the freedom of the glory of the children of God? commanding us to take possession of His glorious kingdom."

"I feel it necessary to say more on this subject. There was a time when I thought and wrote otherwise. Some years ago, in the year 1853, I published a small volume of 'Village Sermons,' which I dedicated to a dear and honoured friend, the Rev. F. D. Maurice, and which was violently attacked, in consequence of this dedication, by those who had previously assailed Mr. Maurice's teaching, as containing what seemed to them erroneous statements of doctrine, and particularly as expressing agreement with Mr. Maurice's views on the subject of 'eternal punishment.' I was able to show, by quotations from my little book itself, that these charges were untrue, and that I had given offence partly by stating larger views of the redeeming love of God in Christ Jesus than the reviewer of my sermons himself thought it right to hold (though views by such men as Barrow and Macknight), but chiefly by expressing my cordial sympathy with Mr. Maurice in his noble and blessed labours. In particular, I was able then to show that, in several places in those very sermons, I had distinctly spoken of eternal punishment in terms directly at variance with those which my friend would have used, and in exact conformity with the views of my reviewer. Accordingly, in the preface to the second edition of his 'Theological Essays,' Mr. Maurice spoke of me as having proved by my sermons that I believed in the endlessness of future punishments. I did believe in that dogma at the time I wrote and printed those sermons,—so far as that can be called belief which, in fact, was no more than acquiescence in common, I imagine, with very many of my brother clergy in the ordinary statements on the subject, without having ever deeply studied the question, probably with a shrinking dread of examining it and without having ever ventured formally to write or preach a sermon upon the subject, and pursue it, in thought and word, to all its consequences. There are many who, as I did myself in those days, would assert the dogma as a part of their 'creed,' and now and then, in a single sentence of a sermon, utter a few words in accordance with it, but who have never set themselves down to face the question, and deliver their own souls upon it to their flocks, fully and unreservedly. For my own part, I admit I acquiesced in it, seeing some reasons for assuming it to be true, knowing that the mass of my clerical brethren assented to it with myself, and contenting myself with making some reference to it, now and then, in my ministrations, without caring to dwell deliberately upon it and considering what might be urged against it.

"The controversy which arose about Mr. Maurice's essays and my own little volume of sermons brought the whole subject closely before me. And for the last seven years I have carefully studied it, with an earnest desire to know the truth of God upon the matter, and with an humble prayer for the guidance and teaching of His Holy Spirit in the search for it. I now declare that I can no longer maintain or give utterance to the doctrine of the endlessness of 'future punishments,'—that I dare not dogmatise at all on the matter—that I can only lay my hand upon my mouth,

and leave it in the hands of the Righteous and Merciful Judge. But I see that the word 'eternal' does not mean 'endless.' And for such reasons as the following I entertain the 'hidden hope' that there are remedial processes, when this life is ended, of which at present we know nothing, but which the Lord the Righteous Judge will administer, as He in His wisdom shall see to be good." . . .

Page 186.—"Seeing, then, that we can recognise, even for some of those who in the main are good and true, a possibility, rather a probability, and even a necessity of 'stripes,' and a presumption, almost amounting to certainty, of growth and progress, an upward, onward tendency in the state of spiritual being in the world to come, we may reasonably recognise something of the same kind as possible in the case of all, of the whole human race, who (as S. Paul says in the text before us) 'shall one day be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God.' He who has been pleased to subject them to their present state has 'subjected them in hope' of this. Stripes more or less, according to the judgment of the All-knowing and All-righteous, may be, and doubtless will be, appointed in His wisdom and mercy, for those who need them; 'indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,' must be the portion—our own hearts plainly tell us this, as well as the Bible—of every one who 'keepeth back the truth in unrighteousness,' of every one who 'worketh out evil.' We bow to this rule as holy and righteous; we glorify God for it; we rejoice, even while self-condemned ourselves, at the very idea of such a judgment as this. But, that utter, unspeakable misery should be the portion, for endless ages, for ever and ever, alike of all, who are not admitted at first into the realms of infinite joy—that there shall be no hope, in the horrible outer darkness, for the ignorant young child of some wretched outcast, who has been noted by the teachers of the ragged or the Sunday School as having contracted some evil habit, it may be, of lying, stealing, swearing, or indecency, any more than for the sensual libertine, who has spent a long life in gratifying his lusts, and has been the means of that child, and others like it, being born in guilt and shame, and nursed in profligacy, our hearts, taught as they are by God's Spirit, instinctively revolt at such a dogma as a blasphemy upon the name and character of the High and Holy One, and refuse to believe it, though a thousand texts of Scripture should be produced which may seem at first sight to assert it." . . .

Page 193.—"How is it possible that the judgment in one case should be more tolerable than in the other, if in both the same ingredient is found which is the very essence of the woe of hell, as popularly understood, namely, the horror of helpless, hopeless misery in utter, dark despair, shut out for endless ages from any possibility of ever seeing again one single ray of the light of God's mercy? And what right have we poor, wretched, ignorant creatures of the dust thus to limit the mercies of our God, to bind Him down to our narrow notions, and positive interpretations of one or two passages of Scripture, when yet the whole tenor of the Sacred Book, and other separate passages, and our human hearts also,

with their best and strongest utterances, are manifestly teaching us a different lesson? If, indeed, the 'eternal fire' be the ever-burning wrath of a Holy Being against all sin, that is, against all wilful evil, so long as that evil continues to exist, it is conceivable that they who sinned against their better light and knowledge in Sodom and Gomorrha, and they that have similarly sinned under the Gospel, may alike be subjected to the vengeance of that fire; and that, on those who had more light given them than others, and have most abused it, the judgments will be sorer and more permanent."

Page 280 (note on 262).—"There will he perish everlastingly—and will lie perishing, until that Father sees the work is done. In the cold and gloom of night he will lie, in the outer darkness, shut out from home, and the place where God's brighter glory shines, while the faithful ones are admitted within, and the children look upon their Father's face, and rejoice in His love; or to use the other figure, he will pass into that 'eternal fire,' which is ever burning to destroy all evil things in God's kingdom. And there, too, will he lie till God sees that the work is done, the wood, and hay, and stubble consumed, the filth purged away and the pure gold left, or silver, or precious stone, which even in the heart of that sinful child the Father's eye can see.

"I do not assert that this is what was meant by the writer of the creed; for it bears the stamp, as I have said, of a harsh and intemperate age, when men were too ready to consign each other to endless perdition."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule IV. the writer maintaining that he cannot any longer maintain or give utterance to the doctrine of the endlessness of future punishments, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule V.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Pages 152, 184.—"Let us rather teach them to look for the sign of God's Spirit, speaking to them in the Bible, in that of which their own hearts alone can be the judges, of which the heart of the simple child can judge as well as—often, alas! better than—that of the self-willed philosopher, critic, or sage,—in that which speaks to the witness for God within them, to which alone, under God Himself, whose voice it utters in the secrets of His inner being, each man is, ultimately responsible,

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule V.

Article vi.

Article xvii. — "Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture, and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God."

Article xx. . . . . "To ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

—to the reason and conscience. Let us bid them look for it in that within the Bible, which tells them of what is pure and good, holy and loving, faithful and true, which speaks from God's Spirit directly to their spirits, though clothed with the outward form of a law, or parable, or proverb, or narrative,—in that which they will feel and know in themselves to be righteous and excellent, however they may perversely choose the base and evil,—in that which makes the living man leap up, as it were, in the strength of sure conviction which no arguments could bring, no dogmas of church or council enforce, saying, as the Scripture words are uttered, which answer to the voice of truth within, 'These words are God's,'—not the flesh, the outward matter, the mere letter, but the inward core and meaning of them,—for they are spirit, they are life."

Pages 383, 513.—"The Bible is not itself 'God's word,' but assuredly 'God's word' will be heard in the Bible, by all who will humbly and devoutly listen for it."

Pages 13, 14.—"And that truth in the present instance, as I have said, is this, that the Pentateuch, as a whole, was not written by Moses, and that with respect to some, at least, of the chief portions of the story, it cannot be regarded as historically true. It does not on that account cease to 'contain the true word of God,' to enjoin things necessary for salvation, to be profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness. It still remains an integral portion of that Book, which, whatever intermixture it may show of human elements,—of error, infirmity, passion, and igno-

Article xxii. . . . . "Grounded upon no warrants of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

Article xxiv.—"It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God."

Article xxxiv.—"So that nothing be ordained against God's Word."

Preface to the Book of Common Prayer; Concerning the Service of the Church.—"For they so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year; intending thereby, that the clergy, and especially such as were ministers in the congregation, should (by often reading and meditation in God's Word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth; and, further, that the people (by daily hearing of Holy Scripture read in the church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of His true religion.

"But these many years passed, this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories and legends. . . It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and nothing is ordained to be read, but the very pure word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same."

Exhortation of the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer.—"When we assemble and meet together to render thanks for the

rance, has yet, through God's providence, and the special working of His Spirit on the minds of its writers, been the means of revealing to us His true name, the name of the only living and true God, and has long been, and, as far as we know, will never cease to be, the mightiest instrument in the hand of the Divine Teacher for awakening in our minds just conceptions of His character, and of His gracious and merciful dealings with the children of men. Only we must not attempt to put into the Bible what we think ought to be there: we must not indulge that 'forward-delusive faculty,' as Bishop Butler styles the 'imagination,' and lay it down for certain beforehand that God could only reveal himself to us by means of an *infallible* book. We must be content to take the Bible as it is, and draw from it those lessons which it really contains.

Preface to Part I., page xii.—"For myself, if I cannot find the means of doing away with my present difficulties, I see not how I can retain my episcopal office, in the discharge of which I must require from others a solemn declaration that they 'unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which, with the evidence now before me, it is impossible wholly to believe in."

great benefits that we have received at His hands, to set forth His most worthy praise, to hear His most holy Word."

The Nicene Creed.—"And I believe in the Holy Ghost. . . . Who spake by the prophets."

The Ordering of Deacons.—"The Bishop: Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?

"Answer: I do believe them."

The Ordering of Priests.—"Then the Bishop shall deliver to every one of them kneeling, the Bible into his hand, saying, 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God.'"

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule V., the writer maintaining that the Holy Scriptures contain *the word of God, but are not the word of God, impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.*

Schedule VI.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Page 152, part of Section 183.—"In view of this change, which I believe is near at hand, and in order to avert the shock which our children's faith must otherwise experience, when they find, as they certainly will before long, that the Bible can no longer be regarded as infallibly true in matters of common history,—as we value their reverence and love for the sacred book, let us teach

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule VI.

The Nicene Creed—"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, ... who spake by the prophets."

Article vi.

Article vii.

Article xvii.—"Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly

them at once to know that they are not to look for the inspiration of the Holy One, which breathes through its pages, in respect of any such matters as these, which the writers wrote as men, with the same liability to error from any cause as other men, and where they must be judged as men, as all other writers would be, by the just laws of criticism."

Pages 186, 224.—"We must next endeavour to arrive at some clearer notion, from an examination of the books of the Pentateuch themselves, as to the time when, the persons by whom, and the circumstances under which, they were most probably written. And, in pursuing our investigation we need not be restrained by any fear of trespassing upon divine and holy ground. The writers of these books, whatever pious intentions they may have had in composing them, cannot now be regarded as having been under such constant *infallible* supernatural guidance as the ordinary doctrine of Scripture inspiration supposes. We are at liberty, therefore, to draw such inferences from the matter which lies before us, and to make such conjectures, as we should be readily allowed to do in a critical examination of any other ancient writings.

Page 382, part of Section 511.—"In this way, I repeat, the Bible becomes to us a human book, in which the thoughts of other hearts are opened to us, of men who lived in the ages long ago, and in circumstances so different from ours."

Page 382, part of Section 512.—"We must not blindly shut our eyes to the real history of the composition of this book, to the legendary character of its earlier portions, to the manifest contradictions and impossibilities which rise up at once in every part of the story of the Exodus, if we persist in maintaining that it is a simple record of historical facts. We must regard it, then, as the work of men, of fellow-men like ourselves, fighting the same good fight on the side of God and His Truth, against all manner of falsehood and evil, though fighting in their own primitive way, and without the light of that Christian teaching which shines upon our warfare of to-day, and makes many things plain and clear to our eyes which to them were still dark and uncertain." 513.—"But then, on the other hand, we must study the Bible with the *heart* as well as with the mind. The Bible is not itself 'God's word,' but assuredly 'God's word' will be heard in the Bible by all

declared unto us in the Word of God."

Article xx. . . . "To ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

Article xxii. . . . "Grounded upon no warrants of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

The Ordering of Priests.—"Then the Bishop shall deliver to every one of them kneeling, the Bible into his hand, saying, 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God.'"

The Consecration of Bishops.—"The Archbishops: Are you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word; and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?

"Answer: I am ready, the Lord being my helper."

who will humbly and devoutly listen for it. Undoubtedly, it is a fact which can never be lost sight of by thoughtful men, that the Jewish nation has been singled out, by the express will of God, from all other nations for this great end, to be the instrument by which His more clear and full revelations of Himself should be in the earliest days conveyed to mankind, and thus be the special messenger of His grace and goodness to all the ends of the earth. As the Greeks have been endowed by the 'Father of Light' with those special gifts in art and science and literature which have made the works of their great masters in all ages the models for the imitation of mankind,—as the Roman has been distinguished in matters of law and government, and other nations have had their own peculiar endowments for the common welfare of the race; so, too, has the Hebrew mind had its own special gift from God."

Page 380, Section 508.—"But some one, perhaps, may now say, 'Do you then take from us God's word—the Bible?'—I must reply again, 'Whatever is done, it is not I, but the truth itself which does it.' If the arguments which I have advanced are not really founded upon truth, let them be set aside and thrown to the winds; but if they are, we dare not, as servants of God, do this; we are bound to hear and to obey the truth. It may be then—rather it is, as I believe, undoubtedly—the fact, that God Himself, by the power of the truth, will take from us in this age the Bible as an idol which we have set up against His will, to bow down to it, and worship it. But, while He takes it away thus with the one hand, does He not also restore it to us with the other,—not to be put into the place of God and served with idolatrous worship, but to be reverenced as a book—the best of books—the work of living men like ourselves,—of men, I mean, in whose hearts the same human thoughts were stirring, the same hopes and fears were dwelling, the same gracious Spirit was operating, three thousand years ago, as now?"

Page 9, part of Section 9.—"I then clung to the notion that the main substance of the narrative was historically true; and I relieved this difficulty and my own for the present by telling him that I supposed that such words as these were written down by Moses and believed by him to have been divinely given to him, because the thought of them arose in his heart, as he conceived, by the inspiration of God, and that hence to all such laws he prefixed the formula, 'Jehovah said unto Moses,' without it being on that account necessary for us to suppose that they were actually spoken by the Almighty."

Page 351, Section 466.—"It is conceivable that the recollections of that terrible march may have left indelible traces on the minds of the people, and may have been exaggerated, as is the case with legends generally, while circulated in their talk, and passed on by word of mouth from sire to son in the intervening age. In this way natural facts may have been magnified into prodigies, and a few thousands multiplied into two millions of people. It is quite possible that the passage of the Red Sea, the manna, the quails, and other miracles, may thus have had a real historical foundation, as will be shown more fully in our critical review of the differ-

ent books of the Pentateuch. And Samuel may have desired to collect these legends and make them the basis of a narrative, by which, he being dead, might yet speak to them with a prophet's voice, and while rejected by them himself as a ruler, might yet be able patriotically to help forward their civil and religious welfare under kingly government, and more especially under the rule of his favourite, David, whose deep religious feeling accorded with his own sentiments so much more fully than the impetuous, arbitrary character of Saul. His annual journeys of assize, when 'he went from year to year on circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places' (1 Sam. vii. 16), would have given him good opportunities for gathering such stories, as well as for knowing thoroughly the different parts and places of the country to which such legends were attached. He may have spent a great deal of his life, especially the latter part of it, since Saul came to the throne and he was himself relieved from the cares of government, in the elaboration of such a work as this, filling up from his own mind, we may conceive, the blanks left in such legendary accounts, and certainly imparting to them their high religious tone and spiritual character."

Page 368, Section 485.—"The preceding investigations have led us to the conclusion that the Pentateuch most probably *originated* in a noble effort of one illustrious man, in an early age of the Hebrew history, to train his people in the fear and faith of the Living God. For this purpose he appears to have adopted the form of a history, based upon the floating legends and traditions of the time, filling up the narrative, we may believe,—perhaps to a large extent,—out of his own imagination, where those traditions failed him. In a yet later day, though still, probably, in the same age, and within the same circle of writers, the work thus begun, which was, perhaps, left in a very unfinished state, was taken up, as we suppose, and carried on in a similar spirit by other prophetical or priestly writers. To Samuel, however, we ascribe the Elohistic story, which forms the groundwork of the whole, though comprising, as we shall show hereafter, but a small portion of the present Pentateuch and Book of Joshua,—in fact, little besides about half of the book of Genesis, and a small part of Exodus." Section 486.—"But in order to realise to ourselves, in some measure, the nature of such a work as that which we here ascribe to Samuel, we may imagine such a man as Asser, in the time of King Alfred, sitting down to write an accurate account of events which had happened four centuries before, when different tribes of Saxons, under Hengist and Horsa, and other famous leaders—the old Saxons, Angles, Jutes, etc., all kindred tribes—came over the sea at different times, in larger or smaller bodies, and took possession of the land of Britain. Yet Samuel's sources of information for the composition of such a history must have been far less complete than those which the Anglo-Saxon author would have had before him, when writing was so common, and, midway between the times of Hengist and Alfred, Venerable Bede had composed his history. The Saxon chronicler, however, has no difficulty in filling up a genealogy, and traces up that of Alfred, through Odin and his progenitors, to Bedwig, who was the son of Sceaf, who

was the son of Noah ; he was born in Noah's Ark!—*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Bohn's edition, page 350."

Page 374, Section 498.—"It is true that the Elohist has set the example of introducing in his narrative the Divine Being Himself, as conversing with their forefathers, and imparting laws to Moses,—though not, indeed, the minute directions of the ceremonial laws in Leviticus and Numbers, for these, we shall find, are all due to later writers. But, in this respect, he has only acted in conformity with the spirit of his age, and of his people, which recognised, in their common forms of language, a direct Divine interference with the affairs of men. The case, indeed, would have been different, if the writer had stated that these Divine communications had been made to himself, that God had spoken to him in his own person, instead of to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and had revealed laws to him, instead of to Moses. It would have been different, also, if he had claimed for all he wrote Divine infallibility,—if he had professed to have received these early records of the race by special inspiration, so that every part of the story which he recorded must be received with unquestioning faith as certainly true." Section 499.—"But there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the first writer of the story in the Pentateuch ever professed to be recording infallible truth, or even actual historical truth. He wrote certainly a narrative. But what indications are there that he published it at large, even to the people of his time, as a record of matter-of-fact, veracious history? Why may not Samuel, like any other head of an institution, have composed this narrative for the instruction and improvement of his pupils, from which it would gradually find its way, no doubt, more or less freely, among the people at large, without ever pretending that it was any other than an historical experiment, an attempt to give them some account of the early annals of their tribes? In later days, it is true, this ancient work of Samuel's came to be regarded as infallibly Divine. But was it so regarded in the writer's days, or in the ages immediately following?"

Page 262, part of Section 339.—"Is it not possible, then, that the name Jehovah may have been first employed by Samuel, in order to mark more distinctly the difference between the Elohim of the Hebrews and the Elohim of the nations round them, and make it more difficult for them to fall away to the practice of idolatry?" Section 340.—"Certainly, it would be much more easy and natural to suppose, if that were not contradicted by the actual evidence in the case before us, that Samuel, or whoever else composed the Elohistic document, found the name already in use among his people, and with some legendary traditions attached to it, as to the way in which it was first made known to them by Moses during their march through the wilderness. If it were right to wish any such fact of history to be other than it really is, one would rather desire such a solution of the present difficulty, and gladly embrace it. But a firm and honest adherence to the plain results of critical inquiry, as set forth in the following chapters, will not allow of our making this supposition. They seem to compel us to the conclusion that the name was quite new to the Hebrew people in the days

of Samuel; and, if so, we can scarcely avoid the inference that he himself must have first introduced it."

Page 339, part of Section 446.—"My own conviction, however, from the accumulated evidence of various kinds before us, is that Samuel was the first to form and introduce the name, perhaps in imitation of some Egyptian name of the Deity which may have reached his ears."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule VI. the Holy Scriptures are spoken of and treated as a merely human book, not inspired by God the Holy Spirit, or inspired only in such a manner as other books may be inspired, and that so to speak and treat of the Holy Scriptures is to impugn and contradict the Catholic faith as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule VII.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

A.

Page xvii., Preface to Part I.—"Being naturally unwilling, in my present position as a Bishop of the Church, to commit myself even to a friend on so grave a subject, if it could possibly be avoided, I determined to detain my letter when written, for a time, to see what effect further study and consideration would have upon my views. At the end of that time,—in a great measure by my being made more fully aware of the utter helplessness of Kurtz and Hengstenberg, in their endeavours to meet the difficulties which are raised by a closer study of the Pentateuch,—I became so convinced of the unhistorical[1] character of very considerable portions of the Mosaic narrative, that I decided not to forward my letter at all. I did not now need counsel or assistance to relieve my

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule VII.

Article vi.
Article vii.
Article xx.

The Ordering of Deacons.—"The Bishop—Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?

"Answer.—I do believe them."

The Ministration of Public Baptism.—(First Prayer).—"Almighty and Everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, thy people, through the Red Sea, figuring thereby thy holy baptism."

Prayer for Fair Weather.—"O Almighty Lord God, who for the sin of man didst once drown all the world, except eight persons, and afterwards of Thy great mercy didst promise never to destroy it so again."

Prayer in the time of any

[1] Page xviii., note to Preface, Part I.—"I use the expression 'unhistorical,' or, 'not historically true throughout,' rather than 'fictitious,' since the word 'fiction' is frequently understood to imply a conscious dishonesty on the part of the writer, an intention to deceive; yet in writing the story of the Exodus from the ancient legends of his people, the Scripture writer may have had no more consciousness of doing wrong or of practising historical deception than Homer had, or any of the early Roman annalists."

own personal doubts; in fact, I had no longer any doubts; my former misgivings had been changed to certainties. The matter was become much more serious. I saw that it concerned the whole Church,—not myself, and a few more only, whose minds might have been disturbed by making too much of minor difficulties and contradictions, the force of which might be less felt by others. It was clear to me that difficulties such as those that are set forth in the first part of this book would be felt and realised in their full force by most intelligent Englishmen, whether of the clergy or laity, who should once have had them clearly brought before their eyes, and have allowed their minds to rest upon them. I considered, therefore, that I had not a right to ask of my friend privately beforehand a reply to my objections, with respect to which, as a Divinity Professor, he might, perhaps, ere long be required to express his opinion in his public capacity.

"This conviction which I have arrived at, of the certainty of the ground which the main argument of my book rests (viz., the proof that the account of the Exodus, whatever value it may have, is not historically true), must be my excuse to the reader for the manner in which I have conducted the inquiry."

Page xx. Preface to Part I.—"If my conclusions, indeed, were only speculations, if they were only matters of higher or lower probability, I feel that I should have no right to express them at all in this way, and thus, it may be, disturb painfully the faith of many. But the main result of my examination of the Pentateuch,—namely, that the narrative, whatever may be its value and meaning, cannot be regarded as historically true,—is not—unless I greatly deceive myself—a doubtful matter of speculation at all; it is a simple question of facts."

Page 8, part of Section 7.—"The result of my inquiry is this, that I have arrived at the conviction—as painful to myself at first, as it may be to my reader, though painful now no longer, under the clear shining of the light of truth—that the Pentateuch, as a whole, cannot possibly have

Common Plague or Sickness.—"O Almighty God, who in thy wrath didst send a plague upon thine own people in the wilderness, for their obstinate rebellion against Moses and Aaron."

The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.—"Then shall the Priest, turning to the people, rehearse all the ten commandments."

"Minister: God spake these words, and said I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have none other Gods but me."

Catechism.—"Question: Which be they?

"Answer: The same which God spoke in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, saying, I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.—"Exhortation for giving warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion.

"Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of His word . . . . repent you of your sins, or else come not to that holy table."

been written by Moses, or by any one acquainted personally with the facts which it professes to describe, and, further, that the (so-called) Mosaic narrative, by whomsoever written, and though imparting to us, as I fully believe it does, revelations of the Divine will and character, cannot be regarded as historically true."

Page 10, part of Section 9.—"This was, however, a very great strain upon the cord which bound me to the ordinary belief in the historical veracity of the Pentateuch; and since then that cord has snapped in twain altogether." Section 10.—"But I wish to repeat here most distinctly that my reason for no longer receiving the Pentateuch as historically true, is not that I find insuperable difficulties with regard to the miracles or supernatural revelations of Almighty God recorded in it, but solely that I cannot, as a true man, consent any longer to shut my eyes to the absolute, palpable self-contradictions of the narrative."

Page 11, part of Section 11.—"For the conviction of the unhistorical character of the (so-called) Mosaic narrative seems to be forced upon us by the consideration of the many absolute impossibilities involved in it, when treated as relating to simple matters of fact."

Page 348, Section 462.—"Thus then, even if it were conceivable that Moses should have written a story about matters in which he was personally concerned, involving such contradictions, exaggerations, and impossibilities, as we have already had before us, yet the fact above noticed would alone be decisive against such a supposition. The great body of the Pentateuch, and all the other historical books which follow it, could not have been compiled until the name Jehovah was in common popular use, and that was not until after, at all events, the middle of David's reign. Whereas the Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch, which appear to have been composed when the name Jehovah was not in common use, and with the very purpose of commending it to popular acceptation, must have been written during, or shortly before, the earliest part of David's life, when that word was only occasionally employed by him. Hence we may, with very good reason, abide by our supposition that they were written very probably by the hand, or, at least, under the direction, and certainly in the time of Samuel."

Page 371, part of Section 491.—"And to such as these I reply, It is not I who require you to abandon the ordinary notion of the Mosaic authorship and antiquity of the Pentateuch. It is the truth itself which does so."

Page xviii. Preface to Part II.—"Now let us consider what this leads to. Let us suppose a clergyman to begin to 'inquire,' having a difficulty about the Deluge put before him by some intelligent layman of his flock. If he does this, he will assuredly soon learn that the results of geological science absolutely forbid the possibility of our believing in an universal deluge, such as the Bible manifestly speaks of. He will find, also, that mathematical and physical science, as well as the plain texts of Scripture, equally forbid our believing in a partial deluge, such as some have supposed, since that involves an universal flood. Rather, without any appeal to

science at all, if only he allow himself to think upon the subject, and to realise to his own mind the necessary conditions of the supposed event, he will need only a common practical judgment to convince him that the story which is told in the book of Genesis is utterly incredible."

Page xx. Preface to Part II.—"On all the above grounds, then, and for many other similar reasons, which the least acquaintance with scientific facts, or common sense itself, will soon suggest to him, if he once begins to 'inquire,' it is extremely probable that any such clergyman must needs come very soon to doubt, and before long to disbelieve, the truth of the Scripture account of the Deluge."

Page 169, part of Section 201.—"We shall see the utter impossibility of receiving any longer this story of the Exodus as literally and historically true, whatever real facts may lie at the basis of the narrative. The one only cause, indeed, for astonishment is this—not that a Bishop of the Church of England should now be stating that impossibility—but that it should be stated now, by a Bishop of the Church, as far as I am aware, for the first time; that such a belief should have been so long acquiesced in by multitudes, both of the clergy and the laity, with an unquestioning, unreasoning faith; that up to this very hour, in this enlightened age of free thought, in this highly civilised land, so many persons of liberal education actually still receive this story in all its details—at least, in all its main details—as historical matter of fact, and insist on the paramount duty of believing in the account of the Exodus, among the 'things necessary to salvation,' contained in the Bible, as essential to an orthodox faith in the True and Living God."

Page 262, part of Section 339.—"In fact, from what we have already seen of the unhistorical character, generally, of the account of the Exodus, we have no longer any reason for supposing it to be necessary to believe that the name Jehovah really originated in the way described in E. vi."

B.

Page 349, part of Section 463.—Ans.: "According to our view, Joshua was only a mythical or, perhaps, legendary personage, whose second name, compounded with Jehovah, certainly originated in an age earlier than that of Samuel. At all events, there is no evidence that this new name was popularised; that it ever did obtain universal acceptance; that Joshua ever was a well-known popular hero."

C.

Page 332, part of Section 455.—"The stories in the book of Judges are also, like the story of the Exodus, most probably founded upon some real traditions; and, though in some places they are evidently exaggerated, and in others they have assumed a legendary form, and the chronology throughout is the despair of the 'reconciling' school of theologians; yet the heroes, whose exploits are there described, seem to have been real characters, and their names, in most cases, may be supposed to be genuine."

Page 343, Section 452.—"We conclude, then, that the 'Song of

Deborah' was written after Psalm lxviii., that is, after the middle part of David's life, perhaps towards the close of it, two or three centuries after the time of Barak and Deborah, by a writer who, except in the free use of the word Jehovah, has produced an admirable imitation of an ancient song, a 'Lay of Ancient Israel,' and thrown himself thoroughly into the spirit of the age which he describes."

D.

Page 196, Section 236.—"For our present purpose, however, it is sufficient to observe, as above noted (235), that the author of the Book of Chronicles must have been, to all appearance, a Priest or Levite, who wrote about B.C. 400, nearly two hundred years after the Captivity, B.C. 588, and six hundred and fifty years after David came to the throne, B.C. 1055.

"This must be borne in mind when we come to consider the peculiarities of this book, and the points in which the narrative differs from, and often contradicts, the facts recorded in the Book of Samuel and Kings. We have already had occasion to point out some of its inaccuracies, and we shall see, as we proceed, further reason for believing that the chronicler's statements, when not supported by other evidence, are not at all to be relied on."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule VII. the authenticity, genuineness, and truth of certain books of Holy Scripture in whole or in part are denied; and that, by this denial, the authority and canonicity of these books in whole or in part are called in question, and denied in contravention of the Catholic faith, as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule VIII.

Extract from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Page xxxi. Preface to Part I. (iii.)—"Lastly, it is perfectly consistent with the most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's Divinity, to hold, as many do, that, when He vouchsafed to become a 'Son of Man' He took our nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited. We are expressly told, in Luke ii. 52, that 'Jesus increased in wisdom, as well as in stature.' It is not supposed that, in His human nature, He was

Articles and Formularies contravened in the Extracts contained in Schedule VIII.

Article ii.

Nicene Creed.—"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God."

Creed of Athanasius.—"Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that He also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man, of the substance

acquainted, more than any educated Jew of the age, with the mysteries of all modern science; nor, with S. Luke's expressions before us, can it be seriously maintained that, as an infant or young child He possessed a knowledge, surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch. At what period, then, of His life upon earth is it to be supposed that He had granted to Him, as the Son of Man, supernaturally, full and accurate information on these points, so that He should be expected to speak about the Pentateuch in other terms than any other devout Jew of that day would have employed? Why should it be thought that He would speak with certain Divine knowledge on this matter, more than upon other matters of ordinary science of history?"

of His mother, born in the world; perfect God, and perfect Man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood; who, although He be God and Man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and Man is one Christ."

The charge preferred is that, in the extracts contained in Schedule VIII. the writer maintaining that Our Blessed Lord was ignorant and in error upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch, denies the doctrine that Our Blessed Lord is God and Man in one person, and by this denial impugns and contradicts the Catholic faith, as expressed in the Articles, etc., above set forth and referred to.

Schedule IX.

Extracts from "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined."

Page 149, Section 178—"And it may be that the time is near at hand, in the ordering of God's Providence, when the way shall be opened for a wide extension of missionary work among the heathen; when that work, which now languishes, which cannot make progress among them, either among the ignorant Zulu or the learned Hindoo, shall no longer be impeded by the necessity of our laying down, at the very outset, stories like these, for their reception, which they can often match out of their own traditions, and requiring them, upon pain of eternal misery, to believe in them all 'unfeignedly;' and when a missionary Bishop of the Church of England shall not be prevented, as I myself have been, from admitting to the Diaconate a thoroughly-competent, well-trained, able, and pious native, who had himself helped to translate the whole of the New Testament and several books of the Old, because he must be ordained by the formularies of the Church of England, and those require that he should not only subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledge the Book of Common

Prayer—parts of which, the nice distinctions of the Athanasian Creed, for instance, cannot possibly be translated into his language—but solemnly declare, in the presence of God and the congregation, that he unfeignedly believes in canonical Scriptures, some part of which, as the genealogies in Chronicles, and the Books of Esther and Daniel, as well as large portions of the prophecies, he had never read."

Page xx. Preface to Part II.—"On all the above grounds, then, and for many other similar reasons, which the least acquaintance with scientific facts, or common sense itself, will soon suggest to him, if he once begins to 'inquire,' it is extremely probable that any such clergyman must needs come very soon to doubt, and before long to disbelieve, the truth of the Scripture account of the Deluge. Rather let me ask, Does any intelligent clergyman at this day—any one who has allowed himself to 'think' upon the subject as he would think about any other recorded fact of ancient history—really believe in that story? Do the Bishops and Doctors of the English Church believe in it? If they do not, then do not these divines, one and all, 'disbelieve the Church's doctrine' on this particular point; whilst yet, in common with all their fellow-clergy, they use habitually that solemn form of address to Almighty God in the Baptismal Service, which expressly assumes the reality and historical truthfulness of the story of the Noachian Deluge—'Almighty and Everlasting God, who, of Thy great mercy, didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water'? It is of no avail to say, 'There was a deluge of some kind or other, and this is only a legendary reminiscence of it.' The Church Prayer Book does not mean this. When those formularies were laid down, and the clergymen were bound by a solemn subscription to declare their 'unfeigned assent and consent to all things written in the Book of Common Prayer,' it was assuredly meant to bind them to express an unfeigned belief in the story of the Deluge, as it is told in these chapters of Genesis, and not to some imaginary flood of any kind, which any one may choose at his pleasure to substitute for it; otherwise, it would be very easy to explain away in like manner every single statement of the Scriptures, Old and New, which we cannot believe. But the fact is that, by the present law of subscription, each clergyman is bound by law to believe in the historical truth of Noah's flood, as recorded in the Bible, which the Church believed in some centuries ago; and he will be so bound, till the Legislature of the realm shall relax the painful obligation, and relieve him from the duty, to which he now stands pledged, of using a form of prayer which involves such a statement as this. Are, then, all these—prelates as well as ordinary clergy—to resign at once their sacred offices because they disbelieve the Church's doctrine on this point?

"But what are they to do under these circumstances—those, I made, who have their eyes open to the real facts of the case, and who cannot bear to utter what they know to be untrue in the face of God and the congregation? Many, probably, will get rid of the difficulty, with satisfaction to their own minds in some way, by falling back on the notion above referred to, that the account in Genesis is a legendary narrative, however incorrect

and unhistorical, of some real matter of fact in ancient days. Others—though I imagine not many—will justify themselves in still using such a form of prayer, though they know it to be unreal and unmeaning, by considering that they are acting in a merely official capacity as ministers of the National Church and administrators of the laws which the main body of the Church has approved and has not yet rescinded.

"But what shall be said to those who cannot conscientiously adopt either of the above methods of relieving themselves from the burden of the present difficulty, and yet feel it to be impossible to continue any longer to use such words in a solemn address to the Almighty? I see no remedy for these but to omit such words, to disobey the law of the Church on this point, and take the consequences of the act, should any over-zealous brother clerk or layman drag them before a court, and enforce a penalty in the face of an indignant nation. It is true that a soldier is bound, as a general rule, to obey his commanding officer, and a servant his master; but there are times when a faithful servant is bound, as he loves his master and cherishes his best interests, to disobey his orders. A master may, in ignorance of the real circumstances of the case, or, perhaps, from want of forethought, or from the mere infirmity of age, issue an unwise or injurious command—one that, if carried out, would in the end be ruinous, and even fatal, to his own safety. He may have issued it long ago, under a totally different state of things, for which he had then most wisely provided. But now, under changed circumstances, such an order may be most ill-judged, and the attempt to enforce it irrational and suicidal. In such a case the most true and trusty servant would deem it right to disobey—would be bound to disobey—though the consequences of the act might bring ruin on himself, should his master, in his blindness or obstinacy, not appreciate his motives. On the other hand, it may be that the master in such a case, however angry and even violent at first, when he sees only the outward act of disobedience, and does not yet recognise the spirit of true faithfulness which prompted it, and the real danger from which he had been saved by it, will at length awake from his delusion, and gratefully acknowledge the righteousness and truth of the course of conduct which he before condemned. Just such, I apprehend, is the state of many of us at present with reference to our relations as clergy to the National Church. At the time when we were admitted into her ministry, we heartily believed what we then professed to believe, and we gave our assent and consent to every part of her Liturgy. But we did not bind ourselves to believe thus always to the end of our lives. God forbid that it should be supposed by any that the Church of England had committed so great a sin, as to bind in this way, for all future time, the very consciences of her clergy. But we engaged in her service, it is true, upon certain conditions, in virtue of which we were subject to her laws, and amenable to her courts in case of disobedience. If, therefore, in obedience to a higher law than that of the National Church,—if in obedience to the law of truth, which is the law of God,—if, in dearest love to our spiritual mother, and truest sense of duty towards her, we now feel it necessary to

disobey, deliberately, any one of her directions, we must be prepared of course, for the consequences of such an act, which, in her present state of ignorance as to the real facts of the case, and the perilous dangers which threaten her, she may choose to inflict upon us. In the end, we know we shall be justified for the very acts which may now be condemned.

"But will they be condemned by the great body of intelligent laity? Is not this the way by which, in England, all laws become disused and practically abrogated, long before they are formally and legally annulled? At this moment, how many are there of the clergy who never read the Athanasian Creed? And do their Bishops compel them to do so? Should, however, a prosecution be set on foot in such a case, and a clergyman be suspended or expelled from the Church of England, because he could not bear to approach the holy presence of God by addressing Him as the Being, who of His great mercy did take Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water, then may we sooner attain the freedom which is needed to make the Church of England what it professes to be, the National Church, and to realise the principle which, however lost sight of and practically ignored in these days, is yet involved in the very fact that her Bishops are seated in Parliament, not surely as the heads of a mere sect, but as the representatives of the whole community, in its religious capacity, and therefore, in these days, of every form of earnest religious thought within the realm."

Page xxviii. Preface to Part II.—"Let the laity answer the above questions for themselves, and then ask themselves the reason of this. It is not because the clergy, bound by their ordination vows and the fetters of subscription, either dare not think at all on such subjects, or, if they do, dare not express freely their thoughts from the pulpit, or by means of the press, without incurring the awful charge of 'heresy,' and the danger of being dragged into the Ecclesiastical Court by some clerical brother who has himself no turn—perhaps no faculty—for thinking, or who has else abandoned his rights and duties as a reasoning man, to become the mere exponent of a Church system or a creed, but who will, at least, prevent others from exercising their powers of thought in the inquiry after truth, and so disturbing the quiet repose of the Church. How, in fact, can it be expected that a clergyman should venture to 'think' on these subjects when by so doing he is almost certain to come to doubt and disbelieve some portion, at least, as we have seen above, of the Church's doctrines; and then he may feel bound to follow his own sense of duty, if it accords with the sentiments expressed by the Bishop of London, and abandon voluntarily the ministry of the Church, deprived of all share in its duties and emoluments, yet burdened still with the necessity, according to the present state of the law, of dragging about with him, for his whole life long, his clerical title and its legal disqualifications for engaging in other duties of active life, for which his temper, abilities, or circumstances may fit him, sacrificing thus the means of livelihood for himself and his family, after work, it may be, for many long years well done, and with strength still, and a hearty will, to do more in the Church's service, if

only he may be allowed to think and speak the plain honest truth as a free man, and not be required to hush up the facts which he knows, and publish and maintain, in place of them, by silence, at all events, if not by overt act, transparent fictions?

The charge preferred under the extracts contained in Schedule IX. is fully set forth in Section II. of the letter addressed to the Metropolitan, being the Annexure A.

APPENDIX IV.—Vol. II. p. 75.

Cape Town, 16th November 1863.

To DAVID TENNANT, Esq.,
Registrar of the Diocese of Cape Town.

SIR—We beg to notify to you, for the information of the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, that we intend at the hearing of the charges preferred by us against the Right Reverend John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal, to avail ourselves of and to use as evidence in support of said charges the following documents, letters, and writings as filed with you, to wit:

1. Declaration by the Very Reverend the Dean of Cape Town, as to the sale within the Province of Cape Town of the books and works referred to in the citation.

2. The Letters-Patent of the 8th December 1853, constituting the See of Cape Town.

3. The Letters-Patent of the 23d November 1854, constituting the See of Natal, being an office copy, extracted from the Principal Registry of the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, together with the profession of obedience to the Metropolitan thereto annexed.

4. The *Natal Gazette* of the 14th February 1854, containing the publication of the Letters-Patent of the Bishop of Natal, with the Proclamation by the Governor of the 11th February 1854.

5. Extract from the "Pastoral Letter from the Bishop of Natal to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese," dated Maritzburg, October 1, 1855.

6. Extracts from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, March 2, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

7. Extracts from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, April 3, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

8. Extracts from a printed letter dated "Bishopstowe, August 11, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal "to the Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Natal."

9. Extract from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, August 2, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

10. Extract from a letter dated "Bishopstowe, November 19, 1858,"

addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

11. Extracts from a postscript to a letter dated "Bishopstowe, December 31, 1858," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

12. Extracts from a postscript to a letter dated "Bishopstowe, March 7, 1859," addressed by the Bishop of Natal to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

13. Minutes of proceedings at a meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops of the Province of Cape Town, held at Cape Town on the 26th December, 1860, and following days.

14. Letter dated "Bishopstowe, Natal, June 1st, 1863," addressed by the Venerable Archdeacon Grubb, of Maritzburg, the Bishop of Natal's Commissary, to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, with the copy of an address by the clergy of Natal to the Bishop of that Diocese, as enclosed in said letter.

And we have to request that a copy of this notice may be served on Dr. W. H. I. Bleek, the Bishop of Natal's agent.

We remain, Sir, your obedient Servants,

H. A. DOUGLAS, Dean of Cape Town.
N. J. MERRIMAN, Archdeacon of Graham's Town.
H. BADNALL, Archdeacon of George.

The Registrar then produced the documents referred to, which he read as follows:

[1.]

I, Henry Alexander Douglas, Dean of Cape Town, do solemnly and sincerely declare that a certain book or work, entitled "S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans newly translated and explained from a missionary point of view, by the Right Reverend John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal," was sold and advertised for sale in Cape Town, in the *Argus* newspaper of the 25th September, 1862, and in the said month of September, 1862, exposed for sale at the publishing office of the *Cape Argus* in Adderley Street, Cape Town.

And I do further solemnly and sincerely declare that the certain book or work entitled "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, by the Right Reverend John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal," being Part I. of said work, was likewise sold and advertised for sale in Cape Town in the *Argus* newspaper of the 20th December, 1862, and 25th of December, 1862, and at the dates so advertised was exposed for sale at the shop of J. C. Juta, of Wale Street, Cape Town, bookseller and stationer, and that the said Part I. of the last-named work was also advertised for sale by Messrs. Davis and Son, of Pietermaritzburg, Natal, in a certain newspaper published at Pietermaritzburg, Natal, and styled the *Natal Witness and Agricultural and Commercial Advertiser*, of the 6th February, 1863, and in said advertisement described as "By the Right Reverend

the Lord Bishop of Natal, the Pentateuch shown to be unhistorical;" and in the *Natal Witness and Agricultural and Commercial Advertiser*, of the 1st of May, 1863, Part II. of the said work was advertised for sale at Messrs. Davis and Son, Pietermaritzburg, Natal, and in said advertisement described as "Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch," as will be seen from the copies of these papers hereto annexed, marked A and B.

(Signed) H. A. DOUGLAS.

Declared at Cape Town, this 16th day of November, 1863, before me,

(Signed) DAVID TENNANT,
Justice of the Peace for Cape Town.

[2.]

Letters-Patent, 8th December, 1853.

[3.]

Letters-Patent, 23d November, 1854.

I, John William Colenso, Doctor in Divinity, appointed Bishop of the See and Diocese of Natal, do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, and to his successors, and to the Metropolitical Church of S. George, Cape Town. So help me God, through Jesus Christ. (Signed) J. W. NATAL.

[4.]

Natal Gazette and Proclamation, 14th February, 1854.

[5.]

Pastoral Letter from the Bishop of Natal to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese.

My Brethren in Christ— Maritzburg, October 1, 1855.

1. I have the pleasure to lay before you a copy of an address which has just reached me from the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity of the Metropolitan Church of Cape Town to those of the Church of Natal, expressing, as you will see, the deep interest they take in the great work to which we have been called.

[6.]

Bishopstowe, Maritzburg, March 2, 1858.

. . . . . I am afraid you will be grieved this mail by a communication from the Dean. Of what kind it will be, I cannot, of course, say beforehand; but the simple fact is that I am directly at issue with him on the subject of our Lord's real presence in the Holy Eucharist, and that I feel bound to protest against the views he holds, to the utmost of my power. . . . . But these things are trifles, compared with what will cause you much greater pain, whether you agree with my views or differ from them. May God guide and comfort and keep you, in this and all the other many trials by which, I fear, your path is beset. . . . .

[7.] April 3, 1858.

By this mail you will receive from me a copy of the sermons which I have preached on the Holy Eucharist, and another I expect from the Dean. What your own views are on the subject in question I know not. . . . . I am grieved that you should be troubled in this matter, when you have so much else to trouble you; but unless I am judged and deposed as a heretic, I must live and die preaching the doctrines of these sermons in this my post of duty, and it will be miserable to feel that every sermon I preach will sound to the Dean as heresy. . . . . I need hardly say that, under such circumstances, it will be impossible for us to work together with any cordiality henceforward. . . . . And if I am not myself to be removed from my office, heartily glad should I be if one of them would present him with a good living in England. . . . .

[8.]

Printed letter "To the Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland, in the Diocese of Natal."

My Brethren in Christ— August 11, 1858.

You are aware that in the early part of this year, the Very Rev. the Dean of Maritzburg and the Rev. Canon Jenkins formally presented me, their Bishop, to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, charging me with unsound and heretical teaching on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, in consequence of two sermons which I felt it my duty at that time to preach in the cathedral church of this diocese, and subsequently to publish for the information and, I would humbly trust, the edification of my flock. As you must naturally be desirous to know what are the views of the Metropolitan upon the point in question, I think it right to say that a reply has been received from him, in which, while declining to pronounce an official judgment upon the matter, he yet gives his opinion on the main subject, in the following words. . . .

Such being the opinion of the Metropolitan on this point, I conclude that there must be passages in my sermons which are liable to be thus misrepresented.

[9.] August 2, 1858.

You will see that one of our resolutions requests me to ascertain how this stands from the *Primate*. I need hardly say that the reference was made to him, rather than to yourself, from no want of respectful sense of duty to you as Metropolitan, but because it was considered that a question of this nature, which was not of the nature of an appeal from a judicial decision, but one of inquiry respecting the principles of the Church of England, ought more properly to be addressed to the Primate. . . .

[10.] November 19, 1858.

In respect of his last letter to yourself, Mr. Jenkins has, no doubt, been influenced to take the course he has adopted mainly in consequence of that passage in your letter to the Dean in which you say that you

think a clergyman is at liberty to present his Bishop—or rather your expression is, "Presbyters" may, for grave matters, present a Bishop. The expression, as it stands, is no doubt liable to the interpretation which Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Crompton, and others, have put upon it, but against which I most respectfully but most firmly protest, on the ground of Church order, and common propriety, viz. that a single Presbyter, or two or three Presbyters, of a diocese may present a Bishop. I say on the ground of Church order, because I find that the American Church, who have doubtless well considered authorities in this matter, beyond what, with the limited means at my command, I am able to do, have laid it down as a rule that a *Bishop*, or two-thirds of the clergy, alone can present a Bishop. And this precedent appears to me to be confirmed by a sense of common propriety. . . .

[11.] December 31, 1858.

I hope that when the Bench of Bishops meets they will take into consideration the question of metropolitical jurisdiction, as well as the constitution of Church councils. . . . . So, too, I use the word Province of the South African dioceses, but only in a popular way. I see clearly Canon Jenkins, and probably the Dean, does not—but looks upon you as an independent Metropolitan. That you would be, doubtless, if you were Metropolitan by Church authority, and not by Royal Patent. But it seems to me that we are really still in a certain sense within the *Province* of Canterbury, by virtue of the clause which makes your proceedings subject, not merely to the supervision, but to the *revision*, of the Primate. To take for example an instance. Suppose that of a clergyman, who had signed adherence to our present rules of council. . . . . I found it necessary, because of some infringement of the rules, to pass a sentence of suspension, and he appealed to you, and you (as you say you should do) reversed my proceeding, of course I must submit to this, as the Bishop of Exeter to the Archbishop in the case of Mr. Gorham; but I imagine that I should do right to appeal to the Archbishop, not to *reverse*, but to *revise* your decision, and that if he decided against you, you would be bound in conscience to follow that judgment in case of any future appeal of a similar kind. This is the way in which our mutual relation at present presents itself to my own mind. But it would be most desirable that the whole matter should be settled for us by the proper authorities in England.

[12.] March 7, 1859.

You say that you regret my sanctioning my clergy and laity writing to the Archbishop. It was not to ask advice of him, however, that they wrote, nor did it occur to me that they were doing anything which appeared to put a slight on your office as Metropolitan. They only wished to be properly understood in England, and, without making any request for the Archbishop's opinion, simply stated to him the facts of the case. . . .

Nevertheless I am sorry that I sanctioned *this* letter being written if it has pained you. . . .

[13.]

Minutes of proceedings at a meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops of the Province of Cape Town.

(Signed) R. Cape Town.
J. W. Natal.
Piers S. Helena.
H. Graham's Town.

[14.]

Bishopstowe, Natal, June 1, 1863.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Cape Town.

My Lord—It is my duty to forward to your Lordship, as Metropolitan, the enclosed, of which a duplicate copy will be sent by the mail now leaving to the Bishop of Natal.

I think it right to add that this document has not been sent to Zululand for the signature of the clergy there, and that of the four licensed clergy in Natal who have not signed it none have any sympathy with the views to which it alludes.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your faithful servant,

C. L. Grubb.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Natal.

We, duly licensed clergy, ministering in the diocese of Natal, desire to address your Lordship upon a matter of the utmost importance to the Church planted in this colony.

We have heard, with the deepest pain, of a work published by you, in which you state in effect that you no longer hold, believe, nor are able to teach, some, at least, of the most vital of the doctrines of the united Church of England and Ireland.

We consider that in our relative positions, it would have ill become us to have been the first to draw attention to acts of yours done before the whole world, and therefore we remained silent until those in authority in our Church had publicly marked their sense of your Lordship's proceeding.

But we understand that a very large majority of the Archbishops and Bishops having written to you suggesting the propriety of your resigning your office, you have answered that it is not your intention to comply with that suggestion.

Under these circumstances, we consider that a longer silence on our part would be most culpable.

There are, we are aware, legal questions which it belongs to others to

decide, but we feel that we have a duty independently of any merely legal proceedings.

The various offices which we hold, the emoluments we receive, are held on the faith of our upholding and defending the doctrines of the Church of England, and on that understanding only could we honestly and conscientiously continue to hold those offices or to receive those emoluments.

Unfeignedly believing all the Canonical Scriptures of the "New and Old Testament," and bound to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word," we feel compelled, in the sight of God and His Church, and more especially before "the people committed to our care and charge," to protest most solemnly against the position taken by you in the publication of this book, and your determination to retain the office of Bishop; and we think it right to lay this our protest before the ecclesiastical authority to whom, next to your Lordship, we must look, the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

We are,

Your Lordship's faithful servants,

C. L. GRUBB, M.A., Archdeacon of Maritzburg.
WILLIAM HENRY CYNRIC LLOYD, Colonial Chaplain, Rector of Durban.
[1] JAMES WALTON, Pinetown.
A. TOUNESEN, Ungaboba.
W. BAUGH, Umbazi.
W. A. ELDER.
JOSEPH BARKER.
A. W. L. RIVETT, Addington.

APPENDIX V.—Vol. II. p. 76.

MY LORD—As duly authorised thereto by the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Natal, I appear before your Lordship for the purpose of protesting against your Lordship's present assumption of jurisdiction over the Bishop of Natal, and to repudiate your Lordship's assumed right to take cognisance of the charge of "false teaching" preferred against the Bishop of Natal by the Very Reverend the Dean of Cape Town, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, and the Venerable the Archdeacon of George.

On behalf of the Bishop of Natal, I therefore protest accordingly against the proceedings now instituted against him before your Lordship, and I request you to take notice that he does not admit their legality; and,

[1] Mr. Walton, after the words "our care and charge," would continue, "to avow our unaltered adherence to the doctrines of our Church as found in our Articles and authorised Formularies, believing them to be in accordance with God's Holy Word; and the office which your Lordship holds, and the opinions you avow, appear to us to be greatly at variance with consistency, accompanied as it is with an intimation on the part of your Lordship that you can no longer use the Formularies to which you have subscribed."

further, that he will, if necessary, take such measures to contest the validity of your proceedings, and to resist the execution of any judgment which your Lordship may see fit to pronounce, in such manner as the Bishop shall be advised. W. H. I. Bleek.

Cape Town, 17th November 1863.

Appendix VI.—Vol. II. p. 87.

Bishopstowe, Aug. 7, 1861.

My dear Brother—I thank you sincerely for your letter on the subject of my Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. I cannot be surprised at your writing so earnestly and seriously, holding the views which you do on some of the points which I have discussed. But, as you will have learned from my last letter, it is too late now to stop the publication of the book, even if I desired to do so. Whatever you may think it right to say or do in the matter, I am quite sure that you will only act from a sense of duty to what you believe to be the truth, which compels you to set aside all personal feelings, in obedience to a higher law. In writing what I have written, and publishing it, I too have done the same, though conscious that I should thereby cause pain to yourself, and others, whom I entirely esteem and love. It is true that you have mistaken some of my expressions; others (forgive me for saying it) you seem to me to have misjudged. But in respect of others, I am well aware that my views differ strongly from yours; though I believe that I have said nothing in my book which is not in accordance with the teaching of the Bible, or which transcends the limits so liberally allowed by the Church of England for freedom of thought on such subjects. I will now touch, one by one, on the several points to which you have drawn my attention.

I. I have no doubt whatever that the Canonical Books of Scripture *do* contain errors, and some very grave ones, in *matters of fact*, and that the historical narratives are *not* to be depended on as true in all their details. I have never stated this publicly; but surely, in this age of critical inquiry, every intelligent student of the Scriptures must be aware of the truth of what I say. It is vain to deny what is patent to any careful and conscientious reader, who will set himself to compare one passage of Scripture history with another. And, I must say, I had supposed that there were very few in the present day, except in a very narrow school of theology, who would contest this point.

For instance, Joseph was thirty years old when he "stood before Pharaoh" (Gen. xli. 36), at which time, therefore, Judah was thirty-four; since Jacob married Leah and Rachel after he had been *seven* years with Laban (xxix. 20, 21), and Judah was his *fourth* son by Leah, and Joseph was born when he had been *fourteen* years with Laban (xxx. 25, 26; xxxi. 41), and therefore Judah could not have been more than *four* years older than Joseph. Now the time that Joseph "stood before Pharaoh," *nine* years elapsed, seven of plenty, two of famine, before Jacob went down to

Egypt (xlv. 6); when Judah, therefore, must have been forty-three years old. But (xlvi. 12) we find that Judah's sons, Pharez and Zarah, and the sons of Pharez, Hezron and Hamul, were among the seventy souls who went down to Egypt with Jacob; and Gen. xxxviii. gives us the full account of the birth of Pharez and Zarah. From this it appears that Judah grew up to maturity, took a wife, had three sons by her *in succession*, and each of these grew up to maturity, *after* which Judah's transaction with Tamar took place, and she had by him these two sons, Pharez and Zarah, and Pharez grew to maturity, and had two children—and all this before Judah was forty-three years old! In that time he might have become twice over a grandfather! I need hardly observe that this unquestionable "error in matter of fact" is the more important, inasmuch as the names of Pharez and Hezron occur in the genealogy of Matt. i.

So again, in the New Testament, it is impossible that Matt. iii. 17, and Mark i. 11, or that Matt. xxvi. 46, and Mark xv. 34, should both be strictly true. In Mark x. 46, the blind man is healed, as our Lord was *going out* of Jericho; in Luke xviii. 35, as He was *entering into* Jericho.

Of course, the above are only a few instances, such as occur to me on the moment, of a multitude of others, which may be found in the Scriptures. And they are not mere *discrepancies* (such as that *one* blind man is named in one place, and *two* in another), which may admit of explanation, but absolute contradictions in matters of fact, to deny the existence of which would, for me at all events, be dishonest and immoral, and most unworthy, as it seems to me, of any one who really values the *general* historical truth of the Scriptures.

But I have nowhere said what you have assumed for me in addition to the above, namely,—that "inspiration apparently is exhibited not in the declaration of *the very truth*, which God has revealed to our faith respecting Himself and the way of salvation by Christ, *but* in the spirit and the life which breathes throughout the Holy Book," etc. I say that "the very truth" *is* "the spirit and the life," and not the mere words in which that truth may be conveyed to us.

With respect to the latter portion of your remarks on this subject, I prefer using the language of the Consecration Service, namely,—that I am persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, which is identical with that of the 6th Article; so that both together express sufficiently the mind of our Church. In this sense, of course, I *do* receive the Holy Scriptures as the "rule of faith." But I object to bind myself to such expressions as yours, which are neither in the Bible nor the Prayer-book, and may easily have a meaning given to them very different from what either you or I intend by them. It would be easy, for instance, for me to say that I believe the Bible to "contain the unerring word of God's revealed truth." The question, then, would be, What is meant by God's revealed truth?" Is it "the spirit and life," or the mere words of the Bible? And if the latter, as I understand you to say, then are *all* the words of the Bible part of God's revealed truth; for instance, the story of the birth of Pharez and Hezron, above referred

to? You once told me, I think, that you held the genealogies in Chronicles to be the "Word of God," and, therefore, I supposed are inspired, "unerring word of God's revealed truth." Now I cannot believe this. I imagine those tables to be mere transcripts of family registers, perhaps not even that: and I *know* them to be full of errors and contradictions, which are not in any way to be accounted for by mistakes in the transcription of manuscripts.

So, too, when you say that the dogmatic teaching of the Bible must be received by all Christians, of course I can assent to this. But then I believe that the dogmatic teaching of S. Paul in the Romans is just what I have set forth in my book; and you judge differently.

I certainly do say, and will maintain, that to the man himself there is but one lawgiver—the law within the heart—to which, in some form or other, he must bring every question of morals or of faith for judgment. One man has fully persuaded himself that the letter of the Bible is the revealed Word of God. When his reason is satisfied of this, his conscience tells him that at all cost of bodily or mental pain he must hold to the letter of the Bible. Another's conscience keeps him, in like manner, subject implicitly to the dicta of his Church, when his reason is once satisfied that the Church has a right to command him. And each of these will test his conduct continually, by bringing it into comparison with the words of the Bible or the Church, before the tribunal of his conscience. If his heart does not condemn him in this review, he will be satisfied, and "have confidence before God," though all the while his conscience may really be injured by slavery to a defective judgment of his reasoning powers. Another takes a different view of inspiration, as I do myself, and believe that God's Spirit is indeed speaking in the Bible to all who will humbly seek and listen to His teaching, but that, even when we read the different portions of it, we are to "try the spirits, whether they are of God, to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," to "compare spiritual things with spiritual,"—that is a part of our glorious, yet solemn, responsibility to do this,—that, having the Spirit ourselves, "an unction from the Holy One, that we may have all things," having the promise that we shall be "guided into all truth" if we seek daily to have our minds enlightened and our consciences quickened, by walking in the Light already vouchsafed to us, we are not at liberty to shake off this responsibility of judging for ourselves whether this or that portion of the Bible has a message from God to our souls or not; God will not relieve us from this responsibility; He will not give us what, in one form or other, men are so prone to desire—an infallible external guide—a voice from without, such as men often wish to substitute for the voice within.

II. On the second point to which you refer, I believe that my language is entirely in accordance with the Second and Ninth Articles of our Church; and I must say that I am surprised that you should have remarked as you have done on this subject, when I have written in my book as follows:

Page 65. "With this knowledge of our sinful state, and without the

Gospel, we should indeed be bound down under a weight of woe, under the consciousness of a heavy burden, helplessly aware of our coming doom, and even now feeling it beforehand. Having thus the certainty of the curse upon us, being, indeed, under it already," etc.

Page 67. "Our death is *no longer* a token of the curse lying heavily upon us."

Page 68. "Through that precious bloodshedding the whole race has been redeemed from the curse."

Page 97. "We shall die—*no longer*, as incurring a part of the curse of our fallen nature."

Page 106. "The curse of their sinful nature has been taken away." "By their natural birth they feel at once as fallen, sinful creatures under a condemnation of death."

Page 112. "The cloud of guilty fear has been removed, which must otherwise have hung, by reason of the sin in our nature, between our souls and the blessed face of God."

But, indeed, there are innumerable passages, in which my book distinctly implies and expresses the belief that Christ suffered as a sacrifice for *original* guilt, as well as for actual sins of men.

III. With regard to the Atonement, I believe of course that I have expressed the mind of S. Paul upon this point. I most assuredly do *not* "deny that our Lord was a true propitiatory sacrifice for our sins," as you say; for I have distinctly said (p. 68) that "we are privileged to look at Christ Jesus, through faith in His Blood, and behold in Him the propitiation for our sins, the object which makes us acceptable to God." I have no less distinctly expressed my belief that "we have redemption through His Blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" for I have said (page 69) through that precious bloodshedding the whole race has been redeemed from the curse." And I am sure that there are other passages where, in other like words, I have said the same.

But I do deny that His was a *vicarious* sacrifice, in the sense in which I understand you to use the word, namely, that He endured in our stead the weight of God's wrath. He bore the penalty due to our sins. I believe that neither the expression nor the idea is scriptural; nor is either to be found in the Prayer-book. In the New Testament it is *invariably* said that our Lord suffered or died *hyper*, on behalf of, not *anti*, instead of, the children of men—the same expression being used as when the shepherd is said to lay down his life *for*, not instead of, the sheep, or where S. Peter says "he will lay down his life *for* his Lord, or where S. Paul says "he is ready, not only to be bound, but also to die, *for* the name of the Lord Jesus." There are passages without number where the preposition *hyper* is used of our Lord's suffering or dying for us, in several of which some manuscripts read *peri*, on account of, but not one of them, reads *anti*, instead of, in place of. Nor is there one single instance in the whole New Testament where the word *antilutron* is used in this connection. The only approach to it is in the use of the expression *anti pollon*, which occurs in Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, where, however, nothing is

implied about enduring God's wrath in our stead, as if He ransomed us out of God's hand; and nothing more is said than I have said myself in page 97, "Now that he, our Head, has paid that debt, we are free;" and in page 110, "We have paid this debt to Sin, the tyrant [which was needed that we might be ransomed from his power], because he has paid it;" and on page 111, "He paid a sufficient debt to Sin, the tyrant, to release us from any further necessity of dying." And so S. Paul, having used a similar expression in 1 Tim. ii. 6, *ho dous heauton antilutron hyper panton* explains his meaning in Tit. ii. 14, to be—not He ransomed them from the hand of God, but He ransomed them from the possession and power of evil, *hos edoken heauton hyper hemon hina lutrosetai hemas apo pases anomias.* I repeat the assertion, there is not a single expression in the whole New Testament which distinctly implies that Christ suffered the weight of His Father's wrath in our stead. If there be, surely it can be produced. The single passage you quote—that He bore our sins in His own body on the tree—does not prove it. If, indeed, the doctrine of vicarious suffering of God's wrath in our stead were distinctly taught in other passages of the New Testament, these words of S. Peter might be explained to have this meaning. But in themselves they do not express it. He "bore our sins," not the penalty due to our sins. And in the same chapter of Isaiah to which S. Peter refers, we read "He bore our sorrows, and carried our sicknesses," which words S. Matthew quotes (viii. 17), just after our Lord had healed many sick persons, to express (as I understand it) His sympathising and sharing in all the sorrows and woes of fallen humanity. In the same sense I understand the words "He bore our sins." For our sakes He took the likeness of sinful flesh, He was made sin, He suffered and died as a sinner. He bore our sins, as He bore our sorrows, His whole life of obedience culminating in the death upon the cross. But there is not a word here of His bearing the weight of God's anger in our stead.

When you say that my language is not always consistent with itself, that it is in some places more evangelical than others, I must respectfully contest this, and assert that my language is the same throughout, as evangelical in one place as another, though it is not possible on every page to produce all that one would say upon the great subject concerned, especially when the thoughts of the commentator must follow those of the original writer. How it can be said that I maintain that our Lord came to "release us only from the power and dominion, not from the guilt of our sins," with such passages as I have written, not only on the pages you have quoted (68, 94, 95, 161, 162), but in many others where the subject led to it, I cannot conceive, as *e.g.* page 65, "With this knowledge of our sinful state, and without the Gospel, we should be bound down under a weight of woe, helplessly aware of our *coming doom*, having the certainty of the curse upon us;" or page iii. "The cloud of *guilty fear* has been removed, which must otherwise have hung, by reason of the sin in our nature, between our souls and the face of God." You ask me how I can reconcile my teaching with the plain declaration of the 2nd Article, which

declares that "Christ truly suffered to *reconcile His Father to us*, and to be a *sacrifice*, not only for original guilt, but for the *actual sins* of men." I answer that, as to the latter portion of this Article, I have repeatedly asserted it in my book: only I see nothing in this Article about a *vicarious* sacrifice, and I have taught that it was a *propitiatory* sacrifice—thus He came to offer, in His life and death of perfect obedience, a propitiatory sacrifice on our behalf, well pleasing and acceptable unto God, so that the Father looks upon the Son, is satisfied in Him, and with us in Him. My whole book teaches, in the words of the 31st Article, that "the offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone"

¶ As to the former portion of the 2nd Article, I am sorry that the expression is there used, "to reconcile the Father to us," because it is not scriptural, and it is liable to be misinterpreted. But these words of our Church cannot be meant to contradict or set aside the Apostle's own words, when he says that "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ," that "God was in Christ, *reconciling the world unto Himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them." There is, of course, a sense in which a father displeased requires to be reconciled to his child, though tenderly loving him all the while that he corrects him and manifests his anger towards him. I have thought that our Lord came, at His Father's own command, to reconcile His Father and our Father in this sense to us; and I have used the expression on page 89, "one reconciled or, rather, reconciling Father and Friend."

IV. The Scripture teaches us that "God is love." Being perfect love, He *must* be perfectly holy, just, and righteous. And surely my book in a hundred places speaks as strongly of God's loving correction of the wilful and disobedient as of His loving delight in the faithful and true. It cannot, I say it confidently, be justly laid to my charge that I overlook the holiness and justice and righteousness of God, though certainly I do not hold the dogma that God cannot forgive sin, even in an infant, without taking vengeance for it, without inflicting on some one pain and bitter anguish as a penalty.

I do hold that *all* men are justified before God, using the word in the sense in which S. Paul uses it throughout this epistle, not in that which modern theologians may perhaps assign to it. I do *not* hold that our justification depends on our faith, because that would make it a matter of works, in direct opposition to S. Paul's teaching. Our *salvation* is a totally different thing from our justification. Being justified, we are to "work out our salvation," and, therefore, for this we must have faith.

But with S. Paul the word "salvation" means something very different from the miserable notion commonly attached to the word, of mere deliverance from the pit of woe. He means by it the being saved from that divine displeasure which is declared against all wilful unfaithfulness, and which will be manifested upon us Christians above all others, if we do not live according to the light vouchsafed to us, and answer to the

gracious end to which we have been called. To "work out our salvation" means, with S. Paul, to live faithfully as becomes the children of God, who are privileged to know that they are justified and brought near to their Father's footstool, and being prepared here on earth for His glory. It is to be labouring daily with the grace already given to cast off the works of darkness, and put on more and more of the armour of light, and so not incur the displeasure of our Lord, as slothful or unfaithful servants, and require His angry chastisements. This is what he means by "working out our salvation," and being "saved from wrath," that wrath which is declared, not against the guilt of our fallen nature, or the sins of impurity and ignorance, in respect of all which "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," but against all who sin wilfully, whether by actual transgressions or slothful negligence, who "keep back the truth," which they know, "in unrighteousness."

I do not agree with your statement of my ideas about faith, viz. that "what faith does for us is to make known to us, to give us a conscious assurance of what would be equally true, whether we have it or not, that God looks upon us as righteous in His Son." I do not think that faith *does* this for us: it is the "conscious assurance" of something which in itself is true, whether we believe it or not, the realising of things hoped for, the conviction of things unseen. The words, however, which you have quoted from page 12 I entirely abide by: I am certain that this is what S. Paul intends to teach in this epistle.

I think you have not rightly read what I have said on page 74. I have not said, as you appear to think, that "justification *consists* in being justified in one's own conscience." Quite the contrary. I hold that we are justified in *God's sight*, whether we know or believe it, or not. But I said that in the particular passage then under consideration, and in some other places, "both here and elsewhere," not, generally, everywhere. S. Paul is using the word justified with reference especially to those who, like Abraham, were privileged to *know* that they were justified—had had brought home to them consciously this gift of righteousness, though really justified already in God's sight, as he was.

But when, after quoting this and other passages, you go on to say, "If these views are true, I cannot see why we need to preach the Gospel to the heathen; it seems to me that you take away the great motive for doing so; they are, without our teaching, accepted, righteous, justified, *saved*." I really hardly know how to reply to this—not because I cannot reply to it, but (pardon me for saying so) because I am amazed that it should be necessary to make a reply to it.

In the first place, I have taught that neither they nor we shall be "saved," if we die in impenitence, each according to the light he has received. But it is plain that you are speaking only of *endless* horror in the pit of woe, whereas I am thinking of that Divine displeasure which every human being will incur who lives unfaithfully in proportion to the light he has received, and dies in impenitence. I have said accordingly (page 95), "We shall be saved from that wrath by having our faults freely pardoned

for His sake *when confessed and repented of.* In what way that anger will take effect on the impenitent in the eternal world, God only knows; but we have the figures of it in the eternal doom and fire, and the outer darkness."

But have we no motive to preach such a Gospel as S. Paul's, according to my views of it, to the heathen? To tell them that God loves them, that He, after whom they have been groping in the darkness, has been caring for them all along, and now calls them near to Himself, that they may know Him more fully and the rich treasures of His love! Why, this is the very life and soul of missionary work. It has been my joy for seven years past thus to publish the Gospel of the grace of God; and, if you could witness the effect upon those who heard the message you would not doubt that it was at least as effective as that Gospel, "which is not a Gospel," which is so often preached to them. Is the Gospel, then, only a means for "saving" men's souls from endless misery? And because they, who are faithful with their fraction of a talent without it, may be as *safe* as, that is, not more or less *safe* than, Christians with their ten thousand talents, is there no work to be done among the heathen that the hearts of our fellow-men may be gladdened and their eyes enlightened, and their spirits filled with life, and, above all, that God's gracious command may be obeyed, and His Name be glorified?

I do believe that my teaching on this subject in this book is "in full accordance with the plain teaching of the Church which I am pledged to guard and maintain, as laid down in her Articles," and above all, with my consecration vow.

V. You have been long aware that I do not agree with those who hold what is called the "Sacramental System," and that I regard their views as unsound and unscriptural. But I have *not* spoken of the sacraments as *only* signs, and not also "means of grace," when duly received. Here also I cannot admit that my language is at all inconsistent with itself. It is perfectly consistent from my own point of view. Of course, we *have* a right—every human being has, if he only knew it, and even a heathen may know it in a measure, and exercise it—to call upon the "Faithful Creator" as our Father and Friend. (Does not S. Paul allow this, when he quotes a heathen poet's words as true, "We are His offspring"?) But in baptism we have that right declared and assured to us in the most gracious manner; we are then taken formally into the family of God; we are made children in a higher sense of the word.

I have said that the "inward and spiritual grace," or free gift in baptism, is "something that is given us in Christ [viz: our dying to sin and rising to new life, by virtue of our union with Him in His death and resurrection life], which is *set forth* to us in the sacrament,—of which we are partakers, which is bestowed freely upon us and upon all mankind, and depends not in any way on the spirit in which we come or are brought to the sacrament." And you remark, "Surely, this is to speak of it as a bare sign, not as the means of conveying any gift or blessing to us." But this inference is quite unnecessary. The free gift of God is set forth to us in either sacrament: it is for us to embrace it, as far as we are able, by a true living faith.

It is true that, as to the "free gift" of God, which is set forth to us in the sacrament of baptism, I have taught that we all share, through God's goodness, from our very birth-hour, without our own co-operation, in the benefit of having "died to Sin," as a tyrant that has any right to hold us in his grasp, and being made "alive unto God" by virtue of our union with the Great Head of our race. To *infants*, then, the sacrament, as the 27th Article teaches, is but the instrument by which they are grafted into God's inner family, the Church, and by which His promises and their adoption to be His children are visibly signed and sealed to them. Whereas to *adults*, coming in the right spirit, it is a means of "confirming faith," already existing, and "increasing grace," of which they are already partaking, not by virtue of any mysterious efficacy of the sacrament itself, as such, but, "by virtue of prayer to God."

With respect also to the Lord's Supper, I have taught in this book, and more fully in my "Sermons on the Eucharist," that we are all partakers in like manner, from our birth-hour, of the benefits flowing from the body and blood of Christ, which is the "free gift" of God, set forth to us in that sacrament. But this sacrament, as the Church Catechism teaches, is ordained for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby; and coming to it faithfully, we shall be privileged to draw continually by it, as a means of grace, more and more life from the Fountain of Life.

Having my book on the Romans before you, and having so recently had occasion to read with some attention my "Sermons on the Eucharist," I cannot conceive how you can find any just reason for quoting against me the words of Articles xxv. xxviii. and xxix., the Communion Service, Homilies and Catechism, with which, as I believe the views which I have expressed in these publications as to the nature of the two sacraments are in entire accordance. I cannot say the same of the "Sacramental System," which I believe to be opposed to the Prayer-book. You say that these Articles, etc., "include my saying that all men are partaking everywhere, at all times, of Christ's body and blood, whether in the sacraments or out of them, whether they feed upon them by living faith or not." I have shown more fully in my "Sermons on the Eucharist" my grounds for making this assertion, viz. that all men have life, spiritual as well as bodily, that they could have no life (as our Lord tells us) without "eating His flesh and drinking His blood,"—that, consequently, they do partake of His body and blood, and so (as Waterland says) "our Lord's *general doctrine in John* vi. seems to abstract from all particulars, and to resolve into this, that whether *with faith or without*, whether *in the sacraments or out of the sacraments*, whether before Christ or since, whether in covenant or out of the covenant, whether here or hereafter, no man ever was, is, or will be accepted, but in and through the grand propitiation made by the blood of Christ." I know that you do not agree in this view, but I am at least not singular in holding it.

VI. I must confess that it does appear to me that you are finding grounds of objection in my book which do not really exist, when you say

that my language on the judgment "leaves you in doubt whether I believe that God has *appointed a day* in which He will judge the world in righteousness: and this, notwithstanding that I have written thus: Page 48, "Whenever Christ shall appear, to visit and judge in His Father's Name, now amidst the affairs of daily life, as well as on *the great day of future account.*" "The gift of righteousness is being continually renewed to such as these, by the free forgiveness of sin in this life, as well as finally declared on the *great day of account.*"

"They often had occasion, as the Apostle had here, to recall the thoughts of men to the fact, that . . . . *the day* would surely come when a righteous Governor would judge the secrets of men." "The new message of the Gospel is that this judgment shall be conducted by Jesus Christ."

Page 75. "All will be judged alike by the same righteous rule, according to their works, and according to the light vouchsafed to them, *in that day when God shall judge the secrets of men by the Lord Jesus Christ.*"

I dare say that there are other passages of a like nature. But I must say, with all deference, that this is not the only suggestion made without the shadow of a ground for it, except it would seem a presentiment, or prejudgment, that so it must be, which has surprised me in your letter.

VII. With regard to the eternal world, I have expressly refused to carry out any scheme to its full and logical conclusions. I have *maintained* no points at all upon the subject, but that He whose Name is Love will deal according to His Name with His creatures. I have said that I entertain "hidden hope"—and I say not even that—for all; and I am very far indeed from saying that the great majority of mankind will be "saved" from God's wrath, because they are all "justified;" though I dare not assert that such wrath will certainly take effect in inflicting endless, unutterable woe; and I have shown abundant reason, as I think, for checking the utterance of that fearful dogma, which so many profess to hold (though they never boldly teach it, and follow it to its consequences), without any authority from the Bible or the Church for holding it—I mean, that the wicked shall not only go into everlasting fire (as I have taught), but shall *remain there in helpless torment for ever and ever.* You would have stated my views upon this subject more correctly if you had written thus: "You maintain these points—that the doctrine of *endless* (not eternal) punishment of the wicked is not found in the Bible or the Prayer-book—that all punishment is an act of love, and *may* be remedial—that our training and discipline *may* not end here, but may extend to the next world, and, for aught we know, to infinite other worlds beyond it—that our chastisement *may* be purifying, that sin may be purged out from God's universe in some way of God's wisdom—that, however, there is no *purgatory*, where penalties are *measured by time and intensity*, and can be remitted by favour or importunity. [What wise and loving earthly parent would remit a punishment until he had reason to believe that it had done its work upon his child?] I am sorry that you do not yourself see an essential difference between my view and the Romish doctrine of purgatory.

Such a difference, however, there is, as I have shown above, and in page 244 of my book.

I do not believe that my doctrine contradicts at all the language of Holy Scripture, or the formularies of our Church, including the Athanasian Creed, when perfectly interpreted. Further, in that Creed, the damnatory clauses are not set forth as any portion of the Catholic Faith. And I understand the language of the 8th Article, namely, that the Creeds can be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture, to apply that *faith* to the doctrine, which is to be *believed* about the Divine nature, rather than to the sanction with which such a belief is enforced.

I am sorry that you have so much misjudged what I have written about the Athanasian Creed as to suggest that I did not hold the essential parts of it, more especially the doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord, than which, from the first moment of my ministry up to the present hour, in all my preaching and teaching (as any one who knows them well must witness), no doctrine of the Church has been maintained by me more strenuously, though I have taught also the doctrine of His perfect humanity more fully and prominently than many, and not lost sight of it practically to a great extent as some do. I say this to you, as a dear friend and brother, though, after all that I have written, even in this book on the Romans, I feel that I should be justified in declining to say it to you as Metropolitan. Nor do I think that you had any just ground from anything that I have said, or omitted to say, in my Commentary, for the remarks which you have made on this point, as on some others.

As to the Athanasian Creed, it is notoriously a stumbling-block to thousands of pious souls, not in the least degree because of the doctrines set forth in the statement of the "Catholic Faith," but because of the harsh language of the damnatory clauses. It is very noticeable that in the oldest manuscript of the oldest commentary (by Fortunatus) on this Creed (preserved at Oxford) the particular clause which you have quoted, the second verse, is left out altogether in Waterland. Do you yourself really believe in the sentence of sweeping condemnation contained in this verse, as *ordinarily* interpreted, in the most *obvious* and *natural* sense of the words? Have you not also reservations of your own, though not, perhaps, as extensive as mine, by which you would except innumerable cases from the judgment here pronounced, which at first sight would seem to be included in one general doom of endless, irremediable woe? I am sure that nine clergymen out of ten have, and, at all events, that they will not dare to take this sentence of the Creed into the pulpit, and preach the doctrine which its words, taken in their most simple and natural sense, obviously contain.

With respect to Rom. ix. 5, it is strange that one of the first advocates for the view which I have taken was Erasmus, no contemptible Greek scholar, I believe, and the first objector to it was Socinus himself. Whatever may be the faults of Professor Jowett, yet as Regius Professor of Greek, he must be allowed to have some voice in a grammatical question of this kind, and he is with me in adopting Lachmann's reading. I have

little doubt that this is the true view of the Apostle's meaning. The explanation which I have given of the connection in which the words stand accounts fully, to my own judgment, for the participle and the position of the adjective, and the whole sentence expresses in fewer words the utterance of Job: "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away," *eie to onoma Kuriou eulogeme non*, just as well as S. Paul says, *ho on epi panton, theos, eulogetus eis touse ionas*, "He who is over all, who orders all, is God, blessed for ever!" The translation I have given in the book is grammatical, but I prefer now the above *theos* without the article, as in Heb. iii. 4.

That God may guide us both in the path of duty, and teach us to buy the truth, at all cost, is the fervent prayer of,

My dear Brother,

Yours ever affectionately,

J. W. NATAL.

P.S.—I was ordained deacon and priest by the late Bishop of Ely, who required candidates for holy orders to pay special attention to the "Lectures in Divinity" of Dr. Hey, formerly Norrisian Professor of Divinity for many years at Cambridge. Upon my consecration to the See of Natal, I received a present of books from the University, printed at the University Press, among which are "Hey's Lectures in Divinity, two volumes," which has been recently reprinted, and is still considered, therefore, to be a standard book. A great portion of the work is occupied with the Articles; and, turning to one or two of them, I find a strange resemblance between his language and some parts of my teaching, to which you have so strongly objected.

Thus, on the eternal world and the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, he writes as follows, vol. i. page 47: "The meaning (of these clauses) is, whoever accepts a message really sent from Heaven must find some benefit from it; whoever rejects such message must at least suffer the *loss of that benefit;* but he may, moreover, have positive punishment inflicted upon him, because of his rejecting what God gave him sufficient opportunity to accept."

Page 49. "Being saved, and being damned or condemned, do not imply any one fixed degree of happiness or misery; but admit of various degrees without limit. . . . Nor is any great degree necessarily implied in the word 'everlasting,' taken singly. Indeed, every *fine* [that is, as the former quotation shows, every loss of blessing], however small, is an everlasting punishment. (Comp. my book, page 184. "As we certainly do," etc.)

Page 50. "It may possibly happen that a man may disbelieve and reject the truth itself, and yet not be condemned to any great positive evil, if God knows that his disbelief is owing to some extraordinary want of means of information."

Page 52. "The word 'punish' admits of degrees, as well as 'saved' and 'damned.' [If so, Dr. Hey admits all that I have said; for there can be no degrees in the horror of utter, irremediable loss of all hope of ever seeing one ray of the glory and goodness of God.] It is probably used either as an equivalent to damned, or as being somewhat *less harsh*."

Page 53. "Though any man may say I must be careful how I reject *truth*, because if I do I shall suffer; though any minister has authority to say, you must be very careful how you reject *truth*: yet no man ought to make himself unhappy, as if he must, of course, be damned for misbelieving the tenets of a certain *creed*."

I hope I may now conclude that a mind not tinctured with superstition or religous fear will be able to supply such *rational limitations* to the *general threatenings* of our Creed, as to judge them harmless in all situations and useful in many—that their tendency is, when terror does not discompose the judgment, to make men *prove* all things, "and *not to accept even the doctrines of the Creed itself implicitly*, lest in accepting anything erroneous they should eventually reject the truth."

As regards the atonement, Dr. Hey sums up his statement of the doctrine in one short proposition, namely (page 187), "God will make sincere Christians eternally happy, notwithstanding some imperfections of theirs, on account of the *merits*, the sufferings, and the death of Christ."

From page 183, taken in connection with the above, it is clear that he does not hold the suffering of our Lord as *vicarious*, in your sense of the word.

"A person may prevent the punishment of another, even by suffering, and yet that suffering not be vicarious. Suppose that a deserter's brother had, by getting maimed and receiving wounds, never perfectly curable, saved a citadel or the life of a commander, and was to solicit for a remission of the deserter's punishment, urging that he wanted no gold or silver for his past services, but only that his brother should that once escape pain. If his petition was granted, he would relieve another, and in a good measure by his sufferings, but yet he could not be said to suffer vicarious evil or punishment; his brother's escape might be conceived as owing to his *merits*, or to be given to him as a reward."

Page 184. "A term much in use in discussions about the Atonement is *satisfaction*. It seems sometimes to mislead. . . . The doctrine of satisfaction implies that God *must* execute justice, so we call inflicting punishment. . . . . Justice is a good quality, therefore a perfect Deity has it for an attribute; therefore, the offender *must* be *punished*. No resource? Why, yes, a corporal punishment may be changed into a *fine*, or A may bear the fine which B has incurred. Why not even a personal punishment? Whichever is punished, the heinousness of the crime is published, and the terrors of justice displayed. In short, a man may be punished by substitute, and then justice will be *satisfied; satisfaction* will be made: there will be an 'atonement' to appease the divine wrath. Thus are men's thoughts apt to run on; and thus is the doctrine of *satisfaction* established. But I think

some expressions in the train are taken as meaning more than they do mean," etc.

Page 186. "The notion of satisfaction, the notion of satisfying divine justice, conceived to be under the necessity of punishing rigorously the sins of mankind, brings in what appears to me a still more difficult doctrine,—I mean that of imputation of sin to Christ. . . . It is a something wholly inconceivable, and only spoken of in order to keep the *theory of satisfying divine justice* entire and compact; though, as far as I can judge, that theory which cannot be supported without terms out of which all meaning must be thrown, should answer some *useful* purpose." He adds in a note, "If all this is to support our popular notion of *satisfaction*, it might as well be set aside."

Page 187. "The Christian is always to consider God, not as acting arbitrarily, but as the rewarder of virtue and the punisher of evil, in which character it pleases His Infinite Wisdom and Goodness to give the inestimable privilege to Christians in a manner perfectly *gratuitous* with *some view to the sufferings, the conduct, the merits of His Son.*"

Appendix VII.—Vol. II. p. 105.

In the Name of God, Amen.

We, Robert, by Divine permission Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan, do hereby make known that,—

Whereas the Bishop of the See of Natal is declared in the Letters-Patent issued to us, under Her Majesty's sign-manual, on the 8th day of December, 1853, to be subject and subordinate to the See of Cape Town, and to the Bishop thereof, in the same manner as any Bishop and See in the Province of Canterbury is under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that Province, and the Archbishop of the same:

And whereas, further, it is provided in the said Letters-Patent that in case any proceedings should be instituted against the said Bishop of Natal, such proceeding should originate and be carried on before us; and whereas we are, by the same Letters-Patent, directed and authorised to take cognisance of such proceedings:

And whereas at the time of the appointment and consecration of the Right Reverend John William Colenso, the Bishop of Natal, the said Bishop of Natal did voluntarily recognise and submit himself to the provisions of the said Letters-Patent, and did accept the said office of Bishop of Natal under the said provisions, and did then solemnly profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, and to his successors, and did thereafter, in due accordance with such promise and profession, continue to submit himself to our jurisdiction as such Metropolitan, and from the said promise and profession hath never been relieved:

And whereas, on the 12th day of May last, the Very Rev. the Dean of Cape Town, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, and the Venerable the Archdeacon of George, did lay before us, as such Metropolitan, in writing, certain charges against the said Right Rev. John William Colenso,—firstly, of having promulgated opinions which contravene and subvert the Catholic faith as defined and expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and the Formularies of the Book of Common Prayer of the United Church of England and Ireland; and, secondly, of having depraved, impugned, and otherwise brought into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer, particularly portions of the Ordinal and Baptismal Services, and of having thus violated the law of the United Church of England and Ireland, as contained in the 36th of the Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical; and the said Dean and Archdeacons did then declare themselves ready to prove the said charges, and to claim our judgment thereon:

And whereas we did, thereafter, on the 18th of May last, cause the said Bishop of Natal be cited to appear before us on the 17th day of November following, in the Cathedral Church of Cape Town, to answer the said charges:

And whereas, on the said 17th day of November, we did, as such Metropolitan aforesaid, hold a Court in the said Cathedral Church, having previously invited certain of the Bishops of this Province to be present as Assessors, and the Bishops of Graham's Town and of the Orange Free State being then present with us, as such Assessors:

And whereas on the said 17th day of November the said Bishop of Natal appeared by his agent, and did then, as well by his said agent as also in a letter addressed to us, admit the service of the said citation upon him, and his knowledge of the charges he was called upon to answer; and did further, in answer to the said charges—firstly, offer a protest against our jurisdiction; secondly, did submit certain matters of defence to the said charges; and thirdly, did intimate to us his intention of appealing if we should proceed to the delivery of a judgment, and such judgment should be adverse to him:

And whereas we did then refuse to regard the said protest, and did proceed to the hearing of the charges brought as aforesaid:

And whereas the aforesaid Dean and Archdeacons did then, in open Court, submit to our judgment certain extracts from two works, alleged to have been written and published by the said Bishop of Natal,—to wit: "S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, newly translated and explained from a Missionary Point of View," and Parts I. and II. of the "Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined;" copies of which extracts had been before served upon the said Bishop of Natal, with the citation aforesaid, and of which extracts other copies are hereunto annexed, and herewith recorded.

And whereas, after hearing the said Dean and Archdeacons, and duly considering the matters of defence submitted as aforesaid, and after due consultation with the said Bishops of Graham's Town and the Orange Free State, present with us as Assessors, we have found it sufficiently proved

that certain of the said extracts, to wit, those of them arranged under the heads of the Schedule I. to Schedule VIII., do contain opinions, as charged, which contravene and subvert the Catholic Faith, as defined and expressed in the thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the Formularies of the Book of Common Prayer of the United Church of England and Ireland; and certain other extracts, to wit, those arranged under Schedule IX., do, in substance, deprave, impugn, and bring into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer:

And whereas it was further duly proved that the works from which the said extracts have been taken were published both in this Province and elsewhere, with the knowledge and by the authority and consent of the said Bishop of Natal:

Now therefore, we, in the exercise of our jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby sentence, adjudge, and decree the said Bishop of Natal to be deposed from the said office as such Bishop, and to be further prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the Metropolitical Province of Cape Town.

But inasmuch as the said Bishop of Natal is not personally present, and we desire to afford him sufficient opportunity of retracting and recalling the extracts aforesaid, before this sentence shall take effect, we do suspend the operation of the said sentence, for the purpose of such retractation, until the 16th day of April next; and we hereby decree and order, that if on or before the 4th day of March next the said Bishop of Natal shall have filed of record with Douglas Dubois, of Doctor's Commons, in the city of London, proctor, solicitor, and notary public, our commissary in England, at his office, 7 Godliman Street, Doctors' Commons, London, a full, unconditional, and absolute retractation, in writing, of all the extracts aforesaid; or otherwise shall have, before the 16th day of April next, filled with the Registrar of this Diocese, at his office in Cape Town, such full, unconditional, and absolute retractation and recall of the said extracts, then, in either case, on the day of such filing, this sentence shall become null and void; but if, on the said 16th day of April next, no such retractation shall have been recorded in manner above set forth, then the said sentence shall be of full force and effect, and shall be published, so soon as convenient after the said 16th day of April, in all the Churches of the Diocese of Natal, and in the several Cathedral Churches of the province of Cape Town.

In testimony whereof, we have hereunto caused our Episcopal Seal to be affixed, and do subscribe our hand, in open Court, this Sixteenth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, in the Cathedral Church of S. George, and do deliver the same to the Registrar of the Diocese to be duly recorded.

(Signed) R. CAPETOWN (L.S.)

APPENDIX VIII.—Vol. II. p. 191.

JUDGMENT of the LORDS of the JUDICIAL COMMITTEE of the PRIVY COUNCIL upon the Petition of the LORD BISHOP of NATAL, referred to the Judicial Committee by Her Majesty's Order in Council of the 10th June, 1864; delivered 20th March, 1865.

Present—Lord Chancellor; Lord Cranworth; Lord Kingsdown; Dean of the Arches; Master of the Rolls.

The Bishop of Natal and the Bishop of Cape Town (who are the parties to this proceeding) are ecclesiastical Persons who have been created Bishops by the Queen, in the exercise of her authority as Sovereign of this realm and Head of the Established Church.

These Bishops were consecrated under Mandate from the Queen by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the manner prescribed by the law of England.

They received and hold their dioceses under grants made by the Crown. Their status, therefore, both ecclesiastical and temporal, must be ascertained and defined by the law of England; and it is plain that their legal existence depends on acts which have no validity or effect except on the basis of the supremacy of the Crown.

Further, their respective and relative rights and liabilities must be determined by the principles of English law applied to the construction of the grants to them contained in the Letters-Patent; for they are the creatures of English law, and dependent on that law for their existence, rights, and attributes.

We must treat the parties before us as standing on this foundation, and on no other.

The Letters-Patent by which Dr. Gray was appointed Bishop of Cape Town and also Metropolitan, passed the Great Seal on the 8th December, 1853. These Letters-Patent recited, among other things, that it had "been represented to Her Majesty by the Archbishop of Canterbury that the then existing see or diocese of Cape Town was of inconvenient extent, and that for the due spiritual care and superintendence of the religious interests of the inhabitants thereof, and for the maintenance of the doctrine and discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland within the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies, and the Island of Saint Helena, it was desirable and expedient that the same should be divided into three (or more) distinct and separate sees or dioceses, to be styled the Bishopric of Cape Town, the Bishopric of Graham's Town, and the Bishopric of Natal—the Bishops of the said several sees of Graham's Town and Natal and their successors to be subject and subordinate to the see of Cape Town and to the Bishop thereof and his successors, in the same manner as any bishop of any see within the Province of Canterbury was under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that province and the Archbishop of the same;" and the Letters-Patent contained the following passages :—

"And we do further will and ordain that the said Right Reverend Father in God, Robert Gray, Bishop of the said See of Cape Town, and his successors the Bishops thereof for the time being, shall be and be deemed and taken to be the Metropolitan Bishop in our Colony of the Cape of Good Hope and its dependencies, and our Island of Saint Helena, subject nevertheless to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and subordinate to the Archiepiscopal See of the Province of Canterbury; and we will and ordain that the said Bishops of Graham's Town and Natal respectively shall be Suffragan Bishops to the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors. And we will and grant to the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors full power and authority, as Metropolitan of the Cape of Good Hope and of the Island of Saint Helena, to perform all functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of Metropolitan within the limits of the said Sees of Graham's Town and Natal, and to exercise *Metropolitan jurisdiction* over the Bishops of the said Sees and their successors, and over all archdeacons, dignitaries, and all other chaplains, ministers, priests, and deacons in holy orders of the United Church of England and Ireland within the limits of the said dioceses. And we do by these presents give and grant unto the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors full power and authority to visit once in five years, or oftener if occasion shall require, as well the said several Bishops and their successors, as all dignitaries and other chaplains, ministers, priests, and deacons in holy orders of the United Church of England and Ireland resident in the said dioceses, for correcting and supplying the defects of the said Bishops and their successors, with all and all manner of visitorial jurisdiction, power, and coercion.

"And we do hereby authorise and empower the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors to inhibit during any such visitation of the said dioceses the exercise of all or of such part or parts of the ordinary jurisdiction of the said Bishops or their successors as to him the said Bishop of Cape Town or his successors shall seem expedient, and during the time of such visitation to exercise by himself or themselves, or his or their commissaries, such powers, functions, and jurisdictions in and over the said dioceses as the Bishops thereof might have exercised if they had not been inhibited from exercising the same.

"And we do further ordain and declare that if any person against whom a judgment or decree shall be pronounced by the said Bishops or their successors, or their commissary or commissaries, shall conceive himself to be aggrieved by such sentence, it shall be lawful for such person to appeal to the said Bishop of Cape Town or his successors, provided such appeal be entered within fifteen days after such sentence shall have been pronounced.

"And we do give and grant to the said Bishop of Cape Town and his successors full power and authority finally to decree and determine the said appeals.

"And we do further will and ordain that in case any proceeding shall be instituted against any of the said Bishops of Graham's Town and Natal, when placed under the said Metropolitical See of Cape Town, such pro-

ceedings shall originate and be carried on before the said Bishop of Cape Town, whom we hereby authorise and direct to take cognisance of the same. . . . .

"And if any party shall conceive himself aggrieved by any judgment, decree, or sentence pronounced by the said Bishop of Cape Town or his successors, either in case of such review or in any cause originally instituted before the said Bishop or his successors, it shall be lawful for the said party to appeal to the said Archbishop of Canterbury or his successors, who shall finally decide and determine the said appeal."

The Letters-Patent which constituted the See of Natal and appointed the Appellant to that See, were sealed and bear date on the 23d November, 1853, fifteen days before the grant of the Letters-Patent to the Bishop of Cape Town.

The Letters-Patent creating the See of Natal recited the Patent of September, 1847, which created the original diocese of Cape Town, and appointed Dr. Gray the Bishop thereof, and that he had since resigned the office of Bishop of Cape Town, whereby the said See had become and was then vacant. The Patent also recited that it was expedient and desirable that the said diocese should be divided into three or more distinct and separate dioceses, to be styled the Bishoprics of Cape Town, Graham's Town, and Natal, the Bishops of the said several Sees of Graham's Town and Natal to be subject and subordinate to the See of Cape Town, and the Bishop thereof and his successors, in the same manner as any Bishop of any See within the Province of Canterbury was under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that Province and the Archbishop of the same; and the Letters-Patent proceeded to erect, found, make, ordain, and constitute the district of Natal, to be a distinct and separate Bishop's See and Diocese, to be called the Bishopric of Natal. And after appointing Dr. Colenso to be the Bishop of the said See, and granting that the said Bishop of Natal and his successors should be a body corporate, the Letters-Patent contained the following passage:—

"And we do further ordain and declare that the said Bishop of Natal and his successors shall be subject and subordinate to the See of Cape Town, and to the Bishop thereof and his successors, in the same manner as any Bishop of any See within the Province of Canterbury, in our Kingdom of England, is under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that Province, and of the Archbishop of the same: and we do hereby further will and ordain that the said John William Colenso, and every Bishop of Natal, shall, within six months after the date of their respective Letters-Patent, take an oath of due obedience to the Bishop of Cape Town for the time being, as his Metropolitan, which oath shall and may be ministered unto him by the said Archbishop, or by any person by him duly appointed or authorised for that purpose."

The Letters-Patent then proceeded to confer on the Bishop of Natal and his successors Episcopal jurisdiction and authority over all rectors, curates, ministers, chaplains, priests, and deacons within the diocese, and directed that, if any party should conceive himself aggrieved by any judg-

ment, decree, or sentence pronounced by the Bishop of Natal or his successors, he should have an appeal to the Bishop of Cape Town, who should finally decide and determine the appeal.

Under these Letters-Patent the Appellant was consecrated on the 30th November, 1853, and he took on oath of canonical obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, which oath was administered to him by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was in these words:—"I, John William Colenso, Doctor in Divinity, appointed Bishop of the See and Diocese of Natal, do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town and to his successors, and to the Metropolitan Church of S. George, Cape Town." At this time there was not in reality any Metropolitan See of Cape Town, or any Bishop thereof, in existence.

These several Letters-Patent were not granted, in pursuance of any Orders or Order made by Her Majesty in Council, nor were they made by virtue of any statute of the Imperial Parliament, nor were they confirmed by any Act of the Legislature of the Cape of Good Hope or of the Legislative Council of Natal.

Previously to these Letters-Patent being granted, the District of Natal had been erected into a distinct and separate Government; and, by Letters-Patent granted by the Crown in 1847, it was ordained that it should have a Legislative Council which should have power to make such laws and ordinances as might be required for the peace, order, and good government of the district. With respect to the Cape of Good Hope, by Letters-Patent dated 23rd May, 1850, it was declared and ordained by Her Majesty that there should be within the Settlement of the Cape of Good Hope a Parliament, which should be holden by the Governor, and should consist of the Governor, a Legislative Council, and a House of Assembly, and that such Parliament should have authority to make laws for the peace, welfare, and good government of the settlement.

In the year 1863 certain charges of heresy and false doctrine were preferred against the Appellant before the Bishop of Cape Town as Metropolitan, and, upon these charges, the Bishop of Cape Town, claiming to exercise jurisdiction as Metropolitan, did, on the 16th day of December, 1863, sentence, adjudge, and decree the Appellant, the Bishop of Natal, to be deposed from his office as such Bishop, and to be further prohibited from the exercise of any Divine office within any part of the Metropolitan Province of Cape Town. In pronouncing this Decree, the Bishop of Cape Town claimed to exercise jurisdiction as Metropolitan by virtue of his Letters-Patent, and of the office thereby conferred on him, and as having thereby acquired legal authority to try and condemn the Appellant; and the Appellant protested against such assumption of jurisdiction.

This sentence and Decree of Dr. Gray as Metropolitan has been published and promulgated in the Diocese of Natal, and the Clergy of that Diocese have been thereby prohibited from yielding obedience to the Appellant as Bishop of Natal.

In this state of things three principal questions arise, and have been

argued before us: First, Were the Letters-Patent of the 8th December, 1853, by which Dr. Gray was appointed Metropolitan, and a Metropolitan See or Province was expressed to be created, valid and good in law? Secondly, Supposing the ecclesiastical relation of Metropolitan and Suffragan to have been created, was the grant of coercive authority and jurisdiction expressed by the Letters-Patent to be thereby made to the Metropolitan valid and good in law? Thirdly, Can the oath of canonical obedience taken by the Appellant to the Bishop of Cape Town, and his consent to accept his See as part of the Metropolitan Province of Cape Town, confer any jurisdiction or authority on the Bishop of Cape Town by which this sentence of deprivation of the Bishopric of Natal can be supported?

With respect to the first question, we apprehend it to be clear, upon principle, that after the establishment of an independent Legislature in the Settlements of the Cape of Good Hope and Natal, there was no power in the Crown by virtue of its Prerogative (for these Letters-Patent were not granted under the provisions of any Statute) to establish a Metropolitan See or Province, or to create an Ecclesiastical Corporation, whose status, rights, and authority the Colony could be required to recognise.

After a Colony or Settlement has received legislative institutions, the Crown (subject to the special provisions of any Act of Parliament) stands in the same relation to that Colony or Settlement as it does to the United Kingdom.

It may be true that the Crown as legal Head of the Church has a right to command the consecration of a Bishop, but it has no power to assign him any diocese, or give him any sphere of action within the United Kingdom. The United Church of England and Ireland is not a part of the Constitution in any Colonial Settlement, nor can its authorities or those who bear office in it claim to be recognised by the law of the Colony, otherwise than as the members of a voluntary association.

The course which legislation has taken on this subject is a strong proof of the correctness of these conclusions. In the year 1813 it was deemed expedient to establish a Bishopric in the East Indies (then under the Government of the East India Company), and although the Bishop was appointed and consecrated under the authority of the Crown, yet it was thought necessary to obtain the sanction of the Legislature and that an Act of Parliament should be passed to give the Bishop legal status and authority. Accordingly, by Statute 53 Geo. III. c. 155, sec. 49, it was enacted that in case it should please His Majesty by His Royal Letters-Patent to erect, found, and constitute one Bishopric for the whole of the British territories in the East Indies and parts therein mentioned, a certain salary should be paid to the Bishop by the East India Company; and by the 51st and 52nd sections it was enacted that such Bishop should not have or use any jurisdiction, or exercise any episcopal functions whatsoever but such as should be limited to him by Letters-Patent, and that it should be lawful for his Majesty, by Letters-Patent, to grant to such bishop such ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the exercise of such episcopal functions within the East Indies and parts aforesaid as His Majesty should think necessary

for administering holy ceremonies, and for the superintendence and good government of the ministers of the Church establishment within the East Indies and parts aforesaid. Subsequently, in the year 1833, it was deemed right to found two additional Bishoprics, one at Madras and the other at Bombay, and again an Act of Parliament (3 and 4 Wm. IV. c. 86) was passed, by the 93rd section of which it was enacted in like manner that the Crown should have power to grant to such Bishops within their dioceses ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and it was also enacted and declared that the Bishop of Calcutta should be Metropolitan in India, and should have as such all such jurisdiction as the Crown should by Letters-Patent direct, subject, nevertheless, to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and it was provided that the Bishops of Madras and Bombay should be subject to the Bishop of Calcutta as Metropolitan, and should take an oath of canonical obedience to him.

So again, when in 1824 a Bishop was appointed in Jamaica by Letters-Patent containing clauses similar to those which are found in the Letters-Patent to the present Appellant, it was thought necessary that the legal status and authority of the Bishop should be confirmed and established by an Act of the Colonial Legislature. The consent of the Crown was given to this Colonial Act, which would have been an improper thing, as an injury to the Crown's Prerogative, unless the Law Advisers of the Government had been satisfied that the Colonial Statute was necessary to give full effect to the establishment of the Bishopric.

The conclusion is further confirmed by observing the course of Imperial legislation on the same subject, namely, the creation of new Bishoprics in England.

When four new Bishoprics were constituted by Henry VIII. it appears to have been thought necessary, even by that absolute Monarch, to have recourse to the authority of Parliament, and the Act that was passed (viz. the 31 Henry VIII. cap. 9, which is not found in the ordinary edition) is of a singular character. After referring to the slothful and ungodly life which had been used among all those which bore the name of religious folk, and reciting that it was thought, therefore, unto the King's Highness most expedient and necessary that more Bishoprics, Collegiate and Cathedral Churches should be established, it was enacted that His Highness should have full power and authority from time to time to declare and nominate by his Letters-Patent or other writing to be made under his Great Seal, such number of Bishops, such number of Cities, Sees for Bishops, Cathedral Churches and Dioceses by metes and bounds, for the exercise and ministration of their episcopal offices and administration as shall appertain, and to endow them with such possessions after such manner, form, and condition as to his most excellent wisdom shall be thought necessary and convenient.

This Statute, which was repealed by the 1st and 2nd of Philip and Mary, cap. 8, sec. 18, does not appear to have been revived. It is remarkable as granting power to nominate and appoint new Bishops as well as to create new Sees and Dioceses.

So also in recent times the two new Bishoprics of Manchester and Ripon were constituted, and the new Bishops received ecclesiastical jurisdiction, under the authority of an Act of Parliament. It is true that it has been the practice, for many years, to insert in Letters-Patent creating Colonial Bishoprics clauses which purport to confer ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but the forms of such Letters-Patent were probably taken by the official persons who prepared them from the original forms used in the Letters-Patent appointing the East Indian Bishops, without adverting to the fact that such last-mentioned Letters-Patent were granted under the provisions of an Act of Parliament.

We therefore arrive at the conclusion that although in a Crown Colony, properly so called, or in cases where the Letters-Patent are made in pursuance of the authority of an Act of Parliament (such for example as the Act of 6 and 7 Vict., cap. 13), a Bishopric may be constituted and ecclesiastical jurisdiction conferred by the sole authority of the Crown, yet that the Letters-Patent of the Crown will not have any such effect or operation in a Colony or Settlement which is possessed of an independent legislature.

The subject was considered by the Judicial Committee in the case of Long *v.* the Bishop of Cape Town, and we adhere to the principles which are there laid down.

The same reasoning is of course decisive of the second question, whether any jurisdiction was conferred by the Letters-Patent. Let it be granted or assumed that the Letters-Patent are sufficient in law to confer on Dr. Gray the ecclesiastical status of Metropolitan, and to create between him and the Bishops of Natal and Graham's Town the personal relation of Metropolitan and Suffragan as ecclesiastics, yet it is quite clear that the Crown had no power to confer any jurisdiction or coercive legal authority upon the Metropolitan over the Suffragan Bishops, or over any other person.

It is a settled constitutional principle or rule of law, that although the Crown may by its Prerogative establish Courts to proceed according to the Common Law, yet that it cannot create any new Court to administer any other law; and it is laid down by Lord Coke in the 4th Institute that the erection of a new Court with a new jurisdiction cannot be without an Act of Parliament.

It cannot be said that any ecclesiastical tribunal or jurisdiction is required in any Colony or Settlement where there is no Established Church, and in the case of a settled Colony the Ecclesiastical Law of England cannot, for the same reason, be treated as part of the law which the settlers carried with them from the mother country.

So much of the Letters-Patent now in question as attempts to confer any coercive legal jurisdiction is also in violation of the law as declared and established by that part of the Act of the 16 Car. I. c. 11, which remains unrepealed by the 13 Car. II. st. 2, c. 12. It may be useful to state this in detail. By the 16th and 17th sections of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, entitled "An Act for restoring to the Crown the ancient Jurisdiction over the State Eccesiastical and Spiritual, and abolishing all Foreign Power repugnant to the same," it was enacted that all usurped and foreign power and authority,

spiritual and temporal, should for ever be extinguished within the Realm, and that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority had theretofore been or might lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, should for ever be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm. And by the 18th section the Queen was empowered by Letters-Patent to appoint persons to exercise, occupy, use, and execute all manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, or any other the dominions and countries of the Crown.

Under this Statute the High Commission Court was erected, which was abolished by the 16 Car. I. c. 10.

By the Act of the 16 Car. I. c. 11, the 18th section of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, was wholly repealed, and by the 4th section of the same Statute all spiritual and ecclesiastical persons or judges were forbidden under severe penalties to exercise any jurisdiction or coercive legal authority, an enactment which closed all the regular established ecclesiastical tribunals; but by the 13 Car. II. c. 12, the ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction and authority, as it existed before the year 1639, was with certain savings restored to the Archbishops and Bishops; and the Act of the 16 Car. I. excepting what concerned the High Commission Court or the erection of any such like Court by Commission was repealed, but with a proviso that nothing should extend or be construed to revive or give force to the enactments contained in the 18th section of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, which should remain and stand repealed.

There is therefore no power in the Crown to create any new or additional ecclesiastical tribunal or jurisdiction, and the clauses which purport to do so, contained in the Letters-Patent to the Appellant and Respondent, are simply void in law. No Metropolitan or Bishop in any Colony having legislative institutions can, by virtue of the Crown's Letters-Patent alone (unless granted under an Act of Parliament, or confirmed by a Colonial Statute), exercise any coercive jurisdiction, or hold any Court or Tribunal for that purpose.

Pastoral or spiritual authority may be incidental to the office of Bishop, but all jurisdiction in the Church, where it can be lawfully conferred, must proceed from the Crown, and be exercised as the law directs, and suspension or privation of office is matter of coercive legal jurisdiction, and not of mere spiritual authority.

3. If, then, the Bishop of Cape Town had no jurisdiction by law, did he obtain any by contract or submission on the part of the Bishop of Natal?

There is nothing on which such an argument can be attempted to be put, unless it be the oath of canonical obedience taken by the Bishop of Natal to Dr. Gray as Metropolitan.

The argument must be, that both parties being aware that the Bishop

of Cape Town had no jurisdiction or legal authority as Metropolitan, the Appellant agreed to give it to him by voluntary submission.

But even if the parties intended to enter into any such agreement (of which, however, we find no trace), it was not legally competent to the Bishop of Natal to give, or to the Bishop of Cape Town to accept or exercise, any such jurisdiction.

There remains one point to be considered. It was contended before us that if the Bishop of Cape Town had no jurisdiction, his judgment was a nullity, and that no appeal could lie from a nullity to Her Majesty in Council.

But that is by no means the consequence of holding that the Respondent had no jurisdiction. The Bishop of Cape Town, acting under the authority which the Queen's Letters-Patent purported to give, asserts that he has held a Court of Justice, and that with certain legal forms he has pronounced a judicial sentence, and that by such sentence he has deposed the Bishop of Natal from his office of Bishop, and deprived him of his See. He also asserts that the sentence having been published in the Diocese of Natal, the clergy and inhabitants of that diocese are thereby deprived of all Episcopal superintendence. Whether these proceedings have the effect which is attributed to them by the Bishop of Cape Town, is a question of the greatest importance, and one which we feel bound to decide. We have already shown that there was no power to confer any jurisdiction on the Respondent as Metropolitan. The attempt to give Appellate jurisdiction to the Archbishop of Canterbury is equally invalid.

This important question can be decided only by the Sovereign as Head of the Established Church and depository of the ultimate Appellate jurisdiction.

Before the Reformation, in a dispute of this nature between two independent prelates, an appeal would have lain to the Pope; but all appellate authority of the Pope over members of the Established Church is by Statute vested in the Crown.

It is the settled prerogative of the Crown to receive Appeals in all Colonial causes, and by the 25 Henry VIII. c. 19 (by which the mode of the Appeal to the Crown in Ecclesiastical Causes is directed) it is by the 4th section enacted that "for lack of justice at or in any of the Courts of the Archbishops of this Realm, *or in any of the King's dominions*, it shall be lawful to the parties grieved to appeal to the King's Majesty in the Court of Chancery," an enactment which gave rise to the Commission of Delegates, for which this Tribunal is now substituted.

Unless a controversy, such as that which is presented by this Appeal and Petition, falls to be determined by the ultimate jurisdiction of the Crown, it is plain that there would be a denial of justice, and no remedy for great public inconvenience and mischief. It is right to add, although unnecessary, that by the Act 3 and 4 Wm. IV. cap. 41, which constituted this Tribunal, Her Majesty has power to refer to the Judicial Committee for hearing or consideration any such other matters whatsoever as Her Majesty shall think fit, and this Committee is thereupon to hear or