

on March 31, sentenced to two years' imprisonment with hard labour (!) for

“removing, or assisting to remove, the cattle of the tribe, without the sanction and in defiance of the authority of the Supreme Chief.”<sup>1</sup>

On March 13, no answer had been received; and the Bishop wrote to ask the purpose of the Governor in the matter. The answer received through Mr. Shepstone was that when the petitioners were asked to state the grounds of their request, they repudiated any intention of urging the request which they had signed. The Bishop replied that this was explained by the fact that they had been intimidated by some indunas, who told them that, having gone to law with the Supreme Chief, they would certainly be put in prison; and he requested that, if this explanation was not received, a copy of the petition and of the correspondence which had taken place in connexion with it should be forwarded immediately to the

<sup>1</sup> He and one other, through the Bishop's exertions, were released on May 24, and told to go (six miles) to Bishopstowe. They were both aged and infirm, and through their imprisonment—one, Mhlaba, for two, the other, Umnyengeza, for three months—still more enfeebled for walking. A waggon would, therefore, have been sent to fetch them if the day and hour of their release had been notified beforehand. “The one,” writes Miss Colenso, “soon broke down, to be picked up and brought out stiff with exposure on a bitterly cold evening, in the Bishop's little carriage; the other poor old petitioner, half-blind, had wandered out of the way, and was not seen again, though we hunted for days far and near (Mr. La Touche helped), till, on June 25, his remains were found charred by a grass fire, three or four miles from Bishopstowe, but only a short distance from the place where his old wife was ‘under surveillance.’” He may have been trying to make his way to her; but it seems more likely that he took a wrong path, and went on till he fell and perished of hunger, cold, and fatigue. So died this poor old man, a headman of some note in his tribe, but surely innocent of any “crime” against the Government. “At this moment,” writes the Bishop on June 30, “there are a number of other aged ‘rebels’ who have been detained as prisoners for the last six months, and who would probably, if their cases were carefully inquired into, be found to be as innocent of any real crime as Umnyengeza.”

Secretary of State. The Governor at first affected to feel great indignation "at the very grave imputations" which the Bishop had cast upon the honour of the Secretary for Native Affairs and other officers "of having by intimidation attempted to impede the course of justice." The Bishop was not to be thus influenced or put down. He denied that he had brought any charge against any European officers of Government, and maintained that he felt bound to mention the fact of intimidation by the indunas, inasmuch as failure to do so would involve an imputation on his own honour that he had forwarded a frivolous and fictitious petition, signed by persons who either did not understand, or did not really mean, what they were doing. His firmness drew forth a request that he would place a plain and concise written statement before the Executive Council, containing the grounds on which he considered the sentence objectionable. In order to do this, he replied that it would be needful for him to have access to the prisoner.

Nor was this the end of the unseemly procedure of the Government. On the 2nd of May, it was announced in the *Natal Times* that Langalibalele had been sent down to Durban heavily manacled; and on the same day the Bishop wrote again to press his request for access to the prisoner. Mr. Shepstone replied by saying that it had been found absolutely necessary to remove both Langalibalele and his son Malambule to Durban, but that as the Bishop had mentioned that he should shortly be himself obliged to go to Durban, it was supposed that no inconvenience would be caused to him by this removal. Some inconvenience and difficulty it could not fail to cause him; but, passing this by, the Bishop merely asked that the extra expense to which he might thus be put should receive the consideration of the Governor, who had expressed himself as "perfectly confident that the Bishop's sole object in this matter was to further the ends of justice."

The following letter from the Bishop to the Secretary for

Native Affairs exhibits the spirit in which his patient efforts for the barest justice were met.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *June 12, 1874.*

“ SIR,

“ I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 10, with a list inclosed of guns registered for members of the Hlubi tribe, for which I am much obliged.

“ You ask when I shall be prepared to go on with the appeal on behalf of Langelibalele, as the delay is causing inconvenience. The delay in question is, of course, to be regretted on all accounts ; but it is one for which I am not myself responsible.

“ The first petition in the matter was presented on March 1, and more than five weeks elapsed before permission to appeal was granted (April 9) ; and then my request to be allowed to see the prisoner with a view to preparing the appeal, first made on April 16, was not granted till a month afterwards (May 16), at which time the prisoner had been removed to Durban (May 1), which involved a delay of ten days more. Moreover, the permission to inspect Mr. Perrin's register, asked for at the same date (April 16), reached me only yesterday, and I purpose to avail myself of it to-day. Also you inform me that you are unable to supply me with the date of Mr. Macfarlane's first reporting to yourself the prisoner's conduct in respect of the guns, which is a point of considerable importance in judging of the extent of the contumacy originally charged against him by Mr. Macfarlane.

“ Under these circumstances I have been much hindered and inconvenienced in the work of preparing the appeal, having had to expend much time in endeavouring, by a laborious comparison of the evidence, to arrive with some degree of confidence at the facts, which an interview with the prisoner himself, the inspection of Mr. Perrin's register, or the supply of certain dates from the records in your office, would have enabled me to ascertain at once.

“ I trust, however, to be prepared to lay the written appeal, as

desired, before his Excellency and the Executive Council, about the end of next week or the beginning of the week following

"I have, &c.,  
"J. W. NATAL."

Again, when on June 24 the Government received the written appeal, and consented for the first time to allow counsel to appear, they required that he should do so on the 26th, in two days' time, and the Bishop had another inch-by-inch struggle, before, on July 4, he secured to Mr. Goodricke the very moderate extension of time, for preparation, to July 8 and "a fee of 120 guineas and expenses." But *no other expenses* were paid, and besides the inconvenience and difficulty to the Bishop there was the positive and inevitable injury to the appeal, as meanwhile the Bishop had to do the best he could with the information obtained during his four or five days in Durban, where he had to preach twice on the Sunday, ordain a clergyman, and consecrate a little outlying church.

"Perhaps," writes his eldest daughter, "the chief good of the appeal lay in the drop of comfort given and received at these interviews in the Durban Gaol, from which, it being cold weather, the Bishop came home without his greatcoat, which was shown as a most valuable possession by the poor old chief, to a visitor at the Cape, a year or two afterwards, with the remark, 'It was his own ; he actually stripped himself for me.'"

On July 13, the judgement of the Executive Council was delivered, in which important points raised in the arguments of Messrs. Goodricke and Moodie were entirely ignored, and the Bishop's written appeal was taken piece by piece and set aside :—

"The court, in short," writes the Bishop, "took advantage of

the fact that no answer was vouchsafed to the request, in my letter of May 5, for some small aid from the confiscated property of the chief towards obtaining legal assistance in preparing the appeal ; and confining itself to this document—which was in consequence drawn up by myself upon the narrow basis afforded by the record of *ex parte* evidence at the trial, produced by the Crown, examined for the Crown, and not cross-examined for the prisoner—it excluded the able arguments of the two gentlemen hurriedly employed at the last, whose presence under the circumstances might however have been dispensed with, and whose advocacy was so much wasted breath.”

The Bishop’s examination of this judgement may be read in the Imperial Blue-book already referred to [C. 1141]. In the arguments used against him will be found, by anyone who will take the trouble to peruse that document, evidence of unfitness to discharge judicial functions in the name of the Queen of England as glaring as any that is to be discovered in history.

The opinions expressed in some quarters in England in reference to these incidents were not likely to be acceptable to some among the colonists in Natal. A meeting convened in Durban

“reprobated in the strongest manner possible the action of Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, in interposing as he has done between the Colonial Government and the natives, by mischievously maligning the colonists, distorting facts, and misrepresenting the trial of Langalibalele as unfair and illegal—conduct unworthy of his lordship’s high position and calling, and calculated in an eminent degree to rouse bad feeling, to foster rebellion, and to endanger the future peace and well-being of the colony.”

In this temper they recorded a vehement protest against some utterances of the Peace Society in England, and in this temper they sent a memorial to the Secretary of State.

The conduct of the Christian ministers of Natal at this time cannot be passed over without notice. Upon Bishop Colenso's "interference" in political matters affecting the people of Natal and Zululand, his country will hereafter look back with unreserved pride and thankfulness. Had he, however, felt his mouth closed, and his hand restrained, by some imperative rule demanding that, in the interests of orderly government, there should be in no case any interference by a clergyman with the "responsible authorities" in the colony, he might still have exercised, though less prominently, an influence for good. But, in determining to raise his voice in public, he could not, without treason to his deepest convictions of duty, have ranged himself on the side of a powerful Government, with the whole colony at its back, against a most helpless and miserable captive. Yet this is what "nearly all the clergy of Natal" did. Their names are to be found enrolled in Blue-book C. 1119, in which they affirm, "as a counter-statement" to that of the Peace Society,

"that, being well acquainted with the rebellion of Langalibalele and the campaign which followed, we feel and affirm that the action of the Natal Government was throughout humane, lenient, just, and urgently necessary."

This manifesto was composed for publication in the *London Times*, in which it duly appeared. It was signed by seventy-four gentlemen, who styled themselves "ministers of the Gospel." Of these, only two were clergy of the Church of England, one of these being an aged clergyman hardly responsible for his acts, who added after his name the words, "as far as I know." The eager zeal with which many among them approved the memorial is very striking. One writes, "I long to append my name to it"; several that the Government had, in their view, been "too lenient"; and one that it had been "much too lenient"; while another said that he had

read the account of the trial, and had been "satisfied that it was *complete, just, and right.*"

It is due to the Church of England in Natal that the following letter, transmitting the ministers' memorial to the Government, should be given here. Writing to the Colonial Secretary of Natal, the Rev. W. H. Mann said :—

"I have the honour to forward to you, for the perusal of His Excellency in Council, the accompanying memorial from seventy-four Christian ministers in Natal. . . . His Excellency will observe that this document, in expressing warm approval of the policy lately pursued with reference to the rebel chief Langalibalele, at least indirectly protests against the attempt that is being made to set aside the sentence of the rebel. I wish also to direct His Excellency's attention to the very large proportion of the Christian ministers in this colony who have signed this protest, and also to point out that (with the exception of two or three whose positions have made them diffident about signing) the few who have not done so nearly all comprise the clergy of the Bishop of Natal."

The appeal made by the Bishop produced, it is clear, a deep impression. The tide of popular opinion was again turning in his favour. The *Natal Colonist* had begun to speak of

"the illegality and arbitrary character of the whole proceedings."

The *Witness* declared that

"the rebel chief had been tried before a new court created for the purpose and by a law and under a form of procedure wholly new to Natal."

The *Cape Standard and Mail* held it "monstrous"

"to accuse a man like Dr. Colenso of maliciously maligning the colonists of Natal. . . . No one who knows anything of his character will believe in such an accusation. . . ."

When they charge him with *misrepresenting* the trial of Langalibalele as unfair and illegal, we are entirely at issue with them, and thoroughly agree with the Bishop's view."

Later on the same paper, having come to understand the matter more clearly, spoke of the Natal authorities as having thrown discredit on a righteous cause by the blunder they committed in trying this rebel chief not even by Kafir law, and certainly not by English law, but by a mongrel mixture of the two. The true conclusion was not yet reached. The cause of the prosecution was not a righteous one, and the prisoner was a guiltless man. The offence which he had given arose from a well-grounded fear of treachery, which explained his conduct at every step. At the trial all reference to the cause of this fear was smothered as an aggravation of the offence, and the key to the whole problem was kept resolutely out of sight. Five months later Mr. Goodricke applied formally to the Court of Appeal<sup>1</sup>

"that additional evidence might be taken which would explain the ground of the fear that led to Mawiza's being made to take off his coat. The Lieutenant-Governor admitted that the court had power to hear such additional evidence, and the room was cleared to consider the application. On the doors being re-opened, the Lieutenant-Governor informed the advocate that the court had decided unanimously to reject the application. It will scarcely be believed that in the final judgement this matter is disposed of by saying, 'there is no evidence before the court upon the point in question.'"

In disregard of the advice of the Secretary of State, and in spite of an application to the Supreme Court for an interdict to prevent the Lieutenant-Governor transporting the prisoner to Robben Island, the measure was carried out. When on

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* the Executive Council.



his way to England, the Bishop applied at Capetown for leave to visit him. This application was refused on the ground that the Bishop should have obtained leave first from the Governor of Natal. Protesting against the impediment thus placed

“in the way of a prisoner approaching the Crown with an appeal for justice and mercy at the hands of his Sovereign, which, as he believes, has been denied to him by her representatives in South Africa,”

the Bishop requested that a copy of the correspondence which had passed on the subject should be forwarded to the Secretary of State. This request also was refused, and the Bishop was left to do as best he could by his own personal representations after reaching England.

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *January 24, 1874.*

“I have read the report in the *Times* to-day of yesterday’s proceedings, and it is my conviction that Mawiza is a scoundrel, and has deliberately lied to the court, and is utterly unworthy of credit in his description of the treatment he has received from Langalibalele and his people. He has *viciously coloured* the whole of his story, for what reason and with what object in view I know not; but I well remember Offy<sup>1</sup> telling me that he was one of the greatest scoundrels in the colony, and I now fully believe it. I will bring to-morrow the written evidence of four witnesses, including two of Mawiza’s men, which will, I think, satisfy you of this.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *January 28, 1874.*

“ . . . I have slept, or rather I have been awake, over yesterday’s proceedings, and I retain deliberately the conviction which I expressed to you of the dishonesty of

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Shepstone’s son Theophilus.

Mawiza's evidence, which seems to me to make him utterly unworthy of the confidence of the Government. . . ."

TO THE SAME.

" BISHOPSTOWE, *February 15, 1874.*

"Colonel Durnford has asked me to luncheon to-day. So please not to expect me after church.<sup>1</sup> But indeed I could not have gone up while this affair is going on. The more I read of the evidence, the more deeply I feel that there is no justification for the course taken with Langalibalele. Of course you think otherwise ; but it does not lessen my grief that such a difference on such a point should exist between us, and I cannot at present see my way out of the difficulty.

" Ever yours affectionately,  
" J. W. NATAL."

TO THE REV. J. REYNOLDS, BERA.

" BISHOPSTOWE, *April 4, 1874.*

" MY DEAR MR. REYNOLDS,

" I know nothing whatever about the 'Peace Society,' its Secretary; or its Manifesto—except what I have seen in the Natal journals. But as you have undertaken to write to me on the subject, knowing well, as you do, from the long conversation which I had with you in Maritzburg, the view which I take, with a deeper conviction every day of its correctness, as to the treatment which these two unfortunate tribes—15,000 human beings—have received, I feel bound to write a few words in reply to your letter.

" Since receiving it, I have read carefully the remarks of the 'Peace Society,' as quoted in the memorial to the Secretary of State adopted by the meeting at Durban. And I can only say that there is too much truth in what is there stated, except in the last clause, where the colonists

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop had generally lunched at Mr. Shepstone's before the five miles' drive home.

of Natal are suspected of practices, said to be common elsewhere under similar circumstances, but which, I am thankful to say, have no existence here. I should have willingly signed a protest, correcting this erroneous impression; though it is certain that if these women and girls had been 'allotted' to 'farmers and others' in different parts of the colony, 'remote from that which they have heretofore occupied,' as announced in the *Gazette*, being without any 'natural protectors' or friends, they would have been exposed to very great evils among the native labourers of other tribes, with whom they would have been necessarily brought into close contact.

"But the rest of the statement is substantially true, as everyone acquainted with the facts must know; and it appears to me that the writer has derived his information from the columns of the *Natal Mercury*. Thus it is quite true that—not 1,500, as he says, probably having before him the *Mercury* of November 27, in which I see it stated:—'There will be 1,500 women and children altogether for distribution; applications from persons willing to employ 5,000 of them have been received,'—but 2,000 or more, I imagine, of 'helpless Kafir women and children, the wives, sisters, and children of the fugitives and others,' were 'torn away by wholesale' from the location, and were to have been 'distributed' and apprenticed out 'for three years' at a distance from their former homes, as announced in the *Government Gazette*, which the writer has evidently seen, or, perhaps, a copy of it printed in the *Mercury*.

"No doubt the intended 'allotment' did not take place. But why? Because a layman—J. W. Winter, Esq., M.L.C., I am glad to say a member of my own congregation—wrote an indignant letter to the *Natal Witness*, protesting against 'such semi-barbarous treatment of the weak and helpless,' saying that 'we should disgrace ourselves if we did not return these women and children,' and adding, 'The time for this sort of thing is passed: let us hear no more of offering these helpless creatures as apprentices and labourers. We shall gain neither credit nor profit by such

conduct." He was well abused, of course, for writing such a letter; but it took effect, and we have heard no more of the 'apprenticeship' system. But how could the writer in England suppose that the Government plan, announced formally in the *Gazette*, would not be carried out? And, mark, he only says, 'It is stated in the last despatches that they *are to be* distributed.' How can any honest man, or Christian minister, deny the truth of this? . . .

"I need hardly say that the resolutions passed at the public meeting at Durban do not in the least trouble me; nor will they deter me from doing my duty as a man, an Englishman, and a minister of Christ, in standing for the defence of any whom I believe to have been down-trodden and oppressed. I should be ashamed to appear in the pulpit again, face to face with a Christian congregation, if I had shut my eyes to facts, and shrunk from the work to which my God has called me. What rubbish is the statement, in the third clause of the memorial, that the women and children had been 'basely deserted, and left to their fate by their natural protectors!'—when they only wished to be left alone, and would have easily found their way to their friends in other tribes or out of the colony. Does anyone suppose that such a flimsy pretext will deceive any sensible person in England? Do we not know that one of the reasons assigned for 'eating up' the adjoining tribe of Putini was that they had harboured some of Langalibalele's women? And were not the women and children of Putini's tribe deprived of their 'natural protectors' by the Government, as far as possible, when all the men of that tribe who could be caught were made prisoners, some of them living quietly on white men's farms—numbers of whom have been already put to 'hard labour' for the Government or private individuals, *without any trial*? It remains to be seen what crime this tribe has really committed, for which they (5,000 people) have deserved to be summarily 'eaten up.' Only last week twenty-four of Langalibalele's old men, some of them quite aged, were torn from their wives and families, and doomed to 'imprisonment for two years, with hard

labour'—for what? For merely 'withdrawing into fastnesses,' to be some little help as 'natural protectors' to the women and children who had taken refuge there, with supplies of food, till the dreadful storm should be overpast, hiding themselves from the approach of the murderous Government *impi*, who stabbed and shot numbers of women and children as well as men—a fact of which the Natal journals have told us little or nothing, and the Secretary of the Peace Society makes no allusion to it, though there are many volunteers, I expect, among those present at the front, who would know something about it. How many did Mawiza's people, when they were ordered home for cowardice, kill in the bush? At all events, one volunteer wrote down for me as follows:—'I saw a long line of Kafir women—prisoners—and most of them had children on their backs, besides a good number of children whom they led by the hand as well. Several of the women had been wounded. Among them I noticed one in particular, who had been shot, the ball having passed through her shoulders from one side to the other; she was still carrying her child, who was tied on behind. Some of the children that were with these women were wounded, but I do not know what became of them.' But how many had been left behind, dying or dead? And then what humbug it is to speak in Resolution 2 of the prisoners' 'own unqualified admission of guilt,' after the manner in which they were tried, with all the world against them, and no one allowed to advise or defend them! Did those twenty-four old men, sentenced to 'two years' imprisonment with hard labour' for 'withdrawing into fastnesses,' make 'an unqualified admission of their guilt,' or, as the memorial says, 'of the justice and lenience (!) of their sentence'?

“And what ignorance of the real facts of the case is displayed in speaking of 'the concurrent testimony of the *principal native chiefs in the colony* to the justice of the sentences respectively passed upon them'! Out of the six natives who were summoned to form the court for the 'trial' of Langalibalele, only two were chiefs at all, and one of them,

Tetelegu, with his people, had been very actively engaged in the field against the prisoner; the four others were merely indunas, two of them being described as 'head induna to the Government,' and 'induna to the S.N.A.,'<sup>1</sup> the latter being a tenant of mine, with a magnificent chieftainship over one kraal of three huts, and a third being the petty induna of the magistrate's office at Durban. The former two, as well as Tetelegu, had formed part of the Government force, and, perhaps, expected their share of the human spoils—provided the prisoner should be condemned—these three having first been employed as executioners of the Supreme Chief's judgement upon the tribe, and then summoned to say whether that judgement was just—and all four indunas depending for promotion on the will of the Supreme Chief!

"But Resolution 3, which is specially directed against myself, contains at least two deliberate falsehoods. I leave the question as to whether I have '*misrepresented* the trial of Langalibalele as unfair and illegal' to the judgement of thinking and unprejudiced men, and to the decision of the legal advisers of the Government here and at home; though I may remark that I have nowhere publicly stated that it was 'illegal,' whatever doubts I may have had upon that point. But I defy anyone to show that I have published anything about Langalibalele's trial, which 'maligned the colonists' or 'distorted facts.' In my *first* letter I said that I agreed with Mr. Advocate J. B. Moodie, that the prisoner 'had not had a fair trial,' because he was allowed no counsel, white or black, who would have exposed Mawiza's lying, and would have drawn out other facts which 'would have modified considerably public opinion as to the conduct of the prisoner and his tribe.' . . . . In my *second* letter, I gave the reasons why I considered Mawiza to be a 'lying scoundrel,' when my witnesses had been confronted with him before the S.N.A. and his whole body of chiefs and indunas. This was not done at my request or importunity, as some of the Natal journals have thought proper to repre-

<sup>1</sup> *Sic* throughout for "Secretary for Native Affairs."

sent it, but because the S.N.A. (very properly) insisted on it, but threatened that, if they were found to have calumniated a Government messenger, they must be severely punished. To this I at once assented, without asking their consent, and accordingly I took them in, as it were, with ropes around their necks, but with the result which you know of. In my *third* letter I explained that the *Witness* was mistaken in supposing that it was a proof of the prisoner's rebellious intentions, that a certain ceremony of 'sprinkling' was performed at his two chief kraals at a certain time last year, such 'sprinkling' having been represented in the published reports as the 'usual preparation for war.' When used for war purposes, the *warriors only* are sprinkled, and always on the day when the *impi* goes forth, or on the day before. Whereas in this case the sprinkling took place about April, six months before there was any disturbance; and *all the people* were sprinkled, men, women, and children, in order to 'strengthen their knees,' partly because no regular 'sprinkling' had taken place at the Umkosi, or 'feast of first-fruits,' which was not properly kept that year, but especially with reference to the somewhat sudden and unexpected death of the chief's elder brother (Uncwane) about a month or so previously. . . .

"This is all that I have written about Langelibalele's trial in the Natal journals, and what is there in this 'mischievously maligning the colonists, and distorting facts'?" And yet two ministers of the Gospel, the Rev. W. H. Mann (Congregationalist) and the Rev. Z. Robinson (Wesleyan), sat quietly by, and heard these falsehoods, and allowed them to be adopted at a public meeting, without, so far as appears, uttering a word of protest against them. Well! if the Secretary for the Peace Society sees the Natal journals in England, and compares the contents of my letters with the terms of this resolution, he will form his own idea, I expect, as to the Christian character of the majority of the meeting and the ministers present—that is, if a *love of truth* be one of the graces which should adorn a Christian. And it is possible that he may measure by the same line the

veracity of other statements in those resolutions, as well as in those adopted at a 'meeting of ministers,' convened by the Rev. W. H. Mann, as you inform me, which were drawn up by the Rev. Z. Robinson, who has only very recently arrived in the colony, and can hardly, I should think, be qualified to speak with much confidence about colonial or native affairs.

"Only this remains to be said. I am not so much surprised at other ministers signing the document in question, who know nothing of the facts which have been freely communicated by me to yourself. But you are responsible to the Master whom we serve for what you know 'more than others'; and, 'to whom much has been given, of them will the more be required.'

"Yours very truly,  
"J. W. NATAL."

TO W. SHAEN, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 14, 1874.*

"I was delighted to get yours of March 4 to-day, and to find that something is being done on behalf of our two unfortunate tribes. Now that the 'trials' of Langalibalele's people are all over, which are mere burlesques of justice, and I can look over all the evidence produced, I am entirely confirmed in the view which I have taken already of this affair: viz. that it began with the impetuosity of Mr. Macfarlane, the magistrate, reporting the chief to Mr. Shepstone when there was no sufficient ground for it; . . . that the chief, being thereupon summoned to Maritzburg, . . . feared that some secret heavy charges had been brought against him, under the weight of which he would be crushed as his brother had been when summoned to the Supreme Chief in Zululand; that as message after message came he and his people got terrified; . . . and so, when Sir B. Pine came up in his glory with all his force of military, volunteers, and blacks, they fled in great fright; that then came the unfortunate affair of the Pass, and now Mr. Shepstone himself 'lost his head,' and all since then has been one



tissue of frightful injustice. . . . I suppose that Sir B. Pine had heard from the Secretary of State when a few days ago he at last allowed the appeal, after nearly six weeks' delay. I shall accept his proposal, as you will see by my letter. And I shall do my best to put in a terse, compact form my arguments, in order that in this way they may reach the eyes of the Secretary of State. I shall try to print the appeal, and I shall append to it the first thirty-two pages of the 'statement' of Nofihlela, &c., as also those about Matshana's affair. This last is really the *key* of the whole affair. You will see what a number of statements I have obtained, all substantially the same. But the last two are from an eye-witness, and I hope in a week or so to obtain two more from eye-witnesses; and if these, far separated from each other, give substantially the same account, there can be no doubt of the truth of the story; and if so, it has blackened the English character among the natives in such a way as must for many years to come affect our prestige among them, more especially as Mr. J. W. Shepstone has not only been appointed, since the act in question, to be a resident magistrate, . . . but was actually put forward as Government prosecutor in this affair of Langalibalele in the presence of a crowd of natives, who all know the story.<sup>1</sup> . . . I have told you in former letters that Mr. Shepstone, when I first mentioned the story to him, on January 13 I think, said that he had never heard of it; and when I told him further particulars on January 27, in presence of the Attorney-General, said that he did not believe it; also that one of the magistrates, Mr. Hawkins, told me afterwards that John Shepstone had assured him 'on his honour' that it was not true. I am constrained by the weight of evidence to believe that *it is true*; and I hope that before the appeal comes on I shall have the testimony of three eye-witnesses. . . . On Good Friday two messengers from the Zulu king Ceshwayo (the *third* set of messengers whom he has sent to our Governor to beg that Langalibalele may be allowed to go to him,

<sup>1</sup> This story, with the evidence establishing it, is reserved; necessarily, for the following chapter (VIII.).

and he has since sent a fourth set, all of whom have been sent back with a refusal) came to say farewell to me, as Ceshwayo had expressly charged them to call on me as one of his '*fathers*' to ask me to intercede for Langalibalele, expecting that I was as intimate as in days gone by with Mr. Shepstone. . . . So I gave these messengers a word of mine for Ceshwayo, that he should send for Matshana, and get the story taken down for me; and in this way, at all events, I fully hope to receive it.

"But, whether I get these two additional proofs or not, I cannot doubt that the story as told in my papers is true. I expect that Mr. Shepstone has been deceived by his brother all along, and has perhaps not cared to inquire too curiously into the affair, which now rises up in a ghastly form, and *must* be examined into. . . . At this moment I imagine that Sir B. Pine has not heard of the story, or has been led to disbelieve it utterly. But, of course, it must appear in my appeal; unless, indeed, he should refuse to grant the very reasonable request which I have made in my final letter—in which case I shall have to consider whether I will prosecute the appeal or refer the matter to the Secretary of State; . . . or unless the Governor should render the appeal unnecessary by letting Langa and his sons go to Ceshwayo, who I expect will send another set of messengers before long to ask for them. . . .

"About ten days ago they held an 'indignation' meeting in Durban, in which, as you will see by the newspapers, I have been somewhat roughly handled. Of course, I care nothing about it, and, in fact, if I am not much mistaken, the violent speeches and rowdy character of the meeting will do more to condemn their cause than to injure my reputation. Also the 'ministers of all denominations' have signed a protest against the 'Peace Society,' and you will see my reply<sup>1</sup> to Mr. Reynolds, one of my clergy, who wrote expressing a hope that I did not approve of it. Most probably Sir B. Pine is at the bottom of all this. . . . Remember that the planters along the coast are all 'bribed' by his ordering

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 359.

out, as Supreme Chief, 2,000 natives to work this season at the sugar and coffee plantations, which were very much in want of labour. I *know* that this has caused great dissatisfaction among the coast natives, and that one chief, of whom 160 men were demanded, called his men together for the purpose, and they refused to obey the order; whereupon he reported the fact to the magistrate, and he told him to separate his property from that of his people, and the Supreme Chief would do what he thought proper. . . . How long this will last remains to be seen. Why should not the farmers now call out for labour? And why should not this 'servitude' for private purposes be enforced whenever it is found convenient?

"P.S. *April 15*.—I have just had a visit from the brother of a coast chief, who confirms the fact that there is great dissatisfaction among them. . . . I told Mr. Shepstone, when I first heard of the order, that it was the work of a madman. Of course, every chief in the colony will be sharp enough to see that his turn may come next. I believe, as I have said before, that this is contrary to the whole spirit of the instructions from the Secretary of State, who has allowed (and even then with hesitation, and subject to Mr. Shepstone's judgement) that they may be called out from time to time, when necessity requires, for *public* works; and I do not think that there would be any serious objection to this. But of course this is the Governor for the colonists. Accordingly, an address has been signed by 'every accessible resident in Alexander county,' supporting Sir B. Pine's action and condemning the action of 'two individuals' (viz. Bishop of Natal and Mr. Sanderson), and no wonder, if . . . their magistrate has turned out for them, under the order in question, 760 labourers for the plantations, having greatly exceeded even the demand made upon him by the Governor. But this is the same half-madman who a year or two ago, because he could not find out who had stabbed certain oxen, flogged every man living within a certain distance, to the number of seventy—of which fact the Secretary of State is well aware, as it was reported to him by Mr.

Ridley, M.L.C. . . . The last batch of Langalibalele's prisoners was marched off a few days ago, and among the last twenty-four old men, some quite aged, were doomed to two years' 'imprisonment with hard labour,' for hiding themselves from the 'Government devils,' as a white man, whose *protégé* they had injured, calls them. . . . Would not Lord Carnarvon order these old men, at any rate, to be let out? They will hardly live out, some of them, two years in prison. How could this punishment possibly help to check 'rebellion,' if there had been any in Langa's case? It is simply a brutal exercise of power to crush the head of these helpless wretches into the dust. But Putini's people have not been tried at all. . . . Yet they have been already treated as convicts, and sent out to labour as such.

"I send a Government *Gazette*, just published. The object of Government Notice 116 is to give away to Europeans the lands lately occupied by Langa and Putini. . . . But No. 117 is most important, for that provides for the forced servitude of the female children, above ten years, till marriage, and of male children, from twelve years to thirteen, of these 'convicts,' as well as for the services of these convicts themselves. Who ever heard of the children of a prisoner being involved in this way in the father's offence in a civilised country? But the object is plainly to provide domestic servants and farm servants for the farmers and others, *i.e.* the planters on the coast especially. Why should these public convicts be assigned at all to private individuals? Before this reaches you, I fear the law will have been sanctioned at home; or it may be left without remark—in which case the Secretary of State can veto it within a certain time. . . .

"I send you a Blue-book with the *authorised* report of the trial of Langa. I have compared it carefully with that in the *Witness*, from which I have hitherto quoted. . . . Let me draw your attention to Mr. Shepstone's statement, about the middle of p. 23, that even so late as October 29, the day before Sir B. Pine left with the force from Maritzburg, he told two men of Langa's to tell the chief 'that, if he would

only meet his Excellency and explain his conduct, *no harm whatever would happen!* Up to that moment, therefore, he and his tribe were guiltless of any *serious* offence. Then, on November 1, Mawiza told his lies to Mr. Shepstone, and on November 4 came the Pass affair; and after that there was a cry of rage and vengeance from the colonists, totally ignorant of Langa's real proceedings; and the bloody work began. . . ."

The Bishop at this point refers to the course pursued by some of the colonists, who had said that

"for a long time we up here had been feeling that things were in a very unsafe state,"

and he adds,

"Yes, and it was the frantic fears of these whites which frightened Langa's women into the caves, &c. If Langa was 'a drunken coward,' he was hardly likely to break out 'in rebellion.' But it was the magistrate, Mr. Macfarlane, who supplied him with bottles of rum—as also, it seems, did Mr. Mellersh himself. . . ."

TO C. J. BUNYON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *May 23, 1874.*

"I am hard at work, preparing to go to Durban next week, with my native printer, Magera, to see Langalibalele. I send by this mail a copy of the *Witness*, . . . and I commend to your notice the sub-leader, which bears directly on myself, and threatens me with the indignation of the colonists if I go and see Langa in his prison, in order to learn distinctly about some facts which are left obscure in the evidence, for the purpose of preparing the appeal which the law allows him. In the same paper you will see that what any man of common sense might have predicted is really coming to pass. A guerrilla warfare is

beginning in the abandoned location, and the lives of men and women are not safe, especially those who have been prominently concerned in bringing these miseries upon the two tribes. The attack on Mr. Mellersh, however, seems to have been made by two of Putini's men, who have had everything taken from them. . . . Naturally the young fellows are savage and desperate ; and I fear that we shall have a troubled winter season. . . . I forward by this mail . . . copies of the notes of the (Langa's) defence ; but there is quite as much matter—no, about half as much, I think—ready in the rough for Part 2, the case of the sons. It is such slow work, however, with my native printer, who is quite alone, to print all this, that I think I shall have this second part printed in town. And perhaps some friends of the natives, through Mr. Shaen, would be willing to advance £20 for printing expenses, any surplus to be laid out for blankets, &c., for these poor wretches, stripped of everything, during our cold winter season, which has just begun. . . . Of course, I shall have to spend this money (if I decide to print in town) before any promise of help can reach me : but I will take my chance. I think there are those in England who will lend a little help for such a work.<sup>1</sup> I do most earnestly hope that a Commission may be already on its way to Natal. We are in a most deplorable state, without any Government worthy of the name ; and I am very much afraid that, unless something is done from England to help us, we shall very soon slip from bad to worse. I send by this mail the Blue-book report of the *three* trials—the chief's, the sons', and the men's. Manifestly, these form in reality but *one* trial, for, throughout, the evidence bears upon the chief. But the result is, I suppose, that I shall be precluded from using in the appeal anything proved in the second and third trials. I . . . am satisfied that on the whole there is absolutely no sign whatever of a 'rebellion' in the chief's conduct or in that of his tribe. . . ."

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bunyon responded to this with a bale of 100 blankets, a most welcome gift, as the women had in many cases been stripped even of their skin petticoats.

The Bishop goes on to notice, *seriatim*, a number of assertions made in the introduction to the Report, and adds:—

“ All these signs of ‘rebellion’ vanish into smoke, when examined ; and it shows the extreme weakness of the Government cause that they should be obliged to rake up such rubbish for want of more tangible evidence. But now I must call your attention to the extraordinary character of the constitution of this second court. . . . Mr. Shepstone . . . is president, whose conduct in the whole affair is really the subject of inquiry quite as much as Langa’s. If there has been no ‘rebellion,’ the S.C. and the S.N.A. have committed a frightful blunder. But then the other members of the court are the ‘administrators of native law’ (*i.e.* magistrates), and the ‘native chiefs and indunas of the colony who may be able to attend.’ As to the magistrates, the same two attended the nine sittings of the court as had attended in the case of Langa. As to the chiefs and indunas of the colony, one would suppose that through a generous impulse the door had been thrown open wide, and all the chiefs and indunas of the colony had had notice that they *might* sit in the court, if they pleased. Not a bit of it. No such notice at all was given ; but the same seven, viz. three chiefs and four indunas, sat on the second trial as on the first, and besides these three others. Now the oddity is that [of these other three] two sat only one day of the nine. Among those who signed the sentence are Hemuhemu, who only attended four times out of the nine, and Hlangabeza, who never attended any one of them ! Imagine a court or jury constituted thus in England for the trial of a capital crime. . . .

“ It appears to be a monstrous and most contemptible thing for the Government thus to bind up this paper, signed Keith and Co.,<sup>1</sup> for which they will not take the responsibility, with the official record of the trial in the Blue-book, and so evade the charge of dishonesty by leaving all the burden to be borne by ‘Keith and Co.’ I never before heard

<sup>1</sup> See p. 348.

of such a proceeding as for the Government to publish an official document in such connexion with a private story. I need hardly say that the story about the white and black ox (on p. xxix.), is declared by the old men of the tribe to be an unmitigated lie.”<sup>1</sup>

TO J. N. WHEELER, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, June 22, 1874.

“Nothing can be kinder than your letter, and I thank you sincerely for sending it. I only wish that others would speak to me as freely as you have done, and then perhaps they would come to understand me better, and the grounds of my action in the case of Langalibalele. I am very sure that you would not be the man to wish me to preach, Sunday after Sunday, what I do not practise—to tell my people to take up, when the occasion comes, heavy burdens of duty on behalf of their fellow-men, when I myself shrink from touching such work with my own hands, though here

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop refers to the following statement made in the quasi-authoritative Report published in Blue-book form by Messrs. Keith and Co. :—  
“It must have been at this time that some attempt was made by augury to pry into secrets of the future. . . In Coomassie recently a white and a black goat were encouraged to engage in deadly conflict; and also here it is said, though it has been found impossible to obtain any evidence confirmatory of the report, that a white and black ox were skinned alive, to see which of them would survive this torture longest. The animals were regarded as representing the whites and blacks.” This wonderful statement comes from a writer who has declared at the outset that he will “take especial care only to include well-authenticated facts.” Yet he knew, the Bishop remarks, that just such a statement as this “would be likely to produce a feeling of disgust and abhorrence in English minds.” Langalibalele said, “Those words are just words of Umtyityizelwa to increase Langalibalele’s fault with the authorities. He utterly denies it; he knows not a particle of it. For he himself was present when each of those three oxen was killed to appease the spirit of Uncwane. There never was an ox of his so treated. It is false!” But, in fact, the writer admits that it was a mere *rumour*, and that it had been found “impossible to obtain *any* evidence confirmatory” of it; and yet he has the assurance and the malignity to say that “it *must* have been at this time that some attempt *was made*.” Comment in such a case is superfluous.



it has been laid in the providence of God at my very doors. Year after year since I returned to Natal from England I have been *saying* this and that from the pulpit; but my life has been on the whole a very quiet, calm, and happy one. I have not been called to do anything which required resolution and painful effort since in 1862 I published the 'First Part' of my work on the Pentateuch; and I little expected when this year began that the middle would find me involved in this most distressing conflict, in which I know I am at variance with very many whom I respect, and whose good opinion I would not willingly throw away. I *seem* to be attacking some to whom I have been—and still am—most strongly attached. But there is no help for it. I should belie my whole past life, and be false to all my teaching, and should be ashamed in fact to face you all in the pulpit again, if I was not true to my own convictions in this matter. I believe that a fellow-man has been most unfairly tried, and he and his tribe unjustly and cruelly treated. And since the Government by professing to give him a fair and impartial trial has challenged the whole community (myself among the rest) to look on and by our silence at all events indorse their action in this matter, and say that we in our consciences believe that the prisoners have had fair play and *justice* has been done—not that flimsy thing called 'substantial justice,' such as the Bishops in Convocation said was done to me in Capetown, but *real* justice according to English notions of it—I for one will not be a party to any such falsehood, and I cannot and will not rest until, as far as possible, the truth shall be brought to light. . . .

"You see that, although the *Witness*, *Times*, and *Mercury* all shouted applause when Putini's tribe was 'eaten up,' yet the introduction to the Blue-book containing the official record of the trials admits (p. xxxvii.) that the treatment of this tribe was . . . a 'State blunder which could only have been committed during a time of panic,' and which ought to be 'remedied' by 'restitution.' I have a strong confidence that when we hear the judgement of the Secretary of State on all

these proceedings it will be found that he takes a somewhat similar view as to the case of Langalibalele. . . . He will, no doubt, judge for himself when he has all the facts before him ; and I suspect also that when those facts are published a very considerable change will pass over the minds of the colonists also with respect to the part I have taken in the matter. . . . ”

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *July 7, 1874.*

“ The printed papers, which I post, will show you how, . . . step by step, I have pushed on a most unwilling Government to allow me to visit Langalibalele in gaol . . . and to employ counsel to support the appeal. . . . With regard to the ‘ Introduction ’ to the Blue-book, it is to my mind certain that Mr. Shepstone has written it.<sup>1</sup> . . . I understand that Keith admits that it has been *revised* by Mr. Shepstone. I have no doubt that it has been composed by him ; and it is curious that at the top of p. xxxviii., where he describes the court, he has omitted himself !—which no other writer but himself could have done. . . . I have thoroughly reviewed it, and hope to send you by this mail my MS. ; . . . and I do hope that there will be liberality enough among some of our friends to contribute . . . towards *printing* it—not necessarily for publication, but to lay it in a printed form before the Secretary of State and influential members of both Houses. . . . I feel that Lord Carnarvon can never be expected to read it in MS. ; and it is of the utmost importance that he should read it, because by this mail Mr. Shepstone himself is going to England . . . in order to cram the ears of the Secretary of State with the same sort of official lies which abound from beginning to end of this ‘ Introduction.’ What I *wish* is (and I do hope that it may be carried out) that my review shall be printed as far as Spottiswoode can manage it, an intimation being given meanwhile, directly or indirectly, to the Colonial Office, as an antidote for the poison

<sup>1</sup> See p. 348.

which I have no doubt will be distilled into the ears of the Secretary of State against Langa. They are afraid that the effect of their written explanation, which goes home by this mail, will not be sufficient. So Mr. Shepstone is sent home to supplement by his personal presence the want of power in his written statement. And just consider what a terrible crisis we have passed through, when first Lucas and Macfarlane can get leave of absence to go to England, then Sir B. Pine runs off for five or six weeks to the Cape, and now Mr. Shepstone is sent off to England. Truly there cannot be much *real* apprehension of a Kafir outbreak. . . .”

The following account of the position of things, both ecclesiastical and political, at this time, is given by the Rev. J. D. La Touche, vicar of Stokesay, who, with the consent of his diocesan, left England for twelve months to help the Bishop in his work. He took this step, as he himself confesses, at no small inconvenience to himself; but there can be no doubt that, if a few more such men as Mr. La Touche could have made acts of the like self-sacrifice, the position of the Bishop and the prospects of his work would have been materially altered for the better.

#### MR. LA TOUCHE'S REMINISCENCES.

- “In the latter part of the year 1873 I received from the Bishop of Natal a very earnest request that, if possible, I would take duty for a year in the colony. It was with some hesitation that I thought of exchanging the quiet of an English country parish for the anxiety involved in such a step; but, as the difficulties which at first presented themselves to my going were one by one overcome, it became a clear duty to obey the call, and, in the beginning of February of 1874, I was on my way to South Africa.
- ‘Upon arriving in Natal, I found the colony in a state of ferment, consequent on the recent expedition against the chief Langalibalele, and the dispersion of his tribe. Bitter party feeling and recrimination resounded on all sides. The

- Bishop's vigorous defence of Langalibalele, and of his friend Colonel Durnford, against the virulent attacks of certain of the volunteers, who, to cover their own disgrace, were heaping every kind of insult and abuse on one of the bravest of officers, had made him intensely unpopular ; and to such a degree of exasperation had the minds of the colonists been excited against the natives, that it seemed at one time as if nothing short of their extermination would appease them.
- “To a new-comer like myself this state of things appeared inexplicable. The quiet-looking Kafirs were in every household, peacefully following their daily avocations, without any outward sign that they could be the dangerous rebels which they were so constantly represented to be. As for the Bishop himself, though I often heard him converse on the subject, he generally, though not invariably, refrained from using strong expressions, and was satisfied to allow facts to speak for themselves. The opinion which I myself formed, and which was continually strengthened during my sojourn, was that he had been perfectly justified in the line he had taken.
- “Some few months after my arrival, the Bishop left for England to prosecute his appeal to the English Government in behalf of the Hlubi chief. It was at this time that Mr. Froude visited the colony in a semi-official capacity, and, as it appeared to those interested on behalf of the natives, became, somewhat unwisely, the guest of Sir B. Pine, the Governor, whose action in crushing the tribe had been so gravely called in question. It was thought that Mr. Froude, by this step, was precluded from taking the dispassionate view of the matter which was desirable. At the request of Miss Colenso, I was the means of bringing about an interview between him and the sons of Langalibalele, who were at the time confined in Maritzburg gaol, their father having been removed to Robben Island, near Capetown. I found it by no means an easy task to arrange this meeting. At first, Mr. Froude was quite anxious that it should take place, but afterwards rather hesitated. Among other things, the Governor wanted to make it a condition that one of Mr. Shepstone's sons

should act as interpreter, and this, it was thought, would frustrate the objects of the meeting, since the young men would not express their true feelings in the presence of one belonging to a family to which they naturally ascribed the ruin of their tribe. The difficulty was solved at last by permission being granted to Mr. Fynney, who was considered a perfectly impartial agent, to act in this capacity, and accordingly we went together to the gaol. Here a highly interesting conversation with the young men ensued. It appeared that one of the reasons which caused Mr. Froude to hesitate to see them was his impression that he could not entirely depend on their truthfulness ; but the evident effect on his mind of their look, their noble bearing, and the simplicity of their replies to his numerous questions, was to confirm fully the statements on which the Bishop had relied.

“Returning from that interview we met a long line of the Hlubi prisoners coming from their work in the brick-fields, and Mr. Froude was much impressed by their fine, open, good-natured countenances, and not less so by the sad assemblage of Kafir women and children—their wives and families—who were waiting about to have a sight of their husbands and relations as they disappeared within the walls of their prison. In spite of the efforts which were made by doles of food and other means to alleviate the distress of these poor creatures, they were in a very miserable condition when thus deprived of their usual means of support.

“In relation to Church matters, with which I was more immediately concerned, a meeting of the Church Council which was held shortly after I reached Maritzburg gave me an opportunity of making the acquaintance of those clergy who had remained faithful to their Bishop, and of observing the able and dignified manner in which he conducted the proceedings. The members of the Council assembled each day in the Cathedral. The chief business on hand was the reconstruction of rules ; but an anxious subject of discussion was the prospect of help from home.

“The situation was indeed most trying to all concerned. In obedience to what appeared to him a clear call of duty, the Bishop had dared to state in plain and unmistakeable terms the facts which he had ascertained about the history of the Pentateuch. But there were few among his clergy who—though, as such, they continued loyal to him—fully approved his action, or, perhaps, quite understood it. With one exception—that of Mr. Tønnesen, a Norwegian by birth, a man of exceptional ability, and whose heart was entirely with the Bishop—they for the most part held what are called Evangelical views. Archdeacon Lloyd, one of the kindest-hearted of men, was a distinct Evangelical, and was always careful to disavow any concurrence on doctrinal points with the Bishop, justifying his adhesion to him simply on constitutional grounds. One gentleman, although he appeared to believe in his heart that the Bishop was right, admitted that he was unable to assert that conviction in public. Of the other clergymen about Durban I did not hear much. They appeared, as a rule, to take the side they did from dislike of the aggressive and oppressive policy of the High Church party. It can, then, be no matter of surprise that they, as too often happens, were more disposed to take colour from the prevailing sentiments of their congregation than to embark on a perilous voyage to an unknown land. The Bishop was not, moreover, a man to court allegiance by concession, or to employ any of those wiles by which worldly-minded leaders are wont to attach to themselves unwilling followers. Very much the reverse. Although he was most loveable and sympathetic towards any one whose principles and motives appeared to him upright and straightforward, these qualities gave place to sternness, if not severity, where a note of insincerity was heard. His intense devotion to truth, and the great cause to which he had consecrated his life, was such that he would, I verily believe, have literally cut off the right hand sooner than allow any personal feeling to influence him where principle was concerned. To a world, indeed, which is content to take things easily, and to look upon stern truth as a mere accident, a life like his

may appear foolish or even reprehensible. If, however, in matters of high principle, or where the supreme interests and lives of thousands of his fellow-creatures were at stake, a fixed resolve to place his duty to God above every earthly tie be considered a more noble standard, then, I believe, what to many may have appeared, at the time, unnecessary harshness would call forth a very different judgement. No one who was intimate with the Bishop could for a moment suspect that caprice or self-interest swayed his mind. On the contrary, I have the best reason to know that it was with pain approaching to agony that he relinquished his cherished friendships, and felt compelled to adopt the line he did against some who had once been his bosom friends.

“ It is not for me to enter here upon the details, or discuss the merits, of that most painful incident in his life—his breach with Mr. (now Sir) Theophilus Shepstone, a man who had stood firmly by him in his early ecclesiastical troubles, and with whom he had previously been bound up in ties of closest affection. But of this I am perfectly certain, that he turned from him only upon what to him, and to others too who have examined the evidence, seemed incontrovertible proof that, in order to shield his brother from blame with regard to an outrage alleged to have been committed by him upon the chief Matshana some years before, Sir Theophilus Shepstone had concealed the truth in the matter, and allowed sentence of death to be passed on an innocent man, himself sanctioning that condemnation of which he knew the injustice.

“ Now the Bishop has said to me that he had been appointed to his see especially in the interest of the natives ; that his first duty lay in using all his influence to have right and justice done to them, and that to this object he was determined to devote himself as long as he held the post he did ; and only from a profound conviction, most reluctantly arrived at by him, that the natives were being treated with injustice, and that their enslavement or extirpation—involving the demoralization of his white flock and the

disgrace of his nation—would certainly be the consequence if such conduct as that of the Natal Government were not exposed, could he ever have been compelled to take the active part he did against his old and valued friend.

“The same remarks apply in some degree to the relations which existed between him and his clergy. It is not surprising, indeed, that some of these should have felt very keenly the difficulties of their position. They had, at a time when much obloquy attended their doing so, shared the fortunes of their lawful Bishop, and now they were compelled to contrast their own scanty means and pecuniary embarrassments with the comparative affluence of their brethren who claimed to be the representatives of orthodoxy. Men so placed are prone, however unjustly, to imagine that they are not treated with the consideration which they are entitled to expect. It is the old cry of the Israelites to their leader in the wilderness. But they were in fact mistaken. Not want of sympathy, but want of the means to assist them, was the true cause. It must be remembered that the funds at the Bishop's disposal for affording them the required help had been almost altogether withdrawn. His own income was that of a very moderate vicarage in England; and the drain upon it from the exigencies of a large and hospitably conducted household, and, after the dispersion of Langalibalele's tribe, the necessities of the natives who settled round Bishopstowe in large numbers, must have been very considerable.

“I don't mean to say that he was ever unsympathetic with inferior minds or lower motives; but he could not retain faith in men who professed high principle when in practice they proved false and weak and mean. When I once happened to mention that Dean Green and others of Bishop Macrorie's clergy were understood to approve in the main of the course he had taken on the native question, he indignantly exclaimed, ‘Then why do they not speak out?’ But their mouths were closed at this time for any practical purpose. Such is one of the worst results of religious acrimony. Of this I had many painful experiences during



my short stay. The first excitement of the theological controversy had passed. The scenes of violence by the partisans on both sides had become only historical. Matters had settled down into a steady sectarian animosity which split up the small community into two hostile camps. I was prepared for something of the kind, but not for the relentless and uncompromising opposition of the clergy of the (so-called) South African Church. Intercourse with them was impossible. I met Dean Green on one occasion in the house of a dying man, whither both of us had been accidentally summoned by his relations, who belonged to each of the two rival parties. I was not sorry for the chance which brought us together, since I hoped that possibly a personal interview might help to soften down the prevailing irritation. But I soon found by the Dean's manner, and the very few words which passed between us, that this was out of the question. In the same way, the Bishop told me that, when Bishop Macrorie came out, he used at first to salute him as they passed each other in the street, but that it was soon apparent that any such recognition was unacceptable, and so it ceased. He was told by a mutual friend that, although Dr. Macrorie's feelings as a gentleman inclined him to acknowledge the greeting, his feelings as a Christian forbade his doing so! The fact is that the party in the Church, which in England can only claim to represent a section of her members, taking advantage of the outcry which had been raised against the Bishop and of their own comparatively independent position, had, in the limited sphere of this colony, striven to establish a sacerdotal despotism, but had signally failed. Everything at one time seemed to be in their favour and against the Bishop. But the fatal step of separating themselves both in name and in some important points from the mother Church, thus setting at nought that State control which in this country keeps within bounds the predominance of one party over the other, had thoroughly aroused in a large section of the loyal Church-members a fear that nothing short of their complete subjection to priestly power was the

end aimed at. They had overshot the mark ; and not only had the result been damaging and disastrous to the cause for which they had staked so much, but it had succeeded in drawing together many who, although they had otherwise but few points in common, yet combined in looking to Bishop Colenso as the champion of their liberty, and supporting him as such. This last consideration, combined with a perception, which none could resist, of the singular beauty of his character and the sincerity of his life, will, I think, account for the apparently contradictory fact that, although the most violent hostility had been excited among some of the colonists against the Bishop in consequence of his action on the native question, the respect for him personally among all ranks and classes continued throughout to be most marked. Amid all the vituperation of which he was the subject, not one word that I heard was uttered against him of personal disrespect—not an attempt was made by those who would have been only too glad so to do, if they had been able, to throw any aspersion on his motives.

“The truth is, the whole life he led and all its surroundings could not fail to impress even his bitterest enemies with respect, if not veneration. It was a life of self-denial and devotion. Although no ascetic, for his nature was a genial one, he would be the last to repine at being deprived of good cheer and bodily comforts, or at the fare, frugal almost to hardness, which often fell to his lot ; and it was a touching sight to see him driving into town in his weather-beaten old spider-gig, arrayed in clothes far from new, in contrast with the comfortable equipage and appointments of his more favoured brethren.

“It was, perhaps, unfortunate for his intercourse with the English population that Bishopstowe was situated at a considerable distance from Pietermaritzburg. But, on the other hand, it was consistent with the original design of the mission ; since it was thus the centre of a native settlement, and the Bishop was enabled to carry on his work among his people without interruption or interference.

“The description of the house already given<sup>1</sup> renders it unnecessary for me to enter into further details here. The spot and all around it, the whole life of the family with which that home was so long identified, breathed an air of culture and refinement in striking contrast with its wild surroundings. All that could tend to elevate and make life happy and useful found a welcome here; and from the noble master, whose ever-kindly smile bespoke a mind at peace with God and man, down to the little Kafir child, the plaything of the family, a sweet purity and innocence seemed to pervade the whole.

“Nothing was to me more impressive and affecting than the reverence in which the Bishop was held by the natives. I have been present at some interesting interviews between them. Sometimes it would be a number of Langalibalele's wives who had come to him about their troubles; at others, a deputation of indunas or head-men from the Zulu king. They would come into his presence bending low, and, as is, I believe, the custom with their king, would sometimes kiss the ground all round where he stood. While he was away in England, the poor fellows would go into his room and look round and say, ‘Ah! here Sobantu lived;’ and, seeing his dressing-gown, which hung behind the door, ‘Ah! there are the clothes Sobantu used to wear;’ or they would recognise with delight in his photograph his spectacles and well-known smile.

“The sound judgement of the Bishop was, it seems to me, conspicuous in his conduct towards his heathen flock. The conversion of the natives to Christianity is one of those problems which, by those who have little or no practical experience in the matter, are often treated as of extreme simplicity. The conviction that the Christian faith is absolutely true, and that all others are therefore false and immoral, imposes on the average missionary the supposed duty of overthrowing the latter at any cost in order to implant the tenets of the former. But in carrying out this object he is confronted with problems of extreme difficulty,

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I. p. 76, *et seq.*

especially in relation to polygamy;<sup>1</sup> and in dealing with these he incurs no small danger of creating moral evils which the religious principles he seeks to inculcate are powerless to counteract.

“It seemed to be the Bishop’s principle to proceed by more gradual steps ; to endeavour to modify, rather than rashly to subvert, the customs of the natives ; to trust to the force of living example and the practical exercise of the Christian virtues of purity, truth, and justice, to impress their minds ; and, by means of education, to lay the foundation for a higher teaching. Divine service was indeed held at the little chapel I have mentioned above, and at the native church in Pietermaritzburg ; but he was not forward to compete with other sects in making proselytes ; and I have even heard him deprecate the line commonly taken by those who, in their zeal to emulate the first preachers of Christianity, seem to forget that the condition of the Greek and Roman world, with which the latter had to do, has but little analogy with that of the South African, and that the very comprehension of most of the terms used to convey Christian doctrine presupposes a considerable amount of culture on the part of those to whom they are addressed.

“Yet it would be far from correct to suppose, as many at the time assumed, that his deep sympathy with the natives had warped his judgement, or blinded him to the necessity of a firm and even strict policy in dealing with them. In nothing did the balance of the Bishop’s mind appear more conspicuous than in his resisting, on the one hand, the hysterical theories sometimes identified with Exeter Hall ; and, on the other, the tendency to magnify slight faults, and punish them with undue harshness. And the practical result of this line of action may be seen in the fact that, probably more than anyone else in his position, he succeeded in winning for these people the consideration which surely they deserve at the hands of those who have appropriated their country ; for, although in spite of all his efforts the wrongs committed in the name of Government were indeed

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. I. p. 63 *et seq.*

great, they would assuredly have been very much greater had this uncompromising and able champion not been raised up to expose them and press home the monstrous character of the injustice. I may mention here the admission made to me by a son of the late Bishop Selwyn—viz. that Bishop Colenso had succeeded in doing for the natives in South Africa that which his father had striven for in New Zealand, but striven in vain.

“In the management of the Cathedral and parish work the Bishop rarely interfered; but in all cases of any difficulty (and sometimes extremely painful ones did occur) I could always count on his advice and sympathy. At the same time he was not a man to isolate himself from the world. Like his great Master and Pattern, he was occasionally to be found in company where I fancy Bishops are not very often to be found, or very welcome. And it was, I thought, pleasant to see him sometimes chatting cheerfully with the young officers in the mess-room, and partaking of their hospitality, and I have good reason to know that, on their part, they were always glad to see him there.

“Whenever it was expected that he would preach, there was always a large congregation. There was that about all his sermons which touched one’s heart, his noble figure and his striking and thoughtful countenance adding no little to the impression they made. For the most part he abstained from the controversy that had occupied him so much. At least, such was the case when I heard him; but he would occasionally introduce enough to leave his hearers in no uncertainty as to his real opinions upon Christian doctrine. Consequently, I found very many members of the Maritzburg congregation far more thoughtful and liberal-minded than is usually the case. As for the unscrupulous assertion made in England by the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Wilberforce), that the hearers of the Bishop consisted largely of godless persons, I must, from an intimate personal acquaintance with them, give my most emphatic contradiction to this outrageous libel.

“The Bishop’s chief theme was the simple and practical cha-

racter of the Christian religion, the Fatherhood of God, and His sympathy with man, as manifested in Christ. With this his whole soul seemed to be so penetrated that the description I received of him from a fellow-passenger whom I met on my voyage out, and who had been much in contact with the Bishop as churchwarden of St. Peter's, does not appear to be inappropriate or exaggerated : ' He is,' he said, ' a Christ-like man ; wherever is sorrow or trial, there he is to be found ; while others talk and preach of Christ, he practises His life.'

" To have known and served under such a man has been to me a privilege worth any sacrifice. It has, ever since I left him, been a source of deep regret that other duties, which had a prior claim, should have made it impossible for me to remain at my post. And I am glad to have this opportunity of saying that the more I became acquainted with him, the more I was impressed by the transparent beauty and simplicity of his life, his unswerving devotion to truth, his pure sincerity ; and I feel convinced that, had I been permitted to remain with him, years would only have tended to increase the genuine veneration and love which I entertained for him."

## CHAPTER VIII.

LAST VISIT TO ENGLAND.—THE MATSHANA INQUIRY.  
1874-75.

THE Bishop's last voyage to England was undertaken primarily in the cause of bare justice to the Ama-Hlubi chief; but the members of the Church of England in Natal felt that he had as much at heart as ever the cause of the English Church, with its comprehensiveness and its freedom, against the assumptions of a new association, which proclaimed war against this comprehensiveness and set itself to subvert this freedom. A meeting held at Maritzburg, August 25, 1874, acknowledged with gratitude the labours of the Bishop in upholding the fundamental principles of the Church of England.

"These principles," they said, "we understand to be the widest recognition of all parties in the Church, consistently with the laws under which the Church is established at home."

Unless these principles are consistently acted upon, the attainment or maintenance of peace is hopeless. Tastes differ, feelings differ, modes of thought differ; and for such differences a very large scope is allowed in England. A scope not less wide must be allowed in Natal. To make profession of width, and then to restrict the freedom of

congregations, is to set up a contradiction in terms. If the members of the Church of South Africa in Natal have adopted practices which obtain in what are called high Ritualistic churches in this country, they must be allowed full freedom in the retention of these practices within the limits prescribed by the constitution of the mother Church. In order to resume their position as members of the Church of England, the members of the Church of South Africa have only to acknowledge their submission to the law of the Church of England, which in all causes secures to the defendant an appeal to the Crown. In short, the comprehensiveness of which the memorialists were justly proud must be a comprehensiveness in reality, not in name only.

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

“R.M.S. *Basuto*, DURBAN, August 24, 1874.

[Having mentioned their detention for a week in the harbour.]

“If all is well, I shall be due in England by the *Syria* about the end of September. Note, however, if I should hear, at Algoa Bay or the Cape, of a Commission being actually on its way, I shall return to Natal, as it is of the utmost importance that I should be here when it arrives. I could not have believed that so much dishonesty could have been practised by a British Government as has occurred in this colony of late. When the *Basuto* came up from the Cape she brought the *Cape Argus* of August 7, which had an extract from the Parliamentary Blue-book on Natal matters laid before the Parliament by Lord Carnarvon. It is singular that neither have I received a copy of this book, though I asked that it might be sent as soon as published, . . . nor has Sir B. Pine—at least he has told the Legislative Council so. . . . From the *Cape Argus* we learn for the first time that Lord Carnarvon wrote to Sir B. Pine on April 13, drawing his attention to the serious difficulties raised as to the question of transporting Langa by the



Imperial Act 31 and 32 Vic. cap. x. Now, Sir B. Pine has transported him in defiance of the Act, and in disregard of Lord Carnarvon's warning. . . . But I want to draw special attention to the manner in which this has been done. My lawyers—Goodricke and Moodie—were totally ignorant of the Act in question, and so was I myself; but I drew their attention to the Act of Geo. IV., . . . and at the end of the appeal Mr. Goodricke quoted that Act as preventing the transportation intended, but said that he was not familiar with it, . . . and asked the Attorney-General to say whether it applied to all colonies or only to the Australian. Mr. Gallwey replied that it referred to Natal as well. Subsequently, in our application to the Supreme Court, Mr. Moodie hammered away for some time upon the same Act of Geo. IV. without learning that it was repealed (the most important portions of it) by the later Act of Victoria. Now did Chief Justice Connor and the Attorney-General know of the existence of this Act of Victoria? Either they did or they did not. If they did not, then (1) they were strangely ignorant of the law so recently passed, and so important to the colonies in its special bearing on this case; and (2) Sir B. Pine must have kept secret from his legal advisers, both members of the Executive Council, the despatch in question, which came up in the mail-bags when he returned from the Cape in the beginning of June. It is incredible that either (1) or (2) can have been the case. But then we find ourselves on the other horn of the dilemma, viz. that they *were* aware of the existence of that law of Victoria; and yet the Chief Justice on the Bench, in a serious criminal case, involving grave constitutional questions, allowed a young inexperienced advocate to go floundering on about an obsolete law, when he (the judge) knew there was a recent law far more to his purpose; and the Attorney-General, when appealed to as legal adviser of the Government by Mr. Goodricke during the appeal before the Executive Council, gave an evasive reply, also suppressing the fact of the existence of that law. In either case, it seems to me, a tremendous charge may be laid

against the Government. John Shepstone has threatened me with an action for damages (£1000) on account of Matshana's affair; but he has taken no steps in the matter at present. . . .

"I send this by your old friend Captain Valler, who lies side by side with us in the *Zulu* bound to Zanzibar, and will go out when we do. It *may* reach England before the letters sent round the Cape do; and I take the chance of it."

Some letters to Mrs. Lyell, written after his arrival in England in 1874, show how entirely his time was engrossed with the special work which had brought him away from his diocese. This work left him, indeed, little or no leisure for intercourse with friends whom he was eager to see once more. Landing at Plymouth, he came up straight to London, and on the very evening of his arrival received a note from the Colonial Office requesting him to call on Lord Carnarvon. In the long conversation which the Bishop had with him on the following day, the Colonial Secretary promised to hold back for a week the despatches which he had already prepared, to give him time for printing the matter to be submitted to him. The same evening brought him the first proofs of the Report which was afterwards printed as a Parliamentary Blue-book, C. 1141. The result was that the despatches of the Colonial Secretary were entirely rewritten, and sent off at Christmas.

TO MRS. LYELL.

"KENSINGTON, *October 6, 1874.*

"I shall be very happy to dine with you on Saturday, the 17th instant, as you kindly propose. I saw Lord Carnarvon yesterday for an hour, and am thoroughly satisfied with the interview. He has promised to wait a week for my MS. to be printed, and I must work hard at it *this week*, and can hardly hope to find time of an evening to run up with F.<sup>1</sup> to

<sup>1</sup> His son.

Regent's Park till this work is off my hands, more especially as Spottiswoode promises to pour in the proofs upon me each evening."

TO THE SAME.

"KENSINGTON, *October 10, 1874.*

"I do not lose sight of your kind invitation. But really the work for Lord Carnarvon has left me no time *to breathe* since I saw you, though I have now pretty nearly got to the end of my printing, and then shall be able to look about me a little. . . . I was very sorry to miss Colonel Lyell when he called. I was at Spottiswoode's, where I have spent a good deal of this week, besides the hours spent at this table."

TO JOHN MERRIFIELD, ESQ.

"37 PHILLIMORE GARDENS, *October 21, 1874.*

"MY DEAR OLD FRIEND,

"I wish that I may have a chance of seeing you and Mrs. Merrifield while I am in England. But my stay is very uncertain, depending on the action which may be taken by Lord Carnarvon in the matter of our natives, and I am obliged to keep within reach of the Colonial Office. Meantime you will see that I am fighting again, and really I am afraid that people will imagine that I *like* fighting for fighting's sake, whereas the truth is that I very much *dislike* it, and would enjoy, if possible, living peaceably and pleasantly with all men. However, I could not sit by and look on quietly while gross acts of wrong were being perpetrated under my own eyes. . . ."

TO MRS. LYELL.

"BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD, *November 23, 1874.*

. . . "I certainly wrote a note to explain what I wished, and I think it must have fallen out when the packet was opened. But at any rate you have divined thoroughly my meaning, even to sending the MS. back by the first post on Monday (this) morning. The copy is beautifully clear, and

will go to Lord Carnarvon. I am really much obliged to Miss Jane Hughes for doing it."

TO MISS JANE HUGHES.

"KENSINGTON, *December 23, 1874.*

"I told your brother, the Professor, that I should ask you to correct the proofs of Part VII. of my work on the Pentateuch. Alfred would run his eye over the Hebrew, and has in fact done so already. But I shall have to send the 'copy' from Natal some time after my return. . . . The Queen has sent privately to express her approval of my doings in Langalibalele's affair. . . ."

During his short sojourn in this country some of the Bishops resorted to the old weapon of inhibition, and among them was the Bishop of London. The peculiar position of the Dean of Westminster put it in his power to administer indirectly a strong rebuke to the prelate who would engage in such unworthy warfare; and of this power Dr. Stanley availed himself in a spirit of righteous indignation. He invited the Bishop of Natal to preach in the Abbey, and he wrote to the Bishop of London to explain the reasons which had led him to do so. He reminded Dr. Jackson that Archbishop Howley had refused to admit Dr. Arnold into the pulpit of Lambeth Chapel on account of the offence which his appearance there would give to the clergy.

"Like the Bishop of Natal," he added, "Dr. Arnold was regarded by the clerical, I might almost say the religious, world of the time, of course with many exceptions, as a dangerous heretic—was denied to be a Churchman, or even a Christian. It is not too much to suppose that the change of feeling, honourable alike to him and to them, which in a few years altered the judgement of the clergy with regard to the head master of Rugby, might also in a few years effect a corresponding transformation of opinion with regard to the Bishop of Natal. Any acts which

may tend to hasten such triumphs of charity and reason, in which, when accomplished, all must acquiesce, are worth attempting, even at the cost of some temporary disturbance."

How little the Bishop of Natal desired that his appearance should cause disturbance anywhere is shown by the following letters :—

TO THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

"December 17, 1874.

... "I have come to the conclusion that I had better decline to comply with your kind request. I need hardly say that under other circumstances I should have gladly carried out your wishes. I might, perhaps, have tried to say a few words to comfort the hearts of some who, at this great crisis of religious thought in England, are looking anxiously to their spiritual advisers for help in their uncertainty. I might also have tried to impress upon my fellow-countrymen the duty which we owe, as English Christians, towards the inferior races under our charge; to say that surely the rule of a nation like ours over so many weaker communities means something more than the amount of property, of material wealth, she can squeeze out of the subject peoples; that if England extends her sway over the earth to enforce justice, to practise mercy, to show care and pity for the weak and helpless, to redress the wrongs of the down-trodden and oppressed, and to raise her dependents in the scale of humanity, there is then a reason for the existence of her vast colonial empire; that it is only such acts as these which will show that our religion is a reality and not a mere name; and that the passionate love of justice which God has planted in the bosom of his children is a sign that our Father thinks and feels as we do. But there are others who will teach these things when I am gone. I did not come home, to assert my own personal position in the Church of England, if that were doubtful which has been recognised by his Grace the Primate of All England,<sup>1</sup> and,

<sup>1</sup> See p. 228.

above all, by the Crown ; and I have no wish whatever to occupy the few remaining days of my stay in England with any such contention as might seem to be implied by my preaching at Westminster after the recent action of the Bishop of London, though, of course, I am aware that you are not under his jurisdiction. I therefore think it best not to avail myself of the invitation which you have given me to preach in the venerable Abbey so dear to the memories of Englishmen ; and I shall return to my diocese rejoicing that I have been permitted to bear to England the cry of the oppressed, and thankful that by English hearts that cry has been heard and answered.”<sup>1</sup>

TO THE RECTOR OF CARFAX, OXFORD.

“37 PHILLIMORE GARDENS, KENSINGTON, *November 5, 1874.*

“MY DEAR SIR,

“I am much obliged by your very kind letter, and I should be very glad to comply with your wish if possible. . . . But would it not be necessary to ask the Bishop’s permission for my preaching in a city church ? And would the Bishop of Oxford grant such permission ? It is true he is not committed to the demonstration made by the other Bishops ten or twelve years ago. But I would not like to do anything which might imply disrespect for his authority.’

TO THE SAME.

“ATHENÆUM CLUB, *November 11, 1874.*

“MY DEAR SIR,

“As I feel sure that the Bishop of Oxford would not be willing to allow me to preach in any of the churches of his diocese, and I should not like to do so without his knowledge, I think it best not to preach in Carfax church, though under other circumstances I should have been very glad to do so. I have promised to preach for the Master of Balliol on the 29th, and shall hope to see you while in Oxford.”

<sup>1</sup> The sermon which was to have been preached in Westminster Abbey appeared in the *Contemporary Review*.

## TO THE SAME.

“THE LODGE, BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD, *November 24, 1874.*”

“The Dean of Westminster sees no reason why I should not preach at Carfax church, if you still desire it—more especially as Bishop Temple has expressly informed a clergyman, who had asked me to preach in his church in Cornwall, that he ‘had not inhibited and did not mean to inhibit the Bishop of Natal from preaching in his diocese.’ If you therefore are still in the same mind as when you wrote to me, or would like to talk over the matter, will you be so good as to call upon me here any time to-day after 4 P.M., or to-morrow morning?”

It was represented to the Bishop, in fact, that it would be an unprecedented step to ask leave for the preaching of a single sermon. In a subsequent letter to Mr. Fletcher, the Rector of Carfax, the Bishop suggested that it might be well if he were to ask the Archbishop of Canterbury whether the Bishop of Natal could, according to the law of the Church of England, be regarded as a deposed Bishop and excommunicated heretic in any sense of the words. Here, obviously, was the point on which the question turned. Until he had been condemned by that law on some definite charge, the proceedings of self-constituted courts in Africa went for nothing. Hence Dr. Tait had, in personal conversation, told Bishop Colenso that in his view he was as much Bishop as if Dr. Gray had never taken any proceedings against him. On this hypothesis the inhibitions put forth by individual Bishops were nothing more and nothing less than a series of deliberate and arbitrary insults.

TO JOHN MERRIFIELD, ESQ.

“BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD, *November 25, 1874.*”

“MY DEAR FRIEND,

“I do not despair of being able to run down and see you, as I do not think that I shall be able to leave England before

the 15th or 25th of December, Lord Carnarvon not having yet announced his decision, though I pretty well know of what kind it will be. But do not expect me, and let me say 'Good-bye' in case I should be unable to come. I thank you most heartily for your kind words, and must now go and prepare two sermons for Oxford next Sunday—one in Balliol Chapel and the other in Carfax city church, if the Bishop of Oxford does not interfere to prevent my preaching. And in one of them I shall say almost exactly what you have said in your note about *progress* unto perfection.

"Lord Carnarvon wrote last week to say that in view of the advantages which he had derived from my presence in England, and the information and explanations he had received from me with reference to the affair of Langalibalele, he thought it only reasonable that my expenses (£120) should be reimbursed by the colony; and he gave me an order for the money, which I received in London."

Mr. Shepstone, sent by Sir B. Pine to support the case of the Natal Government, had reached England a month before the Bishop. Having, as he trusted, fought the fight, and won a measure of justice for those to whom wrong had been done, the Bishop would have sought Mr. Shepstone out in the hope that the old friendly relations might yet, to some extent, be re-established between them, and was somewhat vexed when Lord Carnarvon, demurring to this, arranged that they should meet in his presence. He was still more vexed at the constraint of this meeting, although he was willing to attribute it to the surroundings. It seemed strange that Lord Carnarvon should imagine that such a case could be met by an injunction to "shake hands." Was it that he feared lest, in a private interview, the Bishop might ask questions more freely and persistently of Mr. Shepstone than of himself; and so might learn, while there was yet time, that the promises which had been made to him were hollow and worthless?



The Bishop expressed his intention of calling on Mr. Shepstone ; but two days later he received a note in which Mr. Shepstone said that they were starting at once for Natal. The following was the Bishop's reply :—

TO TH. SHEPSTONE, ESQ.

“LONDON, *December 6, 1874.*”

“I cannot tell you the pleasure with which I received your kind note yesterday. And though the steamer which takes this will, I hope, take me also to Natal, I wish to write a few lines which you will receive before you can see me, to explain that you were mistaken in supposing (as Mr. Torrens told me yesterday) that I had ‘cut’ you at a railway station. I should have almost thought that you knew me too well to suppose that this could possibly have happened. . . . The fact is, of course, that I never saw you. I heard from Major Erskine something about our having met at a railway station, when you were on your way from High Clere, and I was going down. But I told him I thought he was mistaken, as you had been there, I believed, on the Sunday previous to that which I spent there. However, so far was I from passing you without recognition that on that occasion I expressed to Lord Carnarvon my wish to go at once and see you on my return to town, and talk over matters with you. But he begged me *not* to do so for the present, as he had not, I suppose, fully made up his mind. Of course, I obeyed orders as you have done. But I longed for the time when I might see you and speak with you again as of old ; and on Tuesday last, when he communicated in general terms the decision at which he had arrived, I again asked him if I might speak with you on the subject, as he told me he had already communicated, the same to you ; and he then said that he would send for me, if he could bring us together on the Wednesday, which he did.

“I should like just to have shaken hands with Mrs. Shepstone before she left, for I know it has been a terrible trial for our

wives and children as well as for us. But I hope the worst is now over, and that good in the end will be brought out of all this misery."

The assurances which he received from Lord Carnarvon could not fail to satisfy him that the wrong done to Langalibalele would be substantially redressed. He therefore readily assented to the wish expressed by Lord Carnarvon, that any further discussion of this subject in the public journals should be discouraged.

"To this," the Bishop wrote in 1878 to Sir Bartle Frere, "I very heartily assented, and proposed to write a letter to the *Times* to that effect, which I did, after submitting it for his Lordship's approval and correction; and in this letter I stated that, though not at liberty at present to publish it, I was perfectly satisfied with the decision of the Secretary of State, which was wise, and just, as well as merciful. . . . But in so writing, I had no doubt that the promises made by the Secretary of State in the Queen's name would be carried out—in spirit, at all events, if they could not be in the letter."

Lord Carnarvon, indeed, had himself said:—

"I will frankly own that I had strained my own sense of what is due to the justice of the case to the uttermost, out of consideration for the feelings and difficulties of the South African colonists. . . . I had brought myself to advise the Crown to reverse or modify the action of the colonial Governments in South Africa in no greater degree than justice as well as public opinion absolutely demands."

According to the arrangement thus made, Langalibalele would not be permitted to return to Natal, but would receive a location in the Cape Colony, where he, with any of his tribe who might like to join him, might live in freedom like any other subjects of the Queen; being, further, supplied with cattle, agricultural implements, and other things which they