

ance to the whole Church, and of such vital moment to Colonial Churches, that you would wish, I feel assured, that I should discuss the points at once, and say what we all feel here concerning them.

We are agreed that the system of Metropolitans and Provinces determined upon by the Bishops of the Church in 1853 under Archbishop Sumner should continue in the Colonies. The Archbishop, however, contends for some provision whereby fealty to the Church of England may be secured and the Patriarchate acknowledged; and has therefore insisted that the oath taken by Suffragan Bishops at their consecration shall be not to their own Metropolitan but to him. He is willing, as I understand, that on arriving in the Province in which they are to labour, they should take a second oath of canonical obedience to the Metropolitan and receive mission from him. Now upon these points I would make the following observations:—I. I have never been unwilling, nor have, I think, any Colonial Churches, that in some way the Colonial Churches should bind themselves to the Mother Church (as distinct from the Establishment). I heartily concurred in what was done at the Lambeth Conference in this matter. For years I have seen and urged here and in England, publicly and privately, that this could only be done by restoring the system of graduated Synods. We have in our Provincial Synod done what we could in this matter, by subordinating our proceedings to those of an Imperial Synod. *Next*, I have, personally, not the same objection which some have to the giving of Patriarchal powers to Canterbury; but if these are given, they should be granted by some public act of recognition by the Church. As a matter of fact, Canterbury is not one of the Patriarchates recognised by the Church, nor has the Archbishop, in law, jurisdiction beyond his own Province. But if he were a Patriarch, he would not be entitled to take, at consecration, an oath of obedience from the Suffragan of another Province. The point would be met by the Metropolitan taking the oath: the Suffragan's subordination is mediate, not immediate.

“ The question is really not one merely of order or propriety.

It is one of very great importance to Colonial Churches. Suppose a case of discipline to arise here, such as we have had, and the Bishop were to reject our authority. A court of law would rule, and rule rightly, that the oath taken at consecration governed the case; that by that oath he had voluntarily submitted himself to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan to whom he had bound himself (in this case, apparently York). It seems to me that the oath he has taken places him out of this Province.

“ You say that that was not the intention, but it does not appear that anything, either before the consecration or at it, was said or done to show this, but that his oath was taken exactly as it was taken by the two other Bishops, and must have as much binding force on him as theirs on them. I am, I confess, in a great state of perplexity as to what I ought to do. I doubt whether, with my view as to what the consecration oath implies, I ought to put to the Bishop another oath which might seem to be at variance with that already taken. I doubt whether he ought to consent to take it. I seem to have no excuse for calling upon him. I do not give him mission. As I understand it, the English Bishops have already done this at our request. If consecrated as Twells was under the Jerusalem Act, the very limits of his Diocese are assigned him. I may be wrong as to facts, and it is possible that the other Bishops may not feel the difficulty so strongly as myself, but it is not unlikely that they may feel it more strongly; and then I do not see what course is open to us but to let Bishop Wilkinson go to his Diocese without taking any oath, and write to the Archbishop to state officially what our view of the Bishop's position is. On the other hand, if this course be adopted, a Bishop in a country already part of this Province is not a Bishop of the Province. We cannot call upon him to subscribe to our Provincial Synod, which makes him take an oath to me. We have no means whatever of enforcing discipline as regards him or his Clergy.

“ If all this has force in it, you will see that the system laid down by the Archbishop would simply break up the Provinces

which have been founded. Every Bishop who has been consecrated for South Africa since I have been Metropolitan—Armstrong, Colenso, and Cotterill, under Archbishop Sumner; Welby, Twells, under Archbishop Longley—has taken the oath to me. The introducing another system, which I hold to be entirely uncanonical, is, in my belief, simply destructive of the unity and discipline of Colonial Churches, for with us everything hinges upon the oath. . . . I am, I trust, pretty well again. My poor wife is far from well. Were it not for the necessity of going to the Free State, I should probably have taken her to England for advice and an operation. The Church in the Free State, however, will collapse if not cared for, and we hear of no Bishop. I am urged even to go to the Transvaal, where two Deacons, with their congregations, plead that they have had no communion for two years.”

Misgivings as to his wife's condition were creeping in daily increasing force upon the Bishop's mind. On June 25th, after sending precautionary advice to his son, who had been ill, he goes on to say :

“I am doing this myself. It is sorely against the grain, and with feelings that I am shirking work, and a knowledge that I have not very long to work, that I preach only once on a Sunday, having my second service in the chapel here. You ask for honest accounts of us both—I am nearly if not quite well. . . . If I had no worries, I think that I should be quite right. . . . I wish I could report equally well of the dearest mother. She, however, causes me uneasiness. Her complaint is the more distressing in that she has a great deal of pain, especially when she is cold. But at times she is without pain, and she sleeps well. I drive her out whenever it is fine, or, as yesterday, put her upon her horse Bokkie, and walk by her side. . . . The medical men say there is no danger. . . . I confess, however, that if I were not constrained to go to the State, I should feel inclined to take her home for advice, and even yet I may do so. In her present state I could not allow her to go with me on Visitation.”

In July the symptoms became so serious that, although it was very inconvenient to alter arrangements long made, the Bishop felt he had no choice but to follow Dr. Ebdén's advice, and take his wife to England for treatment. The decision was so suddenly made that there was no time to announce it to those at home; and by the first mail which could have carried tidings of their intentions the Bishop and Mrs. Gray arrived in England.

During the passage, the Bishop wrote to Miss Fair, Superior of S. George's Home:

"At Sea, July 27th, 1870.

"You will be glad to hear that we are getting on well. My wife has, I think, decidedly improved at sea. She looks better, and is able to sit on deck in her chair about six hours a day. G. is much the same. . . None of us are, I suppose, peculiarly happy at sea, but we are a very harmonious party, and I think that the daily prayers are attended better than when we came out. Nearly every one attends, I think, which adds much to my comfort. We hope to be at S. Helena early to-morrow morning. I shall desert my ladies for the day, and this time probably get my ride up to the Bishop's. I am very weary already of the sea, but we could not have had anything more favourable. In spite of all, however, I pine for the land, and heartily wish that I were on my way up to the State, to encourage the poor Clergy there. It seems so strange to be packed off suddenly to England when one has no wish to be there! But I doubt not God orders all things well, and that good will come of this forced absence. . . My love and blessing rest upon you all.—
Ever your affectionate father in Christ, R. CAPETOWN."

The Bishop wrote from Plymouth, August 17th, to announce their landing, saying that his wife was none the worse for the voyage, which had been very favourable. A consultation of physicians took place, and the result was that little more than giving temporary relief could be hoped for.

"They wish her to remain for some time under their care, that they may watch her," he wrote to his son (August 30th).

"I told them that if they thought she would not live long, I believed she would rather go home and see her children, but that if they thought that they could even partially restore her, I should feel it my duty to keep her here at all cost; they urged her to remain. . . . I thought it best to tell you all this before you came. I need not say that she is full of patience and gentleness. She says that she has had a very happy life; that we have long had good health, and must take cheerfully the loss of it."

In reply to a similar note to the Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce) that loving friend wrote in a more unmeasured tone of distress than Bishop Gray himself :

"Testwood, September 1st, 1870.

"My dearest Brother—Your letter quite overwhelmed me. It is well for her. It must be well for you, for God cannot forget those who have served Him as you have served Him. But it is a dark and trying dispensation. May He guide you aright. . . . I fear myself that it is not to be hoped that there will be a restoration, but for those I love dearly my heart early desponds. It was broken so early in my own life that new sorrows seem always to make it jar with notes of hopelessness. But the end may be long delayed. . . . Pray let me hear soon again, for my heart is very greatly with you. . . . Will you give her my most affectionate remembrances? May God support and bless you and her.—Ever your most affectionate

"S. WINTON."

To Miss Fair Bishop Gray wrote :

"53 Cambridge Square, September 7, 1870.

"My anxiety about my dear wife has been greatly increased. The doctors give me little hope; there is very great pain and increasing weakness. She is as calm and patient as possible. Few know how much she has suffered for a year past. The doctors urge me to wait and see what their skill can do; of course I shall be guided by them. She only moves now from her bed to the sofa. I have many invitations, but I do

not mean, except on great occasions, to leave my wife for a night, and therefore I can only work about London, which is more desolate than I could have imagined. Literally every one seems to be away, consequently there is not much to be got.

"Yesterday I went to see the Mother (of Clewer) who has just returned from abroad. She was very kind, and went over all the buildings with me. But she has neither a Sister nor an Associate for us at present. . . . Mrs. Monsell said she thought that she could not send Sisters for education under three years, and from all she said I believe it is not now in her power. I have heard from Upton Richards, saying that the All Saints Sisters do not take up educational work. I have written to Butler, but he is away. . . . All my dear daughters will, I am sure, pray for me, and ask that my dear wife may be spared. And all will strive more and more to love one another. I pray for you all. The Peace of God be with you. My best love to each."

To his son the Bishop wrote again, September 15th: "I write a line to say the doctors have just been here. Your mother has been easier, and I think a little stronger. Dr. ——— is satisfied with a certain improvement. He will not, however, fully discuss her prospects with me till the day after I get home, Friday in next week. The best he allows me to hope is a possible thrusting back of the disorder for a time."

To the BISHOP of WINCHESTER.

"53 Cambridge Terrace, September 16th, 1870.

. . . "I am to know next Friday whether I am to return immediately to the Cape that she may see her children before she dies, or whether she will derive benefit from a longer residence in England under the best advice. She is perfectly calm, contented, happy. I must try to see you before I go, if I have to leave suddenly. I wish to see what can be done to make consecrations in England canonical, and not subversive of Colonial Provinces. I wish also to express my great hope that

the Church of England will at this time renew her appeal to a Free Ecumenical Council, for the sake of Christendom—for her own sake. Nothing, as it seems to me, would at this moment more commend her to Christendom than such an appeal. There are many other points I should like to have discussed, but God only knows whether there will be a time. I will write to you after Friday, which is the day for me in this life. I am going meantime for a night to Charlie. I should not like to leave England without seeing him in his parish.—Ever very affectionately yours, R. CAPE TOWN.”

“I have offered the Free State to Jones,¹ and told him that I had consulted you. I like what I have seen of him very much. He is young, but he seems very sober, and likely, I think, to evangelise, if spared, that large region.”

That waiting for “the day for me in this life,” was a heavy time. Mrs. Gray was as cheerful and contented as ever, saying continually that “it is all as it should be, I can wish for nothing better,” and her husband said, “She has never been overcome except when speaking of the suddenness of sweet little Loui’s death—she prayed against that;” but she could not bear much talking, or seeing any one for long, and at times fits of pain so severe came on that, in spite of all her tender longing to save her husband distress, the poor sufferer was forced to go and lie on her bed moaning until she fell asleep. The patient endurance of both is very touching. “If the doctors do not say that her life will soon be cut short, there are many reasons in the way of work for my remaining at least two months longer in England,” the Bishop wrote.

It was on October 6th that the consultation, to which the Bishop still clung with some hope, took place, and as soon as it was over he wrote a few sad lines to his son to say that the medical men all agreed that the patient was much worse, the disease making progress, and that it was useless to try her with painful remedies which could not cure. “The disease is malignant, not benignant. She may perhaps live a year.

¹ The Rev. William West Jones, now the Bishop’s successor at Cape Town.

I have not talked to her since, as she is always upset by the doctor's visit, and prefers my waiting a day. My impression is that she will wish to go on the 11th or 25th November, but you shall hear at latest on Saturday. I have long been engaged to preach at S. Lawrence's on All Saints' Day."

October 8th the Bishop wrote the following touching note to his youngest daughter :

"My dearest Flossy—I must send you a line. Probably your dear mother has told you that the doctors have given up all hope of her recovery, and that in consequence we think of returning home very soon. We must not repine, but be thankful that God has spared her so long to us. I trust that you will yet see her, and receive her last counsels and treasure them up for life. I am quite well, though worn by anxiety and the constant pressure of callers and letters. . . . Your dear mother suffers a good deal of pain—she is now moaning on the sofa while I write. Her great wish is to see her children once more. I have written to Agnes and Blanche at George. . . . Look at the xvii. chap. book iii. of Thomas à Kempis. Your dear mother for twenty years has tried to bring herself into conformity with what it teaches. She has had those words by heart for many years. Do you, my child, dwell upon them, and learn to have no will but God's.—Ever, my dearest child, your affectionate father,
R. CAPETOWN."

To the Sisters at Cape Town the Bishop wrote :

"Now, God's Will be done. The Lord gave, and the Lord taketh away. She knows, and wishes to know all. She says it is all as it should be. She ever hoped that her death might not be sudden. She is calm, patient, cheerful, looking on to the end. . . . Now, as to work. Butler cannot help us, nor East Grinstead, nor Clewer, nor All Saints. My letter in the Church papers about your work has as yet brought no offers, but I am inquiring everywhere, and hear of some. I tell them I shall not dare to face you all without recruits. I am doing what I can as to sermons, but London is still empty, and I cannot go into

the country. My first month has produced little more than £100, and I have had no special offerings. To-morrow I preach at Stoke Newington and Highgate (not Dalton's); I am going for an evening meeting to Dalton's, and on S. Cyprian's Day to S. Cyprian's. . . . I am in much trouble about men. I have not yet a precentor. I have offered the State to three men, and I am looking out for Madagascar. I hope to see these appointments filled before I leave, but it is anxious and laborious work, writing about and selecting men. The Bishop of London has been most tenderly kind, and the Archbishop writes himself, very kindly. I am quite well, and have not spoken to any doctor, though I may do so before I leave. You are all, I know, interceding for us. I pray for you, I need scarce say. May God bless you all, and make you of one heart and mind, and fill you with love to one another, and enable you to see all the good in each other, and all the evil in yourselves. You may depend upon my doing all that I can for the Home. It is very near my heart.—Believe me, ever, my dear daughters in Christ, your affectionate father, R. CAPETOWN.”

Another letter a little later says :

“On Tuesday afternoon we had our last consultation. It took from me the last remains of hope to which I had been clinging. The disease has made rapid progress. The doctors will not commit themselves now to any opinion as to how long she may be spared. If she returns to the Cape, they advise her leaving in three or four weeks, but I think they would advise her to stay if it were not for the work. She wishes to die at the Cape, to give her last counsels to the dear children, and to hand over her work to any who may be appointed to carry it on. I am going to-day to the City, to see about ships. Her mind is all that I could wish. She read to me last night, most touchingly, the 17th chapter of the third Book of Thomas à Kempis,¹ as illustrating her feelings. She had known that

¹ “My son, suffer Me to do with thee what I please ; I know what is expedient for thee. Thou thinkest as man, thou judgest in many things as human feelings persuade thee.

“O Lord, what Thou sayest is true. Thy anxiety for me is greater than all

chapter by heart for twenty years, and her aim had been to school herself into agreement with it."

A further consultation with Dr. Farre gave some little more temporary encouragement, and probably helped the Bishop through some work which he felt it right to undertake, though he shrank from leaving his suffering wife for a night.¹ He undertook to go to Wolverton, Buckingham, Cambridge, etc., to Hastings, Chatham; and on S. Andrew's Day (November 30) the Bishop was in Scotland, in order to consecrate the new Bishop of the Free State (now called Bloemfontein), the Rev. Allan Webb. Mr. Webb was to have been consecrated in S. Paul's, with Dr. Cheetham, Bishop of Sierra Leone; and Dr. Huxtable, Bishop of Mauritius; but the Archbishop of Canterbury insisted on the oath of obedience to himself, and a long correspondence between him and the Metropolitan of Africa on the subject having brought forward nothing to make such a course seem other than uncanonical and injurious to the Colonial Churches, the Metropolitan decided on accepting the cordial hospitality of the Primus of Scotland (a decision in which, be it said, the Archbishop

care that I can take for myself. For he standeth but very totteringly, who casteth not all his anxiety upon Thee. O Lord, if only my will may remain right and firm towards Thee, do with me whatsoever shall please Thee. For it cannot be anything but good, whatsoever Thou shalt do with me.

"If it be Thy Will I should be in darkness, be Thou blessed; and if it be Thy Will I should be in light, be Thou again blessed. If Thou vouchsafe to comfort me, be Thou blessed; and if Thou wilt have me afflicted, be Thou ever equally blessed.

"My son, such as this ought to be thy state, if Thou desire to walk with Me. Thou oughtest to be as ready to suffer as to rejoice. Thou oughtest as cheerfully to be destitute and poor as full and rich.

"O Lord, for Thy Sake I will cheerfully suffer whatever shall come on me with Thy permission. From Thy Hand I am willing to receive indifferently good and evil, sweet and bitter, joy and sorrow, and for all that befall me I will be thankful. Keep me safe from all sin, and I shall fear neither death nor hell. So as Thou dost not cast me from Thee for ever, nor blot me out of the book of Life, whatever tribulation may befall me shall not hurt me."

¹ "I have never had harder work than since I came to town," he wrote. "It is often anxious days and sleepless nights. The letters about men and women, too, have been innumerable. I have still three or four on my list to whom I could have offered the State . . . but the refusals have been very depressing."

entirely acquiesced), and Mr. Webb was consecrated in Inverness Cathedral on S. Andrew's Day, the Metropolitan of South Africa being assisted by the Primus (Bishop of Moray and Ross), the Bishop of Aberdeen, and Bishop Abraham, who was sent by the Bishop of Lichfield to represent himself. It was the last time that Bishop Gray was to take part in any Church ceremonies in this country, and those who were present look back upon that day with a mingled sense of thankfulness and sadness. Not all his personal cares could turn that champion of the Church's liberties from his duty to her; and on his return he wrote to the Bishop of Winchester:

"I have heard with some surprise, not unmingled with indignation, that, in reply to the Archbishop's request for a license for the consecration of the Bishop of Madagascar, Lord Granville has expressed a reluctance to issue it. He requires to know the number of the Clergy already in that Mission, and the number of converts; and he intimates that, in his judgment, the Bishop of Mauritius might exercise jurisdiction over the island. He assumes to himself the right to decide what shall be the constitution of the Church's Missions; whether they shall or shall not have a Bishop at their head. You are aware that there is no Mission which has been founded in our time that has so great a weight of authority of the Church for its going forth in the completeness of her constitution. Nineteen Bishops, with many eminent Clergymen and laity, decided that there should be a Bishop. I trust that you and the dear Bishops of London, Lichfield, and Rochester, with whom I deeply regret that I cannot be to-night, will remonstrate against this petty act of persecution before it is too late. If Lord Granville will not listen to reason, I hope that you will make your appeal to Mr. Gladstone. I believe that he still loves his Church and hates injustice. If he will not interfere to stop this contemplated wrong, he will lose the hold he has upon many very earnest men. The Romanists may have their Bishop; the Norwegians theirs; any and every other religious body in the land may found its mission in its own way; the

Church alone, which the State affects to cherish and support, shall be deprived of her liberties!

“Can we wonder that those who love their Church are day by day demanding in increased numbers that she shall be set free from this oppressive thralldom?—Ever, my dear Bishop, affectionately yours,
R. CAPETOWN.

“Why did not Lord Granville raise his objections in the case of Zululand? There are but three Clergy at present in that Mission. I did not consecrate Madagascar in Scotland, because he will not be in my Province.”

It was decided before now that the Bishop and Mrs. Gray should sail¹ for Africa, December 11th, by the ship “Northam,” their son, the Vicar of Helmsley, who had been suffering from an attack on the chest, going with them. It was, of course, known to all their friends that this was a last parting from Mrs. Gray; but probably most may have hoped to see the dear Bishop again. He did not think so himself. He wrote to the best loved of all his friends, the Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce):

“53 Cambridge Terrace, December 5th, 1870.

“My dear Brother—I had hoped to have been present at the Colonial Bishops Council on Wednesday, and to bid you

¹ Only two days before this his last departure from England, the Bishop wrote the following kind notes to the Rev. M. S. Suckling of Shipmeadow, through whom the children in the Union Workhouse in that place had sent an offering, which they had for some time been encouraged to save out of their little earnings, for the Cape Town Missions, by their schoolmaster:—

“My dear Sir . . . Will you say to the Union boys for me how glad I am to hear that they have learnt to work for Christ and His Church? It may be that they are thus laying the foundations in their own lives and characters for greater acts of self-sacrifice and love in the cause of Him Who so loved them as to give Himself for them.”

And to Mr. Stammer, the boys' master, the Bishop wrote:

“I am told by your excellent Vicar that I am indebted to you for the help given by your boys to Missions in South Africa. I am glad to hear that you endeavour to lead all under your care to take an interest in the advancement of our Lord's Kingdom upon Earth. Everything we do for Him returns back with manifold blessing to ourselves. Pray tell your boys how thankfully I accept their offering. I have not a moment to write, and am overwhelmed with work.”

farewell there ; but I am compelled to leave town with my poor wife on that day to be ready for an early embarkation on Thursday. So I write to say good-bye. It has been amongst my great losses in England not to have been able to enjoy your society for a day, and to learn your view about matters of deep interest to the Church of God. It is probable that we shall not meet again here, though I trust hereafter. The consecration went off very well ; the good Primus as kind as possible. I have a letter before the Council on Wednesday ; I trust that it may be able to meet my view. I am brought into debt by what I have done for Natal, and the uncertainty as to the Bishop's income is a source of unceasing anxiety to me. Gladstone's reply to my letter is, that it was too late to interfere in the present case as to issue of letters patent ;—that it might be desirable that they should not again be issued for Crown Colonies, since the Natal Judgment, and Palmer's and Coleridge's Opinion, but be 'Independent Churches like the Irish ;' but that it would be 'a doubtful measure to force this liberty on weak communities, such as Sierra Leone.' In other words these Churches cannot stand alone ; therefore we will force them to have letters patent, which do them no good whatever, but simply impose upon them irremovable Bishops. How clearly does all this show that the Church of England has never attempted to carry on her own Mission work ! The Prime Minister says, You will have anarchy without our chains ; therefore we will not release you. He knows of nothing in the Church upon which he can rely to guide and govern these infant churches. Pray have a Board, with large powers, which will regulate the Missions of the Church in accordance with the Canons and ancient precedent ; and get the Bill, agreed upon by the Committee of Lambeth, of which the Archbishop was the head, and of which Gladstone approved, brought in this Session. J. Brunell, Esq., 15 Devonshire Terrace, had, with the Bishop of Graham's Town, the chief part in preparing it.

“ If my correspondence with the Archbishop does nothing else, it at least reveals the wretched state in which our whole Mission work is. This subject must be taken up thoroughly,

if the greatest confusion is not to arise. All that is wanted is for the State to allow to the Church the free exercise of her religious liberties in this matter. At present ours is the only communion which is restrained by law from so simple a privilege as the consecration of our Missionary Bishops without a violation of our own Canons and usages.

“Would —— do for the very important post of Dean of Capetown? I want one who will have a grasp of a large work in a city of 30,000, with 8,000 Mahometans, 8,000 heathen, schools, orphanage, sisterhood, etc. A line to me posted on Thursday, on board ‘Northam,’ Plymouth, would reach me. . . . God bless, preserve, and comfort you.—Ever, my dear Brother, affectionately yours,
R. CAPETOWN.”

A hurried line, December 9th, told his brother and sister that the Bishop had taken his poor wife to Plymouth without any extra suffering, although the great cold of that winter, which had already set in, made travelling a risk. “She has borne everything well. I have not known her for a long time so free from pain. Our parting love to all near and dear.” The voyage was trying. The Bishop wrote:

“December 17th, 1870.

“My dear Edward—We have commenced our voyage very sadly. The morning after we left Plymouth the wind became foul, and soon grew to a severe gale in our teeth. When the sea was at the highest on the 13th we had two men washed overboard. Though steaming hard we were not going more than one knot an hour, and immediately backing the engine, kept close to the poor fellows till they went down. Ropes and buoys were flung close to them, but they could not reach them. They have both left widows and children, for whom we have made a subscription. I have never had so sad a beginning. We have lost two, if not three, days already. In twenty-four hours we made about thirty miles. The ship has of course been knocked about, and been uncomfortable, but we are all right now, with a fair wind, and shall probably reach Madeira to-morrow afternoon. I need scarce say that Sophy

has been as calm and tranquil as usual, making the best of everything. The heavy rolling has fatigued her, but on the whole she has not suffered. She has slept well, and not had great pains. Her appetite, too, has improved. She has not left her berth, but has dressed every day. We were disposed to quarrel with the arrangements of the cabin, but the junction of the two berths has been a comfort to her, as she can move from one to the other. Charlie was somewhat ill, but is himself again. Tell Annie we are going to begin upon her champagne to-day. It was very wicked of her to take away my character in this way! We have a very respectable set of passengers. Many who have chest complaints will leave at Madeira. They have not by any means yet got over their sickness; but such as are well enough are very punctual in their attendance at daily prayers, and we are very harmonious. I always tell them at the beginning of each voyage after dinner that we ought, while together, to live as much as possible as one family; and that nothing will do more to bind us together than family prayer. I am able to do my reading in spite of cold, bad weather, as on other voyages. . . . I am already very weary of the voyage; but I have nothing save the dear wife's state to make me very anxious, as on so many other occasions."

To Mrs. WILLIAMSON.

"Off S. Helena, January 3rd, 1871.

"My dearest Annie—Some of you will expect a letter from S. Helena. We have had a very quiet time since we left Madeira,—trade wind all the way. The dearest wife suffered a good deal from the heat on the line and on each side, but it has done her no serious harm. She has for the last week been most mercifully spared nearly all pain, for which I am very thankful. She gets upon deck after prayers, 10.30; comes down for a nap at 3.30; up again before 6 o'clock, and remains on deck till 8 P.M. She thinks herself weaker than when she embarked, but I do not. . . . For the last week and more Sophy has been enjoying the champagne which your love and thoughtfulness put on board. . . . I have got through an

immense amount of reading. These two voyages in the past year have given me more time for study than I often get. I like my ladies very well.”¹

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

“Bishop's Court, January 17th, 1871.

“Thank God we have reached home in safety. Sophy suffered much pain all the way from S. Helena, and acute agony in the drive out here. She enjoys greatly the perfect still of this place, and the singing of the birds, and the comforts around her. She will now, I believe, sink gradually to her rest. I think she is weaker than when we left home. I find plenty of troubles here. . . . Glover has made up his mind to come and live with me, but he must return to George for the present. Thus I have both Dean and Archdeacon to look for. There are many other worries, but I will not trouble you with them.”

The Bishop struggled on with his work conscientiously and earnestly, but his heart was sore at the daily watching of pain in her, to save whose suffering he would have borne anything himself so gladly. He writes to his sister :

“March 2nd, 1871.

“I am in the midst of an examination of candidates for Holy Orders, and to-morrow will be taken up with *viva voce* work ; so I write a line to-day to say that there is no great change in the dearest wife as regards strength. She is not weaker ; but she is now hardly ever free from pain, and she sleeps worse, and is very restless. . . . I am craving for more Sisters, and to hear of the appointment of a new Dean. I think it pretty certain that we shall lose the Bishop of Graham's Town, and that Merriman will succeed him. I get very cheering letters from Bishop Macrorie. . . . Our ladies' school will begin after Easter. I have taken a very large house for it for a year. We are more likely to be inundated than to be left without pupils.”

¹ Some recruits for S. George's Home whom the Bishop was taking out.

TO MRS. MOWBRAY.

“Bishop’s Court, March 18th, 1871.

“My dearest Lizzie—This is perhaps the only letter I shall write to the family by this mail. My dearest wife still lives, but it is a life of unceasing suffering. Her moaning when she thinks none can hear is very distressing. She is now never easy, though at times without much pain. . . . She is, as ever, most patient and resigned, and ‘would not wish it to be otherwise than it is.’ She will hardly let me read to her, which soothes her very much, for fear of interrupting my work. I think that when the time comes she will be thankful, though her anxiety about me makes her willing to stay. A few days ago I thought her sinking rapidly; her symptoms were worse, and the pain exhausting. I do not now think that the end will be so soon. . . . We have heard, *vid* Mauritius, of the capitulation of Paris. Alas for poor France! I hold that this is clearly a chastisement for accumulated sin, as Nebuchadnezzar’s capture of Jerusalem, or the Roman destruction of it. May we learn in time. I believe our treatment of the Education question, ousting God out of our schools and universities, forbidding teachers to make known Him, and His nature and attributes, and dealings with His children as revealed by Himself, is a great national sin, and will, unless repented of, draw down future punishment. I should not be surprised, if I live, to see the chastiser in turn chastised, as Nebuchadnezzar was, for God’s judgments are upon the earth now as ever. We have nothing new here. Diamonds still found, but most unsuccessful. I do not see how we are to provide these 20,000 scattered souls with means of grace. They are not giving £100 a year to support their minister. Those who find get away, the beggars alone seem to remain. . . . We have had one village nearly washed away by a waterspout—our mission school is gone.”

“April 16th.

“This is the first morning that dearest Sophy has, through great pain, been compelled to keep her bed till I came back

from church, and leave her children during the hour of dinner. Death, save for an interference which we may not look for, is fast approaching. But at Easter tide we ought not to repine at this. She is patient and submissive as ever. I read to her and pray with her daily, but she is ever afraid of taking up my moments, and throwing back my work. There are many signs, I think, of growing influence through the Church. We are now about to discuss the possibilities of union with the Dutch Church. I doubt whether it can be effected, but I think that under any circumstances good will arise to the Church."

On April 22nd, writing to the Bishop of Bombay, the Bishop says: "Ere I hear from you again, I shall, I fear, have lost what I have ever called 'my chiefest of my many blessings.' Well—God's Will be done."

Matters continued thus, and the end still did not seem very near, when on April 19th their son, Charles Gray, left the Cape to return to his parish at home. But that very night the last crisis came on. The Bishop's own account was as follows:

"Bishop's Court, April 28th, 1871.

"My dearest Charlie—It will be a shock to you to hear that your dear mother has been called away. Within a few hours of your leaving, at eleven o'clock that night, great pain came on. The night was passed in moaning. She sank to rest at seven o'clock yesterday evening. On Saturday I became very uneasy, and soon after her powers of attention failed. She continued getting worse. During all Wednesday and Thursday she was in a state of coma, taking nothing, and keeping her eyes closed. Her last words were in reply to my question, 'Darling, are you in pain?' 'Yes, dearie.' But she did not speak, I think, for the last thirty-six hours. I do not think that much before this she took in what I said, or heard my prayers. Nothing could be more tender than her tone towards me during these dreadful eight days. She thought during her whole illness, I believe, more of and for me than of herself. It is a great comfort to have been able to return some little of her tender care of me, and love for me. Bessie and I were with her throughout. I never saw greater devotion and

love than she has shown—her energies never flagged night or day. The dear children are calm, loving, attentive. Edward Glover came on Saturday, in time for her to recognise him. He is a great comfort to me. How remarkable that on the very day you left she should have become worse. You would have been glad to be present to help at this sad time. I am well. God will, I believe, support me. But none but myself know what she has been to me.

“ April 30th.—We buried your dear mother yesterday in Claremont Cemetery, under the shadow of our unfinished parish church, of which she was the architect, and in which she took so deep an interest. We removed her yet open coffin, after morning prayers, into the chapel; then we had the service from the Priests’ Prayer Book for the friends of the departed; then Holy Communion. I think that we never so realised the Communion of Saints before,—our dear one departed, and yet with us. Nothing could be more sweet or calm than her expression after so many days and nights of suffering. She seemed to be telling us of her rest, and peace, and joy. Bessie¹ and Fanny and I laid her out. It was very trying for us all, but we were enabled to do it. Her coffin was of polished teak, with a long brass cross the whole length. The Sisters sent a beautiful cross of flowers. When her mind was beginning to wander she said, ‘Have you written to Charlie?’ I said, ‘You know he has only just left.’ She replied, ‘It will be better for him not to know till he reaches home.’”

To his sister the Bishop wrote :

“ April 28, 1871.

My dearest Annie—You will look for a line to tell you how I bear the sorrow with which God has afflicted me, for my darling went to her rest yesterday evening. . . . Thank God I am calm and well, and I trust supported by God. It has even been a relief to see that dear patient sufferer no longer in agony. For some time past her pains have been increasing, but I saw nothing to make me think that she would not be

¹ Bessie Simpson, now Mrs. M’Owan, who had lived some thirty years with the Bishop and Mrs. Gray.

with us for some months to come. She herself was, I think, desirous of her release, for the poor body was sorely tried. I have many blessings left; the dear children are loving, and anxious to do all they can. God spared me family afflictions during the many anxious years when contending in the Church for principles. The loss of her at that time would have crushed me. Now public anxieties are not what they were. This sorrow, however, is a very great one, and will not easily pass away. She entered with the deepest interest, and a keen intelligence, and a sound judgment, into all the questions in which I have had to bear a part. She was identified with me and all my plans and pursuits as none other could be, and was my counsellor and helpmate. I must needs therefore feel more than many others in my circumstances would." . . .

Writing to Mrs. Mowbray on the same day, the Bishop says: "It was not her nature to talk much of her spiritual life; she had done this, however, freely to me, months ago. It was well that I knew it, for she could not in the last few days respond to anything, or even understand what I said to her. None whom I know strove more to discipline themselves, and bring the soul and the will into subjection to the Will of God."

A letter from the Bishop to Miss Mackenzie, written May 1st, gives some further touching particulars.

"Your warm heart," it says, "will feel for us when you hear that my dearest wife has been taken to her rest. She had been suffering more pain and getting weaker for some time. On the night of the 19th, the day on which Charlie left us to return to England, she became much worse. For eight days and nights she continued in a very sad state, sinking at last into coma. Her mind began to wander before we could believe her to be in any immediate danger. Her work of preparation, however, was carried on through life. For more than a year she was satisfied that she could not recover, and she was ready when the call came. You know what a noble soul was hers, and still is, and how she toiled and sacrificed herself to help on God's Work in this land. None but myself can tell what she was to me.

In all my troubles she ever counselled the strict line of duty at whatever sacrifice, and she was ready to bear her share. She would have been a martyr, if called to suffer unto death. . . . Bessie or I was with her from the hour when she was stricken, and we laid her out. I did not think that I could have done this; but she would have done more for me. Her tenderness and love throughout her sickness were most touching."

In spite of all his gentle trustful submission, the wound was a very deep one. It was no ordinary bond between those two hearts; and the survivor was as a tree, the roots of which are loosened by the fall of one from its side. The gentle pathos of all the Bishop's letters at this time is most touching. He writes:

"Ascension Eve, 1871.

"My dearest Charlie . . . We are all well, and going on with our daily avocations. The dear children are as loving and thoughtful as they could be. The going through all your dear mother's papers and accounts has been very trying, but now it is almost over. All her writings, etc., have brought touchingly before me her unwearied labour for the Church, her care and thoughtfulness.

"I am often upset when alone, but not so hysterical as at first. I try in public to be as cheerful as I can, but at times I am unable to shake off my deep depression. I never realised so forcibly what the *pœnum damni* must be. I mean that I did not think that the loss of God's Presence must cause unutterable woe. I see now, from my present suffering, in some small measure what the misery must be of never being permitted to see the Face or joy in the Presence of Him Who is Love. I trust the effect of my chastisement may be to lead me to live nearer to God, and more for Him. Of course I desire to do all I can for the dear children, but I cannot feel the same interest in life, or in things around me (at least not at present), as I did before she was taken from me. I feel now how insufficiently I prized her,—how little I deserved to have her for thirty-four years,—how much more I ought to have done during my whole married life in the way of converse about the highest and holiest subjects.

I think that I did all I could for her during her illness, and I shall never forget the inexpressible tenderness of her tones. Her voice grew in pathos whenever she spoke to me, as the end drew nigh. How terrible would it be if I could not think of her as now in Paradise! I never knew till now how closely we were bound together. I suppose very few wives have ever so identified themselves with their husbands' work, and taken so large a share in it. I am sure none ever urged more than she the very highest course of action, involving the greatest sacrifice, when the line of duty had to be decided upon. With her I felt that I could have been happy anywhere. I never wished for other society when I could have hers. But why should I pour all this out to you? Chiefly, I suppose, because I cannot do so to others.

"I am going to take the children with me on Monday for a four days' change, while I am confirming at the Paarl, Wellington, etc. I hope to send them over Bain's Kloof. Edward is as good and gentle as he can be. I am trembling lest the next mail with the Bishop of Bloemfontein and a party of eleven, and then my new Dean and Archdeacon, should be put into quarantine.¹—Ever, my dearest boy, your most affectionate father,
R. CAPETOWN."

"I try to go on with my usual work and to be cheerful," the Bishop wrote (May 17th) to his brother, "but her form is ever before me, and everything leads back to her. . . . I must soon make a Visitation, but I dread it, for there is not a nook or corner in this land,—not a farmhouse at which I shall touch, or a view at which I shall look, but what will be associated with her, and bring back the past. That which made the rough places smooth, and every difficulty and discomfort tolerable, was her cheerful happy contentment. I did not know till I lost her how wrapped up I was in her, though I used never to want any other if I had her, and was never so happy as when alone with her. Well, my dear fellow, I trust that the separation is but for a while. If I had not comfort in the

¹ There had been quarantine on account of smallpox lately.

thought of her present state, I should be very unhappy. But there is an aching void, a yearning for her presence, which I endeavour to check. I preached yesterday at Claremont. I have been to examine a Mission School to-day, and to see a good pious woman who is afflicted in the same way, for whom my dearest felt keenly, contrasting her own comforts with this poor soul's needs. She sent me to see her, and pray with her, and provide for her wants."

"Ascension Day, 1871. We are going on much as my darling would have done, if I had been taken and she left, *i.e.* doing in quietness and as cheerfully as we can the work God has given us to do. The girls, I think, go more among the poor coloured people around us, among whom there has been sickness, and take great interest in their night school from 6 to 8.30 three times a week, and rise up to their new duties in the house. They are very tender and loving, but you know how fondly the memory dwells upon the one who has been to us more than all the world besides, and how no other earthly affection compensates for the loss of that one. Well, the world henceforth will be another world to me. Only may God give me grace to live while in it to Him. . . . On Monday I take the dear children out with me for four days' confirmation—they need a little change. After that I shall have to receive the Bishop of Bloemfontein, then my new Dean and Archdeacon; and so soon as the weather will admit of it, I shall have to go to Namaqua Land, or over the rest of the Diocese, both of which journeys I dread. I am quite well, save that my nights are broken. . . . People all through this land know how my dearest laboured for the Church, and express themselves very kindly. May we both, dearest Annie, join our loved ones in God's good time in Paradise, and may I be able to turn, as you have done, God's chastisement to good account, and be cheerful under it as you are. I shall need your prayers for this."

To Miss MACKENZIE.

"Bishop's Court, May 19th, 1871.

. . . "I am, thank God, tolerably well, going on with my

work as my darling would have done hers, if I had been first taken. I know that I dearly loved her, but I never knew how entirely I was wrapped up in her until now. Her image is ever before me. I could not wish to bring her back to her sufferings, for they were very great, though most meekly borne. One of her last sayings before the final attack came on was, 'Dearest, you would not wish to keep me amid so much suffering, would you?' But I must not dwell on these things. . . . This life can never again be to me what it has been. I used to tell her that she was the chiefest of my many blessings, and that with her for a companion I could live anywhere happily, even in a Kafir hut. I believe an attempt is going to be made to complete Claremont Church as a memorial to the dearest wife, who was its architect and foundress, and now lies under its shadow."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"Bishop's Court, June 14th, 1871.

"I write a line by a stray steamer to say that we are all well. Everything is going on much as if my darling were still with us, only it is with a heavy heart that I go about my work. I had hoped this time last year that, now that my chief public troubles and contests were apparently over, we might have a little quite time together in the evening of life, with more leisure than heretofore. I now see that we should have taken up our rest here. It is in mercy and love I doubt not that she has been taken to the true Rest, and I, who most needed it, have received a call, which I pray God I may answer, and suffer to work its work within me. It has already, more than all other things that have happened to me, weaned me from this world, and made me anxious to prepare myself so as to be fit to be with her in God's good time. . . . I have since I last wrote been immersed for days together in accounts. It is not easy to take up another's system, and these accounts are most marvellously complicated, embracing as they do so many distinct funds, and £50,000 being in mortgages most irregularly paid, and being constantly changed. . . . I hope that Edward

and I together have got all clear at last. The poor Bishop of Bloemfontein is still at Saldanha Bay (in quarantine) with his party of nineteen. A second case of smallpox occurred, and they will not be released till the 22nd.

"I am expecting Archdeacon Fogg in the 'Cambrian' every hour. The Bishop of Graham's Town will, I suppose, leave in July.

To the Same.

"S. Peter's Day, 1871.

. . . "The Bishop of Bloemfontein and his party are here, Archdeacon Fogg, and the Dean with his governess and little boys. I can hardly work myself up to the necessary amount of talk. The aching void is as keenly felt as ever. Life is not what it was, and will never be so again. It is very difficult to feel an interest in anything.

"S. P. G. has reduced our grant by another £100. I have placed before the Dutch Church authorities a large scheme for union of Churches. They have had it before them a month, but have not yet sent their answer. We are, I fear, too different to be united in one Church. . . . I install the new Dean (Rev. C. W. Barnett-Clarke) publicly during Divine service on Sunday. We have a short special service after the First Lesson."

"July 18th, 1871.

"The Bishop of Graham's Town and Mrs. Cotterill are now with us on their way home to take up the work in Edinburgh. I shall miss his strong sense and ripened views, especially in the Provincial Synod, if spared to see another. . . . I am well, at times tossed to and fro, but in the main cheerful. I would give I know not what, if it were God's Will, to have my darling back again. I suppose that had she been spared to this time when my great ecclesiastical struggles seem over, and the Church is in peace, life would have been too happy, and we should have taken up our rest here, and I should have clung to the creature rather than to the Creator. I would have nothing otherwise than as God wills. All I care for now is to be fitted, when my time comes, to be with her at our dear

Lord's Feet. There is much, very much, to be wrought in me and rooted out of me, before this will be."

To the BISHOP of BOMBAY.

"August 10th, 1871.

. . . "I need not tell you of the aching void, the yearning and the longing, the depression, the impossibility of bringing the mind into the state in which it ought to be. She had identified herself with all my work. I took counsel with her, and we shared each other's thoughts. I cannot but mourn, while bowing, I trust, submissively to God's Will. Do what I will, there is ever the under-current of thought about her. You and your dear wife know what a noble-minded woman she was, how she ever took the highest view of duty, how she watched and cared for me. . . . There have been some very strong expressions of feeling towards her, both here and in England. . . . In time I hope that I may attain to cheerfulness, but the pangs of separation cut very deep. May you, my dear friends, be spared them for many a day. I have not been very well of late, chiefly, I think, because the mind has been telling upon the body."

It was certainly with a saddened, but nevertheless with a brave heart that the Bishop worked on, and so far from indulging any ideas of turning to England for rest and quiet during the few years at longest likely to be his, he accepted Africa more than ever as his earthly home, and as the place where God would have him be. This is strongly put forward in a letter to his brother, who had expressed a natural wish that the remainder of his bereaved life might be spent among those left of the once large, now very diminished family, who all loved him so deeply. The wonderful humility of the writer is most touching:

"Bishop's Court, July 18th, 1871.

"My dear Edward . . . The Bishop of Bloemfontein went up through the Karroo, and has been stopped by snow about 400 miles off, a thing which the inhabitants had not seen for twenty-four years. Ours is a very fine winter. You pro-

pose to me to abandon my work here, and go to England. I have ever thought an English country parish the happiest abode and sphere of labour for a Clergyman, and I did not leave my Mother Church or Mother land to please myself. We both felt the summons to come out here to be a call. I have never doubted that it was. The work done is, I think, generally felt to show this. I am still quite as equal to the duties of my office as when my darling was with me to help and comfort me. What plea should I have for resigning? It seems to me that my doing so would be sinful. At present I am useful here—more so, perhaps, than I have ever been. The finishing of many battles has been followed by general respect and confidence. So far as I can see, the Church is getting day by day a greater hold upon this country. At this moment we have no troubles or controversies of any kind. The greatest religious body in the country is considering on what terms it can unite with us. I know full well how suddenly all this may be changed—we are in the Church militant, not the Church triumphant. Difficulties may be in store, which one who feels himself shattered may be unequal to cope with; or health may give way; or spiritually, I may become, through Satan's assaults, unfit for my post, and feel it a duty to retire. But I think that I shall end my days here, so far as I can see; and it is my hope that my bones may be laid beside the bones of her who was and is so precious to me. I can hardly at times feel that she is gone, and I half expect to see her, and so, I trust, I shall in God's good time, but not here. I have a great deal yet to learn, and there is a great deal to be wrought in me, and there are many hindrances. My inward battles had, so far as I can see, better be fought out here, where my outer battles with the powers of darkness have been fought. Pray for me, my dear brother, but do not think about change of worldly circumstances. I never was, I think, ambitious. I certainly ought not to be so, and, I trust, am not so now. My dearest ever felt with me the wish to be only where God would have us be. With her I could have been happy anywhere, for she made the best of everything, and was ever bright and contented

and cheerful. I must try to be happy, where God has placed me, without her; and I should be so, but for the remains of sin with me. The rest of my life must be given mainly to the struggle with the evil that is in me, and the assaults of the Evil One, who has, I think, since I have been left alone, assailed me more vehemently than before. Perhaps after, by God's Grace, I am strengthened, I shall be more useful to my people. I have long felt that my Episcopate was too much taken up with external work. You may have heard me complain of being compelled for so many years to serve tables. Perhaps a little time may yet be spared me for purely spiritual work."

No, there was certainly no slackening in energy at his work, with however saddened a spirit it might often have to be done; and no diminution of the Bishop's keen interest, in all that touched the Church's welfare. He wrote to his son:

" August 1st, 1871.

. . . "I feel my state of widowhood more and more. Nothing in this world can compensate for the loss of her, for none else can ever be to me what she was. I am very much like one of our wrecked ships. Nothing can be nicer than the children and Edward. . . I like all that I see of ——. I do not feel very uneasy about the Ritualists.¹ I think the remonstrance of the 5,000 has really won for them the day. The Bishop of London tells me that he thinks Parliament would have interfered if the Judgment had been different. I do not think so. The Court of Privy Council has lost its weight. Its judgments have *throughout* been so one-sided, and based upon expediency, that it can never again command respect. How the Bishops *can* go on scolding these poor Ritualists, and bidding them obey the law, while they never think of obeying it themselves, and are quite content that the Evangelicals should set it at defiance in a hundred ways, I confess I do not understand!"

The Bishop wrote to Archdeacon Thomas:

" Ely, October 31st, 1867.

" The state of the Church generally, so far as I can see, is

¹ Alluding to the Purchas Judgment.

satisfactory. We are holding our own against dissent, but not absorbing it. There is development, I think, and life everywhere, and less bitterness, I should hope. There is, however, a deepening life within the Church, and certainly the mind of the Church is going in strongly for hearty services and a moderate ritual. I do not myself like *ultra*-ritualism, but I do not believe that these men are untrue to the Church of England; and I believe that they might be guided if they were dealt fairly with, and sympathy shown to them."

To the BISHOP of BOMBAY.

"April 22, 1871.

. . . "You will be as sick as I am of this wretched persecution of the Ritualists. If I had not been so much in collision with the powers that be, I think that I should have joined in some public protestation. I think the course is—

"I. To call upon the Bishops, before they exercise discipline, to obey fully the Church's laws themselves.

"II. To insist upon *all* being required to obey these laws, or *none*.

"III. That if obedience cannot be exacted of the gentlemen of the Church Association, to allow a latitude to their opponents.

"The one-sidedness and partiality in the administration of the affairs of the Church is to me most shocking and revolting. . . . I hope you will fight for more Bishops in India."

Just at the same time (April 19, 1871), Bishop Wilberforce writes from Sandringham :

. . . "You will know almost as much as I can tell you of home affairs. The letters of the Archbishop are most unfortunate, and do us a vast amount of harm. But I think every attack on any part of Catholic belief or practice calls forth an answer which shows the widening area of faith, and the deeper earnestness with which those who hold it at all, do hold it. I rather incline to think that the issue of the last judgment will be a general adoption of the surplice and of copes in cathedrals, and the celebrant standing where he and his people choose.

The Madagascar Bishopric question is far from over. I *hope*, in spite of —— and ——, that S. P. G. will persevere, and it is shaking C. M. S. to its foundations, and calling out a new spirit in its supporters, who are sick of being Venn-ridden." . . .

The Bishop might well say he did not "understand!" His large generous nature could never see the right or meaning of any evasion, or press any yoke upon others which he was not ready first to bear himself. As already said, he was certainly not a Ritualist in the then acceptance of the word. He had strong convictions as to what was right, and no one who knew him could for a moment question that he was a true and hearty Catholic, but he had a marvellous fund of consideration and tenderness for others. His own habit and liking, *e.g.*, was to celebrate before the altar; and when he received the Purchas Judgment, he wrote that he "was sorry for it, but should make no change."

"We are not very ritualistic here," he wrote (April 29th, 1870), "but, by giving time to people to be accustomed to changes, as, *e.g.*, celebration with face to the altar, they are quite reconciled to our proceedings." He always pleaded for patience and forbearance, and for going quietly and gently on, even in introducing what he held to be right. "You will remember," he writes to his son, soon after he went to Helmsley, "that a parish church is in a different position from most ritualistic churches, which have their special congregations, attracted by the very services which repel others. . . . Everything in these matters depends upon what people can bear. It is infinitely better to go slowly than to have a great row, which will throw everything back." . . .

And again: "I need not urge you to be gentle with the Methodists. By your account it is zeal that has led to their multiplied ministrations. Hearty services, if changes are not made too rapidly, will attract and absorb the population. I should say, Be slow in all your movements. Let there be a gradual preparation of men's minds. If not, you will throw back your work, and have disappointments, which perhaps would not otherwise have arisen."

Again: "You will, I hope, *festina lente* in your new field. I do not know what sort of a man your predecessor was, but probably he did not pave the way for your teaching. I often pity congregations which have a succession of pastors of different views. It must be very trying to them, specially as regards ritual, as to which they are more sensitive than doctrine. Give them a little breathing time, and introduce changes gradually."

To a young Clergyman who had asked the Bishop's advice as to habitually wearing his cassock, he replied: "I think that you would do wisely not to wear it while people are wholly unaccustomed to it, and confound it with Rome. We have no right in these excitable days to shock and startle people who do not know us. For a year or two, if all goes on well, you will be able to do what you like in this matter without putting a stumblingblock in a brother's way, and causing him to offend. If the church is near, I see no objection to your walking to it in your cassock, but I think I should not *at first* wear it all day in the house."

To a question as to going into society, the Bishop wrote: "I should say dine with your Squire whenever he asked you, if it did not interfere with some plain duty. It is of great importance that you should be on easy terms with him, and it is a great thing to interest him and his in your plans, and teach them in Church matters, which can be best done in an evening. I should also dine out with neighbouring Clergy, and drink tea with the tradesmen. I am persuaded that it is better not to shut yourself up in your shell, but to mix socially in a moderate way with all who are around you. It is better for your own mind to be taken off from the incessant routine of parish work,—and *you* may become narrow in solitude as well as others. S. Paul's rule should be weighed, 'All things to all men;' 'Servant of the Lord, gentle to all men,' etc. It is in the putting self and temper entirely aside that you may best hope for success."

Early in the year 1869 the Bishop's son had published a pamphlet on the subject of Confession, containing a catena of English divines, proving that the doctrine and practice of con-

fession both essentially belong to the Church of England, and have never been discarded or denied. On receiving the *Statement* (as the first edition was called: it is now printed under the title of *Confession as taught in the Church of England*) the Bishop wrote to his son:

“Beaufort, March 31st, 1869.

“Your *Statement* reached me at Prince Albert, where I was on Good Friday and Easter Day. I think that you have stated your case well, and unexceptionably and moderately. Neither the Bishop, nor any one calling himself a Churchman, can justly find fault with you, writing as you do reverently and devoutly.”

A little later in the same year, when Mr. Gray was presented to the Vicarage of Helmsley, in Yorkshire, he wrote a full expression of his opinions on the subject of the Blessed Sacrament to the gentleman who offered it to him; and as it was his wont to consult his father in every step, a copy of the letter was sent to him. Bishop Gray acknowledges this, January 30th, 1870, saying, “I quite concur not only in your views on the Holy Eucharist, so far as you have unfolded them, but in your course in putting them frankly before ——.”¹

In the beginning of the year 1869 some parishioners of

¹ “S. John Baptist, Kidderminster, December 21st, 1869.

“My dear —— . . . As regards the Holy Eucharist . . . I should maintain that in a Sacrament there are two parts: (1) a part we *can* see; (2) a part we *cannot* see. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we have: I. ‘The outward visible sign,’ or part we *can* see, which is Bread and Wine; II. The inward part (or ‘thing’ which is ‘signified’ by the bread and wine), which we *cannot* see—the Body and Blood of Christ. In accordance with this, *as* I believe the outward part, Bread and Wine, to be always really and truly there, *so* I believe the Body and Blood of Christ to be really and truly there present as the inward part ‘verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful’ (*i.e.* baptized people cf. Article xix. and Collect 21 and 25 after Trinity) ‘in the Lord's Supper.’ To take away the *Outward Part* of Bread and Wine (as the Romanist would do) declaring it transubstantiated, or changed into flesh and blood, is, I believe, unscriptural, unprimitive, and ‘overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,’ which requires two parts. To take away (as I conceive the Calvinist does) the *Inward Part* of the Body and Blood of Christ is unscriptural (since to do so you must apply the same sort of interpretation to the sixth chapter of S. John, S. Luke xxii. 19, etc. as the Socinian applies to the first chapter), and unprimitive,—overthrowing the nature of a Sacrament which requires two parts. When I say that I believe the Body and Blood of Christ to be truly present, and so ‘given, taken, and eaten

S. Thomas, Malmesbury, formally complained to the Bishop of certain practices adopted by their parish priest, the Rev. W. E. Belson—*i.e.*, “I. Vestments; II. Cross; Super altar; III. Candles; and IV. Adoration after the consecration of the Eucharistic elements;” and in a second letter they further complained of the V. Mixing of water with the wine, and what they now called “adoration of the elements; VI. Of a Hymn being sung

in the Lord’s Supper’ (Art. xxvii.), I should be most unwilling to do what our Church has not done, *viz. define* now. This only I would say, that we are not to understand it in any gross, carnal way, but ‘only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,’ spiritually, though really and truly.

“The above view makes the ‘real and essential,’ though spiritual, Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ to be dependent on and a result from the consecration of the Bread and Wine by God through His appointed agent. Whereas, what I must call the semi-Calvinistic, though popular view, makes it to depend on the faith of the individual receiver. Faith is a requisite for him who would eat and drink worthily of what is already there. Again: Since we are told that ‘*as* the benefit is great if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament, *so* is the danger great if we receive the SAME’ (Sacrament with its two parts) ‘unworthily, for then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord’s Body.’ And since we pray (in prayer of humble access) ‘Grant us . . . so to eat the Flesh of Thy Dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood’—(evidently fearing lest we should eat it with a different result), I believe that the wicked as well as the good do receive both the outward part (*signum*) and the thing signified (*res*) of the Sacrament, though not the ‘*virtus*,’ *i.e.* they do not *partake*, or eat to the strengthening and refreshing of their souls, though both parts of the Sacrament be given to them. Again: I believe that adoration paid to the Sacramental Bread and Wine would be idolatry to be abhorred by all, and any adoration of any fancied Corporal Presence of Christ’s Body and Blood would be erroneous,—yet I do believe that the real though spiritual Presence, mysteriously and wonderfully there, demands all due reverence and adoration, real though not necessarily demonstrative. As regards the Sacrifice in the Holy Communion, I believe only in the Sacrifice of Christ once for all offered upon the Cross never to be repeated; but I do also believe that just as He continually pleads the remembrance of that Sacrifice before the Father in Heaven, and as we in *word* at the end of every prayer plead the remembrance of that Sacrifice when we say, ‘Grant us this through Jesus Christ our Lord;’ so do we, as it were, in a visible prayer or act plead and present before the Father in the Holy Communion, the Blessed Sacrament as a memorial or remembrance of His Son’s Death,—the most powerful way of obtaining what we desire. In short, I believe that the Lord’s Supper was ‘ordained for a continual *ἀναμνησις*, or ‘remembrance’ before God ‘of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ,’—as well as ‘for the benefits which we receive thereby.’ . . . I remain, etc. etc.

“C. N. GRAY.”

immediately before the consecration; VII. Of the sign of the Cross used in the administration; VIII. Of bowing to the Cross; IX. Of coloured stoles, alb, and girdle, and the discontinuance of using the University hood, etc. Perhaps no better way of representing the Bishop's official mind and action can be adopted than by giving extracts from his reply to these documents:

I. The lawfulness of crosses as ornaments of churches, he reminds the petitioners, was determined in the case of *Liddell v. Westerton*, in 1857; "and since that judgment I believe the question has not been further agitated. They are very common, and are becoming general in churches. The material of which they are made in no way affects the question. They are made indifferently of marble, stone, wood, silver, brass. . . . Being a legal ornament, I have no right to object to it."

II. As to the super altar and candlesticks, the Court of Arches had declined to pronounce them illegal, and they must be regarded as lawful ornaments of the Church. "You are probably aware," the Bishop adds, "that the lighting of candles during the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, pronounced to be in accordance with law by the recent decision of the Court of Arches, has just been declared contrary to law by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."

III. With respect to vestments, the Bishop remarks: "The matter has been keenly debated in England. On the one side it has been argued that the Canon of 1603 regulates this matter for parish churches, as distinct from Cathedrals; and that if the language of the Rubrics differs, the custom of the Church, from nearly the time of the Reformation, has been against the use, and that upon the principle of '*mos pro lege*' the question ought not to be regarded as an open one. On the other side it is argued that it is expressly ordered by the 24th Canon of 1603, that the cope shall be used in the celebration of Holy Communion in Cathedral churches, that these vestments have been in use in some churches down to a late period, and that they are required by the Rubric at the beginning of the Book of Common Prayer, which orders 'that such ornaments,' etc. . . . It is the true meaning and right

construction of this Rubric, which, it is agreed on all sides, must mainly govern the question as to the proper legal ornaments of churches and the other accompaniments of Divine Service in England, inasmuch as Rubrics form part of an Act of Parliament, and Canons do not. . . . However this may be, the question of vestments is not before any Court, nor apparently is it likely to be. From the Mackonochie case, lately on appeal before the Privy Council, it was deliberately omitted, probably in consequence of the strong legal opinions given by eminent counsel as to their legality. The point is fully entered into in the very interesting appendices attached to the evidence laid before the Ritual Commission. . . . Sir R. Phillimore, Sir F. Kelly, Sir W. Bovill, Mr. W. M. James, Q.C.; Dr. Dean, Sir J. D. Coleridge, Attorney-General; Mr. C. J. Prideaux, Mr. J. Hannam, Mr. J. Cutter, all held that the vestments are a legal dress."

The Bishop then refers to the different way in which Eucharistic adoration is mentioned in the two letters, remarking upon the "importance of accuracy of expression in theological questions." If Mr. Belson "adored the elements," he was of course wrong. "I do not, however, for a moment, impute this to Mr. Belson; he indeed denies it. Apparently what he does is this. After consecrating the elements he kneels as if in adoration, but saying no prayer aloud. If this be so, there is nothing to condemn in the act. Every Priest does it, before communicating himself. If at that sacred moment Mr. Belson adores his Lord, mystically and sacramentally Present in His Own appointed Feast, he is perfectly justified in doing so, nor can I, indeed, conceive how any one so circumstanced can refrain from adoration. The judge of the Court of Arches says, with reference to Mr. Mackonochie's practice in this matter: 'It is true that the Rubric does not give precise directions that the celebrant himself should kneel at the times when it appears Mr. Mackonochie does kneel, but I am very far from saying that it is not legally competent to him, as well as to other Priests and to the congregation, to adopt this attitude of devotion!'"

The Bishop goes on to consider the question of the mixed

chalice. "Mr. Belson says: 'I do mix a little water with the wine, but not in the Church and during service, and only as allowed in the late judgment in the Court of Arches.' If this be so, I have no right to find fault with him; but if you are right, and he does it at the celebration, I say, *with great reluctance*, that if the act is a cause of offence to the communicants, Mr. Belson should cease to do it. My reluctance is founded on the following considerations:—It is believed that our Lord followed the Passover practice, and used at the institution of the Holy Sacrament the mixed cup. It certainly was so used in the very first ages of the Church. Justin Martyr, the earliest of the Fathers (as Bishop Kaye observes), of whose works we possess very considerable remains, in describing the customs of the first Christians, says: 'Bread is then brought to that brother who presides, and a cup of wine MIXED WITH WATER.' So-called General Councils have ordered expressly that it should be thus mixed. The Church in Scotland mixes it to this day. Some of our own greatest champions against Roman errors—as, *e.g.*, Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Cosin—practised it in their day. Many do so in our own. It is a very simple custom, and a beautiful one if adopted as symbolical of the Water and Blood which flowed from the Saviour's Side." . . . After quoting the judgment ruling that the water may be mixed before, but not in the celebration, the Bishop goes on to say: "I unfeignedly regret that this point has been referred to me."

As to Elevation of the Eucharist: "Upon this point the Judge of the Court of Arches says 'that the original practice in England, as in other countries, had been to stir up the devotion of the people to God by the Elevation of the Blessed Sacrament;—that the Curia of Rome introduced an unwarrantable innovation upon an ancient and laudable usage,—that the act was prohibited at the Reformation,—that it is unlawful.' I have no means of judging whether Mr. Belson practises what is technically called 'elevation,' which consists in lifting the Cup above the head. If so, his practice is not sanctioned by our Church. Some kind of elevation there must be, as Dr. Phillimore has said.

"Your next objection is to the introduction of a hymn before the Consecration. There is no authority for any hymns in our Service, except after the 3rd Collect. You are aware, however, that the greatest diversities of practice prevail without restraint of authority in this matter. In some churches there is a hymn before the service, in others at the close; in some there are Processional and Recessional hymns; in some during the celebration of the Eucharist. There is a monthly choral celebration in my own Cathedral. . . . I do not feel that I have any right to interfere with the liberty of a Clergyman in this matter. The question, I venture to think wisely, is left to the discretion of the minister."

As to the sign of the Cross in communicating people, the Bishop said he did not himself like it, though he did not condemn it, but would counsel that if it offended people it should be discontinued.

With reference to "bowing to the Cross," the Bishop remarks that the petitioners should be more careful in their statements. Mr. Belson, as might be expected, stated that he "bowed his head, but not to the Cross. I make an act of reverence to Christ truly present."

"I never heard of any one bowing to the Cross," the Bishop says, "and I did not need the assurance he has given. He admits that he bows, but he shows why, and to what. Believing in our Lord's promise that where two or three are gathered together in His Name, there is He in the midst of them,—that the altar is the most sacred place in the Church, that his Lord deigns to be present there,—he bows in reverential recognition of that Presence.

"It is not my custom to do this, chiefly because I was not brought up to do so, and I have the same distaste for changes that you have, and adopt them but slowly; but I cannot condemn the practice in others. It is one of those things to which, as it seems to me, S. Paul's rule (Rom. xiv. 3, 6) especially applies. The custom prevails largely in England at this time. It has existed, as appears from the evidence given before the Royal Commission, in some at least of our Cathedrals, from time immemorial, *e.g.*, Canterbury, Durham, and I believe

Carlisle. The Convocation of 1640 in the eighth Canon 'commends to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obedience both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, according to the most ancient custom of the Primitive Church in the purest times, and of this Church also for many years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.'

As to coloured stoles, the Bishop said, "No one, I think, questions that they are lawful. Certainly they are not forbidden, and are largely in use. The 'white alb plain' is expressly ordered by the Rubric of Edward VI., First Book, which our present Rubric refers to. . . . I seldom wear my own University hood in church, chiefly because of the heat of the climate, and therefore I can hardly urge Mr. Belson to do so; but if his not doing so gives offence, I think he might well resume it."

In the course of some conciliatory words of counsel to all concerned before closing, the Bishop, in accordance with his wonted consideration for others, says: "I sympathize largely with those who, perhaps from childhood, have been accustomed to certain forms and modes of conducting Divine worship, and feel a dislike to changes, even though those changes may be improvements. . . . That there have of late years been great improvements in our mode of conducting it in this land, as well as in England, is patent to all. That our services are not as yet all that they ought to be, most are ready to admit. There are few more vehement opponents of Ritualism than the Bishop of S. David's, who is regarded as the most learned of our Bishops. And yet he says: 'I fully admit that our order of Morning and Evening Prayer is not in its present state adapted to the purpose of an early service, which common people even of devout habits could be expected to attend:' and again, 'I readily admit that in many of our churches there is large room for improvement in the prevailing practice of our public worship:' and again, 'We can hardly fail to see clear signs of a wide-spread feeling that something is wanting in the ordinary services of the Church to make them generally

attractive or impressive.' This feeling is shared, I believe, by very many within the Church. The desire to make our worship more hearty and more real is a healthy one. It grows, and I trust will continue to grow, for it is an indication of the deepening of devotion, and of the Divine life among us. We could not go back to the mode of worship of the last century, in which the Service was not unfrequently what has been called a duet between the minister and the clerk, without infinite loss.

"These matters are as yet far from perfect with us. So rapid and general has been the improvement in England (extending even to dissenting chapels), that whereas a few years ago we, in this land, were in advance of the ordinary parish Church, I fear that at present we are behind in what is very common." After quoting Mr. Gladstone's *Chapter of Autobiography*, and his words "Our churches and worship bore in general too conclusive testimony to a frozen indifference," the Bishop goes on to say: "Whether the Church will ever give any more minute directions for the conduct of Divine Service than the Prayer Book contains, it is impossible to say. Very many think that there should be ample room for the diversities of men's tastes and views;—that in some churches there should not only be choral services, but an elaborate ceremonial; while in others, if desired, there should be services of the simplest and even baldest kind. I lean myself to this opinion, considering the state of men's feelings as a solution of existing difficulties, for congregations often urge on changes more than Clergy;—but whatever may ultimately be authorised, our present duty is to bear and forbear."

But to return to what were indeed now the Bishop's last days. In spite of all his brave exertions, his body had always been far too readily affected by whatever distressed his spirit not to suffer now, and he was obliged to own (August 4th, 1871) that he was not well. "The mind tells upon the body, and the body in turn reacts upon the mind," he wrote. "I have had a good deal of mental struggle and trial. . . . The girls have now in charge twenty-five patients in fever.¹ They take them four bottles of

¹ Black people on his own and neighbouring estates.

wine, with a great infusion of quinine, daily. Had it not been for them, and the food we have given them, the Doctor says most of them would have died. . . . Merriman will probably be unanimously elected Bishop of Graham's Town. I have issued my mandate for the election. The consecration will probably take place on S. Andrew's Day. I start, D.V. for Namaqua Land on September 4th, with Edward Glover. I do not much relish my six weeks' most uncomfortable journeying. It is a dreadful country."

Before starting the Bishop suffered from a severe attack of lumbago, and admitted that he was altogether out of order, though, with his usual cheerful patience, he says in a few hurried lines written just before starting, that he trusts to the Visitation to put that right! In the same note (concerning many matters, and written to Mr. Edward Gray) he speaks of two years as needed to complete certain matters, adding, "And I do not expect to live so long!"

Starting for this Visitation the Bishop wrote to Mrs. Williamson:

"I feel my darling's departure more and more. Just now I am making all the arrangements which she ever made for our long journeys. For twenty years, I think, I have scarce been away from home without her. My only guide over a great part of my present journey to Namaqua Land is a tracing of the country, with all information connected with it, in her dear hand. She was bent on making this journey with me. I sometimes allow myself to think of what the departed may be permitted to do and see. If she can do so, I am sure that she will not only be interested in what interested her here, but continually looking on and praying for me and my work."

On September 4th the Bishop started upon the journey alluded to. Archdeacon Glover kept a very interesting Journal of this Visitation tour in Namaqua Land—the Bishop for the first time failing to do so, probably in part from feeling ill, and still more from the many recollections which such Visitation Journals brought with them. From that first short Visitation, more than twenty years before, when he had taken his wife, affirming that she "would never want to go again," Mrs.

Gray had not failed to go with him, often bearing fatigue and privation that make one wonder her health did not break down much sooner, but resolute in her determination to go, knowing to how very great an extent she could help and spare her husband amid the toil which he so gladly endured, but not without cost. Even this very Visitation she had intended to share, and but a very short time before her illness was known to be fatal, the Bishop had written: "Sophy insists upon going with me to Namaqua Land, but I cannot allow it in her present state."

It was the same cart in which they had so often travelled, and three of the old team, with one new horse, Phoenix by name. The Moravian mission station Mamre was the first point; then Saldanha Bay, where the Bishop confirmed thirty-eight candidates in Dutch, and gave the Holy Communion to fifty-five persons. Hostzis Bay, S. Helena Bay, Hopefield, and Malmesbury came next. Great heat, and sickness among the horses, made the journey very uncomfortable, and caused delays, which, on September 14th, nearly led to a serious accident in crossing Oliphant's River. In the darkness the driver missed the drift, and "we found ourselves," Archdeacon Glover says, "with the horses' heads down the river. The Bishop and I both got out [into the water], he to make out the proper exit, and I to explore a turning place for the horses, free from holes." They got out with some difficulty. Again, after leaving Clanwilliam, there came a very troublesome time,—struggling through rivers, the Bishop, Archdeacon, and their men all in the water, dragging cart and horses through or up hills "at a rate of from six inches to six feet at a time," till the Bishop, who was not well to begin with, and suffering from the old trouble of sleepless nights sometimes spent in the cart, was so exhausted that he could hardly get on at all.

Great heat, and a nearly broken axle, detained the Bishop at Ebenezer, a Rhenish mission station; and on September 23rd they reached Bowesdorp, a village consisting of Dutch church and parsonage, four houses and five huts. The church is capable of holding about 500 people, and was well filled on the occasion of their "Nacht maal," which took place on the following day (Sunday 24th).

"It was a very picturesque sight. Seventy-one wagons had already arrived. The village lies in a hollow, with hills or low mountains all around, and in this basin the wagons and their inhabitants were encamped. Almost every one had a gipsy fire beside it, with cooking apparatus."

The Bishop and his companion had secured a not very luxurious room, but it was to them a luxury to go to bed at all, and to wash in the morning. But the Bishop was already very much exhausted; every day he seemed to suffer more, the Archdeacon said; but he did not relax in whatever work he had undertaken, though evidently performing it with increasing difficulty. September 27th they reached Ookiep, the headquarters of the Cape Copper Mining Company, where they were warmly welcomed by Mr. Wild, the superintendent, and the other officials. "It is a dreary, desolate country; true, the want of things pleasant to the eyes above ground is in some measure compensated for by the possession of the richest copper mines in the world below; but this is only the shareholders' consolation."

The next day the Bishop went off to Port Nolloth, Mr. Morris, the Company's chaplain, going with him; while Archdeacon Glover remained at Ookiep to take services on Sunday and Michaelmas Day. At Port Nolloth the Bishop became seriously ill, and on rejoining him at the house of the Company's manager, Mr. Hall (who with his wife nursed him most tenderly), his son-in-law found him "deplorably thin and weak." However, he gathered up strength to confirm at Springbok on October 13th, and he undertook to preach both there and at Ookiep on Sunday 15th, but that day a messenger was sent to the latter place to tell the Archdeacon that the Bishop was too ill to come. Indeed he had so serious an attack that it was with difficulty he could be got back from the church.

"Over-fatigue," he wrote, October 27th, 1871, "brought on a very severe illness at Port Nolloth, when Edward Glover was 100 miles off. Nothing could exceed the kindness of every one. I was nursed most tenderly. The manager of the mines sent their doctor 100 miles, and he and Edward rode through the night to get at me."

The overland journey now became impossible. "The day before I was to return by land I was able to do nothing but lie on a bed, so I gave the journey up, and came down in a wretched little coaster. We had nothing but foul winds, and were out seven days and nights. I am still very weak and reduced, but gradually gain strength now that I am at home again. It is a month since my attack. I find a great many troubles on my return; two of my Clergy dying.¹ . . .

"The Dean has been making a stir in Cape Town; he finishes an Octave of Services to-morrow, on the re-opening of the Cathedral after its alterations. I mean to say a few words at the eleven o'clock Celebration on All Saints' Day."

The Consecration of Archdeacon Merriman was soon again to call the Metropolitan forth. He wrote to the Bishop of Winchester:

"Bishop's Bourne, Graham's Town, Dec. 5th, 1871.

"On S. Andrew's Day I consecrated, with the aid of the Bishops of Maritzburg and Bloemfontein, the Bishop of Graham's Town—my old friend Merriman, who was universally elected by the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese. He is much beloved by all, and his consecration excited very deep interest.

"I sent you by last mail my correspondence with the authorities of the Dutch Church on the subject of Union. They have since spent a day with me discussing points at issue, and, as they enjoyed it, I hope they will renew their visit. It is only slowly that new ideas will spread in this country; but we are strong in our position, and discussion will do good.

"I inclose the substance of a letter written to Gladstone and to Lord Kimberley, which will explain itself. If you can help to prevent this dangerous Bill² from becoming law I am sure you will do so. I would have written to the Archbishop,

¹ The Rev. Edward Langdon and Rev. Robert Sheard.

² This was a Bill which Dr. Colenso had got through the Natal Legislative Council by a majority of one, transferring property vested in the See of Cape Town to that of Natal. It was reserved, by order of Lord Kimberley, for the consideration of Government.

but Colenso has made such use of his name and sayings in time past with reference to him in a speech before Committee of the Council, and published in the Blue Book, that I am sick at heart, and shrink from doing so. Colenso's Church Council have passed a resolution that his successor must be a Bishop who refuses to have anything to do with the Provincial Synod; and it is commonly said that if he succeeds in getting this Bill passed, he has another ready, providing for the succession to his See. If this matter is not nipped in its present stage, there may be provided by Colonial law a scheme for a schismatical succession. The Diamond Fields are growing in importance; the Bishop of Bloemfontein has already there three Clergy, one Catechist, and two Readers, and he is going to send a Clergyman for the natives. There are said to be 50,000 people there."

To the Rev. CHARLES N. GRAY.

"Port Elizabeth, December 12th, 1871.

"My dearest Charlie—Blanche and I are here on our way back to Cape Town. The consecration went off very well. The Bishop is beloved by all Dissenters as well as Churchmen. I found him very low and weak, unable to walk about the town with me. He got better during the excitement and great fatigue of our week at Graham's Town. We had late dinners, and early rising, and too little sleep, and this was more than I liked. I am sending home for publication the Bishop's ride through Independent Kaffraria to Natal and back. It is very racy. He and Waters say that his spirits were overpowering during all that time, when he was living upon mealies, and sleeping with natives in a Kafir hut. . . . The Bishop of Bloemfontein is doing, I think, very well. . . . I am afraid that I shall be little more than two months at home before I am off on a three months' journey; half of the time must be in the Karroo, and I do not like the idea."

To EDWARD GRAY, Esq.

"Port Elizabeth, December 13th, 1871.

. . . "Gold is coming into this country in great quantities in payment for diamonds. These are revolutionising the

country. I suppose that I passed 300 wagons on my way to Graham's Town, either bringing down wool or taking up to the Fields the necessaries of life. They cannot find men or horses now for the traffic, and a railroad for 400 miles has become a necessity. Then the gold fields in the Transvaal are becoming productive. God seems beckoning us on into the heart of Africa. This town is fast growing rich, and all the country begins to look up. From some parts, however, half our Church people have gone to the Fields. . . . The yield is certainly more than a million, perhaps nearer two millions per annum. Half the people have diamonds in their pockets. I think that I am stronger for my trip to the east, but I sigh for the quiet of home, where work is accumulating. I shrink from another long journey from March to June. I am weary in body as much as in spirit. I fear from all accounts that William¹ must be breaking. Well, he has had a long tranquil quiet life, and if only he be ready the change will be blessed. I think that he has felt that one loss a blow, as I do mine. We may go on with our work, and be thankful for many undeserved mercies, but the world and life can never be again what they were. Do not think, my dear fellow, that I murmur; I am surrounded with blessings. . . . Pray let all remember that I want at least eight more ladies, and that this Diocese is most anxious to have Sisterhoods."

The Bishop alludes repeatedly in the last few letters to an attempt for union with the Dutch Church. From his earliest days, even the quiet studious days at Whitworth, when he had time to read Church history, his heart always yearned for unity, and his visit to Germany with this object in 1857 has been mentioned. The present attempt rose from two resolutions passed by the English Synod in the beginning of 1870 to the effect that

"I. This Synod desires, with special reference to the circumstances of the Church in this land, to express the deep sorrow with which it views the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world, ardently longing for the fulfilment

¹ Mr. William Gray, the Bishop's eldest brother. He died July 1872.

of the prayer of our Lord, 'That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me;' and here solemnly to record its conviction that unity will be most effectually promoted by maintaining the Faith in its purity and integrity, as taught by the Holy Scriptures, held by 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, with fasting and humiliation, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity and forbearance, judging ourselves rather than others, and a love of the Lord's appearing.

"II. That this Synod, deeply deploring the manifold evils, and especially the hindrances to the powers and spread of Christ's Kingdom in this land, resulting from the divisions among Christians, would rejoice if, before its next session, the state of feeling in the various religious communities should afford an opportunity to the Bishops of the Province of discussing with the authorities of other communions the principles upon which re-union in one visible body in Christ might be effected among those who are now unhappily divided."

These resolutions the Metropolitan sent to Dr. Faure, Moderator of the Dutch Church, and a correspondence followed,¹ which, however, as might be expected, did not lead to much. It was hardly possible to look for any real approach to union with a body who reject Episcopacy; and as to what is called "exchanging pulpits,"—Priests of the Church lowering their office by preaching in dissenting places of worship, or inviting dissenters to speak to their people,—the Bishop did not consider that any advance towards real unity could ever be made by such unworthy compromises. To all such propositions he was "constrained to reply that whatever it is that keeps us apart and forbids our becoming one Communion, unfits us, in my estimation, to be at once safe and outspoken teachers of each other's people. There are few things, as it appears to me, which would do more to undermine men's belief in any posi-

¹ See *Sermons and Charges*, etc.

tive Creed, and lead them to think that the Church holds nothing as fixed and definite, than the laxity which the system you advocate might introduce as to preachers and the doctrines preached."

The Bishop's published "Reply" concludes with some prayers for unity—*e.g.* that from the Prayer-book—"O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc., the daily prayer of A. P. U. C.,¹ and the Collect for S. Simon and S. Jude's Day.

It will be remembered that in his Charge the Metropolitan alluded to the Evangelical Alliance, saying that he had always looked with interest upon its proceedings, "though based, as I think, upon an essentially wrong principle, because I have regarded its formation as the expression of a conviction that our present state is a wrong one, and ought not to be persevered in. Its work is a preparatory work. It may pave the way for future reunion and reorganisation in one body. It can never become a substitute for the unity of the Church. Organisation is essential to joint action. . . . Christians cannot do the work of Christ effectually while they are separated from each other. An 'alliance' is a junction for certain purposes and for a certain time of two or more distinct and separate parties. How far short is such a union of that which our Lord prayed for His disciples, 'that they all may be One, as thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee; that they may be made perfect in One.'" The Bishop alludes to "the steps taken by the American Church and our own Convocation towards the restoration of communion with the orthodox Greek Church; and the societies (A. P. U. C., the Eastern Church Association, and the Christian Unity Society) founded and prayers published for the restoration of unity both in England and America; the publications put forth jointly by members of different Churches on this subject; and the reviving Gallican principles in the French Church, which are, in many respects, so near our own," etc. etc.

"Are not all these things tokens for good? Do they not indicate a very widespread and deep-seated conviction that a divided state is a wrong state—that true believers in Christ should not remain for ever in a state of alienation from each other, but should search after some basis for union among

¹ Association for Promotion of the Unity of Christendom.

themselves? May these convictions spread deeper and deeper as years pass on, among ourselves and throughout Christendom! May the Comforter descend with healing in His Wings, and unite all the followers of a common Master in one household and body and Church, holding and embracing the 'one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all.' Our prayers should be directed to this end; our daily intercessions should be offered for the restoration of lost unity among ourselves and throughout Christendom. We should strive, amid our manifold divisions, to give as little offence as may be to those who are separated from us. If the restoration of unity be the condition of the conversion of the world, every sacrifice but that of truth must be made to attain it."¹

Some of those who were about the Metropolitan at the time when the Grand Duke Alexis of Russia visited the Cape remember how he sent several messages to the Duke's Chaplain inviting him to come to Bishop's Court and seeking friendly intercourse. The Chaplain, however, happened to be a monk, unable to speak anything but Russ, and not at all highly educated, or able to enter into religious discussion with the Bishop. It seems even doubtful whether the messages were ever delivered to him. A friend observed to the Metropolitan that it was a great pity the Grand Duke was not accompanied by some learned man—some Bishop who could have had free intercourse with him. His reply was that had such a man come to Cape Town, he would have offered him the use of the Cathedral, would have attended his service, and have gladly communicated at it, if permitted so to do.

The year 1872—which was to be the last of Bishop Gray's life—opened with very hot weather. He was cheered and comforted by the increasing number of communicants.

"They are largely increasing," he wrote January 1st. "There were 450 at three celebrations in the Cathedral on Christmas Day; Badnall at Rondebosch had 150. This morning at 6.30, at Claremont, I had sixty. All these are

¹ These words are part of an extract from Bishop Gray's sermon, published in the second series of *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom*, 1865.

much in excess of other years. I think there is some growth in the religious life here." At this time he was very anxious for the establishment of Brotherhoods, with a view to forwarding this growth. "If we cannot work through some sort of a Brotherhood," he said, "the Romans bid fair to get a large share of education into their hands. I would that something were done in England to draw out and regulate the zeal of young men through Brotherhoods."

The Bishop writes :

"Bishop's Court, January 4th, 1872.

"My dear Butler—What is passing in England and here is impressing me with the necessity of our attempting, if possible, the work of education through Brotherhoods. You know the state of things around you. Here the Romanists are planting schools under Marist Brothers, in all the towns and centres of population, and bid fair in this way to get a great hold upon the country. They scarce do anything for Missions. The system hitherto in operation is for committees to establish schools, or individuals to set them up. High salaries are looked for. The committees get behind hand, the school becomes vacant, and there is delay in filling it up. There is no stability in the system, and consequently no confidence. On the other side there is a Corporation which can always keep the schools going. The teachers are trained ; they work for the love of Christ, not for money. I am afraid that we have not the material here for founding a Brotherhood, nor the funds, and if such institutions existed in England, you would absorb for years to come all trained in them. But you have had much experience in training women, and once contemplated the establishment of a Sisterhood of teachers, therefore I write to ask you to consider whether anything can be done about a Brotherhood. Do you suppose that —— or —— are making this branch of work their own, or is there any Brotherhood that does? I lament greatly that so little progress has been made in establishing Brotherhoods."

There was much work to be done, and he had no longer the devoted help of his wife to take so much of detail off him.

"I came home last night from a short Visitation to Malmesbury," the Bishop writes, January 16th, "and am in the agony of making up my complicated accounts, public and private, with which I have had very little to do for many a year. . . . What a whirlpool all nations and Churches seem to be in! Everything seems so unsettled. Yet for our own Church I am more hopeful than the dear Bishop of London. She has yet an important work to do as regards all Christendom. She upholds, with all her shortcomings, Catholicity far more than Rome does. We can grapple with the difficulties of the age, which she only denounces or mourns over."

To Miss MACKENZIE.

"January 19th, 1872.

. . . "You will feel the loss of dear Bishop Patteson, whom in your last letter you compared to your dear brother. Perhaps the Church growing indifferent to its Missionary duties, and so unfair as it is becoming, if we may judge by the press, to its Missionary Bishops, needed this blow to revive its dying zeal and interest."

To the Rev. CHARLES N. GRAY.

"Bishop's Court, January 20th, 1872.

"My dearest Charlie—I have only a few minutes before breakfast to write. Worrying work is pressing upon me just now,—the Orphanage, Hospital, S. John's, with much more. I am writing to men in England about a Brotherhood. I see plainly that we must have one here, both for Mission work among the Malays, and the work of higher education, at least in the East. Perhaps the Superior might be also Chaplain or even Warden of the Home. I should be very glad to have any notes or information about Retreats. I never was present myself at more than one.¹ . . . I believe our people are very

¹ That Retreat was at Cuddesden—occupying from July 23-26, 1862—a time when, it will be remembered, the Metropolitan's cares were pressing almost at their heaviest upon him. One of the Priests (the Rev. T. Edwards of Prestbury) who shared in the Retreat, writes as follows: "On arriving at Cuddesden on the