

legal position to prevent the election of a Bishop to preside over them by those of our communion in South Africa, who, with ourselves, hold him to have been canonically deposed from his spiritual office. Considering, then, the post of Bishop to be vacant, and the needs of that district of South Africa to be urgent, we dare not advise you to refuse the call which has reached you. But before we can advise you to accept it, there appear to us to be certain grave doubts which require to be solved. It is evidently of the utmost moment that no room should be left in the action which you are invited to take for creating a schism which would still farther divide and weaken the Church. For the avoidance of so great a danger, it seems to us unusually important that the canonicity of your election should be clear from any reasonable doubt. Now, we perceive—1, That the electing Clergy were a decided minority of the Clergy of the Diocese; 2, That an equal number voted for and against the proceeding to an election; 3, That some of those who opposed proceeding to an election, recorded their refusal to receive a Bishop if he were consecrated as the result of so nearly balanced a vote. These considerations suggest to us the doubt, whether there is, as yet, the proof which you have a right to require—1, That the canonicity of the election is certain; 2, That it will be recognised by the Metropolitan and Suffragans of the Province as canonical; 3, That it will be so recognised by the Church at home.

We farther notice that though a large majority of the lay communicants present voted for the election, yet that they amounted only to twenty-nine, so small a proportion of the whole number of lay communicants in the Diocese that we doubt whether their vote can properly be taken as expressing 'the assent of the laity,' more especially as we do not perceive that they pledged their order to make the needful provision for their Bishop. We advise you, therefore, to suspend your decision until these important questions concerning your election shall have been completely answered. — With earnest prayers to God to lead you in this matter to see and do His Will, we remain, ever yours,

C. T. CANTUAR.

"S. OXON."

Upon receiving this Mr. Butler sent a copy of it to the Dean of Maritzburg, expressing his own inability to accept the office until the difficulties pointed out were removed; and he also did the same by the Metropolitan, who thereupon wrote formally to the Bishops of the Province, asking them to say whether they confirmed the election, and were willing to consecrate;—at the same time instructing Dean Green to obtain from the Clergy of Natal and Zulu Land their matured and ultimate decision as to whether they were prepared to receive Mr. Butler for their Bishop in case he should be consecrated to that office, and at the same time to ask them each to supply a list of their communicants, notifying who were prepared to receive and who to reject Mr. Butler.

To Mr. Butler the Metropolitan wrote :

“February 15th, 1867.

“I think that you have acted quite as one in your position should do, in placing yourself at the disposal of your Bishop and Metropolitan. I shall be quite content with their decision, and believe it to be of God, though if it be adverse, as far as I can see things in Natal must get worse and worse, till the Church breaks up. The Bishop of Oxford wishes to know— 1, Whether the Bishops of this Province would fully recognise you? There can be no doubt of this. We will either receive you if consecrated by the Archbishop, or consecrate you on his recommendation. 2, Whether the Clergy of Natal will receive you?” (Here the Bishop enters upon sundry individual details—resulting in the opinion that one of the Clergy would refuse any one set over him; another, though opposed to Dr. Colenso, would have difficulties on the score of Supremacy; a third, though feeling difficulties, would not recognise Dr. Colenso, and would, like the last, be in heart with the new Bishop; and a fourth would be bothered by his people, but quite loyal.) “The general public for a time would be against you, *i.e.* the world, avowedly on grounds of Supremacy; really because Colenso is the representative of the world, and the world hates the Church. You would have comfort only in the Maritzburg

congregations, and at Umzinti. But, like God's servants of old, you would grow stronger day by day, and Colenso weaker. But your witness for Christ would for a long time be a martyrdom. God guide you to a right decision."

The result of these further investigations was conveyed to Mr. Butler by the Metropolitan in the following letter:—

"Bishop's Court, April 16th, 1867.

"My dear Mr. Butler—I informed you by the last mail of my intention to send a circular to the Clergy of Natal, requesting them to intimate to me whether they accepted you as their Bishop or not; and to furnish me with a list of their communicants, distinguishing between those who acknowledged you, and those who would not. I did not myself write to Mr. —, because he had repudiated the authority of the Metropolitan as well as of Dr. Colenso, wishing, for good reasons, to be under no one; but I told the Dean that *he* could do so. It seems that he did not. Of course I did not write to Mr. Tonnessen, who is himself excommunicate by communicating with Dr. Colenso; nor to Mr. —, a Clergyman without license, who left (on account of drunkenness) the Diocese of Graham's Town without testimonials; nor to Gray, who has just been dismissed by Government from a school in S. Helena and has no testimonials, and has gone expressly to join Colenso. There are seventeen Clergy in all whom we can recognise as in communion with the Church. Of these, twelve are prepared heartily to welcome you as their Bishop. One, —, who cannot remain long, has sent no answer. Four—Callaway, Newnham, Tozer, and I suppose Lloyd—decline. All except the last decline unwillingly, and from scruples about the Royal Supremacy and Colenso's possession of letters patent. . . . As to the Laity, nearly 300 communicants cordially welcome you, 50 wish not to express any opinion, 12 decline to receive you. . . . Of course I cannot say positively what the whole number of communicants in the Diocese may be, but, *including all who openly communicate with Colenso*, I do not myself believe that there are 100 who would repudiate you. I do not say

that this represents the state of feeling in the outside world. I find it very difficult to estimate that, but I think you have now fairly before you the voice of the living Church. I read all the documents which I have received by this mail. You will see by them that notice of your election was read in eight churches, and the congregations appealed to to state objections, if they had them. At one place only, where the people were chiefly Wesleyans, five objected on the ground of your being a High Churchman. You have now the whole case before you as regards the Diocese. . . . Personally the Bishop of Graham's Town would prefer the new Bishop being a coadjutor to the Metropolitan, and he thinks that Dr. Pusey concurred in this view. I cannot say that I do. The See is vacant, or it is not. If it is, the new Bishop should be Bishop of the Diocese; if it is not, I have no right to send a deputy there. Indeed under no circumstances does it seem to me we could canonically consecrate a Coadjutor Bishop to take charge of that Diocese. . . . I am writing to the Archbishop to say that in response to his Grace's summons I purpose, D.V., to sail for England by the June steamer. There must, therefore, I fear, be delay in your coming out, should you consent to do so. Once in England, I cannot say when I can leave, for the inability of S. P. G. to grant what is absolutely necessary to keep up my work will compel me to give some time to the raising of funds. You will see that Colenso has cited the Dean, Archdeacon Fearn, and Mr. Walton, to appear before him. They will take no notice, and he will deprive them all. His attempt to thrust — upon S. Andrew's congregation failed, but he will try again, and the Court will back him up in everything. Judge Connor, you will see, joins in inviting you to come. . . I am afraid that I am in for an appeal on the subject of the title to Church property. I understand, however, that the Privy Council will allow the question to stand over for months. I shall, therefore, do nothing till I reach England. I presume that after Colenso deprives the Clergy he will apply to the Court to turn them out; that it will do so, and then they must appeal. I have suggested that, without acknowledging him, they may checkmate

him by telling him that they appeal to the Metropolitan to protect them against his pretended sentence. His own lawyers told him that they had an appeal to me, and he published their opinion. I don't think that the Dean will consent to the possible appearance of a recognition, and I believe that the Supreme Court, if Colenso referred the point to it, would override the appeal; the men are reckless in their partisanship. You can show this letter to the Archbishop and the Bishop of Oxford. I cannot write fully to them, having only this one day for my whole English correspondence. Praying, my dear friend, that our God may guide you to a right decision, I remain ever, faithfully and affectionately yours,  
R. CAPETOWN."

After the second appeal to the Diocese and Province had been made known to them, the Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford wrote to Mr. Butler as follows:—

"Rev. and dear Sir—The communications which have passed between ourselves and the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, and the Bishops of Graham's Town and the Orange River Territory, at length enable us to answer the important questions which you have proposed to us. We are of opinion—I. That you are duly elected and chosen by a large majority of the Clergy and lay communicants, members of the Church of England resident within the territory of Natal, to be their Bishop and chief pastor, with your See at Pietermaritzburg. II. We have ascertained that the Bishops of South Africa, who are in communion with the Church of England, are ready to confirm your election and act upon it, on being assured of your acceptance of the same.

C. T. CANTUAR.

"S. OXON."

We have somewhat anticipated matters, in order to keep this correspondence together, and must now look back a little. Important events to the Church crowded so rapidly one upon the other at that time, that it is hard to keep pace with them. The case known as *Colenso v. Gladstone and Others*—in which Dr. Colenso sued the Council of the Colonial Bishops Fund

for his salary, had been argued in June 1866; when the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Treasurers of that Fund, maintained that the arrangements made by the founders of the Fund in 1841, assumed that the Crown would have created legal Bishoprics, with legal Dioceses and ecclesiastical power, but that this having been denied by the late Privy Council Judgments, the Bishop of Natal was merely a titular Bishop with no ecclesiastical position at all, and consequently he was without the pale of such Bishops as those endowments provided for. Mr. Selwyn argued on the same side, as also Mr. Wickens and Mr. Pemberton. Messrs. James, Stephens, and Karlake, on the contrary, pleaded, on behalf of Bishop Colenso, that the Bishop of Natal was created by the Crown expressly on the promise of an endowment from the Colonial Bishopric Fund; that he was appointed on the faith of it; that he was still Bishop of Natal *de facto*, and had done nothing to deprive himself of the benefit of the endowment; and that the Council and Treasurer were not justified in withholding payment. The Master of the Rolls, Lord Romilly, gave judgment in this case on November 6th.<sup>1</sup> The immediate effect of this judgment was to order the payment of Dr. Colenso's salary, but other and much more weighty issues were opened by it, greatly affecting the Colonial Churches. Apparently this judgment put them and their Bishops back to the position they held before the late Privy Council Judgment—their Dioceses being legally constituted, their Bishops lawful Bishops—themselves part of the Church of England. The only difference Lord Romilly saw between Colonial and English Bishops was that they had no coercive jurisdiction. Lord Westbury had toppled over their whole fabric; Lord Romilly stuck them up again for the next Privy Council to play at ninepins with! But we will let Bishop Gray give his own definition and character of the judgment, which he received by the mail of December 17th, and, at the first glance, pronounced that it could not be worse, though he had not had time to go through it and forecast consequences.

On that same day he wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:

<sup>1</sup> The Judgment will be found in a volume of Charges and Documents shortly to be published.

“Bishop’s Court, December 17th, 1866.

“My dear Bishop—Your letter of October 8th has just reached me, and with it the Rolls Judgment. I have but a moment either to study the Judgment or to write, for the mails, both to England and Natal, leave in a few hours, and I am overwhelmed with work. First—As to the Judgment. From the glance I have been able to take of it, it appears to me intended simply to bring all Colonial Churches under the heel of the State, and place lay Judges over Colonial Bishops. It ignores the very existence of Provinces and Metropolitans; and compels the exercise of all discipline through lay courts, and ultimately through the Privy Council, thereby destroying discipline, in consequence of the great expense. It seems to me most artfully framed to crush out all life and liberty from our Churches, and to court the lay desire to place the ultimate government of the Church in lay hands. Its aim is to withdraw lay support from Bishops in Colonies, and it will, to a great extent, succeed in this, because it directly appeals to their inclination to resist spiritual authority. It appears to me that either there must be an appeal to the House of Lords, or an Act of Parliament based upon different principles. But I confess that I have no hope of this. I believe this Judgment, more than any preceding ones, will be productive of disorders, dissensions, schisms in the Colonial Churches; because there are very many prepared for *any* alternative, rather than see the Church under the government of the Privy Council. Will this lead the Archbishop to move in the direction of the National Synod? I hope so. . . . I never thought your vindication of me cold! and I quite feel that you should not appear, in the eyes of the Church or the world, a mere partisan. Do not trouble yourself about such matters. We have a work before us enough to task us to the uttermost. I will not say that I am not sensitive; but I trust that I am ready to sacrifice fair fame, or anything but truth and honesty, for that which is the cause of Christ.”

A few days after he wrote to the Bishop of Graham’s Town :

"I have been thinking what we ought to do about this most impudent Judgment? Do you think that we ought to take any public step? If so, what? when? I am afraid that we could not meet in time to influence the British Parliament or Government. If we Bishops soon meet, should Clergy meet too? I have written a long letter on the Judgment for publication. I have shown it to no one yet. If I can, I should like to show it to you, and your Dean and Archdeacon, to Clergy here, and Watermeyer, if he would consider it, and send it to England by the next mail. I have taken up these two points:—

"I. The existence of English law in the Colonial Churches.

"II. The revolutionary line with regard to their constitution. Romilly breaks up Provinces, substitutes independency, makes the Supreme Court and Privy Council actual Courts of Appeal, against the view of Lord Lyndhurst. His inconsistencies are very great. No law is more clear in the Church of England than that which fixes its Provincial character. The final court he gives us is not that which Parliament has given to the Church of England. I am persuaded that all he says about our being bound by English ecclesiastical law is moonshine—rests upon no foundation but the *sic volo*. Will you work this out in your mind, and correct my document when I send it? I am not satisfied with my paper—one ought not to have to write upon these grave subjects in a hurry."

And on December 30th he wrote again to the Bishop:—  
 "I have been strongly advised by several of the Clergy, who have read my letter, to put it forth at once here, because ——— and ——— have concocted a petition to Parliament, praying that the Privy Council may be declared our Court of Appeal, and are privately soliciting good Churchmen to sign it. I fully expected that judgment would lead to some such movement. It appeals directly to the laity, who wish to have lay government over the Church; and it pretty plainly affirms that in adopting the title recommended by the Committee of Convocation, we have seceded from the Church of England. The Clergy here think that on Archdeacon Thomas's return from Caledon ten days



hence, they must face a public meeting and discuss the whole question as to the status of the Church, including the subject of appeals. I am very sorry that I must publish my letter without having the benefit of your criticisms, for it touches upon many delicate points. I have sent it to Judge Watermeyer, and hope to discuss it with him. *P.S.*—I have had a three hours' talk with him, and have assented to his criticisms."

To the BISHOP of GRAHAM'S TOWN.

" Bishop's Court, January 7th, 1867.

" My dear Bishop—Since the appearance of the Rolls Judgment I am more than ever perplexed as to the course to be pursued. As your Diocesan Synod is due, probably the calling it is the right step for you. But you will see that some of our people have printed their petition, and as it is plausible, and meets the prejudices of laity, it *may* be largely signed. I cannot get my Letter through the press at this time of year for a day or two more. But I preached on the subject in the Cathedral yesterday. The Clergy of the Archdeaconry of George are now in Session. I believe they mean to petition both Houses of Parliament, and to address both Lord Carnarvon and the Bishops, and to protest against the interference with their rights and with the constitution of their Church which Lord Romilly's Judgment implies, and some ask for. I am very much inclined to suggest this course to the Clergy here, for it is at their liberties that the blow is struck. Do you think that we can do anything in this direction? We shall probably have a general meeting for discussion, but these gentlemen have got the start of us by their petition. I say openly, that the principles of Lord Romilly's Judgment, if adopted, can only lead to divisions. . . . I propose by this mail to address Lord Carnarvon officially, and with reference to the petition, first give him copies of the Resolutions, both of the Provincial and Diocesan Synods, and, while expressing the satisfaction with which we should see our rights as a voluntary association recognised by Parliament, protest against that interference with any constitutional rights which legislation for us by the British Parliament would in-

volve. . . . I think that we are in for discussion now, and that we must go through with it."

During this time various meetings of more or less weight, to which the Bishop alludes, were being held in the South African Church, on the subject of the Master of the Rolls' Judgment, which excited the keenest amazement and indignation in every direction; but, as was strongly affirmed at the time, the effect was on the whole good, for it concentrated men's minds, which were in danger of running out into an endless variety of opinions and suggestions, upon two main points—*i.e.* the assertion of the South African Church's independence, and her preservation in the Unity of the Faith and in Communion with the Mother Church. The Bishop's published letter appeared, as we have seen, in the early days of January 1867, and it certainly appeared to most Churchmen to be a virtual upsetting of Lord Romilly's judicial affirmations. After explaining that so far he had held back, wishing rather to gather the views of others than to put forth his own, the Metropolitan went on to say, that believing the Master of the Rolls' Judgment eminently calculated to mislead men's minds in very grave matters, he could not lightly remain silent. That document was rather a treatise on the position of the Colonial Church than a judgment. Happily no part of it was law, save that which declared that the non-existence of jurisdiction on the part of Colonial Bishops was not to be followed by the loss of their endowments. The argumentative part only contained the reasons which had weighed with the individual Judge in framing his sentences, and was binding on no one. The Metropolitan had no intention of meddling with the sentence itself, and certainly had no reason to complain of it, inasmuch as it restored to him, as well as to Dr. Colenso, his ecclesiastical income, which had been withheld for nearly two years. But he was constrained to deal with the theory propounded and the principles involved. The Metropolitan felt grateful for the great clearness with which Lord Romilly had brought out the distinct spiritual character and powers of the Church of Christ; but, on the other hand, he had laid down maxims upon two very vital points, which, if ac-

cepted, would prove fatal to the wellbeing, and, at no very distant day, to the being, or at least to the unity of Colonial Churches. I. As to the law now existing among these Churches. Hitherto it had been carried into distant lands by Churchmen, *foro conscientiæ*; neither they nor their Bishops carried any law with them except for themselves; but the Master of the Rolls affirmed (only on his own assertion, he produced no confirming law) that all—Bishops, Clergy, and laity—were bound to adhere, not only to the Bible and Prayer Book, as received by the Church of England, but to all (or rather inconsistently, almost absurdly, *not to all* but to some) of the statute laws enacted in past or future for the Church of England, and to the headship of the Queen. “We are,” he says, “bound by such of these laws as are suited to our circumstances, and if we do not abide by them we forfeit our connection with the Mother Church.” But who was to decide what was and what was not suited to these circumstances? Not the Church or the Bishop, according to Lord Romilly, but the Civil Court, where a Jew or Mahometan might be called to decide what are the Church’s laws, what they mean, and even what its faith is!—“In reality to legislate for us, and very probably overrule the judgment of the Bishop in matters purely Christian. Can anything well be more monstrous? He is to decide what religion is to be taught in our churches, and the Church itself is to be helpless in the matter, for it is not to have the power of defining or amending its own laws. It must submit to this anomalous state of things, it must be content to work with an indefinite amount of English statute law hanging ever loosely about it; or cease, according to Lord Romilly, to be in connection with the Church of England. But you have admitted as much, says the Judge. It is a fundamental doctrine with you that the Queen is the head of your Church, that all your discipline centres in her; you must accept at her hands what she rules to be your status and your faith. Now, Lord Romilly knows as well as most men, that when Henry VIII. assumed this title, which belongs of right to Him Who Alone is Head of the Church, which is His Body, he extorted it from Convocation under threat of persecution—

under penalties of *præmunire*;—that even then the Clergy insisted on qualifying the hateful term with the proviso *quantum per Christi legem licet*; that nothing short of actual confiscation of their property, and imprisonment, coerced them to submission; that a Court of Equity would hardly rule that a man ordinarily would be bound by admissions wrung from him under such circumstances; that Queen Elizabeth repudiated the usurped title; that no law either of Church or State confers it on the Crown; that it appeared in Reformation times so awful a title to earnest men, that, though disclaimed by the Church it was a fruitful cause of schisms; that it wounds the consciences of Christian men in these days as much as in the olden time; and yet, with Lord Westbury, he deliberately applies it to the Church of England. . . . He says it is part of our Faith! and is taught in the 37th Article. That Article affirms no more than this: That the jurisdiction—*i.e.* the legal coercive powers which the Pope claimed in England,—the setting up by a foreign Prelate and Potentate of Courts (in the full sense of the word) within the kingdom of another independent Sovereign, an *imperium in imperio*, had no foundation in right or law,—that to the Crown 'the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.' I say the same. 'Causes' are matters contested before courts of law with legal jurisdiction. Neither Pope nor Bishop has a right to establish such courts in the Queen's dominions. In all courts of the realm everything must run in the Queen's name. Her authority is paramount in them. They are the Queen's Courts; their decisions are her decisions. But this has nothing to do with the tribunals which voluntary religious associations may set up as their *forum domesticum*. If Lord Romilly had wished to deal fairly with the Church, he should have quoted those other words of the 37th Article: 'We give not to our princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments, but *that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself.*' All Christians are, I suppose, prepared to admit this."

The Metropolitan went on to show that Lord Romilly would take away what the Long Judgment granted—that he identified the Church with the Establishment—confounded it with the State to which it is allied. In the Colonies the State has declined to establish the Church, and consequently the latter is not hampered with its laws; but it is not separated from the Church of England because the Establishment is not an essential, but a mere accident of the position of that Church, and the Colonial Church is united to it in all that is essential—its succession, its faith, its formularies. Lord Romilly does not attempt to prove that the Queen's mandate transfers English Ecclesiastical law to the Colonies; and the Metropolitan claimed freedom and independence for the voluntary religious associations so resolutely proclaimed by the Judicial Committee!

He went on to show that whatever rights—"territorial See" or "legal Diocese"—letters patent gave a Bishop, they also of necessity gave to a Metropolitan; and that the judgment in setting this aside was both inconsistent and revolutionary—inconsistent, for, having affirmed that "all laws" of the Church of England were binding in Colonial Churches, it annihilates one of the more fundamental, viz. that all Suffragan Bishops are in some Province and subject to their Metropolitan. "If we are to have English law in all things, why not here? In England we have Metropolitans. Why, if we are the same Church, having had them once appointed in Africa, are they to be destroyed there? In England appeals lie by law from the Suffragan to the Court of the Metropolitan. Why are they not to lie here?—etc. etc. Grave consequences cannot but result from an act of so much injustice. The immediate fruits are—

"I. The destruction both of the spiritual character of the Church and of its actual constitution, by the annihilation of its spiritual tribunals.

"II. The fencing and screening of Dr. Colenso, and through him of all unbelief, from all control save that which Civil Courts may be pleased to exercise."

He next shows the revolutionary character of the judgment

in the matter of appeals, overthrowing the laws of the Church of England, the very system of the Church as it has been, if not from Apostolic times, "certainly long before the Council of Nice, as appears from its Sixth Canon, and substituting, without the slightest warranty of law, a system of government over the Church by Civil Courts, which are not to confine their jurisdiction to the true office and functions of a Civil Court in matters spiritual, that is, to give legal effect and consequence to the decisions of Spiritual Courts, unless there be reason to suspect *mala fides* in those Courts . . . but to be above the Spiritual Courts for all the purposes for which they exist,—to be Courts of Appeal from their determinations, and entitled to revise all their decisions, precisely as the Metropolitan Court in England revises or overrules the decisions of the Diocesan Courts. If this be so, I have a right to say that Lord Romilly subverts the system, canons, laws of the Church, on a matter of universal obligation, essential to the very life of the Church. He destroys, as far as it is in his power to do, not the liberties of the Church only, but the Church itself, and turns it into a mere department of the State."

The Metropolitan proceeded to show how Lord Romilly contradicted a celebrated judgment of Lord Lyndhurst (*in re Warren*), in which he expressly affirmed that the Civil Court has no right to go into the merits of a case. After going at some length into this part of the recent judgment, the Metropolitan goes on to say: "We have seen what evils have already resulted in England through the definition of the Faith of the Church by Civil Judges. Against the remonstrance of both Archbishops, it has been declared that men may teach within the Establishment that the Bible is not the Word of God—that the decisions of the Judge in the Great Day are not final and everlasting. And 10,000 of the Clergy, with the two Archbishops at their head, have been compelled to protest against a decision which has misrepresented the Faith of the Church of England, and gone far to obscure and compromise her character as a witness for the Faith, and to rob her of two Articles of the Faith. The question which has been raised is one of the

deepest moment. It touches the conscience very nearly in matters relating to God and His Revealed Truth. For my own part, I say that I never can consent to submit the deepest questions of the Faith to the decision of such a Court. . . . If any change is to be made" (in the order and constitution of the Church), "let it be made by a free National Council. I submit myself entirely to the decisions of the Church so assembled, in this and every other matter. But I repudiate, and repudiate with a conviction so deep and a determination so fixed that I cannot measure or express it, the substitute now sought to be forced upon us, which breaks up our organisation as a Province, destroys our connection with the patriarchal See of Canterbury, places the final decision as to what our faith is or shall be entirely in the hands of Civil Judges, reduces each Bishop to the position of a mere officer of the State, a policeman under the government of the day, and could not but end in the breaking up into distinct separate Churches the now united Churches in the Colonies."

Going on to foreshadow the hideous evils liable to result from such a course as Lord Romilly would lead to, the Metropolitan affirmed that "a stand must be made somewhere, and if not made now and here, I know not where it could be made. If we ask to have the Privy Council for our final court of appeal, we bind ourselves to abide by its decisions in all matters relating to the Faith, and we must be prepared, bit by bit, to surrender our whole faith. But why, if this be so, some say, does not the Church of England define her views afresh, so distinctly that Civil Judges cannot misapprehend or misinterpret them? I reply, first, that she has already done this sufficiently for any candid mind; and next, that practically it is impossible, for no new definitions of hers would be binding in the Law Courts, unless made law by an Act of Parliament; and, constituted as the House of Commons is, of Churchmen, Romanists, Quakers, Jews, and Dissenters of every form of opinion, it would be hopeless to expect its assent to any fresh definition of the faith of the Church of England. All that she can do is to speak by her own constitutional organ, the Convo-

cation, and this she has done. It is because of this great wrong done to the Church of England against her vehement reclamation, and because we see that there is no security against the gradual change, by repeated decisions, of the whole faith of the Church as a Church, that very many feel constrained (and I rank myself among the number) to resist at all costs and hazards, be these what they may, the imposition of the Privy Council yoke upon the neck of Colonial Churches. We believe that in submitting to it, we should risk the betrayal of God's Revealed Truth, and surrender the custody of those mysteries of which we are the appointed stewards. It is for this reason—because the question really involved is that of faithfulness to Christ and His Written Word, or abandonment of His Truth—that we hold ourselves in conscience bound to resist the contemplated invasion of our office.”

These points are expanded and enlarged upon, and the Metropolitan concludes with the expression of his belief that, though troubled times, ours are also hopeful times, and that the deep life stirring within the Church of England is perhaps preparing her for a work of greater depth and extent than we may venture to imagine.

On the 18th January, 1867, Bishop Gray, sending this Pastoral to his brother, wrote as follows concerning it:—

“That Judgment has caused some stir here. I wrote, because Mr. Long and two of his violent friends got up a petition to Parliament, praying for no alteration in the Church of England in the Colonies, and trying to throw dust in people's eyes. I took the chair at a large meeting in Cape Town, at which a resolution to the same effect was proposed, and an amendment moved. Only five hands were held up against the amendment; which asks Parliament, *if* it legislates (which would be unconstitutional), to legislate on the principles of L. P.'s, not on those of Rolls Judgment, and invites the Archbishop to call a National Council. The petition was not well signed, but is being hawked about the streets. At Graham's Town they have just telegraphed a resolution, adopted by 400 Churchmen, denouncing Secular Courts for keeping Bishops and Clergy who



deny the faith in their posts. The Archdeaconry of George has been in conference; they have adapted an excellent petition, and passed some strong resolutions. The laity would denounce the Bishop of London for his treatment of me.

“All this excitement is very trying; there seems no end of it. Blow comes after blow, and men commit themselves to false principles without in the least understanding the points at issue. The Bishop of London (Dr. Tait)<sup>1</sup> has been very impertinently addressing not only all Colonial Bishops, but their Clergy, on questions at issue. He will get well snubbed, for the Clergy are very indignant, and say that they should have been addressed by the Archbishop through their own Bishops. I have sent copies of my replies to him to the Archbishops and to S. Oxon, and have written in the name of the Synod of this Church fully and formally to Lord Carnarvon. Things are much *in statu quo* at Natal. Judgment has not been given in Colenso's suit against me. It is said that he is preparing to eject the Dean from his Cathedral. Lord Romilly has done his best to split up the Colonial Churches. The Clergy almost to a man, would refuse to be ministers of a Church founded on the principles he has laid down. They would call themselves the Church of the Ranters, Jumpers, Muggletonians, or any other hateful name, to escape the tyranny and oppression which he would propose for them; and they would proclaim to the world that the aggressive judgments of Secular Courts had forced them to assume a title they hated, instead of one which they loved.

“The Governor has written me a nice letter, proposing a scheme which he thinks would get us out of the difficulty Lord Romilly would get us into. He proposes our successive Courts should be, I. Suffragan; II. Metropolitan; III. Patriarch (in each case *forum domesticum*); IV. Supreme Court; V. Privy Council. Five Courts for every poor Colonial Clergyman with

<sup>1</sup> “In the midst of all this, the Bishop of London, impertinently enough, intrudes into the Diocese, and sends printed circulars to the Clergy about the Bill he wishes to introduce into Parliament; and this adds to our perplexities, for he plainly intimates that he wants what he knows the Bishops are opposed to.”—*Letter (to Miss Cole)*, January 31st, 1867.

£200 a year, and each poor Bishop with £800! There could be no discipline in such case. I tell him the Clergy will never consent to alter the system laid down in the L. P. until altered by a free National Council. We know we can only (except in Crown Colonies) have a *forum domesticum*, but we insist upon it, as Long Judgment affirmed, that the *forum domesticum* shall stand in the same relation to Civil Courts as in the case of Wesleyans, and that the principles laid down by Lord Lyndhurst, which Privy Council has over and over again said it will abide by, shall be maintained. If this is not allowed us the Colonial Churches will break away from the Mother Church, and will break up among themselves within five years. I showed my MS. to Judge Watermeyer before I published; he said the argument was irrefragable. I believe the Chief Justice agrees. Of course they are not bound to my platform."

Writing on the same subject a little later (February 5th, 1867), the Bishop says: "It is very hard to have common half-educated laymen forced to consider questions of such deep moment, without any previous training or preparation. And it is harder still to have to argue them into a right course, against the decisions of Law Courts, and the suggestions of the Bishop of London; especially as we (I above all) lie open to the imputation freely cast upon me that I argue for my own power, that I wish to make myself Pope of an independent Church. I trust that the English Parliament will say, Begone, be free, do not trouble us; and that the Archbishop will call together the National Synod. No other body than that can preserve the Churches in unity."

To the Rev. the Hon. HENRY DOUGLAS.

"January 30th, 1867.

"I sent you by the last mail my Pastoral. Our Evangelicals in hot haste went in for the Romilly Judgment, and committed themselves to a petition. Now they are beginning to open their eyes, and to see that they have been asking for what they do not want. Meantime both Dioceses are moving in a right direction, and we shall, I think, speak on the whole with

no 'uncertain sound.' . . . I see the *Record* charges me and the Bishop of Oxford with forcing on Colenso's consecration in spite of its warnings. The facts are these:—He had published a volume of Village Sermons,—the *Record* declared that in them he had denied the eternity of punishment. He published a pamphlet to show that the charge was wholly untrue, which he did by numerous quotations, and he affirmed his belief in the doctrine as the Church holds it. The pamphlet or letter was addressed to Archbishop Sumner. He declared himself perfectly satisfied. Neither I nor the Bishop of Oxford had anything to do with his decision. The *Record* was inaccurate and unjust, but we must give it the credit of having scented out the odour of heresy. Nearly all Colenso's friends whom he took me to visit were Evangelicals, and some of them were leading men." . . .

It was a weary, dispiriting time; and though the Bishop kept up his brave unselfish heart throughout, there were periods when he felt it very keenly so to be. From Kalk Bay, where he had gone for a week's rest in the great heat of February 1867, he wrote to his son: "I hear that the Natal Judges, the only respectable one dissenting, have pronounced that all Church property in that Colony vested in the See of Cape Town is really vested in the See of Natal. Not a little of this I have bought. You can look for no honest verdict from lawyers in matters relating to religion,—that is a settled axiom with me. They are always biassed. I have now to appeal, at a vast cost, probably to be beaten again. I shall leave the decision on this point with the Bishop of Oxford. Things have gone of late against us. But 'the Lord's Arm is not shortened—Christ reigneth.' I am not disheartened, but I am very weary. It seems as if there were never to be an end to contention and turmoil; as if there were to be not merely no rest for this troubled Church, but not even breathing time." It was a rest to the Bishop to turn from his own cares and troubles to his son's developing work and interests.

"If —— and —— would read some of our seventeenth-

century divines, they would get more solid theology out of them than the modern, and without the taint of present controversies. I think that if men lose sight of themselves and teach principles their work would be lasting. If your people act in a certain way to please you, or because they like you, you will do them but little good. Of course personal influence must always have weight, and is valuable as an element for good; but the work of popular men is often shallow and sometimes a failure, because they do not look quite away from themselves, and insensibly lead others to look to them. Sound Churchmen have an easier path in this matter than Evangelicals. I mean that their system leads and compels them to look to principles and authority more than to individual influence. Therefore their responsibility as to fruits is greater. I agree with you in thinking that we hardly teach Church doctrine enough, and that in existing circumstances it is often done more effectually by catechising than from the pulpit. Of our mixed congregations it is true now as of old, 'neither yet are ye able to bear it.' They have not yet mastered 'the first principles of the doctrine of Christ.'"

Again, March 17th, 1867 . . . "I do not believe that dogma is learnt from sermons; it must be got either through reading or catechising. I think that there should be public catechising in every church (we have little enough here). Our people have no definite faith for want of this. If pains were taken with it, and the children prepared for it, and a running comment made upon it, parents would be interested and come and learn, while professedly hearing how their children acquitted themselves. Had public catechising been general in the Church, our people's faith had been clearer, deeper, more defined. School catechising will train you to be a Catechist in church. I have great doubts as to the extent to which what some would call controversial preaching should be carried into the pulpit. People don't understand the subject, and half are offended at it. . . . Do not suppose that I wish to keep dogma out of the pulpit—far from it; but I think we must avoid preaching it in a bare, dry, abstruse way, and try to show the bearing which each

truth revealed has upon the life of the soul. In this way truth may commend itself, which, taught merely as part of the faith needful to be received, would only stir up opposition. We must put truth before people in the least offensive way. You say you preached on the point that there is 'no true ministry save by Apostolical succession.' Is not that unnecessarily irritating and antagonistic? Why not teach the truth positively, and not add negatives? Show that our Lord founded a Church, and what its constitution from the first was. Leave to the hearers to draw the inference, which, if you put it bluntly before them, would only put up their backs. . . . — says that you are overtaxing yourself; I think this very probable. Remember that you have no right to do this. It is weak and immoral to do so. God has given you certain powers of mind and body, you have no right to become a spendthrift as regards these. I do not think that you get rest or change enough, and you should go away oftener from the parish; if you do not, some fine day you will find that you cannot go on, and that it would have been a wise economy to have taken a run more often. It is mere vanity to suppose that your work will not go on without you. . . . Do not dwell in your ministerial work too much upon Church questions. It is true that we have not taught them enough, but if you are ever harping upon them, you will irritate, and your people will feel that you are giving them husks to feed upon rather than the true Bread. The essence of all teaching, and that around which all should centre, is the Person and work of our Lord. I think, as the religious life deepens in your own soul, you will feel this. Men far advanced in the religious life can speak with more weight about these questions than very young men. I would not overlook them, but keep them in their proper place. Do not let the idea grow up in people's minds that you value the shell rather than the spiritual food which it contains."

About the same time the Bishop, writing to Miss Cole, says: "We cannot throw ourselves into all the ritual question which is so agitating the Church, seeing that we cannot measure the extent to which it has gone. I remember the copes hang-

ing up in Durham Cathedral in the place where they had been used in Cosin's time. They were afterwards removed to the College Library. I should be for allowing a great latitude in these matters, though I do not like an elaborate ritual myself."

Looking to a journey to England in 1868, the Bishop was making arrangements for a Visitation first, and preparing to leave his Province in as much tranquillity as possible, amid the endless distractions, movements and counter-movements, resulting from the unhappy state of the Church in Natal. All his plans, however, were altered by the Archbishop's summoning the Council of Bishops, generally known as the Pan-Anglican Synod, at a much earlier period than had been originally looked for. The formal invitation for September 24th was issued from Lambeth, February 22nd, 1867, and immediately on receiving it the Bishop resolved to sail for England by the June mail, a determination which involved almost more work than even his energetic mind and body could get through. "The dear Archbishop has given us very little time to arrange," he writes, April 18th. "You can scarce conceive how many things require careful consideration, and what a great mess things get into when we leave home. Our poor people alone are a great anxiety, and then horses and servants and fifty other things. . . . I was just preparing for a long Visitation, to be ready to go to England next year, and we have a great deal of unfinished work throughout the Diocese."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"May 16th, 1867.

"I venture to send you a copy of Resolutions which embody my views as to what would be desirable conclusions for the General Synod to arrive at. I have not forwarded them to the Archbishop, because I thought that it might be presumptuous to do so. I know, however, that you will not misunderstand me. I have no intention to move them all, they are merely my rough thoughts, and my contribution to the stock of subjects for discussion. I am greatly afraid that we shall be hampered for want of time. When one thinks how

various are the subjects which will be mooted, how numerous the speakers, and divergent the opinions, and for how long a time the ancient Councils sat, one cannot but dread lest at the end of four days very little progress will have been made.

"I earnestly hope that there will be ample opportunity afforded for many informal meetings before the appointed days, that things may take shape, and the greater number of us may let off superfluous steam."

Up to the last moment Dr. Colenso was harassing the Church to the utmost of his power—applying to the Civil Court for an interdict to prevent Clergy from officiating without his license; attempting to deprive the Dean, Archdeacon, and Mr. Walton of Pinetown, etc. etc.; and even venturing to send an attorney's letter to the Metropolitan demanding £329 for arrears, with interest, of his private subscription of £100 a year, which, being given for the benefit of the Church of Natal, Bishop Gray necessarily discontinued upon Dr. Colenso's deposition. The lawyers advised that all these proceedings should be left unnoticed, and treated with contempt; but they were infinitely harassing and vexatious, and the kind heart of the Bishop was sorely pained at the unworthy conduct of one whom he would fain have respected, if he could not commend him. "Poor fellow! he has sunk very, very low," is the harshest judgment wrung from the Metropolitan. But he was sorely anxious as to the Erastian, vacillating line to which a part of the Church at home seemed disposed to commit her, and often reasserted his opinion that the Church of England would not last unless she asserted her position as the Kingdom of our Lord in England;—and that the questions really at issue were, "Whether our Lord has a Kingdom upon earth; and what claim the State has to assert that she is such, or act as if she were?"

Nevertheless, as he said to his son, "Do not get *hot* on Church questions; all will come right in God's good time."

The Bishop and Mrs. Gray sailed in the "Briton," June 20th, for England. Before embarking he celebrated in the Cathedral, and all the Clergy within reach joined in the Holy Communion.

After service, a short warm address to the Bishop was signed by all present, bidding him God-speed. "The Lord prosper you;—we wish you good luck in the Name of the Lord. May Almighty God, and His Son our Lord Jesus Christ, afford you and your brethren the Bishops His continual Grace, and especially may He vouchsafe that whatever is counselled and done by you may be guided and inspired by the Holy Spirit. It is our devout hope that confusion and doubts may be removed, concord and unanimity be promoted, the Catholic Faith upheld, and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ be honoured and worshipped throughout the world."

The Bishop made a brief reply, his parting words being, "Brethren, pray for us." He had already put forth a very short Pastoral, showing of how great importance the expected Council of Bishops was to the Church at large and all her members, and urging all—both Clergy and laity—to pray instantly that God's Blessing and Guidance might be with them.<sup>1</sup>

In a few lines written to Dean Douglas, off S. Helena (June 27th, 1867), the Bishop says: "We have had fine weather, light breezes, and consequently get on slowly. The ship is comfortable, but we have an intolerable number of screaming children, who bellow from morning to night. Miss —— declares she must jump overboard! . . . The passengers attend daily prayers, and most seem reverent. We are weary enough already of the voyage, and shall be very thankful to have it over."

Having made a short stay at S. Helena—just time to admit of an interview with the Bishop thereof, who, unable

<sup>1</sup> The following prayer was appended to the Pastoral :—

"Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast purchased to Thyself an Universal Church by the Precious Blood of Thy Dear Son, mercifully look upon the same, and guide the minds of Thy servants, the Bishops and Pastors of Thy flock who are to meet together in Thy Name. Be with them: enlighten their hearts by Thy Presence, direct them in their works and ways, and teach them what they ought to do, that by Thy Aid they may please Thee in all things. Assist them with Thy Holy Spirit, that their counsels may contribute to the extension of Thy Kingdom, the maintenance of truth, and the restoration of godly union and concord. And this we pray, through the Merits and Mediation," etc.



to come himself to England, empowered the Metropolitan to act as his proxy—the “Briton” reached Southampton July 2nd, and the Bishop and Mrs. Gray at once proceeded to London, to begin the usual routine of toil which attended his home visits, looked upon, as they might be by some—how mistakenly!—as pleasant holidays.

## CHAPTER XI.

JULY, 1867, to OCTOBER, 1868.

LAND AT SOUTHAMPTON—BISHOP OF OXFORD—MANIFOLD ENGAGEMENTS—DEATH OF JUDGE WATERMEYER—"LESSONS"—LONDON CHURCHES—S. P. G. DAY AT SALISBURY—DISCUSSIONS WITH BISHOPS OF SALISBURY AND OXFORD—PRELIMINARY MEETING OF BISHOPS FOR PAN-ANGELICAN SYNOD—MEETING OF COLONIAL BISHOPS—SPECIAL SERVICES AT S. LAWRENCE, JEWRY—MEETING OF ENGLISH AND AFRICAN BISHOPS—DECLARATION CONSIDERED AND ACCEPTED—PAN-ANGELICAN SYNOD—IMPROMPTU DECLARATION OF FIFTY-FIVE BISHOPS ACCEPTING THE SENTENCE ON DR. COLENSO—RESOLUTIONS AND PASTORAL LETTER—CONVERSAZIONE IN S. JAMES'S HALL—CONCLUDING SERVICE—THE "TIMES"—CHURCH CONGRESS AT WOLVERHAMPTON—PRESENTATION OF CROZIER—ELY—MR. BUTLER AS BISHOP-ELECT—CORRESPONDENCE—MR. BUTLER DECIDES NOT TO GO TO NATAL—MEETINGS AT S. P. G., S. ANDREW'S WELLS STREET—CAMBRIDGE—RESUMED LAMBETH CONFERENCE—REPORT OF NATAL COMMITTEE—SEARCH FOR A BISHOP OF NATAL—MR. MACROBIE—OXFORD—DIFFICULTIES ABOUT CONSECRATION—LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF LONDON: FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK—REPLIES—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—CONVOCAION: LOWER HOUSE, UPPER HOUSE—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE BISHOP OF OXFORD—VISIT TO OXFORD—ROUND IN THE NORTH—YORK—NORWICH—DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM'S DESPATCH—INTERVIEWS—SIR ROUNDELL PALMER—DESPATCH WITHDRAWN—JOURNEYS—CUDDESSEN FESTIVAL—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONVOCAION—DEBATE OF THE UPPER HOUSE: LOWER HOUSE—NATAL QUESTION IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS—E. C. U.—MEETING AT S. P. G. FOR CAPE TOWN ASSOCIATION—QUESTION OF MANDATE—VEXATIOUS DELAYS—APPOINTMENT OF DEAN OF CAPE TOWN TO BE BISHOP OF BOMBAY—PREPARATIONS TO DEPART—FAREWELL SERVICES AT S. LAWRENCE, JEWRY—INTERVIEW WITH MR. DISRAELI—LAST WORDS FROM PLYMOUTH TO BISHOP OF OXFORD.

**A**FTER a prosperous voyage, touching at S. Helena, where there was time for an interview with Bishop Welby, and also at Madeira, the Bishop and Mrs. Gray landed at Southampton, July 23rd, 1867, and went at once to London, where almost his first object was to see the Bishop of Oxford, his unfailing adviser and sympathiser through all his troubles, and whose hearty and unconventional embrace seemed to carry real comfort with it. Bishop Wilberforce was not well, and his friend

found him in bed, but the day's programme scarcely sounds restorative:—Breakfast at 9, with a Ritual discussion; Ecclesiastical Commission Meeting at 11; at 1 o'clock a Ritual Commission Meeting, where the Bishop expected trouble; and at 5 House of Lords, where Lord Shaftesbury's Ritual Bill was to come on; . etc. etc.

Bishop Gray plunged at once into work, and his Journal records a series of discussions at S. P. G. with Mr. Bullock, at the Colonial Office with Sir F. Rogers and Sir G. Barrow; conferences with prelates English and American; and the like. One of these gentlemen, now Lord Blachford, refers in a private letter to his share in these interviews, saying: "I, as every one else must have been who came across the Bishop of Cape Town, was greatly struck by the energy, ability, courage, and singlemindedness with which he pursued the objects to which he had devoted himself; and I used to hear of the acts of generosity, and of the love and respect which he inspired. Our communications, though very interesting at the time, were on matters of business of passing importance, sometimes of controversy (political), so that they left behind them nothing to *tell*, but only the impression which all who met him must have derived from his manner, appearance, and history."

Amid his manifold engagements, one most religiously heeded was attendance upon Judge Watermeyer, who had come home in consequence of ill health, and who was now dying. Bishop Gray had given him introductions to the Bishop of Oxford, etc., with a view to his spiritual comfort, and he now used to visit him himself, praying with him and comforting him, and giving him the Blessed Sacrament. The Judge died September 21st, and the Bishop attended his burial.

The warmest sympathy was shown to the African Metropolitan by many of his Episcopal brethren. Affection and sympathy always cheered him, though, as he said, "praise was almost as painful as abuse;" especially feeling as he did that no other course was open to him than that which he had followed. From Archbishop Longley he always met with almost tender kindness. Bishop Gray visited him at Addington shortly after his arrival in England, and they went over the subjects to be

discussed at the coming Conference, as also the troubles of the African Church. At this time it was a question whether Mr. Butler should not be consecrated immediately, so as to take his place in the coming assembly of Bishops. Bishop Gray was frequently at the House, listening to the debates on the Colonial Church Bill, etc. In August he went to Pershore with his sister, Mrs. Williamson, to Mr. Douglas at Hanbury, and to Mr. Murray of Bromsgrove, where he was pleading the cause of his Diocese when summoned in haste by the Archbishop to discuss Mr. Butler's consecration. Hurrying up to London, Bishop Gray was seized with one of his old attacks, and he was so ill that he could hardly get through the consultation, which he sums up by saying: "The Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford told me that they had agreed that the best course was for me to address the Archbishop, and for him to consult his Suffragans. As this was announced to me as conclusive, I felt that I could not vigorously contest it; and indeed the lateness of the hour, and my pain and exhaustion, prevented my saying all that I otherwise would have said. I was, however, greatly disappointed. I fear that the intention is to shelve the whole question; and then what becomes of the Church of England and of her witness for Christ in South Africa?" The result of this interview was the following letter:—

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"4 Linden Grove, August 10th, 1867.

"My dear Bishop—I have sent to the Archbishop the formal letter which I undertook at his request to write. It is with great misgivings and anxiety that I contemplate the course about to be pursued. Had the question of the sending forth a Bishop been submitted to the gathering of Bishops, after invocation of the Holy Ghost, I should have been perfectly satisfied. To submit it privately in succession to the Bishops of the Province, seems to me likely to have but one issue. If you and the Archbishop hesitate, how can they be expected to do otherwise? Then what is to be done? Under such discouragements, and without the knowledge of men who might be willing to go out, even though the countenance of the

English Bishops were withheld, I do not think that another Bishop could be elected. Then Colenso would remain with the acquiescence of the English Church teaching his dreadful heresies in her name and with (in some sense) her authority. In a very few years the Church in Natal would die out. It is not in human nature for men to struggle on for ever, under the trials and difficulties which beset them, deserted as they would feel themselves to be. But what would be the position of the Bishops and others in the remaining South African Dioceses? I am sure that there are very many both here and in South Africa who would feel greatly troubled as to what duty demanded of them if Colenso's claims are acquiesced in. The refusal of Convocation to say that it was not in communion with Dr. Colenso has, to my knowledge, been a great trouble to many consciences. The declining to sanction the election made of a successor to him will be a greater. There may be difficulties attending upon the consecration which I cannot see; but I am sure that if all allusion to Natal is to be forbidden in our Conference, when half the Church believes that it will form the chief subject for consideration,—and if the Church's sanction is to be withheld from Butler's consecration, that very great evil will result. Circumstanced as I am, I feel that I ought not to withhold my convictions at this juncture. I have not the least wish to bias your mind from any personal considerations; but if consequences arose which I myself cannot help dreading, I should blame myself greatly hereafter if I had been silent now. I am sure that you will forgive me for pouring out my anxieties to you. I was hardly able, from suffering and exhaustion, to say much in the House, and I have been in my bed ever since. Had there been time, and I were well, I do not think it would have been respectful to the Archbishop to argue against what he termed his conclusion in the matter.—Believe me ever, etc. R. CAPETOWN."

While still ailing, the Bishop went to his son at Kidderminster, where he preached; and then to Wantage, which admirably-worked parish, with its machinery of Home, Schools of all kinds, etc., excited more than ever his wish to see its

organiser at the helm of the troubled ship he had left behind him. Sermons and meetings, as of old, began to fill up every day, and the Bishop's Journal records his movements in all directions. He always left the arrangements for these to his wife, who used to make him out the neatest possible plan or programme of what he had to do,—trains marked, hours of engagements noted. These he used to call his "lessons," and if, as occasionally did happen, he lost his precious "lesson," he was altogether thrown out and did not know where or how he was to go."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As a specimen of these Lessons :—

Sunday, October 26th.

*Morning Service.* St. Matthew's, City Road.

Mr. Laurell to have a cab and sandwiches ready by 1.10. 35 minutes to London Bridge.

London Bridge, 1.45.

Sevenoaks Junction, 2.53. Brougham to meet this. One mile to drive.

If too late for this train, try for

London Bridge, 2.0.

Dartford, 2.55. Fly, seven miles, to

*Afternoon Service.* Crocken Hill. Rev. W. Gardner.

Service  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 4. Fly to be ready.

Drive by Dartford to Mrs. George Murray's, The Hollies (?), Hirn's Cross Stone, for refreshments. Then on to

*Evening Service.* Greenhithe. Rev. — Russell.

Service at 7.

Sleep at Mrs. G. Murray's (or Rev. F. W. Murray).  $\frac{1}{2}$  of hour walk.

Monday, October 27th.

Gravesend. Evening Meeting, 7 p.m.

Greenhithe	.	2.1		3.8		4.29		Dine and sleep at
Gravesend	.	2.13		3.20		4.38		Rev. C. E. Robinson's.

Tuesday, October 28th.

Leytonstone. Evening Meeting, 7 p.m. Rev. H. H. Evans.

Gravesend, Town Pier . . . . . 11.27

Tilbury . . . . . 11.40

Plaistow . . . . . 12.26

Mr. Cotton's carriage to meet you, and take you to his house to dinner after 2. (Church Union Meeting 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ .) Service, Forest School before Meeting. Rev. J. S. Gilderdale.

Late trains :

Leytonstone	.	8.43		10.21		Plaistow	.	9.48
Fenchurch Street	.	9.13				Fenchurch Street	.	10.10
Bishopsgate Street				10.45				

Late in August the Bishop returned to London, to meet his South African brethren, and prepare with them the matters to be brought before the Synod. They agreed fully and heartily upon certain Resolutions, which were to be submitted to the other Colonial Bishops who were to meet at Archdeacon Wordsworth's on September 19th and 20th. The Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford proposed that Bishop Gray should invite the English Bishops to meet the African Prelates before the Conference, in order to discuss Mr. Butler's appointment. He however said that it was useless for him to do this on such short notice (it was then already September 4th), and that the Archbishop alone could now get them together. His reply was conveyed in the following earnest letter to Bishop Wilberforce:—

“September 4th, 1867.

“My dear Bishop . . . Several of the Colonial Bishops have had, as the Archbishop suggested, meetings to consider the Resolutions named in the printed paper as likely to be brought under the notice of the Conference, and at their request I have asked all the Colonial Bishops now in England to meet on the 19th and 20th at Archdeacon Wordsworth's, who has offered his house for the purpose. I do not think that I could, with any hope of success, invite the English Bishops to a meeting. Some of them at least would feel that I was taking a liberty with them, and very few would or could perhaps attend at a short notice, and at my request. The only possible chance, as it appears to me, of getting them together, would be for the Archbishop himself to summon them. But I confess that, besides this, I think that the South African Bishops have done all that they can or ought to do in this matter, and that the responsibility as to the future now rests wholly with the English Bishops. We have done all that we can in the way of consulting the Mother Church, and have endeavoured to carry out the course laid down, whether in the Resolutions of Convocation in 1866, or in his Grace's and your joint letter to Mr. Butler, in its minutest points. The second election has taken place as directed; the declaration has been made, and is

ready to be submitted to his Grace, if he desires to see it; and we have, as Convocation suggested, presented Mr. Butler to the Archbishop for consecration. We can, I think, do no more. I had hoped that Mr. Butler might have been consecrated before the Conference, taken his seat at it, and gone forth with all the moral weight which would have attached to a general recognition of him on the part of the whole English Episcopate. It is too late probably now for that, but it is not too late for him to be summoned as Bishop-elect; and I earnestly implore of you, for the sake of all concerned, but chiefly for the sake of the Church of England herself, to urge the Archbishop to summon him.

“This is not, my dear Bishop, a time for men to conceal what is passing in their own minds, and I will open my whole soul to you, whom I have loved deeply and revered deeply, and from whom it would be a great pain to be separated. But, after long and anxious thought, I am driven to this conclusion, That if the English Bishops do not separate themselves from Colenso, whose writings they have in Synod declared are subversive of the Faith, and will not give the right hand of fellowship to him who has been elected in accordance with the principles they have laid down, but ignore the act of deposition and separation from the communion of the Church on the part of those who alone have authority from Christ and from the Canons of the Church to separate their brother,—they involve the Church of which they are Bishops in formal heresy, and—forgive me for speaking what I feel—are unfaithful to Christ and betray His cause. God forgive me and teach me otherwise if I am wrong. I shall be the greatest sufferer if I be in error; but, believing this, I do not see what other course is open to us, if that came to pass which appears too probable, but for me to resign my present position, and with it communion with the Church of England.

“I need not tell you how infinite to me would be the pain of this step. From infancy I was taught to love the Church of England. I have loved her very dearly, and, however imperfectly, have served her faithfully, with all my power. I



still believe her to have (apart from her thralldom to the State) the best inheritance and the truest position in Christendom, and that round her might yet be gathered all that is good and true. All that I care for on earth is still wrapped up in her, and it would be a sore trial to me to separate from the many whom I honour, admire, revere. But if Dr. Colenso is not publicly disowned and repudiated by her Bishops, if his excommunication is not recognised by them, and another welcomed in his room, I shall feel constrained to sacrifice all. I need not tell you that I could never go to Rome; I believe the supremacy, as now held, a lie; the worship offered to the Blessed Virgin, idolatrous. Nor need I add that I feel keenly the position in which I should place myself. I see all this, and, sad as it would be, it would be less intolerable than even an implicit alliance with or recognition of known heresy. My own belief is that even you do not know how deeply thousands of the best men in England feel upon this subject. I am spoken to or written to every day upon the subject. The only courses, I believe open are, either to summon Butler as Bishop-elect, or to recognise, by public act, the deposition and excommunication. Both ought to be done; what the hindrance is to the recognition of Butler, I cannot understand. The legal difficulties appear to me mere cobwebs; but if the Bishops are not prepared to make a stand in this case, they never can or will make a stand against the world, but if the State bids them, must recognise Jews and Mahometans. I hear, not from himself, but from an undoubted authority, that the Bishop of Gibraltar has said he will not attend the Conference, because he hears that the Colenso question is to be excluded.—Believe me ever, my dear Bishop, affectionately yours,  
R. CAPETOWN.”

Meanwhile the Bishop records a visit to S. Michael's, Shoreditch, wishing, as he says, to help an earnest man working in one of the most trying London districts. “I found Mr. Nihill living in two small rooms at the top of a model lodging-house. On the ground was the Sisterhood in four or five small rooms; the Superior was a former parishioner of mine at Stockton,

once a Wesleyan. I found them living in the utmost simplicity and poverty, with beds, furniture, rooms, not better than those of the poor; their only luxury a quiet little oratory. One Sister has charge of the school just begun with one hundred children; another of a little shop for the sale of Bibles, Prayer Books, etc. All visit the poor, and care for them in sickness. The church was full with a congregation of people, chiefly, I think, men from the lower orders, and lower middle. After the 3rd Collect, Mr. Nihill came up to me and said that full 250 people had come from a neighbouring congregation to express their gratitude to Almighty God for the defence of the Faith on the part of the Church of South Africa,—that it was very late, near ten o'clock,—and they could not remain for the sermon—would I give the blessing before the sermon? I agreed to this, and before preaching said a few words on the subject to the congregation.”<sup>1</sup>

September 1st, the Bishop went to S. Alban's, Holborn, where he liked the hearty responses of warm devotion; though, coming, as he now did, for the first time to what are called Ritualistic services, and being, as he has said already for himself, not constitutionally fond of ritual, he did not understand or enter into all he saw; though, judging by parallel entries of “Drowsy service at . . .” there is not much room left to doubt which his hearty spirit of devotion would prefer. And when in 1869 he was called to give his official opinion upon “Ritualistic” proceedings, as used in South Africa, he will be found giving a clear emphatic judgment which stopped the mouths of cavillers. Nevertheless the Bishop was most assuredly not a Ritualist, as the word has been used, though thoroughly Catholic he as assuredly was, and his large-hearted sympathy went out towards all whom he found doing good service for God. At Wymering he “visited the Home where many Sisters are employed in various works, including an orphanage. Much pleased. I found there one preparing to be a Sister, who told me that she used to come

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop was vexed afterwards at some of the newspapers taking this up, as though he had intentionally thrown himself into a prominent Ritualistic demonstration, which was not the case.

to me as a young girl at Stockton for religious guidance." He also went over the "kind of college," and was pleased with it and its practical teaching, especially with one "huge Yorkshireman," whom he found cooking.

In a letter to Bishop Welby, written about this time, Bishop Gray says: "Ritualists may be indiscreet in some things; but all England is going in for a higher form of worship; Dissenters not less than Churchmen. And men who are called Ritualists (it is impossible to draw the line) have a firmer grasp of the Faith than most others. Moderate Ritualism is decidedly popular already, and my belief is that gradually the Church will adopt almost all that these men are contending for."

In their tour of visits Hursley was included, where of those loved friends the Kebles, the graves only were to be found; and after a gathering at Beaminster, where some old friends gathered round him, the Bishop reached Salisbury on September 11th.

"Soon after arriving the Bishops of Oxford and Salisbury proposed to me to walk with them. We walked till near seven o'clock discussing the question whether anything was to be done about Colenso in the Episcopal Conference. I have never had a more painful discussion.<sup>1</sup> Their argument is that nothing can be done—I. Because the Archbishop pledged himself that nothing should be done; II. Because the Bishops cannot agree, and division would be scandalous. I, on the other hand, maintain that the Angels of the Churches assembled in the Name of Christ, after invocation of the Holy Ghost, cannot pass over the fearful scandal which the Colenso heresies have occasioned, without sinning against our wounded and insulted Lord;—that something *must* be done;—that the Churches must declare that they hold no communion with Colenso, and will give the right hand of fellowship to Butler, or if they like not him, to some other faithful man elected in his room, and confirmed by the Bishops of the Province. They reply that the Bishops would then have

<sup>1</sup> Referring to this season Bishop Gray said to a friend: "They accuse me of self-seeking and love of power; but I should not care if I were at the bottom of the sea, so long as the English Church does her duty!"

as a body to accept the deposition and excommunication, and that some of them object to this. I rejoice that I do not want the Bishops to endorse anything that I have said or done; that if the Church re-echoes the Bishops of London and S. David's denunciations, I will be silent and acquiesce, but that, if I had said nothing, still the Church in her Synod of Canterbury had pronounced Colenso's teaching subversive of the Faith, and would be bound to hold no communion with him; that if nothing is done, the allegiance of thousands of the Church of England will be shaken; and that I must ask the Church to do that which, if she will not do, she would go far to destroy her character as a witness for Christ.

"They then appeal to me to cover and not expose the shame and weakness of my Mother Church; and as Butler cannot be recognised, to pass him over; choose some one else at the Cape, consecrate him there, and let him come home and preach in their churches; or else that I should find some one here who might be willing to go out without that sanction of the home Church which Butler considers essential. I point out that I cannot set aside the election of the Clergy and Laity of Natal; that three years ago they decided that they would never elect any one who had taken part against Colenso, lest it should be said that they had personal objects to serve in their opposition to him; that if it were known that the House of Bishops refused to hold out the hand of fellowship to Butler, no one else could be expected to go. I am afraid that my dear brethren regard me as obstinate, self-willed, determined at all hazards to force the Mother Church to a recognition of my proceedings, or else to incur risk of a schism. They will hardly believe that it is to save the Church of England herself from a course which I believe to be suicidal, that I make the stand which I feel constrained to do."

The next morning the annual Sarum Festival of S. P. G. was kept, the Dean of Cork (Dr. Magee) preaching "a wonderful sermon; then luncheon-dinner [at the palace]. I think there must have been two hundred people; and a meeting at 6.30 in the Town Hall. I was so disturbed and distressed in mind

that I wished not to attend, as if I spoke I must say what would probably be distasteful to my dear friends. The Bishop of Oxford, however, said, that if I did not name the Conference they did not care what I said. The meeting was evidently intended as a great demonstration in support of the Bishop of Salisbury, at this time of great trial to him (seventy of his Clergy having appealed to the Archbishop against him in consequence of his Charge). I was received with great enthusiasm, which upset me, and in my present worn and weak state from want of sleep (I was thinking and praying for guidance half the night) broke me down for the moment. I, however, said what I wanted to do, though with a sadness and oppression of spirit which rather changed the previously jubilant tone of the meeting.<sup>1</sup> A large party to supper again in the evening."

The next day, September 13th, the Bishop was called out of the Cathedral for another talk with the Bishops, the Bishop of Oxford being obliged to leave before service was over. "Their tone was modified since our last conversation. The Bishop of Salisbury proposed to move a resolution. S. Oxon dwelt more upon legal proceedings. God guide us all aright! He gave me a letter from the Archbishop, written in consequence of my solemn one to him. The dear Archbishop much distressed, but argued the case for doing nothing. Wrote another long letter to his Grace, explaining matters, replying to his statements."<sup>2</sup> The next day, September 14th, Bishop Gray joined the Glovers at Shaftesbury, greatly exhausted and worn in body and mind. How keenly he felt the present state of things may be seen from the entry in his Journal of September 15th:—

"I have felt keenly to-day how nearly I stand alone, as far

<sup>1</sup> A friend who was present at this meeting wrote: "When Bishop Gray rose to speak, there was such an expression of deep sorrow on his face, and he spoke evidently with such painful effort, that one feared he would break down; but the intense earnestness of his manner so enchained his hearers, that even the eloquence of the Bishop of Winchester seemed to fall flat by comparison. The deep sorrowful earnestness of his manner struck every one."

<sup>2</sup> He wrote that same day, telling his son some of his troubles, concluding with these words: "Do not, even in your heart, find fault with the Bishops, but pray that our gathering may be overruled for good, and the clouds which hang around your father's head be dispersed."

as the Episcopate is concerned. Not an English Bishop is, I fear, prepared to support me on the points of refusing communion to Colenso, and giving the right hand of fellowship to Butler. My daily prayer for myself these many years has been, Give me the gifts and graces needful for my high office,—wisdom, faithfulness, patience, meekness, humility, gentleness, purity, love, firmness, decision, determination. Never did I need them all so much as now. Would that I had prayed more fervently and striven more earnestly to become what I have prayed that I might be. Of Clergy and Laity I have no doubt that multitudes are with me. I am told so on all sides, nor can I for a moment doubt that mine is the right and only safe course for the Church to pursue.”

On September 17th a meeting of about thirty-six Bishops took place at S. P. G., with the object of preparation for the coming Conference. The following account of it is taken from the Bishop of Cape Town's notes. The Archbishop consulted them about various matters of detail, such as the admission of reporters, whether the Bishops were to be robed, what the services should be. The opening service, it was settled, should be in Lambeth Chapel, the concluding one possibly in Westminster Abbey; but it was already understood that the Dean only offered this on the condition that Dr. Colenso was not condemned, and the Bishop of Cape Town not supported. The Archbishop read a letter from the Bishop of Brechin objecting to the title "*Protestant Episcopal*" as applied to the Scotch Church, and a discussion followed in which the Americans joined.<sup>1</sup> "The Bishop of Oxford proposed a form which should be general, and include all Churches in communion with the Church of England. I had prepared a similar form. The Bishop of Norwich proposed we should come to no decision at this meeting, as it would hamper decisions at the Conference. This was agreed to. I then stated my objection to the clause which had been added in the second edition of printed resolutions, as presumptuous, aggressive, inexact, unwise. It assumed

<sup>1</sup> We remember to have heard certain eminent Americans express their profound objection to the name during that same autumn.

that we were on the mount, and had to teach all others. . . It was *aggressive*; we were 'to seek to diffuse through every part of the Christian community the principles of the English Reformation!' Unity would not be reached through controversy. It was *ineexact*, because we did not want Rome or Greece to 'return' to the 'faith of the undivided Church;' but to rid themselves of what they had added to that faith. *Unbecoming*, because we were more lax than other religious bodies as to insisting that the Faith should be taught in our churches. We could hardly press others to a 'resolution' to abide by *discipline* when we had no such resolution ourselves; when we allowed adulterers to come unrepented to Holy Communion, and scarce professed to have any discipline except for Clergy. . . . The Bishop of Montreal then read a letter from the Bishop of Columbia, expressing his great regret that he could not fulfil his intention of attending the Synod, and appointing Montreal his proxy. He was anxious on two points:—1, Support of the Bishop of Cape Town's proceedings *in re* Colenso. 2, Protest against legislation for Colonial Church. He had written to me on the subject. I next told the Archbishop that the Bishop of St. Helena had requested me to act for him."

The Bishop of Graham's Town (Cotterill) then spoke of subjects his Diocesan Synod wished him to lay before the Conference, and alluded to Resolutions which we desired to submit as bearing on those published by the Archbishop.

The Bishop of Ontario (Lewis) then rose and asked if he should be allowed then or at the Conference to submit some Resolution on the subject of Natal? The Canadian Church had asked for this Synod mainly with a view to the settlement of this question, and great injury, in his belief, would be done if it were passed over.

The Bishop of Gibraltar (Trower) had a Resolution which he would ask leave to read. It related to Natal; expressed sympathy with the Bishop of Cape Town, and claimed from Government remedy for the evil inflicted on the Colonial Church through mistakes about letters patent, etc.

The Bishop of Huron (Cronyn) felt that the greatest evil and

greatest disappointment would arise if the Conference did not come to some decision on the Colenso question.

The Bishop of London (Tait) saw the greatest difficulty in taking it up. The Bishops had come to this Conference, never dreaming that it would be entertained. It was unfair to them to force it on. Unestablished bodies could not understand the peculiar difficulties of an Established Church.

The Bishop of Cape Town spoke of the necessity laid upon him—he must speak his mind fully and freely, and would, beforehand, apologise if he said one word to wound. Conference, he thought, could not ignore this subject. It was the first time that the Churches had met since this great scandal had arisen. The heresies which had been taught by one still claiming to be a Bishop of the Church of England, and to speak in her name with authority, were greater than any that had been put forth by any Bishop of the Church. The Church of England, when it considered the subject in Convocation, had spoken with hesitation; the trumpet had given an uncertain sound; this had been Dr. Colenso's great moral support. He had said, and his followers had said, that men could not be wrong in holding communion with him, seeing that the English Bishops did not disown him. He had appealed to the position of the Bishop of London, to the learning of S. David's (Thirlwall), to the undoubted orthodoxy of Lincoln (Jackson) and Ely (H. Browne). Words of the Bishop of Lincoln had been expressly quoted in public documents as justifying Colenso's position. The speaker felt that if the Church now met was desirous to remain a branch of the Church of Christ, it must repudiate him who had taught these fearful heresies.

I. Duty to Christ, her injured and insulted Lord, required it, for He had been pronounced ignorant and in error,—not to know more than any intellectual Jew of His own day; it was said that He ought not to be adored.

II. Duty to herself. Her own position as a branch of the Church of Christ was at stake. She had herself declared Colenso to be a heretic, and she could not hold communion with him, without sharing his heresy. It was necessary to vindicate her



in the sight of Christendom that she should disown him. All the world was expecting it, nearly all the Bishops who had come to the Synod expected it. If it was a wrong done to the English Bishops to discuss a question which they had decided not to discuss, it was a much greater wrong to those who had come from the farthest ends of the earth, expecting it to form a chief subject of discussion, if it was set aside. Men's minds were troubled, uneasy. Allegiance to the Church was shaken. It would be an evil day for the Church of England and for us all, if nothing were done.

III. Duty to those souls who, because of the Church's hesitation, were clinging on to heresy.

IV. Duty to the struggling Church of Natal, which would soon be destroyed if nothing were done.

The Conference could do this. (the Bishop of Cape Town said) without endorsing his proceedings if they disapproved of them. In truth he loathed the very expression "sympathy with the Bishop of Cape Town," which was so often used. They might utterly condemn his course, if only they would steer clear of all complicity with this heresy. They might repudiate Dr. Colenso not because the Bishop had deposed him, but because their own Synod had condemned him. He could never understand the legal difficulties which some English Bishops foresaw; the only difficulty which could arise would be if any statesman forced Dr. Colenso upon the Church as a Bishop, or any patron presented him to a living. Would any Dean or Chapter dare to elect? any Bishop who knew that he must stand before Christ's Judgment-seat, dare to give him spiritual mission—cure of souls? Then would not such a decision as he was asking for be a great support to any called to bear this trial? The only penalty that he knew of for those who held that the law of God was higher than the law of man would be an action at law, the penalty of *præmunire*. The dear Dean of Maritzburg and other faithful Clergy were braving this; even now they were probably turned out of their Churches and homes. Why could not an English Bishop do the same? He implored them not to pass by this great question.

The Bishop of Lincoln said he had not changed his view as to law. The law might say that Colenso was in legal communion (!) with the Church, and then what was to be done?

The Bishop of Cape Town asked if his brother would institute Dr. Colenso to the cure of souls?

The Bishop of Lincoln would not do so.

The Bishop of New York (Potter) said that it was quite true that two-thirds if not three-fourths of American Churchmen wished to see the matter settled here, and alluded to the uncomfortable position in which the American Bishops found themselves when opposing their kind and hospitable English brethren.

The Bishop of Montreal (Fulford) said it was a question affecting the whole Church, and infinite disappointment and mischief would be caused if nothing were done.

The Bishop of New Zealand (Selwyn) wished to explain why his Church had not done more in publicly avowing Colenso's deposition, because it had no doubt, but was thoroughly one with the Bishop of Cape Town. He accepted the sentence as that of the proper tribunal.

The Bishop of London dwelt strongly on legal difficulties. He had approved of all the Bishop of Cape Town had done up to excommunication, but he thought when the sentence was declared null and void in law, the case ought to have begun through the legal courts *de novo*. He wished the Bishop of Cape Town, instead of raising the question here, would meet the Bishops in Conference, they point out fully their legal difficulties, and counsel him or the Archbishop how to proceed. The real difficulty was, How was he a Metropolitan? made by letters patent which were now worth nothing.

The Bishop of Oxford drew out the distinction between the legal act of a legal court and the spiritual decision of a spiritual court which had no existence in law. The Privy Council had said that the Metropolitan's act was one of which law could take no cognisance, but that did not touch his spiritual act. He further answered the Bishop of London as to the whole history of the Metropolitan office. He thought that the object of the Bishop of Cape Town might be attained by an

addition to, or amendment of, some of the resolutions, and, with his Grace's permission, he would propose an amendment.

The Bishop of Cape Town said he would be very glad to meet and discuss with the English Bishops the question of future legal proceedings against Dr. Colenso, the prosecution of appeal which must come on in November, and the case of the four Natal Clergy. Some more conversation on that and other subjects took place, and the meeting broke up.

The next day (September 18th) Bishop Gray had a good deal of conversation with some of the American Bishops—Vermont, Arkansas, North Carolina, etc.—who were most hearty, almost enthusiastic, in their encouragement to him. On the 19th the proposed meeting of Colonial Bishops took place at Archdeacon Wordsworth's. Bishop Gray walked down there, feeling, as he said, refreshed and invigorated by the air, and by the quiet time for thought and prayer as he went. At the meeting were assembled the Bishops of New Zealand, Montreal, Barbados, Christ Church, Gibraltar, Huron, Ontario, Niagara, Graham's Town, Nova Scotia, Central Africa, Free State, Labuan, and Quebec. The resolutions agreed to by the South African Bishops formed the basis for discussion. Most of the points were agreed to; some resolutions were improved, others (so Bishop Gray thought) "emasculated, with a view to carry what we could. I was obliged to leave at 5, for Croydon, where I had to preach—a beautiful choral harvest service—crowded church. Got home again after 11 P.M., much exhausted." He had a suffering, sleepless night, the usual penalty of excitement and anxiety, and returned to the meeting (adjourned) feeling worn and ill. The Bishop records that they had a "very interesting discussion, and decidedly improved some of our resolutions; again, weakened others. I read to the Bishops the resolutions which I meant to propose, pledging the Conference to recognise Butler and hold no communion with Colenso. All said that the English Bishops would not concur. I said that I must move them. Too ill to discuss the subject fully. The Bishop of Gibraltar proposed a most weak but perfectly harmless resolution, which all adopted,

for not one stood fully by me. 'The Bishops think it right to declare their conviction that the character of the whole Anglican Communion is affected by the present condition of Natal, and they recommend the appointment of a Committee to consider the best means by which the Church may be delivered from the scandal;' very inoffensive, but, for all that appears on the surface, Bishop Cotterill's or my own proceedings may be the cause of the scandal, not Bishop Colenso's heresies."

After the meeting broke up, at 5.30 P.M., the Bishop went with some friends to one of the Missionary Services which were proving so successful at S. Lawrence's, Jewry, the church being crowded three times a day. "I felt quite exhausted, head splitting, spirit broken. Church crammed from end to end—service very noble—volume of voice overpowering—enough for the greatest cathedral. There were five Bishops and more than a hundred Clergy present—congregation a sea of heads; got through my sermon, my power of voice increasing as I proceeded—got home between 11 and 12, beat. I have not for a long time been so near breaking down. The church was suffocating."

Harassing days, sermons in crowded churches, and sleepless nights, were, as the Bishop wrote in his Journal on the 23rd, "a poor preparation for a very trying day;" adding, with an expression of anguish which he did not often suffer to escape him, "O my God, I cry unto Thee in the night season, and Thou hearest not!" But in truth God heard him, and it was only his deep inward sense of God's upholding Hand, and of His imperative claims, which enabled Bishop Gray to bear up resolutely and patiently through this well-nigh overwhelming season. This day, the 23rd, the Colonial Bishops again met, at Archdeacon Wordsworth's, to work up matter for the Synods, put the resolutions agreed upon into shape, etc. "Sir Frederick Rogers came, and we discussed legal questions relating to the Colonial Church with him. I was obliged to leave without concluding matters, and at 2 P.M. attended at S. P. G., to meet English Bishops with African, and two other Metropolitans, New Zealand and Montreal, to discuss the Colenso

question. 1, Considered whether legal proceedings could or ought to be taken to deprive him of letters patent—general feeling that none should be taken. Next, whether I should proceed with appeal *in re* property—feeling against it. Then, the course to be pursued. All at length agreed that the Bishops of Montreal and New Zealand should submit the following Resolution on the second day of the Conference,—the Bishop of London reserving right to suggest alterations if he found that those with whom he acted differed :—

Resolved — “That in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal, and that a Committee be appointed at this general meeting to consider the whole case, and inquire into all the proceedings which have been taken therein, and to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from the continuance of the scandal, and the true Faith maintained; and that such report be forwarded to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a request that, if possible, it may be communicated to any adjourned meeting of this Conference; and further, that his Grace be requested to transmit the same to all Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask for their judgment thereupon.”

“The Bishop of New Zealand was very strong upon the point that the Conference could not, as a Synod of the whole Church, confirm either the decision of the Province of Canterbury, or that of Cape Town, without going into the whole question. I contended that the Conference must either accept the spiritual sentence, or provide for a rehearing of the case—and that I should push matters to this. The Resolution as agreed upon I assented to as providing for a full judgment of the Church diffusive. We then discussed the question of Butler’s consecration. The Bishop of Oxford put the question to the Metropolitan of Montreal and New Zealand, Whether the proceedings in the election, as stated by me, were canonical? They thought they were. The Bishop of Oxford undertook to see whether the Archbishop would consent, upon this state-

ment, to recommend Mr. Butler to go. I read the Resolution on the subject which I intended to propose to Conference, unless the matter were previously settled, or his Grace thought it unwise to raise the question in Conference."

On the 24th the Pan-Anglican Synod met at Lambeth, about eighty Bishops being present. The day began with celebration<sup>1</sup> in the chapel, and a sermon from the Bishop of Illinois. The session was opened by an address from the Archbishop.

In this address (which was published by authority) his Grace recapitulated the subjects of discussion already named in the prospectus sent to all the Bishops.

- I. The best way of promoting the reunion of Christendom.
- II. The notification of the establishment of new Sees.
- III. Letters commendatory for Clergymen and laymen passing to distant Dioceses.
- IV. Subordination in our Colonial Church to Metropolitans.
- V. Discipline to be exercised by Metropolitans.
- VI. Court of the Metropolitans.
- VII. Question of Appeal.
- VIII. Conditions of union with the Church at home.
- IX. Notification of proposed Missionary Bishops.
- X. Subordination of Missionaries.

The Archbishop observed that in the selection of topics regard had been chiefly borne to those which bear on practical difficulties seeming to require solution. It had been found impossible to meet all views and embrace every recommendation, and it had been thought desirable on this occasion rather to do too little than to attempt too much, and confine discussion to matters admitting of a practical and beneficial solution. "The unexpected position in which our Colonial Churches have recently found themselves placed," his Grace said, "has

<sup>1</sup> It was stated in the *Guardian* of September 25, 1867, that on this occasion the bread used was made from corn grown at Bethlehem, and the wine brought from Jerusalem.

naturally created a great feeling of uneasiness in the minds of many. I am fully persuaded that the idea of any essential separation from the Mother Church is universally repudiated by them;—they all cling to her with the strongest filial affection, while they are bound to her doctrines and forms of worship by cogent motives of interest. At the same time, I have good reason to believe that there are various shades of opinion as to the best mode in which the connection between the Daughter Churches and their common Mother can best be maintained; and I trust that the interchange of thought between those who are chiefly interested in those important questions will lead to some profitable conclusions.” After some other remarks, the Archbishop went on to say, “Doubtless there is much in these latter days, even as we have all been taught to expect, which is dark and dispiriting to the mind that has not been exercised to discern the meaning of such signs. The enemy is on every side plying his insidious arts to sap the foundations of belief, to hinder the cause of God’s Church, and prevent the Word of God from doing its work in the conversion of the soul of sinful man. No effort is spared to disparage the authority of those who witness for the truth, and uphold the dogmatic teaching for which the teaching of the Apostolic writings is at once the model and the warrant. Though it be not our purpose to enter upon theological discussion, yet our very presence here is a witness to our resolution to maintain the Faith which we hold in common as our priceless heritage set forth in our Liturgy and other formularies; and this our united celebration of offices common to our respective Churches in each quarter of the globe is a claim in the face of the world for the independence of separate Churches, as well as a protest against the assumption, by any Bishop of the Church Catholic, of dominion over his fellows in the Episcopate.” After some words of sorrow over the divided state of Christendom, and invocation of the Spirit of Wisdom, Peace, and Love, the Archbishop concluded, and the Declaration was considered. Its form, as finally accepted, was—

“We, Bishops of Christ’s Holy Catholic Church, in visible

communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, professing the Faith delivered to us in Holy Scripture, maintained by the Fathers of the English Reformation, now assembled by the good Providence of God at the Archbishopal Palace of Lambeth, under the presidency of the Primate of all England, desire—I. To give hearty thanks to Almighty God for having thus brought us together for common counsels and united worship; II. We desire to express the deep sorrow with which we view the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world, ardently longing for the fulfilment of the prayer of our Lord, 'That all may be one,' etc.; and, III. We do here solemnly record our conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held in the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils;—and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity, and a love of the Lord's appearing."

"Day taken up with Declaration," Bishop Gray writes; "did not finish it. General Councils excluded from first part. House divided about it. Felt the discussion did not promise well. I moved an amendment that they should be brought in in the first clause, where we spoke of the basis on which future reunion of Christendom might take place. Archbishop consented that a Committee should be formed, both to consider the terms of Declaration, and to prepare a Pastoral *ad fidelium*. We met after breaking up to consider these matters. The Bishop of Oxford produced a Pastoral which, at the Archbishop's request, he had sketched. Debate upon it, and deferred final approbation till to-morrow. All thought it very good. Got the Bishop of Ely to work with me to get the General Councils recognised. Dined with a large party at Fulham (Bishop of London's).

"*September 25th.*—Short night. Walked down to Lambeth by eleven o'clock. Long discussion again about Declaration. Postponed it for the Colonial Church work. Bishop of New



Zealand moved, one by one, the Resolutions we had agreed upon among ourselves. Hard fight with the Bishops of London and S. David's about Synods, and their relations. To-day the former objected to our agreeing to a system of Synods culminating in an Œcumenical Synod. I showed him the language of Convocation upon the point. He disputed it, but struggled in vain. We defeated him, affirming the principle, and leaving details for a Committee upon which I am.

"We had then a great debate on the Natal question. The Bishop of New Zealand moved, and the Bishop of Montreal seconded, the Resolution agreed to at the Meeting of English and African Bishops, to which I had given a very reluctant assent, because I was told that I was no fit judge of a matter in which I was personally so deeply concerned." [The Resolution was given above, p. 344.]

"The Bishop of S. David's rose to object, but the Bishop of Vermont (Hopkins), presiding Bishop of the American Church, rose at the same time, said that he was altogether dissatisfied with the Resolution, which seemed to hold the balance even between the Bishop of Cape Town and Dr. Colenso; that all the American Bishops had accepted the Metropolitan's sentence, and that he believed the great majority of Bishops were prepared to do so. He moved a long amendment to that effect.

"The Bishop of S. David's then rose to protest against carrying on the discussion at all;—asked the Archbishop whether he had not engaged to him and others that the Colenso question should not be discussed? He and the Bishop of London pressed the unfairness of breaking an engagement. Others said they had come from the ends of the earth to what they believed would be a free discussion;—that men everywhere believed that this would form a main subject for deliberation;—that the Canadian, the whole of the American Church, and the whole of the English, Home and Colonial, were looking for some decision;—that the addresses which had come in when the suspicion arose that it was about to be passed over, were evidence of the deep feeling on the subject. The Archbishop has no firm hand in guiding a meeting, and it is perhaps well that, through-

out these days, he let all say their say; as a safety-valve was much needed for all. During the discussion the Bishop of S. Andrews proposed another amendment similar to the Bishop of Vermont's, but more condensed, yet still containing too much. At length the Archbishop rose to give his decision, but not until I had stated what was the proposition which I meant to submit, if his Grace permitted me to do so,—*i.e.* 'That this Conference, while pronouncing no opinion upon any question as to legal rights, acknowledges and accepts the spiritual sentence pronounced by the Metropolitan of South Africa upon the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal.'

"The Archbishop ruled that it would be a violation of an understood arrangement with some English Bishops if he allowed any of the three amendments to be put,—Bishop Hopkins', S. Andrews', or mine; that the utmost he could allow was the Resolution agreed to at the Bishops' meeting summoned to consider the question;—that he himself, however, objected to parts of that Resolution, which might be construed as holding the balance even between the Bishop of Cape Town and Dr. Colenso, and requested these might be struck out. They were struck out, and the Resolution was passed by a large majority, the dissentients being the Bishops who wished for the amendments. I said but little throughout these discussions, feeling that it was to so great an extent a personal matter with me; but before the Resolution was put, I said to the Archbishop that I accepted, and bowed to his Grace's decision, however grieved I was at it. I had declared beforehand that I should do so, and would therefore sit down. I was at the moment very doubtful as to the proper course to be pursued. So desultory have been our proceedings, that the discussion might easily have been prolonged, and I have no doubt but that my amendment would have been carried by an overwhelming majority, unless our universal desire to show respect to the Archbishop, so meek, and kind, and fair, and considerate for all, had prevented many from voting at all."

After the debate the Bishop of Labuan (Dr. Colenso's brother-in-law) and others went up to the Bishop of Cape Town to