the defendant, Bishop Gray, "wholly wrong in the course he thought fit to take," and refused him costs of the appeal.

A month later, September 20, 1869, rheumatic pains were still hanging about the Bishop; but writing on that day to Mr. Domville, he speaks of the immediate need of setting out on horseback on his visitation.

"It is impossible for me to do what some of my friends in England think possible—remain at home and let country places take care of themselves. Of course, if they were all supplied with clergy, as in England, this might be done. But here the Bishop's visit often supplies the place of a settled clergyman."

On the conduct of the S.P.C.K. he still could not but feel strongly. The Society, he said, pretended a singular regard for order and law, which the S.P.G. did not; and then secretly voted every penny of the £2,000 away from those who *obeyed the law* (though many of them were not adherents at all of his,—some indeed, on religious grounds, so opposed that, while they recognised his office as Bishop, they would not come within hearing of his sermons), and gave it all to Dr. Macrorie.

"We have now a complete list from the secretary of the Society, and all I can say is that it has been so disgracefully *squandered* . . . that it will not do so much harm as it might have done, if carefully husbanded, and disposed of according to the real needs of the colony.

"I hardly know," he adds, "what to make of the Privy Council judgement. Of course, it is very satisfactory that Bishop

Gray is ousted from all power to interfere with us in this diocese. But who is to act as trustee? There is a farm, for instance, of 6,000 acres, besides a number of other Church properties, which were all held in trust by Bishop Gray, and would have all been transferred to me, if the judgement of our Supreme Court had been maintained. But now who is to look after this farm, grant leases, receive rents, &c.? I am afraid we shall have to apply to the Supreme Court again, in consequence of this decision, to tell us what we are to do.

“Just after the last mail left Natal, Mr. Keate sent me a copy of a letter from Lord Granville, saying that my petition had been laid before the Queen, but that he had not been able to advise that anything should be done in the matter. I expected this after the Solicitor-General had given his opinion that *I* could not be reached in any way for my heresy, in which case, of course, Bishop Gray could not be reached for his schism. But I do not at all believe in the justice of this opinion.”

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *November 9, 1869.*

“I am just about to start on my second tour of visitation this year—this time up the coast from Durban, as my first was down the coast. Macrorie has been up and down a few weeks ago, but failed in the object of his visit. At one place, the Umkomazi, the schoolroom was refused to him on the ground that they were perfectly satisfied with their own minister, and adhered to the laws of the Church of England. At another, Umhlali, they applied to the resident magistrate for the court-house, and he, though no particular friend of mine, . . . replied that there was a church which answered all their purposes—the said church being in my hands and occupied by one of my clergy. . . . I inclose a newspaper cutting¹ which will inform you how matters are

¹ This cutting gave particulars of a meeting held in the island of St. Helena, September 30, 1869, to determine whether they would accept the Metropolitan's invitation to send delegates to the forthcoming Provincial

going' in St. Helena. Will Bishop Gray excommunicate them all?"

TO C. J. BUNYON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *November 10, 1869.*

... "You mentioned in your last the death of Bishop Hamilton, and you are quite right in thinking that I had a very high respect for his character. He was an honourable, truth-speaking opponent, who fought a fair fight (as far as I am concerned), and said honestly in Convocation that the Bishops 'could hardly trust their feelings to act with justice towards me,' that they 'felt it difficult to deal with strict justice with regard to Dr. Colenso.' There was with him none of the slippery underhand working of the Bishop of Oxford, by this time I suppose Bishop of Winchester." ...

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 20, 1870.*

... "I am thankful to find that the Clergy Fund amounts to *so much* as £150, with which I have to fight not only S.P.C.K. and S.P.G., but H.M.'s Government also, for Lord Granville has written to say that they will not interfere about Mr. Green's £100 a year, which small 'worldly influence,' I confess, I did rather reckon upon, in addition to the Clergy Fund. Well! we still fight on and maintain our ground. . . . By the by, I see that in the *Church Times*, November 12, 1869, is a complaint that 'S.P.C.K. has just shown a remarkable degree of bigotry. They have refused even to consider the making of a grant towards the new Cathedral at Inverness. The objection was that the Episcopal Church in Scotland was *not established.*' By what right, then, have they given £2,000 to support a schismatical Church here, in opposition to one which is established according to the decision of our Supreme Court?"

Synod. The decision to refuse the invitation was unanimous, and the ground taken for it was the resolution to adhere to the Church of England instead of joining a society which disclaimed obedience to her laws.

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *February 22, 1870.*

. . . “If you see reports of the ‘Provincial Synod’ at the Cape, you will see that Dean Green has been making himself ridiculous, by saying that he hoped no step would be taken to admit the laity to have votes in the Synod until they had communicated with—the Patriarch of Constantinople! to know if such a measure would be a hindrance to reunion with the Greek Church. Macrorie also has not distinguished himself, having actually threatened them that, if they passed a certain rule admitting the laity to vote, his . . . Church would secede! which caused an explosion among the grandees of Capetown.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *March 10, 1870.*

“I need not say that I was most agreeably surprised by the contents of your last letter, and that I feel deep gratitude to our departed friend, and to the gracious Providence which overrules all, for this bequest, which relieves me from all anxiety respecting my boys’ education, under which I was beginning to feel burdened. . . . Now, thank God, I can breathe freely, and I feel bound, out of regard to Mr. Perry’s memory, to try to complete and publish my sixth volume. . . . By the same mail I had a letter from my brother-in-law, strongly advising me *not* to publish my sixth volume, because he understood that it contained a good deal of hard criticism, and would not be likely to sell. It is, of course, quite true that it is to some extent of this character; that cannot be helped, for it is absolutely necessary to put the plain truth, and the evidence of it, clearly and fully before the scholars of England and Europe, and I have no expectation that the book will do more than realise its expenses, though I think it will do that, as Part V. did and more. . . .

“I see Macrorie at the Cape says, ‘When it shall please God to remove the sole cause of our disorder [meaning my

unworthy self], there will be perfect peace and unity in Natal'! I think he is mistaken;¹ but certainly I might, if I thought it right to indulge in such indecent speculations, retort the language with quite as much force."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 24, 1870.*

. . . "The principal event here, since I last wrote, is the termination of the 'Provincial Synod' at the Cape, and the publication of its proceedings, which will give me ample matter for discussion at our approaching Church Council. I have summoned it for May 31, and the summons has been most heartily responded to by the laity, who have everywhere (except at Ladismith) . . . elected the very best men; and we shall have a very strong, highly respectable, and influential Council,—about thirty altogether, including six or seven clergy. I shall be able to show that in various points 'The Church of the Province of South Africa,' as they now formally call themselves, have deliberately separated from the Church of England, *e.g.* forbidding their clergy to marry a person whose divorced husband or wife is still living, and declaring that they will not be bound by the decisions of the Queen in Council, &c."

Bishop Gray set great store by Synods and Convocations. The Bishop of Natal, probably, achieved more effectually all that is good in such assemblies through the Church Council, of which the first session was held in 1858,² the two following in 1859 and 1860. The fourth session in 1861 was broken up after a short sitting, owing to the trouble which was at that time apprehended from the Zulu country, most of the lay delegates being thus prevented from attending. In the years which immediately followed, the assembling of the

¹ The event has shown that the Bishop was right in so thinking.

² The secession of certain members of the Council from the preliminary conferences has been noticed already (Vol. I. pp. 105, 106).

Council was rendered impracticable by the proceedings of Bishop Gray. The fifth session was therefore not held till 1870, when, on May 31, the Bishop once more took counsel with his clergy and laity. The chief subject for discussion was, necessarily, the formation of the Church of South Africa, and the results which were likely to follow from this enterprise. The subject was one of the gravest practical importance ; for it resolved itself into the question whether the being in union and full communion with a given body was the same thing as being part and parcel of that body. The state of union and full communion was claimed by the South African Church ; but they claimed it under conditions precisely parallel to those under which Wesleyans, professing to remain Wesleyans, might reject the authority of the Conference ; or Presbyterians, remaining Presbyterians, might avow that they had adopted an episcopal form of government. If the Wesleyans and Presbyterians would not put up with such treatment at the hands of these virtual seceders, so neither will the Church of England. But the South African Church had done much more than proclaim its freedom to reject the law of the English Church ; it had in Natal set itself in direct opposition to an integral portion of the Church of England in that diocese. Speaking in the Upper House of Convocation, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Tait, said :—

“ The Bishop of Natal is just as much Bishop of Natal as any one of your lordships is Bishop of his own diocese. It has been decided by the court before which this matter was brought that in the eye of the law of England Dr. Colenso is Bishop of Natal ; and until that decision is reversed, he is in the same position as myself, or any other of your lordships at this table. It has been said that the Church of South Africa is in no better and no worse position than any dissenting body ; but if that applies to any part of the Church in Africa, it is to the Church in Capetown. The

Church in Natal is by no means in that condition ; it is a branch of the Church of England, established to a certain extent by law, and in which the Bishop has coercive jurisdiction over his clergy. . . . So long as that judgement remains unaltered, it seems to me ridiculous to treat the Church in Natal as a mere voluntary society, when it is nothing of the sort."

Not only, however, had the Church of South Africa claimed the power of rejecting, if need should so be, the law of the Church of England ; but in its Provincial Synod, held before the promulgation of the so-called sentence against the Bishop of Natal, it had bound itself to be governed by rules which are in some respects directly at variance with that law, and had thus separated itself effectually, in fact as well as in name, from that Church. This the members of the South African Church would have been quite free to do, if they had kept aloof from all interference with the affairs of the Church of England. But, as the Bishop of Natal rightly insisted,

"it is different when we observe throughout their proceedings a systematic purpose to interfere in our affairs, and an unfair attempt to claim all the advantages which may be derived from retaining their former organic connexion with the Church of England, while yet deliberately renouncing the principles and laws by which that Church is governed."

Thus, in England, a clergyman, though not obliged, is yet free to celebrate marriage between persons the divorced husband or wife of either of whom is still living. In the Church of South Africa this has been made a penal offence. But the standard of rebellion was raised most especially against what were termed secular courts—that is, against the jurisdiction of the Sovereign in causes ecclesiastical. It was especially declared that

"in the interpretation of the standards and formularies the Church of this province be not held to be bound by decisions

in questions of faith and doctrine, or in questions of discipline relating to faith and doctrine, other than those of its own ecclesiastical tribunals, or of such other tribunal as may be accepted by the Provincial Synod as a tribunal of appeal."

In these words, the Church of South Africa had refused to acknowledge decisions

"by which the 'interpretation' of the standards and formularies is taken out of the hands of mere ecclesiastics, and committed to the highest court of judicature in the realm, including what the nation regards as an amply sufficient representation of the ecclesiastical body."

It is useless to beat about the bush in such a case as this.

"It is a mere pretence," the Bishop of Natal urged, "a mockery—to speak of holding the same standards and formularies, the same Creeds, Articles, and Liturgy as the Church of England, if the 'interpretation' of them is to proceed upon totally different principles: in the one case being based upon facts and the exact legal meaning of words; in the other upon the theological sentiments of the presiding judge or judges, supported by an appeal to the 'general principles of canon law,' whatever these may be."

Few steps have ever been taken more gravely affecting the liberties of Englishmen than this setting up of the so-called South African Church. The Bishop of Natal might well say:—

"How Bishops of the Church of England, like the Bishops of Capetown, Grahamstown, and St. Helena, can pretend that laws like these—which excommunicate a clergyman if he refuses to submit to suspension or deprivation because he has 'married a divorced person, whose divorced husband or wife is still living,' or because he teaches doctrines which have been decided by the Privy Council to be perfectly lawful within the Church of England—are according to the

laws and usages of the Church of England ; or how Bishop Gray can allow himself to say, in the hearing of the 'Provincial Synod,' 'We have been supposed by some to desire to found a Church in South Africa, severed from the Church of England : our true purpose is the precise opposite to this,'—it is not easy to understand."

Nor was it a very difficult matter to divine the motives of the Bishop of Capetown and his abettors. In the Bishop of Natal's words, they were trying to combine two things which are incompatible with each other—the enjoyment of all the status, influence, property, and other advantages connected with adherence to the Church of England, and the power of making for themselves as an independent Church laws which, though they may not be such as to break communion with the Church of England, must of necessity exclude from their body all the attached members of that Church, whose eyes have once been opened to the real nature of their proceedings.

To the Bishop, the clergy, and the laity of the "diocese of Natal" no invitation to attend the "Provincial Synod" had been sent—whatever may have been done for the so-called diocese of Maritzburg. Still, with the assurance which characterised all his proceedings, the Bishop of Capetown insisted that the Synod represented the whole province ; and a decree was framed accordingly. It became, therefore, a matter of mere self-defence to take all possible precautions to prevent, in case of the avoidance of the see of Natal, the intrusion into that see of a Bishop who might be "not a Bishop of the Church of England," but bound to administer among his flock the laws of another Church.

With the subjects already noticed the question of Church property is most intimately connected ; and this question the Bishop treated with great fulness and precision. Bishop Gray and his supporters had done all that they could to maintain

their hold on this property ; and in this, as in their other plans, they were unscrupulously aided by the funds of the two Societies (for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Promotion of Christian Knowledge) whose rules bound them to administer their grants to missions through the Bishop of the diocese to which those missions belonged. The aid thus granted amounted to £4,000 or £5,000 a year ; and these were tremendous forces indeed in a community of necessity so poor as that of Natal.

“It could not but be expected,” Bishop Colenso said, “that a schism so powerfully supported by moneyed arguments should have made some progress amongst us. Yet you all know how little comparatively has been done to weaken the attachment of English Churchmen to their mother Church. Your presence here to-day is a sufficient proof of this ; and I thank God heartily that, amidst all discouragements, we have had so much to console us in the past, and have so much ground of hope in the future.”

Nothing could have been more unfavourable to the body of English Churchmen generally than the recent financial condition of the colony, which left them almost wholly at the mercy of their antagonists.

“However, thank God,” the Bishop added, “better times, we trust, are now at hand ; and the day of gloom—of thick, dark, almost hopeless gloom—seems at length to have passed away.”

The spirit in which the Bishop's remarks were received is sufficiently shown in the following passage of the address in which the Council says that they are

“Churchmen who, leaving our various avocations, have come hither, many of us from the more distant parts of the colony, to aid, as best we can, that branch of the Church of England which is established here, and to which we belong. The injustice with which our Church has for many years been

treated will, we believe, when known to our brother Churchmen in England, arouse something more than a feeling of surprise, and will obtain, for your lordship and us, sympathy and aid in maintaining in this colony the Church of England with all its rights and liberties—rights and liberties dearer than ever to us, because of attempts to wrench them from us, but which we are resolved, whatever may be the opposition, to uphold and adhere to. In saying this, we are speaking not only for ourselves, but for the congregations we represent ; and we beg to assure your lordship that we shall continue as heretofore to support you as Bishop of Natal, head and ruler of the Church of England in this colony, under Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria as ‘supreme head.’”

But the members of the Church of England in Natal were not the only persons who felt it their duty to speak out against the schism involved in the setting up of the Church of South Africa. Bishop Gray said that he had exerted himself to get together the funds necessary for establishing the bishopric of Natal for far other teaching than that of Bishop Colenso. But decision after decision has made it plain that the clergy of the South African Church have no right to endowments in land or money set apart for the uses of the Church of England, from which they are separated “root and branch.” Nay, more the Bishop was obliged to remind his Church Council that, in answer to an inquiry from the registrar of the diocese of Natal, Lady Burdett-Coutts, the donor of the endowment for the original see of Capetown, had stated :—

“I can have no hesitation in declaring that the object of my endowment was to maintain a bishopric of the Church of England in the diocese of Capetown. Therefore any attempt to apply that endowment to the establishment of a separate Church is opposed to the views and wishes which I entertained at the time when I provided the funds, and still continue to entertain.”

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *August 8, 1870.*”

“It was refreshing to see your hand again, and very pleasant to receive your books, and to know that you were still actively at work. I have read a great part of the small one ; but the *Aryan Mythology* I have only at present run my eye over, having reserved it for a visit to the coast, for which I start to-morrow, when I expect to have several days of complete leisure while waiting near Durban at a friend’s house for the steamer which we hope will bring our daughter Frances from England. I have not the slightest doubt that your book is one of grave importance, and that it will mark an epoch in the history of the religious conflict of the age. We want someone to say boldly what we all know or surmise, but shrink from suggesting—that sun-worship is at the basis of *popular* Christianity (I do not say of Christianity as Christ taught it), and that when so many young ladies wear the elegant symbol of the cross so strikingly displayed upon their bosoms, they are but doing what heathen girls did ages ago. I am certain it would be a most interesting and instructive study if somebody would pursue thoroughly the connexion between the ancient solar worship and *Church* Christianity, of which Romanism and orthodox Protestantism are only different developements. I expect to find that in the course of your work you have given many hints which may fructify in the reader’s mind.

“My work on the Pentateuch is nearly completed ; but I shall like to see the *Speaker’s Commentary* on the Pentateuch, which is promised at the end of this year, before going to press with it. Of course, I do not expect profit from the publication ; but it completes MY *magnum opus* in life, and justifies many of the statements and assumptions in former volumes, correcting others (all in the less orthodox direction : I mean that I am compelled by the truth to be less conservative now than I wished to be, and was able to be, when I wrote my first volumes). At any rate it will put on record a mass of results which have cost me a great deal of labour, which future writers may use as stepping-stones.”

In his next letter, May 16, 1870, the Bishop had to inform Mr. Domville of a disappointment which he had long been looking for with no little anxiety. The departure of Dean Gray had become a necessity, chiefly from monetary misfortunes (caused by the failure of a bank) which lay beyond his control. The providing of a successor was under the circumstances a difficult task.

"The people," he says, "are going to try Newnham, and I should not be surprised if he consented, as he is worn out with work in his present post ; but a few days will tell us. . . . Possibly I shall have to take the double duty again by myself for a while, as of old. . . ."

"I really believe," he adds, "that the diamond fields are a great fact ; and if so, South Africa will be revolutionized. Major Francis, I hear, an excellent friend of ours, has just offered another friend . . . all his expenses and £60 per cent. of the proceeds, if he will go up and take charge of a party of diamond-seekers for him. This shows the reality of the movement, and also, I expect, the hazardous character of the work. Lynch law will be prevalent, I expect, where a small stone is so precious—more here than at the gold-fields."

Writing four weeks later, the Bishop speaks of the diamond discoveries as no longer an uncertainty or as unworthy of consideration. One stone of thirty-five carats had been valued at £9,500 ; and if some diggers had reaped so far a poor harvest or none, others had been abundantly recompensed for their toil. From the gold-fields came tidings of an increasing yield, and the two could not fail largely to affect the colony generally, and to give fresh importance to its Church affairs. Of the meeting of the Church Council he speaks as a "great success."

"Nothing could have been better, as Mr. Shepstone and all the delegates agree. . . . The tone throughout was excellent."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“August 20, 1870.

. . . “There is internecine war at present between the colonial Government, backed apparently by Lord Granville, and the colonial legislators. They have again, I believe, refused the supplies; and in that case Mr. Keate fully expected that the charter would be withdrawn, and the colony fall back again into a Crown colony, with which conclusion of the struggle many of the most intelligent members would be perfectly content.”

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, September 8, 1870.

. . . “I have dropped a note to Bishop Wilkinson boldly, to ask him what he means by saying that he was ‘sent out by the Church and State of England to form one of the Bishops of the province of South Africa.’ I have asked him if the Church of the province of South Africa, which formally excludes the diocese and Bishop of Natal, as established by the Queen’s letters patent, has been officially recognized by any public act, unknown to me, by the Church and State of England.”

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

“BISHOPSTOWE, December 19, 1870.

“We were delighted to get your letter by this mail, and to find that you are comfortably settled in your rooms at St. John’s. I almost envy you the luxury of having rooms in the old College, which I should very much like to see once more before my sand runs out. You remember—or perhaps you were too young then to know much about it—that when I wrote to ask the Master, who was a very old friend of mine, and had received me once or twice most kindly, to give me, if he could, a room at the time of the opening of the new chapel, to which I had subscribed my £25, he was obliged to write and ask me not to come. I suppose that either Mr. Reyner, or Bishop Browne, or Bishop Ellicott, or

others of the same class, had expressed their determination not to attend if I did, or that they dreaded some scene at the Holy Communion. If Mr. Reyner helped to administer, probably he would have openly refused it to me. I am glad that the Master has been kind to you, as I knew he would be ; and so I should hope would some other of my friends among the Fellows. Remember me very kindly, when you have an opportunity of so doing, to Messrs. Mayor and Todhunter, and even to Reyner if you like to do so ; for, though he has become such a narrow-minded partisan of Bishop Gray, I do not think that he has any personal hostility to me, and we used to be intimate friends ; and it might even do him good to hear of me, and especially to be assured that the reports sent home [by Dean Green and others] are in numberless cases exceedingly false."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

" BISHOPSTOWE, *October 25, 1870.*

" I hope that you have long ere this returned from the Continent, without having seen the inside of a French or German prison, as some of your fellow-countrymen have, it appears, in their zeal to supply England with news. It is idle, however, to say more about the war, which will have passed through different phases doubtless with you, while we have only a telegram announcing in a few words the Emperor's captivity and the surrender of 80,000 of his army. *Our* sympathies are wholly with the Germans in the conflict ; but I trust that the King of Prussia will be moderate in the hour of triumph, as I fully believe he has every wish to be. . . ."

TO THE SAME.

" *December 4, 1870.*

. . . " At this moment I have a Bill before the Legislative Council, which I hope will be passed, making me trustee of all the lands which were formerly held by Bishop Gray. On the whole, I hope we shall carry it either this session or

the next. The Bill includes the site of the Cathedral. If we do get it, my hands will be strengthened, as I shall be trustee as well as Bishop ; but if we are beaten, we shall be no worse off than we are.

“I hear that Cetshwayo, the real power in Zululand, will not receive Bishop Wilkinson as ‘Bishop of Zululand,’ but only as an ordinary missionary, there being already a Lutheran Bishop there—Bishop Schreuder, the head of the body to which Mr. Tönnesen once belonged, and which has laboured in the field for more than twenty years.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *December 19, 1870.*

. . . “In our Natal almanac, just published, Macrorie has actually entered himself as Bishop of the Church of England, and two deacons, ordained by him, as clergy of the Church of England, though on landing he stated to the Durban Churchmen that he was not, and had never claimed to be, a Bishop of the Church of England, inasmuch as there could be no Church of England out of England. . . .

“Captain Harford, M.L.C., has just had a line from his brother, who is a Minor Canon at Westminster, advising him to put the whole account of his treatment at the hands of Bishop Macrorie¹ before the Archbishop of Canterbury. So by this mail he sends home a letter to his Grace through my hands, asking him to say whether Macrorie is a Bishop of the Church of England, and whether the clergy ordained by him become thereby clergy of that Church. I do hope that the Archbishop will reply and say ‘No.’ It would help us very much if he did, in the face of these assumptions.”

¹ Captain Harford and his wife, at the request of a bridal party whom they accompanied to St. Cyprian’s church, presented themselves as communicants, and were passed over by Bishop Macrorie. The correspondence which followed between Bishop Macrorie and Captain Harford was published. A letter from the Bishop of Natal to Captain Harford, published as an appendix, pointed out the inaccuracies and misstatements in the letters of Bishop Macrorie.

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *February 2, 1871.*

“ By the time this reaches you, you will probably have seen your father, though from what I have heard I fear you will have found him in broken health, and ready to receive the call to ‘ come up higher.’ If you should still be with him when this finds you, may I ask you to present my most sincere respects to him, as one whom, though not having seen, I have learnt to admire and love, through the knowledge which I have gained of him from my conversations with yourself? ”

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *March 20, 1871.*

“ My new volume is now in the printers’ hands. . . . The point of it is to show that all the priestly and sacrificial portions of the Pentateuch were written *after* the Captivity ; the evidence of which, when once clearly and fully set forth, is irresistible. Besides this Part VI., I have also Part VII. (the concluding Part of the work) in hand with the printers, and Fani [a native printer] is printing 1 and 2 Samuel in Zulu, . . . and Davis and Sons are reprinting my *Zulu Grammar*, which has taken up, and still will take up, much of my time, as this new edition will be much enlarged and improved. . . . You may possibly hear somewhere that Bishop Wilkinson¹ has been treated with unkindness by me and my friends. In fact, he has just written to me a letter, in which he speaks of ‘ the unkindly attitude assumed by yourself and party towards me, which deeply saddened my involuntary stay in your colony, and made me glad to leave behind me, I hope for ever, all the hard words and bitter feelings which assailed me almost daily, from the day of my arrival to that of my departure.’ What he means by this tirade I cannot in the least conceive. I suspect that he is angry with himself and his advisers, in having himself taken up a position of hostility to me and mine upon his

¹ Missionary Bishop in Zululand.

landing. I am not conscious that a single demonstration of 'hard words and bitter feelings' has 'assailed' him since he landed, from any of my friends or from myself. I know that we were all prepared to receive him courteously and kindly, and Archdeacon Lloyd and his churchwardens intended to ask him to preach in St. Paul's. But when he rejected the very first advances of Mr. Lloyd (as he admits he did), how could he expect that there should be any demonstrations of friendship on our part, which we had every reason to suppose would be in like manner rejected? Besides, we were all, in fact, rejected in the person of the Archdeacon; and no doubt, though I do not know it as a fact, he was 'let severely alone' by the members of the Church of England while here, and has probably felt that Macrorie and his sect did not compose the whole population either of Durban or Maritzburg."

TO JOHN WESTLAKE, ESQ., Q.C.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *February 20, 1871.*

. . . "I see that in the *Guardian* Bishop Gray states that Macrorie's income will come to an end very soon, unless a fresh effort is made on his behalf. Ah! if it were not for the dishonest proceedings of S.P.G. and S.P.C.K., it would soon be seen how little hold he has really upon the colony. If they would only leave us like Prussia and France, to fight it out by ourselves, the monster would soon be thrown back, like Louis Napoleon, after his first noisy boast of triumph. . . . Ten years hence I expect this colony will be flourishing enough; at present it is very poor, and the internecine conflict between the Government and the elective legislators has greatly increased our difficulties.

"I hear nothing about Bishop Wilkinson, except that having been duly warned against using my Zulu translations, and having furnished himself with a supply of Dr. Callaway's when he went off to Zululand, he has been obliged to write to his bookseller in Maritzburg, and request him to send up a supply of my books, as he finds he cannot get on with

Dr. Callaway's, and mine are well understood by the Zulus. So much for the £800 grant of S.P.C.K. to enable Dr. Callaway to translate and print the Bible in Zulu."

TO W. SHAEN, ESQ.

" BISHOPSTOWE, *August 19, 1871.*

"We have arrived at a crisis in our political affairs in this colony; and I rather apprehend that Mr. Keate's term of office as Lieutenant-Governor may come to an end before another year has passed over our heads. . . . Now can anything be done to bring the name of Mr. Shepstone favourably before the Secretary of State? I know of no one in England to whom I could address myself on the subject except Mr. Fortescue, and he is not, unfortunately, now in the Colonial Office. Some weeks ago, however, I drafted a letter to him, of which I inclose a copy, which would put all the facts of the case before you, and which you possibly might be able to make some use of through your friend Mr. Stansfeld, though I know how chary Ministers are of intruding in any way upon each other's Departments; and I do not feel at all sure that anything can be done in this way. However, it is worth my trying, for I am quite sure that the Bishop of Winchester will be at work to get a successor to Mr. Keate after his own heart and Bishop Gray's, which Mr. Keate is not, though he has steered very clear indeed (and some may even think too clear) of showing any special leaning towards *me* in matters affecting my position here. Still, it would be a great blow to me if a regular High Churchman were sent out to take his place, who would fraternise thoroughly with Bishop Macrorie. However, this is a very minor consideration indeed. I write in the interests of the whole community, and especially of the natives. . . . That Mr. Shepstone would be generally acceptable you may gather from a copy of the *Natal Times*, which I send you. It is edited by Mr. Ridley, the leading Radical in the House, who is pushing hard for responsible government; but yet you will see, whatever he

says against Mr. Shepstone's policy, there is an evident recognition of his invaluable services and great abilities, which, coming from an avowed opponent of the Government, is even a more important testimony to his real worth than anything I can say.

"*Do what can be done in the matter.* I think another friend will write to Mr. Charles Buxton on the subject, and it really is a time when all who feel for the native races under our charge should exert themselves, if possible, to secure such an appointment for one who has all his life long been a devoted friend of the natives, as well as a most valuable servant of the Crown.

"I need hardly say that Mr. Shepstone himself has not the remotest idea of my writing, or of any movement whatever being made in his behalf."

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *August 19, 1871.*

... "I was very glad to find that you had secured your First Class; and though probably you are not quite so high in it as you may have hoped, that is of no consequence whatever. You have now learned to measure your strength with your fellows, which you had never an opportunity of doing before, and have done uncommonly well, considering the drawbacks you have had. Work on steadily, and you will secure a respectable place, I feel sure, at the next examination,—and at any rate you will have done your duty, which is the main thing to aim at.

... I have been very hard at work since the last mail arrived, reviewing Bishop Browne's work in the new *Bible Commentary* (which is really a disgrace to the Church of England in this age). I have finished a pamphlet or little book, in which I have thoroughly discussed every part of his contributions to that *Commentary*; and perhaps shall take all the writers, one by one, in hand, and especially my old friend, the editor, Canon Cook, who is, I almost think, even worse than Bishop Browne. . . .

Macrorie is down on the coast. . . . We have had an amusing correspondence—*indirect*, through Mr. Hughes—about a 'certain box addressed to the Lord Bishop of Maritzburg, which a Kafir put into my carriage one day without my looking at it, and so I brought it home, but sent it in again the next morning by post-Kafir. . . . Thereupon Macrorie writes Mr. Hughes¹ a fuming letter, as he had no other mode, he said, of communicating with the 'Bishop of Natal,' using my title for once, in inverted commas, and begged him to ascertain if the box had been opened, since, if the address did not prevent its being taken to Bishopstowe, he saw no reason why it should prevent its being opened. So you see the style of man."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *November 20, 1871.*

. . . "I wish you particularly to make an inquiry for me as to whether my name still remains on the list of Incorporated Members of the S.P.G., and if so, in what form does my name appear? as Bishop of Natal? I was elected, I think, in the year 1851 or 1852, when I was actively employed by S.P.G. My name would be sure to appear in the Report for 1852 or 1853; and they have no right to strike it out. Please inquire. . . . If it is struck out, I should ask some one to ascertain *why*.
 ". . . Now for our Church Lands Bill. . . . It has passed through our Legislative Council after a tremendous fight. Every possible endeavour has been made to get it thrown out; but they have failed, thanks to the courageous and able advocacy of Messrs. Sanderson and Ridley. The latter began by being unfriendly to it; but, as the work went on, he became more and more decidedly in favour,

¹ Mr. Alfred Hughes, second son of the Bishop of St. Asaph (mentioned Vol. I. p. 182, &c.), had come to Natal for his health. He soon became one of the inner circle at Bishopstowe, throwing himself enthusiastically into work for the Bishop, both in verifying references and correcting proofs of critical matter, and also as secretary to the Finance Board of the Diocese, an office which was no sinecure.

and made an admirable speech on the second reading. . . . Now the Bill has gone home,—rather will go home next mail,—to the Secretary of State, for the Queen's consent, and they will move heaven and earth to try and get it negatived in Downing Street. In fact, Mr. Turnbull (registrar, as you know, of Bishop Macrorie) said, in the House on the third reading, that they had influential persons at work in England, and therefore the Bill would not receive the Royal assent."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *October 16, 1871.*

"I have reviewed the *Bishops' Commentary* to the end of Leviticus, and cannot help thinking that when the shallowness of that work is thoroughly exposed, as I am able to expose it, more will have been done to shake the traditional position than perhaps by anything else that I have done. Probably no one could have done this so effectually as I can, because no one will have all the points of the case so completely at his fingers' ends as I must have them, from the necessity of the case, after thoroughly completing my own labours on the Pentateuch. Scholars generally will turn away from the *Bishops' Commentary* with contempt, as beneath their notice in respect of critical knowledge, though, of course, it contains some good information on geographical and other matters, all which, however, may be found in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

"The diamonds are greatly disturbing the colony, though ultimately, I doubt not, both they and the gold will be the making of it, together with our own products of sugar, coffee, and cotton."

TO THE REV. C. VOYSEY.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 19, 1872.*

"I have received the proposal from Mr. Wright to become President of your Association, but have felt obliged to decline it. In the first place it seems to me hardly correct

to become President of an Association with whose proceedings I could not interfere. Although it would be an honour to be associated, even nominally, with such an influential body as is formed by your supporters, yet I should certainly be held—by my adversaries, at all events—and rightly held, to be responsible substantially for all your teachings and doings.

“Now you know that I do not think that any permanent result will be obtained by separating from the National Church, so long as such a Church exists, and that I do not therefore agree with the course which you have taken in trying to establish a distinct Church. . . . Even if I fully agreed in the principal points of your teaching, as set forth in the paper forwarded to me, and which may be regarded, I suppose, as a sort of manifesto of the Association itself, I should not be sanguine as to any lasting effect resulting from the experiment. During your own life-time, and while health and strength last for the work which you have undertaken, . . . no doubt your services will afford relief to many pious souls who cannot worship elsewhere. But when you are gone, what will then become of your new Church? I see no signs of stability in it. . . .

“Then, again, I cannot say that I fully approve of the manifesto, as I call it, of your Association. I can heartily adopt all your positive statements; but there are some of your details which I could not indorse, at least in their present form. I could not undertake, for instance, to deny the ‘doctrine of the Trinity.’ What ‘doctrine’ do you mean? The Platonists held a doctrine of the Trinity, and so do several heretical bodies. And I, for one, should not be able to use your expression without definition of the particular ‘doctrine of the Trinity’ to which you refer. The case would be otherwise, if you had said ‘not maintaining as necessary to salvation’ the doctrine in question, whatever it may be. But how can you undertake to dogmatize on so mysterious a subject as the Divine nature? May there not be, as philosophers of old have held, a Tri-Unity in the Godhead, which at any rate good men may

hold, if they do not inforce their views upon others, and which you are not called upon, nor (as it seems to me) authorised, to deny?

“Again, I do most certainly hold the doctrine of salvation by faith only, and consider my view on that point to be the Pauline and orthodox view. In short, I admire and thoroughly approve of your positive statements, but I do not agree with all your negations, and I should altogether object to some of them. As to the name of your Church, I could not call myself barely a Theist. Of course, I am a Theist, but I am a ‘Christian Theist,’ not a ‘Hindoo Theist,’ or a ‘Mussulman Theist.’ . . . Of course, by Christianity I do not mean believing certain dogmas attributed, rightly or wrongly, to Christ and his Apostles, and laid down by the Church. But I mean receiving Christ’s doctrine concerning the Father, as His Father and our Father, His God and our God, and trying to live in the spirit of Christ. Imperfectly as that spirit is exhibited in the Gospels, Christ assuredly revealed the Father to men, and has taught us, by His example in life and in death, to be also in our measure revealing daily the Father one to another. In short, the three primary doctrines of Christianity, as I hold it, are these: the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and the Revelation of God in Man; and these really lie at the basis of the Church Creeds.”

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *June 17, 1872.*

. . . “About a month ago a paragraph appeared in our papers, saying that our Church Lands Bill had been disallowed. Since then I have heard from very good authority that Bishop Gray has written to say that Mr. Gladstone had said that the Bill was objected to because I was made sole trustee; and no doubt this is the source of the paragraph in question. It will be a great piece of unfairness if Mr. Gladstone interferes; but it seems plain that they have applied to him, and I gather that they are not quite

at ease as to Lord Kimberley. . . . Please to communicate the above to Mr. Shaen. He knows, of course, that the enemy compelled us to strike out the check on my action which was provided in the Bill by the necessity of the Church Council approving of my proceedings. They would not hear of the Church Council, in which clergy and laity vote in one house—horror of horrors!—and now that they have struck it out, make the sole trusteeship an objection, though Bishop Gray was sole trustee in the Grahams-town Bill. Why was not this objection raised before, when three others were raised, all which have been met in the present Bill, as we should have met this also if we had known that it would be raised, instead of spending £100 of my precious money upon the Bill? Who are to be co-trustees with me? Bishop Gray or Bishop Macrorie, who both ignore my very existence, and will not have the slightest connexion or communication with me? My own Dean or Archdeacon? Well, I should be perfectly ready to consent to this; but this would be only myself in another form, whereas now I cannot part with any property, under the Bill, except by giving previous notice in the *Gazette*, which of course gives the opportunity of opposing in the Supreme Court.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *July 20, 1872.*

. . . “Macrorie has just been holding his Synod, which has covered them with ridicule in the eyes of the colonists, as one of the main points considered was the necessity of calling upon the Capetown and Grahamstown dioceses to excommunicate all my supporters, as Macrorie and the rest do here; so that Mr. and Mrs. Keate ought to have had a ‘ticket of leave’ from Macrorie or one of his clergy before they should be received to communion at Capetown, or, of course, in England. These and like proceedings (one young clergyman calling the Privy Council a ‘despicable tribunal,’ another older one ‘warning those white heathens

who had been married by a magistrate that they were not married in the eye of the Church, and that any man so "married" would be allowed by the Church to abandon his so-called wife and marry another woman'—and all this in the presence of Macrorie, and without a word of protest or reproof from him) have opened men's eyes, and made the breach plainer than ever between the Church of South Africa and the Church of England. . . . In short, this Synod has greatly strengthened my position. . . . The Rev. G. H. M——, of Cambridge, who is a narrow Evangelical, and therefore has no sympathy with my views, had been officiating on the coast without any licence, having means of his own, and being equally opposed to Ritualism and Rationalism. So Macrorie bullied him and coaxed him alternately, till he got him to accept his licence about a month ago. But after a day or two he threw it up, and said that, if he must take some licence, he would prefer to take that of the lawful Bishop of the diocese. Accordingly I went down and saw him, and regularly licensed and instituted him to the valuable preferment of New Carisbrooke *cum* Victoria *cum* Umhlali, from which altogether he may extract about £40 per annum, but as he is independent in means this does not matter. . . .

"As Bishop Macrorie's operations in respect of Mr. M—— obliged me to run down to the coast, I thought I might as well wait about Durban till the mail-steamer arrived with the new Governor. . . . In due time Mr. and Mrs. Musgrave landed, and received an enthusiastic welcome from the people of Durban. Last Thursday they gave him a grand public dinner, at which I also was a guest; and I have ordered a copy of the *Natal Mercury* to be forwarded to you, though I fear that it cannot be posted in time to accompany this letter. So I may as well say that, when I arose to return thanks for the 'Bishop of Natal and the clergy of all denominations,' I was received with what the papers call 'tremendous cheering, which continued for some time.' In fact, they gave me a complete 'ovation,' which I received, of course, as given, not to myself personally, but

to the cause which I represent, in opposition to the doings of Macrorie and his Synod. As there were more than 120 guests, and very many of them belonging to different Dissenting bodies, this reception was very satisfactory, as giving the new Governor the information that I did not stand alone in the colony, and he might show his colours (which I believe are liberal) without any hesitation."

TO C. J. BUNYON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *August 4, 1872.*

. . . "I have nothing to do with Mr. Voysey's present movement, except that I respect him as a faithful servant of the God of Truth according to his light. . . . That he is a most sincere Christian, whether he adopts the name or not, I do not in the least doubt—perhaps a far better one than many of the so-called orthodox believers who scream out against him. But I exceedingly regret some of the expressions used by him in his sermons, and I do not at all agree with his mode of carrying on the warfare against traditionary notions. But to his own Master he must stand or fall. There is very much that I admire and love about him; and I heartily embrace him as a fellow-labourer for the kingdom of God."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *August 14, 1872.*

. . . "By this mail the Governor has received a letter, from the President of the Council to Lord Kimberley, with reference to our Church Lands Bill, in which I notice . . . that the Privy Council knows nothing of the 'Bishop of Maritzburg,' but speaks only of 'Bishop Macrorie' and the 'Bishop of Natal.' . . . No one here was aware of the fact until it incidentally comes out in this letter from the Privy Council. . . . Of course, I have no means whatever with which to carry on an expensive litigation. Otherwise this reference to the Privy Council is a superb fact for us, and what was not at all anticipated, I venture to believe, by the