

After this a few friendly explanations were given, and the Bishop of Derry proposed that, as all sought the same end, though they differed as to the best means, they should appoint a Committee to prepare a document which all might sign. The Archbishop pressed this, feeling the importance of unanimity, and after some further discussion that course was agreed upon, the Archbishop remarking that this was the last attempt to secure united action, and he earnestly asked God to prosper it.

A few days later the Bishops met again, and the Archbishop read the letter which had been prepared by the Committee, calling upon the Bishop of Natal to resign his office. There was a good deal of discussion as to the precise wording of this letter, and its phraseology was here and there altered; but finally it was adopted and signed by forty-one of the Bishops present,¹ the only dissident being the Bishop of

¹ The Prelates who signed were —

| | |
|---|---|
| C. T. Cantuar. (Longley). | John T. Norwich (Pelham). |
| W. Ebor. (Thomson). | J. C. Bangor (Campbell). |
| Marcus G. Armagh (Beresford). | J. C. Rochester (Wigram). |
| Whately Rd. Dublin (Trench). | Samuel Carlisle (Waldegrave). |
| A. C. London (Tait). | H. Worcester (Philpott). |
| C. Dunelm. (Baring). | Horace Sodor and Man (Powys). |
| C. R. Winton (Sumner). | Joseph H. Meath (Singer). |
| H. Exeter (Phillipotts). | Plunket Tuam. |
| A. T. Cicestn. (Gilbert). | J. T. Ossory and Ferns (O'Brien). |
| J. Lichfield (Lonsdale). | Robert Cashel (Daly). |
| T. Ely (Turton). | Robert Down and Connor and Dromore (Knox). |
| S. Oxon (Wilberforce). | William Derry and Raphoe (Higgin). |
| Thos. Vowler S. Asaph (Short). | John Cork, Cloyne, and Ross (Gregg). |
| J. P. Manchester (Prince Lee). | H. Kilmore (Verschoyle). |
| J. Chester (Graham). | F. Montreal (Fulford). |
| A. Llandaff (Ollivant). | F. Sydney (Barker). |
| John Lincoln (Jackson). | F. R. Tasmania (Nixon). |
| W. K. Sarum (Hamilton). | Anthony G. Jamaica (Skinner). |
| Auckland, Bath, and Wells (Lord Auckland). | G. T. Spencer, late Madras. |
| R. Ripon (Bickersteth). | J. Chapman, Bishop. |

The *Guardian* of March 4th, 1863, had authority to state that the Bishop of Hereford (Hampden) wished his name to be added to the list. Bishop Davys, of Peterborough, was absent, and Dr. Ellicott had not yet been consecrated to Gloucester and Bristol.

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

to the Church. And we solemnly ask you to consider once more with the most serious attention, whether you can, without harm to your own conscience, retain your position when you can no longer discharge its duties, or use the formularies to which you have subscribed. We will not abandon the hope that, through earnest prayer and deeper study of God's Word, you may, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, be restored to a state of belief in which you may be able with a clear conscience again to discharge the duties of your sacred office;—a result which, from regard to your highest interests, we should welcome with unfeigned satisfaction.—We are your faithful brethren in Christ," etc. etc.

The circumstances of these meetings, and the signatures affixed to this letter, are all-important facts with respect to later events, and to the difficulties and opposition which were to be the almost ceaseless trial of the remainder of the Bishop of Cape Town's life.

It is needless to say here that the Bishop of Natal did not comply with the advice given by his Episcopal brethren;¹ and on February 11th, 1863, the subject of his writings was brought before the Lower House of Convocation, when a motion was moved by Archdeacon Denison, seconded by Dr. M'Caul,

¹ In a letter from Archbishop Longley to the Bishop of Oxford, dated Lambeth Palace, March 6th, 1863, His Grace says: "You will see that Bishop Colenso's reply has soon appeared. He blinks the real question, and chooses to presume that we hinted at his giving up, not his Diocese, but his Episcopal Commission.

"In a letter to me he complains bitterly of the want of sympathy on the part of the Bishops when he came to England. But we offered, as you know, to confer with him, and, as you know, he declined the interview; and surely the tone and spirit of his books are such as to repel rather than invite sympathy."

On March 23rd, 1863, the Archbishop sent a Circular to all the Bishops, to this effect:—

"Lambeth Palace, March 23rd, 1863.

"My dear Lord—I herewith forward to you a copy of the Resolution to which you gave your assent at the meeting in the beginning of February. I wish to inform you that I am myself about to act in it.—I am, my dear Lord, yours very faithfully,
C. T. CANTUAR."

"RESOLUTION.—That, having regard to the grievous scandal to the Church occasioned by certain books published under the name of the Bishop of Natal, and not disavowed by him, we, the undersigned, express our own resolution not to allow the said Bishop to minister in the Word or Sacraments within our several Dioceses until the said Bishop shall have cleared himself from such scandal."

and carried, that the standing orders be postponed in order to the moving of an address, praying the Upper House to direct the appointment of a Committee to examine Bishop Colenso's book on the Pentateuch, and to report whether any, and if so, what opinions, heretical or erroneous in doctrine, it contained.

A discussion of some length ensued, begun by the Archdeacon, who set before the House the two grounds on which his resolution was founded—*i.e.* that the book in question denied the truth of Holy Scripture, and impugned the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Archdeacon observed that he did not anticipate any great amount of serious objection, for it seemed to him that they could not come there to do the business of the Church of England, and pass by such a book as this written in the Church of England, which denied such vital truths, and which was published in London, the centre of the civilised world and of the Province of Canterbury, which those present claimed to represent on the part of the Clergy. Dr. M'Caul said that the book had, to his knowledge, done great injury already among candidates for Holy Orders. He quoted Bishop Colenso's own assertion that, if his principles prevailed, in five years there would not be an intelligent young man from any of the Universities offering himself to be ordained, unless a change was made in the doctrines of the Church of England. "If we love the souls of the people and the Church which we have inherited, I hope we shall elevate our voice in the condemnation of this book."

Some feeble opposition was raised by one or two speakers of no great weight, after which Professor Harold Browne proposed an amendment, which was seconded by the Dean of Canterbury, affecting not the principle of opposition, but the manner of carrying it out. The Rev. J. Fendall, Rev. J. Bramston, Canon Woodgate, Dr. Jebb, the Rev. H. Mackenzie, Chancellor Masingberd, Canon Selwyn, and the Rev. C. E. Kennaway, the Rev. Mr. Mayow and Professor Jeremie, spoke, all at one as to the noxious character of the book, after which Archdeacon Denison's original motion was carried.

The resolution was sent to the Upper House on February

13th, and a debate of some duration also took place there, begun by the Bishop of London, who, after speaking at very great length, and with various references to the course adopted with respect to *Essays and Reviews*, ended by objecting to accept the proposal of the Lower House. The Bishop of St. David's spoke next, also alluding to that recently censured book, and pointing out the difference between Bishop Colenso and the authors thereof. "He is not, like these authors, a Bishop or a Clergyman who sincerely, however mistakenly, believes that his views are consistent with the doctrines of the Church of England, but he has expressly declared that the difference between his views and those doctrines is so great that, unless they should be brought to coincide by a movement which he expects, but which is still, to say the least of it, in the uncertainty of the future, it will be impossible for him to retain his office and position in the Church;" and on the ground (as expressed in a resolution which he brought forward) that Bishop Colenso's "ecclesiastical position will soon become untenable," he likewise opposed the course proposed by the Lower House.

The Bishop of Llandaff proposed a resolution to accede to that course in these words:—

"That the Upper House, having received a request from the Lower House of Convocation as to a book, etc. . . . and thinking fit to comply with the same, request that his Grace the President be requested to direct the Lower House to appoint a committee to examine the said book:" This was seconded by the Bishop of Lincoln, and carried by three to two—these two Bishops and S. Asaph voting for it, the Bishops of London and S. David's against it. The President remarked, when this was done, that to have refused would have seemed to him something like stifling inquiry.

The Committee delivered their report in the May following. It contained a brief analysis of the book, condemning its teaching and declaring that it contained "errors of the gravest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God;" and that "the spirit of the book is not

that of sympathy with the faith and the hopes of the Church of Christ, but of antagonism to the general belief of Christian people."

The Lower House having forwarded this report to the Upper House, it was there taken into consideration, and the following resolutions were adopted:—

"I. That the said book does, in our judgment, involve errors of the most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God.

"II. That this House, having reason to believe that the book in question will shortly be submitted to the judgment of an Ecclesiastical Court, declines to take further action in this matter at this time; but that we affectionately warn those who may not be able to read the published and convincing answers to the work which have already appeared, of its dangerous character."

Meanwhile Bishop Gray had returned to Africa. Before leaving England he left directions as to the presentment of the Bishop of Natal which was to be expected, desiring that the advice of the Queen's Advocate, R. Phillimore, might be closely followed, and directing that, as he was altogether unable to pay the legal expenses of these matters out of his income, stock should be sold for that purpose. The Metropolitan, accompanied by Bishop Tozer and others, reached the Cape April 11th. The following letter alludes to the voyage:—

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, April 18th, 1863.

"My dearest Charlie—Your mother will have given you a better account of our proceedings hitherto than I can do; we were very weary of the voyage. I was not at all idle, and worked up a good deal of reading. The Bishop and Arch-deacon (Thomas) made miserable sailors, and most of the officiating fell to me. We like them both very much. The Bishop bids fair to be driven into *puris naturalibus* in Central Africa. He has hardly any clothes, and only had two flannel shirts. . . He sails on Monday with all his party¹ in the 'Orestes.' I

¹ Among these was Dr. Steere, recently (1874) consecrated Bishop of Central Africa.

have had my hands full with his affairs since my arrival. Reaching home on Saturday evening, on Sunday I preached with reference to Colenso in the Cathedral; on Monday went down to the Admiral at Simon's Town to arrange about a ship. Last night we had a public meeting to welcome the Central African party, and bid them farewell, and all the week a house full. We found all our dear ones well, thank God, though Louisa looks and seems feeble. The Government has recalled Livingstone's expedition, but I hope that he will have got half his ship up the falls and be unable to leave. . . . The Clergy have prepared articles against Colenso. I shall probably cite him to a trial in November, making a Visitation of the Diocese in the interim."

Addresses were presented to the Metropolitan both by his own immediate Clergy and those of Natal respecting the painful matter of Bishop Colenso. "The case has been attentively considered by us," they said; "and while we are anxious that the proper steps should be taken to test the soundness of the opinions which the Bishop of Natal has published, and their compatibility with the retention of his high office, we are also prepared to take the share which belongs to us in giving efficacy to the Church's power of discipline, and putting her laws in force." In the Bishop's reply, after speaking of the new Bishops sent to the African field, and other local matters, he said concerning Bishop Colenso: "The affliction is a very heavy one, the reproach great. You are aware that the subject has engaged the earnest attention of the Church at home; that the Lower House of Convocation has taken the matter up; and that the Bishops, though unable to bring to a formal trial a Bishop belonging to a distant jurisdiction, have nevertheless called upon him, as brethren, to resign an office which in their judgment he ought no longer to retain. From a Cape paper I learn that he declines to do so. The Bishops will therefore very generally issue the inhibition upon which they had previously agreed. . . . You intimate your intention of bringing the teaching which he has put forth to the test of

a formal trial. I need scarce say that if, after full consideration of the subject, you still feel that you ought to frame articles against the Bishop, and present him for his writings, I shall feel it my painful duty to cite him to appear before myself and such other Bishops of this wide-spread province as can be gathered together, to answer the charges brought against him."

The Clergy of Natal "most humbly besought their Metropolitan's attention to the afflicted state of the Church among them," representing how much hurt had been done among souls by their Bishop's teaching. "Some had been shaken in the faith; others, wearied or perplexed, had grown cold, and turned aside to serve this present world." Bishop Gray alludes to this and his other pressing anxieties in the following letters:—

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, May 13th, 1863.

"My dearest boy—I seize a few quiet moments in the vestry¹ to write to you, as I have no time at home from press of work. To-morrow is Ascension Day; on Friday we go to D'Urban, Malmesbury, Paarl, etc., and do not return till the mail has left. I have been distracted since my return by unceasing demands for money, greatly owing to the distressed state of the country. If I were a Croesus, they would make me bankrupt! Yesterday we had the annual examination of the Kafirs; if you were as well crammed as they were with historical facts, you would be pretty safe! They were bristling with facts in English History from the Romans down to George III., especially the Wars of the Roses and Blenheim's Campaigns. The Clergy here have brought their charges against the Bishop of Natal for false doctrine, and I send them home by this mail. In August I calculate upon starting for a three months' Visitation. I hope that you are taking steadily

¹ He used to take a piece of bread or a bun with him to the vestry for luncheon, and regularly fed the mice with the crumbs. He would put up his finger in warning as some one came in noisily, saying, "Hush! don't frighten away my little mice!"

to work after your ten days' fishing ; but keep up your exercise. What an animal you are ! I don't think that you ever win a prize for anything but gymnastics ! The College here has got its buildings up, and they look tolerably well. There never was before so efficient a staff of teachers connected with any educational establishment in South Africa. I trust that it will rise more and more ; but the Oxford young men are really without any definite views, and partake of the general laxity of opinion caused by Jowett and Stanley. There is nothing *positive* in their minds. In the Free State there is a move towards re-absorption in the Colony ; they are beginning to petition for it. We have heard nothing from Bishop Tozer and his party since they left. Livingstone is recalled, but I do not believe that he will come back. I like the vignette picture of you better than any other, and fancy that I see a resemblance to your venerable Governor ! I have been interrupted about six times while writing these few lines, so you will not be surprised that they are somewhat disconnected.—Ever, my dearest boy (with another interruption), your affectionate father,

“ R. CAPETOWN.”

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

“ May 15th, 1863.

“ Within an hour we are off on a short Visitation which I am compelled to make, to look after parishes which, during my absence, have been going to the bad. The country is half bankrupt, and I have scarce done anything else than try to defend (not always with success) my hard-earned pittance. One parish to which I gave £50 just before I left, to help half the expense of turning a building into two schoolrooms, spends £288 and sends the whole bill to me ! . . . Another writes to say that minister and two parishioners gave a bond for £160 debt upon the Church ; the lender is now bankrupt, and they are called to pay ; they cannot, will I ? Another wants me to lend them on their bond (worth nothing), £400, to build a parsonage. Another, do. ; another to build a mission school and chapel. Clergy in debt in several quarters owing to last year's famine

prices and their own indiscretion. In other quarters last winter's heavy rains brought down our Mission buildings; in others, lands bought for Mission stations are bringing in no return; and so I might go on. I hate all this work most thoroughly; but what is to be done? My life is spent in serving tables. The Government deficiency is about £90,000 this year—bankruptcies abound. Parliament, asked to impose taxes, shows a determination to refuse. I am citing Colenso by this mail to appear and take his trial on November 17th. . . Through Brooks, I offer him my house at Kalk Bay. If the Privy Council give a right judgment, everything in Africa will go well. If not, I dread the collisions with P. C. and others, into which, perhaps, I shall be driven. I feel very strongly that duty to Christ forbids our allowing any Civil Court to constitute itself the recognised Court of Appeal in things spiritual. Well—'sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.' I can write by this mail to no one else. But love to all near and dear to us. Many years of happiness to the younger Essex, who, I suppose, will by this time be married.—Ever, dear Edward, your affectionate brother,

R. CAPETOWN."

TO CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, June 12th, 1863.

. . . "We have just had sad news from the Zambesi. Dear Scudamore, the flower of the party, has been called away; he died January 1st.¹ A fearful famine, the result of a severe drought, has spread over the land, reaching up to Lake Nyassa, and nearly depopulated it. There are bodies floating down the river daily, and the inhabitants of the villages are either starving or dead.

¹ In a letter dated "Chibisa's, January 23rd, 1863, Dr. Dickenson (the physician attached to the Universities Mission) says: "Our much loved brother, the Rev. H. C. Scudamore, was attacked with fever on December 18th. . . . on the 31st, I saw that all hope was gone. He gradually sank, and died January 1st, 1863. I may mention that his health was considerably impaired during the dry season from repeated attacks of fever. The great heat of October and November, and the want of nourishing food, affected him considerably. The absence of flour and wine, and a limited supply of animal food, has affected all of us, and the general physical condition of the party has suffered materially from that cause and the effects of climate." See *Guardian* for July 23rd, 1863.

Their own supply of animal food has quite failed them; our letters of February 24th last say they had only one goat and six fowls left. They had come to the conclusion that if help and animal food did not reach them before June 15th, they must quit the country. It is impossible to say whether the Bishop will reach the Station before they have left. We shall do what we can to send them up food; the Bishop, of course, took a considerable supply with him. He will have an anxious and difficult work before him. On his arrival at Mozambique or Quillimane, he may find them all there. The Diocese of Natal is now addressing me and its Bishop on the subject of his delinquencies. He will find his Clergy repudiating his authority if ever he should go back to the country. Some say outright that they will not worship with him. . . . I hope, my dearest boy, soon to hear that you have got through your additional work and taken your degree, and are thinking seriously of the great work of life, and what God would have you at least attempt to do for Him.—Ever your affectionate father,
 “R. CAPETOWN.”

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

“Bishop’s Court, June 14th, 1863.

. . . “I have no alternative but to go on with the Natal case; I *must* hear charges against him, and act according to the best of my judgment, but I have no intention of ever going again in a spiritual cause before the Civil Courts. I will wield spiritual weapons only. Not that I think I did wrong in pleading before them in Long’s case. But I then laid down principles by which, I think, I shall abide let the Privy Council decision be what it may. Some of the Clergy of Natal have addressed me in a document which will be published, together with a reply from me, in which I state, historically, the course adopted by them and myself in former cases. Others have addressed the Bishop protesting against his course in claiming to hold office after his avowal, and have forwarded a copy of their address to me. The working up of this case is very laborious. I must do it before I leave for Visitation, and I have

but little time. We have not near worked up arrears yet. You can hardly conceive the kind of appeals made to me almost daily for help from Clergy and laity. The drought, dearth, and poverty of the country are causing very great distress, and it quite makes me miserable to be persecuted as I am. It is easy to polish off mere strangers, but most of these are men with whom I have been connected. . . . I have been threatened again with sleepless nights, from the pressure of anxieties."

The Articles of Accusation alluded to (which are lengthy, and will be found in the Appendix) consisted of extracts from the Bishop of Natal's writings, placed in parallel columns with passages from those formularies of the Church which they were alleged to contravene. They were presented to the Metropolitan with the following letter:—

"To the Most Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D., Lord Bishop of Cape Town, and Metropolitan.

"My Lord—We, the undersigned, being Clerks in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, and having cure of souls within the Province of Cape Town, under your Lordship's metropolitan jurisdiction, constrained by a sense of duty to the Church within which we hold office, desire to lay before you a charge of false teaching on the part of the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Lord Bishop of Natal, and a Suffragan Bishop of this Province. The charge which we bring is founded upon certain extracts from writings published and put forth by the Bishop, entitled, etc. etc.

"These extracts are contained in nine schedules, and a copy is hereto annexed, numbered from I. to IX. inclusive. I. With respect to the eight, all and each of them, which stand first, we charge the Bishop of Natal with holding and promulgating opinions which contravene and subvert the Catholic Faith, as defined and expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles, and the formularies of the Book of Common Prayer. And accordingly, under each schedule of extracts we have placed . . . that which we are persuaded those extracts contravene. II.

With respect to the extracts in Schedule IX., we charge the Bishop of Natal with depraving, impugning, and bringing otherwise into disrepute, the Book of Common Prayer, particularly portions of the Ordinal and Baptismal Services, and in so doing of violating the law of the United Church of England and Ireland, as contained in the thirty-sixth of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical. We are deeply conscious of the gravity of these charges, as brought against one who holds the office of a Bishop, and of the responsibility we incur in making them; but the scandal which these publications have caused, and the feelings which are entertained regarding them by the Clergy of the Province generally, seemed imperatively to require that we should lay them before your Lordship, and ask for your judgment upon the doctrines which are therein maintained.

“It only remains for us to inform your Lordship that we are prepared, if required, to prove the charges which we bring; and further, to request that an opportunity may be afforded us of proving them in such time and in such manner as your Lordship may see fit to appoint.

“Dated at Cape Town the 6th, and at Graham’s Town the 12th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1863. We are, my Lord, your Lordship’s faithful servants,

“H. A. DOUGLAS, Dean of Cape Town.

“N. J. MERRIMAN, Archdeacon of Graham’s Town.

“H. BADNALL, Archdeacon of George, and Rector of S. Mark’s, George Town.

The responsibility, moral and material, weighed heavily on Bishop Gray, as the following letters will show—

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

“Bishop’s Court, July 20th, 1863.

“My dear Edward—Many thanks for your offer to do anything about expenses, *in re* Colenso; but I do not see what is to be done. I am already committed to Brooks, Baddely, and Sir R. Phillimore, and I have had to tell Bishop Welby, who

pleads inability to bear the cost of coming, that I will be responsible. I shall have to do the same with the Bishop of the Free State; in addition to the hardship of having to return after having been only a month in his Diocese, he will not be able to bear the expense.

“I have mentioned to the Bishop of Oxford that the law expenses *in re* Long have been very heavy, and that I am behind-hand with the world, and if he thinks anything can be done, I am sure he will do it; but if not, I do not care. I cannot make offerings or bear sacrifices in a better cause, and I would willingly go into a cottage if I could, and let my house, or do anything else (for that would be no act of self-denial) to meet these expenses, be they what they may. I believe that we cannot overestimate the importance of this case. If he is tolerated, the Church has no faith, is not a true witness to her Lord. I am prepared to go through anything and endure any loss in defence of the Bible as the Word of God, and of the Faith once for all delivered. I count it a privilege to do so, therefore do not be uneasy about me. The struggle is only just beginning; it will, I foresee in many ways, be full of difficulties. All that I care for is for discernment to see my way aright, and faithfulness to do my duty. Pray that I may have wisdom and courage. There will probably be occasions during and after the trial when I shall be called to act at a critical moment, without much time for thought. I fear this more than anything else, lest at such times I should compromise a great cause, and give a handle to the adversary. However, I shall have the support, God be praised, of *all* the Clergy of our six South African Dioceses. Our names have been cast out these many years for evil by the *Record* and its admirers: it will soon be seen that there is not one among us but what is ready to contend to our last breath for God's Word, and the Faith of the Church which we have sworn to maintain.

If any one is to suffer for Natal, I ought to do so. I was a main instrument in bringing him out here, trusting too implicitly to the judgment of others. But enough of this.”

To the Rev. Dr. WILLIAMSON.

“ Bishop’s Court, July 20th, 1863.

. . . “ I am in for the trial of Natal, and I fear for heavy expenses. Bishop Welby writes word that he fears he cannot come, though most anxious to do so, mainly on the score of expense. . . . It seems to me that the burden and responsibility of dealing with this case rests upon me, and that I may not shrink from it. I should regard myself as a traitor to Christ and His Church, if upon any personal ground whatever I declined the contest to which I am called. The Church of England is no true branch of the Church of Christ, nor is her South African daughter, if either allows one of her Bishops to teach what Natal teaches, and to ordain others to teach the same. If the Faith is committed to us as a deposit, we must keep it at all hazards; and if the world and the courts of the world tell us that we have no power, we must use the power which Christ has given us, and cut off from Him and from His Church avowed heretics, and call upon the faithful to hold no communion with them. We need, I am sure, in these days to ponder well the warnings of our Lord in the Apocalypse to the Seven Churches of Asia. God be praised, not a single Clergyman of any one of the now six Dioceses of this Province sympathises with the Bishop or his views. I believe two holding secular offices in institutions founded by Governor Childe . . . in some measure do. Some laity here and in Natal do,—some have given up attending church since his book was published.”

In a letter of the same date to his son, Bishop Gray speaks in greater detail of the difficulties he was placed in through the great expenses in which he was involved, and the personal economies necessary, even to his wife “going without articles of dress which she really needs.” And writing to Dr. Williamson (November 12th) he says: “Brooks has written to ask me to draw up an appeal for subscriptions!!! I am not going to send my hat round. If the Church feels that mine is a common burden, and ought not to be borne by me alone, well. If not, I shall feel honoured in being called to make this sacrifice in vindication of my Lord’s Person and His Truth.”

His departure on Visitation was delayed owing to Bishop Twells not having arrived by the July mail. While waiting to start on the deferred journey in August, he wrote the following letter to his son, who was just leaving Oxford :—

To CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

“ Bishop’s Court, August 13th, 1863.

“ My dearest boy—I must try to write to you before the mail comes in with Bishop Twells, for when it does, I shall have my hands full, with Colenso, Long, the Bishop himself, etc., for this is Thursday, and I leave for three months’ Visitation on Monday.

“ As the time draws near for you to decide upon Cuddesden or Wells, I have been naturally weighing the matter continually. I confess that my mind is still in the same state as to what is best for you. Though I have not the least desire, my dearest boy, to force your inclination, I think that I should do wrong if I did not tell you what, weighing the matter only with a view to your good, I think would be for the best. I confess that, forming the best judgment that I am able to do, my opinion of Wells is,—that its present chief benefit is from the contemplation of the life and the receiving the counsel of its excellent Principal. It seems to me to want system, and to be deficient in discipline. I believe that you want both of these, and that you would get more of them at Cuddesden than at Wells. The temptation of Oxford to men at Cuddesden I think you over-rate; and if it be a temptation, it is one which it were well to meet bravely at once. The positive advantages of Cuddesden I regard as arising—I. From the greater discipline of the life there. II. From the probable advantage to you in your future life, not in the way of advancement so much as in other ways, of becoming in any degree well known to the Bishop of Oxford. I am sure that, if for my sake alone, he would take an interest in you, and that interest would show itself in your after-life in much thought for you, when perhaps you were least aware of it. It would be a great comfort to me if I lived some years, and you were, as you wish to be, in Eng-

land, to know that my dear friend had you in his eye, and saw something of you ; and I think as years roll on, if he and you were spared, you would feel the benefit of it too. It would, I think, really distress him if my son deliberately went away from under his wing. As to Cuddesden men being marked men, I do not believe that it is so, except in a good way, by the most devoted Bishops, and the men of the highest stamp within the Church. Though hating party spirit myself, and having as little taste for Romanisers as for sceptics, I have never through life cared whether people called me a party man or not, and I would advise you to do the same. Do what you believe to be right, and cling to the right, let who will gainsay. Having said thus much, I will leave you to decide for yourself, only begging you to weigh the matter thoroughly, and with prayer for guidance, and then to make arrangements for going to one or the other after Christmas." . . .

Bishop Twells and his Mission party arrived, and remained at Bishop's Court a few days, taking their departure on August 20th, when the Metropolitan started on his Visitation. The same mail brought out the Privy Council's Judgment *in re Long*, the Bishop's reception of which has already been mentioned. It was not a convenient moment in which to leave home ; but personal convenience never weighed a moment with Bishop Gray, and he was soon as actively employed in the daily toil and duty of the Visitation as if there were no other claim upon his time and thoughts. Travelling was not all smooth work yet, as the following extract from one of Mrs. Gray's letters to her son will show.

"Knysna, September 11, 1863.

. . . "We went by Worcester, and had cold weather there—snow on the mountains ; Robertson, Swellendam, to Riversdale, as fast as we could, in ten days—about 240 miles ; then to George, where there was an Ordination ; so we stayed five days with the Badnalls. . . . We were not very well off for horses ; poor old Ceres, whom I used to ride, was fit only to carry the bags, being very unsafe on her legs . . . and the

poor Bishop had to ride a very rough one. The Archdeacon and Mr. Davidson set off with us. Mr. D. undertook to guide us by a short cut, and brought us down a very steep place through the forest to a narrow but rocky drift, and there he had not an idea which way to go through! The Bishop went first to try, and very soon got into a hole amongst slippery rocks, and his horse was all but down. At last it scrambled out on to a rock in the middle of the water, and he did not know how to get off again. Mr. Davidson then tried wading in up to his middle, but he also slipped about, and had to give it up. Then the Bishop managed to get off the other side of the rock, and by winding about between rocks, found a pretty good path; but when he got to the other side he came out at a wrong place, and again got on a sloping rock, and the horse slipped and fell on his side, very nearly on the Bishop; however, he was only a little bruised, and got up again directly, and then we all followed one by one."

The Bishop writes more particulars from

"Beaufort West, October 9th, 1863.

"My dearest boy—We have a tolerably quiet day or two here, where we are enduring great heat, after equally great cold and rain last week. I have been this time to Victoria, a new village, 100 miles farther to the north than I have ever been before. We shall have a great struggle to plant the Church there, but I think we shall overcome the difficulties. From thence up to the Orange River there is a scattered population of Boers, Kafirs, and Hottentots in the lowest state of degradation. The Boers ill-treat the coloured people, shoot them as they would ostriches, and the coloured people retaliate when they can by murder. Six Hottentots were hung here for murder ten days before my arrival. This state of things extends over hundreds of miles.

"We are now on our way back, having travelled about 1000 miles. I have had more rain than on any previous Visitation, and the whole country is looking well, though the Karroo is the most desolate-looking country. But the small,

dry, dead-looking bush is wonderful pasturage for sheep and oxen. Some farms, 60,000 acres in extent, have from 10,000 to 20,000 sheep. We have had some rough travelling. One night, after going 60 miles with one of the horses tired out, we arrived at a farm which we found deserted; only a Hottentot woman there. She let us in, but there was no food but what we brought; and your mother slept upon a short table, I on a chair without a bottom and the mud floor, in alternate changes. There was a hen and chickens in the room; and we had had nothing all day but some sweet cake and a piece of brown bread which we asked for at the place where we slept before. We had nothing to wash in but a pie-dish; and by two o'clock the next day, when we got to Beaufort, the state of our commissariat was not pleasant.

"I suppose by this time you are just going up for your examination. . . . This work over, and a little recreation had on the Continent or elsewhere, you must begin to grapple with the great work of life. The preliminary stages have lasted longer with you than with most others, for I was anxious that you should have the full benefit of all that the University could do for you. The physical contests have had their place; the intellectual, too, have had their chance; the spiritual must now be entered upon. Read S. Paul's allusions to the Isthmian games, and try to realise with him the words, 'Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown, but we an incorruptible.' Set this before you steadily for the rest of life. Hitherto you have been training the lower faculties of the man—the flesh—the intellect. The higher must now have the chief share of time and thought. It is with the moral and spiritual nature that man can best serve God and his fellow-men. Graces will do more than gifts for the lifting up of ourselves and others nearer unto God. Now is the time when mere study has ceased to have paramount claims upon you, that the great objects for which man lives, or ought to live, should be pondered, and resolutions formed of giving yourself up wholly to God and His Service. At twenty-three the character should be formed, the mind sobered. We hope to get back in No-

vember, and then comes this unhappy trial, the commencement probably of the greatest struggle that I have ever been engaged in. I fully expect to be in open collision, before it is done, with these Civil Courts, which will, if not curbed, destroy the Church."

From Swellendam the Bishop wrote again (October 26th, 1863) to his son:—"I wish myself to hold the Faith as the Church of England holds and maintains it, having received it from the Catholic and undivided Church, and I should rejoice to see you holding and maintaining it on these grounds and because it is the Catholic Faith. . . . Independently of its great Bishop, I think that Cuddesden has this advantage over Wells, that in it the religious life is more fostered and watched. I think that the mere fact of living together as a College, and not in lodgings as individuals, has its value. May God, my dearest boy, bless your next year to your great good; during it may your faith be deepened, and your views as to the great work in life enlarged. All the past, if kept in due subjection hereafter, will have been of use in strengthening you for the great work and battle of life. Self-discipline is your next lesson; then a deeper faith, and a growing desire to do God service in the world."

After eleven weeks' travelling the Bishop and Mrs. Gray got home again, more knocked up than usual with bad weather, rough accommodation, and want of food. Their journey home from George even was trying, owing to heavy roads, full rivers, horses tired and galled with wet harness, and themselves so thoroughly uncomfortable that the Bishop was detained at Swellendam for two nights quite ill, partly from harass of mind about the sea of trouble to which he was returning. "Then comes the excitement of the Natal trial," he wrote just before this. "Many will consider him persecuted, and sympathise with him because he is a *celebrity*. We must witness for Christ, and purge the Church of deadly heresy, let the consequences to ourselves be what they may. I am quite prepared to find that this case will bring me into direct collision with Civil Courts, and into much personal suffering; but I have counted the cost."

And, November 12th, he writes : " I am now in the thick of the preparations for the Colenso trial. The Bishop of S. Helena has not arrived. Bishop Twells has not come, being detained in the East by floods. We expect him daily. The Bishop of Graham's Town has been with me for some days, and he and I work harmoniously and with thorough mutual confidence at this case for hours daily. The Bishop of Natal denies jurisdiction; says he has taught nothing contrary to the faith of the Church; will appeal. I have a difficult and anxious work before me; the questions very delicate. They combine almost the whole range of theology."

Anxious and difficult work it assuredly was—the very novelty of the whole case, and the apparent uncertainty as to most legal points connected with the matter, adding in no slight degree to the difficulty. Under this vague, unknown condition of the law, Bishop Gray had thought it right to take the best legal opinion he could get as to the extent of his jurisdiction under the letters patent; or, if they were worthless, apart from them by consent, or contract, or the common law of the Church. He was accordingly advised by Dr. Phillimore that, " If the Bishop of Cape Town can bring together all the Bishops of his Province to hear and determine with himself the charges against the Bishop of Natal, and their decision is unanimous, an objection as to the sufficiency of the tribunal will not be allowed to prevail; and with respect to the mode of proceeding, if the Bishop of Natal is duly cited to appear, and the citation appoints a proper time and place, and states the person before whom, as Metropolitan, he is convened, and the charges which he will be called upon to answer, and allows him ample time for preparation, and for reaching the appointed place; and the citation is also shown to have issued from the proper quarter, and with full authority, it seems to me that this will suffice; and that the Courts, whether of England or of the Cape of Good Hope, if the proceedings are brought before them, will not sanction any mere technical objections, when they are satisfied that the rules of justice have been substantially and fully observed. I think that the pro-

ceedings must be taken at Cape Town, or within the Province of the Metropolitan; not in England or in any English Court, nor before any temporal Court in the Colony; and as to the charges or articles which Bishop Colenso is to be called upon to answer, if they are clear, distinct, and pertinent, showing the passages of his works which are alleged to be unsound, and the canons, articles, and formularies of the English Church which they are respectively declared to contravene, so as fully to satisfy all the real merits and justice of the case, they will in all probability be upheld by any Court before which they may hereafter be impugned, notwithstanding some defects of form or minor irregularities which they may exhibit. But the most complete regard to everything which can be deemed matter of substance and importance must be shown, and the most ample means must be afforded to the Bishop of Natal for meeting the charges and for making his defence."

When this opinion was given, the Long Judgment had already been delivered; and, so far from being thought to be any hindrance to the Natal proceedings, it was considered as rather smoothing their way. The letters patent were clearly defective, and Dr. Phillimore said that if the case depended entirely upon them, the Metropolitan would not "have any means of vindicating his authority, or any right to proceed against the Bishop of Natal. . . . But I am of opinion that, notwithstanding their defects, the Bishop of Cape Town may lawfully exercise a control, as Metropolitan, over the Bishop of Natal, and that the Bishop of Natal is amenable to him: this right being grounded not upon any independent and absolute jurisdiction, but upon the actual consent of the Bishop of Natal, and his recognition of Bishop Gray's metropolitanical authority."

As we have already seen, the essentials mentioned had been complied with in the carefully-prepared Articles of Accusation and the citation (dated May 18th, 1863) served upon Bishop Colenso. There were further questions pressing upon the Metropolitan, even when it was clear that he both could and ought to proceed. How was he to try the case? Before what Court? How was it to be composed? Was the Metro-

politan to sit alone, as the letters patent implied, or was he to have assessors? and were those assessors to consist of all the Bishops who had taken the oath of obedience to him as Metropolitan, or only of those within the Queen's dominions? Were they to deliver independent judgments? How many were actually necessary to form a Court? and when these questions were decided, how were the proceedings to be conducted? All English law, including, of course, ecclesiastical law, being expressly excluded from the Colony by treaty, how far ought it to govern such proceedings? and who could decide this point? In the absence of any ecclesiastical law suited to this case, how far ought Canon law to take its place? and what was the existing Canon law of the Church of England? how far had it been abrogated or overlaid by subsequent statute law? what might the disestablished Church of Africa appropriate from the Established Mother Church? Again, would the Civil Courts, which loomed in the distance, recognise the African Church as a corporation having laws, or merely as individuals subject to a mutual contract? and if this was all, what was the contract worth? and what did it involve? Had the Metropolitan any greater legal powers in Natal than in the Cape, the constitution of the former being of a later date? Was there any appeal from the Bishops of the Province? and if so, to whom—the Archbishop in person, or in the Court of Arches, or to the Crown?

All these questions pressed heavily on Bishop Gray's mind, feeling as he did that he must act upon certain definite principles, and take a decided line upon every one of them—questions of the most weighty importance to the Church, as he knew them to be.

“It would not have been greatly to be wondered at,” he wrote, “if a few Clergy in a distant land, without any great amount of learning or ability, and without the opportunity of consulting any whose opinion ought to guide them on some of the points which they were called to decide, should have made mistakes with regard to questions which have troubled and perplexed the wisest and the most learned; though I am not

aware that we have made any of moment. It may be said, perhaps, that, foreseeing what was coming, I should have fortified myself on such questions as I should have to consider, by counsel with the Fathers of the Church, and of eminent men learned in the law. But this was precisely what I endeavoured to do, though without any great results. Men shrank, amid the uncertainties of the case and the absence of precedents, from giving any clear definite advice, and I left England, after every effort to obtain authoritative and decided counsel, with the conviction that I must act upon my own responsibility; that I must decide the questions which I at least could not avoid, as best I might, and carve out a course for myself. To the Queen's Advocate, indeed, ever ready to lend an attentive ear in any case in which the faith and wellbeing of the Church are concerned, I was indebted for some information, especially respecting the case of Bishop Watson; and I studied that case so far as the imperfect records admitted of, both in the annals of the time, and in the documents preserved at Lambeth. I had hoped, indeed, that this grave cause, affecting as it did the whole Church, might have been taken up by the Bishop of London, who was so much better able to deal with it than myself; and that I might have been spared the labour, anxiety, and responsibility connected with it. I had trusted that it might have been so, because it was publicly stated that the works which had given so great offence having all been published within his jurisdiction, he might bring charges, founded upon them, before the Court of the Archbishops, and thereby obtain a verdict. I know not whether this could have been done, or whether any legal consequences would or could have resulted as regards the Natal letters patent; but, however this may be, the Bishop showed no disposition, at our conference or at any other time, to take active measures, and was most vehement in urging upon me my responsibility in this matter. It was therefore with the greatest reluctance, and moved only by a solemn sense of duty to the Church and to its Head, that I accepted the responsibility which was on all

sides proclaimed to be mine; and in a case so entirely without precedent, adopted the measures which seemed to me to be proper under the circumstances."

Feeling all the weight of this responsibility, the Bishop was preparing for the trial now coming on. Up to the last moment there was doubt about Bishop Twells' arrival. November 16th, Mrs. Gray wrote:

"The trial begins to-morrow. Up to Saturday we were almost in despair. The unusual rains had filled the rivers, and rendered travelling almost impossible, and stopped the posts. Bishop Twells had not been heard of on this side the Orange River, and even the two Archdeacons, whom we thought safe, had not arrived when due. They were to have come from George by post-cart to Swellendam, and there seemed no rivers to stop them, but both passengers and post-carts came in without them. On Saturday afternoon, however, all had arrived. Bishop Twells, after innumerable delays from the weather, had got to Port Elizabeth, just too late for the steamer, but had been most fortunate in getting a return private cart, and coming on immediately. He crossed the Kromma River just before it rose,—the post-cart starting a day and a half later was stopped at it, and half drowned. Bishop Twells has had a dreadful journey—he was upset in the middle of a river, and everything he had soaked. He and the Malay driver crept out, and sat on the overturned cart to consider their next move! . . . At last they managed to right the cart again."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, November 16th, 1863.

"My dear Bishop—We begin our sad and solemn work to-morrow. I arrived at home, nearly knocked up with work and bad weather, about ten days ago, and was followed soon by the Bishop of Graham's Town. . . . He and I have talked over every point, and are as nearly of one mind as any two men can be. He approves of all that I mean to say, but while assenting to my judgment upon the several points, would like to give his opinion in his own way. There are questions yet to be dis-

cussed between us, as to the future, which we have not yet worked out. He goes to his task with ability and soundness, and we work together in thorough harmony. . . . We are all, thank God, well, and in good heart, and feeling we are defending the Person and the Truth of our Lord.”¹

The Metropolitan’s assessors having duly arrived, on November 17th, according to the citation, the trial began. It was held in S. George’s Cathedral, a space before the altar being set apart for the purpose, and as, of course, the trial was public, it was attended by a very considerable number of people. The Metropolitan presided, assisted by the Bishops of Graham’s Town and Orange Free State. Dean Douglas of Cape Town, and Archdeacons Merriman and Badnall, were present as accusers, and Bishop Colenso had sent Dr. Bleek, the Curator of the Gray Library (a German and a known unbeliever) to be present as his personal friend and protest against the proceedings.

The Bishop of Cape Town having mentioned the presentation of articles and citation, declared himself ready to hear the charges, together with the other Bishops present, and called upon the Registrar to read the citation² and charges. The letter of presentation was then read, followed by the articles of accusation.³ Certain documents⁴ having also been read, Dr. Bleek read a letter from Bishop Colenso, according to his instructions. The letter (which was dated London, October 23, 1863), after acknowledging the receipt of the citation, went on to say: “I am advised that your Lordship has no jurisdiction over me, and no legal right to take cognisance of the charge in question. I therefore protest against the proceedings instituted before you, and request you to take notice that I do

¹ It must be remembered that this was not like an ordinary criminal trial, in which evidence, hitherto not known, might be brought forth. The Judges thoroughly knew the whole case, the books containing the heresies they condemned, and their position as militating against the Faith. There was no prejudging in coming to the case thus. Bishops of the Church of Christ, of course, could not but have their minds distinctly made up upon the questions about to come before them, before hearing the case. The only opening for uncertainty was the possibility of Bishop Colenso withdrawing or retracting his utterances. ² Appendix II. ³ Appendix III. ⁴ Appendix IV.

not admit their legality, and that I shall take such measures to contest the lawfulness of your proceedings, and, if necessary, to resist the execution of any judgment adverse to me which you may deliver, as I shall be advised to be proper. My absence from the Cape will make it impossible for me to know what view your Lordship may take of your jurisdiction till long after your decision has been announced, and I have no desire to cause any unnecessary delay in the settlement of this matter, such as would be produced if I were to confine myself to a mere protest against your jurisdiction. I therefore think it better to state at once the answer which—if you have any jurisdiction in the matter—I have to make to the charge brought against me.

“I admit that I published the matter quoted in the articles annexed to the citation, but I claim that the passages extracted be read in connection with the rest of the works from which they are taken; and I deny that the publication of these passages, or any of them, constitutes any offence against the laws of the United Church of England and Ireland.”

Bishop Colenso then referred to a letter of his, written in or about May 1861, containing some replies to objections raised by the Metropolitan to his writings, going on to say: “I have instructed Dr. Bleek, of Cape Town, to appear before your Lordship on my behalf for the following purposes:—

“I. To protest against your Lordship's jurisdiction.

“II. To read this letter, of which I have sent him a duplicate, as my defence, if your Lordship should assume to exercise jurisdiction.

“III. If you should assume jurisdiction, and deliver a judgment adverse to me, to give you notice of my intention to appeal from such judgment.”

The Metropolitan here observed, that if Dr. Bleek wished to argue in support of the Bishop of Natal's first exception, on jurisdiction, this was the time to do it. Dr. Bleek replied that his instructions were merely to protest, and he accordingly handed in his protest.¹

¹ Appendix V.

The Dean of Cape Town then spoke, touching first upon the reluctance with which he undertook the office of an accuser; which, however, having been forced upon him, in virtue of his office, by the Clergy of the western section of the Diocese, he did because he could not help it, with a sure hope that the Lord he desired to serve would help him in his task, and a prayer as earnest as the heart of man could offer that every word he spoke might be chastened with the Spirit of Wisdom, and serve nothing but the pure and simple ends of truth. The Dean explained that his co-accusers were in a like position, the Archdeacon of George being present at the request of that Archdeaconry, and representing the Clergy thereof; and the Archdeacon of Graham's Town as proxy for that Diocese. Natal took no part, not out of any sympathy with the opinions of its Bishop, all the Clergy repudiating them, but out of delicacy. "We have come here, not to trifle, or so speak smooth things," the Dean said. "We charge a Bishop with that which the Church has called heresy, and we believe that we can prove that charge."

Referring to the nine charges, the Dean ranged them into two classes—the first, of errors on the subject of man's recovery from ruin; the second, of errors pertaining to the doctrine of Scripture as God's Word.

With respect to the first of these subjects, the Dean urged that, in order to a clear discrimination of the Bishop of Natal's meaning, it was important to look at the truths under discussion from his point of view. What that point of view was seemed to admit of no doubt. The references to "modern dogma," and the "dogma of modern theology;" the allusions to *Paradise Lost*, and the general tone and scope of the whole Commentary, indicated that the author's mind was occupied, as it were, in a recoil from some real or imaginary school of theology which seems to represent the Almighty as a severe and vindictive Being Who took pleasure in the punishment of His Son, and thus to exhibit the redemption of the human race as a concession wrung from an unwilling and arbitrary ruler who was forced to recognise the claims of justice, rather than

as an act of sovereign mercy which had its primal origin in God's Paternal Love. While fully acknowledging Love to be the crowning attribute in that Mysterious Entity which we, after our human fashion, describe as the Divine Character, the Dean believed those whom he addressed would also say with Bishop Butler that the Author of Creation shows Himself to us as a Moral Governor Who is both Righteous and Just; that, to quote the great Bishop, "God's whole Nature is one great impulse to what, upon the whole, is best." Moreover, it would be admitted that man must not be wise beyond what is revealed for his guidance, and that truth is to be found by weighing Scripture against Scripture, doctrine against doctrine, with scrupulous exactness, giving to each its due place and relative importance. He thought it was a deficiency in this patient investigation, in this quiet self-restraint of mind, which can bear long with difficulty and obscurity, content to wait and see mistily until the light breaks and the dimness vanishes, which had led to the errors now under consideration. The Bishop denied the existence of that wondrous harmony of truth and mercy which Scripture teaches us to have led to man's Redemption. In his opinion God is absolute Benevolence, which, however great it sounds, will on closer consideration prove to be only another name for absolute weakness. God is so Love as to be Love only; and in accordance with this the Bishop put forth a string of opinions which stripped from the Atonement its satisfying, vicarious, and propitiatory character; removed faith from its position as the introduction to a state of salvation; took all use and virtue from the Sacraments, denied the existence of a Church, and did away with Hell.

"I am conscious," the Dean said, "of the strength of the language I am about to use; but I cannot refrain from asserting at the outset of my argument that opinions such as these are something more than heresy. Upon the plea of showing forth the love of God our Father, the Bishop has put forth a wild though mystic and alluring scheme of blind benevolence, which is subversive of all that is generally known as Christianity. Professing to show us that God is all love, he represents

Him as indifferent to evil; and maintains that our Lord was sent here, not to die for sin and bear it for us, but only to cheer and encourage us in our efforts for our own deliverance; to show us, indeed, the way to God, but not to propitiate His Father's anger, for there never was any real separation between man and God."

Here the Archdeacon of Graham's Town interrupted with the question, as to Dr. Bleek, whom he had never seen before, whether he were a member of the Church of England, or of any communion which would recognise its formularies, on which all the argument was founded? The Archdeacon of George endorsed the query, adding, that though neither had he ever seen Dr. Bleek before, having lived so much in Cape Town, he had heard of him, as not only not a member of the Church, but as very well known to sympathise in the very strongest way with quite the freer sort of Socinianism. The question being formally put to Dr. Bleek, he declined to answer, and the Dean proceeded to deal with the opinion set forth concerning the Atonement by Bishop Colenso. Referring to a passage in the Commentary (section 144), which probably he would select as the fullest expression of the light in which he viewed our Lord's Sacrifice, the Dean said that in itself he did not quarrel with it. Taking it as describing one aspect of that mysterious and many-sided doctrine, he was rather disposed to admire the beauty of its language, and to rejoice in the fervour of its thought. Had it stood alone it might have seemed insufficient, but no one would have cavilled at it; but taken together with other passages (to be found in the Articles of Accusation), no one could help believing that it was intended, as a complete exposition of our Lord's Atoning Sacrifice, and that the author meant emphatically to deny that His Sufferings were vicarious, or that any act of His was needed to satisfy the Father before He could forgive the world its sin. Bishop Colenso denied again and again that our Lord died in our stead. He died on our behalf, to express and display His boundless sympathy, but not to bear our sins, or the weight of our curse. The Bishop will not allow it to be said that God was reconciled

to us, because that implies anger before reconciliation, which never existed. "He regards the doctrine that our Lord died instead of man as a modern dogma; and, not objecting to the novelty—for that, I imagine, would not offend, as the antiquity, most assuredly, is not the ground on which he seeks to recommend his own opinion—he asserts, with a boldness which is astounding, that the dogma finds no colour for itself in Holy Scripture, and that there is no ground for thinking that God could require to be reconciled . . . because He never had any wrath to be appeased."

Observing that the present Court was not a sphere for discussing questions of grammar and exegesis, and that the duty of the Bishops sitting there was not to arrive at truth by immediate deduction from Scripture, but rather by taking the results at which the Church has already arrived, and which are binding upon her members as a test, the Dean entered upon certain critical points, showing that Bishop Colenso's Greek was faulty, and going on to deal with the charge of novelty, as alleged against the doctrine of vicarious suffering. It is with a real burst of eloquence that he exclaims: "I maintain that this dogma is even more than apostolic. It is as old as Revelation. It has been believed from the days of Adam to our own day. Seen as in a glass, darkly, in prophecy, in figures, in types and ceremonies by patriarchs and Jewish saints, it has been clearly recognised in the Christian Church as the essential counterpart of the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, and as a truth which cannot be denied by any who will not, sooner or later, proceed to deny also that Jesus is the Son of God. Dogma of modern theology! I protest against the libellous insinuation. I appeal to every offering for sin which ever burnt upon a Jewish altar; I appeal to the Creeds of the Church; I appeal to the Liturgies of Christendom, to the Fathers of the first and every age; and to the sign of the Cross, so early used as the type and symbol of our Faith; and I affirm, as I believe I can also prove, that the life and existence of the Church, both Jewish and Christian, has turned upon belief in Christ's vicarious Death as its moving spring and cardinal principle.

It has always been believed. The Church of the early centuries believed it; the Churches of the middle ages believed it; it is believed by the Church now!"

Going on to show how the Church has ever understood the terms "propitiation" and "satisfaction;" how the ancient liturgies and our own use them; how the Fathers used them, and that the truths they embody are part of that inheritance of faith which should be as dear to us as life, while the denial of them can only be termed rank heresy;—the Dean proceeded to show that on the difficult question of justification the Bishop of Natal differed from all schools of opinion, and completely contravened the articles and formularies of the Church of England. According to his commentary, all men, Christians, Jews, Turks, stand upon the same level before God. There is no real difference between them, all are justified. God's gift of righteousness was from the first bestowed upon them, etc. What then, it seems only natural to ask, is the good of being a Christian? What the difference between Christian and heathen? Bishop Colenso answers that the Christian knows more, is conscious of his privileges, and has a present joy in God; that in actual state and condition there is no difference between a Christian and an infidel; both are regenerate, both members of Christ—both belong to God's family, and have received the gifts of righteousness; but the heathen is, for the present, in darkness; in short, that all the Christian gets from Christianity, the Church, the Sacraments, or the gift of the Spirit, is clearer *knowledge*, and consequent joy and peace. But such knowledge, severed from all grace, is purely intellectual, and if we talk of Gnostics in early days, surely we have Gnosticism here!

The Dean next showed the faulty teaching of the Bishop of Natal as to the Sacraments, asserting, as he did, that man's "new birth unto righteousness" takes place, not in Baptism, but in "his very birth-hour," when they are joined to Christ and made members of His body through grace. Baptism, according to him, is only the sign or test proving to them that they had had this new birth. And with respect to the Holy Eucharist, the Bishop taught that the gift of Christ's Body and

Blood is given to us not only in the Sacrament, but at all times and to all men, whether Christians or not, with or without faith, knowing and valuing, or ignorant of and despising it. "If his view is at all correct" (the Dean said), "the most sacred ordinance of our faith is in no way needful to salvation. He teaches that the grace of that Sacrament is independent of the Sacrament. Jew, Turk, and infidel feed upon it; men who are steeped in every sin constantly partake of it. Men who have faith receive this grace, but men who have no faith equally possess it; men who know about it have this precious gift, but men without knowledge have it also." The Dean believed the Bishop of Natal incapable of a wilful outrage upon decency, but he could not look upon the publication of such opinions as other than defiling the most sacred rite of our religion, and dragging it through the mire. Of course such a theory does away with any meaning in the assertion of the Eucharist being "generally necessary to salvation." The *sufficiency* of the Atonement is one thing, the efficiency to save all another; and universal salvation is as clearly contrary to every line of Holy Scripture, as universal redemption is written in light on every page.

The denial of eternal punishment was the fourth charge into which the Dean went at length, setting forth both the unquestionable affirmation of the doctrine by Holy Scripture and the Church of all ages; and its denial by the Bishop of Natal, together with his bold assertion of the "absolute wickedness" of the clauses contrary to his opinion in the Athanasian Creed, and his disagreement with Article VIII.

The Dean summed up the day's argument as follows:—

"I have shown that on each of four important questions the Bishop has been guilty of publishing opinions which overthrow and contradict the Faith. My Lords, if but on one of these points his teaching had been heretical, the keys of discipline which your Great Head has placed in your keeping must have been turned against him, to shut him out from his exalted privileges, unless, by God's Grace, he should recant his error and return to the way of truth. What, then, when your brother is in error upon all? From the Atonement of our Divine Lord he

takes away propitiation, denying that the sin of man was borne upon the Cross. He makes that virtuous habit of faith which goes before righteousness a mere feeling which is unintelligent and follows righteousness. He confuses between grace and nature in the spirit of a pure Pantheist, and, to use the language of Holy Scripture, he throws the children's bread, which God gives to His own in Sacraments, to dogs and swine. And then, having thus made void the mystery of man's redemption, whether we look to the objective side of Christ's work or to the subjective side of man's reception, he walks from time and sense into the world invisible, and confuses all our thoughts of Heaven and Hell. What are we to think of such theology as this? Is it possible to look calmly on and permit a Bishop of the Church to teach this new and strange doctrine, which does not only undermine the Faith, but saps the very foundations of society, and makes sin nothing while it boastfully proclaims the Love of God? My Lords, it is no pleasure to me thus to accuse one whom, for his office, I should venerate, as for much that is in him I admire as a man. But in these days, when truth is often held too cheap, and zeal for truth undervalued, it may be well to remember that S. Paul himself could say anathema on one who preached another gospel. . . . I maintain, my Lords, that the truth from which your brother has fallen is part of Christ's Gospel. I contend that he has denied the Faith."

November 18th the Court sat again, and the Dean resumed his argument, dealing with the Bishop of Natal's views of Holy Scripture, concerning which we have already seen what was the opinion of the whole English Episcopate. The Dean set forth how the Church has ever regarded the Bible, and wherein the Bishop's language contradicts its teaching generally, as well as that of the formularies of our English Church. The whole speech (too long to be quoted here) is strikingly clear and interesting, and leaves it beyond any doubt (had Dr. Colenso himself not expressly stated his dissent) that the Bishop of Natal rejected the doctrines affirmed by the Prayer-book, and had done as much

to "hinder and slander God's Word"¹ as any one could well do. He then proceeded to follow out the strange and sad results which end in charging the Blessed Saviour Himself with ignorance and error in quoting Holy Scripture as He did." "The Bishop says that our Lord was wrong—wrong upon a matter of which He spoke continually—wrong, too, upon things pertaining to His Own Book. . . . The Bishop teaches that He Whom we believe to be the Author of the Bible was ignorant both of the substance and the sources of the Book. And if our Lord was wrong in this, where was He right? What are His words worth? when can we trust Him? where shall we follow Him? Is it for such an One as this that Apostles forsook all, that saints lived, that martyrs died? Has this mistaken Person changed the world, revived society, restored humanity? . . . Men who teach thus destroy the faith of others; can we believe that they have any faith themselves?"

The conclusion of the Dean's speech re-echoes the opinion already so strongly expressed by the Bishops of London, S. David's, and others, as to the absolute necessity of Dr. Colenso's resigning his office.² The Bishop was bound by his office, not only to respect the Liturgy, but to see that others did so too; yet he taught others not to use it. Again and again he had committed himself to promises and obligations which ought to make it sacred to him; and if his opinions were so changed that he could not use it, one might lament the change, but all would respect the man who left the Church he could no longer hold to. But Bishop Colenso renounced his belief, not his position. He abandoned the Bible and Prayer-book, of which his office made him the guardian, and yet retained that office. If he had boldly said: "I leave the Church, I shake off the

¹ See Exhortation in Communion Service.

² See p. 46, meeting of Bishops (February 1863). Bishop Thirlwall said it was absolutely impossible that Bishop Colenso should remain in the Church of England, his position was utterly untenable, etc.

See also Part III. Pentateuch: Preface, p. xxii., where Dr. Colenso wrathfully quotes the Bishop of London's statement in his charge that "if inquiry led to doubt, and if the doubt ended in disbelief of the Church's doctrines, of course he would resign his office as one of the Church's authorised teachers."

dust of my feet against a body which I despise ;” we should at least feel that he was acting honestly. But, as the Dean said, instead of that, he stands within the Church itself, mutilating and tearing out the pages he had sworn to use and defend. “ These things which we believe, and which we weave into our solemn prayers, what are they ? ‘ Fictions, transparent fictions ! ’ The Bishop almost says,—‘ Is there a fool on earth who can believe them ? ’ Be it so. But then the Bishop’s office is a fiction, all the institutions of the Church are fictions, the Cathedrals which our fathers built are fictions, the history of Christendom is a fiction : I might say the Christian world is one great fiction. But certainly, if these things are fictions, the Bishop of Natal is part of this system of imposition ; and if he loves truth as he professes to love it, he should have left this state of fiction, and taken up his place among true and living things. . . .

“ Speaking on behalf of my brother Clergy, who with one mind and one mouth repudiate and reject these novel doctrines, these strange contradictions of revealed and unalterable truth, I ask you, without fear or favour, without regard to man and man’s opinion, with an eye singly fixed on that Divine Person Who, as He reigns upon His Throne above, watches the work which is now proceeding, and the judgment which this Court will pronounce,—before Him our God, I ask you to put in force those sacred laws which you are pledged and commissioned to administer, and though the person accused is a Bishop and your brother, to award that sentence which is right and just.”¹

That afternoon and the next morning (November 19th) Archdeacon Merriman addressed the Court. He said that he was anxious to press on the attention of the Court what he believed to be the fact,—that, never since the foundation of

¹ November 19th the Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Oxford :

“ The Dean has made a most powerful, a noble address. In point of oratory, eloquence, grasp of subject, analysis of the Bishop’s system, clearness of style, soundness of theology, it is a very remarkable production. . . . He has risen to the occasion, and surprised us all by coming out beyond what we deemed his powers. It is the opinion of us all that there are very few men in England who could have delivered such an address.”

Christendom, was any individual, heretic or false teacher, cited to appear on so wide and multifarious a field of erroneous doctrine as that which it had been necessary to charge the Bishop of Natal. This point was important to observe, because, however much uncertainty there might be in attempting to fix the meaning of certain theological phrases used inconsistently or erroneously by the Bishop,—however much his accusers might misunderstand him or be baffled in their attempts to explain his meaning, the cumulative weight of argument to be drawn from so great and multifarious a mass of false teaching is really irresistible. Nearly all the great heresies condemned in ancient times, and considered in the first four General Councils, are implied;—and a denial by implication of our Lord's Divine Nature, or of the perfection of His Human Nature, seems necessarily to lie at the root of much thereof. “And the free handling of the Holy Scriptures, after the manner of Socinus and his followers, culminates at length in the Bishop of Natal's writings in such fearful statements regarding our Blessed Lord, that we hardly know under what class to reckon such heresy, even when running over the names of the copious brood of them which sprang up in the sixth century.”

Later on the Archdeacon alluded to the “appalling” nature of the calm threat that the same spirit of inquiry will be carried into the writings of the New Testament.¹ He might well have said that one who could offer so grievous insult to our Lord in His Sacred Humanity, was not likely to hold His written Gospel in any special reverence. Having committed the judgment “calmly, confidently, and prayerfully” to the Bishops, he concluded, saying: “May God defend the right.”

Archdeacon Badnall next spoke, reminding the Court that he appeared as the representative of every Clergyman in the

¹ “But it is said, ‘the same spirit of inquiry will be carried into the writings of the New Testament.’ I answer, Undoubtedly it will and must be; and if there is any part of the Church's teaching, depending on the New Testament, which will not bear the test of truth, we shall of course, as servants of the God of Truth, be bound to reject that also. Is there, then, a ‘dark chamber’ here too, which we are afraid to examine,—into which we dare not suffer the light of day to enter?”—Preface to Part III. of the *Pentateuch*, p. 40.

Archdeaconry of George. His speech, which was continued on November 20th, necessarily travelled over the same ground as that on which his predecessors had dwelt, though perhaps it was more elaborate, and went with greater minuteness into the various issues, occupying upwards of eight hours. This closed the case for the prosecution, and the Bishop of Cape Town called upon the Registrar to read a letter¹ addressed to himself by the Bishop of Natal, August 7th, 1861, defending his *Commentary on the Romans*, concerning which the Bishop had written, as before mentioned, entreating him not to publish it. In this letter the Bishop of Natal thanks his Metropolitan "sincerely" for that which he had written, saying: "I cannot be surprised at your writing so earnestly and seriously, holding the views which you do on some of the points which I have discussed. But as you will have learnt from my last letter, it is too late now to stop the publication of the book, even if I desired to do so. Whatever you may think right to say or do in the matter, I am quite sure that you will only act from a sense of duty to what you believe to be the truth, which compels you to set aside all personal feelings, in obedience to a higher law. In writing what I have written, and publishing it, I too have done the same, though conscious that I should thereby cause pain to yourself and others, whom I entirely esteem and love. It is true that you have mistaken some of my expressions; others—forgive me for saying it—you seem to me to have misjudged. But in respect of others, I am well aware that my views differ strongly from yours." . . .

One cannot but grieve that Dr. Colenso did not remember this his certain belief, and that but a short time after (doubtless under the irritation of deserved censure and the estrangement of all holding the one True Faith of Christ) he should so wantonly and inconsistently have accused his Metropolitan of the very reverse—of unfairness, personal feelings, and the like!

The Bishop of Natal's letter having been read, the Bishop of Cape Town inquired of Dr. Bleek whether there was any-

¹ Appendix VI.

thing he wished to say on behalf of his principal. Upon that gentleman refusing to do anything beyond the strict fulfilment of his instructions, "to protest and read a letter and give notice of an appeal," the Dean suggested that, as the Bishop of Natal's letter was put in as his defence, and that having been carefully written some years before, it seemed due to him amply to weigh his explanation, and therefore the Dean proposed that time should be given to consider the letter, and to make such remarks upon it as might seem called for.

Accordingly, on November 21st, when the Court met again, the Dean, after expressing the regret felt by all at the Bishop of Natal's absence, and the satisfaction it would have given had he himself said what he could in his own defence, went on to say that, as matters stood, they must of course accept his letter as containing the substance of all he would have said. It was evidently written with great care;—the expressions were well weighed, and it entered with great particularity into some of the very points raised; but the Dean must add that he and his colleagues felt that, instead of in any degree weakening their case, or refuting their arguments, it did but confirm and strengthen them on many of the most important points. This letter contained the seed of the Bishop's later writings upon the Pentateuch. The Dean then went through the chief points of Bishop Colenso's letter, showing how it in fact epitomised his erroneous opinions, ending with the expression of a hope that, when the Bishop saw the inevitable alternative before him of either charging God with error, or allowing that his own theory of the Bible was mistaken, he would reconsider the latter, and allow that there must be a mistake somewhere, although he might not be able at once to perceive where. The Dean trusted that this *reductio*—not *ad absurdum*, but *ad profanum*—would lead him to see his error and reject it.

The case being closed, the Metropolitan said that he and his assessors must, of course, take time to go into the whole case and its most important evidence before giving judgment, and the Court separated. Many hours of patient, anxious

study and investigation were bestowed upon the matter by the three Prelates assembled at Bishop's Court; and, finally, December 14th, the Court sat to hear the opinions of the assessors. Dr. Bleek received due notice, but he did not attend. The Bishop of Graham's Town first gave his opinion, going clearly and forcibly into the charges, examining them by the Formularies of the Church of England, as taken in their usual and literal sense, rather than by the writings of theologians—the object of the investigation being to determine whether the Church, of which the Bishop of Natal was an authorised minister, condemned or allowed the doctrines which he had set forth. On each of the nine charges, the Bishop's opinion was that it was clearly proved. After delivering this opinion as to the charge affecting Bishop Colenso's teaching upon the Sacraments, he said: "I have examined the Bishop's explanations on this subject and the whole of this charge against him with the more care, because of the diversity of opinion which exists among members of our own Church as to the meaning of the Church's teaching respecting Sacraments. But it appears that the Bishop contradicts truths in which all schools of theology agree, and that his opinions are wholly outside the limits of the questions discussed between them."

Probably any one who desired fully to understand the history of this most grievous passage of Church history, in so far as a clear setting forth of the obnoxious and heretical teaching of Bishop Colenso, its unquestionable opposition to the faith of Christ's Church, and the answers with which, to all honest and logical minds, it is utterly refuted, would nowhere find what they needed more clearly and ably summed up in the Bishop of Graham's Town's opinion, than anywhere; and those who will study its clear definite sentences will not fail to come to his conclusion—that "the Bishop of Natal's arguments are not consistent with any creed that teaches the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, except that which is condemned by the Church as Nestorianism;" and that his "teaching does deprave, impugn, and bring into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer, as he is charged with doing." The concluding words of the opinion

are as follows: . . . "These charges have included questions from the whole range of theology; they have not referred to a few isolated opinions which might be held without any departure from that faith which by his office in the Church the Bishop is pledged to maintain and set forward; they have affected the gravest and most fundamental principles of revealed truth. Whatever latitude of opinion may be allowed, and ought to be allowed, within the limits marked out by our Church, the Bishop, so far as I can judge, has transgressed these limits in regard to every one of these charges. I see no way of escaping this conclusion if the standards of our Church are to have any definite meaning. If the Bishop's is not false and heretical teaching, I know not what teaching could be condemned as such. Sometimes by express words, and always by the conclusions which follow from his words, he contradicts those standards to which he has bound himself. With regard also to some of the opinions held by the Bishop, I cannot overlook the fact that the offence of promulgating error is aggravated by the spirit, reckless of all consequences to the faith of the young and the unstable, in which opinions, unsound in themselves, are pushed forward to conclusions subversive of all faith in Divine Revelation. The opinions are maintained in full view, as it seems to me, of the result to which they point, and they cannot, therefore, be excused on the plea of any unconsciousness on the part of the writer of the tendency of these speculations. I cannot but conclude that, by the false teaching proved against him, the Bishop has wholly disqualified himself—unless he shall now openly retract and revoke this his false teaching—for bearing rule in the Church of God, and for the cure of souls therein; and that he cannot, consistently with the laws of our Church, unless he shall thus retract his errors, retain any longer the office of Bishop of Natal."

The Bishop of the Free State next proceeded to give his opinion. He pointed out that it was not a question of words, but of most important doctrine throughout, and that doctrine not containing matters of ordinary theological controversy, or involving opinions held by any of the special schools of religious

thought existing, but teaching opinions strange to all alike. Going through the various schedules, he pointed out the error into which the Bishop of Natal had fallen in saying that "Protestants only were the small majority among Christians who held the dogma of everlasting punishment, inasmuch as no doctrine of purgatory has ever interfered with the uniform teaching of the whole Catholic Church in all ages, according to the literal words of the Athanasian Creed." The purification of Purgatory has ever been held to apply to those who are saved, in contradistinction to those who are lost. The Bishop having given it as his opinion also that each of the charges had been proved, the Metropolitan proceeded to appoint December 16th as the day when judgment would be delivered.

Accordingly on that day the Bishop of Cape Town gave his judgment. He began by saying that the case was one of the gravest and most painful character. That a Bishop should be formally accused of heresy was a circumstance happily almost unknown among us since the Reformation, absolutely so among the non-established Colonial Churches; and thus to the African Church was attached the reproach of being the first to be charged with a wide departure from the faith in the person of one of her prelates. The absence of all precedent added greatly, the Metropolitan observed, to the difficulty of dealing with a case so distressing under all aspects to the Bishops of the Province, called to sit in judgment on one who had been their fellow-labourer so long, and with whom they had lived in friendly counsel and brotherly intercourse. After glancing at the question of his own jurisdiction as disputed by the Bishop of Natal, he went on to consider whether the charges brought against him had been proved, and whether they were such as to warrant the conclusion at which the Metropolitan and his assessors had arrived.

"In forming a decision as to the soundness or unsoundness of the Bishop's views," he said, "I shall be guided entirely by the language of the Articles and Formularies, including, of course, the whole Book of Common Prayer. I do not mean thereby to imply that these are the only tests by which the

Bishops of this Church should try the teaching of its Ministers. I am of opinion that the decisions of those Councils which the Church of England regards as Œcumenical are the very highest authorities by which they could be guided; and the received faith of the Church of all ages, even if not defined by any Council, if it can be ascertained—as, for example, on such a question as Inspiration in connection with the Holy Scriptures—must also be a guide to them which cannot be disregarded. In the present case, however, though I may refer to these authorities as illustrating and confirming the doctrine of the Church of England, and compare the Bishop's teaching with them, I shall not base my judgment upon them, because the presenting Clergy have not, in their articles, referred to them, but have contrasted the Bishop's language exclusively with the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England. I do not feel called upon to estimate, with precision, the amount of authority to be attached to each of the documents which the Church of England has stamped with her authority . . . but . . . it may be enough to say, that while regarding them all in their several measures and degrees as utterances of the Church's voice, I regard the three Creeds as of the highest authority, because they express the mind and faith, not only of the Church of England but also of the whole Catholic Church from the beginning. That I consider the Articles as next in authority to the Creeds . . . and that I regard the whole Prayer-book, more especially the Catechism, the Ordination Services, and services for Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, as of great authority; and as sufficient to show what the faith of the Church is on matters upon which the Articles may be silent, or their language require explanation. I shall, without assuming to decide upon the extent of authority to be attached to the language of the Homilies, refer to them as authorised expositors of the more condensed language of the Articles, and as illustrating their meaning, but I shall not use them as an independent authority. . . I shall not refer largely to the writings of those generally considered as the great divines of the Church; and when I do so, it will be for the purpose of illustrating the Church's teaching, not as inde-

pendent authorities. If there are any who are entitled to rank as authorities, Jewell and Nowell pre-eminently are so, because of the sanction given by Convocation to certain of their writings; but even these will be used only for the purpose of explanation and illustration.

“In interpreting the Church’s standards of faith, I shall endeavour to ascertain their ‘true, usual, literal, plain, and full meaning?’ Wheresoever it is possible, I shall decide this by the ‘literal and grammatical sense’ of the words.¹ Where the sense of the words is not plain, where they are theological words, and have an historical meaning, I shall interpret them by a comparison of passages; by the history of the controversies which gave rise to them, by the analogy of the Faith. I shall always have regard, when this is possible, to the *animus imponentis*, the intention of the Church in the wording of its documents.

“This course appears to me to be the fairest, both to the Bishop and to the Church. The Creeds, Articles, Formularies, and Book of Common Prayer are the documents to which he has given his assent, by which he has acknowledged himself to be bound, and in accordance with which he has pledged himself to teach, and affirms in his defence that he has taught. In common with all engaged in these proceedings, I deeply regret that the Bishop was not himself present on the occasion of the trial” . . .

Proceeding to take the charges one by one, the Metropolitan dealt first with the charge against the Bishop of Natal of maintaining that our Lord did not die in man’s stead, or bear the punishment of our sins, and that God is not reconciled to us by the Death of His Son. Bishop Colenso’s writings distinctly affirm that “there is not a single passage in the whole of the New Testament which supports the dogma of modern theology that our Lord died for our sins, in the sense of dying instead of us; dying in our place, or dying so as to bear the punishment or penalty of our sins.” He had gone carefully through the *Commentary* and through the letter of August 1861, put forth by the Bishop of Natal, as at once an exposition and a defence of his views, to see whether the above and similar

¹ Declaration prefixed to the Articles.

expressions were incidental, not supported by the general tone of the book, but modified and corrected elsewhere, inasmuch as the writer did not always express himself accurately or exactly when treating of the great mysteries of the Faith, and not unfrequently used language inconsistent with itself. The result was that much might be quoted which did not seem so at variance with the teaching of the Church concerning the Atonement as to call for condemnation if taken alone. But, unhappily there were other passages which proved that he used the words atonement, redemption, sacrifice, satisfaction, and propitiation, all of which may be called ecclesiastical and historical words, in a sense of his own, different to that in which the Church uses them, and repudiating some of the truth they teach. Instances of this were quoted, such as "It is very unfortunate that the true meaning of the word Atonement . . . should be so commonly lost sight of, and the notion introduced of something paid down to atone, as it is said, or compensate to God, or at least to reconcile God to us for our sins" (*Comm.* p. 98). Other instances followed: Thus of satisfaction the Bishop of Natal wrote, "I do deny that this was a vicarious sacrifice, in the sense in which I understand you to use the words, namely that He endured in our stead the weight of God's wrath; He bore the penalty of our sins. I believe that neither the expression nor the idea is Scriptural." Again, "I repeat the assertion, there is not a single expression in the whole New Testament, which distinctly implies that Christ suffered the weight of His Father's wrath in our stead." "He bore our sins, not the penalty of our sins." . . . "He paid this debt, not in our stead. . . . He did not bear the weight of the curse. He did not suffer the accumulated weight of woe due as a punishment for the sins of the world." These and similar passages establish the assertion that throughout the Bishop of Natal shrank from and repudiated substitution.

The Metropolitan proceeded to show from the Office for Holy Communion, from the IInd and XXXIst Articles and Homilies, that Bishop Colenso was not justified in denying that "our Lord died for our sins in the sense of dying instead of us, or dying so as to bear the penalty or punishment of our sins;" as

also that he in so many words denied the assertion of Article II. that "Christ, Very God and Very Man, truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us."

The second charge was that the Bishop of Natal maintained justification to be a consciousness of being righteous, and that all men, even without such consciousness, are treated by God as righteous, and counted righteous; and that all men, as members of the great human family, are dead unto sin and risen again unto righteousness. After quoting passages containing this teaching, the Metropolitan said:

"The question for me to decide is whether this teaching is consistent with the language and decisions of the Church. Had the Bishop contented himself with affirming that our Lord redeemed all mankind; that His Sacrifice was offered for the sins of the whole world; that we know not how far His meritorious Cross and Passion may avail for those who never heard of His Name or of His Sacrifice of Love; that God's Mercy and Love might exceed His own gracious promises; that, being the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, Christ's Redemption looked backward as well as forward, and might have an efficacy beyond what some had been willing to admit;—he would have expressed himself as many within the Church have, without challenge, expressed themselves before him. The Church has not dogmatised in such matters. But the Bishop has done more than this. He has confounded justification with redemption, and it is not the mere mis-application of a word. Justification with him means more than the Church means by redemption. He means what the Church means by justification, but he extends this, which the Church does not, to the whole human race. He says, 'The curse has been utterly taken away, and we all of the human race, being recognised as one with our Head, are counted to be righteous as He is righteous, are made the righteousness of God in Him.'"

After quoting various other like statements, the Metropolitan went on to say:

"The necessary consequence of such views is, that faith in any intelligible and accepted sense cannot be necessary to justi-

fication. And this is the Bishop's view." (Here follow passages in proof.) "But does the Church allow language like this, which, as has been truly said, confounds the Merits of Christ, which are the cause of our justification, with faith, which is the instrument of our justification, the virtue and grace by which it is made ours. Does it allow its teachers to proclaim that all men are justified, let their creed be what it may, or let there be no creed at all? that faith is not needed in order to justification? The Bishop claims justification for men who do not believe in Christ, who have never heard of Him. A heathen remaining a heathen, a Mahometan continuing a Mahometan, is, in his view, justified. . . . Apparently he makes no distinction between a baptized and unbaptized child." . . .

After most anxious consideration, and making every allowance for any counterbalancing passages, the Metropolitan felt obliged to declare the Bishop of Natal's teaching in this matter contradictory to that of the XIth and XVIIIth Articles, the 3rd Collect for Good Friday, the Offices of Holy Baptism (both for Infants and Adults), and the Homilies.

The third charge was that the Bishop maintained all men to have the new birth unto righteousness from their very birth-hour; that is to say, to be regenerated when born into the world as members of the great human family; also that all men are at all times partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ; by which teaching he virtually denied that the two great Sacraments are generally necessary to salvation, and convey any special grace; and further, that faith is the means whereby the Body and Blood of Christ are received and eaten, and that faith is necessary in order that God's Grace, bestowed in Sacraments, may have wholesome effect and operation. Quoting passages which affirm these things,¹ which are not (he remarks) mere incidental passages at variance with the general teaching of the book, the Metropolitan decided that it contradicts the express teaching of the Church Catechism, the Offices for Baptism and Confirmation, the Nicene Creed, and the XXVth, XXVIth,

¹ See Articles of Accusation.

XXVIIth and XXVIIIth Articles, as well as the principle of the Church's teaching in all ages.

The fourth charge concerns eternal punishment, which the Bishop of Natal denied. "I did believe" (he says himself) "in that dogma when I printed those sermons,¹ so far as that can be called belief, which, in fact, was no more than acquiescence. . . . I now declare that I can no longer maintain or give utterance to the doctrine of the endlessness of future punishments," etc. etc. There could be no doubt that such opinions contradict the language of the Church in the Creed of S. Athanasius, the Offices of Burial, and other formularies. The Metropolitan went into a point which had been brought forward on behalf of the Bishop of Natal—viz., that in the Articles of 1552 there was one (the XLIIInd) which expressly condemned those who held the opinion that all men should be saved at last; and that this Article was omitted in the revision of 1562. It has been urged that this implied a change of opinion in the revisers, especially Archbishop Parker; but as he about the same time likewise revised the *Reformatio Legum*, according to which such teaching as the Bishop's is heresy, and also put forth a new edition of it in 1571, nine years later, this can hardly be borne out. So of Dean Nowell, his fellow-reviser, and the Lower House of Convocation, of which the Dean was Prolocutor;—his Catechism, with very strong expressions² on the subject, having been "unanimously approved and accepted as their own book and owned doctrine." The real reason for this omission is doubtless that assigned by Hardwicke, that the doctrines of the Anabaptists, against which that and some other articles were levelled, were no longer so menacing as they had been a little while before. The Metropolitan remarked that, if this reasoning were to be admitted, it would be equally open to say that the Church had no belief in the Resurrection, an article concerning that essential point of the Faith having been dropped at the same time as the XLIIInd.

¹ Village Sermons, 1858.

² It speaks of the "*tenebras perpetuas*" of hell; "*ubi scelerum suorum conscientia, et sempiterno igne, atque omni summoque supplicio excruciat, aeternas poenas dabunt atque dependent*" (p. 97, Oxf. Edit. 1835).

The Bishop of Natal had endeavoured to find shelter under the teaching of the Roman Catholics as to Purgatory, but the Metropolitan points out that this is an error. "The teaching of the Church of England clearly is that the punishment of the wicked will last for ever. And this has been the Creed of the Catholic Church in all ages. . . . It is the Creed of the Church of Rome; nor does its doctrine of Purgatory, to which the Bishop refers, and which he pleads as justifying his refusal to believe in the endlessness of punishment, notwithstanding the language of the Creed, really bear him out. His argument is, 'The Church of Rome receives the Creed even as we do, and yet it believes in some remedial process after death. Why may I not interpret the damnatory clauses as the Church of Rome does, and reject the doctrine of everlasting punishment?'

"The reason why is obvious. The Church of Rome holds the doctrine of everlasting punishment, together with that of Purgatory. . . . Purgatory is for the good, not for the wicked;—they are condemned to everlasting punishment."

The remaining charges had reference to the Bishop of Natal's work on the Pentateuch. He was accused of maintaining that, although the Holy Scriptures contain the Word of God, they are not the Word of God, strongly expressed in the sentences, "The Bible is not itself God's Word, but assuredly God's Word will be heard in the Bible."

"The Pentateuch as a whole was not written by Moses; and with respect to some at least of the chief portions of the story, it cannot be regarded as historically true." He also speaks of "the intermixture of human elements, of error, infirmity, passion, and ignorance" in the Old Testament, and says: "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 Testament, which, with the evidence now before me, it is impossible for me to believe."

There can be no question as to this (and much more such) language contravening sundry Articles; to wit, the VIth, VIIIth,

XVIIth, XXth, XXIIInd, and XXXIVth, as also various parts of the Prayer-book, Nicene Creed, Ordination Office and teaching of the whole Church. "But were the Articles and Formularies altogether silent as to the Bible being the Word of God" (the Metropolitan said), "or were the Church's language less decided on the subject, I should still have felt it my duty to declare on other grounds that the Bishop was not entitled to say that the Bible was not the Word of God, or that it was marked with 'error, infirmity, passion, ignorance.' The Church of England does not date its existence from the period of the Reformation. Its history stretches back to Apostolic times. It holds what the whole Church has always held. Silence upon any particular point of faith, or upon any great question of religion, is no reason for supposing that the Church of England was indifferent to that portion of the Faith. There might be reasons, and there were, why articles and definitions should not be multiplied at the Reformation. But the Articles do not embrace the whole of the Church's teaching. . . . Bishop Pearson says: 'The Book of Articles is not, nor is pretended to be, a complete body of divinity, or a comprehension and explanation of all Christian doctrine necessary to be taught.'" The Metropolitan quoted various other authorities to the same effect, going on to the subject of Inspiration, concerning which Bishop Colenso's false doctrines are copiously cited in the Schedule VI. (see Appendix). Here the question for the Judge to decide was, whether the Church allows her ministers to put forth such statements which reduce a large part of the Old Testament history to a mere legend or fiction?

"Now, without wishing to limit the proper field and province of criticism, or to restrict the freedom which may be regarded as desirable for the eliciting of the truth;—without attempting to define Inspiration—(a word which does not occur in the Articles or Formularies in connection with this subject)—or venturing to say where the human element in the Bible ends and where the Divine begins, I must deny that the Church does or can permit her ministers without restraint to make such assertions as these. They are, in my judgment, wholly

much more to the like purpose ;—the Metropolitan went on to say :—

“ The charge must be admitted to be proved, but how far does this bring the writer under the condemnation of the Church ? And here I would observe that I do throughout these proceedings bear in mind that the inquiry we are conducting is both a very solemn and a very serious one ; that it affects the character and future prospects of one high in position ; and that the best construction is to be put upon his language which his words will bear. But I must, on the other hand, add that I cannot think that the language of the Church should be strained to the utmost to cover unsound teaching, because the proceedings in which a judge may unhappily be engaged do seriously affect the character and position of an individual. My first duty in this case I believe to be to the Church and to the Church's Lord. I am bound to be on my guard lest consideration for the accused should lead me to say anything which might tend to injure or destroy the Faith, by making that an open question which the Church never intended to be an open question ;—or by sanctioning the teaching of error to those who look with confidence to the Church for instruction. The faith and teaching of the Church may be added to, or it may be gradually weakened, undermined, changed, by the decisions of Courts. This last result will arise, if it be declared that the Clergy are not required to teach that which the Church holds to be essential, unless the teaching of it is absolutely enjoined in words which will admit of no doubt or cavil. The Church itself might thus, through no fault of its own,—unless it be a fault not to have expressly provided against every possible heresy,—cease to be a witness for truth which once it upheld. It is the first duty of the Bishops of the Church to see that its teaching shall be preserved pure, incorrupt, complete, fixed, and positive, at all hazards. But so far as is compatible with this, not only must freedom be allowed to the Clergy, but special care must be taken not to overstrain or exaggerate their engagements, and the most generous construction must be put upon the language of any who may be accused of false teaching.”