might need, and so be started fairly in their new career. This decision was (December 2) communicated verbally to the Bishop by Lord Carnarvon. The despatches conveying the official version of this decision were dated two days later; and these the Bishop was not allowed to see. This circumstance aroused his fears.

> "Notwithstanding Mr. Shepstone's opinion that without much difficulty a suitable location might be found in the Cape Colony, . . . I must say that I had grave misgivings; and while expressing my most sincere thanks on behalf of the ex-chief and his son and people for Her Majesty's clemency to them, I ventured to suggest a doubt as to the practicability of carrying out at the Cape Her Majesty's gracious intentions. But Lord Carnarvon, relying probably on Mr. Shepstone's opinion, was quite satisfied on this point, and it would have been presumptuous, of course, on my part to have said more."

The Bishop followed Mr. Shepstone as soon as he could, ending his last sojourn in his native land on Christmas Day. Expressions of sympathy and good wishes came to him from a large body of his fellow-countrymen (in many cases, in spite of much religious prejudice), and from the Queen herself; and at Plymouth, as the steamer passed that port, he received an address with which he was much gratified. An order for the release of Langalibalele had preceded him; but the hopes which he may have entertained of peace and of "the worst being over" were soon to be dashed to the ground. He had asked to be allowed to visit Langa at the Cape on his way home, and Lord Carnarvon had said that he expressly wished him to do so, and would write to that effect. Mr. Shepstone would communicate to the chief, officially and authoritatively, the decision of Her Majesty, and the Bishop was to speak with him afterwards as a friend, and do his best to reconcile

his mind (if necessary) to submit to those parts of it which might not be pleasant.

The Bishop landed at Capetown, Thursday, January 21, 1875, and received at once from Mr. Fairbridge, M.L.A., whose guest he was during his stay at the Cape, a letter marked *private*, left for him by Mr. Shepstone. In this letter Mr. Shepstone, referring to Lord Carnarvon's decision in Langalibalele's case, and the co-operation which he asked of the Cape Government in the matter, informed him that the Cape Ministry had felt it their duty to decline acceding to Lord Carnarvon's wish, and that a serious complication was the consequence, the immediate effect being that Lord Carnarvon's decision could not be carried out as it stood. Of the subsequent incidents the Bishop wrote as follows:—

"Informed as above, I wrote to Sir H. Barkley, who, I found, had requested the Premier, Mr. Molteno, to meet me; and we had conversation for about an hour on the subject of Langalibalele, from which it appeared that the Cape Ministry refused to 'intern' Langa, as desired by Lord Carnarvon, somewhere in the Cape Colony, under proper restrictions, because Lord Carnarvon has also announced that the Bill passed by the Cape Parliament in order to carry out Sir B. Pine's plans! making legal the reception and detention of the chief and his son, as convicts at Robben Island, would be disallowed, and in that case they would have no power to place him under any such restrictions, or to exercise any surveillance upon him. Accordingly, a reply has been sent to England to that effect by the mail of January 5; and nothing can be done, or at all events will be done, until the Secretary of State's reply to that despatch shall have been received, possibly about the end of February. Thus, though charged with a message of mercy for the prisoner, my mouth was effectually closed, though every facility was given for my visiting him, and the Government steamer *Gnu* placed at my disposal for going over to Robben Island on Friday morning.

"Accordingly, I arrived as arranged, the passage taking about forty-five minutes on a very fine day, as this happened to be. We were landed from the little steamer in a boat, from which we got into chairs carried between staves on the shoulders of convicts, who were at hand for the purpose on the arrival of the steamer, and so we reached the island. Parched with the heat of this dry summer season, it looked arid and dreary in the extreme, fit only to be the haunt of sea-birds, of which some hundreds were flitting about. Scarcely a single tree or bush of any kind was to be seen on the island; but there was a small, now dried-up, patch of garden-ground, from which the vegetables for the institution [Lunatic Asylum] were raised, and I was informed that cattle do very well on the island, though of course their number must be limited by the small extent of it, which would hardly suffice for more than a hundred. I met with a very kind reception from Dr. Biccard, the excellent superintendent, who was much interested in the chief and his son, as were also the ladies of Dr. Biccard's family, and said that they were thoroughly well behaved, had given no trouble whatever, and certainly had very little the *appearance* of being rebels of a malignant and dangerous character, whatever the real fact might be. After a short rest I was taken to a room where they *now* live, having previously been lodged in separate convict cells, until this room was built and appropriated for their use, and I found it airy and comfortable. They were, of course, rejoiced to see me, having heard by some means that I had passed through Capetown on my way to England about five months ago, and had been refused permission to go and see them, and also that I had just come back from England with, so they fondly hoped, a word of grace from the Queen for them. It was hard to have that word actually intrusted to me, with a special charge from the Secretary of State to communicate it to them, after its official communication by Mr. Shepstone, and to use my influence to bring them to acquiesce contentedly in the arrangements made for them, as the wisest and best that could be made; and then to have my tongue

tied by virtue of Mr. Shepstone's letter and my own sense of the difficulties of the present situation, and be able to do no more than assure them in general terms that the chief induna of the Queen had heard very kindly what I had said on their behalf, and that there was mercy in store for them, though *when* or *how* it would be shown I could not exactly say. I ascertained on close inquiry that Mr. Shepstone had told them *nothing* except that 'the Bishop had remained behind, and was trying to make out their offence to be less than the Government considered it to be.' It was sad to see the effect upon them of my saying that I could not tell when they would be removed from Robben Island. 'Then it is death for us,' said the chief, and drew his finger across his throat. And for a long time their dejection was so great that I could scarcely get them to take an interest in the questions which I wished to put to them. I found that they had a perfect *horror* of the sea. I *fancied* that this might be the case, when the first talk was made about transporting them. But I had no idea of the extent to which this feeling of dread possessed them. . . . It is perfectly inhuman in any Christian Government to have sent the two poor wretches to this spot, where they have had no one to speak to of their own kind, and have endured this misery month after month, longing for my return from England, and buoyed up with the hope of being released on my arrival, or at least assured of a speedy release, a hope, alas! which has been so cruelly disappointed."

On his own side the hope entertained by the Bishop that the storm which threatened his friendly relations with Mr. Shepstone had spent itself was to be again rudely shaken. Mr. Shepstone reached Natal on the 15th of January, and on the 19th two of the three despatches (those, namely, which virtually recalled Sir B. Pine and released Langalibalele) were read publicly at an "indignation meeting" at Durban. Of these papers the former appeared in the *Gazette* at Maritzburg on the very day of the meeting, and the latter was not

published till two days had passed after the meeting, while the despatch which announced Lord Carnarvon's intention to introduce improvements into the native policy of the colony, though of the same date as the others, was not published till January 26.

> "I need hardly say," the Bishop remarks, "that the reading of these despatches at the Durban meeting abundantly accounted for the violence which was exhibited on that occasion, and for the insults prepared for myself on my arrival, the echoes of which may still be heard in one or more of the colonial papers."

For the time justice seemed to be down-trodden. There were the despatches, and there was the proclamation in the native language to Langa's tribe. The former spoke of an act of clemency to be done to the tribe and to the chief; the latter declared that any of his tribe, who wished to do so, might go to him, although he could not be suffered to go to them, and that all should be provided with such things as they might need. Yet Lord Carnarvon could state presently in the House of Lords that

> "it was only intended that Langa should be accompanied and surrounded by his immediate relations and friends,"

although to Sir B. Pine he had written that any promises made should be

> "performed with the most scrupulous fidelity, and that any other course of action would be calculated to bring the Government into the deepest discredit."

Nor was this all. The promises made by Lord Carnarvon in the Queen's name were not fulfilled even in this attenuated form. The despatches had insisted that

> "every care should be taken to obviate (for the members of the tribe) the hardships and to mitigate the severities

which, assuming the offence of the chief and his tribe to be even greater than I have estimated it, have far exceeded the limits of justice."

No such care has ever been taken; no such means have been provided. A large number even of his "immediate relations" remain to this day refugees in the Free State, and the number of his companions has never at any one time during the last thirteen years exceeded four or five, exclusive of infants. The chief himself was never released, although his place of banishment was changed; and this was the treatment dealt out to a man who had committed no crime at all. This breach of faith on the part of the Colonial and Home Governments was a heavy weight on the Bishop's mind to the end of his life. His last appeal for Langa was made, in December 1882, to Mr. Gladstone, who held out, as Lord Kimberley had held out before him, hopes of the old man's speedy release, and Langa has now at last (April 28, 1887) been brought back to Natal by Sir Arthur Havelock, though still a pauper and a prisoner.

"Justice as well as public opinion" had "absolutely demanded," Lord Carnarvon said, some action on his part; but the demands of justice were not satisfied by recalling Sir B. Pine as a scapegoat, and putting Sir G. Wolseley in his place, while the permanent staff of colonial officials for native affairs remained unchanged, with their intentions unaltered, and their feelings embittered by the check which they had received.

The trial of Langalibalele involved indirectly consequences full of pain for the Bishop personally. It led ultimately to the severance of the intimate and brotherly friendship which had existed for more than twenty years with Mr. Shepstone. The Bishop's letters, up to the date of his return to Natal, in January, 1875, bear witness to a hard struggle against the

conviction which was in the end forced upon him, that the friend whom he had implicitly trusted was not, after all, what he had taken him to be. A letter to Mr. Froude, which is given below, marks the date at which this sad conclusion was reached; and from this time to the end of his life the Bishop recognised in the policy promoted by Sir Theophilus Shepstone an influence in deadly opposition to the highest interests of Europeans and natives alike in South Africa —a policy through which the name of Englishman was fast

> "becoming in the native mind the synonym for duplicity, treachery, and violence, instead of, as in days gone by, for truth, and justice, and righteousness."

Painful, however, and disastrous though the result might be to himself, the Bishop could never hesitate in a question of duty. *Amicus Plato: magis amica veritas.* The dissolution or the interruption of a long and close friendship must be a deep grief to him; but he felt that he must be ready to give up everything, if the surrender must be made in the cause of justice and truth; and, as far as the happy convictions which made up the old friendship were concerned, he did give up everything. The incidents which led ultimately to this unhappy necessity were strange indeed, and in the story of these incidents, as has been already indicated,[1] we have the key to the mystery of the Langalibalele episode. It had been charged as an exaggeration of the offences committed by Langalibalele that, when a Government officer was sent to summon him to the presence of the Governor, he grossly insulted that officer by stripping him of his clothing. This circumstance the Bishop mentioned to his native printer Magema, who answered that Langalibalele had done no more than make the messenger take off his overcoat. "Well," the

[1] See pp. 346–57.

Bishop replied, "Somtseu [Mr. Shepstone] has heard a different story, and he believes it, and so do all the white people, and it has made them very angry. But why did he make Mawiza take off his coat?" "Because of what Mr. John Shepstone did to Matshana." "What was that?" Thereupon Magema told a story, which he said he had heard when a boy, to the effect that Mr. John Shepstone, having been sent to seize and bring to Maritzburg the chief Matshana, who had been concerned in killing a man, induced that chief to come to a conference, during which he drew out a short gun, and tried to shoot him, but hit another man. Matshana made his escape; but the "little trick" became a matter of traditional history, and led Langalibalele to fear that a like stratagem might be tried against himself.

The importance of this incident depended on the terms of the commission given to Mr. John Shepstone and the veracity of the reports of his acts. In his own report drawn up at the time nothing was said about the shooting. His conduct had been approved by the Secretary for Native Affairs; and sixteen years had passed away since the time of the alleged occurrence. The circumstances under which the matter was now judicially inquired into, while the Bishop found himself invested for the time being by the Government with the functions of a Public Prosecutor, are stated in the Bishop's letter to Mr. Froude to be presently given.

Langalibalele had not been acquitted by Lord Carnarvon of all blame. The verdict of the Secretary of State was as follows:—

> "The material offence actually established against Langa appears to me, after weighing all the circumstances of the case with the most anxious care, to amount to this—that, having been thrice summoned to appear before the Government, he at first neglected, then refused, to come, and finally, having so disobeyed the orders of the Lieutenant-

Governor, he endeavoured to fly the jurisdiction of the Colonial Government with his tribe and his cattle."

Lord Carnarvon, while admitting that the refusal to appear may have been "dictated by fear," pronounced this to be an "unfounded panic," adding that

"there could of course be no real ground for such apprehension."

This was the full extent of the chief's offence. But, inconsiderable though it was, it is clear that it would have appeared still smaller had Lord Carnarvon been aware of what Mr. Theophilus Shepstone could have told him—of what was, indeed, presently to be accepted by him as judicially established after a minute investigation before a member of Sir Garnet Wolseley's staff.

The Bishop, as we have seen,[1] had his attention first drawn to an incident that had made a deep impression on the natives, by observing the manner in which Langa's plea of "fear of treachery" was treated by the court. It was held to be "an aggravation of the insult" offered to the Government messengers.[2] The Bishop proffered evidence, with the result already stated.[3] All references to the incident were studiously suppressed throughout proceedings which had for their avowed object the estimation of the real intent and culpability of Langa's acts.

Lord Carnarvon, then, felt at liberty to set aside explanations which the unfortunate chief based upon a knowledge of this incident. That the Colonial Secretary was not encouraged by Mr. Th. Shepstone to attach any importance to the incident was only in keeping with his past conduct.[4] But the matter was

[1] See pp. 343, 344. [2] See p. 345. [3] See p. 344, *note* 2.

[4] The Bishop had originally brought the matter during Langa's "trial" to the notice of the court and of the prosecutor, Mr. J. Shepstone, through Mr. Th. Shepstone, the Secretary for Native Affairs. The latter wrote

too serious to be altogether ignored; and Mr. John Shepstone having expressed himself as anxious only

> "that his character might be cleared of a charge which, on examination before a court of law, would prove to be utterly groundless,"

Lord Carnarvon desired Sir Garnet Wolseley to institute an inquiry into the matter, which was accordingly held by Colonel Colley.

The official report of this inquiry is given in an Imperial Blue-book,[1] and in an unpublished pamphlet (278 pages) by the Bishop. But of this history it is enough to say here that the Bishop's action was in the result more than justified. Sir G. Wolseley "left it entirely" in his hands "to obtain the necessary witnesses," and through and in spite of perpetual thwartings and obstacles he continued to collect eye-witnesses from both parties: those who had been with Mr. John Shepstone at the time from among the Ama-Hlubi in Natal and the Free State; Matshana's men from the north of the colony and from Zululand. It was not an easy task.

Twenty-one witnesses[2] called by the Bishop were accord-

officially to his brother on July 26, 1874, "You are aware that I did not tell you" of what the Bishop had said. But Mr. J. Shepstone had already, on July 24, written to the Bishop, "I admit that [my brother] casually alluded to what you had said concerning me." . . .

[1] C. 1401, February 1876. The pamphlet by the Bishop, is intitled "The History of the Matshana Inquiry, with a report of the evidence as taken down by the Bishop of Natal and the Rev. Canon Tönnesen."

[2] Of the difficulties experienced by the Bishop in gathering the witnesses some idea may be formed from the facts that already, before going to England, for asking the Zulu king to send down two of his subjects, Matshana's men, he had been reprimanded by the Governor through the acting Secretary for Native Affairs (Mr. John Shepstone himself), for holding communications with an outlawed chief, and that when these men arrived the same functionary asked them how they dared to appear in the colony, where they must know that they were looked upon as wild beasts to be killed as soon as seen. Another declared, "The gaol has injured my memory; don't send me back to the gaol." As the Bishop

ingly examined, together with four others who were called both by the Bishop and by Mr. J. Shepstone, and nine who were called by the latter on his own behalf. Sixteen witnesses whom the Bishop was ready to produce were not examined, as Colonel Colley urged that time was lacking for an inquiry so protracted. The Bishop's witnesses agreed in one straightforward story which was not impugned on a single point of importance. It also appeared that the statement put forth by Mr. J. Shepstone in 1875 was not consistent with his report sent in immediately after the attempted arrest. That report said nothing about Mr. J. Shepstone's having fired at Matshana or anyone else, or of any suspicion of a conspiracy on Matshana's part to murder Mr. Shepstone. The statement of 1875 declared

"that, having determined to execute the warrant handed me by the magistrate for the arrest of Matshana, on a charge of wilful murder, at all risks, and having a day or two previous received authentic information to the effect that, at a large meeting held by Matshana, it was decided that at this interview myself and party were to be put to death, and they were to leave with their chief in a body for the Zulu country, a signal was agreed upon to be made by the chief for the massacre, and was actually twice repeated at the meeting, but fortunately for us not acted upon. I had therefore to prepare, not only for the arrest of Matshana, but for the safety of myself and party. It was too late to withdraw at this stage, so I made up my mind to face our almost certain fate, we numbering one to their ten or more."

It might well be asked, Why were not all these things stated in the original report? His wife and her two young children

remarked, witnesses who came at his request knew that they were coming, as it were, with a rope around their necks; and if it should be declared that they had borne false witness, they had every reason to fear that for calumniating so high an official their punishment would be severe.

(by a former marriage) were by his own admission present at the interview, and the Bishop remarks :—

"It seems almost incredible that Mr. John Shepstone should have made up his mind to face almost certain death, not not only for himself and all his men, but for his wife and her two young children, on the ground that it was 'too late to withdraw at this stage,' when at any time since the 'day or two previous,' when the information in question reached him, he might have put off the meeting, or at all events have sent his wife and her children to a place of safety. It is, however, proved, and this also by the admissions of Mr. J. Shepstone himself, that he did not look on the principles of English good faith as applicable necessarily to dealings with the natives. Thus he had met Matshana at Dilizela and shook hands with him, giving him cattle for food in a friendly manner, and himself says of this, '*I should have apprehended him*, had it not been for the reason I have given—namely, that he was attended by upwards of three hundred armed men, was himself armed, and [*sic*] did not any of them lay down their arms during the interview. . . . But should the Government still see it necessary, I can seize him at once, but will require an armed force to do so.'"

In the opinion or judgement drawn up for the Secretary of State and forwarded through Sir H. Bulwer, the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, Colonel Colley found as follows :—

"That Matshana was enticed to an interview, as stated by the Bishop, and was induced to come unarmed, under the belief that it was a friendly meeting, such as he had already had with Mr. Shepstone, for the purpose of discussing the accusations against him, and the question of his return to his location.

"That Matshana, though very suspicious and unwilling, came there in good faith, and that the accusations against him—of meditating the assassination of Mr. Shepstone and his party, of a pre-arranged plan and signal for the purpose, and of carrying concealed arms to the meeting—which are made

in Mr. J. Shepstone's statements, are entirely without foundation. . . .

"That Mr. Shepstone did not attempt to shoot Matshana, as described by the Bishop, but fired into the air, after the attempt to seize Matshana had failed, and in consequence of the attempt made almost simultaneously by some of Matshana's men to reach the huts and seize the arms of Mr. Shepstone's men.

"The concealment of a gun, and the fact that a great number of Matshana's men were killed in the pursuit, is not disputed by Mr. Shepstone."

If in using the word *shoot* Colonel Colley meant that Mr. Shepstone did not mean to *kill* Matshana, he was saying only what the Bishop said. There was no reason for supposing that Mr. J. Shepstone wished or intended to kill the chief. As a "noted sportsman and shot," he could have done this with ease; but it was not so easy to wound without killing or without hurting seriously. All that he wanted was by disabling him to make his capture more sure and his chance of escape smaller.

In reference to this decision of Colonel Colley, Lord Carnarvon, in a despatch to Sir H. Bulwer, dated December 15, 1875, declares:—

"I am bound emphatically to say that I have no hesitation in accepting it as a sound and just conclusion. On the other hand, I must, even after the lapse of so many years, record my disapprobation of the artifices by which it is admitted that Matshana was intrapped into the meeting with a view to his possible arrest. Such underhand manœuvres are opposed to the morality of a civilised administration; they lower English rule in the eyes of the natives; and they even defeat their own object, as is abundantly illustrated by the present case. Mr. J. W. Shepstone, however, was a subordinate officer, and, if his mode of executing the warrant was approved by the superior authorities

in the colony, the blame which may be attached to the transaction must be borne by them at least in equal proportion."[1]

When Lord Carnarvon, in this despatch, speaks of the "conviction" of Colonel Colley,

"that the charge brought against Mr. J. W. Shepstone, of having attempted to shoot Matshana, could not be sustained,"

it is clear that he also takes the word *shoot* to mean *kill*. The charge of attempting to kill had not been brought against him. The charge of attempting to wound or of firing in order to insure his capture had been in effect burked, though unintentionally, we may be sure, on Colonel Colley's part; and on this point the testimony of the witnesses generally was conclusive. In his statement of September 15, 1874, Mr. J.

[1] Blue-book, p. 250. The two accounts of Mr. John Shepstone, on which "with the greatest difficulty" Colonel Colley had based his decision, had represented him as firing after Matshana's men had turned to rally. His remarks, which were not forthcoming at the inquiry, but are now, by a curious irony of fate, published in the same Blue-book with Colonel Colley's Report and Lord Carnarvon's acceptance of it as "a sound and just conclusion," flatly contradict his other two accounts, and, by consequence, contradict also the decision based on these accounts in reference to the only point on which Colonel Colley had believed it possible to avoid convicting him,—his words here being, "When I found the whole force turning upon us, I did not fire again." In a letter to Lord Carnarvon, dated April 27, 1876, the Bishop, expressing his unfeigned admiration of the masterly manner in which Colonel Colley summed up the evidence (taken through an interpreter, and without assistance), recognised not only the judicial impartiality but also the singular accuracy of the summary composed under such conditions. But he pointed out the fatal contradiction since revealed, and also the "serious misapprehension under which Colonel Colley had laboured, through entirely overlooking (probably under the heavy pressure of work devolved upon him at the last moment of his stay in the colony) that portion of the Bishop's remarks which . . . . . had expressly guarded against any such misapprehension" as that the Bishop had made any charge against Mr Shepstone of having attempted to *kill* Matshana.

Shepstone had said that no opportunity of executing his warrant against Matshana had offered itself before

> "the day on which I am charged with having treacherously inveigled him."[1]

This charge of inveigling both Colonel Colley and Lord Carnarvon held to be fully sustained.[2] From first to last, Mr. J. Shepstone, and his brother Mr. Th. Shepstone, had denied, not merely the fact of the shooting at Matshana, but that of inveigling him also.

The circumstances of the Bishop's return to Natal in 1875 presented a striking contrast to those of his landing nearly ten years before. The disaster of the Bushman's River Pass had been used to stir up in the minds of the colonists an unreasoning hatred of the Hlubi chief. By saying anything in his favour the Bishop was regarded as taking part with a bloodthirsty ruffian; and those of the officials who might have corrected their blunder were too much interested in securing the condemnation of Langalibalele to think of doing so. But it is a significant fact that the relatives of the three young men who fell at the Pass were not among those who were loud in abuse of the Bishop. Personal intercourse with him in their sorrow soon justified to them both his motives and his acts.

Before he landed, efforts to excite the worse part of the white population against him had been made by some who would not have been sorry if their rage had led them into tumult, and the tumult had ended in his bodily injury. In the town of Durban some of the shops were closed as a sign of mourning, and on many of the vessels in the harbour the flags stood half-mast high. Broad hints that the Bishop might be lynched reached the ears of Colonel Durnford and Mr. Warwick Brooks. Without saying anything to alarm the

[1] Blue-book, p. 255. [2] *Ib.* p. 257.

family at Bishopstowe, these stanch friends went down to the harbour to receive him. The steamer had arrived late at night; and the passengers would land early in the morning. The friends were on shore close to the ship at dawn, Colonel Durnford in full uniform, and wearing his sword;[1] and when, on his landing, they placed themselves one on either side, the crowd parted silently, and indulged in nothing more than black looks, of which the Bishop took no notice. All this ill-will might easily have been repressed, or even dissipated, if men in high office had not found that it would better answer their purpose to pander to it. The most powerful influences were exerted on the other side.

"I will now tell you," Colonel Durnford wrote to his father (July 3, 1875), "what I think of Sir Garnet Wolseley and his policy here. He came out to carry some point, I imagine, not yet divulged, and from the first he went in for conciliation, and therefore, I suppose, did not desire to show countenance either to the Bishop of Natal or to myself. . . . So we two had 'cold shoulder,' nothing we could take hold upon; we were asked to the official and public entertainments and to *none others*, although hospitality is the order of the day at Government House. I suppose the General feared to impair his popularity! . . . I have, as you know, stood up for the Putini tribe, and my views have been indorsed by Lord Carnarvon. The tribe, having confidence in me, collected funds and sent them to me to purchase land for them. They could not buy direct—the white man would certainly cheat the savage. I ascertained that Sir Garnet Wolseley and the Secretary for Native Affairs approved of the natives procuring land, and I informed them both of the fact that the tribe were sending me money for the purpose. Well, one day I was sent for to Government House, and informed that it was inexpedient that I took any further action in native matters, and I was called upon 'on my loyalty' to cease. I was told . . . that my

[1] The Bishop regretted the rebuke to the people implied by this.

usefulness as Colonial Engineer had been very much impaired by my political sympathies with Bishop Colenso, and so on. I resigned at once. My resignation was not accepted. . . . Sir Garnet Wolseley told me that, with my feelings that the Natal Government acted wrongly in the destruction of the Putini tribe, I was a *traitor* to that Government (as C.E.) in my action for their redress, and I should then have resigned. I rejoined, 'That is impossible, as the Queen has indorsed that action. I led the Government to the right path.' [1]

"He [Sir Garnet Wolseley] has treated the Bishop of Natal and myself with marked coldness ever since he came. His is a conciliating, popularity-seeking policy. Well, I'm in good company, better than ever I hoped for, and in a good cause. . . . One count against me, I find, is that I went to Durban to meet my friend the Bishop when he returned from England, thereby plainly showing my sympathy. Some people threatened to tar and feather him, to prevent his landing! Well, as a Government officer, I am told, I *should not have gone near him.* Is that not a nice creed for a gentleman to hold? Desert your friends when trouble comes!" [2]

Not content with bullying Colonel Durnford, who could not, by military etiquette, defend himself, Sir Garnet Wolseley undertook to "snub" the Bishop whose offence was akin to that of Colonel Durnford. As the Bishop himself says:—

"Nothing having been done after Mr. Shepstone's return to carry out Lord Carnarvon's instructions for the relief of Langa's tribe, I did what I could (having, I believed, some influence with them, and having first consulted Mr. Shepstone and secured his apparent approval) to induce the able-bodied men of the tribe to engage in work for the Government upon the roads, &c., under the Colonial Engineer (Colonel Durnford), in the hope of saving money to buy land for themselves in the colony after a time. . . . . It having been reported, however, by certain officials to

[1] *A Soldier's Life and Work in South Africa.* [2] *Ib.* pp. 122, 123.

Sir G. Wolseley that my messengers had 'caused agitation' by stirring up the natives with the hope that the chief Langa would return to Natal [an unfounded report, as the Bishop showed], he disapproved of my proceeding, declaring that members of the Ama-Hlubi tribe were still liable to forced servitude on their return to the colony, . . . and that the policy of the Government is not specially to encourage their return."

The Bishop insisted that permission for their return could not be withheld without a breach of faith on the part of the Government in a question, in which, to use the words of Lord Carnarvon, "the justice and the honour of the British Crown are involved." Finally, Sir G. Wolseley agreed, on condition that the Bishop should send them no more messengers, to make known to the Ama-Hlubi in the Free State and Basutoland that they were free to return. The Bishop assented, and Sir G. Wolseley "kept the word of promise to the ear" by ordering a notice to this effect to be inserted in the *public papers*, and so taking care that it should not reach the Ama-Hlubi. At the same time he called upon the Bishop "by his loyalty, to do nothing contrary to the policy decided upon by that constituted authority which represents Her Majesty in the colony."

The Bishop's reply ends with the following words :—

"His Excellency will be aware that during the past year I have felt it to be my very painful duty, as a loyal subject, to do many things contrary to the policy decided upon by the representatives of the Crown in this colony; that this policy has been condemned, and overruled, or materially modified by the Secretary of State; and that my conduct has met with the approval of Lord Carnarvon, and, I may add, with that of Her Majesty herself, conveyed to me by the Dean of Westminster. It would be no sign, therefore, of any want of 'loyalty' on my part, if under any like circumstances which might occur hereafter—which God

forbid—I should be found acting contrary to the policy of this Government. Nor, I am sure, will His Excellency wish or expect me, considering the relations in which during the past year I have stood to these people,—in this colony almost alone, but with the full approval of the highest authorities at home,—to be bound by restrictions, expressed or implied, to which no other white man in the colony would be subject."

The history of this period of the Bishop's life may run counter to the tastes and the prejudices of some or of many; but even these will be constrained to ask themselves whether it was possible for a truth-loving and single-minded man to follow any other course than that which he actually took. Pressed by anxieties of two kinds—anxieties for the securing of bare justice (to say nothing of merciful and gentle dealing) for the natives, and anxieties for the highest welfare of the white population of his diocese—he yet struggled on, cast down, but not dismayed, in the path of his duty. But that the pressure of the load was sorely felt is shown by the following letter to his brother-in-law:—

To C. J. Bunyon, Esq.

"Bishopstowe, *March* 8, 1875.

. . . "As for my remaining here without men and without money, which . . . . friends of mine speak of so complacently, that is utterly impossible. I wait to see what course my friends in England, who promised me assistance, will take to aid me in what is really a superhuman struggle, at least a struggle too hard for one single man *unassisted* to maintain against all the world, political and theological. I wait also to see what course the native question may take here. But if nothing happens within twelve months to make my stay here hopeful or even possible, I should certainly not reject such a proposal as that from the Manchester New College, if it came to me, or any other by which I could get my bread respectably."

TO THE REV. J. D. LA TOUCHE.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *July* 30, 1875.

"Your letter of June 21 reached us yesterday, and very glad indeed we are to hear that you found all well at home, as I did, thank God, on my return from England. Soon after you wrote, you must have received my letter which would in great measure supply the answer to this of yours,—so far at all events as to settle the question for you whether *your* return to Natal would be acceptable or not. I can only say that it is much desired by all parties concerned, and *my* only reason for not urging it upon you with all my power is that you only can know your own circumstances in England, and you also are acquainted thoroughly with the state of things in Natal. But come to us again, if you can, and come as speedily as you can. . . . At present nothing whatever has been done in respect of the natives, nor, so far as I can see, is anything likely to be done, by Sir Garnet Wolseley, who . . . . does not seem to have a particle of sympathy with me and mine in what we have done for poor Langa and the Ama-Hlubi.

"You will hear from our boys or Mr. Chesson what a snubbing Sir G. Wolseley has given to the 266 Christian natives for their memorial. . . . The *Times*, of course, comes down upon the natives, having evidently supposed . . . . that *I* was at the bottom of it, whereas I had nothing to do with it. It was a genuine document, emanating from the natives themselves. The *Mercury* insinuated all it can against me and Magema, who was employed to write it; but only nine of the 266 signatures belong to this station. The fact is that the petition was suggested by Bishop Macrorie's head man in Maritzburg, and Bishop Macrorie's teacher undertook to draw it up for them."[1]

[1] The petitioners subsequently re-wrote it for themselves in English, and it was sent to Sir Garnet Wolseley (of all men!) in the following form:—"We, the undersigned Christians . . . are glad to welcome your Excellency's arrival, the great chief whom we are under, and our father who released us from all heaviness. We welcome your arrival with our

On August 14, 1875, Mr. Froude, writing at Maritzburg, addressed a long letter to the Bishop on the subject of the Matshana inquiry. In this letter he contended that, by the accepted ethics of secret or confidential Government service, Mr. J. Shepstone was not to blame for shooting "a supposed criminal when resisting a lawful arrest;" that the Bishop was going beyond the mark in charging this to him as a crime; that statesmen and soldiers are exceedingly jealous of such interference from outsiders as that which was involved in the part taken by the Bishop of late years in native affairs; that the miseries of the Langalibalele business were attributable to "everyone who has talked nonsense about the black races for the last eighty years;" that the blacks must be ruled by the whites; that the sooner the former could be convinced of this the better would it be for both sides. In a postscript Mr. Froude mentioned the allegation that the inquiry was the result of the Bishop's charging Mr. Shepstone with "murderous treachery" which disqualified him for public employment.

"I do not think," he said, "such a charge can be made good. If you could withdraw *that*, and let the matter stand where it did in Langalibalele's trial, public opinion would then bear you out."

To this letter the Bishop returned the following reply:—

To J. A. FROUDE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *August* 16, 1875.

"I thank you heartily for your letter and for all your kind words in it, as well as for your frank expressions of opinion on all points concerned.

nearty thanks. . . . We say that you are the same as a hen, which does not mind any kind of chicken, whether of a duck, or turkey, or of any other bird—she does keep them all under her wings."

"As to the case of Mr. John Shepstone, you—and doubtless Sir Garnet Wolseley and others—entirely mistake my position. I do not think that Lord Carnarvon does, or my friends in England; and I shall, of course, have to take care that my action is not misrepresented in the matter, as it has been here persistently. *Originally*, it was no part of my business to prove that Mr. J. Shepstone did the deed attributed to him. I neither cared, for the purpose I then had in view, nor (for his brother's sake) had I any wish to do so. I quite admit all you say about the justification which might be urged, and would be allowed by many, for the act in question under the circumstances, if it occurred. What I did was to urge it, whether true or believed to be true, as an excuse for Langalibalele; and when the Government here, that is, the S.N.A., refused to allow it any weight, and treated it as an impudent pretence, both in the sentence and in the judgement of the Court of Appeal, I had nothing to do but to submit the facts, as far as I then knew about them, to Lord Carnarvon for his own information. This was done by one of my own friends sending him my first pamphlet (*Defence of Langalibalele*); and though he did so without my express authority, yet I take the responsibility of the act, because I, no doubt, expressed in my letters the wish very strongly that Lord Carnarvon knew the facts of the case. Lord Carnarvon then sent my pamphlet out for Sir B. Pine's information, requesting him to reply to the statements made in it, and this produced Mr. Theoph. Shepstone's minute printed in the Imperial Blue-book (C. 1121) containing also Mr. John Shepstone's official report as forwarded at the time—a minute so untruthful, so dishonest, as regards this particular point, that the last links of friendship between us, which (as far as I was concerned) still held us together, were snapped asunder as soon as I read it, after my return from England. What course I should have taken ultimately in the matter, it is impossible to say; but the point was settled for me by Mr. J. Shepstone's entering an action against me for a false and malicious libel,

asserting that the statements I had made were 'as untrue as unfounded,' and calling upon me to 'retract unreservedly the aspersion it contains concerning me,' to which, of course, I replied that I declined to retract anything which I have written concerning Matshana's affair, until I am satisfied that the said statements are 'untrue and unfounded.' This obliged me to refer the matter to Sir B. Pine, and from his decision to Lord Carnarvon. I did not impute blame especially to Mr. J. Shepstone for his 'treacherous, murderous act,' as his brother (*not myself*) called it, as if *that* was the point on which I laid particular stress, as you and Sir Garnet seem to believe. But I said that he had lied to the Government at first in his official report; that he had lied again when his own act was alleged before him, as prosecutor, by a prisoner on trial for his life, in suppressing the truth from the authorities concerned; that he had lied, and was lying, down to the present moment, to Lord Carnarvon himself, in denying the truth of the story I had laid before his Lordship, and charging me with making statements of a most libellous and malicious nature. I do not, of course, mean that I used so coarse a word as lying; but undoubtedly I implied the fact expressed by that word. And it is *this* offence, against his own superior and against the Secretary of State himself—and not the original fault, which I quite well agree with you would be justified or excused by many a politician—which is the real subject of this inquiry ordered by Lord Carnarvon.

"You will see, I think, that under the above circumstances the whole of that part of your letter which refers to the matter of Mr. J. Shepstone is altogether irrelevant to the real point at issue. I never said that his act of 'murderous treachery' (Mr. Theophilus Shepstone's phrase) disqualified him from public employment. But I said that his dishonest concealments of that act (if it really occurred) in his official report, and still more his suppression of the truth when he acted as public prosecutor against Langalibalele, and, most of all, his daring denial of it in the face of Lord Carnarvon and of the whole world, . . . unfitted him to sit

on the Bench as the distributor of justice in the name of England; not to speak of his acting as Secretary for Native Affairs in his brother's absence. . . . I fully contemplated the possibility of the public trial with which Mr. J. Shepstone had threatened me, through his lawyer, before I left Natal; and all I wanted was to be protected so far by Lord Carnarvon as to have no obstacle thrown in my way by the Natal authorities in preparing my defence and calling my witnesses. The whole course pursued by Lord Carnarvon in this matter, as far as I know, is entirely his own; most certainly it was never suggested by myself (*i.e.* in getting Mr. J. Shepstone to withdraw his action at law, and substituting an inquiry in place of it). . . .

"With respect to Sir Garnet Wolseley, I agree with almost every word you say. I was fully prepared for some amount of feeling on his part as to any appearance of interference by an outsider like myself with the affairs of Government, with which, I may add, I have never once interfered during the twenty-one years I have lived in the colony till compelled to do so by the matter of Langa. Nor did I expect to be 'consulted' by him: that is far too grand a term to be used for any friendly talk which I might, perhaps, without any great presumption, have expected him to have with me, as privately as he liked, on native affairs, in which, as he knew, I had taken so deep an interest. I confess I see no reason why Sir Garnet Wolseley, coming direct from Lord Carnarvon as you do, might not have looked upon me with favour, as my action was approved by his superior, and have shown me, as you have done (independently, I venture to believe, of our former slight acquaintance), a little kindly sympathy in private—if he could not do so in public—considering the painful difficulties I have had to encounter, and in serving his chief and our Sovereign. But I was soon, as I told you, made to feel that this was not to be, and that I must still go on my solitary way; and I was content to do so, and *have done so*, withdrawing myself from all interference in native affairs ever since I received Sir Garnet's most uncalled-for snub-

bing, though he evidently does not believe this—*e.g.* as regards the Christian natives' petition. . . . I think also that you would find it difficult to show that I, in fighting the battle of Langalibalele, had been 'obliged to condemn the whites of Natal most severely.' I have no recollection of having ever done so on any single occasion, and certainly not in conversation with Lord Carnarvon. I remember his expressly asking me if I thought the people were disposed to be unjust and cruel to the natives, and I replied, 'Certainly not. They are mistaken in the present affair, because they have been utterly misled by the Government. But I fully believe that, as a body, they would wish to deal with them justly and kindly, and even generously.' . . ."

Three months later, writing to the Bishop from Capetown, Mr. Froude said that he must hasten with all speed to England, to undeceive Lord Carnarvon, "who imagines that the colonies are ripe for confederation."

"As to Colonel Durnford," Mr. Froude remarked, "I have rarely met a man who, at first sight, made a more pleasing impression upon me. He was more than I expected, and his distinguished reputation had led me to form very high expectations indeed. He has done the State good service. He alone did his duty, when others forgot theirs: 'among the faithless, faithful only found.' He has borne without complaint the most ungenerous calumnies. And, if it be possible for me to bring his case under the consideration of people at home, you may be sure that I will not neglect to do so."

TO THE REV. J. D. LA TOUCHE.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *August* 30, 1875.

. . . "The Matshana inquiry ended, as far as I am concerned, last Thursday, by my sending in my summary of the evidence. I am *perfectly satisfied.* I brought forward twenty witnesses, who all supported my view of the affair in the

most distinct straightforward manner. To many of them I had never said a word on the subject before they appeared to be examined, and I had never even seen the face of seven of them, of whom four were brought down by Mr. J. Shepstone and kept in his hands all the while in Maritzburg. I expect he thought I should be *afraid* to call them, supposing that, summoned as being his witnesses, they would support *his* story. But I did call them nevertheless; and they manfully spoke the truth. The only one who ate his words (as I expected he would) was Ncamane, whose story you know, and even he by the lies he told really proved my account to be true. Mr. J. Shepstone brought four eye-witnesses, who *all* of them lied transparently. In short, the matter is proved beyond a doubt, as Lord Carnarvon must see, *if only the evidence is sent home fairly.* But I must confess I have the greatest misgivings as to what Sir G. Wolseley may do. . . . In this inquiry he has refused me at first all help towards getting witnesses; and though at last he was obliged to send [to Zululand] for some at my request, *e.g.* Matshana himself, . . . he has refused to pay any of the expenses which I have had to incur in the matter. I hope to get these out of Lord Carnarvon. But the tone of his speeches wonderfully repeats Sir G. Wolseley's 'Let bygones be bygones.' Yes; and Langa is still at Robben Island, . . . and nothing has been done to assist the Ama-Hlubi to recover from their ruin; . . . and the Putini people have little done for them—not £2,000 altogether, I firmly believe, instead of the £20,000 which Lord Carnarvon speaks of. . . . The revelations made in this inquiry as to the rottenness of our whole native system, when the indunas, and would-be indunas, are actually trained to lying and deceit by the example of their white superiors, are very shocking. I am certain that Sir G. Wolseley will do all he possibly can to burke and hush up the affair, and perhaps he will succeed in doing so. . . . Lord Carnarvon himself has written a very kind private letter to me, asking me, in effect, to do nothing to help these unfortunate tribes, and Mr. Froude

has written another kind letter to suggest to me to drop the Matshana inquiry. And as I, of course, shall do neither the one nor the other, I shall be as usual, I suppose, abused by all parties. . . . Sir G. Wolseley's visit ends with this steamer, which carries him and his brilliant staff away. It remains to be seen what real good he has done. . . . The new native law seems to be nothing but a law to render legal all that Mr. Shepstone has been doing hitherto illegally or irregularly. The whole power is contained in his hands alone—legislative, judicial, and executive—as far as the natives are concerned; and through these he really rules the colony, and, like Sindbad's Old Man of the Sea, cannot be shaken off. He seems to me to be firmer in his saddle than ever."

TO THE EARL OF CARNARVON.

"BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL, *September* 1, 1875.

"MY LORD,

"I feel very deeply the most kind and frank manner in which you have written to me with reference to native matters in this colony, and I desire to express to your Lordship my sincere thanks for your letter. I am sure that I shall be allowed to express as frankly, with all possible respect, my own feelings at the present moment. And if I may not succeed in wholly removing from your Lordship's mind the impressions which have evidently been conveyed to it with reference to my proceedings since Sir Garnet Wolseley came to Natal, yet I venture to believe from the experience which I had while in England of your Lordship's kindness that you will at least consider seriously what I would say to justify myself in your Lordship's estimation.

"I suppose that I may assume that your Lordship's letter has been elicited by communications from Sir Garnet Wolseley; and I have no doubt that he believes that I am a somewhat troublesome—probably even a dangerous—agitator in native matters. He imagines, very probably, that I expected to be consulted about them in consequence of my recent action in Langalibalele's case; that I am disappointed at having

received from him, ever since he landed, an unmistakeable 'cold shoulder' in respect of all such matters; and that I have been, in consequence, more or less engaged ever since in stirring up the native mind, listening to their complaints, and fomenting their discontent. Nothing, however, can be more unfounded: there is not a shadow of real ground for such a suspicion. From the time of my landing in 1854 I have never interfered in political matters, with reference either to whites or blacks, till my sense of justice, outraged in Langalibalele's trial, and by the cruel wrongs done to his tribe and Putini's, compelled me to take the course I did; and when I returned from England and read the words of your Lordship's despatches, I heartily thanked God that my labour had not been in vain. Langalibalele, indeed, is still, I believe, a prisoner on Robben Island [he had been removed to Uitvlugt on August 26, though this was not known in Natal on September 1, when this letter was written.—J.W.N.],[1] though his condition is ameliorated; and certainly not one of his wives or children or friends has as yet been sent to him [nor was sent until Nokwetuka, Mbombo, and Mabonsa were sent at my persistent instigation on February 4, 1876.—J.W.N.];[1] and a week or two ago I saw a private letter (from the Superintendent of the Cape Botanic Gardens), in which the writer said that Langa would be more comfortable at Robben Island than at the place provided for him by the Government. Of course, the provision made for him has fallen very far short of what your Lordship intended, and most kindly mentioned to me in Downing Street, and of what, indeed, is implied in the despatch. But in face of the difficulties in which the whole affair had been involved by the rash proceedings of this Government and the self-assertion of the Cape Government, taking also into account the fears expressed, partly no doubt genuine, partly fictitious, of native disturbances as the natural consequence of your Lordship's action, I felt that perhaps all had been done in the case that could be done, while I trusted also that your Lordship might see reason to cut short his

[1] Notes appended at a later date by the Bishop.

banishment, of which indeed a promise has been given him by Mr. Brownlee, if he behaved well. He *has* behaved well, and he has now been for twelve months a prisoner on Robben Island, besides eight spent in gaol in Natal.

"But there was no such difficulty in carrying out your Lordship's wise and merciful instructions with respect to the people of the two tribes. And here I must say I have been painfully disappointed. The despatch said that 'every care should be taken to obviate the hardships, and to mitigate the severities, which, assuming the offence of the chief and his tribe to be even greater than I had estimated it, have far exceeded the limits of justice.' I am not aware that anything has been done in this direction—except that their 'apportionment' to farmers and others has been cancelled—as by supplying grain, cattle, or clothing, except food and blankets given to the wives and children of Langa himself at my request, while awaiting the decision in their case as to their going, or not, to Robben Island. Again, your Lordship directed that, 'as far as possible, means should be provided by which the members of the tribe may be enabled to re-establish themselves in settled occupations.' I have not heard that any means whatever has been provided for this end by the Government, while my own efforts to get them employed under the Colonial Engineer, with the view of their saving money to buy land, have been effectually checked and stifled at the very outset by the course taken by Sir Garnet Wolseley under the advice of Mr. Shepstone. It is on this point only that I have come into any appearance of conflict with the Government; and I venture to inclose for your Lordship's perusal a copy of the correspondence which has passed between Sir Garnet Wolseley and myself on this subject. I do not forward it officially through the Governor, not wishing that your Lordship should be troubled with any further reference to these matters. But it is impossible that your Lordship should understand how innocent I have been of any wish to intrude beyond my proper sphere into Government affairs, unless you will have the kindness to cast your eyes over it. I inclose also another corre-

spondence, in which, after speaking privately to Sir Garnet Wolseley upon the subject, I petitioned at his suggestion for the release of two unfortunates still kept in gaol—the last victims of the Ama-Hlubi tragedy. Sir Garnet Wolseley was pleased to grant my prayer in respect of one of them, but for the present declined to release the other. I humbly submit the case of this man (Sibanyana) to your Lordship's merciful consideration.

"When I found that my efforts to get the men of the tribe to work with a view to buying land at the end of three years —instead of their merely sinking into serfs—did not meet His Excellency's approval, I withdrew at once from all active interference with such matters, or with any matters in which the natives were concerned, until I was called to act in the Matshana inquiry. Sir Garnet Wolseley has been led, I believe, to attribute to my suggestion or co-operation the Christian natives' memorial,[1] of which, of course, your Lordship will have heard; and the fact has been even stated, and after my express contradiction repeated, in the present Government organ, the *Times of Natal*, that my daughter had written two pages of the names of the natives attached to it. I trust that before this Sir Garnet Wolseley has become aware of the mistake into which he has been led on this point. It was a genuine product of the half-civilised native mind; and I venture to think that, with all its defects in manner and matter, it hardly deserved the severe reprimand which Sir Garnet Wolseley —I presume on Mr. Shepstone's advice—thought it to be his duty to administer. It was meant to be respectful to His Excellency, though complaining of several points in the present native system of government. Some of their complaints I know to be very real, and they might be and ought to be remedied, and Sir Garnet Wolseley would not be likely to hear of them from any other quarter. But, after such a rebuff as the petitioners have received, it will be long, I expect, before a Governor will receive any other expression from themselves of their real or imaginary troubles.

[1] See page 419.

"It was plain, however, from the first moment of his landing, that Sir Garnet Wolseley, while showing all possible courtesy and kindness to myself and my family, as he did to all around him, meant to keep himself entirely aloof from me on native questions; acting, I presume, on your Lordship's instructions, perhaps understood by him in a somewhat exaggerated sense. I understood of course, that policy might require that he should ignore in public, in respect of native matters, the existence of one who had made himself so unpopular as I have become in the colony through my recent action, and whose only claims to a hearing were that of having mastered sufficiently the native tongue to be able to enter into their hearts and understand their thoughts and feelings more than others, and that of having also in some measure won their confidence by having exerted myself and suffered on their behalf. As to being formally or officially consulted, I never dreamt of it, unless it might be perhaps with others as member of a Native Board. But I did think it possible, I must confess, that, coming fresh from England and your Lordship's presence, he might express to me in private some sympathy with the peculiar difficulties of my position; might perhaps ask if I had any suggestions to make in respect of the two tribes, in which he must have known I was so deeply interested; or might even let me know to some small extent what he was doing, or meant to do, on their behalf—more especially as I stood in this colony almost the sole public representative of that strong English feeling by which your Lordship's action was so warmly supported, and was in some sense responsible to those I represented and whom I persuaded, so soon as I heard your Lordship's decision, to lay aside all further public discussion of the subject in England, and leave themselves, and the cause of these unfortunate tribes, with perfect confidence in your Lordship's hands.

"But, as I have said, I know not what has been done in respect of the Ama-Hlubi to correspond with the generous language of the despatch. With regard to the Putini

people, I see by the report of the debate in the House of Lords on July 24, which has just reached us, that your Lordship is under the impression that 'the sum of £20,000 has been laid out by Sir Garnet Wolseley in cattle, stock, agricultural implements, &c., which were to be given to the tribe by way of compensation.'"

The Bishop then describes the actual condition of the dispossessed tribe so far as it was known to him at the time, and adds at a later date the note that "£980 16*s.* 8*d.* was the real sum at the date of my writing, and £550 at the time Lord Carnarvon heard of the £20,000." In this instance, the nature of the misleading statements made by colonial officials to the Secretary of State enabled the Bishop directly and completely to disprove them. The evil which he was to see wrought in Southern Africa was due chiefly to the fact that colonial officials might sin with impunity both in word and deed, while no weight was given to the Bishop's strict and unswerving integrity, when it became necessary to judge of a conflict of testimony between him and officials of the Natal Government.

"Your Lordship is reported to have said [in the House of Lords] 'I would earnestly intreat those who have taken part in these transactions—whether it be the Bishop of Natal, whether it be others, who have taken a leading part, by influence, by word, or by action—I would intreat them to allow the past to be forgotten, and to address themselves to the future.' Most heartily would I for one throw myself into the spirit of these admirable words, and exhort my friends in England to do so, were the past really bygone, and had the instructions of your Lordship's despatch been really carried out. But it is hard to be called upon to do this, when it is only we—the Government and the white people—with whom these things are bygones—we, who retain the property of both tribes, and the lands of the Ama-Hlubi; while Langa and his son are still in exile, and prisoners,

without the society of any of their women or friends; and that poor solitary sickly wretch is still in gaol at Maritzburg; and nothing whatever has been done to help the Ama-Hlubi to settle down again on lands of their own, though willing to buy them with their own labour; and the restitution to the Putini people has hitherto—so far as appears—been chiefly in name, and not a reality. Under such circumstances can it be expected that the misery and injustice of the past two years should be forgotten by the natives?

"But you may be assured that it will be, as it has been all along, my most earnest desire to act as far as possible in support of the measures which your Lordship has devised for the future well-being of the colony, especially in respect of native affairs, knowing well, as I do, that your Lordship has only in view the good and happiness of all concerned. And I pray that your efforts may be abundantly blessed.

"I have, &c.,

"J. W. NATAL."

TO THE REV. C. J. H. FLETCHER.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January* 6, 1876.

"I am much obliged by your letter forwarding me a draft . . . on account of the Carfax sermon, which I shall duly apply to assist our work among the natives in Natal, and especially those of our two unfortunate and most shamefully ill-used tribes. I write more strongly now, because, I grieve to say, all the promises of Lord Carnarvon have turned out to be delusions, except merely as to the removal of Langalibalele from Robben Island to the main land. Lord Carnarvon appears to have thrown himself completely into the hands of Mr. Shepstone (now Sir T. Shepstone)—the very person whose policy has been the cause of all our recent troubles. . . . I wait to see what Lord Carnarvon will do in the Matshana affair before deciding what other steps to take. But I do not intend the monstrous iniquity

which has been allowed to take the place of all Lord Carnarvon's grand professions . . . . to pass unexposed in England. . . .

"It is quite true that the course which I have taken in native affairs has deprived me of much of the support which my theological warfare had left me in Natal, and I hardly know as yet what the end will be. . . . On New Year's Day there was a grand display at Durban on the turning of the first sod of our first Government railway, the Governor, officials of all kinds, and all the world of Natal and his wife, being present. But they left me out in the cold, as a punishment for my sins; so that the bitter feeling which met me on my return has not yet died out. This does not at all trouble me, for I expected it. But I certainly did *not* expect, after my intercourse with Lord Carnarvon in England, to receive nothing but the 'cold shoulder' from his confidential emissary Sir G. Wolseley."

TO MISS JANE HUGHES.[1]

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January* 24, 1876.

"I received long ago your most kind letter of April 17, and I ought to have replied to it before this time. But the truth is that I and mine—that is, especially my eldest daughter, Harrie—have been fighting ever since on behalf of these poor natives. . . . Our dear Alfred[2]—what an interest would he have taken in this whole affair, and perhaps he does take it! I need hardly say that I have not progressed a single step with my last Part on the Pentateuch. . . . The Langa people have not been encouraged or assisted in any way to settle themselves comfortably down again in the colony. On the contrary, they have been discouraged and deterred from returning into the colony.[3] . . . Then Lord Carnarvon said in the House of Lords that £20,000 had been restored to the Putini people in cattle, agricultural implements, &c. At the time when he said this, not £500, I believe, had been restored to them. . . . Lord Carnarvon now writes to the

[1] Daughter of the Bishop of St. Asaph.

[2] See p. 243, *note.* [3] See p. 417.

Aborigines Protection Society, in a letter which has now reached us, that Sir G. Wolseley had estimated their losses at £12,000, and had settled to restore it to them in four annual instalments of £3,000 each. Now, first, this amount only represents the sum admitted to have been actually paid into the Natal Treasury from the [forced] sale of the Putini cattle; and thousands of their cattle had been used to supply the Government force, white and black, with food for some weeks, and multitudes had died of lung-sickness, contracted by the captured cattle being crowded together, neglected, and ill-treated. . . . But besides the cattle there were about 200 horses and an immense number of goats; 1,239 huts, at least worth 10*s.* each, burnt down; all the household utensils, pots, sleeping mats, &c. of 5,000 people looted; ditto all their clothing; ditto . . . . all their stores of grain for four months' eating, besides considerable sums of money in individual cases. Thus, £20,000 would be, I believe, far *within* the limit of their losses. But taking them at £12,000, the result of Sir G. Wolseley's absurd policy . . . . is that the Legislative Council voted £3,000 for 1875, of which £2,000 was spent by the time Sir G. Wolseley left the colony; but for this year they voted only £1,500 for the relief of individual cases of distress among natives, arising out of the Langalibalele 'revolt'; and, as the Colonial Secretary told me last week, they will vote no more!

"I hope you will not be tired with so long a discussion of native matters. But, while these things continue to be done, you will see how impossible it is for me to think of laying down my weapons or leaving the colony.

"You must know that I *preached* half of your letter as a part of my Cathedral sermon on one occasion; it suited so well to express my own feelings."

To F. W. Chesson, Esq.

"Bishopstowe, *February* 1, 1876.

"Sir G. Wolseley visited the location about the end of June, in the depth of the winter season, when it was bitterly cold

and the snow lay deep upon the ground in those parts; and he immediately ordered up a large supply of blankets, which might (under Lord Carnarvon's instructions) have been provided by a humane Government long before, since the Government force had plundered the whole tribe, men and women, of clothing of all kinds as well as of food; and subsequently they received a large grant of land-hoes, used by women, at 2*s.* 6*d.* each—I am not aware of any other agricultural implements having been supplied to them—and, some time after Sir G. Wolseley left, about 400 head of cattle. Altogether it appears from the report made to the Legislative Council on November 20, 1875—just two years after the 'eating up' of the tribe—that in all that interval they had only received, in picks and blankets, food and cattle, £2,261 18*s.* 4*d.*"

To C. J. Bunyon, Esq.

"Bishopstowe, *January* 16, 1876.

. . . "We have at last—only yesterday—succeeded, by dint of personal application and perseverance, in getting the consent of this Government to two wives and one man being sent to Langa, which, as one of the wives named is a great invalid, I shall try to get changed into one wife and two men, one of whom is to come back and report to the rest how they find their chief. And this, at the end of twelve months from the publication of the famous despatches, is all that has been done to carry out—not the promise of those despatches, *i.e.* of the proclamation to the natives sent with them, that 'the Ama-Hlubi, if they chose, might go to him,' but—even the much later statement of Lord Carnarvon in the House of Lords, that 'it was only intended that he should be accompanied and surrounded by his family and immediate friends.' Up to this moment not a single member of his family or friend has been sent to him, and when about a month ago, five men wanted to go down to the Cape at their own expense, to see him and return to Natal, they were refused permission by the autho-

rities here—or rather, Mr. Shepstone saw the chief man among them, Langa's first cousin, an elderly man, who has been for twenty-five years a Christian (not of the Church of England), a thoroughly quiet, respectable man, and spoke with him thrice on the subject: (1) when the man asked for help from the Government to go to Capetown; (2) when he received the refusal of the Government to advance the small sum needed for this; (3) when he went to take leave respectfully, having partly raised by small subscriptions, and partly borrowed (from myself) the money (£40)—and let him go off upon a fool's errand, without telling him that, when they got to Capetown, they would not be allowed to see Langa! The meanness of this Government—their petty underhand way of doing things—is incredible. Fortunately I had my suspicions, ... and I went to Sir H. Bulwer, and from what he said was able to recall them in time from Durban, whither the poor fools had gone down for embarkation—and after correspondence, &c., the result is what I have stated, that three people are now to be sent down." . . . .

By pleading the cause of even-handed justice between white and black the Bishop had raised up, as he knew that he could not fail to raise up, formidable hindrances in the way of his work throughout the diocese. By speaking the truth on the origin and growth of the Hebrew Scriptures he had alienated many. By raising his voice on behalf of native chiefs and their people, he had, it might almost seem, alienated all. To many eyes not a rift appeared visible in the monotonous blackness of the sky over his head; and the only result of some three and twenty years of care and toil seemed to be a feverish desire on their part to be rid of him altogether. With one exception, the newspapers assailed him with something of the fierceness of a crusade, and the editor of the one paper which supported him (the late John Sanderson) had to share the obloquy poured out upon him.

> "If there is one man," said the *Witness*,[1] "more unpopular than another in the colony of Natal, it is the Bishop of that ilk. . . . We are careful not to tell it beyond the range of the colony, lest it should give his lordship an undue advantage over us, for the English people have great faith in a hated man."

It was nothing to the "authorities" at the time, or even for some time after, that he was declared to be in the right, and the Natal Government in the wrong, on every point submitted by him to the English Secretary of State for the Colonies. It mattered not that, although the wrong was not in every case redressed, there was in every case the admission that the Bishop had never spoken without reason, and had never alleged facts on insufficient evidence. It was enough that his statements imputed something much worse than incapacity to the Natal Government, and much worse than mere terror and panic to some of the colonists. In one sense he was successful throughout; but this very success was, with the motives which prompted his action, the offence not to be forgiven.

So it seemed at the time; and the opposition thus evoked was, in itself, no light burden for him to bear. It was pain and grief to think that they who should have been his closest friends and most earnest supporters should appear so utterly estranged. But he might have hoped that the tide would in the end turn (as in fact it did), and that he himself might be able to arrest it, had he not had to encounter difficulties of another sort, which involved a struggle against a vastly more powerful set of influences. If we think of it soberly, we shall see that a greater injustice to a religious community has seldom been committed by an ecclesiastical society or faction than that of which the promoters of the Church of South Africa

[1] March 17, 1876.

had been guilty against the members of the Church of England in Natal. These had gone out to the colony as such; they had, as such, received among them a Bishop of the Church of England; and because this Bishop had written and published books for which he had not been tried as any Bishop or clergyman writing and publishing them in England would be tried, if the materials of a case were forthcoming, they found themselves transferred, so far as the arbitrary decree of some self-constituted judges could transfer them, from the Church of England to a society which styled itself the Church of South Africa. It was nothing to the point to urge, as was virtually urged, that the two societies were as like each other as two pins; and that, in fact, there was no difference between them. There was a vast and vital difference. There might be an outward uniformity for the time, but it was obtained at the cost of loss of freedom. The new society had resolved that at all costs the right of appeal to the Crown should be abolished—in other words, that Bishops, priests, and deacons should be dealt with in the last resort by a purely ecclesiastical tribunal. Such a tribunal had professed to depose and excommunicate the Bishop of Natal; and in order to carry out the sentence it became necessary to commit a series of gross wrongs against his clergy, and also on the laity committed to his care. Nor was this all. The very refusal to prosecute the Bishop in the courts in which alone a clergyman in England could be prosecuted was, in fact, a confession that the conclusions established by the Bishop of Natal were utterly hateful to them. Of this fact there was no pretence of concealment; but it implied further that in their opinion their own rulings and interpretations ought to be accepted in England. It was notorious that they would not be accepted in England. There the battle was lost. But this defeat might be compensated if the great English Societies, formed for the purpose of aiding

the missionary work of the Church of England in the colonies, could be prevailed on to transfer their help to the new South African community. The compact was made, and not only was all aid withdrawn from the Bishop of the Church of England in Natal, but grants of double or treble the amount bestowed thus far on the Natal missions were now placed at the disposal of men who warned the Natal laity that they were no longer free to look on themselves as members of the Church of England, or to claim their rights as such. To the Church of England clergy this appeal to the purse had been, of necessity, almost irresistible. Some of them differed, or thought that they differed, widely from their diocesan on theological or Biblical questions; but it was not enough to express this difference, and still to insist on regarding themselves as clergy of the Church of England. Unless they joined the community set up by Bishop Gray, the incomes paid to them out of the grants from the great English Societies would cease. To the force thus applied some yielded; and the Bishop's power of action was practically paralysed. It was obviously impossible for him, on an income barely more than sufficient for the wants of his own frugal household, to maintain a body of clergy in distant and lonely villages, where the colonists could do little or nothing; and although his political unpopularity might sooner or later become a thing of the past, here there seemed to be an obstacle which he could by no efforts hope to surmount.

His thoughts turned, not unnaturally, to resignation. He had fought a hard battle; and, except from the merely temporal point of view, it could not be called a losing one. Still, if he were himself a hindrance to peaceful settlement, it would be his duty to think, in the first place, of the interests of others. The friends whom he consulted gave him sound advice. In no case had he intended to desert his work in Natal. Even if he ceased to be Bishop of the see, he

could still remain to labour amongst the native tribes who revered him as Sobantu. Let him, then, his friends urged, remain there as he was. His position was as clear and as unassailable as that of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and if some of the colonists, professing themselves members of the Church of England, should reject his ministrations because he had not allowed the Government to misuse the natives, that was not his fault. There should be, and probably there is, no need for saying that this course was not suggested by any action of the members of the Church of South Africa. Mr. Macrorie had been stationed at Maritzburg for years before the political excitement began. It was the latter which lessened or took away the support of the *laity*, and the loss of this support it was which turned the Bishop's thoughts more definitely in the direction of resignation.

TO C. J. BUNYON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *March* 13, 1876.

. . . "I cannot help thinking that the severe reprimand of the Secretary for Native Affairs by the Secretary of State, perhaps strengthened by other words which have not been communicated to me, has taken effect. At any rate, since the receipt of the despatch the S.N.A. has told his indunas that he is going to retire at once, being worn out, and has even named to them the person whom he wishes to succeed him, but said that the Government did not approve of that person, and was choosing among four others whom he named, and he hoped they would soon decide, as he was weary. The indunas said to themselves, 'He is not old and worn out. Has any news come about the Matshana matter?' This reached me from native informants. . . . It would be curious if both he and I should retire at the same time. It does not follow that either of us would leave the colony—at least for some time to come. At all events, I

should like to have a hand in assisting in the work about to be done (as Lord Carnarvon promises) for the improvement of the position of the natives."

TO MRS. LYELL.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *March* 31, 1876.

"I hope that I did write to you some weeks ago, acknowledging the receipt of the draft you sent me. . . . I ought to have done so, and I meant to do so; but I do not feel sure that I carried out my intention, amidst the multiplicity of cares which have just now been pressing upon me, chiefly in respect of my relations with the natives and this miserable Government. . . . Things are going on here very unsatisfactorily under Sir H. Bulwer, as under Sir G. Wolseley. But it is to be hoped they will be mended when the new Native Administration Law comes into operation—that is, if Lord Carnarvon is not persuaded to send it back for alteration in one of its most important particulars, viz. that which insures that no 'native law' shall be valid in future, except through an Act of the Colonial Legislature. This would take away from Mr. Shepstone the power which he now possesses of *making* law, just as he requires it, as he did in poor Langa's case, by laying it down that merely to run away, as he did, was an act of *rebellion* against the Government. However, I won't trouble you with any more disquisitions upon native affairs. If you have read my report upon the Matshana inquiry, or have even studied merely the official documents included in it, you will see what a crafty policy that of the S.N.A. has been; and I am sorry to say that Lord Carnarvon has to some extent lent himself to it—from motives, no doubt, of State policy. . . . I now inclose another document, by which you will see that I have been left to bear my own expenses in this inquiry. . . ."

The sum spent (to be accurate, £64 16*s.* 0*d.*) had been expended in summoning and feeding witnesses. The payment of this sum was at first refused by Lord Carnarvon actually on

the ground that "the charge of attempting to shoot (*i.e.* kill) Matshana had not been sustained"; but subsequently he expressed the remarkable opinion that

> "the justice of the case would be best met by the repayment to both sides of the expenses incurred,"

and left the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir H. Bulwer, free to propose such payment to the Legislative Council. As justifying the refusal of this claim, Lord Carnarvon pleaded that by directing the inquiry to be held he had relieved the Bishop from the heavier charges attending the action at law which was abandoned by Mr. Shepstone at Lord Carnarvon's instance. To this allegation the Bishop made the following reply:—

> "Now that I see the whole strength of my position—which must have been well known to Mr. J. Shepstone beforehand, though not to myself—and perceive the damaging effect of Colonel Colley's decision to Mr. Shepstone's reputation for truthfulness, I must say that I very much doubt whether the action would have been brought which was only threatened; . . . but I did not mean to shrink from this encounter. . . . I was prepared, if necesary, to defend the threatened action at law. With fair play I had no doubt of being able to prove the substantial truth of my statements. But if, in the then excited state of the colony, the verdict had even gone against me, I should have appealed for help to my fellow-countrymen in England, and, I venture to believe, should have appealed successfully. It would now, no doubt, be more difficult to do so, when the general interest in the whole matter has comparatively died away; and I am very unwilling to have recourse to my friends for this purpose. But I am not a rich man. I have no income beyond the small one attached to this colonial bishopric, and have very little besides to fall back upon. It is true, I count the service done by this inquiry to the cause of truth and justice worth any expenditure, on my part, of time and anxious thought and labour; and I can bear to

face, as the necessary consequence of the part I have taken, the sacrifice of many friendships, and the loss of influence among those who have been led to misjudge my motives, and who have been wholly in the dark till now of the justification for my conduct to be found in Colonel Colley's Report. It is too late, at my time of life, to try to stem the tide of hostile feeling on the part of many who have, till these matters occurred, been among my chief supporters in the colony. But it does seem hard that, having done the State service in this affair, as is proved by Colonel Colley's decision and your Lordship's despatch. . . . I should be condemned in a penalty of more than £50."

It was perhaps inevitable that the constituted authorities should grudge the Bishop his influence among the natives. For the last eight years he had been known among them as a great teacher, standing alone (as the teaching of the other missionaries made only too obvious) yet not overpowered; and now his wonderful intervention on their behalf had increased his influence tenfold. That this was in part the result of their own misdoing only added to the annoyance of the authorities; but, for good or for evil, the influence was a fact, which it was no more in the Bishop's power to undo than in theirs. His influence with the natives was one of the powers which they were bound to take into account, and to use for the future for the general good. They persistently took the opposite course; the result being that many of the steps taken to bring natives to a due sense of his insignificance had precisely the opposite effect. It was in vain that he was always willing, and at first attempted, to efface himself, and to lay every benefit done to the natives to the credit of the authorities, while these, by casting aside the directions of the Secretary of State and then yielding a few concessions inch by inch, made it abundantly and needlessly plain that the Bishop in some way or other had power to wring these conces-

sions out of that terrible being, the "Supreme Chief" himself, entirely against his will.

In spite of the tardy admission of Lord Carnarvon that the Bishop ought to be indemnified for his expenses, the money was never paid although the matter was more than once the subject of a debate in the Legislative Council of Natal.

TO THE REV. J. D. LA TOUCHE.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *March* 31, 1876.

"I have delayed writing to you from mail to mail, because I wished to be able to tell you the decision to which I had definitely come after receiving the judgement of Lord Carnarvon on the Matshana case. . . . I need hardly say that, if this is *all* that Lord Carnarvon has said or done in that matter, I am thoroughly disappointed, and I must conclude that he has made up his mind to sacrifice truth and justice to political considerations, especially to his desire to bring about the South African Confederation, for which he considers that he has special need of Mr. Shepstone's assistance. However, it is quite possible that he has said *more* than has been communicated to me by Sir H. Bulwer. . . .

"Meanwhile, I have sent by this mail to my brother-in-law a letter (of which Mr. Bunyon will be able, I expect, to show you a copy, if he and Dean Stanley decide to forward it to his Grace), in which, considering the strong prejudices with which I am still encountered in the colony by reason of my recent action in native matters, I have offered to resign on certain terms; or, if the Archbishop does not approve my proposal, then have notified that in future I cannot take upon myself pecuniary responsibilities for the support of clergy or building of churches, but must confine my labours, as far as the whites are concerned, to those who *desire* my services and do not expect pecuniary aid, and devote myself chiefly to work for the natives, of which, in fact, there is plenty to be done, and enough to occupy the most hard-working man."

TO A CORRESPONDENT.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June* 27, 1876.

"If the S.P.G. were not betraying the interests of the Church of England—I mean the Established Church, with its rights and liberties—in support of mere ecclesiasticism, I should not have had the slightest difficulty in standing here. . . . . My present difficulty is, of course, this, which my friends in England seem to lose sight of—that the Church people here have not, as a body, rejected me. On the contrary, the Cathedral is well filled, and so is St. Paul's at Durban, and St. Thomas's at the Berea, and Christ Church at Addington. But all these are populous neighbourhoods, where the clergymen can be supported—though with very moderate incomes—without help from the charities of the Societies in England. In the *country* places throughout the colony there would be the same kindly feeling shown by many towards me, notwithstanding my recent action *in re* Langa; but during the last ten years they have been nursed by S.P.G. missionaries in enmity to me, and others, of course, who perhaps have never seen my face, stand wholly aloof from me in consequence; and this makes it hopeless to do anything, when, even if united, they would be unable to support their minister without aid from home. . . . Our Native Administration Bill has not yet come back from Lord Carnarvon. And the report among the natives now is (derived from Mr. J. Shepstone himself) that his brother is going to England immediately for the Conference, and he (John Shepstone)[1] is to be acting Secretary for Native Affairs in his place; and this after Colonel Colley has convicted him in his report of having deliberately tried to palm off a lying story on the Governor and Secretary of State *in re* Matshana. . . . If Lord Carnarvon allows this appointment, it will be indeed disgraceful. But he seems infatuated about this Confederation scheme, which is quite premature, and, I strongly suspect, will end in a complete fiasco."

[1] Now His Hon. Mr. Justice Shepstone, Judge of the Native High Court.

The truth is that the Bishop was feeling more and more the weight of the influence thrown into the scale on the side of a South African Church, which accepted just so much as it chose, and no more, of the law in force in and over the Church of England.

To Miss Jane Hughes.

"Bishopstowe, *August* 21, 1876.

. . . "Our Government is at last sending two wives and a son and servant of Langalibalele to reside with the chief near Capetown. These are in addition to the one wife and two men whom by dint of persevering worrying we got sent last February. And this is all the outcome of Lord Carnarvon's grand promises—first, that the members of the tribe that liked might join him, and then that his family and immediate friends might go to him, as he said in the House of Lords. They must not put forward now the old pretence that the wives were not *willing* to go; their objection merely expressing their dread of the sea, and their ignorance as to his real condition. Once assured, by the report of a man whom we got sent in February for the purpose of returning with a report of the real state of things at Capetown, that the chief was alive and well and comfortable, and that the voyage was not so dreadful as they imagined, they were ready at once to go, and were bitterly disappointed to be refused permission. . . .

"Thank you for sending me the copy of *Faber's Hymns.* That is a very beautiful one which you have marked for me; every line of it is good and true. And there are other passages also which I like very much, though, of course, I cannot sympathise—nor you either, I imagine—with his creed on all points."

To the Rev. J. D. La Touche.

"Bishopstowe, *November* 28, 1876.

. . . "I have seen, and had a business meeting with, Sir T. Shepstone. All was friendly enough, as far as externals

went. He is going up at once to the Transvaal, from which important news has just reached us, viz. that the Boers have been defeated in an attack they made on a native fortress, three white men killed—including the commander-in-chief of the Transvaal warriors, Von Schlickmann—three other Europeans wounded, and three natives of the Transvaal force. This is a very grave reverse for the Transvaal Government, and I suppose will make it more easy for Sir T. Shepstone to take over the territory, as it is supposed he has authority to do. Otherwise, till this occurred, there seemed little opening for British intervention. . . ."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April* 30, 1877.

"As to the Transvaal affair I hardly know what to say, except that the sly underhand way in which it has been annexed appears to me to be unworthy of the English name, and to give the lie direct to Lord Carnarvon's public statements about Sir T. Shepstone being only sent to offer friendly offices to the Transvaal Government. It is plain that the whole was planned in England; and I am afraid the scheme will be found to include other annexations—*e.g.* of Zululand, which will be a very serious affair indeed. But time will show how Sir T. Shepstone means to govern the Transvaal—as large as France and Germany together, so they say—and how he means to make a recalcitrant people pay for such government. The expense will enormously exceed that of the Boer Government. Is the British taxpayer to be bled for it?"

There had been a thought of transferring the Manchester New College to Oxford or Cambridge; and to this scheme the Bishop refers in the following letter.

TO JOHN WESTLAKE, ESQ., Q.C.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April* 30, 1877.

"I now come to Mr. La Touche's letter, received this morning. In this he quotes Professor Jowett's opinion, which is

strongly opposed to the idea of founding a separate college at Oxford in the way proposed, but is decidedly in favour of founding one or more professorships of Theology or Biblical Literature or Criticism, 'say one at each University for the Old and one for the New Testament.' They ought to be offered to the University in the first instance, and would probably be refused. But, even in that case, the professors, if they were Oxford or Cambridge men, would have all the privileges of the University. Such professorships should be of the value of £800 or £1000 a year. They should, if possible, include the subject of Ecclesiastical history, and the history of other religions. I do not know if this idea of founding a professorship has been entertained by the Manchester New College Committee. But it is what I should have suggested myself, in my reply to your letter, as a possible solution of the question. Only without help from the Manchester N.C. funds, I see not how an income could be raised for a professor. . . .

"You will hear, of course, of the annexation of the Transvaal, which is, I suppose, only a prelude to other 'annexations' in this part of the world. I cannot trust myself at present to write all I think upon the subject, except to say that I fear it will be found that we have got a 'white elephant' upon our hands. . . . Much as I (and others) would have rejoiced to see the Transvaal come fairly and honourably under English rule, I cannot take any pleasure in the proceedings which have actually taken place." . . .

TO THE REV. J. D. LA TOUCHE.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *March* 3, 1878.

. . "It is fully expected that Sir H. Bulwer will introduce a law for native education; and it would be unwise, under these circumstances, to strike out any new path for myself. However, I am reprinting (with amendments and additions) my Zulu-English Dictionary, and I have in the press Part VII., concluding my work on the Pentateuch, and have almost completed in MS. another work (on Criticism of the Pentateuch) as important as any I have yet published."

CHAPTER IX.

CETSHWAYO AND ISANDHLWANA.

1875–1879.

THE Bishop, as we have seen, had always felt a deep interest in the Zulu people, and naturally, since they were the predominant tribe among the natives of South-east Africa to whom he had been sent. The Zulus living entirely under their own laws administered by their own chiefs, and proud of their position and independence, had cultivated friendly relations with the English, ever since their first arrival and settlement.[1] These friendly relations had continued ever since, absolutely unbroken, although Zululand was separated from the colony by "a river easily fordable for the greater part of the year, and not too wide to talk across at any time."[2]

In November, 1859, the Bishop had founded a Mission station of the Church of England in Zululand, visiting the king "to obtain his sanction and support." This he had done at some personal risk, since the country had hardly recovered from the civil war of 1856, and it was well known that the young prince Umkungo, who had then fled to Natal, was at school at Ekukanyeni under Sobantu's protection. "As they

[1] At this date the Zulu dominion under the conqueror Tshaka reached south to the Umkomanzi River, in Natal, west along the Drakensberg, and north to Mzilikazi's (Moselekatze's) District.

[2] Sir B. Frere.