

inconsistent with an honest subscription to the Formularies of the Church. It is impossible to conceive that it should be true that the writers of the Bible 'wrote as men, with the same liability to error from any cause as other men;' and yet that the Bible should be 'God's Word written;'—for it is the Bible—not a part of it only, but the whole Bible, that the Church declares to be such. . . . The Church's practice is defended in ordaining that 'nothing be read except the Holy Scriptures,' etc. But according to the Bishop of Natal, the order to read the Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament in Church, is an order to read fables, myths, uncertain stories and legends. He is at direct issue with the Church as to the character of Holy Scripture. It were a mockery and a wrong for the Church to use the language she does respecting the Scriptures, if in its belief the whole Bible was not the unerring Word of the Living God; or if it were to be ruled that her ministers were allowed to teach that the Sacred Books contain 'uncertain stories and legends,' and openly to reject nine of them as 'legendary' and mythological, full of palpable 'exaggerations, contradictions, impossibilities, and improbabilities,' language must altogether lose its meaning. Pledges, promises, declarations, must be regarded as so much waste paper if the words of the Church in those Formularies and Articles which speak of the Bible, and which are in accordance with, and interpreted by the language of the whole Church on this great subject from the beginning, are not held to be violated by the Bishop in the passages referred to, which are but a specimen of the views propounded throughout his books."

The 7th charge is that of denying the authenticity, genuineness, and truth, of certain books of Holy Scripture, in whole or part—and the passages cited to justify this charge are numerous and long. After quoting some of them, such as that "the account of the Exodus, whatever value it may have, is not historically true,"—that the historical truth of the Pentateuch "is not a doubtful matter of speculation," but that the reverse is "a simple question of facts,"—that it "cannot possibly have been written by Moses, or be regarded as historically true," and

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.”

Bearing this in mind, it was impossible not to pronounce Bishop Colenso's teaching as contradicting not only the teaching of the Church, but of our Lord Himself; and this leads on to the 8th charge, of imputing error and ignorance to our Blessed Lord, by affirming that He merely spoke of the Pentateuch "in the language any other devout Jew of that day would have employed," and that His knowledge concerning all such matters was purely human.

The Metropolitan proceeded to show that there was nothing new in these views, which are simply a repetition of the Nestorian heresy. After quoting the General Councils, and several great theologians, he summed up the Bishop of Natal's error "as separating the man from the God, and really following Nestorius."

Defining the true faith, the Metropolitan went on to say:—

"The question raised is not a light one. It is not a mere question of words. If, as the Bishop affirms, our Lord while on earth was ignorant and liable to error,—if He quoted fiction for fact, legends for history,—if He mistook altogether the character of the Bible, believed the mere human composition to be the Word of God,—believed that God really had spoken to Moses when He had not,—made blunders about the most important matters, as to which it has fallen to the lot of Bishop Colenso to set Him right,—then, if these things be so, we have no sure ground for our faith. Mistaken in one point, He Whom we call Lord may have been so in every matter. We could not admit the Bishop's statements without shaking to its very foundation the whole Christian Faith as a revelation from God. I must decide that in imputing to our Blessed Lord ignorance, and the possibility of error, the Bishop has committed himself to a most subtle heresy, destructive of the reality of the Incarnation, and that he has departed from the Catholic Faith, as held in the Church from the beginning, and as expressed in the IInd Article and in the Creeds."

The 9th and last charge, of impugning, depraving, and otherwise bringing into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer,

particularly portions of the Ordinal and Baptismal Services, needed little proof—the Bishop of Natal's writings are sufficiently outspoken. "I see no remedy but to disobey the law of the Church," etc. etc.

Having thus gone through the Articles of Accusation, concerning each one of which no person of ordinary information or judgment can hold any opinion other than that they are fully proved, the Metropolitan concluded in these words:—

"I have felt the greatest difficulty in dealing with this case, and with the charges which have been brought. Considering the office of the accused, the almost entire absence of precedent, the novelty of my own position and that of my brethren who have been my assessors, and the gravity of the charges brought, I would gladly have shrunk, had it been possible, from the responsibility of acting, and have left this most painful case to be dealt with by the Bishops and Doctors of the Mother Church. By general consent, however, it has been concluded that the burden must be laid upon the Metropolitan and Bishops of this Province, all of whom have been summoned as my assessors on this occasion, though some, from the vast distances which separate us, from the great difficulty of communication, and, I may add, the heavy expense to which they would have been put, have, though most anxious to bear their share of responsibility, not been able to be present.

"For myself, I may be permitted to say that I have taken up the burden which has been laid upon me with fear and trembling; but having assumed it, I have felt it to be my duty, looking up to God for guidance, to vindicate, so far as it was in my power to do so, the Church's Faith, and at least rescue it from the charge of conniving at false teaching in the person of one of its Prelates. The accusations brought are many and weighty. They touch the greater number of those doctrines which have been most debated within the Church, and which are unanimously regarded as fundamental. It is with the deepest pain that I have arrived at the conclusion to which I am driven—that my brother, once a witness for the truth, is now a destroyer of that faith which in days past he upheld."

"I do not stand alone in this conviction. It is hardly too much to say that the whole Church concurs in it. On account of these writings which have been under review, nearly¹ every Bishop of the Church of England has called upon him to resign his See, and on his refusal to do this, has inhibited him from officiating in his Diocese. And both Houses of the Provincial Synod and Convocation of Canterbury have pronounced their formal judgment against that work of his which has attracted most attention, but which is hardly more dangerous than the other. They have united in a solemn declaration that the book contains errors of the gravest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God. This is a very heavy condemnation. It has, however, further, in my judgment, been most clearly and convincingly proved against the accused, in the proceedings which have taken place before the Bishops of this Province, that not on one point only, but on many, he has contravened and denied the Catholic Faith, as taught and expressed in the Creed, Articles, and Formularies of the Church.

"It becomes, therefore, my painful duty first to declare that, convicted as he has been of false teaching on many grave and fundamental points, involving a wide and systematic departure from the Faith, he is unfit, so long as he shall persist in these errors, to bear rule in the Church of God, or to exercise any sacred offices whatever therein; and next, to pass sentence accordingly. In this opinion, and in the sentence which I am about to give, my assessors entirely agree.

"I have only to add that, if it be desired, as has been intimated, to make a formal appeal to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, I shall consent to forward my judgment to his Grace for revision, waiving in this particular case, which is itself novel and of great importance to the whole Church, any real or supposed rights of this Church, and feeling that it will be a very great relief to submit my decision to the Chief Pastor of the Church at home, and to share my responsibilities with him, and if he should see fit, with the other Bishops of the National Church."

¹ The only dissident was the Bishop of S. David's, Dr. Thirlwall.

Then followed the technical sentence¹ whereby the Bishop of Natal was deposed from that office, and prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the Metropolitan Province of Cape Town.

Opportunity was given to the accused of retraction by the operation of the sentence being suspended until the 16th of April 1864, at which time, if no such retractation should have been made, the sentence would take effect, and be published in all the churches of the Diocese of Natal, and in the several cathedrals of the Province of Cape Town.

Dr. Bleek handed in Dr. Colenso's protest against the legality of the proceedings, and validity of the judgment, which he announced his intention of treating as a nullity. Dr. Bleek also gave notice that his client intended to appeal from the proceedings, and to resist any attempt to enforce and carry out the execution of the judgment, in such manner and by such lawful ways and process as he should be advised to be proper.

The Metropolitan replied that he could not recognise any appeal save to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and that he must require that to be made within fifteen days from the present time.

Here the proceedings closed. Unfortunately it is too well known to the whole Christian world that the unhappy person in question did not retract his errors, and did proceed to defy the Church without scruple.

¹ See Appendix VII.

CHAPTER IX.

DECEMBER, 1863, TO JULY, 1865.

PASTORAL TO THE CHURCH OF NATAL—CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. WILLIAMSON, ETC. : WITH MR. KEBLE—LETTERS TO HIS SON ON THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS—CUDDLEDEN, ETC.—LINE OF ACTION CONTEMPLATED BY THE BISHOP—LETTERS FROM MR. KEBLE—FORMAL SENTENCE ON DR. COLENZO PASSED—VISITATION OF NATAL—CHARGE DELIVERED AT THE PRIMARY METROPOLITAN VISITATION—ADDRESS FROM CLERGY—CONFERENCE—DR. DUFF—DEATH OF MRS. ROBERTSON—DR. COLENZO'S APPEAL HEARD BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE—PUBLIC OPINION THEREON—LETTERS—DEATH OF MR. HENRY GRAY—ORDINATION OF THE BISHOP'S SON—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. KEBLE : HIS ILLNESS—JUDGMENT ON DR. COLENZO'S APPEAL—VISITATION CHARGE—ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS OF SYNOD—BISHOP GRAY'S REGRET AT HAVING BEEN REPRESENTED BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL—LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP—ADVICE TO HIS SON—JUDGMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL IN DR. COLENZO'S CASE—GENERAL FEELING OF THE CHURCH—DR. PUSEY—THE JUDGMENT RECEIVED IN AFRICA—THE BISHOP'S IMPRESSIONS OF IT—LETTERS TO MR. KEBLE, THE BISHOP OF GRAHAM'S TOWN, ETC.—MEETING OF THE CLERGY OF NATAL—RESOLUTIONS PASSED—UPPER HOUSE OF CONVOCATION—BISHOP OF OXFORD'S SPEECH—ADDRESS OF SYMPATHY AND ADMIRATION FOR BISHOP GRAY PASSED—SENT DOWN TO THE LOWER HOUSE : DISCUSSION THERE—LETTERS TO HIS SON ON A CURATE'S DUTIES.

THE following Pastoral was now read in all the Churches of Natal :—

“ TO THE CLERGY AND FAITHFUL LAITY IN NATAL.

“ Brethren in Christ—We think it our duty to inform you that, after long and anxious deliberation, we have come to the conclusion that your Bishop has not been charged falsely with erroneous teaching; that he has openly proclaimed opinions which are at variance with the belief of the Church in all ages, and of our own branches of it in particular, and which are, in our judgment, subversive of the Christian Faith. In consequence of this it has been the painful duty of the Metropolitan, with the advice and consent of such other Bishops of the Pro-

vince as could be conveniently assembled, to deprive him of his office as Bishop of Natal, unless he shall within a specified time retract the false teaching which has been condemned. Should he, by God's Grace, be led to see the grievous errors into which he has fallen, and to renounce them, we shall have won back a brother to the Faith, and your Bishop shall be restored to you. Should he refuse to do this, he will no longer have any authority from Christ or his Church to bear rule in the Church of Natal, or in any way to minister in Divine offices; and the Clergy will be released from their vow of canonical obedience to him, and will not be at liberty in any way to recognise him as their Bishop. Let us earnestly pray to God that he may be recovered, and yet again uphold that faith which he once pledged himself to maintain, but which of late he has sought to overthrow. We are not unmindful, brethren, of the sorrows and anxieties and perplexities which have come upon you through the falling away from the Faith of your chief Pastor. It is our desire to bear you continually in remembrance before the Throne of Grace, that not being tossed to and fro by every wind of vain doctrine, you may stand fast in the Faith which is in Christ Jesus, as that Faith has been held and taught by the Church from the beginning, and may walk worthy of the Gospel of Christ. It is possible that your Bishop may return to Natal before receiving the Metropolitan's judgment. If so, you will remember that the sentence does not take effect until the 16th of April next, when the period of retractation will have expired. Commending you very earnestly to the Protection and Guidance of God, we are, dear Brethren, your faithful servants in Christ,

" R. CAPETOWN, Metropolitan.

" H. GRAHAM'S TOWN.

" EDWARD, Bishop, Orange Free State.

" Cape Town, December 17th, 1863."

The Metropolitan's own mind as to the proceedings in Dr. Colenso's trial will be best shown by his private letters written immediately after its conclusion. Sentence was pronounced

December 16th, and on the 18th he wrote as follows to Dr. Williamson :—

“ I have not changed my views on the Long judgment. I think it is as unjust to the Church as it is to me, and that is saying a great deal. The Church, indeed, may work under persecution and injustice, and we shall try to do so; but we are sore puzzled. I have had meetings of Bishops and Clergy and laity too during the past month on the subject, and I am still as much at sea, as to action, as ever. We have, however, held a Provincial Synod of Bishops only, and I have been half tempted to send our ‘ Acts and Constitutions ’ for the Province, with my compliments, to Lord Kingsdown and his friends. I forward copies to Edward. You will see that we are prepared, if there is to be a struggle with the world, to do what we believe our duty to our Lord requires us to do. If Civil Courts interfere and send Colenso back, God helping, I will excommunicate, and if my brethren will join, will (if the Church at home is afraid to do so) consecrate an orthodox Bishop. I know that this will provoke the vengeance of the civil power; but I am prepared to brave everything in this case. If ever there was a heretic, Colenso is one. If we allow him to act in the name of the Church, the sin is ours, and the punishment will be ours. What would our Lord have us do in this case? What would the early Bishops and martyrs have done? They would have said, ‘ To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour.’

“ I do not mean to defend either my jurisdiction or my judgment in Civil Courts should Colenso appeal to them, though I do not quite see how he is to get there. I have spent one fortune in the Long case, and I have incurred considerable expense in this: I do not feel called to spend my children’s inheritance in fighting a battle which I should probably lose, and which would hamper my future proceedings. It is through Civil Courts that the world in these days seeks to crush the Church. They represent the world’s feelings, and give judgment accordingly. A great struggle may, and perhaps will, arise out of this case. I don’t want to be dogged, but I want to be found faith-

ful, and not by cowardice compromise Christ's Church and truth. I hope that you will help me with prayers and counsel. It will rejoice you to hear that the Bishop of Graham's Town is of one heart and mind with me. We have worked together as brothers; and there is as little difference of opinion between us as there can well be between two men. He has been nearly six weeks in my house, with Bishop Twells. We have spent the whole of every day (nearly) in this case, working separately in our rooms till four P.M., and then comparing our conclusions. We have all three agreed to and revised each other's documents. His mind is a very able analytical mind. You know he was senior wrangler, 1st Smith's prizeman, 1st class classical tripos. He came down certainly not prepared for all that we have agreed upon in Synod, but we have weighed step by step each point, and he concurs in all.¹ This is from the force of truth, not from any influence of mine, for he is mentally far, very far, above me. . . . Our trial lasted five days; Badnall's speech was a very able one, but, I think, not equal to the Dean's. My judgment is long-winded; but I could not help this. It embraces almost the whole circle of theology, and the Bishop not being present,

¹ In his "Statement" relating to the facts of this period, Bishop Gray says:

"The proceedings will, I believe, bear comparison with those ecclesiastical causes conducted before the highest judicial Court in England. The only objections that Dr. Colenso has, I think, himself raised, have related to the presence of the Bishop of the Orange Free State, and to the evidence allowed to be used with reference to the question of Metropolitan jurisdiction. As to the Bishops present, he has said in his letter to the laity of Natal (p. 3): 'The Bishop of Cape Town selected as assistants, two Bishops—one a recent nominee of his own, and nominated, doubtless, as generally agreeing in sentiments with himself; the other, known also beforehand as holding the same opinions as himself very strongly, on the most important matters likely to be discussed.' The facts are that all the Bishops of the Province were summoned; that the Bishops of Graham's Town and of the Free State only could attend; that the Bishop of S. Helena, to whom all the documents connected with the trial were forwarded, wrote to express his concurrence with the sentence. That there was no 'selection,' must, I think, have been known to Dr. Colenso. . . . One assessor, he objects, was 'a recent nominee' of mine. Bishop Twells was a Clergyman holding a cure in the Diocese of London. He had been ordained by the Archbishop. It had been agreed that the Archbishop, the Bishops of London and Oxford, with myself, should appoint. Dr. Twells' name was submitted to all, and assented to by all. But by what law, asks Dr. Colenso, and the Bishop of London has re-echoed the question

I was compelled to quote largely from his works as well as our formularies. I have endeavoured, while condemning him, to say as little as I could about doctrine. I wished not to *make* doctrine, but I wished also not to let heresy be tolerated. Well, God help us all to embrace and to defend the truth. . . . Public opinion and the press here say that we have done the only thing we could in Colenso's case, and that he has had a full and fair trial. May it be the last of my collisions with the world. I wish, if it please God, for the rest of my life to eat my bread in quietness, and do my own work, and have time for the study of God's Word, and the preaching of it, which I have not had these seventeen years."

To the Rev. JOHN KEBLE.

"Bishop's Court, December 17th, 1863.

"My dear Mr. Keble—I have to thank you very sincerely for your generous help towards the payment of the heavy expenses which have fallen upon me. . . . I, yesterday, gave judgment, depriving the Bishop of Natal of his office, allowing

(House of Lords, June 18th, 1866, and Convocation, June 29th), had a Bishop with a Diocese beyond the Queen's dominion a right to sit as assessor in a trial upon a Bishop within the Queen's dominions, holding letters patent? Since the late judgments of the Privy Council, I should have thought the question would not have been asked. The Long Judgment declared that Colonial Churches were in law only voluntary bodies. The Natal Judgment declared that there is no Diocese, no jurisdiction, no territorial limits—nothing but a title and a lay corporation. But, apart from this, the Bishop of the Free State was appointed precisely in the same manner as the Bishop of Natal, or any other Colonial Bishop, with this only difference, that the one appointment was by letters missive or mandatory, the others by letters patent. . . . In law, one Bishop's position is as good as another's. Neither has legal rights to sit in judgment upon the other. By the law of the Church, by canon law accepted by the Church of England, Dr. Twells was as much a Bishop of this Province as Dr. Colenso. The objections against the other Bishop are equally futile. 'He was known beforehand as holding the same opinions as myself very strongly,' etc. I had thought otherwise. The Bishop of Graham's Town had been declared often to be a very pronounced Evangelical; I an equally decided High Churchman. The 'most important matters to be discussed,' were the doctrines of Justification, the Atonement, the Sacraments, the Nature of our Lord, the Inspiration of the written Word, the authority of the Church—questions upon which our supposed different schools of opinion might be expected not altogether to agree."—P. 38.

him till the 16th April 1864 to retract absolutely and unconditionally the passages from his writings articulated against him. . . . The case was very ably argued. . . . The Dean's speech was really a very remarkable production. . . . Colenso will, of course, endeavour to get the case before a civil court, and I am writing to say that I will neither defend my jurisdiction nor my sentence before a civil court. Poverty alone would prevent my rushing into heavy expenses, but I make my stand on principle. These courts are no courts of appeal for us. However, on this and on other points I forward to you a report of our proceedings in a Provincial Synod which we have just held. You will, I trust, approve of all that we have determined upon, saving our resolution about laity. I do not think, however, that in the position in which we place them, and keeping the Diocesan Synod in its due subordination to the Provincial, we need anticipate evil from their presence. I have never found any, and, though keenly alive to the mischief arising in some Dioceses, do not apprehend any here. I think it doubtful, however, whether I shall myself invite them again, after the language of the Long judgment on this subject, which I regard as offensive and impertinent. I probably shall throw the responsibility very much on the laity themselves. If they are very anxious to come, I must invite them; if they prove indifferent, they will forfeit the privilege.

"I am myself prepared, should a civil court thrust Colenso back, not only to cut him off from the Church, but to consecrate another Bishop if the Church at home and the Colonial Secretary decline to send out another. Will you tell me what you think our duty would be?

"I have given the judgment which I have done with trembling. The charges touch nearly all the greatest questions of the Christian faith. I hope that I have not *made* doctrine, and I hope that I have said nothing to sanction heresy. We have had a difficult duty to discharge. It is one which might have troubled even you. We have done our best, and spared no labour. May our Lord accept what we have done for the vindication of His Name and Truth. Pray for us that we may be

faithful whatever comes upon us, and act wisely and humbly. There *was* a serious difference between the Bishops and the lawyers in the Essay case. I pray God the Bishops have not yielded. I confess I look with the utmost alarm upon this assumption of civil courts in matters of faith. *We* protested, and forwarded our protest in 1850, after the Gorham judgment, to the late Archbishop, saying we could not receive the decisions of the Privy Council in matters of faith as binding upon us. But I will not weary you further. It is a great comfort to hear that dear Mrs. Keble is restored to you again. My wife is, as usual, working hard for me. . . . If the writer of the article in the *Edinburgh* will pay me a visit I will show him that I have some work to do, and give him some too if he is inclined for it."

TO CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, December 19th, 1863.

"My dearest boy—By this mail you will receive my judgment deposing the Bishop of Natal. It is of necessity very long. . . . I do not mean to defend either my jurisdiction or my sentence before a civil court, if he should succeed in getting his case before one. But I have forwarded the whole proceedings to the Archbishop of Canterbury for his consideration. We have also held a Provincial Synod, and resolved that if Dr. Colenso should resume Episcopal functions without retractation, or restoration by the Metropolitan, it will be my duty to pass the formal sentence of excommunication. . . . I do not feel called on to maintain my cause before judges whose authority to decide it I do not recognise, and the Church has left me to fight this battle alone. Dear Mr. Keble is the only one that has as yet helped me. We are clear and decided here as to the future. If a struggle comes with the civil power and civil courts, we are, I trust, prepared for it."

And a little later (March 19th, 1864) the Bishop wrote to Mrs. Mowbray: "If you see Sir John Coleridge again you may tell him from me that he has wronged by his judgment all those young Churches which in our Colonies are struggling to

plant the faith of Christ. He has sought to bring them under the power of the world, and into the same miserable bondage as that under which the Church of England groans, and from which she must free herself or perish. With us it will fail, and it may be that this Colenso case will bring the question as to whether the Colonial Churches are to bow down before the world and the Dagon of the Privy Council to an open issue. For myself, I say that I will not go before any civil court in the matter, and that I will not be restrained by any sentences they may give from doing my duty to my Lord. If they send us back Colenso, I will excommunicate him. If my brother Bishops and the Diocese of Natal will unite with me, and I can find the right man, I will consecrate a successor in the face of the State and its heretical Bishop. I am much disturbed at hearing that an appeal is about to be made for funds to carry on legal proceedings in England. I must protest against being supposed to concur in this. From the first I have said I would be no party to legal proceedings. It cannot possibly help me. My costs and difficulties are outside English courts this time. Were I to spend another fortune in vindicating the discipline of the Church, I know what English lawyers' hatred of ecclesiastical courts and ecclesiastical authority would lead the Privy Council to decide. I could write their judgment for them. Perhaps, dear, you will think this bitter. It may be so, but the Church may well be bitter under her wrongs from the world and the courts of law, in whose decisions all those wrongs are concentrated. If the Church does not denounce the judgment which I hear is to be delivered *in re Essays and Reviews*, she will cease to witness for Christ. She must destroy that masterpiece of Satan for the overthrow of the Faith—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as her Court of Final Appeal—or it will destroy her. Now, where shall we find a Bishop for the See of Natal in England, who, trusting to God only for his support, will consent to be pastor of a poor and distracted flock, that knows not what to believe, or where to look for counsel? I am sure there are many such. There are some here that would be willing to go, but they

think with me that we want a fresh man from England. I ask the Archbishop and S. Oxon to look out for a man, and if the law restrains the Archbishop, beg him at least to encourage us to do our duty. The assumption of the Crown as to the right of appointments and the necessity of letters patent I hold to be mere assumptions; but if not, no earthly law or claim can hold good against the law of Christ. And so, not intending it, I have poured out my mind to you on a subject much in my thoughts. You used to like stories of the early Church when you were a good little girl:—How would a primitive Bishop have acted if the powers of the world had set aside his spiritual sentence, and bade him welcome back a heretic? God give us grace to do as they would have done.”

Full as the Bishop's thoughts were, as he says, of this momentous subject, he was not thereby rendered indifferent to general interests, above all when they concerned others. In the letter of December 19th to his son, already quoted, after dwelling upon the uppermost topic, he goes on to say: “I am glad that you are attending theological lectures. You have nearly everything yet to learn on the subject of theology. Tell your young heretic, as you call him, to pray and live near to God, and study, and be humble. He will never reach the truth if he does not adopt this course. Forwardness and bumptiousness betoken a temper of mind which will lead to a fall. You will see what Burgon says about Jael at p. 222 in his volume on Inspiration. In judging of such acts, we must bear in mind that the Bible professes to be the record of a history of perpetual revelations of God's Will. It is very concise, leaves gaps to be filled up, touches generally only salient points. Jael's deed done by you or me would be a treacherous and a wicked act. But God may see fit to cut off an oppressor—be he a Napoleon or Robespierre—by disease, or the hand of an avenger. Cholera, or fever, or war, or an assassin, may be the instrument that God chooses to use to rid the world of one who is an enemy both of God and man. The only question is, whether God has ordered it. He often does smite with sick-

ness, as He did Herod, who was eaten up with worms. He *may* have smitten by Jael's hand;—the Scripture implies that He did. If Jael was moved by Him to cut off the oppressor in this particular way, the act could not be wrong. The whole question turns upon whether she did act in accordance with the Divine Will? If your 'young heretic' does not believe that the Bible relates facts truly, he should leave it alone altogether. He should take its whole statements or none. It is consistent with itself and with the character of God, if looked at from its own point of view as a supernatural history. But if you leave out the supernatural, and refuse to believe it, you should in fairness let its statements alone. We have been very hard at work these six weeks. The Bishop of Graham's Town has left. Bishop Twells leaves in a few days. People here seem to think we have taken the only course open to us, and say that Bishop Colenso has had a fair trial. We have bad news from the Zambesi. Rowley has been for some days in my house. The Bishop has come down to near the mouth of the Shire, and settled upon a mountain. I begin to fear that the Mission will not be able to hold its ground. I am anxious to hear the result of your examination.—Ever, my dearest boy, your affectionate Father,

R. CAPETOWN."

To the Same.

" Kalk Bay, January 18th, 1864.

" My dearest boy—I am glad that you have got your *testamur*. A little steady work from the beginning would have got you more. You have, however, had the full benefit of all Oxford can give for four years, and have, I trust, laid the foundations upon which you may build in after-life. You say that you are more fond of reading. I hope that you will now keep close to theology for the year at Cuddesden, to which I am glad you are going, and where you will, I think, find a really good man in Mr. King. . . . You must remember that you have got to lay the foundations of the greatest of all sciences, for you have never yet *studied* theology. Hooker is, I think, the book that will most deeply interest you. It is the work of a great

master. You must tell me what the course of study is. You kick in your mind against what you call private school rules; but there is wisdom in these rules. They would scarcely be felt if they were not needed. Comfort yourself with the thought of this. I am sorry that you undertook a walk of eighty miles in twenty-four hours. It is too great a strain upon the system, and is very different from ordinary athletic exercises. I hope you will not be the worse for it; but I think you will fail."

"February 19th, 1864.

"I am very thankful to think that you are now at a Theological College, and I trust that your year may be greatly blessed to you—that you will lay the foundations of theological learning, and enter with humility and earnestness upon the greatest questions which can exercise the soul and mind of man. I envy you the year of quiet thought and study under able guidance. You fear that you will find it slow. I do not, if you will enter upon the real work of the place. Your mind will open out to new questions and studies, and you will have laid a foundation upon which, in after-life, you may build. There will be two parties, I doubt not, there as elsewhere—an idle and a studious one. Keep clear of the former. I wish that I could look in upon you. . . . We are all very quiet here, preparing for the struggle which we may have yet to go through; for we do not mean to let Civil Courts ride roughshod over us. I think I told you that the Zambesi Mission is breaking up. We may have Bishop Tozer and his party down here any day in the 'Pioneer.' I trust that they will immediately recommence operations in Panda's country, and the regions beyond to the north-east of Natal, which is the nearest approach to the plan originally intended which is feasible. The N.E. of Panda's country is only 700 miles from the Zambesi."

"March 17th, 1864.

"It is a great comfort to hear that you have settled into your new position well, and without any great distaste for it. Restraint at your age, and with your habits and disposition, is

sure to be distasteful. If you have your doubts or dislikes as to anything, talk the matter over privately with the Principal, instead of either brooding over it or denouncing it. He may show you reasons for things which do not occur to you. Your tendency to set down things or persons as absurd should be watched and checked. I am very glad that you like Mr. King so much. Everybody speaks most highly of him. Though your year be somewhat irksome to your temperament, I am mistaken if in after years you will not look back upon it with thankfulness. But I don't want to preach.

"I consider myself as just entering upon the real struggle in the matter of Colenso. I have very strong convictions as to what duty may call me to in his case. And I do not feel sure that others will concur altogether in my views. I hope that I may be led to do neither more nor less than what God would have me do. Very possibly I may go to Natal after the next mail comes in; but this is uncertain."

"Pieter Maritzburg, May 27th, 1864.

"My dearest boy—I am sorry that the great pressure of anxious work now upon me prevents my writing as fully to you as I could wish to do at this time. You are much in my thoughts, because I feel that your present year is probably the most important in your life,—that during it your views will be deepened, and your whole future career become one of real devotion to God, and zeal for His Service, or else that your ministry will become shallow, commonplace, lifeless. My prayers are offered for you day and night that you may be filled with God's Holy Spirit, and led to give yourself up wholly to Him and to His Service. I shall be very glad to hear that you have got into free and friendly intercourse with Mr. King. We have had a laborious and anxious month here. People are very ignorant on religious subjects, and much in love with Privy Councils, and jealous of Church authority, and publish in the papers that I wish to become Pope of South Africa! But God overrules all. We have had a very interesting Visitation, during which I delivered a very long charge, which has made some impres-

sion, and which I hope to send to you with a sermon which I have been asked to publish, by this mail. And we have had an important conference. . . . The Clergy say in their address, that if a Civil Court were to send Colenso back, they dare not recognise him as having spiritual authority; and the whole Conference say that they can never again receive him as their Bishop."

There is something very remarkable in finding the Bishop, with all his energy and life, all his sensitiveness for the Faith, and anxiety to exercise the fullest consideration and tenderness for others, so perfectly calm and undoubting after the harassing time of Dr. Colenso's trial and all the troubles appertaining to it. He writes soon after its conclusion to his brother:—

"Kalk Bay, January 14th, 1864.

. . . . "I have seldom had greater quiet of mind than now. Thank God, I can go about my work at present without great anxiety. I often think that at such seasons one is gathering strength for some greater future trial, under which, but for previous rest, one would break down. Colenso will, I fear, give me much trouble; but I am thankful that I have no doubt about his case, and only trust that I may have grace given to act wisely and firmly under whatever circumstances may arise.

. . . . "Colenso's name does not appear in our papers. They are usually self-sufficient enough, but I do not see in any of them a single letter criticising my judgment in any way. There seems a certain awe over men's minds. The case is too bad to be taken up and defended. . . . We are down here for a change, but I get less quiet than at home, and the glare distresses me. There is a good deal to be done among the coloured people, which I cannot half do. I have a class of about sixteen for Baptism or Confirmation. I get a bathe most mornings and short swim, but the bathing is bad, the coast rocky, and the sea heavy. This, with catechisings, visits (for the place is full), sermon-writing, and a ride generally with Sophy, fills up the day."

“Bishop’s Court, February 18th, 1864.

“My dear Edward—I am thankful that the Treasury is willing to bear part of the expenses to which I have been put;¹ but they should have borne all or none: I cannot understand their principle. Seeing that nothing was done, the Clergy here have been moving in the matter. I shall now stop them. The utter prostration of this country, amounting almost to a general bankruptcy, is sufficient reason for laying no needless burden on any one. . . . The line of the press and of Churchmen sickens me. The Privy Council is the great Dagon of the English Church—all fall down before it. If it sends back Colenso, I shall still excommunicate, and then it will turn and rend me. I write by this mail to the Archbishop, and pray him, if Civil Courts reinstate Colenso, and prevent him from consecrating a successor, to write and encourage me to do my duty to our Lord and to the Church, for which He gave Himself, and to elect out here and consecrate one, without letters patent or other idle formalities. I do not look forward to all this with any satisfaction, but, I trust, with a mind made up; and nothing so disheartens one and weakens one’s hands, as this miserable subservience in matters of faith to the world and the Courts of the world. . . . I have had very nice letters from the Archbishop and others.²

“Bishop’s Court, March 18th, 1864.

“My dear Edward—I am sorry that an old gentleman of your years should have so much trouble about my affairs, especially when your better half, having no employment, was sure to be niggling at you from morning till night. (It is well that I am at this distance, or I know what sort of a punching I

¹ In the Long case.

² Among the many letters of this period the Bishop was pleased with one from Dr. Alexander Duff, a well-known Free Kirk Missionary from India, who was at that time travelling in Africa. “Since my arrival,” he says, “I have been perusing, with painful yet joyous interest, the trial of the Bishop of Natal for erroneous teaching: painful because of the erroneous teaching, joyous because of the noble stand made by your Lordship and the Clergy at large for true, primitive, apostolic teaching. For this stand, worthy even of primitive times, it is no mere word of course to say that I do, unfeignedly, thank God and take courage.”

should get!) However, we may all thank God that the poor dear soul is now herself again. . . . The real expense to me in this case will be in the future steps I may have to take, and risks to run, in bringing out another Bishop. The funds given in answer to the contemplated appeal, will, I believe, mainly go to enable the Colonial Bishops' Council to fight a battle in the Civil Court. Of course this is quite legitimate, but I hope it will not be done under the idea of helping me. I should be far more effectually helped by any single person, great or small, advertising in the *Guardian* that he would receive any contributions that might be offered to relieve me of some portion of the cost to which I had been put, and still expected to be put, in vindicating the discipline and faith of the Church. I object to be mixed up with any appeal for funds to fight a battle in Colenso's case in the Civil Courts, which from the beginning I said that I would not fight. My line is a purely spiritual one. I will consecrate a successor, let the world say and do what it will. I know that I may get into great difficulties through such a course; that the world will turn and rend me; but stop short I dare not, when the question is whether the Church is to witness for Christ, or to allow one convicted of most grievous heresies to usurp government over the flock of Christ. I will do, God helping me and the Church concurring, what I believe S. Cyprian would have done, under my circumstances, in N. Africa in the third century. Our relations to the world and to the Empire are the same. Now, do not fuss and trouble yourself about all this. I don't want you to do anything, but I write freely to you, because I think you would wish to know what view I take as to the proposed Appeal. All that I would ask of you would be, that if I am in any way compromised by this Appeal, you would write a line to the *Guardian* to say that I am not in any way a party to it. I do not, however, wish this to be done, unless I am clearly compromised. . . . The Bishop of Oxford has told me what the P. C. Judgment, *in re* Essays, etc., would be. I pray God that the Archbishop may not only dissent, but tell the Council that he protests against the judgment as in any way

a judgment of the Church; and that he may call upon the Clergy and faithful Laity to join in his protest. If the Church of England submits to having heretics ministering at her altars, she ceases to witness for Christ, and her candlestick will be removed."

Among the letters which at this critical period cheered up the Bishop's heart, was one from Mr. Keble, dated—

"Torquay, February 29th, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I do not know how to feel ashamed enough for not having sooner written. I quite meant to do so last month, but stupidly missed the time. And I am sure we none of us know how to thank you and your assessors, and I will add your Dean and the other prosecutors, enough for all that you have done in that momentous trial, both matter and manner. But you would not like for me to go on and say what I should like to say about that. God grant that your health may be spared, and that you may be duly supported here; and I hope that there is a fairer chance of it than the seeming apathy hitherto would make one think. Pusey's opinion, written to me on the announcement of the sentence, ran thus:—

" 'The Bishop of Cape Town, I hope, is quite clear and healthful. I see that he does not allow any appeal except to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and I hope that even if made the Archbishop would not accept it, for it would bring in first his own lay representative, Dr. Lushington, and secondly the appeal to that infidel Privy Council. Then I understand that he means to fill up the See of Natal. I hope that he will do this in Natal itself, in presence of the people, so that they might virtually accept the new Bishop. This would embarrass the Privy Council exceedingly. This, I hope, he will do as soon as the time is expired which he has allowed. This was the way in the great case of Basilides and Martialis, which S. Cyprian approved without waiting for any appeal.'

"Thus far E. B. P. As I write it out I feel how wrong it was in me to let slip the last mail, for I suppose the time is

long past for you to have acted literally on his suggestion. It seems quite understood that Dr. Colenso declines the Archbishop's jurisdiction as much as yours. I have seen talk of a petition to the Queen, which means, I suppose, to the Privy Council, and such papers as the *Guardian* write in their oracular way of the doubtfulness of the law on the subject. On the other hand, I am told that the *Times* (?) and the general impression is in your favour in this instance. But I should fear it only means that if there were an appeal to the Privy Council the case is so flagrant that you would get your cause. Whether you would be supported in declining the jurisdiction is another question. I have good hope that you might, especially considering the terrible exposure which the Court has just made of itself, which is rapidly leading, as you will hear by this mail, to a coalition between High and Low Church to dethrone it. Under such circumstances, and speaking with such very limited information as I can have, I could wish that it might be found possible to mitigate instead of defying the Queen's Supremacy, and while you decline to plead on the question of deprivation, obtain a real Church check upon the appointment of a successor; still keeping (as it were by way of a rod in your pocket) the resolution to renounce the Supremacy if it be so intolerably abused. Would it not be well to get from Natal itself a move, as nearly unanimous as possible, for petitioning yourself (and through you the Crown) to fill up the vacancy as soon as possible, or rather to allow the African Church itself to do so? It might be so worded as to pledge them before God and man never to accept Colenso back again; and if you could get it amply supported from the other Dioceses of your Province, it *must* be attended to. We on our side *must*, and I doubt not *shall*, adopt it as our own cause, and make the Government understand that it will be a *casus belli* for them to pretend to reverse such a sentence as yours. The judicial tone and fairness which even the enemy allows to have been kept up in Colenso's trial will greatly help us.

"In one thing I own I am less sanguine than I was. Our dear good Archbishop will hardly, I fear, prove equal to such a

crisis. He somehow has allowed the lawyers to mystify him in this Wilson case, and is even now before the world as tolerating their sophistry about the word *αὐθις*, which it seems to me that any clear-headed boy might refute. He has promised to explain himself, and do away with the scandal; but I cannot hear that he has done anything yet. . . . I have asked my neighbour, Sir William Heathcote, to consider about bringing in a Bill for a better Court of Appeal, and I think he is turning his mind that way. But after all, referring matters to the Bishops, with whatever help, would hardly set us right, unless we could mend the *Bishop-makers*: *there* eventually will be the tug of war. I wonder whether, if the Privy Council meddled, a prohibition might be moved for in any of the Courts. That would be one way of testing the law; or Colenso might bring a civil action against the trustees denying him his salary;—that would be another. Anyhow, if we were prepared in our several provinces with passive resistance;—South Africa to refuse Colenso, England to ignore and disobey sentences which are against the Faith, we should keep our deposit, and that is the one thing needful. I trust we shall have grace to do so.”

“ March 1st.

“Since I wrote the above I have heard that a plan is on foot for a ‘monster’ petition to the Queen against the Court of Appeal, presented by the Bishop of Oxford, who is also understood to approve of a ‘Declaration’¹ emanating from Christ Church and Record, pledging all the Clergy who sign it to the doctrines of Plenary Inspiration and Eternal Judgment in a way that cannot, I think, be evaded. I have not a copy to send you, but doubtless it will reach you by this mail. It is a most providential thing that E. B. P. keeps so well, and so thoroughly up to work. His Conference, in which he gathers from seventy to eighty undergraduates and B.A.’s, and permits them to produce their Scripture difficulties, which he discourses on, are said to be doing great good; and Liddon is like a second edition of himself (though indeed he is a most original and

¹ See *Guardian* of March 9th, 1864.

first-rate man), raised up to help and comfort him. What surprises me much is the pecuniary apathy of our friends in the Williams and Wilson causes, as well as in Colenso's. I want to make a noise about it, but hardly know how, having been obliged to part company with the *Guardian* by their way of dealing with the doctrine of Judgment. . . . You see, my dear Lord, how I am fain to fill up my paper with scraps of matter which will be of no use, when I could wish to be sending you hints and precedents from antiquity, or the like. I am away even from my own books, having been driven here just after Christmas by symptoms on my wife's chest which left us no choice, and we chose this place instead of Penzance as being far less of a journey."

" March 4th.

"I have, I am sorry to say, no more news at present. The good Primate has not as yet, that I can find, put out any declaration of his dissent from the offensive judgment. It must be hoped that, when it does come, it will be the more full and absolute and entire, and backed by his brethren. Stanley, who appears more prominent than any one else in the Latitudinarian move, is going on in a wonderfully dexterous way, trying how far he can get every one to symbolise with him. He is now (this is private *at present*) getting up a group of preachers for the Abbey after Easter, and he has asked Pusey, who rather demurred, but now finds that the Archbishop of York, Canon Stowell, and others, have accepted. What should *you* do? But of course this is an abstract question. Yet I should like to know. Canon Wordsworth, G. Williams, and others, say Yes. One most shocking thing is the number of persons who subscribe (it seems) to Colenso's Fund. I trust that we too shall find help. But you don't like that subject. Now I have only just room to say for my wife and myself how much and earnestly we remember you and Mrs. Gray. May God reward you.—Most truly yours, J. K."

The Bishop's answer to this letter was as follows:—

"Bishop's Court, April 12th, 1864.

"My dear Mr. Keble—I have to-day received your kind letter of the 29th. It has been a great comfort and refreshment, amid much to depress me. We received that awful judgment of the P. C., *in re* Williams and Wilson, by a stray Indian steamer. By another stray steamer I wrote to the dear Archbishop in deep distress, entreating him to call upon the Church to repudiate it. It seems to me that that judgment commits the Church if she does not repudiate it—I. To heresy in the matter of eternal punishment; II. To the loss of all real Revelation, for it will cover all that Dr. Colenso has written; III. To an admission that she is not a branch of the Catholic Church by refusing to consider anything but the documents of the Reformation as expressing her Creed;—the decision of General Councils, for instance, *in re* Nestorius, appear to be no part of her Faith.

"I have told the Archbishop that, if not repudiated by the Church, I fear it will break up our Communion; for that, determined as we are to stand by the Faith, I do not see how we can continue to call ourselves 'in union and full communion' with a Church that tamely surrenders it. A really bold line alone will save the Church at this crisis. She must formally in her Synods repudiate the profane judgment, and deny that that Court is sanctioned by her, or entitled to misrepresent the Faith in her name. The world cannot crush the Church if she will assert her independence, and at all hazards witness for Christ. Her servility is her great curse, and will, if she does not rise up in the strength of her God, prove her ruin. I have sent my letter through the Bishop of Oxford, fearing it might be too strong, and I have entreated him, if the Archbishops fail at this crisis, to put himself at the head of a great movement. I feel ashamed to be writing all this to *you*, but the trial to which I am just now exposed makes me feel strongly, and perhaps speak too freely. Many thanks for your and dear Dr. Pusey's counsel. I have just heard from him. The mail sails for Natal on the evening of the 16th—next Saturday. I have taken a passage in it for myself and my wife. On that day

the time allowed to the Bishop for recalling his writings expires, and I go up to take charge of the Diocese *sede vacante*, and to hold my metropolitanical Visitation. The Diocese, as might be expected, is in a very sad state. The Dean of Maritzburg, a very devoted man, is the only person in the whole country with whom I can take free counsel. . . . I could not consecrate a Bishop at once, even if I could get the Clergy to elect, or the Laity to concur, for we have not a man ready. All the Presenters would do, but it would not perhaps be well to appoint them, and all have large families, and there may be absolutely no maintenance. . . . I trust that you will pray for me, that I may be guided aright."

Mr. Keble wrote again :—

"Penzance, Low Sunday, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I must write a few lines by this mail, though I have nothing to say, or next to nothing, but what you will see in the papers. Our water at home is so hot, that as yet we hardly feel the stream from South Africa; which yet, I suppose, we must. Not a word have I yet heard of Colenso's appealing, more than when I wrote last; only I see that some keep on subscribing to his fund: in the last batch is Mr. Jowett's name, which, of course, is as it should be. I fancy by the little I can hear, that our lawyers and statesmen find the late judgment a more serious matter than they had expected, and that some of the best are by this time seriously turning their minds towards amending the Court of Appeal. The Archbishop's Pastoral¹ (is it not excellent?) has made them open their eyes. Heathcote and Page Wood, among others, are laying their heads together; and I fancy there is some notion of asking the Chancellor in the House of Lords why the Bishops might not explain in Court the reasons of their dissent from the other Judges, which simple question will open the whole matter. I have reason to believe that —, notwithstanding appearances, is really thinking very deeply on the subject. I will give you (in religious confidence) a couple of sentences from a letter I have just received from him.

¹ See *Guardian* of March 23rd, 1864; and for the Archbishop of York's Pastoral, May 11th, 1864.

"I am sorry to say, the more I have thought of the matter, the worse it seems. I am impressed with the fear that in matters of faith, what is called judicial construction will be found to mean liberty of simple contradiction to solemn engagements; and also that the chain of reasoning, which seems only to question one point as an isolated point of religion, in reality involves the whole fabric of Christian belief.' This and some other things being as they are, I think that, at any rate, things will not be allowed to pass away as in a dream. The sort of coalition between us and the Low Churchmen is likely, I trust, to do much good, though, for the present, it estranges us from some who had been learning for years to decline touching the *Record* except with a pair of tongs to put it into the fire! The squabble about Jowett's salary, too, has made a kind of breach for the time between E. B. P. and many Conservatives. But the Primate with his 10,000 will, on the whole, *D.V.*, keep us well together. The tendency of the Court will, I fear, prove one of the most untoward things. A friend of mine, the other day, was looking at a certain devotional book, the title of which I do not know, but it is from the German, and is understood to have been the Prince Consort's favourite manual, and to be under Her Majesty's especial patronage. In it my friend saw clearly taught the non-existence of the Evil Spirit, and the passages concerning him in the Gospels made out to be mere accommodations to Jewish prejudices! I am not surprised at this, seeing the great favour shown to ——, whose theology looks worse and worse the more one knows of it. . . . I trust that we shall hear that you are holding your own, and in good heart. —I am, my dear Lord, ever yours, JOHN KEBLE."

It is perhaps better here to carry on this correspondence, so interesting as it is, to completeness, and to give the Bishop's reply:—

"Deanery, Maritzburg, May 30th, 1864.

"My dear Mr. Keble—Your letter, dated Low Sunday, reached me here yesterday. I must strive to find a few moments to thank you, though the mail leaves on Wednesday, and I have much to do and write.

“ I have had an anxious and most laborious month here ; but by God’s Goodness all has been done that I think could have been done. The Clergy, in their address to me, say that if Dr. Colenso were to come out again with legal authority, they dare not receive him as having spiritual authority ; and the Conference of Clergy and Laity say that under no circumstances could they ever again receive him as their Bishop. Declarations too are about, repudiating his opinions. . . . The great difficulty with which I have had to contend has been the ingrained notions of an exaggerated supremacy, and the notions about ‘ free inquiry,’ and ‘ persecution,’ and, perhaps, a little jealousy of a Bishop from the old Colony. Upon the whole, however, I have been most heartily received by Clergy and Laity and I think they feel grateful for my making sacrifices to come and stand up for our Lord and His Truth among them. The Cathedral has been crowded, and I have been preaching unceasingly. Nothing can well be worse than the state of the Diocese. I hope, however, to ordain two good men, but we want ten for immediate service. I am told that Colenso means to bring out men of his views, and funds too, and create a work. If the Church does not fill up posts from which there is a cry for help, they will, I fear, accept Colenso’s men, rather than have none ; for people here are very ignorant as to his views, and the lengths to which he has gone.”

Upon Mr. Keble’s next letter, the Bishop of Cape Town has made a note to the effect that it was written under a misapprehension. “ I had expressed,¹ both to him and to the Bishop of Oxford, my conviction that if the Church of England did not repudiate Dr. Colenso, she would be in alliance with heresy, and drive those of her members, who felt it to be their first duty to maintain the Faith, out of her communion.”

“ Hursley, June 4th, 1864.

“ My dear Lord and my dear friend—I fear my letter will be even more hurried and unsatisfactory than usual, for here is

¹ See letter above of April 12th, 1864.

almost the hour come for posting it, and I have let the days slip almost unawares since I received yours. I have wished I had accepted an offer which the Bishop of Oxford made me at Cuddesden the other day, to read your letters before. I left him as I did rather in a hurry. I had not realised the greatness of the subject of them, though he gave me some idea. But since I have heard from yourself there was the less need.

"I am afraid that, pressed as I am for time, I shall speak in too off-hand a way; but you will understand me. I will say then at once that your letter gives me the idea (and I am afraid that S. Oxon, etc., will have the same) of our hastening *too eagerly* to the 'ultima ratio,' which in this case would surely be the greatest calamity to the whole Church. That 'ultima ratio' must surely be kept in mind, and influential people, like those you have written to, must be made aware that it is so. But I have observed, even on this very subject, that the best persons I know, whenever I give a hint tending that way, seem to recoil from the idea; it strikes them as 'deserting one's post.' I gather from this that we ought to wait until the complicity of the Church of England in these atrocities is much more decided than it is yet before we set up 'altar against altar.' And I don't really feel that it is 'servility.' I have no doubt that in such a man as, *e.g.*, ——, who cannot bear the idea, it arises from nothing but pastoral and dutiful feelings. He says to himself, 'Because some who ought to know better allow wolves to come in in sheep's clothing, is that a reason for me to leave the flock, and not rather to stay that I may protect it?' I grant that in your case there is a difference. You can in a manner take your flock with you out of the way. An English Bishop, for obvious reasons, could not half so well do the same; and a Priest, or any number of Priests, without a Bishop, separating from the body simply on account of the present scandal, would be just giving up self, flock, and all, in a kind of suicide, which would please only the enemy. But I conceive that you do not mean anything so strong at present; it could only be when the hope of adequate repudiation was gone. Now really, unless I greatly flatter my-

self, we are in a way to something like it. First we have the two Archbishops and the nearly 12,000 Clergy who have publicly disallowed and branded these heresies. Then there will be a great demonstration of all sorts, Clergy and Laity, rich and poor, Whigs and Tories, etc., waiting to thank the Archbishops for so doing. At least the train for such a thing is laid, and we have good hope that the explosion will be very loud. Then there will, I quite expect, be a synodical condemnation of *Essays and Reviews*. And what seems to me most important of all, the Archbishop will, I believe, ask the House of Lords for a select Committee to take into consideration the state of the law as to dealing in the last resort with Ecclesiastical causes involving doctrine. It may be granted, and it would be too barefaced to deny it. I cannot conceive their making any other report than such as would incurably damage the present Court; and *that* being once put down as unconstitutional, these dreadful decrees would of course go with it, as those of the Star Chamber and High Commission Courts did. And then we should be formally right again, should we not? At least if we could get, as we surely might, a Court which should be bound to give due weight to real Church authority. All this would take time, and might take more than one session, perhaps more than one Parliament; but if it showed life as it went on, and ended well at last, how sorry would a good Churchman be to have excluded himself from such a move by premature separation; and would he not have to reflect that if many had followed his example, perhaps the contrary result might have followed, there would not have been enough to fight the battle? 'Hoc Ithacus velit.' I fear that if South Africa were to put us out of communion, we being no more committed to these heresies than we are at present, it would greatly add to our difficulty in shaking them entirely off, and would also, from the severe view which it would imply of our position, drive not a few in the direction of Rome.

"Of course there are limits to the forbearance which I recommend. As soon as it became quite plain that the English nation had finally made up its mind to carry on this kind of

tyranny with a high hand, the sin of the Church in bearing with it would *perhaps* be rightly considered intolerable, and the Bishops going on to connive at it would *perhaps* have forfeited their claim to be communicated with; and then *perhaps* it would be right and canonical for the other Bishops of the Reformed Catholic Church to come to the relief of the orthodox in England, and supply them with the means of grace, excommunicating those who would then be the State Bishops. I don't see my way in the matter *canonically*; but *if* such a miserable necessity should arise, His tokens would not be wanting to His people. I feel absolutely certain that it has not yet arisen; that what has happened is indeed most dangerous to the *well-being* of our Church, but has not affected her being; that to whatever extent we have allowed it, we have sinned and are sinning grievously, and ought never to rest, nor let our rulers rest, until these sentences are swept away as if they had never been. From a report which reached me I hoped I should have to congratulate you on the Attorney-General's declaring that Dr. Colenso has no appeal to the Queen; but I cannot make out the authority for it; you will of course hear if it is so. At any rate I feel sure you have general sympathy here in your proceedings against *him*. . . . The Clerical subscription question, I hear, is likely to result in the substitution of the following for the 2nd and 3rd clauses in the 36th Canon, viz. —That 'he alloweth the 39 Articles *and the Prayer-book*, as *agreeable* to the Word of God,' instead of 'not contrary.' The *assent* and *consent* in the Act of Uniformity will, I imagine, be omitted, only the engagement to use it will remain. I don't think it will make much practical difference, but in theory it sounds rather immoral. The putting the Articles and Prayer-book on the same footing is to me a real and great improvement.

"I grieve over the debate on the Oxford subscription, for I fear it will rather estrange our members from each other. Nor can I like trusting government and tuition to persons only pledged to be *bona fide* members of the Church of Eng-

land. I want them to sign the eight first of the thirty-nine Articles; but of this I daresay the Liberals will not hear.

“My wife, I am thankful to say, is better for the West of England. She sends her kind and respectful love to yourself and Mrs. Gray, and I join with her, heart and soul, being always, my dear Bishop of Cape Town, most sincerely and affectionately yours,
J. KEBLE.”

To this letter Bishop Gray replied :

“Bishop’s Court, July 15th, 1864.

“My dear Mr. Keble—Many thanks for your kind letter and friendly counsel. I have no thoughts of separating from the Communion of the Church of England. It must be something very much worse than what has actually taken place to lead me to any overt act of that kind. Nothing can be better than the Archbishop’s Pastoral. It is a *de facto* reversal of the Lord Chancellor’s judgment, by him to whom the Head of the Church has given authority to judge in matters of faith; and the repudiation of judgment (it is nothing less) by the eleven thousand faithful Clergy is very comforting. It needs but the Synodical condemnation to clear the Church of all complicity in this profane judgment. I confess, however, that I believe that the existing Court of Appeal, having been created to perform duties which our Lord has not given it to perform, will destroy the Church of England if the Church does not repudiate *it*; and I know not how soon it may be the instrument of breaking up the Communion of the Church. At this moment the law officers of the Crown have advised the Crown to refer to *it* questions which could not come before it by the ordinary process of the law, as regards this Colenso affair. Suppose they reply that the Crown could not give powers to the Metropolitan; that Colenso is not legally deprived, because of invalidity in letters patent; and treat the fact of my appointment by the Church in consequence of the decision come to by the meeting of Bishops under the presidency of the late Archbishop as a nullity—am I, having received my commission from our Lord, through His Church, to acquiesce in an

infidel filling the See of Natal, to the destruction of the Body of Christ in that land? God forbid.

"I am bound, still, to excommunicate him; and then, if my brother Bishops will act with me, to consecrate another, if the Archbishop of C. cannot. But, then, in what light will the Church at home regard all this? Will the Bishops still pay Colenso, without being forced to do so by a decree of a Court? If they do, can they or will they recognise as Bishop the true witness for Christ in Natal? These are questions which may be coming on. I cannot, for one, consent to let the Privy Council settle for us who is the true Pastor of that Church, or force an unbeliever on that Church; nor can I take the charge of that Diocese permanently along with my own. It would not answer. The Church there, seeing that we did not or could fill up the post, would break up; some would go over to Colenso as the recognised Bishop, not half understanding his views; some would give up religion altogether. The more earnest would go over to the sects, as many have already done. and the labour of working up that Diocese in its present miserable condition would be beyond my power.

"I have only just come back from my most painfully interesting Visitation. My wife rode with me 700 miles;—great part of it in a beautiful country. I have pledged myself to double the Clergy within a year, if men can be found, and S. P. G. will allow me to appropriate their existing grants." (Here some details of the Visitation are given.) "God has, I hope and believe, overruled events, and guided men's hearts and minds. If Civil Courts do not persecute the Church there, with judgments denying its religious liberties, I can carry the Diocese with me.—Believe me ever, dear Mr. Keble, faithfully and affectionately yours,
R. CAPETOWN."

"Church Crookham, Farnham, August 4th, 1864.

"My dear Lord—I must write a few lines, were it only to thank you for your kindness in writing to me in the midst of your overwhelming work, and for your Charge, of which I will only say that it looks to me like a fragment of the fourth century

recovered for the use of the nineteenth. How the matter will be dealt with by the authorities I have no knowledge at all. I hope you will hear from others by this mail something more to the purpose. Our own great anxiety continues, allayed in some measure by what Convocation has done; but in one sense *that makes me more anxious*; the Clergy, *especially the High Church portion*, are so disposed to think the least that is done sufficient. The other sort, on this occasion, are much more in earnest; *e.g.* the Irish parsons sign the Oxford Declaration in the ratio of nine to one; the English, six to one. I got very anxious about it all a fortnight or three weeks ago, and went to London partly on purpose to find whether anything was in preparation against the next session. I saw ——, who told me that there really is a fair chance, but no notice has been given in Parliament. I apprehend that the Bishops have not yet been able to agree sufficiently among themselves; and I also have heard that the hitch is chiefly with W. Ebor., which I can well believe. In the meantime the address to the Archbishops is getting signed very well I imagine, *where the Clergy are hearty about it*; in such degree as it may be a failure, it will be due to the cause above mentioned—I mean the apathy of High Churchmen. I found the poorest and simplest of my parish quite intelligent and quite cordial about it. The personal character of Lord Westbury, which, in Hampshire at least, is well known, adds to their horror at the thing itself. On the whole I returned from London more comfortable than I went, and am satisfied that it is our duty here for the present to wait and see what comes of these promises; but still to keep up the soreness which is so apt to heal of itself. Pusey, who has been communicating with Sir R. Palmer, seems more discouraged. He is about to publish the said Sir R.'s opinion on the legal effect of the judgment, with a preface, which I am to see in proof, and it is possible that he and I may have to come out severally with strong views on the absolute necessity of a change in the law of Appeals, if schism is to be averted; but we must take care—it is so much better in general, as our old friend, Bishop Butler, says, to *understate* than to *overstate* in such matters.

"J. H. Newman's *Apologia* is quite an event. I shall be anxious to know how it strikes you. I can fancy it doing us a great deal of good; assuredly he means it to do so. Some time since I saw a letter of his to Isaac Williams, in which he expressed great grief at this trouble in our Church, and a hearty wish that it might succeed and stand in this crisis, for in this country, he said, it was the only body that could wrestle with infidelity. 'The Catholic Church,' he said, 'has not the power to do so' here. And now he publishes his wish for an 'armed truce' between us and them. I wonder what the Pope will say to it all. The publication has been the greatest relief to J. H. N. himself, and he tells me that, so far, he has had the rare luck to please both parties; but his testimonials from Roman Catholics, as far as I have seen, are not from the Continent. There is a plan for the Bishop of Oxford and George Williams to go out as a Deputation to Russia (D.V.) next year, and influential friends there are said to be preparing the way for them. Some of us want much to know what you think of the Zambesi matter. Now, I can only add my wife's and my own best wishes and prayers for yourself, my dear Lord, and Mrs. Gray, and all yours, and all your works.

"Yours, with deep love and reverence, J. KEBLE."

It has seemed better to keep these interesting letters in direct sequence, although, by doing so, we have run ahead somewhat, and must now go back to a rather earlier date.

March 14th the Bishop wrote to Dr. Williamson:

. . . "You say you think that I am cast down. No. I have had two quiet months, and have been reading more than I have done for many a day, and gathering, perhaps, some mental strength for the struggle which is probably approaching. My difficulties are only just beginning;—the trial is the least part of them. I fully anticipate an appeal to the temporal Courts against the Colonial Bishopric's Council for payment of stipend—perhaps a verdict in Colenso's favour—return to Natal—resumption of spiritual functions, excommunication, and then

the real struggle. Will the Diocese place the appointment of another Bishop in my hands, to be consecrated in the teeth of the Crown without letters patent? Can I find a fit man willing to come out and witness for Christ against Colenso, he having the income, and perhaps the churches, and recognised by officials? Nothing less than this will, humanly speaking, save the Church, and the difficulties of various kinds in the way are manifold; but if it becomes our duty, grace will, I believe, be given to us to see it and to do it. Upon these topics my mind is dwelling. . . . Nothing has more discouraged me or weakened my hands more than the low, worldly, servile view which nearly everybody in England takes of these questions. Well, say they, you have done your duty, whatever be the result of an appeal to the Privy Council. What would a Christian of the first three centuries have said to such a notion? And whatever your state in England may be, ours is that of the three first centuries. Civil Courts have the disposal of all our property, but they have no more right to affect to control my spiritual actions or to bind my conscience, than in the third century to control and bind Cyprian. Well, my dear fellow, I stand pretty much alone in my views, but I am persuaded of them, and, as I said to my advisers at the time, shall have to do penance for not having acted upon them in the case of Long, when the Courts threw their mantle around him because he denied all jurisdiction in spiritual Courts. I mean now to act upon my convictions as far as possible; and if I am beaten in maintaining what I believe to be Christ's Cause, I am beaten. As dear Annie says, in the words of the Church,—God give me wisdom to 'know what things I ought to do, and grace faithfully to fulfil the same.' I have had with me all this morning a worthy Churchman and merchant from Natal, who prays me to go up to that widowed, desolate Church. He says that all life is gone in it. . . . He says that Churchmen are looking to me, and will shut their churches against Colenso; but that with the godless he is popular, because he preaches universal salvation."

-- April 16th, 1864, was, it will be remembered, the day up to

which it was in Dr. Colenso's power to retract and express his repentance. Accordingly, when that day passed without any sign, the sentence was formally passed, and on the last day of May it was officially served upon the deposed Bishop by Messrs. Brooks and Dubois, Proctors to the Metropolitan. Meanwhile, as we have seen, the Bishop of Cape Town was preparing to visit the unfortunate Diocese. He wrote to his brother (April 4th): "The idea is that Colenso will, by claiming churches, or by an action against me, get into the Natal Court, and from thence to the Privy Council, which, I verily believe, would affect to reinstate him, for this awful and profane judgment would cover all that he has written, and probably was intended to do so. I do not relish this journey and voyage, and dislike it most because of the possibility of a personal collision with Colenso. It is, however, necessary that I should take the charge of the Diocese, and be a rallying point for the faithful, and strengthen their hands. Thank God I can leave my own Diocese without anxiety just now. What is to become of the Church of England if it does not in its Synods repudiate this judgment *in re Essays and Reviews*? Seriously can she be called 'a witness and keeper of Holy Writ' if she does not utterly denounce it, and the wretched Court that framed it? God give her grace to rise up as one man, and say that she will separate from the State if she is to be thus wronged and cheated of her office as a Church to witness for Christ."

In a letter already quoted the Bishop spoke of his coming departure. On April 15th he wrote: "I start (D.V.) to-morrow to take charge of the Diocese, and, if I can, guide it into a right path. It is an anxious time, for it has a poor ministry, and the people have never been taught. . . . The Long Judgment is now a thing of the past, and yet a poor coloured congregation sent me their little offering last week of £2:10s. in diminution of my expenses. . . . I have worn out my eyes with writing since I determined to go. Just now I have to settle about the future of the Zambesi. Keble writes me most loving letters, and Pusey too, and Denison, in the tone of the shield, the sword, and the battle. And the Bishop of Lincoln

and Archdeacon Bickersteth, both full of sense and readiness for action. The real struggle is now coming on;—hitherto it has been skirmishing. Now it is with the world clothed in ermine. God defend the right. Colenso has been advised by his friends (it comes from letters to a friend here) not to publish his Part V., which contains an attack worse than in Part IV. on the New Testament, till this matter is settled. ‘We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.’”

To the Bishop of Oxford the Metropolitan wrote:—

“Bishop’s Court, April 14th, 1864.

“My dear Bishop—I start (D.V.) for Natal on Saturday, Colenso ceasing that day to be Bishop. I wish that we may hear of a man willing to come out and trust to God for a maintenance, and, at the same time, well qualified to fill a very difficult post. I am asking Archdeacon Bickersteth to look out, and be a referee. The Archbishop’s letters to me are very nice. Surely these two things are essential:—I. The repudiation of the judgment by the Synods of the Church. II. A demand upon the part of the Church for the suppression of the Court of Appeal, and a return to the principles and practices of the Reformation as to these matters.

“Gladstone’s letter to the Bishop of London after the Gorham Judgment is full of matter for these times. His abiding by his views and acting them out at this crisis should be the test of his adherence to or abandonment of the Church.

“I hope that all will not evaporate in useless protests. The Church will speak boldly, if it feels strongly, and, if bold, will have its way. This horrid, crushing, stifling result of modern notions of the Supremacy is ruining the Church. It is undermining men’s faith in her. The Court of Appeal must be overthrown, or the Church will perish. It has done more during the thirty years of its existence to drive men to Rome than all the writings of all the Romanists during that time.”

Accordingly, on April 16th, 1864, the Bishop and Mrs. Gray embarked in the coasting steamer "Dane," stopping one night at Port Elizabeth, and, after a tedious voyage, battling with contrary winds, they landed at Port Natal on the 26th; Archdeacon Fearn and others of the Clergy and Laity waiting on the quay to receive and greet them heartily.

Some days were spent in D'Urban, where there was much to be done. "All represent the state of the Diocese as most deplorable" (the Bishop's Journal of May 28th says): "the Clergy diminished in numbers, and disheartened; the Laity distracted, some of them perverted." Mr. and Mrs. Robertson, the devoted Zululand Missionaries, came down just then, and the Bishop was glad to have much discussion with Mr. Robertson concerning his work, and they visited the Umlazi Mission Station together.

The sentence of Dr. Colenso's deprivation was to be read on Sunday 31st in all churches of the Colony. On the Saturday the Bishop heard that there were some people disturbed about this, and a protest signed by twenty-seven persons was sent in. On inquiry he found that the general idea was that it was a sentence of excommunication. There was a crowded congregation on the Sunday at both services—the Bishop preaching, in the morning on Faith, and in the evening on the Inspiration of the written Word. When the sentence was read after the Nicene Creed, about eighteen or twenty people walked out, but nothing could be more reverent and devout than the general congregation, and there were the usual number of communicants. The Bishop's Journal notes that he was very much exhausted with this day's services, chiefly because of the painful circumstances attending them. The ignorance and want of comprehension with which he had to deal may be seen from the following passage:—

"May 2nd.

"One of my visitors, a great friend of Bishop Mackenzie, told me that though in church yesterday, he had believed, until Mr. Robertson undeceived him, that I had excommunicated Dr. Colenso during the service, and that that was the general

belief. He told me also that the idea of some was that this was persecution, and that I had no authority whatever, by letters patent, or oaths taken by Dr. Colenso, over him as my Suffragan. I gave him my letters patent to read, and the oath taken by the late Bishop on his consecration. He was amazed! He told me that he really believed that, with the exception of a very few, the laity generally repudiated Dr. Colenso's teaching, and would never wish to see him back in Natal again; but that they knew nothing of the office of Metropolitan, and thought that I wished to make myself a Pope, and did not like 'Table Mountain Government.' I had a long conversation with him about the nature and constitution of the Church, Civil Courts, etc. It is thus that difficulties and trials and misconceptions force men to think and examine for themselves. If they are right-minded men, and have no personal objects to serve, they never fail in time to see the truth. In the evening, one of the churchwardens came to express his regret for his own misconceptions, and to assure me that he and his colleague would gladly co-operate in any plans I might have for the benefit of the place or Diocese. . . . It seems that a few people here who caused great anxiety, and offered much opposition to Bishop Mackenzie when he was placed here, have been endeavouring to get up an agitation, and that they have signally failed."

On May 3rd the Metropolitan and Mrs. Gray left for Pieter Maritzburg, stopping by the way at Camperdown to minister to the last hours of a traveller who had just before been taken ill and was dying in the inn. After endeavouring to comfort the poor widow as far as might be, they went on, and were met on the road by Dean Green and some friendly laymen. It was fourteen years since the Bishop and Dean had met, and there were indeed weighty matters before them both for discussion. "The feeling against the Bishop seems very general" (says the *Journal of May 7th*), "in spite of much to attract personally, and many acts of kindness shown by him to individuals, and appreciated by them. I cannot hear of more than two or three people in this place, known to be infected by his teaching. The great body of Church people shrink from his views, though

scarce knowing the extent to which he has carried them. They do not, however, see their way clearly as to the future. The case is of so novel a character, that plain people may well be perplexed and puzzled as to the relation of the Bishop to the Metropolitan, and that of the Metropolitan to the Primate of all England. . . . The time that has been lost, to say nothing of other things, has been a great evil. People feel, very keenly, that the Bishop has been spending the last two years of his life in publishing infidel books in England, instead of doing his own proper work. . . . The work must languish, the Church must die out in this land, unless for the next few years the Mother Church will help it in its affliction. We have all of us contributed to inflict a great blow upon it, by sending out one who has undermined its life, by instilling the poison of unbelief into it. We must all come to its succour in its hour of weakness and danger, and provide it for a time, and largely at our own cost, with true and faithful pastors. It is, at this hour, the weakest of all the Church's outposts; and it is in greater danger than any other."

On May 10th they rode out to Ekukanyeni, the late Bishop's residence, about five miles from the town, built on about 8,000 acres of valuable land given by the Government partly for a Mission Station, and partly as an endowment for the See. Here Bishop Colenso had begun a native institution, long since abandoned. They found one Zulu printing some part of the New Testament, and two Zulu catechists with whom Mr. Robertson had some conversation, but everything looked very desolate, and the Metropolitan's heart was filled with sadness as he thought how different a state of things he had once looked for. Mr. Robertson had a long talk with the pet Zulu (William by name) who is constantly instanced by Dr. Colenso in his books as suggesting doubts and difficulties, and who now was teaching that there is no resurrection and no eternal punishment. From William's own remarks, we might be inclined to infer that he had rather been the recipient than the originator of the afore-said doubts and difficulties; for he told Mr. Robertson that he had attended carefully to the Bishop's teaching—he always sup-

posed so clever a man could hardly be wrong, but he simply wished to teach what the Church teaches.

Bishop Gray visited all around, going, among other places,¹ to Mr. Barter's farm in a beautiful situation some 1,800 feet above Maritzburg, to Shafton, Kar Kloof Falls, etc. On Whitsun Day he preached twice in the Cathedral to crowded congregations, on the subject of the day, and with special reference to the present needs of the Church. On Whitsun Tuesday the Bishop went to meet Dr. Duff, whose letter on arriving in Cape Town has been already mentioned. The gathering was at the house of Mr. Buchanan, editor of one of the Maritzburg papers, and was a large one. It turned into a sort of Missionary meeting, Dr. Duff giving some interesting recollections of Bishop Heber, and accounts of his own work. "He is one of those large-hearted men" (the Metropolitan writes) "whose Christianity is above all sectarian feeling, and who would be prepared to sacrifice everything for the faith."

On May 18th the Metropolitan held his Visitation in the Cathedral, his Charge occupying two and a half hours in delivery.² In it he went fully into the late Bishop's teaching, and into all the questions of mutual relations of Bishop Metropolitan and Patriarch, the relation of State to Church in South

¹ On Whitsun Monday the Bishop visited Miss Barter's Mission Station, about six miles from Maritzburg. "She has erected a small house upon land amounting to one hundred acres given by Government, and she has gathered a few people around her. She came out to labour among the natives, and has done so very devotedly for some years."

² "The most assiduous collector of theological pamphlets may search his shelves in vain for anything bearing the name of an Episcopal Charge that can be compared with that which has recently reached us from Natal. . . . It is no mere treatise or disquisition, read for the fulfilment of the Bishop's professional duties at a triennial meeting of his Clergy. It is the statement of a great argument, on which depend issues no less important than the life and liberty of the Church. And the statement comes from one who is avowedly the great actor in the struggle. A character less firm and a temper less ardent would have quailed before the risks and distresses that could not but attend on such a measure as the formal deposition of a Comprovincial Bishop on the score of heretical teaching. Of those distresses no one can foretell the end. But the voice of the Metropolitan rings out as clear as if there were no legal perils in his path, no machinations of enemies, no lukewarmness of friends, to be feared. . . . Our own persuasion is—assuming the judgment to be theologically correct—that his course is not less wise

Africa, the independence of Colonial Churches of Civil Courts, the true standing-ground of the Church, etc.

Before the ordinary Visitation dinner an address was presented to the Metropolitan, signed by all the Clergy of the Diocese. After expressing their sympathy and gratitude to Bishop Gray, they went on to "place on record our emphatic repudiation of the erroneous teaching of Bishop Colenso, and our conviction that, should it please God for the chastisement of our sins to allow him to return to this Diocese with legal authority, he must still be regarded as lying under a righteous sentence of condemnation, and that we dare not acknowledge him as having authority in spiritual matters."

In his reply the Metropolitan said that "we ought not to suppose that any Civil Court would, if appealed to on the question of civil right, venture to send back to this land one whose teaching you yourselves, with the whole Church, have solemnly repudiated, with the right to take possession of the property of the Church, given for different purposes. . . . Our country's Courts will not commit the great wrong of giving a legal right to a Bishop deposed and rejected by the Church to force himself into your churches, and proclaim from your pulpits 'erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word,' which he and you have sworn at your ordination 'with all faithful dili-

than bold. . . . The deposed Prelate contends that the final resort in all ecclesiastical causes is the Crown, and his petition still stands for hearing. . . . The jurisdiction which Bishop Colenso invokes is confessedly destitute of statutory authority. If the Crown is to review the judgment of a Colonial Metropolitan, its right to do so must rest on principles long since abandoned in practice, if not actually contrary to law. . . . If the Queen, acting by a select number of Privy Councillors, could reinstate a deposed heretical Bishop in his place, the Church would be in a very much worse position than any other religious society in the British empire—in so bad a position, indeed, that it would be foolish to expect her members to submit to it. . . . Bishop Colenso would be a State officer without a flock to govern, disowned by his order, and repudiated by the Society which sent him forth. We can hardly believe that he would care to accept so anomalous a position in the forlorn hope of using the authority of his title to give his peculiar views weight. On this contingency, however, it is vain to speculate. At present we have but to congratulate the Bishop of Cape Town on the undaunted spirit with which he maintains the liberties of the Church, and the integrity of the Christian faith."—See leader in *Guardian* of August 10, 1864.

gence to banish and drive away.' . . . But if it were so, your course is plain. Christians have, before now, been driven to worship on the mountain-top or the river-side, in dens and caves of the earth."

The next day, May 19th, a Conference met at the Cathedral, consisting of all the Clergy of the Diocese except two, who were ill, and about an equal number of laity. After prayer, the Metropolitan put before them the three objects he wished to consider with them :—

I. The present condition of the Diocese as regards means of grace for the Europeans, and Missions for the conversion of the heathen.

II. Whether there was any desire on the part of the Clergy and laity of the Diocese that any Clergyman now in South Africa should succeed to the office of Bishop in Natal.

III. Whether the Conference desired to express to the Metropolitan any wish as to the steps to be taken by him in securing the appointment of another Bishop.

On the first of these points opinion was unanimous, rather to let the Clergy minister to the English and Kafir population in combination, than to increase the number of Mission stations, the contrary system tending, as experience proved, to create a feeling of mischievous separation between races.

On the second point some strong desires were expressed to have the Dean of Cape Town as the future Bishop, but this seemed undesirable on account of the part he had been obliged to take in the late Bishop's trial. The Metropolitan explained that he merely wished to know the views of the Clergy and representatives of the laity, against the time when the selection might be made, whether by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Colonial Secretary of State, or Metropolitan.

On the third point the Conference had no suggestion to make, and the Metropolitan said that he thought any decided step at this moment by the Church of Africa would be premature. It would, on every ground, be better to wait, and endeavour to obtain the appointment of a Bishop in the usual way, by the Archbishop, etc. But, he added, if unfortunately

any civil court should affect to reinstate Dr. Colenso, he having been deposed by the Church, the Metropolitan would, God helping him, come with his suffragans, and consecrate another Bishop in that very Cathedral. He said that, believing it to be a matter of life and death to the Church, he dared not do otherwise; he could not hereafter stand before his Lord if, at such a crisis, he stood patiently by while the wolf devoured the sheep; it was in truth simply a matter of conscience to him. "What I believe Christ would have me do, that I will do at any cost, for the saving of His Body from ruin." A resolution was then passed to the effect that Dr. Colenso would not be acknowledged as Bishop in consequence of his wide departure from the faith of the Church.

A letter written before leaving Maritzburg by Dr. Duff is worthy of remark, as tending to show the strong feeling drawn out by others than members of the English Church:—

"Maritzburg, May 19th, 1864.

"My Lord Bishop—It was my privilege yesterday to hear the Charge delivered by your Lordship to the Clergy of the English Church in this Diocese. The occasion was one of pre-eminent solemnity, the subject one of life and death importance to every branch of the Evangelical Church of Christ throughout the world. On the principle that when one member of the body suffers, all the members suffer, I have felt intensely the deep wound which has been inflicted on your noble branch of the Universal Church; and through it on every other that holds by the Head,—Christ the Lord of Glory, the Lord our Righteousness. On this account I cherish an inward consciousness that you will not be disposed to regard any reference on my part to the services of yesterday as an intrusion. With certain portions of your Lordship's Charge, such as the office itself of Metropolitan, the question of jurisdiction in the present instance, I do not feel myself called on in any way to intermeddle or to pronounce any judgment at such a time as this. These are matters respecting which the wisest and holiest of men have differed, and will continue to differ. Sufficient for

me, on an occasion like the present, that the office of Metropolitan is in strict accordance with the Ecclesiastical polity of the Church of England, and therefore one in which all the members of that Church ought to acquiesce. . . . What I, as a professing disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, feel deeply, vitally concerned with, is the grand subject-matter of the Charge, as an emphatic testimony against Gospel-extinguishing heresies, and in favour of those glorious fundamental verities which constitute the very Gospel of Grace and Salvation.

“ Considering the extreme peculiarity of the occasion and the circumstances, I know not that I ever listened with more real heartfelt enjoyment to any statement or vindication of the foundation doctrines of our Common Christian Faith, than when listening yesterday to your Lordship’s noble Charge. There was transparent clearness in happy combination with intrepid firmness and indomitable strength. It was worthy of any of the Fathers of ancient, or any of the Reformers of modern times, viewed as a martyr-like testimony to the assailed essential verities of the Jehovah’s Holy Oracles. I have thanked God, and will ever continue to thank God, for that noble testimony. Excuse me for writing thus ;—what I feel I like to express; what I feel strongly I cannot but express strongly. . . . Very sincerely yours,
ALEXANDER DUFF.”

The Bishop went on to Richmond, Springvale, etc., returning to Maritzburg, whence he wrote wearily, though hopefully and trustfully.

“ I feel getting old,” he says in one letter, “ but, thank God, I am still able to go through my work.” On June 1st he and Mrs. Gray started, accompanied by the Dean, for the Umgeni, holding services and visiting at various places ;—Estcourt, Colenso, Ladismith, Greytown, the Noodsberg, Verulam, etc., reaching D’Urban on the 15th. Here among others the Wesleyan Superintendent came forward with earnest thanks to Bishop Gray for “ his decided, noble, and persevering stand ” in defence of hallowed doctrines which are the heritage of all Christians. When the Metropolitan said in the course of con-

versation that he would consecrate a faithful Bishop for the Diocese under shelter of a tree, if driven out of the Cathedral by the strong hand of mere secular power, the old gentleman expressed his hearty delight, and said he would come and "raise the psalm tune!"

The Berea, Clairmont, the Ispingo, the Umzinto, Ungababa, the Illovo, made a round occupying a week; and on returning to D'Urban, the Bishop's tender heart was saddened by finding among other letters one from Mr. Robertson, from whom he had so lately parted, with tidings of his wife's death by an accident. It was after crossing the river Tugela, and in descending a piece of very rough ground, that their wagon was upset, and some heavy boxes fell upon Mrs. Robertson and crushed her.

"The Church had not two more loving and devoted labourers in her service," the Bishop wrote. "Mrs. Robertson was full of love for the native race; and she was full of zeal, gentleness, devotedness, and even enthusiasm, for the work. . . . Her husband goes back to a desolate home, to labour, as he says, with more entire devotion to his Master's service. But I fear for him. He is not a strong man, and of earthly comforts and supports he has but a small share in his distant and solitary outpost. Marvellous are God's dealings. We see not now why such strokes are permitted to fall, but we shall know hereafter. I cannot but contrast my happier lot, I trust with gratitude, to that of my poor friend."

It was on June 25th that the English mail brought tidings of Dr. Colenso's proceedings.

"I hear," the Bishop writes, "that Bishop Colenso has petitioned the Crown to hear his Appeal against the sentence of the Metropolitan, and that the law officers of the Crown have, in consequence of the many difficult legal and constitutional questions raised thereby, advised that his petition be referred to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council for their consideration. If this be so, it seems to me that the recommendation (while it may lead to the settlement of important questions) is open to some serious objections. This, at least

seems clear, that the Judicial Committee of Privy Council (or the Crown through it) is not, by any law, a Court of Appeal from a sentence of the Metropolitan of this Province; for if it were, the appellant might have gone at once to it and sought redress there. It is only because the Privy Council could not hear him that he petitions the Crown to order it to do so. He asks the Crown to assume, by a stretch of the prerogative, functions which no law or custom or consent of this Church assigns to it. It is certain that no statute law gives this right, for even if there were Acts of Parliament which give it in the case of persons circumstanced as he is, in England or elsewhere, those Acts have, by treaty, no force here. It is plain that no consent gives it. If the letters patent be worth nothing else, they at least serve to show what was the understanding upon which the Church and Province were founded. They are evidence of the consent of the Crown—of the Mother Church as represented by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the Church here, as represented by myself—being given at the period of the formation of the Province, to Appeals to Canterbury from the Metropolitan, and to no other quarter. We mutually contracted that such should be the case, and I accepted my office upon that condition. Had it been proposed that the Privy Council should have been our Court of Appeal, I should have felt bound to protest against it, this Church having, in the year 1850, made a solemn Declaration in Synod, which was forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the effect that they could not consider the Judicial Committee of Privy Council as their Court for deciding matters of faith.

“The grave objection which cannot but be felt to exist to the course actually pursued is this—that it refers it to the Privy Council to say absolutely whether or not it shall be a Court of Appeal for us. If it says that it will be so, there is no remedy; nothing but an Act of Parliament could set aside that decision, and that of course could not be obtained. It is therefore invited to decide whether or not it will assume powers which no law or consent on our part have conferred upon it, and there are no means open whereby this Church

could rid itself of the effect of that decision. It is to be hoped that the distinguished lawyers who are certain to sit for the hearing of this petition will disclaim the functions with which Dr. Colenso is anxious to invest them. Having already decided that we are a purely voluntary religious association, in no better, but in no worse position than other religious bodies (in *Long v. Bishop of Cape Town*); and a great judge (Lord Campbell), with three other learned judges as assessors, having decided, in a case often referred to as authoritative, that Bishops of Colonial Churches are not, like the English and Irish Bishops, prelates of a Church which is the Established Church of England and Ireland; that they have nothing in common with them, but that they are 'Protestant Bishops canonically consecrated, and holding the faith of the Anglican Church' (*Queen v. Eton College*); we claim to be free from all the peculiarities which attach to the Mother Church as the Established Church of England, and trust that we may never be forced, by a decision to which we could not submit, into a contest for the maintenance of our religious liberties. Looking, however, as I am bound to do, to the possibility of such an issue, and to the probable schism which would be the result of it, I cannot but regret that when no court of law would hear the case, because there is none entitled to do so, the Crown should have been advised to come to the Appellant's relief, and bring the cause under its own cognisance, by the extraordinary course which has been adopted. There are cases upon which, I understand, the Crown can and does consult the Privy Council—there was an instance with regard to this very Colony. When a judge was suspended by a former Lieutenant-Governor, the Privy Council was consulted on some point connected with that act. But these were officers of the Crown, acting under the sole authority of the Crown. The cases are not analogous. We are officers of the Church, not of the State, and in this case the rights and liberties of the Church are intimately concerned. The Crown appears to me to have been advised to consider whether it is entitled to do, in this very important case which affects the religious liberties of a large portion of its subjects,