

## CHAPTER VIII.

APRIL, 1861, TO DECEMBER, 1863.

KAFFIR INSTITUTION—ZAMBESI MISSION—LETTERS FROM BISHOP GRAY TO HIS SON—OXFORD WORK—WRECK OF THE "BERNICIA"—GOVERNMENT DIFFICULTIES—GREAT FIRE AT BISHOP'S COURT—VISITATION OF CLANWILLIAM, ETC.—DEATH OF BISHOP MACKENZIE—RETURN TO ENGLAND—LETTER TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE CENTRAL AFRICAN MISSION—APPOINTMENT OF BISHOP TOZER AND BISHOP TWELLS—COLENZO CASE—EARLY DIFFICULTIES—PUBLICATION OF BISHOP COLENZO'S COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS—BISHOP GRAY'S LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—MEETING OF ENGLISH BISHOPS—PRESENTMENT OF THE COMMENTARY—PUBLICATION OF COLENZO'S BOOK ON THE PENTATEUCH—QUESTION OF THE BOOKS RAISED IN CONVOCATION—MEETINGS OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS WITH REFERENCE TO S. P. G.—QUESTION OF INHIBITION—ARCHBISHOP OF YORK'S DECLARATION—SPEECH OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE—UNITED REQUEST OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS TO BISHOP COLENZO TO RESIGN HIS OFFICE—CONVOCATION—LOWER AND UPPER HOUSE—CONDEMNATION OF BISHOP COLENZO'S WRITINGS BY BOTH—BISHOP GRAY'S RETURN TO AFRICA—ADDRESSES FROM THE CLERGY OF CAPE TOWN AND NATAL—VISITATION TO D'URBAN, ETC.—STATE OF FINANCE IN THE COUNTRY—DEATH OF MR. SCUDAMORE—BISHOP OF NATAL PRESENTED BY HIS CLERGY—ARTICLES OF ACCUSATION—PREPARATIONS FOR TRIAL—LETTERS CONCERNING CUDDSDEN—VISITATION—ARRIVAL OF THE BISHOPS OF GRAHAM'S TOWN AND FREE STATE—OPINION OF THE QUEEN'S ADVOCATE CONCERNING THE TRIAL—CITATION—TRIAL—DR. BLEEK—LETTER OF BISHOP COLENZO—DEAN OF CAPE TOWN'S ARGUMENT—ARCHDEACON MERRIMAN'S ARGUMENT—ARCHDEACON BADNALL'S—LETTER PUT IN BY BISHOP COLENZO—DEAN OF CAPE TOWN UPON IT—BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN'S OPINION—BISHOP OF THE FREE STATE'S OPINION—JUDGMENT OF THE METROPOLITAN—SEVERAL CHARGES—SUMMING-UP—SENTENCE OF DEPOSITION OF BISHOP COLENZO.

WE must now go back somewhat to take up the other threads of the time in which the Long case was prominent. Among other interests of that period the Kafir Institution is conspicuous; the Bishop was actively engaged in forwarding its work, all the more that just then Mr. and Mrs. Glover were obliged to go to England on account of health; and Miss Ainger, the lady in charge of the Kafir girls, died,

after some prolonged illness. "We have lost our dear patient Miss Ainger," the Bishop wrote. "She is a great loss to our Institution; she was a thorough Christian lady and a very good teacher. I do not know where to look for such another. Twelve more girls came to-day." The Bishop did not like to be away for more than a day or two at this time, wishing to be able to minister to the last to the dying woman.

The Zambesi Mission was also the cause of lively interest to those left behind at Cape Town.

"I received letters from dear Mackenzie yesterday," the Bishop writes (April 12th, 1861). "All the party reached the mouth of the Kongone in safety, and found, to their joy, Livingstone, his brother, and Dr. Kirk there, with sixteen Makololo, all well. We had been in some anxiety about him. He urged them strongly not to go up the Shire on account of the season, but to proceed with him to explore the Rovooma. After a stout resistance from Mackenzie, he carried his point; and the greater portion of the Mission party is now at Joanna, one of the Comoro Islands, and Mackenzie and Rowley have gone with Livingstone up the Rovooma. I think that the decision has been a right one. It is thought by many naval men here that the Rovooma is connected with Lake Nyassa, and perhaps navigable all the way. It has no bar, almost the only river without one; and lies between the Portuguese territory and the dominions of the Imaum of Muscat. Our Government has long been anxious for the survey of that river, and the French have been said to contemplate taking possession of it. This expedition will settle many questions about it, and may prove it to be the best access to the interior for us, and the fittest high road for commerce. Another interesting fact is that Sir H. Currie, whom the Governor has sent up to the country (down which I travelled), between Natal and Kaffraria, has induced the natives to surrender a great portion of it, and to apply to be governed through English Magistrates. It will soon be altogether English territory, as I used to say in my speeches in England. It was one of the fields which I implored might have a Bishop, and for which S. P. G. voted

£300 a year, and for which I engaged Mr. ———, who was got rid of by S. P. G. when I left England. I shall never cease to deplore his not being sent out. . . . Miss Mackenzie is still with us."

Some of the Bishop's letters at this time to his son are too characteristic and too valuable, as the open-hearted manly advice of a father who fully lived up to whatever rules he could offer, to be passed over.

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"April 16th, 1861.

. . . "I should think that a walk somewhere in England during the Long would be pleasant, and a fair relaxation. I do not want you, my dearest boy, to deny yourself any fair amusement or pleasure, or really to scrimp;—but to remember that we are accountable for spending money as well as other things, and to act accordingly."

"May 15th.

. . . "Your last note gave me some additional insight into your course of studies. The prizes, however, seem all to lie in the direction of physics. Only take care that the pewter cup is not followed by the wooden spoon! I shall have to treat your elbowing with more respect when we meet again than when last in London! : . . You do not say what you are reading in the way of theology. You should always have something of this kind on hand. I wish that you would get Wordsworth's Commentary on the New Testament, especially the Acts and Epistles, and read them through. I think an hour a day at it would repay you. Then, if you were to work as you have time at Professor Browne's work on the Articles, you would have a very interesting study. Have you read Pusey's Commentary on Hosea? I have read it through to your sisters, and look anxiously for the other minor Prophets, and, above all, for Isaiah, which has been the study of his life. Do you get in leisure hours any English reading? I should not let any branch of study be neglected. . . . I am surprised at

your difficulty about logic. I was rather fond of it. In my day you might have taken up half-a-dozen books of Euclid instead. . . . I wish that —— did not set up private theatricals;—they are not the thing for a Clergyman's house. Take care of yourself, my dearest boy. 'Keep thyself pure.'—Ever your affectionate Father,

R. CAPETOWN."

"September 12th, 1861.

"I suppose that you will have gone up for your examination before this reaches you. I wish I could think that you had been really working through the Long;—but I gather that you have been desultory, and this, according to the opinion of most, seems to be your snare. You do not give yourself to the one work before you thoroughly, but sip, like the butterfly, at a great many flowers. I do hope that, after your examination, you will read a portion of Wordsworth's Greek Testament daily;—it would, I think, give tone to your mind. Religious knowledge cannot be reached by a jump at last, nor the character be formed at once. You are now being formed very largely; you are daily *becoming* what you will for ever *be*. . . . We have had cheering letters lately from Bishop Mackenzie. He was in the Shire, just reaching Murchison's Falls, where he was to disembark and plant his first Mission. The Rovooma was given up for the present, as the season was too far advanced. They are to meet the female part of the expedition at the mouth of the Zambesi, by January 1st. Livingstone will then proceed again up the Rovooma. He and the Bishop get on famously together. The Bishop says they chaff each other all day like two school-boys. They have all had the fever, but are well again. . . . The 'Pioneer' is to be at the Kongone not later than January 1st. We may have some difficulty about getting a ship to meet them. Your mother and I rode down yesterday to see the Admiral about it."

To the Rev. Dr. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, July 18th, 1861.

"My dear Richard—Unfortunately the Essays, with many

other books and boxes, were lost in the wreck of the 'Bernicia,' in which poor Mr. Oliff lost wife, wife's father, two children, and withal all his goods. They were wrecked on Robben Island on a Sunday night, having had prayers at seven o'clock. . . . Curiously enough, Oliff saw a few pages of the Essays on the shore the next day. The only piece of property which I have recovered is *The Divine Life in Man*, in a tattered condition, with my name written in the title-page by Annie. Poor Oliff found his head laid, when he reached shore, on a large Bible given him by his scholars when he left, which also was all tattered, and he picked up a photograph of his lost children. One of them, a little chorister of seven, comforted a little girl who was crying (she was saved) by telling her not to mind, 'We shall all be angels singing in Heaven to-night.' . . . We are all well, but worn out with a house scarce ever less than full. Our washerwoman (who was paid £60) has just given up, saying that it is not like a private house. It is indeed a hotel!"

African affairs excited the keenest interest in the Bishop's mind at this time, and he wrote at great length upon them to those in England whom he thought likely to help. The Governor of Natal—Mr. Scott—had been encouraged by the Duke of Newcastle (then Colonial Secretary) to act independently of Sir George Grey, and a complication had ensued through the two Governors acting on a diverse policy, and disturbances were threatening in consequence. Interesting as the Bishop's detailed letters are, the events they narrate have now so much drifted away amid the past, and other more immediately weighty matters taken their place, that it would perhaps scarcely be well to give them here. But it would not be doing justice either to the Bishop's own warm friendship for Sir George Grey, or to the Governor himself, altogether to omit to notice the strong expressions concerning him which continually occur, as the one man in whom Africa had confidence as an administrator of native affairs, and the unbounded regret that, at so critical a moment he should be sent, as was the case, to New Zealand.

The Bishop hoped and believed that Sir George Grey would be sent back with large powers, and expressed his own conviction that nothing but Sir George's plans for a kind of federation of Provinces—between east and west—could meet the many difficulties which had arisen. Various other subjects of interest are alluded to in the following letters.

To Mrs. WILLIAMSON.

“ October 18th, 1861.

“ We are in the midst of picnics. Yesterday we gave one in our grounds to a lady's school, and were forty in number. Next Tuesday we give one up the mountain to the College, and shall be near ninety. Then we are to have all the school-masters of the neighbourhood for a day, and are to discuss Sunday and night schools. You would have been interested to have been with us, when two days ago I opened our School Chapel at Constantia. . . . It is a Dutch district, but nothing had been done there before, and all joined in this work. We had five races present, gathered by the Church out of their various nations into the one family of Christ. The Kafirs from Zonnebloem were the choir, and chanted the service very nicely. You would have been struck with their reverent and devout manner. . . . Within a month from the departure of Sir G. Grey, Government writes me word that, owing to the withdrawal from Kaffraria of the Parliamentary grant, they will have to reduce greatly, and probably altogether withdraw, their grant of £1000 a year from my Kafir College. If so, the industrial work must be given up, and two-thirds of the pupils dismissed. . . . We have twenty-one buildings at this moment in hand, or in contemplation. If my life is spared, and S. P. G. won't come forward, I shall have two years hence to go home and plead for Hottentots, to the infinite disgust, I doubt not, of many. But the Clergy cannot leave the work around them untouched, and I cannot restrain them, and this country cannot supply all the means.”

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

“November 18th, 1861.

. . . “You must now chalk out a line for yourself for the remainder of your College career, and keep to it. The books to be read, the time to be given to each, should be fixed. Do not cram, however. But probably you will think I must be very credulous to think that there is a chance of this! Two of the most important years of your life have passed since we met; the next will be still more influential over the future—it is the year which will probably fix you. I am glad to see that you are really working in earnest. What I care for is honest work—not success. Let us do what we can: God does not look for more. . . . I had hoped that we should have some quiet this summer, and time for thought and reading, but I see no chance of it, and I have almost whole charge of Rondebosch parish during Fry’s absence.”

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

“November 19th, 1861.

. . . “I want to go to sleep and let my mind rest, and revel in books. We have been making a vineyard, and planted 10,000 vines. This country is wonderfully suited to the grape. Cuttings not longer than my middle finger, and planted not two months ago, are, in some cases, putting forth bunches of grapes. We keep ten or twelve men always employed in trenching land for cultivation, and we are trying to build houses for the poor. I want to improve this property if I can for my successor, but it is costly work. Matters are all very dull with us. The Bishop of S. Helena, to my great sorrow, goes to Colombo, and Welby succeeds him. I mean to make the Secretary of State apply to me for confirmation as Metropolitan, or else kick up a row. He has no right to ignore the existence of the Province, and set aside the laws and constitutions of the Church. . . . How thankful I should be if I never had another appointment to make, and yet perhaps my greatest battles will one day be about Patronage! I am greatly disappointed at the delay about the Free State Bishopric.”

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

“ Bishop’s Court, January 20th, 1862.

“ My dearest boy—I am sorry that the mail left without your being able to announce your fate. I fully expect, however, that you will have got through notwithstanding your apprehensions. I think you have worked fairly when you had to face the awful schools. I am for steady, plodding work,—even work,—not a rush at the end. Dear Louisa has come back thin, and not very well,—I do not think either of them improved. . . . You will think I am very vigorous when I tell you that I leave home every Sunday at 9.30, and do not return till 9 P.M., taking two services at Rondebosch, visiting sick, etc.,—thermometer 80, and never tired. We had a dreadful fire last week, which has again burnt 200 acres. Cloete set his veldt on fire without giving me any notice. It has destroyed £4,000 worth of wood. I would not have taken £1,000 for the injury done to this place;—the walks and woods are spoilt for years to come. I rode three horses that day, tiring out two, and was up again, not being able to sleep, between two or three in the morning. Our new Governor has arrived—he seems an amiable man. No news from Bishop Mackenzie. If we go to war with America, our chance of communication with them may be cut off.”

To the Same.

“ Kalk Bay, February 19th, 1862.

“ My dearest boy—It is clear by your own account that you ought to have been plucked! It is lucky that you escaped your deserved fate!! You say that you will do what I wish about Greats and honours. I wish you to do what I advised at first;—to read steadily, not so much with a view to examination as to improvement. I think that every young man is bound to work while he is at college honestly and earnestly at that for which he was sent there. I recommend you to master one after another the books or things which are needful for your passing your examination creditably;—to go on steadily



at this till the period of your examination. If you find that you know enough subjects to justify your going in for honours, go in. If not, be content with having done all that God has given you the power to do. . . . Dear Agnes's<sup>1</sup> death was a great shock to me—I had not the slightest apprehension of it. For her I cannot grieve, but for her poor dear children I do. . . . We are all growing old together, and some drop off before us. I think that I feel the worries of the management of this immense parish more than I did. I am in close communication with 100 men, and everything is referred to me, and it is not pleasant to know all that goes on feebly or amiss, and to have to regulate so complicated a machinery.”

To the Same.

“Bishop's Court, April 17th, 1862.

“My dearest boy—Your mother will give you a better account than I can do of our long and hot ride of 500 miles to Clanwilliam, S. Helena, Saldanha Bay, etc., from which we have just returned. . . . Do you make speeches at the debating society? It is well to cultivate early the power of thinking and expressing yourself in public. Much as I have been driven to speak, I have never been able to *think* in public,—in a great measure, I believe, from want of early training. I hope that you keep steadily to reading. In your last you speak of training, but it is for games. The mind is above the body;—the soul above both. The victories of each are important in the same rates as their relative importance to each other.”

In a letter of the same date, the Bishop says that his wife was a little fagged with this, their longest and hottest ride, and she was also suffering from the effects of a fall from her horse. “I would give a great deal,” he adds, “to be three months in England to look out for men for the Free State.” He was to be there sooner than he expected. Almost immediately after this last letter was written, he heard of the death of Bishop Mackenzie, whose sister, with Mrs. Burrup (wife to the Bishop's companion in suffering), had left Bishop's Court in January, in

<sup>1</sup> His sister-in-law, widow of the Rev. Charles Gray.

hopes of joining the Missionaries at Magomero. On April 26th the ladies returned to the kindly shelter, bereaved of brother and husband. The fullest and most intensely interesting details of Bishop Mackenzie's last days are given in his *Life* (already referred to). Here we must only say that fever seized them both while making for the Ruo mouth, and all their quinine was gone. A journal-like letter of Bishop Mackenzie tells the tale of increasing illness, and of the unflinching strength found in knowing that "He who brought us here can take care of us." It ends with the words "Good-bye for the present." The Bishop became aware of his approaching end, and told his Makololo attendants that Jesus was coming to fetch him away. On January 24th, 1862, he died, Mr. Burrup, who was almost as ill himself, doing what he could to minister to his dying friend. The native chief insisted on immediate burial on the mainland, and the Missionary Bishop was laid to rest under a large tree, his half-fainting friend saying so much as he was able of the burial-service over him in the dim evening light. Mr. Burrup was taken back to Magomero in a state of great exhaustion, and he too died on February 22nd. The ladies arrived, as appointed, at the meeting place, the junction of the Ruo and Shire, and heard the sad tidings, returning, as already stated, to Cape Town at once.

The Metropolitan's letter to the Bishop of Oxford concerning this sad episode is so comprehensive in its information, that it must be given here.

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, April 29th, 1862.

"My dear Bishop—Alas! alas! sad news from the Zambesi! Our dear brother has fallen. He and his equally devoted priest, Burrup, have been taken from the Church on earth, and the work so successfully begun, to the rest above.

"Livingstone left in the 'Pioneer' on the 15th to meet the 'Lady Nyassa,' his wife, and our second Mission party. The Bishop could not at the moment accompany him, but left on January 3rd, hoping to meet Livingstone at Malo, an island at

the mouth of the Ruo, half-way down the Shire, about eighty miles from the Mission station. They could not procure proper boatmen for the only canoe which they could obtain. It was upset in the night, and they lost their medicines and medical comforts. Burrup and three Makololo accompanied him. Both he and Burrup had been suffering from diarrhoea; at the island fever was soon added. They might have returned, or dropped down the river to Livingstone, who had left the island only a few days before, but they remained, apparently with a view to pave the way for a future Mission to the island. The Bishop gradually sank, and breathed his last on January 31st. Burrup buried him under a tree by the river-side, then turned back to the Mission station. He reached Chibisas partly by canoe and partly on foot, and was carried from thence by the Makololo to the station, where, after a few days, he too died. There is but little doubt that if they had gone forward, or returned home, their lives would have been spared; but neither of them were at all careful about their health. Burrup, you know, had proceeded from Quilimane, with Dickenson and Clarke, up to Titli, in a canoe lent him by the Portuguese, and from there, all alone, up to the Murchison Falls—300 miles altogether—without knowing a word of the language of the country. Livingstone, in a letter, says such a feat had not been performed before.

“You will see in the deeply interesting papers I am sending home the whole history of this Mission, which has begun in so remarkable a manner, and has been founded amid great losses and much misery. I will here only give you a bare outline. Immediately on landing at Chibisas from the ‘Pioneer,’ they found the country in a state of utter distraction from the inroads of the Ajawa into the Magnana country, on a slave-hunting expedition, in which they destroyed villages, crops, people, etc. The day after they landed they met a party of more than eighty slaves. The Bishop was bathing, but Livingstone took the gun from their driver, and set them all free. During the next few days they met and set free many others, and proceeded against an encampment from which they had been assaulted. Livingstone headed this, and the Bishop, not willing to fire, gave

him his gun. They then settled with a chief, and he told them all other chiefs had fled, and he must fly unless the Bishop would settle at his village. He did so. In a few days various chiefs came to intreat his protection against the Ajawa. He went against one party some miles off, and 400 women and children were thrown upon his hands. Afterwards he went to punish another chief, who had robbed and nearly murdered Proctor and Scudamore, and burned his village.

“The two last acts he details at full length in his Journal, in a letter to his sister, and probably in letters to various others. Evidently Livingstone and the Bishop were both nervous about the view that friends and still more enemies at home will take of their proceedings; but the Bishop, to the last, was quite satisfied in his own mind that he had done right. People will probably come to different conclusions on the subject. I confess I am very doubtful as to the last act. The result, however, so far as we can at present see, has been that peace has been restored to the whole country; that the Ajawa now understand what the Bishop sought to impress upon all their nation with whom he could speak, that he loved them as well as the Magnana, and only desired to see them living together in peace, and not destroying each other by selling all they could seize for slaves. The letter of Dr. Meller, Livingstone’s naturalist, which I send to the committee, gives the best account of the difficulties in which the Bishop was placed by the solicitations of all the surrounding chiefs, and the assurance that his presence in their respective villages would prevent the Ajawa from attacking them. . . . Livingstone thinks that the Mission should have confined itself to the defensive; but it is clear that he began the aggressive system, though the Mission may have carried it too far. It is curious that the question of using arms was freely discussed in my house, and that the party—the Bishop and Scudamore most especially—maintained that it was unlawful under *any* circumstances, even in defence of their lives; that their line was patient suffering.

“The Bishop’s Journal and his last letter to his sister are full of interest. A few days before his death, he says—‘I read

Burrup this morning the Keble for 25th Sunday after Trinity. I do so admire the last verses.' He did not then know how applicable they were to his own circumstances. His last recorded words are, 'Burrup is very low, and we have no medicine: of quinine, which we ought to be taking every day, there is none. But He who brought us here can take care of us without human means. If we should be both down at once, Charlie (the Makololo) will take care of us. The texts in Greek, which we have learned day by day, lately have been Rom. ii. 28, 29, "He is not a Jew;" Rom. iii. 21, "But now the righteousness of God, etc.;" vi. 2, 3, "The wages of sin is death;" vii. 24, 25, "O wretched man;" viii. 38, 39, "We are persuaded that neither life nor death," etc. Good-bye for the present.'

"One could scarce wish for more. Blessed words and truths to be last imprinted on the heart and mind of the dying servant of the Lord. . . . I preach on this sad event on Sunday. But now for the future. I have been hesitating what to do. Some think that I might go to the Mission, but it is quite uncertain *when* I could get there, and almost certain that I could not get away perhaps for a year or two. Others and more thoughtful men think that I should go at once to England to confer and cooperate with the committee in the steps which must immediately be taken. The difficulties about men for the Free State, which is being lost to us, and occupied by the Wesleyans through our delay; the case of the Bishop of Natal, who is on his way home; my own appeal to the Privy Council—all would make me concur in this view, if it were not that I ought to visit my whole Province this year, and that the twenty-five men whom I brought out last year are not thoroughly settled in their places, and give a great deal of trouble, and cause a correspondence which no one but myself can settle. I therefore am disposed not to go. These points seem to me to be of great importance.

"I. It is essential that a new head be sent out immediately. If one is not on the spot by January 1st, it is feared that the Mission will break up. The officers who went up,

Captain Wilson and Dr. Ramsay and Dr. Meller, all urge the importance of immediate action. . . . Waller urgently pressed to come down to represent to me and to you in England the absolute necessity of a steamboat, and better communication. . . . Everybody loved the Bishop. Not a man came across him who did not fall under the influence of his loving spirit. Alas! alas! that he and others of them have been such spendthrifts of their health.

“The Bishop must be consecrated in England, unless he could come out here before Welby leaves the Cape for S. Helena. Any one that you or your committee select I at least shall gladly welcome.

II. As to a better system of communication: Not one-third, I understand, of the goods taken up by the Bishop with him, or forwarded by me at his request, to the mouth of the Kongone, have reached the station. . . . The consequence is that the Mission has lived largely on native food, has been without the essentials of wine and brandy, and has suffered much from diarrhoea. They have also been almost out of calico, which is their money, and without which they cannot live. The question therefore arises, as to what we can do to remedy this. Livingstone urges me to push my original plan of a steamboat. The Missionaries re-echo his advice, and say that it is essential. . . . The Bishop spoke strongly in his last writings about a steamboat, and has left behind him a rough draft in pencil of an appeal to the University Boat Club to provide one.” [Here the Metropolitan goes into the *pros* and *cons.* concerning this point, and the establishment of an agency by means of which goods might be sent up to the Mission.]

“Another subject for consideration is, whether anything can or ought to be done politically? It is quite clear that the ten guns in possession of the Mission have for the time, and perhaps permanently, settled the country, checked the slave-trade, and given a turn to public opinion among the heathen. Whether this will last, whether the pro-slavery party will be driven to combine against the Mission, I know not. . . . It is certain that the Portuguese are the chief instigators of the slave-trade. They are the merchants who carry it on. The

Governor of Mozambique is not known to be implicated in it, and he has done a great deal for the country. . . . The going up of two boats of a man-of-war with Miss Mackenzie and Mrs. Burrup to the very foot of the Murchison's Falls cannot but have a salutary effect both upon Portuguese and heathen. It shows them that they are not beyond the reach of British power. The gallant Captain Wilson (a very fine fellow, to whom we are all much indebted) told them that if they troubled the Mission, a body of men would come up from a man-of-war to punish them. It is a question whether the slave-trade may not be more effectually crushed by fifty marines from a man-of-war on Mount Zamba near to which the land between the fresh-water Lake Nyassa and the salt-water Shirwa is only five miles broad, than by all our ships on an unhealthy coast. . .

"The Portuguese endeavoured, at Du Prat's instigation, to obtain from the Imaum of Muscat at Zanzibar the gift of the coast of the mouth of the Rovooma. We were only just in time to stop him. It is high time to let Portugal know that all this encouragement of the slave-trade (for the river was wanted purely for this purpose) will not be tolerated. Livingstone is more discouraged by finding them tracking his steps with their slave-dealers, up the banks of Nyassa, than by anything that has happened to him in Africa. . . .

"May 10th.—Since writing the above, I have resolved to break through all difficulties, and go home. I trust to sail by this mail. I cannot be absent long. I need not say I shall find you out as soon as possible. Ever affectionately yours,  
"R. CAPETOWN."

Feeling, as the above letter shows, the importance of his presence in England to seek a successor to Bishop Mackenzie, the Metropolitan did not delay, but sailed at once for England, where, as mentioned before, he and Mrs. Gray arrived June 26th, 1862.

The Bishop's published letter to those who were interested in the Central African Mission expresses his earnest feeling and anxiety—

“My dear Brethren—I venture to lay before you the reasons which have brought me suddenly and unexpectedly to England, and the objects which I seek to accomplish during my short stay in this country.

“The news of the death of dear Bishop Mackenzie and his brave fellow-labourer, the Rev. H. Burrup, filled the hearts of all Christian men at the Cape, as it will do in England, with the deepest sorrow. It was brought to us by H.M.S. ‘Gorgon,’ the officers of which had conveyed the wife and sister of those who had fallen, in their boats, to the Mission station, and from thence to the Cape. They were the bearers also of very touching letters from the bereaved Mission party and from Dr. Livingstone. These all, with one voice, urged upon me the necessity of immediate action, and expressed a belief that the existence of the Mission might be endangered by delay. Had it been possible, I should have proceeded myself at once to aid our brethren in the trying and difficult position in which they were placed; but there was no ship by which I could hope to proceed there, and I could not have reckoned upon returning, if life were spared, within two years, which would have caused an absence greatly injurious to my Diocese. The opinion also of those with whom I took counsel was, that, looking at the difficulties connected with the consecration of another Bishop, the dangers which at this time surround the Mission, and the risk of delay in sending out another leader, I should do much good by returning at once to England to take counsel with the Committee, and aid in finding and in consecrating a worthy successor to him who has been taken from us; and that it was my duty to do so.”

The Bishop goes on to put forth the other objects which he also had in view, among which the appointment of a Bishop to the Free State was foremost. “That large territory, with the country of the great Chief Moshesh, constituted originally while belonging to the British Crown, a portion of my Diocese. When the Sees of Graham’s Town and Natal were founded, it was already decided to abandon the country, and it was therefore not included in any of the three Dioceses. It is now a



Dutch republic. In all the villages there is an English population, and there are perhaps 200,000 native heathen. It is now full three years since the S. P. G. voted an income for a Bishop, but no Bishop has been appointed. I may not quit England till one has been consecrated." The Bishop then speaks of his Kafir College Mission work among the Hottentots, and some of his other works, begun or to be undertaken;—the English College and Orphan Home, already existing, a Training School, so greatly needed, and the fact that "the time is fast approaching when we must begin to contemplate the erection of at least a portion of a Cathedral."

The result of this was the appointment of the Rev. W. G. Tozer, of S. John's College, Oxford, then Vicar of Burgh-with-Winthorpe, Lincolnshire, to succeed Bishop Mackenzie; and the Rev. Edward Twells, of S. Peter's College, Cambridge, Incumbent of S. John's, Hammersmith, to the Bishopric of the Orange River Free State Territory; and the two Missionary Bishops were accordingly consecrated in Westminster Abbey on the Feast of the Purification, February 2nd, 1863, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Metropolitan of Africa, and the Bishop of Oxford, assisted by the Bishops of Lincoln and Montreal.<sup>1</sup> Bishop Gray found the search for men, and the various anxieties attending on these appointments, harassing and wearing, but these were by no means the chief or heaviest anxiety pressing upon him. He had now fairly plunged into what may be advisedly called alike the great trial of his whole career,

<sup>1</sup> The Metropolitan wrote to Dean Douglas, February 3rd: "The consecration of the two Bishops took place in Westminster Abbey yesterday, the Bishop of Oxford preaching. I have had immense difficulties and anxieties about this. On Saturday the Archbishop's secretary wrote to tell me that, in his judgment, the oath of canonical obedience could not by the Jerusalem Act be made to the Metropolitan of South Africa. I went down at once to Addington and told the Archbishop I could not join, but must formally protest against the consecration. Twiss and Bishop of London both working against me. Archbishop most anxious to do as I wished, but timid about law. I did not know till I came back from preaching for Zambesi in the city at ten o'clock at night that all would be right, and I went down in the morning still with my protest in my pocket. If I had not been very firm, we should have had two jurisdictions, and, as far as we could make it, two Churches, and the Jerusalem Act would have carried the day."

and the episode for which the whole Catholic Church of Christ will ever remember his name with gratitude and reverence. No need to say we mean the (so-called) Colenso Case.

A somewhat remarkable letter from Dr. Colenso to the Bishop of Oxford has been preserved, dated Lostwithiel, November 19th, 1853 (about ten days before his consecration), in which he complains of an attack made upon him by the *Record* newspaper, as supporting Mr. Maurice's views, which at that time were much canvassed and deprecated by Churchmen and the religious world. It is noticeable that, in this letter, Dr. Colenso distinctly repudiates doctrines which he not long afterwards as distinctly taught. After mentioning *Village Sermons*, which were dedicated to Mr. Maurice "as an opportunity of saying a few kind words to him at a time when others were dealing so harshly by him," Dr. Colenso goes on to say: "You will observe, however, that I have expressly limited my address to an acknowledgment of gratitude derived from his teaching, specifying *one* particular point, that of Universal Redemption as connected with the Incarnation of the Son of God, which for me and others he had brought into clearer light. . . . But as to the other points on which his book is objected to, I am quite silent. An honest man would have concluded that I did *not* mean to adopt his views on these points, more especially, as with regard to two of them—his view of the Atonement and of eternal punishment—I happen to have used in several places in my sermons the popular language,—to have spoken of the death of our Lord as *penal*, and of the woe of a lost soul as *endless*."

It will be remembered that, when in England in 1858, Bishop Gray had occasionally alluded to anxieties with respect to Natal,<sup>1</sup> which followed him in the shape of consultations from both Bishop and Clergy. Dr. Colenso's appointment had been suggested by Dr. Hills of Great Yarmouth, when himself declining to take the office as Bishop of Natal, and the recom-

<sup>1</sup> In his very detailed and confidential correspondence with the Bishop of Oxford these anxieties are constantly referred to in the kindest, most considerate manner.

mentation being endorsed by the Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Hinds) and others, he had been consecrated at the same time as Bishop Armstrong; and while travelling and working together, a most kindly and affectionate intercourse had existed between the Metropolitan and Bishop Colenso. Bishop Gray was in very weak health from overwork and over-excitement, and, as he himself says, he was watched over and cared for very tenderly by his new fellow-labourer, and until the period of Dr. Colenso's return to England in 1862 to publish the first part of his work on the Pentateuch, they were "as brothers." Their correspondence was unceasing and most confidential. The Bishop of Natal had many troubles and trials from the time he first reached his Diocese, owing to the unsettled state of things in the Church itself, and the way in which Bishops were sent forth by the Mother Church to found and organise churches in all parts of the Colonial Empire, as best they might, without any code of instructions, without counsel or guide of any kind, without any Board of Missions, or recognised authority in any shape, to which they could refer under critical circumstances.

"In consequence of my being the founder of the work of the Church in Natal," Bishop Gray writes, "and my connection with all that had previously taken place there, and also because of the relation in which I stood as Metropolitan to the new Diocese, I was consulted by both Bishop and Clergy about everything that happened, and gave what help I could in the solution of difficulties."

One of these questions was how far polygamy was to be allowed among the converted heathen, a matter which roused much excitement and opposition in the Diocese. On this the Metropolitan abstained from expressing a decided opinion, believing that it required the deliberation and determination of a Synod of the Church. Another point was the formation of a Church Council, respecting which he differed from the Bishop of Natal, who proposed that it should consist of Clergy and Laity voting together as one body, but always with an excessive number of Laity. About half his Clergy refused to sit in such an assembly, and the Metropolitan thought them right.

The question was brought before the Archbishop of Canterbury, who at first took the Bishop of Natal's view, but, on learning facts, and perceiving that the position and powers of the Clergy as a distinct Order in the Church were damaged by such an arrangement, he changed his mind. Furthermore, both Bishop and Clergy referred the teaching of the former respecting the Holy Eucharist to the Metropolitan, who regretted greatly some of his language as unguarded and unsatisfactory; yet, believing that it might be construed consistently with the Church's formularies, and desiring earnestly to support Bishop Colenso in every way possible, to allay disturbance, and lead the Clergy to give him due obedience, he did his best to explain it favourably and to promote peace. "In my efforts to accomplish this, I know that I made the hearts of faithful men sad," he writes: "I know that they who thought they were contending for great principles which were endangered felt discouraged and aggrieved."

Some of Bishop Colenso's doubts had evidently reached the Metropolitan, for, in a letter dated November 20th, 1860, Bishop Gray, after alluding to the difficulties raised by his Suffragans concerning Bishop Mackenzie's consecration, and playfully observing—"The Bishops are clearly wrong, as you may suppose, if they differ from *me*!!" goes on to say; "But Natal is a very wilful, headstrong man, and loose, I fear, in his opinions upon vital points. We shall have to fight for Revelation, Inspiration, the Atonement, and every great truth of Christianity, ere long."

When Bishop Colenso came to Bishop's Court in December 1860, all his brother Bishops were painfully struck by his changed manner, by a gloomy reserve and half-restraint, while yet he at times broke forth with opinions which grieved them much. The Bishop of S. Helena (Dr. Claughton) had a great deal of conversation with Bishop Colenso on various subjects which troubled him, although (as stated in the Preface to Part I. of his book on the Pentateuch) the Bishop had not then begun to enter, while fully intending to do so on his return to Natal, upon the inquiries which led him, a little later, to write to a friend (we

are still quoting from his own Preface) that he "felt more hopelessly than ever how hollow is the ground upon which we have so long been standing, with reference to the Inspiration of Scripture;" and that, "for myself, if I cannot find the means of doing away with my present difficulties, I see not how I can retain my Episcopal office, in the discharge of which I must require from others a solemn declaration that they 'unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which, with the evidence now before me, it is wholly impossible to believe in."

Speaking of this time, Bishop Gray says, in a letter dated January 9th, 1861: "I am very anxious about Natal. His views are dangerous. I fear that we may have taught in Africa 'another Gospel which is not another.' It is curious and painful to see how the reaction of his mind from the utter Calvinism in which he was brought up, is driving him to the contemplation of God solely as Love, the Loving Father of all creation,—into opinions which seem to me to undermine the whole Gospel scheme—no Atonement in the true sense of the word—no need of any—no eternity of punishment—ultimate universal salvation. I do not say that he has worked out all this into a scheme, but I think that he speculates most dangerously upon these points."

However, Bishop Colenso concurred in most of the proceedings at the Conference of Bishops, and took part in the consecration of his friend Bishop Mackenzie. In the month of June following, the Bishop published a new Translation and Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, which he sent to the Metropolitan, who at once intreated him to withdraw it from publication, but in vain.

"You will be sorry to hear" (Bishop Gray wrote to Dr. Williamson, July 18th, 1861), "that the Bishop of Natal has printed a Commentary on the Romans, containing opinions similar in most respects to Maurice's on the Atonement, and to the Essays on other points. On the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, Justification (all heathen, etc., are righteous and accepted before God from their birth), Original Sin, the Sacra-

ments, the Judgment, Eternal Punishment, Universal salvation, he has propounded opinions at variance with those of the Church. I have not heard of any one having a copy of the book but myself, and I have written to pray him to keep it back for at least a year, and consult his friends, but I do not expect that he will do this. He is at times quite inconsistent in the language which he uses, often expressing himself on the Atonement and on other points in evangelical language. I expect that the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg will present him to me. I shall be cautious how I act, and feel the difficulty of my position."

To the BISHOP OF OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, July 15th, 1861.

"My dear Bishop—What I have for some time apprehended with regard to the Bishop of Natal has come to pass. He has published a Commentary on the Romans, full, as I conceive, of the most objectionable views, and entirely substituting a new scheme for the received system of Christianity. This is strong language, but, I really think, not too strong. Upon the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, the Atonement, Justification, Original Sin, the Sacraments, the Judgment, Eternal Punishment, Universal Salvation, he has affirmed opinions at variance, as I conceive, with those taught by the Church of England, and ever held by the Catholic Church. The book has probably been sent to Mr. Maurice; if so, I hope you will get a sight of it. In case you should not, I forward to you certain extracts from this work, that you may have some idea of the views set forth. Of course they will not convey to you the freshness and eloquence of the book itself. I have only the copy which has been sent to me, and I do not hear that any one else has one. This has led me to hope that it is not published, and I have written to him praying him to keep it back, and reconsider it and consult his friends. Though the book is full of Maurice, I feel satisfied that there is much in it of which he would not approve. I have also written to the Bishops of Graham's Town and S. Helena, to ask them what they think I or we ought to do. I wish you also to counsel me, and if you

think that I ought to ask counsel in the matter of the Archbishop or the Bishops, then to do so formally for me, in my name. My own feeling is that such a book cannot be allowed to be put forth among us silently, and without notice. I feel satisfied that if it is published it will make a disturbance here, and that the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg, and probably others of his Clergy, will present him formally to me. I should add that his language is frequently inconsistent with himself—at times it is strictly evangelical. He has not worked out his theory with exact accuracy.”

On September 18th, 1861, the Bishop writes again: “I am in great anxiety about the Bishop of Natal’s book on the Romans, and do not yet see my way clearly as to what I should do. By next mail I *may* hear from S. Oxon, but hardly expect it. The Bishop of Graham’s Town urges something being done. He really ought to be tried or suspended. But you may imagine at least some of the difficulties of my position with regard to such a step, though perhaps not all of them. It would open out questions far more perplexing than those raised in Long’s case, and I unfeignedly shrink from having *two* on my hands, and the probabilities of mistakes on my part. I shall be cautious what I do, but I trust and pray that I may be guided to see my duty, and strengthened to perform it.”

To the BISHOP OF OXFORD.

“ November 15th, 1861.

“I have by this mail written to the Archbishop of Canterbury about the Bishop of Natal’s book, and asked him to bring the subject before the Bishops of his province, and counsel me how to act. I have forwarded the book to him, and also to you. I have also sent him a copy of the correspondence between the Bishop and myself, and of one between him and the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg, and Archdeacon Fearn, forwarded by them officially to me. The Bishop wished me to apply directly to the Archbishop, rather than through you. I have therefore done so. . . . The Clergy and Laity in Natal

are very uneasy . . . the book is doing mischief, and unhooking men's minds, not a few saying that it is a very liberal and comfortable Gospel, and all right!"

"November 18th, 1861.

"I am in great trouble about the Bishop of Natal's book. The Dean of Pieter Maritzburg and Archdeacon Fearné have forwarded to me their correspondence with the Bishop, and asked counsel. I have been in correspondence with him, and have formally laid the matter before the Archbishop, asking him to consult his Bishops, and tell me what my duty is with reference to that book. I am doomed never to be out of hot water! This touches, however, the very Faith in its most essential points. I am appealed to publicly and privately, and I have been long convinced that our brother was conscious of holding views subversive of the received interpretations and teaching of the Church. Nothing can well be more delicate or more difficult than my present position. I hope that I shall be guided aright."

The letter addressed by the Metropolitan to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Archbishop Sumner) was as follows:—

"Bishop's Court, November 12th, 1861.

"My Lord Archbishop—It is with very great pain that I forward for your Grace's consideration a copy of a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, recently published by the Bishop of Natal, and ask you to counsel me as to my duties and responsibilities with reference to it. The volume appears to me, I confess, amidst much that is excellent, to contain unsound opinions upon many points of deep importance, more especially with reference to the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, the doctrine of the Atonement, and Eternal Punishment. The questions which I desire to propose to your Grace, and through your Grace to the Bishops of your province, are—*First*, Whether the Bishop's teaching is so erroneous as to make it a duty which the Church owes to her Lord and to her members to rid herself of the guilt of sharing it? *Secondly*, If so, in what way this



should be done? Whether by synodical condemnation, or trial, or in some other way?

"I think it right to forward to your Grace a copy of the correspondence which has already passed on the subject between the Bishop and myself; also a copy of the correspondence provided to me by the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg and Archdeacon Fearné. I have also been in correspondence on the same subject with the Bishops of Graham's Town and S. Helena. The Bishop of Graham's Town, who has himself been in correspondence with the Bishop of Natal about his book, takes precisely the same view of our brother's teaching as myself, and feels as strongly as I do that it cannot be left unnoticed; but, with me, he is in doubt as to the way we should proceed. The Bishop of S. Helena had not seen the book when I last heard from him. The book has excited great uneasiness and alarm amongst both Clergy and Laity in this province, and I am appealed to in various ways to take action upon the subject.

"Whatever is to be done, I presume that the responsibility of proceeding rests chiefly with myself. Much as I love, and in many respects admire my brother, from whom I feel that I may learn a great deal, I shall not, I trust, allow private feelings to interfere with the discharge of duty, when I can make up my mind as to what my duty is. Your Grace will, I am sure, feel that in a matter of so grave a character, and happily so novel in our Church, I may be permitted to seek for counsel from the fathers of the Church at home.

"Praying that God may guide us all into the truth, I am, your Grace's faithful and obedient servant, R. CAPETOWN."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, December 17th, 1861.

... "The Bishop of Natal quite approves of my letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, of which I sent him a copy, and says that he knows that I shall always show the utmost kindness that my sense of duty will admit. Poor dear fellow! I feel deeply grieved about him. I really believe that a philosophical Catholic would set him straight. One or two wrong

principles are at the bottom of his errors. I think that I shall, without entering into a discussion with him on particular doctrines, try to get him to look at his opinions from a different point of view from what he has hitherto done."

"I have had a very touching letter, full of kindness and sympathy, from the dear old Archbishop" (the Metropolitan writes, March 18th, 1862), "about the Bishop of Natal's book, and the part I have taken. . . . It is a sad position for his Clergy, who feel that he is a heretic; it injures the faith of many. 300 copies of the book have been sold in Cape Town, where, chiefly among the Dutch, rationalistic views are spreading. Something must be done in this case. If the Bishops at home can do it, I should thankfully hand over my erring brother to the Patriarch, but the Church of England is awfully trammelled by State law."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, March 20th, 1862.

"My dear Bishop—I had a most kind letter on the subject of Natal's book from the dear old Archbishop, which greatly relieved my mind. I believe that he is just leaving for England. Should Convocation think that the book is heretical, and that he or it should be proceeded against, it appears to me that the *book* would be condemned with more weight by you; and that possibly the Archbishop *qua* Patriarch might try him, but unfortunately the English Ecclesiastical Courts are a great bar to this. My own belief is, that if such a step were deemed necessary by the Bishops at home (and I would not act without this), the Bishops of this province might try, and the Metropolitan deprive a Suffragan—probably with a right of appeal to the Patriarch. If the judgment of the Supreme Court here is sustained by the Privy Council, this at least is clear, that Colonial Courts would be compelled to uphold Bishops, Metropolitan, Provinces, Patriarchs, in their respective rights; and the only difficulty will be to make out clear for Courts, should cases come before them, what these rights are. My appeal, therefore, is of the utmost importance to the whole

Church, whether at home or in the Colonies. It will settle for ever, not only what our status is in the Colonies, but what our relation is to you, and yours to us. I have upheld in my speech the Patriarchal rights. I am not sure, however, that I agree with you about them. The Patriarchate of Alexandria has peculiar privileges, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, though in earlier ages sometimes called a Patriarch (Twiss once gave me the authorities for this), has never been formally acknowledged as a Patriarch, and I do not know whether it could be done, for if I remember right the counsel of the other Patriarchs is necessary.

“Something, however, should be done, for questions like that of Welby’s consecration are being settled in different ways, and there will be disputes. Adelaide, all the New Zealand Dioceses, Canada, claim to elect their own Bishops. *We* have declared that no appointment is to be made to Cape Town without the consent of the Church here. Meantime, not the consecration only, but the actual appointment of Welby, is assumed by the Secretary of State and Archbishop, without the canonical reference either to the Bishops of this province or his own.

“I do not think that the Archbishop could maintain his right to appoint all Bishops *qua* Patriarch. The Colonies would, I think, pretty generally resist.”

In May 1862 the English Bishops had a meeting to consider the questions proposed by the Metropolitan of South Africa, and as we know, he was himself at that moment actually on his way to England. During the voyage Bishop Gray heard from a fellow-passenger (a member of the Zambesi Mission, who had recently touched at Natal) that Bishop Colenso had just printed privately and circulated among his friends another book attacking the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and had lent it to him (the Bishop’s informant) to read. This was Part I. of the work called *The Pentateuch Critically Examined*, and Bishop Colenso was actually following in the next mail to England with the intention of publishing it there.

Naturally this did not tend to make Bishop Gray more

easy as to the state of things. On his arrival in London he was met by private letters from most of the Bishops who had assisted at the recent meeting to discuss the Commentary on Romans, expressing their decided opinion as to the unsoundness of that book; though, considering that the two Archbishops would very probably be called upon to give a judicial utterance on the subject, it was not thought right that they should commit themselves beforehand by expressing any public judgment. Archbishop Sumner's letter concluded with the words: "I am greatly struck by the mildness and conciliatory spirit which you have united with the firmness and decision exhibited in the whole of your distressing correspondence with the Bishop of Natal."

As soon as Bishop Colenso arrived in England, the Metropolitan wrote to him as follows:—

"London, August 8th, 1862.

"My dear Brother—You would be surprised to find me in England. I did not make up my mind till three or four days before sailing. The Clergy, however, urged me very strongly in the critical state of the Mission. I am glad that I came, though I did so very reluctantly, for I had arranged for a Visitation, upon which I should now have been. I found on arriving that the Bishops had discussed at a meeting our correspondence and your Commentary. All, I believe, felt the gravity of the subject, and some expressed themselves very strongly. Since my arrival in England I have conversed with several of them, and had communication with others. The desire on the part of some has been very strong that two or three of the Bishops should meet you, and discuss the subject with you lovingly as brethren, in the hope that they might be able to satisfy you that you were in error on certain points, and that nothing in the meantime should be done on your part to compromise yourself or the Church further. I need not say that at this late period of the season all have dispersed to their dioceses, and that it would require some little time to get two or three together at a time which would suit the convenience of all. If

you are willing to meet them, I will make the attempt. Since leaving the Cape I have heard that it was known both there and here that you have another work, it is said denying the authenticity and inspiration of the Pentateuch, already in print. I was asked repeatedly if I had seen it, on my arrival here. Among others the Bishop of Labuan seems to have spoken about it. If there be such a book, let me entreat you not to publish it, at least until after your interview with our brethren at home. I am sure that the true Christian course is that which I have suggested. I came up here to preach, and believe I must leave town on Monday. My wife joins in kind regards to Mrs. Colenso. The Archbishop is in a very precarious state; he feels this case very deeply, but is not well enough to act in it himself. He wrote to me about it, and I have conversed with him since I came home.—Ever affectionately yours,

“R. CAPETOWN.”

Again, August 12th, 1862, the Metropolitan wrote to Bishop Colenso, pleading earnestly and, as he thought, tenderly with one who had been as a brother to him, urging him to take counsel with Bishops whom he considered more learned and more likely to have weight with Bishop Colenso than himself. The Archbishop of York (Longley) and the Bishops of Oxford and Lincoln promised to come to London on purpose to enter upon a friendly discussion with the Bishop of Natal, but he would not accept their offer. Meanwhile, as the Commentary on the Romans had been formally presented to the Metropolitan by the Dean of Maritzburg and Archdeacon Fearn, he felt that, whether supported or not, he would have to take action; and this conviction could only be increased by the publication in October of Bishop Colenso's first part on the Pentateuch, which was rapidly followed by the succeeding volumes;—Part II. appearing January 1863, and putting forth still more unqualified and unbelieving statements, practically accusing all the Bishops and Clergy of the English Church with hypocritical falsehood<sup>1</sup> in the exercise of their ministerial functions, especially in the Sacra-

<sup>1</sup> Colenso's *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 21.

ment of Holy Baptism ; and inviting them, as the only "remedy, to omit such words, to disobey the law of the Church, and take the consequences ;" while bitterly inveighing against Ordination vows and the fetters of subscription, "owing to which" the Clergy either dare not think at all on such subjects, or, if they do, dare not express their thoughts freely from the pulpit or by means of the press, without incurring the danger of being dragged into the Ecclesiastical Court by some clerical brother who has himself no turn, perhaps no faculty, for thinking ; or who else has abandoned his rights and duties as a reasoning man, to become the mere exponent of a church-system or a creed ; but who will at least prevent others from exercising their powers of thought in the inquiry after truth, and so disturbing the quiet repose of the Church. How, in fact, can it be expected that a Clergyman should venture to "*think*" on these subjects, when by so doing he is almost certain to come to doubt, and disbelieve some portion at least, of the Church's doctrines ?" The writer goes on to affirm that the Clergy are "required to hush up the *facts* which they know, and publish and maintain in place of them—by silence at least, if not by overt act—transparent *fictions*."

This is not the place wherein to enter upon an analysis or refutation of Bishop Colenso's writings, a task which has been clearly and ably done by those competent to the undertaking.<sup>1</sup> Suffice it to say, that even before the appearance of the Second Part of the Pentateuch, a general and increasing indignation at "the sight of a Bishop pulling the Bible to pieces," had arisen in the Church, and the Metropolitan began to be urged on all sides to take action, and was even reproached for what some mistook as unconcern and indifference. How far from deserved this reproach was, it is needless to say, or that he was really endeavouring to do whatever might be in his power in defence of the Faith. In a letter to Mr. Keble, who had written—"congratulating you (if that is the right word) on the great things

<sup>1</sup> The Metropolitan writes to Dean Douglas, February 3rd, 1863 : "I am sending you some replies to the Bishop of Natal. Pritchard's, as far as it goes, is, I think, excellent. S. Oxon and the Archbishop think it one of the best."

which your Province is doing in Christendom. You do, indeed, set us an example of not slumbering or sleeping"—he says :

“Tarrant Gunville, November 4th, 1862.

“It is a great privilege to have your support and encouragement in my work. . . . It is, I trust, pleasing God to enable His Church to do some work for Him in Africa, but it is still in its infancy, and surrounded with many difficulties and discouragements. The Bishop of Natal is our greatest distress at this time. I have been in counsel with the Bishops respecting his first work, and shall be ere long respecting his second. I trust that I may be guided aright as to the course to be adopted with regard to him. But the case is a new one, and, happily, the precedents are not many. At this moment I am uneasy as to the claim which the Privy Council may set up as to the interference with cases of discipline in the Colonial Churches. I am sure that they will not submit to much interference, and that if it is attempted, it will lead to schisms. . . . I hope that I have a Bishop for the Free State. I am now attempting to found a Mission in Madagascar.”

At last, November 25th, Bishop Gray wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury as follows :—

“My dear Lord—The communications which I receive respecting this last sad book of the Bishop of Natal make me feel how necessary it is that I, at least, should decide what my own course as Metropolitan should be. Men are getting impatient, even under the present short delay. I do not like to move without the counsel and advice of the Church at home, or, at least, without informing your Grace of the course which I may feel it my duty to adopt. Could I see your Grace on Saturday?”

In a letter to the Dean of Cape Town (Mr. Douglas) written from Lavington, January 2nd, 1863, the Bishop says :

“I have been thinking a great deal about this trial, and I have to-day had a talk with S. Oxon. He quite agrees with my view. I am satisfied on these points :—1. The Bishops, even though only Graham’s Town and I should be present, meet as

the Synod of the Province, and also as a Court to try the Comprovincial. 2. As a Synod they may declare what the Faith of the Church is, and as a Court condemn. I will not be bound by the narrow limits, as to the Church's Faith, laid down by Dr. Lushington or Privy Council. I will not recognise them as an authority as to what are the doctrines which the Church of England allows to be taught. The Privy Council will make itself, if not checked, the *de facto* spiritual head of the Church of England, and of all religious bodies in the Colonies. I believe this to be the greatest of our many dangers."

Meanwhile addresses began to pour in from Clergy and Laity to the Bishops, and to Convocation; while the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appealed formally to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as their president, for advice as to their proper course, the Bishop of Natal being one of their Vice-presidents, and receiving large contributions from the Society for his Missions. Before replying to this, and with a view to calming the general excitement in the Church, the Archbishop felt it only right to summon all the English Bishops, as also such Irish and Colonial Bishops as were available, to meet and consider how best to deal with the matter.

Accordingly, on February 4th, 1863, there was a large meeting at the Bounty Office (the meeting place of the Upper House of Convocation), of which the Metropolitan of South Africa took copious notes at the time, from which the following details are given. There were present the Archbishops of Canterbury (Longley)<sup>1</sup> and York and Armagh; the Bishops of London, Oxford, Winchester, Bangor, Lincoln, Worcester, Llandaff, Hereford, Carlisle, Rochester, Gloucester and Bristol, Manchester, Sodor and Man, Chichester, Exeter, S. Asaph, Durham, Chester, Salisbury, S. David's, Bath and Wells, Derry, Down, Montreal, and Tasmania. After prayer, the Archbishop having alluded to the death of Bishop Mackenzie, stated that the S. P. G. had asked advice as to their duty in regard to the Bishop of Natal—whether, under the grievous scandal caused by his writings, they ought to re-elect him as one of their vice-presidents, and whether, until the scandal were removed, he ought to be permitted

<sup>1</sup> Archbishop Sumner died September 6th, 1862.



to administer the funds of the Society. Some discussion then took place, not as to any doubtfulness concerning the scandal given by the Bishop of Natal, as to which all agreed, but different opinions were expressed as to how far it behoved the Bishops to advise the Society. The Bishops of Oxford, Lincoln, and Exeter explained that it was the Archbishop who took counsel with his brethren as to the course he should take, not the Society consulting them; and then the Archbishop put the question, Shall any advice be given to the Society?

The Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts) said, that looking at the custom of the Primitive Church, to place alms at the disposal of the Bishop, he thought that, before departing from so sound and ancient a provision, the Bishops should first come to a decision whether the Bishop of Natal had forfeited the confidence of the Church. So dignified a body as that then present should first settle this question. There were present nearly the whole of the English Episcopate, several Bishops of the Irish and Colonial Churches. It appeared to him that they should first resolve that the Bishop of Natal had forfeited the confidence of the Church. After some remarks from the Bishop of S. David's, the Bishop of Exeter went on to say that he himself felt the gravity of the question very deeply. The Bishop of Natal had put forth views affecting the faith of the Catholic Church: all must feel that a *prima facie* case had been made out against him. He should feel obliged to say that the Bishop had forfeited the confidence of the Church, and he was ready to say to the Society, "Suspend your confidence." This was his judgment on this unhappy case. We must protect the Church from seeming to regard with indifference so great an assault upon the faith. If ever there was a case in which the whole Church felt no confidence in a Bishop, it was this. The Bishops *could* not give an answer evading responsibility. (Hear, hear.) The case was one of singular notoriety, of vast scandal, of universal reprobation. The Bishops could not advise his Grace to shrink from responsibility, or urge him to decline replying fully and frankly to the Society.

The Archbishop said he gathered that there was a remark-

able concurrence of opinion as to the main fact, that the Bishop of Natal had lost the confidence of the Church, though some thought that they were not sufficiently informed on the subject to speak as decidedly as they could wish.

To this the Bishop of Exeter replied that it was a subject on which all ought to be thoroughly informed. After some further conversation, the Bishop of Oxford's resolution was carried, to the effect that the Bishops now present "respectfully advise his Grace, that the circumstances of the case of the Bishop of Natal are such as in our judgment to make it necessary for the Society to withhold its confidence from that Bishop until he has been cleared from the charges notoriously incurred by him."

The Bishops then proceeded to discuss the general question of the Bishop of Natal's publications. The Archbishop said, that, in his judgment, the question of such a book having been put forth by a Bishop of the Church was one which could not be passed over. He wished to know the opinion of his brethren as to the steps to be taken in this great emergency—a moment which, he believed, was a crisis in the history of the Church.

The Bishop of Winchester (Sumner) thought that the first question was, whether any legal proceedings were to be taken.

The Archbishop said it was clear that the Bishop of Cape Town alone, as Metropolitan, could take proceedings, and that he himself, as Primate, at least in the first instance, had no power to do so; and he called upon the Bishop of Cape Town to state his intentions.

To this the Bishop of Cape Town replied, that he had consulted most of the Bishops individually, and had also taken counsel with the Queen's Advocate and the Solicitor-General, Sir Roundell Palmer: both advised him that he could proceed against the Bishop of Natal, and suspend or deprive him; but that he could take no action in England, nor in Africa, until his office was promoted there, and until the sale of the Bishop's books had been proved there. The letters patent which constituted him Metropolitan were at this moment under discus-

sion before the Privy Council, and the judgment of the Judicial Committee might materially affect his legal powers. He was quite prepared to cite the Bishop to a trial so soon as he was in a position to do so; but the difficulties in this case were greatly increased by the fact that both the Bishop and himself were at this time in England. Several months must elapse before proceedings could be taken by him, and he trusted that the Bishops would not defer action because of the likelihood of a trial. He thought that the whole Church was looking to them to do something—that it was waiting with great anxiety for the result of this day's proceedings. His duties had of late taken him over every part of England, and he could truly say that everywhere the utmost anxiety prevailed as to what the Bishops of the Church might say and do at this crisis of our history. The weak and infant Church in South Africa was, he believed, quite prepared to do its duty in this matter; but he trusted that, as these publications were put forth here in England, in the face and in defiance of the whole Church, the Fathers of the Church at home would deal with them, and not throw the whole responsibility upon an unlearned and distant branch, whose hands would be greatly weakened if the Church at home were to remain silent and apparently indifferent.

The Bishop of S. David's (Thirlwall) made some obstructive remarks to the effect that, as he saw Convocation meant to deal with the book, it was useless to discuss it now. He should listen with great pleasure to the discussion, but he could himself give no opinion, nor did he even know what was the practical object in view in this discussion.

The Archbishop replied that the object he had in view was to ascertain if the Bishops were prepared to express an opinion, for which, he thought, the Church was waiting, on the subject of the Bishop of Natal's books.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Hamilton) said that he had prepared a Pastoral Letter to his Diocese on the subject, but on receiving the Archbishop's summons he withheld it. He considered that they were now meeting to take counsel as to their duty with regard to these books, which were shocking and

horrible. He should certainly feel it his duty to inhibit the Bishop of Natal from officiating in his Diocese.

The Bishop of Oxford said that he had looked through Part II. of the book, and could tell the Bishop of S. David's some of its contents. It affirmed boldly that the books of the Pentateuch were forgeries by Samuel or Jeremiah, and told the laity that "our (*i.e.* the Bishops) belief in these matters is the same as his own, but that we are too cowardly to say so."

The Bishop of Durham (Baring) thought the Bishops ought not to wait till legal proceedings were taken, and that the country expected them to do something. The Bishop of Winchester would be prepared to inhibit, even if legal proceedings were taken. Here the Bishop of S. David's remarked that the Bishop had said he did not mean to officiate. The Bishop of Oxford thought that such an assurance was not sufficient. In his judgment this was a case in which the Church should assert her authority and vindicate her discipline. He thought that the Bishops were bound to shelter the Church as far as it lay in their power to do, from the danger and poison of this Bishop's false teaching. We were not to depend upon his forbearance as to whether he would preach in our pulpits;—it clearly was their duty to direct their Clergy not to allow him to officiate until he had cleared himself of the existing scandal. This was absolutely necessary to quiet the mind of the Church.

The Bishop of London (Tait) said that there was not the slightest difference of opinion in that body as to the Bishop's teaching. They had no confidence in that teaching. But the Diocese of London was different from all other Dioceses; there must be a greater latitude and freedom given in it than in most others, from its peculiar circumstances as being the capital and centre of the land. He should be very sorry to cause needless disturbance to his great Diocese, which would be the result if he were to inhibit. He could not do so; and it was needless. The Bishop had distinctly said that he did not mean to officiate, and he thought it most undesirable to stir up people to make a martyr of the Bishop. He could not undertake the grave responsibility of stirring up strife in his Diocese by issuing a fulmination against the Bishop.

The Bishop of Chichester (Gilbert) said that he must certainly inhibit.

The Bishop of Winchester must do the same. If the Bishop of Natal had pledged himself not to officiate, he had violated his pledge, for he had quite recently done so in his Diocese.

The Bishop of Oxford here observed that, in justice to the Bishop of Natal, he must say that he had not given any such general pledge. What he had said was that he was "so busy with his present work in hand, that he could not accept offers to preach."

The Bishop of Exeter said that he would inhibit, and the Bishop of Chester (Graham) asked what was the course to be pursued in so doing—to which the Bishop of Oxford replied, that the Queen's Advocate said a general inhibition would not prohibit;—there must be a special and particular inhibition. But the mode of proceeding was not now the question. Clearly, if all agreed to inhibit, it would have a great moral effect, and that was what we had to look to. The Archbishop of York (Thomson) thought that it would be best for each Bishop who was inclined to inhibit, to do so by himself.

The Bishop of Oxford said there was all the difference in the world between the two modes of action;—the effect would be infinitely greater if all agreed as a body to inhibit, than if some, or even all, did so individually. What was needed was a Corporate Act.

Here the Archbishop asked for a definite Resolution, and the Bishop of Oxford read one, "That we agree, after common counsel, under a great scandal to inhibit. We would not assume the Bishop's guilt, as he has not yet been tried, nor make a charge against him, but assert that there was a great and notorious scandal."

The Bishop of London said it was not because he doubted whether or no the Bishop of Natal was fit to discharge duties in his Diocese that he objected to the course proposed, but because of the difficulties which would arise out of it. What he deprecated was, that anything should be done to raise Bishop

Colenso into a greater position than his present one, or to give him importance. It was their bounden duty to be very cautious not to add to this. If he heard that Bishop Colenso was going to officiate in his Diocese, he should stop him; but there was not one Clergyman out of the thousand in his Diocese that would think of asking the Bishop to officiate without first obtaining his leave. He thought it most important that this question should not be stirred up beyond what was absolutely necessary. We must not have a discussion raging if we could help it, nor put forward this man as one of the prominent men of the age. Nor must it appear or get abroad that the Bishops differ among themselves on these questions—this he wished to press upon his brethren. He thought there were only two courses open—I. To act judicially, which must depend upon either the Bishop of Cape Town or the Archbishop. II. For each Bishop to express, as occasion served, his own individual opinion, which might be done with vigour, and without using vague expressions. If this were done, it could not be said that the man had been made a martyr of. Any statement by the whole Episcopate must, to meet all views, be vague. The Bishop then made a suggestion that a Committee of Bishops should be appointed to put forth a Declaration on the whole subject of the Inspiration of Scripture.

The Bishop of S. David's again objected. He did not think the time for action had come. Inhibition would be premature, as prejudging a question which Convocation was about to discuss. Moreover, he thought the action of the Bishops now assembled not in Synod would be very unimportant. In short, he considered inhibition certainly superfluous, if not mischievous.

The Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) thought that there was a confusion of ideas in the Bishop of London's mind about raising the Bishop of Natal into importance. He had already assumed a position of very great importance by his bold and rash assumptions. That a Bishop of the Church should have published what he had, in itself lifted him into importance; we could not say that a man who had so rapidly sold 15,000 copies of a

book assailing the Bible, did not occupy a position of importance. The Church was watching to see what the Bishops would do under such circumstances—whether they would do their duty by this unfaithful teacher.

The Bishop of Llandaff (Ollivant) urged the adoption of the resolution, and the Archbishop of York (Thomson) opposed it, because it proposed a course which was highly penal. His opinion of the book was that it was thoroughly bad and mischievous, but he thought the Bishops must consider the effect such a course would have upon the laity; what, for instance, on lawyers (with whom, from circumstances, he had much intercourse). They would say, You prefer punishing to replying. It is easier to do so. He was for appointing a committee to examine the book.

The Bishop of Manchester (Prince Lee) was not prepared to concur in an inhibition, but wished for a declaration; the expectant country would be dissatisfied if nothing were done, and the mischief of the Bishops separating that day without some declaration would be immeasurable.

The Bishop of Rochester (Wigram), who had already put out a letter inhibiting the Bishop of Natal, in consequence of the strong representations made to him by leaders of both parties in the Church, thought that there would be general dissatisfaction if the Bishops took no action; and the Bishop of Winchester agreed in this opinion.

The Bishop of Cape Town then spoke. He said that we were fond of comparing ourselves with the primitive Church; how would it have acted if a Bishop had put forth views denying the Faith and destructive to the Bible as a revelation from God? It would undoubtedly have refused communion; and could the Church at home do less than forbid the proclamation of such views as far as lay in her power? Was it not the office of the Church and her Bishops to witness for Christ? and how could she witness for Him if she tolerated such teaching? Her own faithfulness to her Lord was in question. He believed that the mischief would be great if nothing were done—men would fall away. Moreover, how unfair it would be to the Church in Africa, to lend it no moral support in its difficulties,

to leave it to grapple, unaided, with this great evil. How would he himself be met when he brought the Bishop to trial? would he not be told that it had been published in the face of the Church at home, that it had challenged interference on the part of the Bishops; that wise and learned men had left it alone, and he should do the same? The silence of the Mother Church would incalculably weaken his hands. He thought that if the chief burden was to fall upon him, he was entitled to all the moral support that they could give him.

The Bishop of S. Asaph (Short) next spoke, saying that he thought the present assembly peculiarly qualified to deal with the question—almost every branch of our Church being represented. The Bishops did not often meet in such numbers, and in his opinion a very decided blow should be struck.

The Bishop of Oxford explained that by the terms of his resolution he wished to withhold anything like a legal opinion or judgment upon the books, and only desired to affirm that there was a scandal, and that the Bishops felt want of confidence in their brother's teaching.

After some more discussion, which was chiefly a repetition of what had been already said, the Archbishop of York proposed a declaration to the effect that the Archbishops and Bishops strongly disapproved of the book, were persuaded that it would not ultimately be permitted to injure the Church, but would be fully answered, saying that the Church of England could not deal judicially with the Bishop, which the Church in Africa alone could do.

The Bishop of S. David's still thought that any declaration must be regarded as a condemnation. He thought it undesirable for the Bishops to pledge themselves.

At last the Archbishop (having said that he felt his own proper course was to save his Diocese from the danger of such false teaching by inhibition, and that he thought it was equally the duty as regarded the whole Church; that, having listened attentively to all that his brethren had said, he remained of the same opinion as at the beginning, and it was his conviction that it was their duty, *pendente lite*, to inhibit,) put the Bishop of



Oxford's resolution, which was carried by twenty-one to six. He then put the Archbishop of York's declaration, with the result of thirteen for and thirteen against it. Nearly all were prepared to tolerate, very few heartily to accept of it. Accordingly the Bishop of Oxford moved that his resolution be adopted as that of the meeting; the Archbishop put it formally, and it was carried by twenty-five to four—the dissidents being the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of London, S. David's, and Manchester.<sup>1</sup>

The Bishops met again on February 7th, one more being present, *i.e.* the Bishop of Ripon (Bickersteth).

The Archbishop of York then objected to a joint Pastoral such as had been suggested, which, he thought, would have no weight, but urged some joint resolution or declaration. At all events the Bench must not be silent, he said emphatically, for the book was a bad one, and they were bound to say so, yet without putting themselves into a false position as probable judges upon it hereafter. He and the Bishop of London had prepared a resolution which was read, but as it only alluded to Part I. of the *Critical Examination of the Pentateuch*, the Bishop of Cape Town observed that he hoped any resolution adopted would refer to all the three volumes published by the Bishop of Natal, especially the *Commentary on the Romans*, to which the Bishop himself referred as containing a full statement of his

<sup>1</sup> The Metropolitan wrote to Dean Douglas, February 4th, 1863: "I have just come home from our great meeting about Natal. The English, Irish, and Colonial Bishops were summoned. We discussed from 11 till 3.30, and meet again on Friday. Ultimately the Bishop of Oxford's resolution, the first moved, was carried, to the effect that under the scandal caused by the publication of his books, he should be inhibited from officiating by the whole Episcopate, *pendente lite*, till he was acquitted or condemned. The opponents were, as you might suppose. . . . All wished something done, and we had four propositions before us; the points to be guarded against were the Bishops condemning before trial. It was generally understood that he could only be tried by me, but it was assumed (we did not discuss the point—Manchester raising it, however, ably) that there would be an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with such Comprovincials as he chose to call in. Exeter shone, perhaps, the most of all. I never saw the good old man to such advantage, and the deference shown to him by all was great. Oxford, of course, more powerful than any. Winchester, Lincoln, Llandaff, Salisbury, very good. Manchester not bad."

views, and which had been presented to the Metropolitan by Bishop Colenso's own Dean and Archdeacon. He had thought it his duty to refer it to the late Archbishop, who had, he believed, submitted it to the Bishops, and they had met to discuss it under the presidency of the present Archbishop. If now they were to pass a solemn formal resolution, omitting any allusion to that work, it would seem very like endorsing the views it contained.

Several Bishops, among them Salisbury and Hereford, agreed to this, and the Archbishop confirmed their opinion. The Archbishop of York then asked why the Bishops who met to discuss the book at the time referred to had come to no conclusion; to which the Bishop of London replied that he believed he was the reason. Many of the Bishops wanted them to inhibit. "I would not inhibit," he said; "I have never read the book, and I hope never to do so."

"Can we tell our people," the Bishop of Salisbury asked, "that we know a book of dangerous character has been published by one of our brethren, but that we do not mean to notice it? That book is a horrible book. Surely we ought not merely to say that we have not read it, and hope never to read it, and therefore cannot condemn it?"

"It is not my business to do so," the Bishop of London replied with much warmth,<sup>1</sup> "I have little time for reading, and when I do read, I wish to read good books. The Bishop of Natal is within the Bishop of Cape Town's jurisdiction. What business had he to refer such a book as that to the Bishops of the Church here? It was most unfair in him to have brought such a book before us." He ought to have dealt with it himself, and not have brought unfair extracts from it, which did not represent its teaching, before them. He went on to accuse the Bishop of Oxford of having also dealt unfairly about the book, and said for his own part he would deal with no book unless it obtained notoriety; the Bishops had no business to be censors of all books that were published; they had other things to do, and this book on the Romans had had no sale.

<sup>1</sup> In his notes, Bishop Gray says, "great vehemence of manner and voice."

Some Bishop here remarked that it had gone through four or five editions.

The Bishop of Oxford said that he must reply to the Bishop of London's assertion that nothing could be more unfair than the way in which he had brought this book before the Bishops last year, by stating that he had not brought it before them at all! It was the Bishop of Winchester who had done so, at the request of the late Archbishop; and he trusted to the Bishop of London's fairness to withdraw such a charge, seeing it had no foundation. Bishop Wilberforce went on to say that the Bishop of Cape Town needed no defence at his hands;—he had simply done his duty, and he (the Bishop of Oxford) believed that thereby he had rendered great service to the Church. It was not fair to say that there had been any desire to condemn the book hastily. At their first meeting some had not read it, and they adjourned for a fortnight that they might read it. (The Bishop here read an extract from his diary to this effect.)

The Bishop of London said they did not adjourn.

Several Bishops successively stated that they had adjourned, the Bishop of Winchester produced documents which proved it, and the Bishop of Llandaff held up the copy of the book in question which he had bought in consequence of the adjournment.

The Bishop of London, defeated on this point, returned to the accusation that the Metropolitan had dealt most unfairly by Bishop Colenso, that he had imputed to him opinions which he denied, that he was actuated by personal motives, and that it was very unfair to bring the *Commentary on the Romans* before the English Bishops.

Thereupon the Bishop of Oxford read the records of last year's meeting, which proved the Bishop of London equally wrong in these statements as in the last. The Bishop of Winchester next went on to express his deep regret for the utterly uncalled-for and unjust attack made upon a prelate whom they all so deeply respected. He felt that the Bishop of Cape Town had fulfilled a very painful duty in as kind and courteous a way

as possible, and that had he acted in the way pointed out by the Bishop of London, he would not have done his duty.

The Bishop of London, on pressure, said he withdrew all expressions painful to the Bishop of Cape Town, but he still begged to ask the Bishop why he had not before this proceeded against the Bishop of Natal? and why he was not doing so now? It was his duty to have taken proceedings in Cape Town. The public will ask, and the Bishops ought to do so too, why he does not proceed? The public will not be satisfied unless the Bishop of Cape Town does take legal proceedings; and the Bishop of London begged again to ask him whether it was his intention to do so?

After a few kindly words from Archbishop Longley, the Bishop of Cape Town said he felt that there was little need for him to vindicate himself after the hearty defence made on his behalf by the Bishop of Winchester, and the withdrawal of offensive expressions on the part of the Bishop of London.

Here that prelate interrupted to say that he did not withdraw them as regarded the fairness of the charges against the Bishop of Natal.

In that case, the Bishop of Cape Town said, he must enter into a vindication of himself, and state the facts, which were these:—A book was published by a Bishop of his Province, which had had a considerable sale, and which, in his judgment, contained teaching contrary to the Faith, and at variance with the acknowledged formularies of the Church of England. He had to consider how he was to deal with it, and the conclusion to which he came was, that, considering the novelty and gravity of the occasion—a Bishop committing himself to false teaching in some of the most fundamental points of the Faith;—considering also the fact that the Church in Africa was an infant Church, and not possessed of the learning, experience, and wisdom which the Church at home enjoyed; and considering the relation in which he himself stood to the Archbishop of Canterbury, both by the terms of his letters patent, and through the patriarchal character of that See;—it was his duty, especially amid the uncertainties which beset the whole question of jurisdiction (which at that very hour was under discussion

before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council), to lay the whole matter before the Fathers of the Church of England through the Archbishop of Canterbury.

He therefore did this, and received the late Archbishop's thanks for so doing. While so doing he had not done what the Bishop of London still charged him with doing—he had not attacked the Bishop of Natal, still less had he acted towards him in any unkind spirit, or on personal grounds; and he was quite sure that the Bishop of Natal himself was no party to such a charge. They had lived together for nearly nine years as brethren in most affectionate intercourse. What he had done was to submit to his Grace the book that had been published, and with it a correspondence which he had had with the Bishop on the subject. That correspondence was in their Lordships' possession, and would speak for itself. If in writing to the Bishop he had in any way misapprehended his views, there were the Bishop's explanations at hand. Nothing, he believed, could be fairer than to submit the whole, keeping back nothing, to the Church at home; he might add that the Bishop of Natal was himself a party to this course, and wished the correspondence to go home. He would only add, that if he had dealt with this case without seeking that counsel which apparently most of the Bishops thought him entitled to ask, and had given freely and kindly, he should justly have been exposed to those animadversions which had been bestowed upon him. As to the Bishop of London's question, What he meant to do? he would do his best to reply, although that was no secret, and had already been a subject of conversation between them. At present he could do nothing, and months might pass before he could do anything. The book was published here in the Bishop of London's jurisdiction, not in the Bishop of Cape Town's, and he was advised by eminent lawyers that until its sale in Cape Town could be proved, he could not act. Even then, some one must promote his office in Africa; he could not be both judge and accuser. As soon as this was done, he hoped that he would not be found wanting in his duty. He should then cite the Bishop to appear before him, to answer to the charges brought against him. Probably he would not appear; but

would deny the Metropolitan's jurisdiction. But that would not deter him; the trial would still proceed. Further he could not go. He had a very difficult and delicate duty to perform, and it was a great comfort to know that in discharging it he had the sympathy of so many of the Bishops and of the Church at large.

The Archbishop of York went back to the Inhibition, which he said he was quite willing to accept, but he wanted the Bishops also to sign his Declaration. The Bishop of Lincoln said that he must be included in the Bishop of London's charge of injustice to the Bishop of Natal, for he had taken an oath to banish and drive away all false doctrine, and thought what had been done was in accordance with his vows. His objection to the Archbishop of York's declaration was, that it was a very feeble one. He did not think it could have any effect either on Bishop Colenso himself, or on those who were looking to the English Bishops to speak their mind. But if his brethren wished, he would sign it. The Bishop of S. David's declined with much disapproval to sign it, and entered at length into the question of refutation. (The Declaration contained a hope that the book would be satisfactorily refuted.) He did not think it would be ably refuted; and referring to some of the recent refutations of *Essays and Reviews*, implied that there were very few people capable of writing such refutations. After some good-humoured sparring between himself and the Bishop of Oxford, Bishop Thirlwall proceeded to say that no one could entertain a stronger opinion than himself that the position of the Bishop of Natal was utterly untenable; it was absolutely impossible that he could remain in the Church of England. Perhaps that was why he felt so little anxiety on the subject. He would let the Church and people generally know what the Bishop of Natal's real opinions are, and what his principles, when developed, would lead to. His book had revived old difficulties—perhaps in some degree strengthened them; but the amount of mischief which it did would depend upon the state of mind in which it was read. It was impossible that there ever could be a perfectly satisfactory reply to such a book. It was full of dogmatizing on points upon which

it was impossible to have clear views. One of its great weaknesses consisted in the author's not reading between the lines of Scripture. There was much in so concise a document which needed to be filled up, and he resolutely refused to do this. There was not, the Bishop of S. David's affirmed, the slightest divergency of opinion between himself and his brethren as to the character of the book. This he repeated several times.

The Bishop of London having spoken again, the Bishop of S. Asaph remarked that he was sorry for this recurrence to the Bishop of Cape Town's intentions. He was surrounded with difficulties, and had a right to ask for his brethren's counsel, and they were bound to do what they could to help him.

The Bishop of Oxford now rose, and, after saying that it was impossible for him to sign the Archbishop of York's Declaration, and that he was constrained to urge all his brethren to weigh the matter well before they signed, he "burst forth," says the Bishop of Cape Town, "into one of the most eloquent speeches I have ever heard from him, which was all the more remarkable from its being addressed, not to a popular assembly, but to thirty grave Bishops met together to consider a matter of the deepest moment to the Church. It made a great impression."<sup>1</sup>

In this speech the Bishop of Oxford pronounced the Declaration as either too weak or too strong. If it meant to condemn the book, it was, he said, infinitely weak. Here was a book published in the face of the whole Church by one of our own order, which declared the Bible to be false and fictitious, which left us without anything to rest our faith upon, which proclaimed God's Inspired Word to be a book stamped with conscious falsehood: and we, the Bishops of the Church, met together to consider that book, to warn the Church against it, and protect weak brethren from its assertions, told them that we viewed the book with "strong disapprobation." Was that the language which the Bishops of the Church, the witnesses for Christ, the keepers of the oracles of God, the guardians of

<sup>1</sup> "Wilberforce made a wonderful speech in defence of the Bible, and in assertion of the duty of the Bishops of the Church in opposition to ——'s indifference," Bishop Gray wrote to his friend, Mr. Boyd of Arncliffe.

the faith, were to use under such circumstances? "*Strong disapprobation!*" We strongly disapproved of many things far less heinous than this! The language was all too feeble for the occasion. Would the Church of Rome, would conscientious dissenters, use such? If the Church had no stronger measure of condemnation, that would happen of which there was already danger, and men would seek for the defence and maintenance of the faith in other folds. He entreated his brethren, if they were to use the language of condemnation, not to be led into the adoption of words so utterly below the gravity of the occasion.

On the other hand, the Bishop went on to say, if there was to be no condemnation until Natal had been tried, the Declaration was too strong, for it condemned him, though feebly. He alluded to the Bishop of S. Davids' able remarks as to the difficulty of replying to this sort of attack, the impossibility of explaining every difficulty that might be started, and refuting every objection, however weak, owing to the fact that Holy Scripture contained but a short abstract of history, and did not enter into details or give explanations. And then, referring to what Bishop Thirlwall had said with reference to the Bishop of Natal's position, Bishop Wilberforce observed, that if, as it appeared, they all felt that it was his duty to resign—(hear, hear)—then, clearly, if he would not do so, it was their plain duty, as far as lay in their power, to prevent his officiating; and he thought the Archbishop's Declaration would weaken rather than strengthen the position the Bishops had taken up in the assertion of discipline. It was unmeaning. He then dwelt most earnestly and powerfully on their duty to banish and drive away all false doctrine.

The Archbishop of York defended his Declaration hesitatingly, after the power, so peculiarly his own, with which the Bishop of Oxford had set forth its weakness. Some discussion, joined in by several Bishops, took place; and at last the Bishop of Salisbury asked if they could not all join in a stronger Declaration? To this the Archbishop emphatically said No! He liked his own, and in the same way the Bishop of Oxford naturally liked best the address *he* had prepared;



whereupon the latter exclaimed: "Can any one for a moment suppose that, in a matter of such deep importance, one could care whose the production was?"

The Bishops of Down and Montreal spoke, the latter affirming that to his mind the greatest scandal of all was that such books should be published and no judicial proceedings against the author as yet instituted. To this the Bishop of Oxford replied that he believed the Bishop of London might proceed to-morrow. He might bring the Bishop of Natal into the Archbishop's Court as a Priest of the Church of England. If he saw fit he might bring all his teaching to a legal issue at once. He did not say that it *ought* to be done, but merely that it *could*.

The Archbishop of York laid his Declaration upon the table, and the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed his opinion that they were now in a position to consider the subject of a pastoral letter; but the Bishop of London maintained he could sign no Pastoral which was not written by himself, and, on further urging from some of his brethren, he repeated this as his fixed determination, and prepared to withdraw. Some altercation respecting his own individual line took place, in which the Bishops of Oxford, Winchester, Salisbury, and Norwich, etc., took part; and at length the Bishop of S. Asaph (Short) rose, and, with great emotion, reminded his brethren that they had begun their sitting with prayer for the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, which he believed to be with them; but that if they suffered themselves to wax warm, that Blessed Spirit would depart from them. All present really believed the Bishop of London was as opposed as they were to the Bishop of Natal's views, and he was quite mistaken in supposing that any one meant to impute to him any sympathy with them. He (the Bishop of S. Asaph) believed that, with the exception of the Bishop of Chichester, he was the oldest Bishop present, and he invited Bishop Gilbert to join with him in asking the President to offer up prayers before any more was said. He begged to propose "that they should fall to prayer."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> " \* . . . grew so violent that S. Asaph rose up with great emotion, told us we were in danger of losing the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and called us to prayer. It was a very remarkable scene." (Letter to the Rev. W. Boyd, February 23rd, 1863.)

S. David's. Neither did the Bishop of Cape Town sign it—not of course, from dissenting in any way to it, but as a matter of delicacy considering his relation to the Bishop of Natal.

The letter was as follows:—

“To the Right Rev. T. W. COLENSO, D.D., Lord Bishop of Natal.

“We, the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, address you with deep brotherly anxiety, as one who shares with us the grave responsibilities of the Episcopal office.

“It is impossible for us to enter here into argument with you as to your method of handling that Bible which we believe to be the Word of God, and on the truth of which rest all our hopes for eternity. Nor do we here raise the question whether you are legally entitled to retain your present office and position in the Church, complicated, moreover, as that question is by the fact of your being a Bishop of the Church in South Africa, now at a distance from your Diocese and province.

“But we feel bound to put before you another view of the case. We understand you to say (Part II. p. xxiii. of your *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*) that you do not now believe that which you voluntarily professed to believe as the indispensable condition of your being intrusted with your present office. We understand you also to say that you have entertained and have not abandoned the conviction that you could not use the Ordination Service, inasmuch as in it you ‘must require from others a solemn declaration that they unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,’ which, with the evidence now before you, ‘it is impossible wholly to believe in’ (Part I. p. xii.) And we understand you further to intimate that those who think with you are precluded from using the Baptismal Service, and consequently (as we must infer) other offices of the Prayer-book, unless they omit all such passages as assume the truth of the Mosaic history (Part II. p. xxii.) Now it cannot have escaped you that the inconsistency between the office you hold and the opinions you avow is causing great pain and grievous scandal