that for grave faults there shall be, by formal sentence, exclusion from it. The power to exclude is to be within the Church herself. 'If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican.' It is to the officers whom He has commissioned and placed within His Church, that He has entrusted the execution of its laws. They act under His Authority and by His Command. 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.' 'I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me.' 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven; whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.' 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.'

"None have doubted that our Lord gave power to His Apostles to shut out from His Kingdom any who might fall away from Him, or that He pledged Himself to confirm their acts. But the Church never supposed that this office belonged only to the Twelve. S. Paul, not himself one of their number, frequently exercised it. Through him the Holy Ghost commanded Titus, Bishop of Crete, as well as the Church of Corinth, to discharge it. 'A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.' 'Put away from yourselves that wicked person.' In accordance with the language of Holy Scripture, the Church has ever held that its Divine Head has lodged this power in the hands of Bishops, to be used by them only as a last resource, when warnings, admonitions, and entreaties have all failed, and the sinner persists in his sin. Bishops, themselves, are no more exempt from the censures of the Church than the humblest individual within it. From the first its discipline has been applied to them in accordance with the Canons which regulate it. It has ever rested with the Bishops of a Province to put in force the discipline of the Church with regard to any other brother Bishop who might either have been betrayed into sin, or have fallen from the faith; and no power but that of a higher Synod could, or can, annul their sentence."

The Metropolitan then touched upon the course of proceedings, and the judgment which pronounced the Crown incapable

of conferring jurisdiction, reducing the Church in Natal to a voluntary association, not bound, as a necessary consequence, to accept Dr. Colenso as their Bishop.

"This decision is, of course, good in law. Whatever legal titles or powers it gives to Dr. Colenso will not be disputed. Legal coercive jurisdiction there is none, and the attempt to give it will never again be repeated. No more letters patent are to be issued, that the Churches may see that they are entirely ee to act for themselves. It is right, however, that I should say that no coercive jurisdiction was ever claimed by me. My judgment neither affected to touch the title conferred upon Dr. Colenso by the Crown, nor the salary allowed him by the Bishops of the Church of England. It affected only his spiritual office as a pastor of souls. It is because he now sets aside and despises the spiritual sentence, and openly affirms that he will preach and teach among us the heresies for which he has been condemned; and claims obedience and submission to his authority on the part of the Clergy and the whole flock, which the judgment upon which he relies gives him no right to demand and no power to enforce, that we, after repeated admonitions and earnest entreaties, are driven to take the last step that the Church enjoins us to take in such cases.

"Upon spiritual sentences or their effects the judgment does not touch: incidentally, however, it recognises the spiritual authority of the Metropolitan given by Christ through His Church. To have refused to acknowledge this would have been to persecute—to deny to the Church liberties which she enjoyed even under heathen emperors. The spiritual sentence, then, of the Church remains just where it did. All that has been decided is a point of law. With the spiritual powers, rights, office of the different orders in the Church, the law has no concern, and does not claim to interfere.

"Though I have ever respected, as I was bound to do, the Queen's letters patent, framed and prepared by the highest law officers of the Crown, and bearing the signature of my Sovereign, and in all my proceedings have endeavoured to act in strict accordance with their provisions, I have never believed, or

acted as if I believed, that my authority was derived from them. I have ever held that my commission was given to me from Christ through His Church. The Church, in her Lord's Name, entrusted me with spiritual power. The Crown sought, but it seems sought in vain, to clothe that power with the authority of law. In its attempts to do so, it has hampered and weakened it."

The Pastoral goes on to explain fully the ecclesiastical side of the question, which has been already sufficiently dwelt upon in these pages, and proceeds to say: "The consequences of acknowledging Dr. Colenso as still in communion with the Church would be,—First, that he and all whom he might ordain and set over, whether the Missions or the English congregations of the Diocese, would be Ministers of the Church, teaching in her name, and with her authority, the very heresies which she has both here and in England condemned by her constitutional organs as destructive to the Faith and ruinous to the souls of men. She would be responsible for this, would be implicated in the guilt of his teaching, provoke the threatened chastisement (Rev. ii. 14-20), go far to unchurch herself. Next, that the poor man, the man uninstructed in the Christian Faith, knowing little of religious truth, would be misled to his soul's loss; while the more instructed and religiously disposed would abandon his Church for some other religious body where at least essential truths denied in his own communion would be taught, and the Church, having sunk into deadly heresy, would at length die out of the land. . . . Most unwillingly, and, God is our witness, with great sorrow of heart, all other means having failed, we have felt constrained, out of duty to our Lord and to the flock which He has committed to our keeping, to this last and only remaining remedy, and separate by open sentence this false teacher from the communion of the faithful. It is the method which our Lord has bid us use for the purging of His Church from the leaven of false doctrine; it is the medicine, too, which He has prescribed for the recovery of the fallen; for this cutting off from the Church is not for the destruction of our brother, but in the hope, and with the prayer, that he may

be led to repentance, and so to restoration, that 'his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'

"I invite you, my brethren, to join with me in daily intercession before the Throne of God, that such may be the case with regard to him who was your Bishop,—that his eyes may be opened, that he may be led back to the truth which he has forsaken, and recover his lost faith, and escape from the snare of the evil one. . . . Who shall say what the issue may be, if, while sorrowing over him who, being sent to lead you to Christ and His truth, has sought to lead you away therefrom, and refraining from his company, you yet day by day pray earnestly for his restoration? Through your prayers he may be given back to us, and we may yet rejoice over him as one who was dead and is alive again, was lost and is found. But whether this be the result or not, I must urge you, beloved brethren, patiently to endure your trial. A storm is passing over the Church, but the Lord, though to some He may appear to slumber, is in the ship. Ere long He will say to the winds and the waves, 'Peace, be still.' However threatening, then, and distressing present trials may be, be not, I pray you, 'soon shaken in mind.' Leave not your spiritual home, but gather round your Church for its protection and your safety. He Who promised to His Church that He would be with it always, is, we doubt not, with this portion of it now, and will not cease to be while it is true to Him. The very trials to which it is subjected give proof of this. Satan does not shoot out all his fiery darts against a dead and lifeless body. It is because His Church is a true witness for Christ in this land, that he thus rages against it. His malice is the token of our life. The Church's lot is to be ever militant upon earth, and this is our lot. Amid discouragements from quarters whence you might have looked for succour, and under the injury inflicted upon you and your children by the oppressive judgments of the courts of this world, look up to your Lord for help, strength, and guidance. Your cause is His Cause. He sympathises with you, sorrows in your sorrows, shares your troubles, suffers in His Members. Any wound inflicted on His Body the Church

pierces Him even. To those who persecute it He says, 'Why persecutest thou ME?' Lean then upon Him in trust and confidence, He will not fail you. In His own good time He will vindicate His cause and His Church, and the faith which is in Him. In patient perseverance possess ye your souls. 'Consider Him that endured the contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest ye be weary and faint in your minds: ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin.'"

As might have been expected, this rightful and necessary measure had no effect upon the outward conduct of the most unhappy person in question. The Metropolitan, having done his duty, felt that he had now only to leave the matter in God's Hands, and wait patiently.

Although it may contain some repetitions, we cannot refrain from giving the Bishop's letter, written concerning this matter, to Mr. Keble,—the last letter he ever addressed to that venerated friend, and one, alas! never to be answered by him to whom it was addressed.

"Bishop's Court, February 5th, 1866.

"My dear Mr. Keble—The sentence was published by the Dean in the Cathedral, after the Nicene Creed. I did not act until I felt that I could no longer keep back. Previous to taking any step, I consulted both my own Dean and Chapter and that of Natal. Each unanimously gave counsel that, under the circumstances of this case, I ought to proceed without delay. Others, too, from other Dioceses, as, *e.g.*, Archdeacon Merriman, wrote to say that hesitation would greatly disturb the minds of the Clergy and faithful laity; that some pious souls were losing confidence in the Church at seeing a Bishop proclaiming, Sunday after Sunday, deadly heresies, and discipline slumbering. What weighed most, however, with me, were these two things:—

"1. The plain instruction of our Lord, and the course pointed out in His Word. I felt that if this was not a case for open separation there could be none.

"2. The decision of our Provincial Synod unanimously agreed to, after invoking the aid and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"Of course the sentence was preceded by formal admonitions, which were treated with marked contempt. I wrote also, publicly, offering to refer my sentence and judgment. . . . I also wrote privately, in memory of past affection, to urge him either to retire or assent to what I had proposed. He took no notice of my public letter, but published a reply to the private one, and proposed the ignoring of all past proceedings, and bringing charges against him before Dr. Lushington, with a right of appeal to Privy Council. Of course I could not have acceded to so monstrous a proposal, but before his letter reached me the Dean had published the sentence. I have heard but little since, but from what I have heard I suppose the sentence has stirred up less opposition than I could have conceived. The Dean said that Churchmen in the capital were waiting for it, and I believe it is a relief to them.

"Its effect in D'Urban I do not know. . . . I have laboured and prayed long for a faithful minister for that place. Dr. Colenso forced himself into the Cathedral, aided by his friend the Chief Justice. The Dean then fixed the hours of service at 9 and 4, leaving 11 and 6 to Dr. Colenso. The congregation went with the Dean. . . . Distaste for appeals to Civil Courts, and distrust of the fairness of their own court, which consists of judges who never go to church, has prevented any attempt to dispossess Colenso of the Cathedral, though vested in the See of Cape Town, and though no Bishop in England could do what he claims a right to do. . . . The desecration is very sad, and is much felt by the congregation, but their feeling is to bear with things as they are for the present. The Dean is really acting a confessor's part, in the very best spirit. The calmness, gentleness, trustfulness, holiness of his mind during this great trial, the burden of which falls chiefly upon him, is very remarkable. . . . We have now only to wait. We can do no more than pray the Lord of the harvest to raise up faithful labourers for that afflicted land. With the Church at home it must rest to acknowledge us, and send out one for

Bishop. I am almost afraid to write all this to you, knowing not how you and dear Mrs. Keble are. Do not trouble yourself to reply to it.[1] I should be very sorry if you did anything that might be in the least injurious to yourself. I have not yet troubled your £1000. I have been able as yet to pay out of other funds all that Natal has needed. I authorise, however, the Dean to draw upon me for what may be needed.—Ever faithfully and affectionately yours, R. CAPETOWN."

"The sentence does not seem to have roused the opposition which one might have expected" (he wrote, February 10th 1866, to his son). "Of course many of the papers find fault, but the minds of very many are relieved. Archdeacon Merriman wrote that the Clergy were perplexed, and the pious Laity losing faith. Dean Green said Churchmen generally were looking for it. A Clergyman in Natal writes me word that he has not met with one who condemned it. Colenso still continues to preach twice every Sunday in the Cathedral, but by every account, very few, not a dozen, Churchmen go near him. His congregations are made up of men of no religion, who go 'for the intellectual treat,' and to hear what will come next;—and of dissenters, who rather encourage him, and hope to make capital out of our troubles. The Dean feels the desecration of his church very much. . . . It is a great relief to me to have nothing more to do. We can but wait now for the action of the Church at home. The Synods of the Church must declare that they hold no communion with him. I have formally notified the sentence to all the Archbishops and Metropolitans of our Church, and to the Primus of Scotland and Senior Bishops of America. We are just now very short-handed as to Clergy, and I have to ride up to-morrow to Rondebosch to enable the Dean (who is with us) to have a quiet Sunday here. I take

[1] The Bishop of Cape Town's troubles lay very near Mr. Keble's heart; only a short time before his death he said, talking of them to the writer: "There is Liddon raised up to be the comforter of Pusey's old age, and Patteson of Selwyn's. I think if I could see a Liddon raised up for the dear Bishop of Cape Town, I should be content." On one occasion he told Dr. Liddon that he looked upon Capetown as the greatest of all Colonial Bishops, because he was a real confessor of the Faith.

my swim[1] every morning in a quiet way, without being tempted by young fellows like you to launch out beyond the rocks among the breakers. I have enough of these ahead, in another direction, for an old man! . . .

"February 22nd.—The Archbishop has recommended a Clergyman for election and consecration at Natal. He has also expressed his readiness to call a National Synod, if the Colonial Churches wish it. I have consequently written to nearly all the Colonial Bishops. . . . The Dean (Douglas) will probably be at home as soon as this letter. You will, I hope, see him. His is a fine mind, and a finer character."

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

(Not dated, but the envelope bears the date March 1866.)

"I have just seen your letter to Mr. —— and his reply. Apparently he would leave heresy and unbelief to spread as a cancer over the whole Colonial Church, until Parliament shall have legislated for us, and brought us into the precise position of the Establishment as far as Courts of Discipline and Appeal are concerned. How extraordinary it is that good men should propose such a course, or think that a Christian Bishop or Church would be at liberty to pursue it!

"I hold that if a Church allows one proved to have taught and maintained fearful heresies to remain as a teacher of those heresies with her sanction, she sins against Christ—betrays Him and the truth which He has committed to her custody. Would St. Paul have allowed one teaching what Colenso teaches to remain a Bishop? Would Irenæus, or Cyprian, have done so? If not, how should it be lawful for us? The command of the Holy Ghost is to reject a heretic after the first and second admonition. What right have we to shrink from obeying this command till Parliament shall empower us? This is pure Erastianism. But next, Parliament cannot, nor can any other body, legislate in this matter. Colonies would not submit to English legislation in their internal affairs. And if an attempt were made in England to bring the Colonial Churches under

[1] The Bishop wrote from Kalk Bay.

the Privy Council, it would simply cause a disruption. We believe that Court to be not only full of danger to the Faith, but subversive in its constitution of the Church, and contrary to the Will of Christ and the Word of God. But how cruel the proposition to deliver over the Church of Natal to Colenso and his teaching for his life time! What a wrong to the souls of our people, what a wrong to the faithful Clergy! These are to be driven away,—(for they would leave),—our people are to be left without pastors, or with heretical ones: a Church in a rising Colony is to be destroyed, lest the Colonial Churches should run the risk of having gradually a different faith from the Church of England, or we should set up an orthodox Bishop against an heretical State one. Now if the Privy Council is to continue the Court of Appeal for the Church of England, a different faith will, I hope, be found by the Colonial Churches. We shall, I pray God, be saved from adopting the heresies allowed by law in the Church of England, and tolerated in that Church, but it will be not because we have changed the Faith once delivered, but because the Mother Church has insensibly changed hers. But we are not, in consecrating a Bishop of Maritzburg, setting up a Church Bishop against a State Bishop. The Crown has done all in its power to give legality to all our proceedings. I have acted throughout strictly in accordance with the provisions of the letters patent. But the Crown is now told by its Judges that it could not give a Metropolitan power to cancel letters patent given by it. The patent remains—it gives a title and a power to hold property as a corporation, nothing more. We do not interfere with these. The Crown did not give mission, or spiritual authority. That Christ gave through His Church—and this the Church takes away, and releases the faithful Clergy and Laity from all moral obligation. The Church also provides a faithful pastor for souls in the room of an unfaithful one.

"Of course there are dangers in this as in every course, and evils too. But the true and only safeguard is that prescribed by the Canons of the Church, and acted upon until the Civil power debarred the Church from the exercise of its rights. We

must restore our graduated system of Synods. Some years ago, Convocation, at my suggestion, pointed this out as the security for unity in faith and discipline, to all Colonial Churches. The Diocesan subject to Provincial; Provincial to National; National to Œcumenical. We are, I trust, on the high road to a National Synod, and before you die, you will, I hope, see the way paved for the Œcumenical."

The Priest here mentioned as recommended for the See of Natal by the Archbishop was the Rev. F. H. Cox, then at Hobart Town. He was suggested first by the Bishop of Oxford, who wrote to him on behalf of the Archbishop, and the Bishop of Cape Town likewise wrote expressing his belief that the Bishops of the Province would all concur in the Archbishop's appointment, as would probably the greater number of the Clergy and Laity of Natal. Mr. Cox received the announcement with great surprise, but after mature consideration, he declared himself prepared to leave Tasmania and accept the call, should it be confirmed by the Church in Natal.

Meanwhile, nothing could be more miserable than the state of things in Maritzburg. Dr. Colenso appealed to the Supreme Court (which, from all accounts, was not calculated to command respect from ordinarily good men any more than from Churchmen) to turn the Dean entirely out of the Cathedral, and give it up to himself. The Court refused to do this, saying that he had the same rights as from the first, until the question was tried. On Good Friday the intruder took possession of all the services, and shortly after cited the Dean, in order to obtain possession of the Registers, which of course were refused. Then followed another appeal to the Supreme Court, and a split among the Judges. But, in spite of all, Easter Day was full of blessings and consolations to the Church party, and at a gathering on Easter Monday at the Mayor's (to which Dr. Colenso was not asked) the Dean met a warm reception. On Easter Tuesday Dr. Colenso's friends tried to elect a churchwarden in his interest, but the endeavour failed, the person nominated not being a communicant, and consequently not qualified.

The Metropolitan strongly recommended the Natal Clergy to elect Mr. Cox at once. "Whether they will do so or not till Convocation speaks, I know not" (he writes, May 30th, 1866). "The Clergy of this Diocese and of Graham's Town are addressing the Dean of Maritzburg, who is a most Christian man. I think I had rather be in his spiritual state than in that of any other man in Africa. He is a confessor for Christ, if there be one on earth now. . . Colenso is bringing an action against me in the Natal Courts for the transfer to him of all property standing in my name."

It was during the Holy Week just alluded to that one at home passed away from among us, whose name will live in the affectionate veneration of English Churchmen as long as time endures. On Maundy Thursday, March 27th, Mr. Keble entered upon the rest of Paradise. His brother, Mr. Thomas Keble, wrote to tell the Bishop of this universally-felt loss, and he replied in a few lines fresh from his heart.

"Bishop's Court, Whitsun Monday, 1866.

My dear Sir—Many thanks for your kind note, announcing to me the loss which the Church has sustained through the death of your sainted brother. His memory will be cherished by generations yet to come, and his works serve to form the character of the Church's children from age to age. I have ever considered it one of my greatest privileges to have known him, and to receive his fatherly counsel. Amid the trials and anxieties of my present position, it has been a great comfort to know that he has approved of the course which I have felt it my duty to pursue. I had expected that dear Mrs. Keble would have been taken first. If still alive, will you give her my most respectful and tender sympathy? I look back with deep interest to the days I spent with them, and the beautiful simplicity, gentleness, and humility, of that loving, holy couple. —Believe me ever, my dear sir, yours faithfully,

"R. CAPETOWN."

On the same day the Bishop wrote to his son:

"It comforts me greatly to find you heart and soul in the

work of your Lord. May He daily give you more grace, and make you an instrument of good to others. I never pray less than four times a day for you,—twice in chapel and twice in private, and at times oftener. This has been my practice ever since you left. God, my dearest child, has answered our many prayers. I do not wonder that you felt used up after Easter. It is the time when all who work need rest. I do not think you get away often enough. I am always anxious to get change for the Clergy here. It is good both for them and for the parish. . . . I want a man to send to the copper-mines in Namaqua Land. We went there by sea in H.M. ship 'Valorous,' had beautiful weather, rough journey over barren lands, sand, and mountains. I consecrated a nice little English church, and held many services. . . . I have written to-day by the Natal mail to urge the Clergy to elect Mr. Cox of Hobart Town, who is willing to come. The poor Dean is 'legally excommunicated!' 'outlawed'[1] by these people, who have openly sided with Colenso from the beginning. . . . Louisa is so unwell that Glover thinks he must take her to England in August for change of climate and advice. We shall probably be at home till September, when we propose to ride about 600 miles;—Ceres, Bokkeveld, Clanwilliam, Pikelberg, the Bays, Saldanha,

[1] "One of the Judges said that he was 'legally excommunicate,' and perhaps it would do him as much harm as the spiritual excommunication did Colenso! Their next step is to summon the Bishop of Cape Town to show cause why Colenso should not take possession of the Cathedral, as Trustee, instead of the Bishop of Cape Town. This is to be on July 2nd. I suppose this must lead to a regular trial and appeal, and expense again. The Archbishop, Bishops of Oxford and Graham's Town, have joined in recommending Mr. Cox of Hobart Town for election as Bishop. His letters are extremely nice. I believe he was suggested by Mr. Butler of Wantage."—*Letter from Mrs. Gray.*

As a specimen of the unfairness with which the Bishop of Cape Town and his proceedings were treated, it may be as well to mention that the *Times* of Whitsun Monday 1866 was made to announce that, "having deposed Dr. Colenso, he has, on his own authority, nominated a successor, to whom he will require the Clergy of the Diocese to pay canonical obedience;"—going on to give a sketch of Mr. Cox's past history! The Dean of Cape Town, who was in England, hastened to give an unqualified denial of this gratuitously false assumption; but, of course, for one person who reads and understands such rectifications, fifty are deceived by the falsehood.

and S. Helena. We shall have to go slower than I like, as I am going to ride Witte-bol, who is now full 17, and not so vigorous as he was, though still wonderfully full of life."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, Whitsun Monday, 1866.

"We have just returned from Namaqua Land. Though nearly as large as Ireland, we have but one Clergyman in it. The copper-mines are prospering, and likely to be increased. I stood with the superintendent on one heap of black dust, intermingled with bright spots, which he told me was worth £40,000. We shall, I trust, be quietly at home for three months. . . . I am urging the Natal Clergy to elect Mr. Cox, recommended by the Primate. They wish to wait for the counsel of Convocation, and they may fairly do so, but S. Oxon counsels action. He quite and thoroughly approves of the excommunication. . . . God grant, my dear brother, that we may meet again in quiet times, when this terrible struggle shall be over. This has indeed been to me a 'Cabo Tormentoso.'[1] Thank God, my own Diocese is going on well, and work prospering, in spite of bad times; but I long for quiet, and to be able to give myself to my proper work. There is so much, so very much, to be done, if I could but be released from public affairs, which excite my mind and consume all my time."

Meanwhile, England and English people were scarcely, as a whole, standing up for their Faith and the Lord of that Faith as might have been expected. A large meeting of S. P. G., on April 27th, presided over by the Bishop of Oxford, did pass some strong resolutions, pledging themselves "by every means in their power to protect and defend the orthodox Church in Natal, and to hold communion with the Bishop to be appointed in Dr. Colenso's place, as well as to raise funds to be placed at the Bishop of Cape Town's disposal." Also, to send petitions to Convocation, "praying it to consider the best mode

[1] Alluding to the old name of the Cape of Good Hope.

by which to warn all Christian people against communicating with Dr. Colenso."

Miss Burdett Coutts (under the influence, doubtless, of others less believing and good than herself) took alarm at the idea of the See of Cape Town being pronounced independent of the English State, and developed some of the vague notions floating about the air concerning the supremacy, etc. Most certainly, neither she nor (one would fain hope) any professing Church people, would have endorsed Dr. Colenso's startling statement, that "in the system of the Church of England the Queen *does ordain* (!!!)—not directly, but virtually—the Clergy of all orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. What is done by ecclesiastics in this matter is done by them ministerially, by virtue of *power committed to them by the Queen*—I mean as representing the State—the *people*. This is not the Roman Catholic principle, according to which all power in the Church is derived from the Clergy; it is not the principle which many excellent persons suppose to be lying at the basis of the system of our National Church. But it is, I expect, *the fundamental principle of the Church of England!*" In spite of Dr. Colenso's "expectations," Church people will probably always believe that the power committed to the Clergy is so committed by Christ and his Church, and not by any one else. However widely differing from him, Miss Coutts had, however, presented a petition to the Queen, praying her Majesty to direct that "in any measure for amending the law with respect to the Bishops and Clergy in the said Colonies, care may be taken to preserve unimpaired to her Majesty and her successors the exercise of her regal supremacy in the appointment of Bishops,"—under the Bishop of London's patronage,—he explaining that she feared "events which have occurred and others announced as imminent threaten to divert those funds to independent Episcopal Churches not bound by or submitting to the laws of the Church at home, and openly repudiating that Royal Supremacy the exercise of which she conceives to be the one main safeguard whereby the various Provinces and Dioceses of the National Church are outwardly knit together in one law and discipline." It is marvellous

how some people seem resolved to deify State and Supremacy, and hardly less marvellous to see good people, counted as Christians, upholding directly or indirectly one seeking to be called a Bishop of Christ's Church, while distinctly disavowing the worship of Christ![1] Some such minds there were to be found, however, when two documents forced the Natal question upon Convocation—first in the shape of a petition presented on behalf of Dr. Colenso (which, by the way, accused the Archbishop of Canterbury of teaching perjury and schism) by the Dean of Westminster — the petitioners being all laymen and *not* all Church people — a petition which, for the credit of English Church dignitaries in general, one is thankful to be able to say was withdrawn by the Dean after some severe animadversions from his brethren. The other document was more important, and led to a prolonged discussion. A debate was held on the subject on May 2nd, 1866, at the close of which the President expressed his satisfaction at the very general and deep sympathy shown for the Church of South Africa; and on June 28th (after some conversation arising out of an Address from the American Bishops, which the President read to the House, congratulating the Church of England upon and thanking it for the resolution passed the previous summer concerning the African troubles, and in which the Bishops of London and S. David's took their usual line of opposition;)—the Bishop of Oxford opened a debate upon three questions addressed by the African Church to the

[1] See *Pall Mall Gazette* for April 3rd, 1866, containing a letter from Dr. Colenso, in which he states that he "objects to prayer to Christ on Scriptural and Apostolical grounds!" See also *Times* of September 6th, 1866, in which a letter from Dr. Colenso says: "I have drawn attention to the fact, that out of 180 Collects and prayers contained in the Prayer Book, only three or four at most are addressed to our Lord, the others being all addressed through Christ to Almighty God. I have said that there are also ejaculations in the Litany and elsewhere addressed to Christ. But I have shown that the *whole spirit* and the *general practice* of our Liturgy manifestly tend to discourage such worship and prayer, instead of making it the 'foundation stone' of common worship." "It appears" (Dr. Colenso goes on to say) "that the practice in question is not based on any Scriptural or Apostolical authority, but is the development of a later age, and has very greatly increased within the Church of England during the last century, beyond what (as the Prayer Book shows) was the rule at the time of the Reformation, chiefly, as I believe, through the use of unauthorised hymns."

Mother Church in England. The Archbishop had reduced them to writing, as follows:—

I. By the Bishop of Cape Town—"Whether the Church of England holds communion with Dr. Colenso and the heretical Church he is seeking to establish in Natal, or whether it is in communion with the orthodox Bishops who, in Synod, declared him to be *ipso facto* excommunicated?"

II. By the Dean of Maritzburg—"Whether the acceptance of a new Bishop on our part, whilst Dr. Colenso still retains the letters patent of the Crown, would in any way sever us from the Mother Church of England?"

III. "Supposing the reply to the last question to be that they would not be in any way severed, what are the proper steps for us to take to obtain a new Bishop?"

There was some petty skirmishing as to who was consulted —whether the "Convocation of the Province of Canterbury," or the Archbishop's suffragans, or the Upper House of Convocation. After this had been disposed of, the Bishop of Oxford went on to say that he could not but feel that that distant branch of our Church had, under present circumstances, a peculiar claim upon the English Church to consider and answer these questions. The State bonds, which bound us together, were manifestly crumbling in our hands, do what we would. The absolutely democratic character impressed, politically, on so many of our Colonial settlements, made it impossible for the Crown to give the *status* of Established Churches to these bodies, and with that *status*, intimate union with ourselves as of old. It was equally evident that it was most desirable for ourselves and for these communities that we should, in every lawful way, keep the bonds of intercourse firm between them and us. This great Church at home had, through her endowments, men of piety, great learning and study; and, through them, the means of answering such questions as may arise to shake the faith; and it was of the utmost consequence that the poorer Church should have the whole benefit of all that hoarded strength which the Providence of God has given to us in this country. It seemed to him on all grounds most desirable—by

every lawful means—to keep alive the connection between these our brother Churchmen and us, and to substitute the spiritual for the crumbling earthly relationship. Among those means, one of the very first was giving them advice under difficulty. In the common affairs of life, if we had one to whom we turned naturally for advice, and were lightly put aside by him, or his advice refused, we should not think we were kindly treated. The same rule applied here, and the Bishop thought these questions ought certainly to be answered. Dr. Colenso had been deprived of his spiritual office for expressing heretical opinions, and there was not one present who did not deeply regret that the errors of that unhappy man had rendered such proceedings necessary. Whatever difference of opinion might have existed at any former time, things had lately come before every one, which must have made it quite clear and past all doubt that his doctrine was not the doctrine of the Church. But this man held, by the Queen's patent, the titular rank of Bishop of Natal. The Sovereign never professed to give him spiritual authority—the Crown never professed to be the fountain of spiritual power. It professed to give him a title and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and its highest court pronounced that it had failed to give this last. So now the people of Natal ask whether the Church of England holds communion with the titular Bishop of Natal, who, in spite of his deprivation and excommunication, is seeking to establish a heretical Church in Natal; or does it hold communion with the orthodox Bishops who have in Synod declared him, *ipso facto*, excommunicate? Bishop Wilberforce pointed to the fact that long before the full development of his evil doctrines, and before the public acts of the Church with regard to them all, the Bishops agreed privately not to allow this unhappy man to officiate in any of their dioceses, and urged him to resign his office. Therefore he proposed to answer the Bishop of Cape Town's question as follows: —"That it is the opinion of this House that the first portion of the question should be answered in the negative, and the second in the affirmative."

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol seconded this motion.

The Bishop of S. David's then raised a variety of difficulties as to denying the communion of the Church of England with Dr. Colenso. The Bishop of Salisbury heartily concurred with the motion. After what had passed, and what had been made public very lately, which must have shocked everybody who still retained any hope as to Dr. Colenso's faith, he could have no hesitation as to whether the Church of England held communion with him. He thought it shirking their duty to do anything else but give a plain answer. He most entirely agreed with the Bishop of Oxford, and in the fullest confidence of doing right, voted that the Church of England did not hold communion with the heretical Church which Dr. Colenso sought to establish, but with the orthodox Bishops who excommunicated him for the course he had been and was now pursuing.

The Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) did not know whether there was such an heretical Church. If he were asked whether he himself was in communion with Dr. Colenso, he should answer, without hesitation, "No;" and if Dr. Colenso were to present himself to be communicated in any church where he (the Bishop) was officiating, he should refuse him the communion. He believed the Bishops of South Africa to be in full communion with the Church of England, nevertheless he would not vote for the motion.

The Bishop of London thought none of his brethren, or himself, had the slightest doubt of the dangerous character of Bishop Colenso's books. He had done quite enough to convince them that he was quite unfit to exercise the office of a Bishop, and he—the Bishop of London—did not think Dr. Colenso could continue to perform its duties with any satisfaction to himself or to the Church. But he went on to speak in very harsh language of the Bishop of Cape Town, as arbitrary and seeking power, forcing his own opinions upon others, etc. etc. He (Dr. Tait) looked with suspicion on his questions and his deeds. It would seem that the Bishop of London was drawing back to his favourite doctrine of supremacy, for he ended by saying his brethren had no legal right to say the

Church of England was not in communion with the letter-patent-Church of Natal.

Speeches from the Bishops of Lichfield, Bangor, and Ely, followed, and the Bishop of Oxford in reply stated that he believed Dr. Colenso would be "no more able to get institution to a living in England than to be made Emperor of China." He also entered a solemn protest against all that Bishop Tait had said concerning the Bishop of Cape Town from beginning to end as most unjust.

"None of us" (he said) "doubt that if Bishop Colenso gives up prayer to Christ, and says it is not according to Scripture that prayer should be addressed to Him our Master, we should say we could not hold communion with him, or with those who followed him. There is not one of us who would not feel assured in his own mind as to the truth of the matter; but then the question is whether it is expedient for us to say what we believe to be the truth. Now, in my deliberate judgment, there is no doubt that we ought to say it. No sufficient ground has been alleged to make us incur the double peril, I may say the threefold peril—1st, of letting the poor ignorant flock there be led away from salvation; 2nd, of leaving our loyal-hearted and faithful brethren without the moral support we are bound to give them; 3rdly, the great danger of letting it go forth to God, to angels and men, that we value a sort of superhuman caution above risking something for maintaining the Truth of Christ; that we will not utter the word which would establish the truth, and put down the error." The Bishop urged his brethren to "incur the evanescent danger of speaking out for the greatest truths the Church of Christ ever held." He believed the whole history of Christ's Church showed that the Truth had only been maintained to this day by men venturing into danger to maintain it, by setting the maintenance of fundamental truth above every possible circumstance, by risking something for the Lord.

The President now mentioned an amendment proposed by the Bishop of Lincoln, which retained the affirmation of communion with the orthodox Bishops, but did not reply in the

negative to the first part of the question as to Dr. Colenso. The amendment was, after some discussion, put in this form:—"It is the opinion of this House that the Church of England holds communion with the Bishop of Cape Town, and with those Bishops who lately with him in Synod declared Bishop Colenso to be *ipso facto* excommunicated."

This was carried, and the Bishop of Oxford proceeded to propose to answer the second question (as to the acceptance of a new Bishop) in these words: "It has been decided on appeal to the highest judicial Court in this kingdom, on the one hand, that the Church in the Province of Natal in communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, is, in the eye of the law, merely a voluntary association; and, on the other hand, as the letters patent do not profess to confer spiritual powers, and have been declared by the Court to convey no Episcopal jurisdiction, it is the judgment of this House that the acceptance of a new Bishop does not impair the connection or alter the relations existing between the Mother Church and the members of the Church in the Province of Natal;—provided, first, that the Bishop be canonically consecrated according to the use of the Church of England; and, secondly, that there be no invasion of the title of the Bishop of Natal conveyed by her Majesty's letters patent."

The Bishop of Oxford thought it very important that this question should be answered, and spoke at some length in support of his opinion, as did the Bishop of Gloucester. The Bishop of S. David's then made a paradoxical speech, the purport of which was, that though really the Bishop of Natal was convicted of heresy, and that he himself thought so, it would not do to "yield to first impressions;"—and with a sneer at "one eminent person revered" by the Church, he said it was possible by a skilful use of language to establish paradoxical opinions. Nor did he see how a new Bishop could be accepted till he was made and offered, etc. etc.

The debate was resumed the next day (June 29th), when the Bishop of Oxford proposed as answer to the third question (it being agreed that the second and third must be taken

together): "If it should be decided that a new Bishop be consecrated, as to the proper steps to be taken; it is the opinion of this House, first, that a formal instrument declaratory of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa should be prepared, which every Bishop, Priest, and Deacon appointed to office should be required to subscribe; secondly, that a godly and well-learned man should be chosen by the Clergy, with the assent of the lay communicants of the Church; and thirdly, that he should be presented for consecration, either to the Archbishop of Canterbury (if the aforesaid instrument should declare the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England), or to the Bishops of South Africa, according as hereafter may be judged most advisable and convenient."

The Bishop of London did not know what this resolution meant; whether it was to say "Go on," or "Do not go on." His opinion was that the House had better not say "Go on." He did not quite collect the meaning of the resolution, but he inferred that it meant "Go on."

The Bishop of Gloucester. "Not necessarily."

Bishop of London. "Then does it mean 'Do not go on'?"

Bishop of Gloucester. "Not necessarily."

Bishop of London. "Then it means nothing at all."

Bishop of Oxford. "It does not mean to answer the question which *you* have put to us, but the question which *they* have put to us."

Various opinions were then expressed. The Bishop of Lincoln deprecated the appointment of a new Bishop, because, though as he said, Natal was far worse off than if it had no Bishop at all, he was convinced the only way of maintaining Dr. Colenso in his present position and struggle was the opposition of another Bishop. If you let him alone, a man placed in such an atmosphere of unbelief as he had placed himself in, must soon collapse, he thought. The Bishop of Salisbury in speaking to the point, took occasion to rebuke the Bishop of London for the manner in which he had spoken of the Bishop of Cape Town, and of testifying that he did not believe there existed a more single-minded, simple-hearted, earnest,

devoted man, or a man less deserving the charge of being ready to dictate to his brethren. He also defended Dr. Pusey, whom he supposed the Bishop of S. David's to have indicated the day before as like to the Bishop of Natal in "explaining away" truths. The two men stood as the antipodes to each other; the one "to whom so many of us owe our very souls, is the earnest, uncompromising, and yet tender affectionate maintainer and builder-up of the Faith of Christ, while the other would pull it down." The Bishop of S. David's said he was alluding not to the Eirenicon but to Tract XC., whereupon the Bishop of Salisbury reaffirmed all he had said, for Dr. Pusey had republished Tract XC.

The argument between the four Bishops of London, S. David's, Oxford, and Salisbury grew warm, and the President tried to stop it. After several speakers had expressed their opinions at some length, the Bishop of S. David's declared that he thought it from every point of view unlawful to create a Bishop with a new title for Natal, and if it were not unlawful, in the highest degree inexpedient and mischievous. He maintained that Dr. Colenso was the lawful Bishop in every respect, though he did not mean in the slightest degree to say that he was fit for the office; on the contrary, he was strongly inclined to say he was not. But he believed the trial to be no trial, to be null and void, and he did not think Dr. Colenso had ever been rightly deposed.

It would almost have seemed that to "mean nothing" was the highest object of language and of the opposing Bishops,—an opinion clenched by the Bishop of Ely when he proposed to vote, without any preamble, "that it appears to this House that the deprivation of a Bishop by the ecclesiastical authorities of South Africa, if legally conducted, and the election and consecration of another Bishop in his room, would not sever the union between that Church and the Church of England," because such a resolution "would commit them to nothing." How pitiful the whole scene would have been in the eyes of a company of primitive Bishops one hardly dares venture to allow oneself to think! Even the Bishop of S. David's remarked that they "appeared all to be at sixes

and sevens"! The next several speakers hardly diminished this undignified aspect of matters. The Bishop of Peterborough did not think they need take on themselves the responsibility of saying to the Colonial Church, "Consecrate a Bishop for Natal," though he was by no means prepared to say it might not be their duty to do so. The Bishop of Oxford strove to make his brethren more definite. What, he asked, if when a judge sends an issue to a jury, instead of giving a simple verdict thereupon, the jury were to say, "This is a most important point, property of hundreds of thousands of pounds hangs upon it, we really cannot find or give an answer"? The true question, he argued, was whether Dr. Colenso was the real Bishop of Natal. "If he be, I will acknowledge him in no half way, by merely refusing to give advice on this or that point, but in the bravest and boldest way. I will support him in his claim to the spiritual charge of the Diocese, and, come what may, I will stand by him in it." . . . The Bishop proceeded to justify the proceedings of Dr. Colenso's trial, going on to say, "That is the case of this man: he is tried before a spiritual authority, who, I maintain, had the true right to try him; his defence was heard, he was condemned, and by that sentence I for one am content to abide. I therefore answer my right reverend brother of S. David's that his case has broken down, and that the trial was *not* imperfect in the sense which he alleges. If then any of us reject the proposal to give the counsel asked on this ground, I declare in the face of the Church that such persons hold Dr. Colenso to be Bishop of Natal spiritually as well as in title. But I hope there are none here who will be ready to take this responsibility on themselves. Every now and then God's Providence throws on men responsibility which they would most thankfully avoid, but if they are His faithful servants, avoid it they cannot. By seeking to escape the difficulty you feel in giving this answer, I verily believe you are in danger of incurring this guilt. This, then, as to the main point of acknowledging Bishop Colenso as spiritual head of the Diocese of Natal. But a second point was alleged, the *inexpediency* of giving the answer for which we are asked. I bar this whole argument

by saying that if it is right it is also expedient." After exhausting this and one or two minor points, the Bishop of Oxford went on to say:

"I think there is no other argument left to answer. . . . We have been reminded of the danger of setting up throne against throne. I will ask how it would have been in any age of the Church when heretical Bishops arose, if the Church had yielded to such an argument as that; if, when a Bishop had been deposed by a council, or by trial in his Province, and had refused to yield, and persisted in his evil teaching, the Church Catholic had said, 'We dare not set up throne against throne, because no evil is so great as that of schism.' Would she have retained the truth of God to the present day? Was it thus she dealt with Arius? Was it thus that Athanasius acted when he made his glorious stand against that pernicious heresy? Who can say that God's promise that the Church should maintain the faith to the end, did not then hang on the fidelity of the body to which he had committed the custody of doctrine? It is on the same great principles I now ask you to act. I maintain that I have shown that by the law spiritual, this man is deprived of the functions spiritual of Bishop of his Diocese. I maintain that the law of the land left those who deprived him free to take that action in the case which seemed to them desirable, expedient, and necessary for the enforcement of their own rules of discipline. I beg you to consider how bravely, how nobly, how carefully they acted for the truth of God, under circumstances of almost unparalleled difficulty: these men, your brethren, in the great trust of the faith, come now and ask your counsel; and I only ask you not to turn away in coldness, or timidity, or scorn, when such counsel is asked of you, or by an evasive answer to disappoint those who have consulted you."

The President then put the amendment, for which only the Bishops of London, Lincoln, and Ely voted. It was therefore negatived. The original motion having been amended by the substitution of the words "that the existence of the letters patent would not cause the acceptance of a new Bishop to in-

volve any loss of communion," for the words, "that the acceptance of a new Bishop does not impair the connection, or alter the relations existing" between the members of the Church in Natal and the Church of England.

The venerable President, in recording his vote, expressed his deep sympathy for the South African Church, affirming that he held the Bishop of Natal to be legally and canonically deposed.

To the third question the Bishop of Oxford now again proposed the answer already mentioned. He said that he agreed with the Archbishop in not wishing to give direct counsel to the Church of Natal to elect a Bishop;[1] he thought the responsibility of the decision rested with them, and on the same ground that he could not throw up a responsibility belonging to England, he would not encourage them to throw up one belonging to themselves.

The Bishop of Gloucester seconded the resolution, pressing the value of the declaration of faith alluded to in it, which the Bishop of S. David's observed had been practically instituted already. The motion was then put and agreed to, and sent down to the Lower House, where, on the first resolution being read, Archdeacon Denison moved that the House should agree to it, seconded by the Rev. T. W. Joyce; Canon Seymour moving a rider, "And they are farther of opinion that, Dr. Colenso having been not only excommunicated by the aforesaid Synod but also deposed from his office of Bishop, if a Bishop shall be duly elected and consecrated for the See of Natal in the place of Bishop Colenso, the Church of England would of necessity hold communion with that Bishop." Archdeacon Denison seconded this motion, which brought the Dean of Westminster to the front, going into the whole story from the beginning, and endeavouring to deal with it from an absurd point of view, *e.g.* asserting that this rider committed the House to affirming that if the Bishop of Cape Town (whom he kindly asserted to be "a highly respectable clergyman") deprived a Bishop for the

[1] Of course this only meant *as Convocation*, inasmuch as both Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford had, in their individual capacity, not only counselled the act, but recommended the man.

colour of his hair, he had full right to do so. A highly declamatory speech followed, of which, as the Dean afterwards candidly acknowledged some of its inaccuracies,[1] it is perhaps charitable to say but little, beyond that it was very much applied to work up public feeling against the Bishop of Cape Town, as what would now be called an "advanced ritualist," likely to deprive his Comprovincials for not using incense, or wafer bread, or the like, and accompanied with sensational outbursts denouncing woe to the Colonial Church! woe to its freedom, to its independence, its influence, if it is thus to be deprived of every privilege that makes the freedom of the British citizen dear to us! etc. etc. The argument of the speech is hardly worth going into, the personal criticisms of the Bishop of Cape Town still less so, though it is satisfactory to learn that, although the Dean had "a very slight acquaintance with him, he had no reason to doubt that he was a highly respectable person!" The rest of the speech was intended (apparently) as an elaborate defence of Dr. Colenso, whose only offence, the Dean seems to imply, was his "narrow-minded attack on *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, which was a transgression of courtesy and moderation. Later on the Dean did admit that Dr. Colenso had spoken "indecorously" of the Prayer Book. The Dean followed Bishop Thirlwall's line as to Tract XC. being on the same level with Dr. Colenso's books, and in so many words took his own stand on Dr. Colenso's ground, claiming for their alliance certain Fathers of the Church, who, we are disposed to believe, would have disposed of such would-be adherents without much "courtesy or moderation."

The Archdeacon of Westminster (Wordsworth) gave an emphatic answer to this speech, and Canon Seymour probably expressed the general feeling of Christians in saying that it gave him great pain to see such abilities as those of the Dean devoted to the justification of an unhappy man whom he believed the majority of that House, as well as the great majority of the whole Church of Christ, looked upon as an apostate from the Faith. He was thankful for Archdeacon Wordsworth's

[1] "Statement."

speech, "showing that there is a very opposite statement respecting Dr. Colenso's writings to that put before the House by the Dean of Westminster, and also showing that, according to the ancient laws of the Church of Christ, the condemnation was sufficient to justify Convocation in what it was doing."

After some more discussion, in which the most notable remarks fell from Chancellor Massingberd and Archdeacon Randall; who thought no technical difficulties ought to be allowed to hinder the Mother Church from heartily upholding and helping the sorely troubled African Church, and who also, referring to Miss Burdett Coutts and her generosity to the See of Cape Town, sympathised with her disappointment at not carrying out her intentions just as she had expected, but could not suppose that she would retract her generous purposes because the scheme was not carried out exactly as she had desired, concluding with a strong expression of his own belief that every new See constituted, and every new church erected, would draw the Churches of England and Africa more and more closely together, cementing the bond of union throughout the world, and making greater the prospect of bringing in the heathen, and restoring the Kingdom of God. The resolutions of the Upper House were then carried, and the debate closed.

On receiving the report of this debate, the Bishop wrote to Bishop Wilberforce:—

"August 9th, 1866.

"My dear Bishop—A stray ship has brought the Resolutions of the Upper House of Convocation *in re* Colenso, and the election of a Bishop. I bless God for what He has enabled you to accomplish. These decisions will have a very important bearing on this case, and, as I venture to think, upon the Church herself. . . . The first Resolution reached me two days before the later ones, and gave me two bad nights. It is greatly neutralised by the subsequent proceedings. But it has given me great pain, chiefly on account of the Mother Church herself, whose nakedness I felt that I had been uncovering. I confess that I cannot understand how the cobwebs of State law should have influenced good men like —— and —— to

act as they did. Here is a Church brought face to face in her highest Synod with the greatest heresies of modern times. She is asked whether she holds communion with the propounder of them. Her answer is, I do not know. We have not heard the last of this. I doubt not that the Conventicle has rung with coarse accusations of complicity with heresy, and I am prepared for the taunts and sarcasms of the Romanists. I confess, but for the later Resolutions, I should have trembled for the Church of England.

"August 14th.

"Since writing the above, I have seen the full report of the speeches in Convocation. I have read it with exquisite pain and humiliation. The sympathy with Colenso on the part of ——, their hatred to me for the course I have felt constrained to take, the indifference to truth on the part of such men as —— the feebleness of others, the willingness to be in communion with a great heretic, the ignorance that communion with him committed those who did communicate to heresy—the want of pity for our poor brethren . . . all, all is very sad. I do not see how matters can remain where they are upon this point. . . Would to God these men would study the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia on their knees."

To the Dean of Cape Town, then in England, Bishop Gray wrote:

"August 16th, 1866.

. . . "We have received the debate. . . The resolutions would be all good enough in themselves, if it were not for the terms of the question as to communion. I confess that the course pursued has filled me with very great anxiety. It has given me four wretched nights. Here is a Church brought face to face in her highest Synod with the greatest heresies of modern times. The teacher of those heresies has been cut off from the communion of the Church. He boasts publicly that his judges have thereby cut themselves off; that he is the true representative Bishop of the Church of England in Africa; that he has taught nothing contrary to what she teaches.

Many poor souls believe him, and gather round him as their great teacher. For their sakes, for ours, for the sake of the Church of England herself, we ask the Synod of the Church to say whether it is in communion with him or not. It expressly and deliberately, after long time for consideration, refuses to say that the Church of England is not in communion with the heresiarch, who teaches openly that it is unscriptural and wrong to pray to our Lord! He is thus entitled to affirm that by the admission of the Church itself he is not out of its communion. But what a position does this place the Church of England in! If she refuses to cast him off, is she not implicated in his heresy? If the Lord is walking up and down amidst the Church, if the Epistles to the Seven Churches have any bearing upon ourselves, what is the present condition of our Mother Church? I confess that her act fills me with the deepest alarm, lest her candlestick should be removed. No Church that I know of has ever before now synodically and expressly repudiated a resolution declaring that it held no communion with a teacher who affirmed that our Lord is not a proper object of worship. She must, I believe, repent of that, her act, or perish. Nothing can be more feeble than to say he might be presented to a living, and the Church forced to hold communion with him. For, first, the law could not do this; and next, is it meant by this that if the law forced a Deist or Mahometan upon the Church, the act would be acquiesced in? If not, does not the acquiescence in the case of one who declares Christ ought not to be adored, show that the heresy itself does not appear so awful in the eye of the Church? And this, surely, is the secret cause of this sad act of the Bishops of the Church. They are not prepared to witness for Christ, or to reject this new manifestation of Antichrist. The acquiescence in the judgment respecting Wilson and Williams, the allowing them to have cure of souls in her name and with her authority, followed by her tacit permission to men whose writings she has declared heretical to preach in her great Church at Westminster, has prepared her for this avowed toleration of Colenso; and I verily believe will lead to

a further loss of grace, and the forfeiture of her standing as a living branch of Christ's Church if she does not retrace her steps. '*Mene, mene.*' I think the faithful in England should not let the matter rest where it is, but that they should represent to the Fathers of the Church the distress and alarm with which their proceedings have filled them, and call upon them to renounce communion with the heresiarch. If this is not done, I, for one, believe that the Church of England has forfeited her right to become what I have loved to think God was calling her to be—the salt of the whole earth—the centre round which all other Churches might draw in one communion and one faith."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, July 12th, 1866.

"My dear Bishop—I must write you a line to thank you for the part taken by you in Convocation, and at the S. P. G. meeting. I feel very grateful. I have written to the timid Bishops pointing out that

"I. I referred questions to Canterbury, because of our special relations by the letters patent to that See.

"II. That, regarding Convocation as the Church of England by representation, we wished to know with whom that body holds communion—Colenso or us?

"III. Whether that body thought that the election of a Bishop would be undutiful to the Church of England?

"We asked no legal question, and did not want to involve the Mother Church in legal difficulties. We should be quite satisfied if the Bishops in Synod replied, We do not hold, and dare not hold, communion with Dr. Colenso; and if he were to come to England, we would warn our flocks not to hold communion with him. If they are not prepared to say thus much, I grieve for them and for the Church of England. It will be infinitely worse for them than for us. . . May God overrule all to His Glory and the advancement of our Lord's Kingdom here and everywhere."

It should also be said that on June 18th, in the House of Lords, the Bishop of London (Tait) had presented a petition

from Miss Burdett Coutts concerning, not Cape Town only, but also the Sees of Adelaide and British Columbia, towards which she had acted so liberally, and the Archbishop of York, a few days later, moved for a Committee to inquire into the relation between the Church in the Colonies and the Church by law established in England. The Bishop of London declared that it would be time for the Colonies to be independent in ecclesiastical things when they were so in civil matters. But, as it was remarked at the time, this was mere phraseology. There actually existed an appeal from the civil courts of every Colony to a civil tribunal at home, called the Queen in Council, but there could be no appeal to any ecclesiastical tribunal at home, from any Colony where no ecclesiastical Court existed. There cannot be an appeal from that which is not a Court to that which is!

The various hard things said by those who should have known better, led to the publication of a letter from one well qualified to give an opinion, the Rev. and Hon. Henry Douglas, which should find its place here. He writes, July 10th, 1866, to the Editor of the *Guardian:*

"Sir—The Bishop of London has recently referred to the conduct of the Bishop of Cape Town on three different occasions, and on each occasion in severe terms. In his letter to Sir George Grey he used the word 'rash.' In his speech in the House of Lords he depreciated the Bishop of Cape Town's zeal as wanting in discretion. In Convocation he implied that the Bishop of Cape Town, if his power was equal to his will, would drive from his Province all whose views are 'Evangelical.' All this within the last few weeks.

"Now, I shall not stop to show that such language as this, coming from the Bishop of London, will add greatly to the cares of one whose burden is already heavy, and will help that erring man who is endeavouring to force himself upon a Diocese which is unwilling to receive him again; but I must say, with all respect, that it is neither fair nor just. The Bishop of Cape Town, at the request of the whole Bench of English Bishops (the Bishop of London, I believe, included), and with the advice and guidance of the best ecclesiastical lawyers, under-

took to try the then Bishop of Natal." (Here follow the details of Synod, the unanimous voice of the Clergy, etc.) "And the steps which have followed have received a very general support. Indeed, the Bishop of London must himself concur in the substance of the sentence, for he has spoken of Dr. Colenso as unfitted for the office of a Bishop in the Church. Now, surely, if the Church is the body of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, unanimity like this in the Bishops and Clergy of a Province is a fact of remarkable importance; at any rate it might show that the policy of the Bishop of Cape Town commends itself to those who are most deeply concerned in the issue, and might shield him from personal assaults. But I deny these charges of rashness and indiscretion, whether as applied to the Bishop or to the Church. When we speak of rashness, we intend, I suppose, to designate conduct the very opposite to that of one who, when about to build, should count the cost of his undertaking. When we speak of indiscretion, we imply the presence of that heat and impetuosity of temper which hurries away the judgment, and aims at ends without a wise selection of means. I must deny, then, that the Bishop of Cape Town has been either rash or indiscreet. The position which he has taken up is the result of calm deliberation, and his resolutions have been adopted upon principle, and with a full and clear perception of the worst consequences which might ensue. There are times and occasions when it is right to dare and suffer everything for the sake of that which must be kept at all cost; and, from the moment that he passed the sentence of deposition, the Bishop of Cape Town felt that such a time had come to him. He knew that the law would be invoked, although the Church in which he ruled had been declared by law to be beyond its jurisdiction. He feared that those from whom he looked for aid in England would, some of them, be lukewarm in their zeal for truth. But he resolved to build his tower;—resolved on it as a matter of duty, of faith, of obedience to Christ;—and, with God's Help, he will finish it. He will give to Cæsar the obedience to which Cæsar has a claim; but he will not give to Cæsar things which belong to God.

"You may call this resolution rashness. I take leave to think that history will call it courage,—wise, faithful, holy courage. Already, indeed, the Church in Scotland and the Colonies have recorded their thankfulness and admiration, and the Church in the United States—Bishops, Priests, and people, with perfect unanimity—has voted its unqualified applause. Such, too, is even now the verdict of those in England who can look upon the Church of Christ as something more than an Establishment, and who can see that the salt has already begun to lose its value when its savour is too weak to maintain and preserve the truth. The last of the three charges could not possibly be made by one who personally knew the circumstances of the Church in Southern Africa. The Bishop of Cape Town, though definite in his own opinions as to doctrine, has long worked heartily with many earnest men, Clergy and Catechists, whose views would best be described as 'evangelical.' Some such men have been appointed by himself; others are to be found among his warmest supporters. But the fact is, party spirit, as known in England, scarce exists out of England,—certainly does not run high. When earnest men find themselves upon the shores of a Colony, they soon discover that there is no ground on which a Bishop or a Priest can stand, except the commission of Christ and the authority of the Church. Once on that Rock differences soon vanish. Listening for some guiding voice amid the strife of opinions and the confusion of tongues which babble round them, men catch from their Prayer-books the sound of that voice which has spoken through the long ages of the past, and become one in mind while listening to it. Men account for the unanimity of the Colonial Church by the secret power of some mysterious autocracy, which is supposed to have gagged society. The real source of unanimity is the welcome of legitimate authority by a free and unfettered Church. H. DOUGLAS."

Storms might bluster, and men in high position might say hard and false things, but Bishop Gray knew his standing ground, and nothing could turn him from his duty to his Lord.

The day on which he heard of the first debate in Convocation, he wrote a hasty line to his brother as follows:—

"June 11th, 1866.

"Mail only in to-day, leaves again to-morrow. . . . Debate of Bishops in Convocation disappointing; the Clergy of Natal now cannot elect till they speak out. I believe men would find no great difficulty in speaking boldly, if they realised the Atonement, and felt that the maintenance of the Faith within the Church was the *first* concern of all her members; that, whatever were the consequences, this was to be affirmed. . . . Poor Dean Green came down here to consult the Bishop of Graham's Town and me about the election of a Bishop. He is full of hope, patience, and trust, and as cheerful as ever—a man of faith and love if there be one. I believe all the Clergy of our several Dioceses, or nearly all, are addressing him—400 of his laity have just done so. Dean Douglas[1] does not give a hopeful account of the state of the intellectual condition of England and Scotland,—doubt, unsettledness, scepticism."

Again he writes to the same:

"July 12th, 1866.

. . . "We are all much *in statu quo*. You will hear how poor Colenso is sinking deeper and deeper. . . . I have been writing to the Bishops about their Convocation speeches. . . . The Church will work its way, under Divine guidance, through its difficulties, let the opposition be what it will. It is a great comfort to me to think that my own Clergy are so true and sound. . . . I am at this moment almost blind with writing all day. Poor —— is evidently set up by the praise received; and expects to rule the Church. Such a course will, I fear, lead to a loss of grace. . . . We propose to ride 600 miles in September. So you see that we are yet in some vigour. The Glovers go home next month. Louisa is not ill, but needs care and advice. It leaves me very shorthanded. We shall, I trust, my dear brother, meet again here below; if

[1] Now Bishop of Bombay.

not, then above, when the warfare shall be over, and the victory won. I do not look myself for a long life, and you will probably last us all out, though you say you are getting old. My life has been that of an old post-horse; a good deal of drudgery, and wear and tear; and at times a good deal of overwork."

To the Rev. CHARLES NORRIS GRAY, Kidderminster.

"Bishop's Court, July 12th, 1866.

"My dearest boy—Thanks for your long letter. I think it would be very desirable for you to go to Cuddesden for a month previous to your Priest's ordination, for study, meditation, quiet, and prayer, and I hope that the plan will be carried out. . . . I hope that you take proper care of your health—having regular meals, etc. I think also that change and relaxation are very desirable. I always used to get regular holidays when I had a parish. I do not attach much importance to ——'s opinions on religious questions. He is a sensible man, but not a really zealous and devoted one. I do not believe that the Church of England will ever admit the Pope's Infallibility, or *worship* the Blessed Virgin. We have our faults, God knows, and we may perish, but I rather trust that God is raising up our Church to be His chief witness upon the earth—to be the centre round which others may gather; the instrument to be used for the restoration of unity. This is no new view. I preached it all over England twenty years ago before I came out, and the Church has taken great strides in this direction since. We have nothing very new here. A Wesleyan coloured congregation, with its pastor, has just come over to us. I shall have to buy their premises, and build a new chapel. We opened on Monday a new school, which Foster (a layman) has built, and which will probably hereafter form part of a Church Institution. . . . I do not give up the Irish Church. I never give up anything that ought not to be abandoned, but hope and fight, however poor the prospect of success. 'Without were fightings, within were fears,' St. Paul says; but for all that he struggled on, and yielded nothing that ought to be maintained. The Irish Church

is, I believe, the same Church as St. Patrick's. The succession is certainly with it, not with Rome. Its ecclesiastical position is a better one than ours. It needs only to be lifted up within, to be less controversial, more earnest in work, *more like a Church*, to recover lost ground.—Ever your affectionate father,

"R. CAPETOWN."

Mrs. Gray writes by the same mail to her son:—"The Archbishop says the Bishops will do better next time! 'Next time,' I suppose, is past now, and I have good hope that they will speak out enough at least to strengthen our hands in Natal. . . . I am glad you are able, in the midst of England, to take the Colonial view of separation of Church and State. The Dean is quite astonished at the Erastianism of even good Churchmen in England."

To Mrs. WILLIAMSON.

"Bishop's Court, July 17th, 1866.

"My dearest Annie . . . We will never submit to the Privy Council, and would break with the Church of England sooner than do so, because we believe that Court will, sooner or later, unless itself destroyed, destroy the Church. I do not think that Erastians know a hundreth part of the strength of our convictions and determination upon this point. All who endeavour to bring us under subjection to the State are doing all in their power to break up our Communion. We shall rejoice to be governed by a National Synod. We never will submit to State-made laws as to what our faith shall be. The judgments of the Privy Council have sunk too deep into our souls and consciences for that. These, however, are hardly topics for you. I am glad, dearest, to hear such good accounts of you. Depressed at times you cannot fail to be; but you have the great comfort of feeling as sure as one can be of what is not actually known, that your dear one is with Christ, his Lord and Master, and that before very long you will be there too. I am sure that this hope is yours, and that you can live upon it now;—that your heart is there where he is—not on

his account only or chiefly, but because of your love to your Lord. May this love grow deeper and brighter in each of us, my dear sister, daily."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, August 11th, 1866.

"My dear Edward—I trust that you are quite right again. As you say, we are all getting old, and drawing near the end, William, you, and Annie (I have you all booked) and I, the only ones left of that large family! I have tender recollections of all that are gone before. Thank God we both continue quite well, and had the Bishop of Graham's Town arrived, should have started to-morrow week on a 600 miles' ride. He does quite right to stay, but it throws me out, as I must see him and decide as to our future course. You think me, I plainly see, more than half a rebel! But I have violated no human law yet, and, as far as I can see, shall have no call to do so. But 'we ought to obey God rather than man;' and if human law conflict with the Divine law, I hope I should not waver as to my course. I have not yet heard from any one as to the proceedings in Convocation, but our course seems pretty clear. I suppose the Natal Clergy will elect. Sir W. Palmer (a great authority) writes me a vehement letter, earnestly entreating that, notwithstanding Convocation, we will assume the title of Bishop of Natal. I hear Stanley has made a fierce speech of four hours long. I trust that I may be spared the necessity of answering it. The Bishop of Graham's Town says that the Dean of Cape Town ought to reply. Archdeacon Jacob of Winchester writes to me about it. Lord Carnarvon will be all right on Church questions. I had a good deal to do with him when Under Secretary, and he was not staggered, though he wrote me word that one of my letters, claiming the right to consecrate a Bishop independently of the Crown, fell like a bombshell upon the Office! . . . I am alarmed at seeing by the Bank returns just come in, that had it not been for the payment of £1000 by Douglas, I should have nothing in either my public or private account. . . . I wish that I could now and

then pop in upon you, but my work seems to be here just now."

To the Right Hon. JOHN MOWBRAY, M.P.

"Bishop's Court, August 11th, 1866.

. . . "I am very glad to see you in your old office again. I wish I could think you would hold it long, but unless Dizzy can come near Gladstone as a financier, which I fear is hopeless, you must give place. I am very glad to see Lord Carnarvon at the Colonial Office. He is a man whom I have often wished to see more prominent. Lord Cranborne, too, I am thankful to see in so important a post—one perhaps of the most delicate and difficult. I trust that he will prove equal to it. Lord Carnarvon, I hear, wishes to bring in Cardwell's bill. You will, I trust, support it. There are only two courses—Establishment, or Free Churches. The *tertium quid* of non-established Churches under the Privy Council we are not prepared to accept. If this is forced upon us, you will drive us into open disruption. . . The only clause in the Colonial bill that I object to is that quasi-connection with the State, derived from the English Bishops consecrating Colonial Bishops under the license of the Crown. I suppose such judges as have hitherto sat on appeals would decide that this brought us under the Crown as represented by the Privy Council. I do not envy the Government the task before it."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"Bishop's Court, August 31st, 1866.

. . . "The debate in Convocation has created very painful impressions here. . . . I picture you just reaching Lavington, and enjoying your rest, and think over the happy days spent there with you. I would give something for another gallop along your downs, but I am going another way, a ride of 600 miles over a wretched country with my wife!"

Early in this year the Metropolitan had appointed the Rev. and Hon. H. Douglas of Hanbury his Commissary, writing to him as follows:—

"My dear Douglas—You probably heard of the meeting of Colonial Bishops and Clergy in London last year, and the results. . . . Among other conclusions to which they came, was one inviting the several Colonial Bishops to appoint Commissaries, or Chancellors resident in England, whose duty it would be 'to consult together on matters relating to the Colonial Church, and to correspond promptly with the several Bishops, so as to elicit their opinions, and obtain their united action on the occurrence of questions affecting the status and welfare of the Church in the Colonies.' I have given my adhesion to the formation of such a body. Will you consent to act as my Commissary? . . . I apprehend that the duties will not be heavy. Probably there will be an annual meeting during the London season. The Commission would only be for a temporary purpose. My view would be to cut away every remaining chain which binds the Colonial Churches to the Establishment; to strengthen every bond which unites them to the Church. Two things should, I think, be kept in view:—The calling upon the Government to cease to issue in the 'Royal Instructions' to Governors, any directions respecting the appointment of Clergy paid by Legislatures of the several Colonies, and to leave the Church to manage all these questions of patronage as unfettered as the other voluntary associations, *e.g.* Romanists and Wesleyans. And far before this—to press the calling together of a National Synod by the Archbishop. . . Probably our Commissaries would watch such legislation as men like —— might seek to introduce. I protest against *any* legislation for us. We don't want it. All we ask is to be let alone, and to be declared free from any pretensions of the Privy Council in consequence of our letters patent or our being consecrated by Mandate from the Queen. We will not work in chains, as the Mother Church does."

In the following letter to his son, the Bishop alludes to his "Statement" just then written, and an important document in the history of this anxious period of Church history.

"Bishop's Court, September 10th, 1866.

"The Bishop of Graham's Town keeps us in a state of great uncertainty. We ought to start this day week, we must to-morrow week, and then ride 50 miles to our and the horses' dissatisfaction the first day. I have a new horse to ride, and not altogether a pleasant one. . . . We do not like the journey: the roads are very sandy, accommodation very bad, chiefly Dutch farmers—scenery tame—places at a great distance from each other—mixed services of Dutch and English. Our Parliament has just begun its sitting with a revenue of £600,000, expenditure more than £700,000. A large debt, general poverty. A move is again to be made to carry the voluntary principle, which, if successful, would take away about £2400 per annum from this Diocese, and place us in a difficult position. I have written a pamphlet containing a statement as to facts which have been misunderstood or misrepresented *in re* Colenso, with remarks upon the important questions which have been raised in connection with this case. I am afraid I cannot get it ready for this mail, and I shall be in the saddle up to the departure of the next mail. I cannot finish it till I have the full debates in both Houses of Convocation, and these have not yet reached us. It will be at least a record for future use, for this matter cannot rest where the Upper House of Convocation has left it, with safety to the Church of England. I have had no mail from Natal since I sent up the replies of Convocation. We are looking hourly for the Bishop of Graham's Town. Sept. 18th, Just received your letter of August 7th. I am very glad that you have been to a Retreat and received good. If it forces you to look into yourself, and show you up to yourself, it *must* do good. Let the fruit be lasting. I shall think of you much on Sunday. I have no Ordination on that day. May you receive fresh grace and power from on high, for the work of the ministry." . .

To Mrs. Williamson.

"Bishop's Court, September 18th, 1866.

"My dearest Annie—I have only time for a hurried line.

The Bishop of Graham's Town came yesterday, and at this last moment I have been obliged to put off my Visitation for a week. I am overwhelmed with work. . . . We are in greater perplexities than ever. Just as I had hoped we were likely to have Mr. Cox elected at Natal, I receive a copy of a letter from him to the Archbishop declining the appointment. What now we can do I know not. Happily I have the Bishop of Graham's Town to take counsel with. I think they will elect Butler, and that Butler will not come. We shall, D.V., consecrate whoever they elect. We violate no law of any kind in so doing. The Crown has absolutely no rights whatever in the matter.

"You think it strange that I should tremble when I contemplate my manifold temporal blessings. My public anxieties have been greater than those of most other Bishops, but my family blessings have been greater too. I have not lost a child,—they are all dear children, and improving daily; I have a wife such as few have been blessed with; health, strength, ample means,—may God make me worthier of His numberless mercies."

The Bishop and Mrs. Gray started, September 25th, for the above-mentioned Visitation, going to Saldanha Bay, S. Helena Bay, Hopefield, and other mission stations. At Clan-William he found Mr. Browning doing very real work among the old settlers; and a very interesting work at Baliergot (*Anglicè*, "the washing-tub"), a little mountain farm which the Bishop had bought the year before, and on which there were 200 people, and 800 within reach.

From Paarl he writes to his son:

"October 17th, 1866.

"We are here on our way home, after a ride of 500 miles over sands and through rocky passes. The work is steadily growing in most places. Only in two I have felt discouraged. Your mother has stood her work well, and so have our horses till yesterday, when my man's horse fell and cut himself, so that I can take him no farther. We hope to reach home

by the end of the week. As I grow old I have more distaste for violent exertion than when younger, but I go through more than most men of my acquaintance can bear, so ought to be thankful. While my horses get a day's rest, I am just going to walk eight miles to a confirmation of coloured people, and consecration of a burial-ground. . . . I hope next mail to hear of your Ordination, and am glad that you have had the retirement of Cuddesden. You speak about the Reformation.—It had its mistakes, but when you come to study the history of the Church from the beginning of the tenth century, and see how largely the Church had become the world, you will not be surprised at any amount of reaction, any loss of faith in the Church on the part of earnest men. The previous irreligion of Popes, Bishops, and the whole Church, is answerable for a great deal that took place at the Reformation. Amidst all our shortcomings God seems to be preparing us to become the revivers of Church life and unity throughout Christendom. All our trials seem to be disciplining us for this, if we only rise up to the duty we are being called to."

To Mrs. Mowbray.

"Paarl, October 17th, 1866.

. . . "Tell John I am glad that he is able to support our Colonial Church Bill, and also that he has work to do as Vice-Under-Secretary for the Home Department. I am heartily glad the Conservatives are in, and I wish them a decade of official life, but (knowing very little to help towards a judgment) I see nothing in Gladstone's course to lower my opinion of him in any way. He has had a difficult post to fill, and I fear lest he should come in at the head of a great Reform party, and be driven farther than he could wish. He is, for weal or for woe, the coming man. I rejoice over Lord Carnarvon's appointment. . . . I have no late news from Natal. The Clergy and Laity were to have met on the 4th to consider the replies of Convocation. But Cox has written to withdraw. S. Oxon now, I think, wishes the Crown to quash Colenso's patent, on the ground of his language about prayer to our Lord; but I, of

course, have nothing to do with this. I have a pamphlet on the subject all but written, but I cannot finish it while travelling daily. Our good Governor has lost his charming wife—they were deeply attached—I feel deeply for him."

The pamphlet alluded to in the above letters was published before the end of the year, under the title of "A STATEMENT relating to facts which have been misunderstood, and to questions which have been raised," etc. etc.; and to a second edition, published the following year, an appendix was added. The main substance of the pamphlet has come forth in the Bishop's private letters. One extract may be useful historically to fill in a gap:—

"Upon the receipt of the replies to the questions put by myself and the Conference of Clergy and Laity at Pietermaritzburg, June 29th, 1865, the Church of Natal met in conference by invitation of the Vicar-General, on October 25 (1866), to consider what its duty might be. I have not yet heard what was the result of their meeting. Dr. Colenso himself, condemned by every portion of the Church which has yet spoken, conscious, one would think, at length, that in no sense can his teaching, especially as to the worship due to our Incarnate Lord, be reconciled with the doctrines of the Church of which he still proclaims himself a Bishop, still holds tenaciously to the title which is by law his, and to the status which it secures to him.

"Can nothing be done, men have asked, without the abandonment of any principle, or of the Church's liberties, to deprive him of this show of authority, which he refuses to surrender? I can do nothing—nothing at least without ignoring my own office—without a condemnation of my own acts, which I still hold to be right and lawful acts; without slighting the Canons of the Church, without compromising, as I believe, the freedom of the Church. But is it so clear that others can do nothing? I do not myself feel sure that the Bishop of London can do anything, though others have thought so, and I am not aware that he has ever taken a legal opinion on the subject. But I

believe all Dr. Colenso's writings have now been published in London; for one volume, at least, of his sermons preached since his return to Natal, is at this time being republished there.

"Feeling so strongly, as the Bishop says he does, that Dr. Colenso is wholly unfit to fill the post of a Bishop of the Church, and disapproving as he does of the course pursued by myself, I venture to invite him to submit Dr. Colenso's writings, if he can lawfully do so, to the examination of an Ecclesiastical Court, and to obtain its decisions upon those writings. If the verdict of such a Court should be that they are not in accordance with the teaching of the Church of England, I should suppose that the Crown could, and would upon petition, cancel Dr. Colenso's letters patent, he having repeatedly expressed his conviction that it has the power to do this, and his readiness to submit to the decision of the Crown.

"The honour of the Church of England, I might also add its very safety, seems to me to demand that matters should not rest where they are; for it is apparently in consequence of the possible legal rights which Dr. Colenso might have with regard to the Church of England that the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury hesitated distinctly to say that the Church of England held no communion with him. Knowing what communion means—that it implies spiritual oneness—union of the closest kind—and that the holding of the Queen's letters patent by Dr. Colenso prevents the Church from saying that such union does not exist with one who denies that our Incarnate God ought to be adored, there is surely a call for the only Bishop of the Church who can apparently move in the matter, if he can do so, to submit the writings which have caused so great a scandal, and are bringing such heavy reproach upon the Church, to a court of law. The question is one which no longer affects this portion of the Church. Dr. Colenso is not in communion with it. No human power will be permitted to force him back upon us, unless by God's Grace he should be brought to repentance and to the truth.

"But it is not so, as some of her Bishops say, with the Church of England. Has it not, then, become absolutely neces-

sary that it should be ascertained whether the law compels her to hold communion with heretics? and if it should prove that it does, then she should demand an alteration of the law. There are many who will wait with deep anxiety till some decision is arrived at as to the course to be pursued, under the avowals that have been made; many who have loved to think that God was training, through His chastening discipline, the Church of England to be a mighty blessing to this earth—to become the centre round which all who love Christ and His Truth might gather, under the shadow of the true and primitive constitution of the Church, but which she never can become unless she holds and maintains the Faith of Christ above all earthly trappings and treasures; and requires all who teach with her authority, or claim to be in communion with her, to proclaim it in all its purity and integrity."

In the latter part of the pamphlet Bishop Gray handles, one by one, and completely disposes of, all the Dean of Westminster's cavillings; some concluding remarks thereupon, as well as a singularly moderate and temperate reply to certain accusations (to which certainly the same adjectives do not apply) of the Bishop of S. David's, being found in the Appendix. At the time the Statement was published Bishop Gray was working, and waiting to hear the result of the Maritzburg conference. He writes to his son—

"Bishop's Court, November 17th, 1866.

"Louisa told us of your Ordination. God make you, my dearest boy, a faithful Priest, and enable you to work long and successfully in your Lord's Vineyard. . . . I daresay your mother will tell you of our four days' trip to Robben Island. I went there to minister to paupers, lunatics, and lepers, last Sunday. We had hard work to get back. Surf-boat rope broke, happily when without its living cargo. We had not made a mile in five hours, beating back, when a steamer came out for us. Your mother is very proud that she was the only one not sick. The Natal mail is not in, but an adverse telegram says the Conference, on October 25th, dif-

fered about the election of a Bishop. Clergy nearly equally divided. Butler elected by a majority of one. Of course he will not come under such circumstances, and I confess that I do not know what is to become of the Diocese. I believe that it will go to pieces. I *cannot* look after it, for I can scarce get through my present work, which, owing to absentees and sickness, is more than usually heavy. All this is the result of the Bishops' course in Convocation, which I believe to be simply suicidal, and well-nigh fatal to the Church. . . . The Bishop of Graham's Town is holding successive meetings of laity to interest them in the question of a Provincial Conference, preparatory to a Provincial Synod. . . . I have my hands just now more than usually full, so must, as you say, shut up."

The Conference above mentioned, of which more detailed reports were soon to arrive, took place on this wise.—On Thursday, October 25th, 1866, it was opened by a celebration in the Cathedral at eight o'clock,—fourteen Clergy and about seventy lay communicants present. Later the Conference assembled for discussion; some followers of Dr. Colenso's intruding, and endeavouring to give to the gathering the character of a general public meeting, an attempt which was firmly and successfully resisted by the Dean. In opening the proceedings, the Dean read extracts from his correspondence with the Metropolitan as to the course he thought the Conference should take. Bishop Gray said, "If you elect amid your difficulties, as I think you will do, it might perhaps be wise to name two or three, and leave the selection from them to the Archbishop of Canterbury or others. I think, under the circumstances, the Bishops of the Province would concur in the act. The way is now clear for you to act. There is no doubt you have a perfect right to do so if you will; and that you will forfeit no privileges which you now enjoy in connection with the Church of England by doing so. Convocation has answered your questions fairly and fully. It throws the responsibility of further action now upon yourselves. The next step *must* be yours. There is nothing more you can fairly ask the Mother Church to do." All those

present (one Clergyman only excepted, the Rev. M. Tonneson, who, it should be said, was a Dane, and had been altogether moulded by Dr. Colenso) stood up and made the following Declaration: —

"We believe, with firm and unhesitating faith, that our Crucified Lord, Very God of Very God, is Adorable, and worthy of all adoration; ever has been, and ever is to be adored, both in heaven and earth. Amen."

A second Declaration was then proposed, and after a suggestion that the word "ever" be omitted had been unanimously rejected, it was made by all present standing as before.

"We, offering our most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God, Who hath planted, and through many ages upheld in our native land of England, a pure branch of the Holy Catholic Church, do hereby declare the earnest desire of our souls, the grace of God assisting us, so to build up the Church in this land, that we and our children may ever remain in union and communion with the Church of England,—we one with it, it one with us; divided in place, but united in faith, doctrine, discipline, and worship."

A resolution was next passed thanking the Archbishop and Convocation for the replies to their questions touching the election of a Bishop; and then, in a speech of some length, Archdeacon Fearne proposed the following resolution:

"Seeing the Apostle S. Peter, in Acts i. 22, declared there was a necessity to elect one to fill the Apostleship then vacant, and as the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury has declared that we shall not be in any degree separated from the communion of the Church of England by electing a godly and learned man to be consecrated at this time Bishop over us; we do now, praying for guidance from Almighty God, choose a holy man whom we may present to the Metropolitan to be consecrated Bishop over the Church of Natal."

Considerable debate took place over this resolution, which was resumed the day following, the small section of dissentients making great use of the hesitating, halting language of certain of the Bishops in Convocation; but the resolution was carried

by a majority of one among the Clergy, and a large majority of laity.

The next resolution was carried *nem. con.*—"That if the person now elected be hindered from accepting the holy office, the Bishops of Cape Town and Graham's Town be requested to choose, with the concurrence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a fit and proper person, whom, when canonically consecrated, we hereby bind ourselves to receive as our Bishop." The Dean then announced the name of the Rev. William Butler, Vicar of Wantage, as having been suggested for election, and the Conference adjourned to the Cathedral, two of the Clergy (Mr. Newnham and Mr. Lloyd) absenting themselves. There, before the altar, the electing Clergy made the following Declaration: "I, ——— ———, having the fear of God before my eyes, and seeking the welfare and glory of His Church, believing William Butler, Priest, Vicar of Wantage in the Diocese of Oxford, in the kingdom of England, to be, by soundness in the faith, holiness of life, and divine learning, eminently qualified to be appointed Bishop over the Church in Natal, do now and hereby nominate him to that holy office."

The Dean then pronounced that the said Rev. William Butler had been duly elected Bishop, and the evening service proceeded.

The Bishop of Cape Town had been for some time past in communication with Mr. Butler, as the following letter will show:—

"Bishop's Court, April 12th, 1865.

"My dear Mr. Butler—Dr. Pusey has written to me to say that you feel the critical state of things in Natal so keenly, and the call there is for some one to go forth as Pastor to that afflicted flock, that you are willing to come if needed. I bless God for this. I shall be very thankful to see you consecrated as Bishop of the Church there, should Colenso be thrust back on us. I believe that our Lord would be with you, and that by His grace you would be stronger than he. Dr. Pusey's letter was a great relief to my mind. The fear lest one should not be found fitted for the trying and difficult work in that land,

and willing to throw himself into it, has been one of my chiefest anxieties of late. I must not, however, let you commit yourself without knowing all that I can tell you. . . . The endowment will be gone. I have ever given £100 a year to Colenso, and I would do the same to you, if not, as I expect to be, mulcted by the Civil Courts. Little or nothing will be got out of the Diocese. We should have to look to England for income, but I think this would be forthcoming." (Here follow various details as to things and persons.) "This I think is all that I need say at present. If it does not alarm you, I will work towards the question of consecration as earnestly and as rapidly as I can. But you will see that I am beset with difficulties. You will of course be prepared to find that many of the laity will be perplexed, and side with the state Bishop against the Church. The Governor, for instance, though he has no sympathy with Colenso, must do this. Officials will all recognise him. All that you could be sure of would be, first and chiefly, Christ's Presence and Blessing, the sympathies of the Clergy and of the best of the laity. The other religious bodies, if not repelled by the indiscretion of the Clergy, would also be with you. . . . Trusting that it may please God that we may be fellow-workers in Africa, believe me, ever faithfully yours, R. CAPETOWN.

"My Synod has asked me to take steps to found a penitentiary. I have written to Carter to know if he has any Sisters for us. We want two, but have as yet raised no funds. Have you any? This climate would suit delicate persons, though Cape Town in summer is very warm. We think we could raise an income to maintain a small establishment, but if any have private means, so much the better. We began our Orphanage in this way."

The election of October 26th was officially communicated by the Dean of Maritzburg to the Metropolitan, and by him to the other Bishops of the Province, and to the Primate of England, and to the Bishop-elect, to whom the Metropolitan wrote unofficially:—

To the Rev. WILLIAM BUTLER, Wantage.

"Bishop's Court, November 19th, 1866.

"My dear Mr. Butler—I send you a Natal newspaper containing the account of the meeting of Clergy and lay communicants at Maritzburg. You will see that you were elected their Bishop by a bare majority of Clergy and a large majority of Communicants present at the time. I have since received a mild protest from Colenso's friends and others in D'Urban, against consecrating a Bishop under existing circumstances. I have not received the Dean's official communication, and have not had time to read the discussions through. The Natal mail has only just come in, and the English mail leaves at 1 o'clock. I will write more fully by the next mail.

"You will see that, as the Convocation trumpet uttered an uncertain sound, its voice has been re-echoed in Natal. Had the Synod of the Church of England said, with unfaltering voice, We cannot and dare not hold communion with the arch-heretic; we recognise the spiritual sentence separating him from the peace of the Church,—all had been well. As it is, the tone of both Clergy and Laity in debate is infinitely better than that of your Londons and S. David's' and others. You will seek counsel of God, and judge for yourself how to act. May He of His goodness guide us all aright. You shall have an official letter when I am in a position to write one."

The Bishop-elect referred the question of his acceptance to the Primate and his own Diocesan, whose opinion was given him in the following letter:—

"January 12th, 1867.

"My dear Sir—We have carefully weighed the difficult questions which you have proposed to us, as to your acceptance of your election to the office of a Bishop in South Africa, and we have concluded:—That the decision of the Judicial Committee having determined the position of our Church in South Africa to be that of a voluntary spiritual society, and that the letters patent held by Dr. Colenso confer on him no territorial jurisdiction or authority, there is nothing in his