all difficulties from the path of Bishop Gray. His partial condemnation, or his acquittal, would have removed all responsibility from those persons in Natal who spoke of the paramount need of maintaining the Catholic faith. These persons would have seen at once what was or was not permissible within the limits of the Church of England, and would have submitted themselves to the laws of that Church, unless they chose to form themselves into an entirely distinct society. Otherwise it is not easy to see how any greater hardship would have been imposed on Bishop Gray, Dean Green, and their adherents, than was imposed in England on the Bishop of Exeter by the acquittal of Mr. Gorham, or on the Bishop of Salisbury by that of Dr. Rowland Williams. But from the first Bishop Gray was resolved that he would under no circumstances face the possibility of any such contingency. The carrying of this case before the Judicial Committee was for him equivalent to an unconditional surrender of what he called the faith of the Church. He declared, and seemed to glory in declaring, that he rejected the decisions of that tribunal; and he had no greater hesitation in saying that he could not concur in some of the rulings of the judge in the Arches Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury—in other words, with the rulings of the Primate himself. He held before himself and before his supporters the idea of some society which maintained, and would maintain indefectibly, what he spoke of as the Catholic faith; and to this society he professed to believe that he and they belonged. The idea was a dream, which could not fail to be dissolved by the rude test of experience; and its only effect would be to perpetuate the divisions which it was designed to heal. If some apparent realisation of it might be found in orthodox or Latin Christendom, it was useless to look for it in the body known to English law as the Church of England.

Bishop Gray thus threw away the only hope of making
peace. It was not true that because either clergy or laity admitted the authority of a Bishop they were in any way whatever bound by his opinions, and could be supposed to have the least complicity with or responsibility for them. The egregious absurdity of Bishop Gray's position lay in this, that he chose to fasten on those who might take part in the worship of God with Bishop Colenso the guilt involved in holding that the Book of Deuteronomy may have been, and probably was, written in the time of Manasseh or Josiah. Among the clergy and laity who were called together for the purpose of electing a Bishop for what was called the vacant see, there were some who were ready to acknowledge Bishop Colenso's jurisdiction, while they professed to have the extremest horror of his teaching. If they could so speak after the intemperate language used and the extravagant judgement pronounced in the Metropolitical Court of Capetown, how much greater would have been the likelihood of peace if the whole question had been submitted to the sober and careful handling of the Sovereign in Council? The fault of Bishop Gray, and (except from his own narrow ecclesiastical view) his fatal blunder, was the determination that, come what might, into the hands of the Crown the decision should never pass; and the result is that his adherents are committed to a modified Hildebrandine theory which in practice can be fruitful only of dissension, estrangement, and ill-will.

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"DURBAN, October 20, 1866.

"I am here at the port for a few days, detained by our spring rains (which have now begun in earnest), and so prevented from running down the coast, as I had designed, to visit a place where, however, there is no Church population of any consequence, but chiefly scattered residents among whom I have some warm friends, and whom I must now reserve
for another trip. I have gone over the most important ground, however, . . . . with very satisfactory results. I have been everywhere most heartily received; and any attempt at opposition has only served to intensify the feeling of sympathy on my side; . . . . and whether from real feeling in favour of my views or determined opposition to those of Bishop Gray and the Dean, I may now, I think, fairly say that the whole mass of the community are with me.

"At this moment two important steps are being taken on my side, in order to obviate, if possible, the systematic deception which has been practised on the English public by reports sent home. In Maritzburg an address is being largely signed to the Bishop of Oxford, demanding the name of his clerical informant, out here, who has so grossly libelled my congregations. . . . . At Durban, again, there is, I believe, a very decided memorial in preparation, which will probably be signed very numerously and respectfully throughout the whole colony, protesting against the attempt to elect a new Bishop, which, it is believed, is to be made on the 24th instant at Maritzburg.¹ It seems the Dean's visit to the coast was expressly on this account—to try to get beforehand the assent of the coast clergy to this measure. But in this, if report speaks truly, he has signally failed. Mr. A——, whom you may remember as having made a warm speech in favour of Bishop Gray when he was here, and written a strong letter against me, . . . is now very friendly with me, and though still, as he said, differing wholly from my religious views, yet is determined to support my lawful authority. He is, in fact, one of the chief leaders of the Evangelical party here, and has a very wholesome dread of Bishop Gray's proceedings now, though at one moment, when the Bishop was here, beguiled into the

¹ This was the title finally selected for Dr. Macrorie. It must be remembered that Maritzburg is strictly the name of no place in Southern Africa. Legally, Maritzburg is non-existent. The town of Pietermaritzburg was constituted a city by the letters patent which nominated Bishop Colenso to the See of Natal.
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notion that he meant nothing—no Church of South Africa, no ecclesiastical despotism, which he dreads more than my teaching. In a long friendly talk which I had with him yesterday, he told me that most of the clergy are altogether opposed to the notion of electing a Bishop, and he mentioned by name ——, ———. . . . If these really stick to their decision, it will be ridiculous for the Dean . . . to do anything, though I am told he has said if he can only get two others to act with him . . . he will proceed to the election. If so, it will strengthen my hands materially; and I think the actual arrival of another Bishop would only intensify the general feeling in my favour. In fact, the Bishop of Lincoln was shrewd enough to see that the Bishop of Capetown's course has been the most suicidal possible. It has helped me splendidly through the only difficult part of my work. . . . The time is gone by now for a wiser course. I have met the members of my flock everywhere, in public and private, and the great body of them by personal contact seem to have lost all dread of my teaching in the pulpit. The policy would have been to put no obstacle in the way of my return, but to have urged the clergy everywhere to work upon the minds of their flocks; and such is the power of clerical influence: . . . that they might have raised at first a very formidable barrier to my gaining the ears of the people. But, in the desire of maintaining their pet ecclesiastical system of discipline they have done everything to smooth the way for me with a Protestant public possessed with an English love of fair play.

"To-day, for the first time, we learn that Cox is not to be the man, at the very moment when the Guardian has just brought us the account of Mr. Cox's having accepted 'the. appointment to the vacant see of Natal,' and notified to his parishioners in Hobarton his reasons for so doing. The information contained in to-day's Mercury that the new Bishop is to be Mr. Butler (I presume of Wantage) has no doubt emanated from the Dean. This change of persons after such definite notices about Mr. Cox will create, I
expect, fresh difficulties for the clergy, and deepen the resolve of the laity to have nothing to do with the matter.

"Mr. D—— has distinctly told me that, when he and T—— left England, they were instructed by the S.P.G. Secretary, Mr. Bullock (who said that the direction was authorised by the President, the Archbishop of Canterbury), not to take a licence either from me or Bishop Gray. Bishop Gray, of course, had no right to give any to a clergyman of my diocese. But here we find the Archbishop secretly sanctioning this direction, some months before the general meeting of the S.P.G. was held, at which the standing order was suspended with reference to Natal, and when that order, the voice of the Society, required their missionaries to receive my licence. And then the Archbishop has the assurance to rise in his place in Convocation, and say that all the clergy, with one exception, have refused to recognise my authority. This is really scandalous."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, October 29, 1866.

... "I completed my four Sundays of visitation, which I deferred as long as possible, waiting month after month for Lord Romilly's decision. At last, as it was plain it would not be given till after the vacation, I determined to go out at once; and circumstances have shown that I went out at the very nick of time, without the slightest idea of the importance of this visitation in the present juncture of affairs. The effect... was, partly through personal intercourse, partly through preaching, which disabused a number of prejudices, to rally round me more strongly than ever, the important population of the coast, having already sufficiently secured those of the interior. The crisis, however, has now arrived, when the value of this has been felt in the circumstances which have attended the recent election of a Bishop... Nothing was heard definitely upon this subject... until an advertisement appeared in the *Times*
of Natal of October 20, summoning a meeting of clergy and lay communicants for October 25 (with a proviso that the invitation was not addressed to any who recognised the authority of Bishop Colenso). But previous to this some private communications had been passing, which have now been made public by Mr. Lloyd. . . . The following occurs in a letter from Bishop Gray to Dean Green:—'I do not believe the Bishops will consecrate without an election. . . . I am strongly in favour of electing. Some urge waiting for the reply of Convocation, but I do not. The Archbishop forgot to lay our petition before that body in February, and very likely will not do so in May, for he evidently by recommending Mr. Cox thinks he has done all he has to do, and the Bishop of Oxford says, consecrate without alluding to Convocation. Procrastination is not good.' From Bishop Gray to Dean Green, May 13, 1866:—'The Archbishop, as requested by the Dean and Chapter, has done all in his power. The Bishops of the Province have done all they can do: the responsibility no longer rests with us. I hope there will be no hesitation or drawing back on the ground that I can do all that is needed for the present. Having secured another valuable man [Cox], who is recommended by the Primate of All England, I feel that henceforth I should be released from all personal responsibility as to the future, even if the address¹ which by this mail has been forwarded to me had not made my taking an active part in the administration of the diocese a matter of greater difficulty than before. Should he [Mr. Cox] be rejected, I think it will not be easy to find another qualified man willing to undertake so arduous and thankless an office. The Bishop of Grahamstown has been on the look-out for a whole year, while travelling through England and Ireland, and has not met with one who does not shrink from a position of so much difficulty and so full of discouragement. I confess that, if there is any holding back now, I shall myself tremble greatly for the future of your Church.'

¹ From the Natal laity, calling upon him to resign. See p. 28.
"To come now to the 'election' itself. . . . On October 12 Mr. Green wrote to Mr. Lloyd a letter which lies before me, and which was read out publicly at the Durban meeting. This letter is as follows (the italics are mine):—'The Metropolitan has written to me that he considers it to be my duty to summon all the clergy to consider the reply of Convocation; that all male communicants, certified by the clergy as such, should be invited to attend; that we should in their presence elect a Bishop, and then seek their concurrence; and lastly that the consent of himself and the Bishops of the Province be formally asked. I have also a letter from the Bishop of Grahamstown expressing his concurrence in the advice of the Metropolitan; and having, as you know, already had much consultation with others on the subject, I have determined on having Thursday, the 25th of October, for our meeting at Maritzburg to take into consideration and act upon the advice of Convocation. . . . Under the name of communicants please let it be distinctly understood that such as communicate with Dr. Colenso are not included, . . . and in order to make it perfectly clear to our fellow-colonists that the meeting is the private gathering of a voluntary association, and puts forth no claims to be anything different, I have, as I have already said, resolved on having a private room to meet in. . . .' "

"It would seem that Mr. Lloyd must have written to Mr. Green to complain that other clergy of the diocese had long ago been informed of what is going on, while he had been kept in ignorance, and only became aware of what is intended by communications reaching him from them. . . . To this Mr. Green replies as follows, October 15th:—'I wrote to you on the 12th, so you ought to have received mine at the time you wrote to me on the 13th. I hope ere this it has reached you. To those clergy who acknowledge the Metropolitan, I wrote some time back. I have not placed you, but you have placed yourself, in a position very different from them. Therefore, of course, I observe a different line towards you. Were I not to do so it would be making light both of your act and ours, and I do not wish to do that."
... Now how you can vote in the election of a man to be a suffragan Bishop to a Metropolitan whom you do not acknowledge, I cannot see. ... I wish much during the next few days you would see your way to act as the other clergy have done, recognise the Metropolitan, and so unite yourself, not only to us, but, I must think, to the Church, for the old canon is true, "ubi episcopus ibi ecclesia." So, unless you acknowledge a Bishop, I do not see how you can be in the Church.' ... "It is plain to me that, at the time Mr. Green promised to lend Mr. Lloyd a tract [connected with Mr. Cox's suspected views], he had fully reckoned on Mr. Lloyd's vote for the election of a new Bishop, or at least had hoped to secure it; and also he had no idea that his vote would be of so much consequence as it will be found to be in the sequel. At that time, though Mr. Lloyd has all along refused to recognise Bishop Gray's Metropolitan jurisdiction, any more than my own, regarding him only as a 'titular Metropolitan,' as he regards me as a 'titular Bishop,' yet Mr. Green had included him always among the 'faithful' clergy, inasmuch as he had signed all the documents of denunciation against myself. Now, however, Mr. Green has got a glimpse of the fact that Mr. Lloyd's single vote, if allowed, may seriously interfere with his plans, and he begins for the first time to intimate to him that he is not 'within the Church,' just ten days before the election, and forgets to send him the 'tract.' Mr. Lloyd requests an answer to his letter, and Mr. Green writes again as follows: -- 'As you particularly ask for a reply to your letter of yesterday, I sit down to write to you, notwithstanding that I wrote to you yesterday also on the same subject. (1) When I wrote to all the clergy who acknowledge the Metropolitan on the 24th of August last, informing them of the contents of a letter I had received from his lordship, and asking them for their suggestions ... [sic: the sentence is incomplete]; but, as you have separated from, by not submitting yourself to, the Bishop of Capetown, I did not feel at liberty to consult you. Except as acting as his lordship's representative, there is no reason
why I should be the one to commence a correspondence or to undertake to arrange the meeting. If, as you write, you expect these things from me, I must ask you to be consistent, and require you to recognise the authority which empowers and requires me to do such things. (2) With regard to the laity, I cannot agree with you that they were taken by surprise. It has been known for several weeks that such a meeting was about to be held [it was not known to his own churchwarden till October 20], and certain points connected with it were discussed with several laymen [members of the Natal branch of the Church Union, and therefore reserved and cautious]. . . . . The body that was once one is now divided into three parts: (1) that follows Dr. Colenso; (2) another, not admitting that it agrees with him, but acknowledging him as its Bishop, and protesting against and opposing the Bishop of Capetown; (3) that acts with the Metropolitan. Now, I am no lover of strife. I am conscious of this division; and to ignore it would, in my judgement, at this hour, only lead to renewed altercation. Vestry meetings would only bring those parties into conflict without doing any good. If men like to call the meeting which I desire to hold, packed or hole-and-corner, or by any such name, I have no manner of objection. On the contrary, I wish to mark and characterize the meeting as one of members of a voluntary association who at the present moment gather round the Bishop of Capetown as their head, and are assembled to arrange some points touching their internal organization. If our proceedings interfere, or seem to interfere, with others, they can hold their meetings, and take such steps as to them shall seem desirable. But we have been told ad nauseam that we have forsaken the Church of England, and that we are a new association, and so forth. I have no wish to argue, but only ask not to be interrupted. . . . (3) You inquire how the cost of the clergy going to Maritzburg is to be met. The Bishop of Capetown (i.e. S.P.G.) will bear the charges of those who acknowledge him. With regard to the laity, his lordship in his letter to me remarks, and I agree with him, those laymen who feel the
deep importance to their souls and to the Church of the question we meet about will make a sacrifice, if needful a great sacrifice, to come. If, however, they absolutely cannot, they will bow to the will of God. . . . . If, however, men will make no great effort, they must be held not to feel deeply on the subject. If they had to come here on their temporal affairs, they would find the means of doing so.

"The first remark I would make (and it is obvious) is, that no one could object to Mr. Green and his party, as a sect, separating from the Church of England, and electing for themselves a Bishop, and getting, if they can, Archbishop Longley or Bishop Gray to consecrate him. What we complain of is, that they still hold possession of buildings and other property dedicated to the Church of England, that they keep back our registers of baptisms, and receive incomes from S.P.G. as missionaries of that Church. But for the meeting itself, the attendance at which, by the Dean's own admission, will show how many in the colony 'feel deeply on the subject,' let it be remembered that every possible exertion that prudence and priestcraft could suggest has been made since August 24 to make it up. . . . . The meeting, as I have said, was summoned by advertisement on October 20 for October 25. The weather was splendid, all that could have been desired; for travelling, you know, in this country is very unpleasant in wet weather. . . . . There was nothing, in fact, to prevent a full attendance at the meeting, except a want of sufficiently deep feeling on the subject. . . . . The number of laity from all parts of the colony, of those who voted for or against election, but who all, I suppose, may be reckoned as 'South Africans,' rejecting me and acknowledging Bishop Gray's proceedings, was thirty-one, after all these preparations. These thirty-one included communicants of all ages and of all ranks. Ten of them came from distant places. . . . . There remain twenty-one from the two congregations of Maritzburg. As these were all on the spot, and the room in fact was crowded by our friends, as spectators, in the gallery (for they were not allowed to sit with the faithful),
you may judge how deep the feeling must have been on the occasion. . . . You will now, I think, be able to form some idea of the real value of this demonstration as far as the laity are concerned, of whom twenty-eight voted for an election and three against. . . . And now as to the clergy. . . . After passing a new article of faith, that 'Our Lord is to be ever adored in heaven and on earth,' they had two days' speeches upon the main question, whether a Bishop should be elected or not. The result was a drawn game, the clergy present voting seven to seven. Of the seven for the election, three do not really belong to the diocese, and a fourth has retired from all active work in it, and I doubt if four out of the seven would have been ordained by any English Bishop for want of theological and general education, though here we are obliged to be content with such candidates. Of those against the election, all were men of education and character, some of them really superior. And now comes in Mr. Green's forethought. When the votes had been taken, he informed Mr. Lloyd that his vote would not be allowed, as he did not acknowledge the Metropolitan. Some altercation took place, and it ended in his name being retained but reported to the Metropolitan as that of an outsider, so that virtually it will be, I suppose, erased, and the numbers of the clergy be reduced to five priests and two deacons for, five priests and one deacon against, the election, and it will be said to be carried by the clergy as well as the laity. But, besides these fourteen clergy who voted, another, Mr. Baugh, wrote decidedly to oppose the election; but, being in delicate health, did not attend the meeting. Another, Mr. Nisbett, is also opposed, but . . . thinks it best to consult his own quiet by staying away from such occasions; and two others (Tönneson and E. Robinson) were refused admission except as spectators.

"But now as to the laity. The people of Durban, Addington, and Berea, on hearing of the intended election, and of the close way in which it was being managed, called a meeting on October 22, and passed, unanimously, except
for one sole dissentient, a series of resolutions...protesting against the whole business. I need not say that in each of these three congregations alone there are communicants enough to overpower utterly the twenty-eight laymen at the Dean's meeting. And even if (as is very possible) great exertions should be made to swell the number that attended the meeting (thirty-one) by getting as many signatures as possible in different parts of the country,...yet I am confident that on the other side would be found, if similar exertions were made to procure them, an overwhelming majority.

"As far as I am able to judge, the step now taken about the new Bishop is the very best thing that could possibly have been done to secure my position. It seems to me hardly conceivable that Mr. Butler of Wantage will accept the proposed bishopric, when he hears the facts about the election, and that he would only be the Bishop of a small sect, and would be refused admission into any of the churches belonging to the Church of England, not by me, but by the people and their elected churchwardens. But surely no English Bishop would take part in such a consecration—at least, not the Archbishop of Canterbury, after saying that he should be very sorry to suppose that his recent vote in Convocation would encourage them to elect a Bishop. Bishop Gray would, no doubt, go through with the business...

"But now, after this open rupture with the Church of England (which, strangely enough, has happened in the very last week of a complete ecclesiastical year since my landing,...so that they have had a whole year to consider what they would do), it is impossible that I should remain inactive any longer, except that I shall await Lord Romilly's decision before interfering with the Dean personally. Before this mail leaves I expect we shall have some decision in our Supreme Court about the Cathedral; and the recent proceedings have gone far, I fancy, to clear up the mind of the judges on the point whether the Dean has any claim to officiate in a church which was given especially for the use
of the Church of England, not of a Church in union and communion with it."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, November 2, 1886.

"Before the mail goes, I expect to be able to notify the decision of our Supreme Court upon the 'exceptions' made by Bishop Gray to our declaration about the Cathedral, which were argued last term. The judgement is to be given next Thursday, November 8th, about the very time, I suppose, when Lord Romilly will be giving his in England. If both these are favourable, I foresee no difficulty now in maintaining my position here as long as it seems desirable. . . . It will even be very desirable to collect the first year's payments for clergy,¹ and to increase the Defence Fund, if possible, as I shall now have to act in earnest with my recalcitrant clergy. It would be weakness, and felt here to be so, if, after giving them so long a time—a whole year—to consider what course they will take, I were not now to assert my authority among them,—though I must, of course, consult prudence in what I shall do. My programme of proceedings at present is as follows. Assuming that the decision of our Supreme Court will be in my favour, sufficiently at all events for practical purposes, I shall first begin with the Rev. F. Robinson,—no clergyman of this diocese, but one intruded by Bishop Gray, and the ringleader in all these schismatic proceedings, who keeps the Dean up to the mark, and drives him on further, I imagine, than his own timidity would have carried him. It happens very fortunately that the clergy have divided themselves as they have done, so that I need not at present take any account of the seven who have not elected a new Bishop, and some of whom it would not be desirable to disturb, until I have

¹ This was a small fund, raised by friends in England, for the support of clergy in Natal working under the Bishop. The proceeds of the Defence Fund were all swallowed up in law expenses, and this, in spite of the generosity of some of his counsel in England, who refused all payment for their services.
some men ready to put in their places. But the seven seceders are the most easily dealt with of all. . . . I think it will be prudent to await Lord Romilly's decision before taking the Dean in hand seriously. But if that is favourable —whether appealed against or not—I must then act, and forbid him to minister any more in the Cathedral church, and also give him notice to quit the Deanery. People—even his own friends, I imagine—will expect this; and I do not see how I can do otherwise, if I am really trustee for the Church of England with respect to these buildings. . . . However, things may happen otherwise than we expect. But, as you will have heard what Lord Romilly's judgement is by the time this reaches you, you will see that, if it is favourable, I shall greatly need increased help for clergy for three years. . . . You will see what the Maritzburg people in their address to the Archbishop and Bishops say about the S.P.G. I do hope that the Society will be called to account at the next general meeting. Surely they cannot go on supporting clergy here (merely to oppose me), who have no laity either to pay or to back them with their influence." . . .

So persistent at this time were the calumnies which represented the people of Natal as wishing to be rid of the Bishop that we are not only justified in adducing all the evidence showing the real facts, but in duty bound to do so. Of this evidence there is no lack: and among the many expressions of lay feeling in the colony the following is not the least significant. Of this paper Mr. Shepstone speaks in a letter addressed to the Bishop, November 8th, 1866:—

"I send you," he says, "a copy I made of an address which has had its origin entirely with the people. It is written by Mr. Winter [Director of the Natal Bank] and is a touching document. It is to be published at once in all the papers as being in course of signature. Tell Mrs. Colenso I think this address, proceeding as it does spontaneously from the Cathedral congregation, and describing as it does so well
and so feelingly the effects and tendencies of your teaching, is a full compensation for anything that all the Newnhams and all the Callaways may have said or ever can say. I am pleased with it beyond measure, and I am sure you cannot but be deeply gratified.

"To our beloved Pastor, the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Natal.

With a view to acquit ourselves of a duty, and in some small measure to strengthen your Lordship's hands in the battle in which you have so nobly engaged, and so worthily borne yourself, the undersigned members of your own Cathedral congregation are desirous of expressing to you, on this the first anniversary of your return among them, their deep sense of the services you have rendered to themselves, and to the great cause of religious freedom.

Before entering into this contest, we have no doubt, you counted the cost, and foresaw, to some extent, the amount of odium, insult, and scorn which would be attempted to be cast upon you, in common with almost every early champion of the Cross, the truth, or the sacred rights of humanity. This clamour has been chiefly raised and sustained by men who profess to be the heralds of a peaceful faith. By them you have been stigmatized as a heretic, slandered as an infidel, denounced from the pulpit, debarred from your own churches by personal violence, and made the subject of a somewhat ridiculous and impotent excommunication. The dignity and Christian forbearance with which you have met these calumnies, and this violence, challenge the admiration of many of those opposed to you, and have bound your friends to you by closer ties.

We may now, however, congratulate you upon the triumphant progress of the cause which we have all at heart,—on the increasing congregations, the earnest devotion and reverent attention of your listeners, and the calm resolve to stand by you in the struggle at whatever cost.

Without alluding to your published works, which are yet before the world unanswered, master-pieces of industrious
research and truth-seeking criticism, we thank you for your weekly addresses, so rich and luminous with reasoning, so logical, touching, and instructive, whose chief aim, setting aside creeds, formularies, and dogmas, is to proclaim goodwill among all mankind, and to teach a faithful reliance upon our Great Father.

"To all of us these sermons have come fraught with glad tidings; but to some among us they have been the source of deepest comfort and consolation. Tried by adversity and borne down in our worldly affairs, as many of us have lately been, we have from them gathered new hope and fresh strength to sustain and guide us in our troubles and difficulties. We thank you for representing to us and to the world, so faithfully and so ably, the Protestant principle of our Church and nation. We thank you for your advocacy of our disenthralment from priestly domination, of the right and duty of private judgement, of the freedom of thought and worship, of the obligation of boldly searching for the truth, and boldly proclaiming it, of the voice of the laity on Church governance, of the grand testimonies of science to God's truth and love, of the hopeful progression of the human race, and of the cheerful tolerance of other phases of faith and forms of worship. We thank you that you have destroyed in this fair land so many idols of man's creation, which had been set up for the blind adoration of the credulous and unreasoning, and have proclaimed in their room a deeper and wider faith in the Divine teaching of our Blessed Lord and Master, a recognition of the brotherhood of man, without reference to creed, or caste, or colour, and over all and above all the merciful loving Fatherhood of the Living God."

In the Bishop's forbearance under abuse and calumny the people of Natal had marked nothing more than all who were not virulent traditionalists had noticed in England. Even among those who most thought him mistaken, not a few had wondered at the self-restraint which received without retort or remonstrance the gibes, jeers, and insults poured upon him.
in floods by Bishops, and others both clerical and lay. That which was done in England was done also in South Africa; and it is well to have the emphatic assertion of his people in Natal, that in the momentous and memorable struggle brought about by the mere assertion of facts he "nothing common did or mean."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, November 19, 1866.

"The effect of the late 'election' is felt to be more and more damaging to the Gray and Green cause in the colony. Nothing could have happened better for our purposes. Last Sunday (yesterday, November 18), after the blessing had been pronounced by me at the morning Cathedral service, the whole congregation, which was very large, waited till I came down from the pulpit, and then the Colonial Secretary, in the name of those present, read to me the address of which I sent you a copy in my last . . . . and I replied. It was a very interesting, and I may say affecting, scene. There were to my astonishment 323 signatures, . . . and all from Maritzburg alone; and, as you will see, not to a mere negative protest against Gray domination, but to a positive identification of themselves with my teaching. The number of signatures far exceeded my expectations . . . . I think it not at all improbable that when Lord Romilly's decision arrives, should it be in my favour, there will be a more distinct recognition of me as Bishop throughout the colony than has yet taken place. I mean positively, by some formal declaration, as well as by merely attending when I preach, which they have done all along. . . ."

"One of mine went to Bishop Gray's registrar to ask to be allowed to copy the names of the 'faithful' thirty-one who voted on the occasion of the election. He was told that if he would ask the next day he should have a reply. The reply was that he might, on condition that he furnished the list of the 160 odd who signed the address of welcome to me when I landed. As if the two sets would have any
comparison—the one a deliberate solemn proceeding, meditated by those who took part in it weeks beforehand; the other a list of signatures, many, no doubt, set down hastily in the excitement of the time. But they shrink from publicity. At first they intended to keep the business of the election private—I mean not to admit the reporters, but one of the laity set his face resolutely against this.

"Mr. Cox writes that the Rev. J. D. La Touche, of Stokesay, had written to say that he had almost made up his mind to resign his preferment and come out to me. I have written to him to say that if, instead of resigning, he could get leave of absence for two years and come out to me at once, he might render the greatest service to the cause. I know him; he would be very useful. And he would be doing exactly what the other side have done. For Mr. Tozer, sent out last year by S.P.G., is an incumbent in Lincolnshire, and only came out upon two years’ leave of absence, and is very shortly about to return to England."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, December 3, 1866.

"Matters are still progressing. Messrs. Newnham and Callaway, having been completely foiled at Durban in their attempt to get up a third party, to protest against Bishop Gray and the 'election,' and to petition the Queen to have me called to account for my grievous errors, have now been trying to form a union with my friends in Maritzburg, where Mr. Newnham has been for the last ten days in close discussion with Mr. Shepstone and others. The result is that he has been distinctly told that for the sake of peace my friends are willing to meet their wishes, so far as to join in a general address of some kind to the Queen, representing the disturbed state of things in the diocese, protesting against the election, &c., and praying Her Majesty to interfere, in such way as may seem best, to restore order; but that not a finger will be moved to forward any action which had even the appearance of hostility to me, as they
were only too thankful to have me among them, and had not the slightest wish to have me called to account; and finally, that nothing whatever could be done towards even considering such a petition until the clergy had distinctly and openly acknowledged my lawful authority, such as any Bishop would exercise by law in England. Mr. Newnham for the clergy, and Mr. Wathen for the laity, have agreed to this as far as they are concerned, and believe that the other clergy and laity of their party will almost all agree to it. And nothing more is to be done until the other clergy have been consulted. . . . Should the petition to the Queen be carried out, its terms, I doubt not, will be general enough, expressing no hostility towards me. But I do not doubt that Callaway and Newnham will write privately to the Archbishop, Bishops of Ely, Lincoln, and others, urging them by every possible argument to get the Government to appoint a Commission to try me. Of course, it would be somewhat hard upon me to do this at this late hour, when they have compelled me to spend my own and my friends' money in coming out here with my family, and living through a whole year of colonial life, besides undertaking various responsibilities and expenses for clergymen and churches. They might have done this a year or two ago, and then I should have readily co-operated to bring matters to an issue in that way. Now I do not feel that there is any reason why I should give any facility to their movement. Rather, I am bound now to remember that I do not stand alone, as I did almost in this colony before my return, but numbers have committed themselves in support of me in various ways, and, as Mr. Tönnesen says, our liberties are as dear to us as their traditions to them. If, therefore, I am called to account, my own feeling is not to give them a single inch; but of course I shall be guided by the advice of my counsel."
CHAPTER II.

TEACHING IN NATAL.—“NATAL SERMONS,” 1865–66.

Our review of the Bishop's work in the examination of the Pentateuch has shown the nature of the struggle with traditionalism, to which in the disinterested search for truth he committed himself. The four volumes of Natal Sermons exhibit some of the results of that conflict which in his notices of the Speaker's Commentary he declares to be internecine. On the way in which that Commentary was received depended, as he urged, the future course of English religious thought and life, and the mode in which missions should be carried on among the heathen. With this latter work he was more especially charged, and long before any portion of the Speaker's Commentary appeared he had begun to put before his people the whole counsel of God, as the conception of this counsel rose in his own mind after the long and unremitting toil which he had cheerfully undergone since the publication of his volume on the Epistle to the Romans. The Natal Sermons exhibit him in the character not only of a critic and judge (it was impossible for him to lay this aside altogether), but of a teacher, a guide, and a friend—one for whom the end of work was that he might "strengthen his brethren." In these sermons he spoke throughout as a fellow-worker and fellow-learner. Nowhere is there the least assumption of superiority
on the score of learning, or in any other way; not the faintest insinuation that he must be right and others wrong—that fatal insinuation which infests almost every utterance of those who belong to any traditional schools. He had never been slow to recognize the duty of tolerance; but since he listened patiently to the questions of the "intelligent Zulu," he had learnt the lesson more thoroughly, and he had come to see that, with all her faults, it was better taught by the Church of England than by any other religious body in Christendom. Against any pretences to infallibility on the part of any society of men he protested most vehemently; and he indignantly denied that any such pretences were put forth by the Church of England for herself, although some of her children might seek to fasten them upon her.

These pretences have assumed monstrous forms. It might have been thought that in the prayer "for all sorts and conditions of men" the Church of England recognised all who professed and called themselves Christians as members of the Holy Catholic Church, for whose good estate she is praying,—that here she was rejecting all arbitrary and artificial restrictions, and refusing to limit the terms of communion to those who had a reputation for orthodoxy. But there are some, it seems, for whom this prayer carries a meaning the very reverse of that which it bears to others. These will have it that in speaking of the Catholic Church, the Church of England goes on to speak not of those who belong to it, but of those who do not, so that the prayer resolves itself into the wish that all who profess and call themselves Christians, but who are really not such, may be led into the way of truth, which they have either rejected or denied, and hold the faith which they have opposed or doubted in unity of the spirit, which they have violated, in the bond of peace, to which they have done despite, and in righteousness of life, which they lack. Such an interpretation would for the Bishop have con-
verted the prayer into a mockery, which he would rather die than sanction. For him, the prayer was evidence that the real spirit of the Church of England was one which sought to include within her communion not merely those who are considered sound in the faith, but all who profess and call themselves Christians, and that by so praying she sanctioned all efforts for the removal of restrictions which never could do any good, and had always done vast harm.

It was impossible that the Bishop should, in these sermons, keep out of sight the incidents of recent years, or suppress all reference to matters of scientific controversy; but from first to last his contention was that the Christian's duty did not call on him to enter into these debates, and that he would be judged and estimated as he was in his true self, and not with reference to opinions expressed in a series of dogmatic propositions. The Divine work in the world was the living work of a living God. It was in no way bound up with any written record; and to suppose that it was so bound up was practically to lose all knowledge of its real nature. The Christian life had no necessary connexion with dialectics, and most assuredly it did not depend upon them. It sprang out of the Divine Love, and the quickening of this love in the heart was the direct work of the Spirit of truth and righteousness.

"All tokens of our Father's favour are summed up and sealed in that message of love, which the Christ Himself has spoken to us; in all the life of Jesus, His life of toil and suffering, sympathy with man's sorrow, endurance of man's sins—as, well as in His death—of patient submission to His Father's will, . . . the Eternal Son was manifesting the Father to us, was revealing the Father's gracious character, was working out the Father's will—the will of Him whom He proclaimed to us as His Father and our Father, as His God and our God."¹

¹ Natal Sermons, First Series, p. 21.
For the Bishop the Christ of God was the

"true Son of man, the perfect Type of Humanity, in whom the Divine idea of what a true living man should be is realised before the eye and in the mind of God."

No sign of a broad and all-embracing charity ever escaped his notice.

"It seemed meet to our Heavenly Father, with respect to whose blessed will, by whose unerring wisdom and love, all things in heaven and earth are ordered, in bringing many sons unto glory (observe, it is not said, 'in saving a few wretched sinners from the pit of woe'), to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." ¹

In the language of the Pauline Epistles, he discerned the expression of profound moral conviction; but he had no hesitation in saying that as to the time and the manner of an outward manifestation, "when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels," the Apostle was certainly mistaken. Nevertheless,

"The loving faithful soul was not deceived or betrayed. Their Lord and Master had come to them again,—not in the way in which their fond hearts looked for Him—not to 'restore the kingdom to Israel' with earthly pomp and observation—not visible to mortal eyes, 'on clouds of glory seated,' encompassed by myriads of the angelic host,—not thus had He come; but by the quiet spread of His Divine teaching, by the setting up of His kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. . . .

"The clouds of glory on which the Son of man came, were the pure and simple lives of the early Christians: the angels, which heralded the entrance of His kingdom, were those bright spirits which surround the throne of God, 'love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness,

¹ *Natal Sermons*, I. p. 34.
temperance.' He did come to restore the kingdom to Israel in a higher sense than they had ever dreamt of." ¹

For the Bishop, then, spiritual truth was a truth by which and in which we live. It was no matter for debate, no subject for a nice scrutiny of terms, no battle-ground for subtle and exclusive definitions. Referring to the words of Jerome, that the body of Christ is His Gospel, or to those of Ignatius, that His blood is His love, he says:—

"You are now at this moment eating the flesh of Christ and drinking His blood, as many of you as have welcomed with joyful obedient faith the precious message of our Father's love, which Jesus delivered to us,—as many of you as believe, that—in His work on earth, in His labours and sufferings, in His life of unwearied love and tender pity for the souls of men, in His constancy even unto death whereby He sealed the Gospel of His life—He was showing us continually of the Father in whose name He came, whose words He spoke, whose Spirit was given to Him without measure,—that He was manifesting to us our Father's tenderness, our Father's merciful pity for the fallen and outcast, our Father's compassion for the sorrowful and suffering, our Father's sympathizing love for His own dear children, the faithful and true in heart, the meek and pure and loving, those who are hungering and thirsting after righteousness, those who are striving by God's help to be perfect, even as their Father in heaven is perfect." ²

But if we wish to have a technical theological teaching drawn out on the lines of passive dogmatical propositions, for such teaching we shall search his pages in vain. We shall fail to find the propositions, and we shall encounter only a condemnation of the spirit of exclusiveness and intolerance which intrrenches itself behind this petrified phraseology. On whatever subject he might be speaking, his great object was to

show to his hearers with all possible clearness the nature of the deadening changes which almost from the close of the Apostolic age overlaid the good news of Christ with a network of iron formulas put forth as living principles.

"Ah! how fearfully," he said, "did the Church contrive during the first thousand years of her history,—ay, during the first five hundred,—to blot out that central truth (of the Fatherly love) from her system, interposing a mortal priesthood between the conscience and its God. . . . Do we believe, then, in the mercies of God, declared to us and ministered in the life and death of Jesus our Lord? Do we believe that in Him—in His hatred of sin, in His grief for the sinner, in His pity for the weak, the fallen, and outcast, in His love for the faithful and true of heart—the Living Word was taking of the Father, and showing to us His blessed character? And have we a 'thankful remembrance of His death,'—that He sealed in that hour the labours of His life,—that He failed not, He fainted not, the dear Son of God, and Son of man, until the work was finished which His Father gave Him to do, leaving us a bright example that we should follow His steps? Do we thank God in our hearts that we fear not now to die, since that loving and Holy One has died at God's command, has breathed forth that gentle prayer, to be laid to heart by all mankind, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit?' And do we bear in mind that He,—who by His pure life and patient death, His constant mind of love, displayed to the end in that other intercession which He made upon the cross with dying lips for His murderers, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,' offered that one offering which alone is acceptable to infinite love, the offering of a holy will consummated in act,—has taught us also each in our measure to do the same, . . . . to offer up to our Heavenly Father that living sacrifice of faith and love and obedience, from all humanity, redeemed from death by the in-dwelling of the Living Word, inspired and quickened with the Spirit of Christ, with which the
Father will be ‘well pleased,’ which will be ‘holy, acceptable in His sight, our reasonable service.’”  

But neither here, nor anywhere, could he put up with any approach to unreal or insincere or even ill-considered language.

“We often say,” he remarked, “that our Lord’s example is to be the guide to us in all our duties of life. And so, indeed, it should be,—yet not in the way that many seem to suppose, by His having actually shared in the performance of those duties and resisted the temptations more especially connected with them . . . . Of His childhood and boyhood we know scarcely anything: of His youth we know nothing. We have very little to show us how He acted as a son or a brother; we have no example in His life of a husband or a parent; no exact pattern for students or men of business, for artisans, domestic servants, village labourers, for professional men, soldiers, or statesmen. The duties of later middle life and of old age were not discharged by Him; the lot of the noble, wealthy, and powerful was not experienced by Him, nor that of the pauper in the poor-house, of the prisoner immersed for years in the dungeon of the oppressor, of the patient racked with pain, or worn with lingering disease in the wards of the hospital. The example which He has actually given us in the Bible is chiefly that of an active ministry of almost three years in the prime of life, under circumstances which can never happen again in the history of the world. . . . . How is it, then, that we are able at once to appeal to Christ’s example, as the perfect model of what human beings ought to be, or ought to do, under all circumstances? It is because we appeal to the spirit of His life,—to the principle which ruled it,—to that conformity to the perfect will of God, that desire to please His heavenly Father, that surrender of His own will to God’s will, which He manifested on all occasions. And

1 Natal Sermons, I. p. 287.
taught as we are ourselves by the Divine Word—enlightened by the Light which is the life of men—we are able in our own minds to fill up that which is wanting for our actual guidance amidst the duties of life,—to say to ourselves, in different situations, 'In this way Christ would act or would have acted.' We are able to set before us an ideal Christ, a perfect image of the Divine Man. That image of perfect beauty and holiness—of the perfect Man—which we thus by Divine grace behold each in our own mind—is not set before us at full length in the Gospels, nor could it possibly be; no record of His life could have supplied minutely all the details needed for this purpose—for setting a mere copy which we are closely to follow in all our different relations of life—even if our Lord had actually entered into human relationship more fully than He has done. It is, I repeat, to the spirit of His life—to the principle which ruled it—that we must be appealing continually day by day and hour by hour, if we would 'put on Christ,' put on the Christian spirit. . . . The example, then, of Christ is not less valuable to us, because the details of His life are few, and leave many and most important points of our lives without models of conduct. Our following of any model, to be true, to be of any worth, must not be an imitation of certain acts, of certain demeanour, appropriate to this or that situation or relation, in which as human beings we may be placed. . . . Christ is our great Example, because He came not to do His own will, but the will of the Father who sent Him—because, He sought not His own glory, but in all that concerned Him was simply obedient, leaving His cause in God's hands—because He bore witness for the Truth on all occasions, regardless of consequences.  

But this example can act upon us and influence us only through love. It was thus that it acted on St. Paul, one "among the most extreme High Churchmen of the Jewish Church," but whose chains were broken so soon as

1 Natal Sermons, I, pp. 315-17.
the truth of Christ's blessed Gospel flashed upon his mind, and he saw that it was a message of love to all mankind, a message of love from the Father of spirits, to tell us, one and all, Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female, that we are 'all the children of God by faith,' no more servants, but sons, and if sons, then heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."¹

That which Christ is we are to be.

"As in Him," St. Paul says, dwelt 'all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,' so we, he tells us, are 'the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.' The glory that was revealed in Christ, is revealed also in our measure in us; the Father that dwelt in Him dwells also by the Living Word in us. These words express a great mystery, which we cannot altogether fathom. But they remind us of the greatness of our high calling to be the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. . . . They remind us of our glorious duty and privilege to be 'followers of God, as dear children.'²

Nor was he afraid that any rude hands could shake the basis of his child-like confidence and faith.

"Theologians may dispute — as perhaps they must — on the history of the Resurrection; critics may do their work for the God of Truth in sifting its details. But nothing can touch the spiritual fact that He, who died upon the cross, now liveth—that He, who died unto sin once, now liveth eternally to God. For us, Christians, the name of Christ is exalted, as a living power, over all the earth; for us His cross is the emblem of the victory of love, of patience, of faithfulness, through suffering. Has persecution stamped out the truth which He taught us? Will it be ever able to do so? Has neglect or the lapse of time rendered His Divine teaching worn out and obsolete? Do His words cease to quicken, to strengthen, to comfort, to stir to the very depths our inner being? Will His example ever fail to instruct, and cheer, and stimulate us?

¹ Natal Sermons, II. p. 38. ² Ib. II. p. 115.
No! in that Truth—in the assurance of our Father's love, of the Sonship of Christ, and our sonship as one with Him, of the grace of the Spirit breathing on the souls of men—in that Eternal Truth, which Christ proclaimed, is the ark of refuge, and ever will be, for the children of men."  

It may be said that in these sentences we do not see with sufficient clearness what may be meant by the cross and the death of Christ. On this subject the Bishop had not been led, perhaps, to analyse his thoughts with a specially careful scrutiny, and there may be to a certain extent a commingling or even a confusion of two senses. But whatever the defect may be, it is as nothing to the exaggeration of this defect which may be said to characterize nearly the whole theological literature of this country. We can scarcely read the words of any preacher without encountering expressions which see in the cross of Christ only the wooden post on Calvary, and in His death only the breathing forth of His bodily life on that instrument of torture. Of the Bishop's real meaning something has been said already, in our examination of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans; but it is enough to say that nowhere in his writings can we find any phrases which lay stress on mere outward incidents, or make the spiritual truth dependent on historical facts, or rather on records of them which may be more or less uncertain. For him beyond all doubt the death of Christ was His death to sin, the eternal death to sin, which is itself His resurrection to the eternal life of righteousness and truth. In His death to sin, in His victory is our victory. It is He, the pure and Holy One, speaking the words, doing the works of God, in whom the Father was dwelling, who came to manifest the Father to us; it is He who has taught us all to say,

"Our Father—all the sons of men, the sinful and sin-oppressed

1. Natal Sermons, II. p. 120.
3. Ib. p. 143 et seq.
as well as the faithful and true-hearted, those who have 'trespasses' to be forgiven, 'temptations' by which they are harassed, 'evil' from which they long to be 'delivered:' it is He who said to that guilty woman, 'Go and sin no more:' it is He who said to the penitent thief, 'This day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise!'"  

The present age had, the Bishop knew, its special difficulties and its special controversies; and for guidance through all these he could intreat his people to have recourse to that book which he was supposed to have done his best to vilify and disparage.

"If perplexed with many thoughts, and harassed with the controversies to which the present age has given rise, and in which you feel you must take a part, from which you cannot escape—rather, from which, as a true servant of God, as a faithful Christian, you cannot consent to withdraw yourself (for you cannot consent, with a weak cowardice or a guilty indolence, to let the whole burden of them fall upon your children in the next generation), you may always fall back on those words in which the writer of Ecclesiastes sums up 'the conclusion of the whole matter,' 'Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty—rather, this is the whole—of man.' . . . . But you can do more than this: you can turn to the Bible, as a treasury of Divine instruction, and teach them out of it. The Lord's Prayer is there, with its simple petitions, which the child can understand, while the hoary-headed saint can never exhaust their meaning. The Psalms are there, which tell how men lived and laboured and longed after God, and were suffered to find Him, in the ages long ago as now. The lives of good men and true are there, with all their patient faith, their noble self-sacrifice, their joyous confidence, their sure belief in the final triumph of God and His Truth—though checkered, it is true, with signs of human infirmity. Above all, the history of Christ Himself is there, with its calm serene trust in the ever-present help of His heavenly Father

with its purity and goodness, its holy hatred of sin, its pitiful compassion for the sinner, its boundless love to God and man, exhibited in life, and sealed in death. And you will find enough in all these, if you are faithful, to help you to do God's work and speak God's Word to your families, to 'bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' 

1

The raising of all men, therefore, from the death of sin to the life of righteousness was for the Bishop the end and aim of the Divine work in the world.

"The faith of Christ, the faith which cares for the weak, which reclaims the fallen, which makes us see in every human creature our Father's child, which teaches us that we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren, which sets before us the Cross, the sacred emblem of love and suffering, as the glory of humanity—how can the Author of that faith, of this pure doctrine, be any other than the Lord and Saviour of men, the dear Son of man and Son of God, in whom 'the Father was dwelling' by the Eternal Word, to whom He 'gave not the Spirit by measure'? Yes! Christianity is a fact,—a fact of the present as well as of the past. No criticism of documents, no discovery of glosses, no sifting of history, can ever disprove it or rob it of any of its essential glories, as the Light,—the Great Light,—which has 'come down from above, from the Father of Lights,' to lighten our race. . . . Nothing is more plain in the New Testament than that the sum and substance of it, as of the Old, is not a system of religious worship, not a summary of many and various things to be believed or done, so that 'whosoever shall not believe or do them, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly,' but a revelation of God, and of our relation to Him, as that of children to a loving Father." 

2

He believed that true Christianity was the highest truth yet made known to man.

1 Natal Sermons, II. p. 275.  
2 Ibid. p. 323.
"The 'peace of Christ' is the settled conviction of God's Fatherly love to Him and to His brethren,—this is that peace which passes all understanding, which He has left as our portion. It is this fact, of His asserting a claim of sonship to God, for Himself and for each one of us His brethren, which differs His work from that of other religious teachers. On the practical realisation by us of this intimate relation, this union between God and man, He laid the chief stress, as the very sign of His Divine mission, when He prayed in His last prayer, 'that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us.' . . . On this was founded that universal fellowship, which we call the Catholic and Apostolic Church."¹

With all narrowness and exclusiveness such a faith as this must be in absolute antagonism.

"In the life of Christ, slight as is the sketch which we have of it in the Gospels, the leading idea is of one who lived wholly for others, to comfort and to heal, above all to bring home to God the lost sheep of the flock, to waken penitence in the sinner, and to assure the penitent of pardon and peace. And if the history in the Gospels of the life of our Head is but a sketch, it is in a measure filled up by the lives of the members of the body of Christ, of all His true followers in every age. Whom do we and all men recognise as true Christians, even though with many weaknesses, perhaps, and imperfections? Are not labours of love, sufferings for love's sake, the essential part of the characters of such? A Christian may be ignorant, feeble, perhaps imprudent; he may know nothing of the Athanasian Creed, or, knowing it, he may dislike some parts of it, and doubt or dispute others; and yet he may receive that blessing which the Master pronounced upon the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peace-maker. But a cruel Christian! a selfish Christian! an avaricious Christian! a vindictive.

¹ Natal Sermons, II. p. 325.
Christian! an impure Christian! even a self-indulgent Christian! is a contradiction in terms." ¹

But while he thus put before them the foundation of our life in God, he was unwearied in his onslaughts on superstitious beliefs which overlay that foundation with falsehoods, and put it out of sight. Many of these superstitions are mere delusions, products of ignorance and defective knowledge, to be dealt with gently and forbearingly; and assuredly no one could submit them to gentler and more forbearing treatment than that of the Bishop of Natal. At the time when he wrote he had especially to counteract a form of teaching which in later years has greatly altered its tone, if it has not dwindled away almost into nothing,—a teaching which seemed to take a positive delight in picturing the Fountain of Holiness, Truth, and Love as a vindictive and arbitrary demon. Thus in a sermon on the Devouring Fire ("Who among us shall dwell with the Devouring Fire? Who among us shall dwell with the Everlasting Burnings?")¹), he points out (1) that the traditional method seizes on these words by themselves, and, hearing the question asked without waiting for the answer, refers them to the pit of woe, to the everlasting burnings of hell-fire; and (2) that the answer given in the context shows that the Devouring Fire is no other than the Living God, with whom dwells the man who walks righteously and speaks uprightly and shuts his eyes from seeing evil.² Having cast the traditional method to the winds, he was not only not afraid of speaking the truth, but he saw instinctively the way in which it would be best to set the truth before men. He would not allow them to remain in bondage to the letter of any book or the decrees of any Church; but he would have them see "that the foundations of their faith stand fixed and sure in the Eternal Rock of

¹ Natal Sermons, II. pp. 327, 328.
² Ib. I. p. 19.
God's unchangeable wisdom and love; that that love is higher and deeper than men's thoughts about it"; that all great truths, which have ever gained a mighty mastery over the minds of men, whether in the Church of Christ or out of it, have come from the Living God, the Fountain of Truth; that the creeds of the Catholic Church—the products, no doubt, of ages when Jewish and Christian forms of thought had been intimately blended with the philosophical systems of Greece and the East, and of which the expressions, therefore, may but imperfectly correspond to the more advanced knowledge and modes of thought of our own times—do yet shadow forth to us eternal realities of the world unseen.¹

He had no hesitation in exposing the folly which speaks of every part of the Bible as so interwoven with the other parts that to invalidate one portion was to throw discredit on the rest, so that if the historical accuracy of the Pentateuch be questioned there will be little or nothing left on which the mind can lay hold for peace and content.² The very phrase "the comfort of the Scriptures," which suggested these expressions, exhibits the absurdity of these notions, it being impossible to refer the term "Scriptures" to any but those of the Old Testament, those of the New not being yet in existence.³ He could quote to his hearers in Natal passages from Dr. Irons's work on the Bible and its Interpreters—and he had a right to do so—which the most vehement of his High Church antagonists could not challenge, Dr. Irons being one of the foremost champions of the "authority of the Church." This straightforward writer had said plainly that the records on which the so-called historical books of the Old Testament were based had perished without exception, and that the outlines which survive have been drawn by other hands, with a design of their own, so that they who seek mere history

must, as, in the opinion of Dr. Irons, the chronicler warns them, seek it elsewhere.¹

If Dr. Irons ² could so speak, the Bishop was not less justified in saying that this judgement of Dr. Irons was undoubtedly true, although he himself drew from it a different conclusion. The design of the chronicler was certainly not to write history; but it was to pervert history so as to make it appear that the Levitical Law had been fully and exactly acted upon since the days of Moses, and to gloss over, or to suppress, every fact which might militate against this position. Thus the Bishop told his people that “the chronicler never gives a hint of David’s great sins of adultery and murder,” nor of Solomon’s heathen marriages or of his idolatry. The Books of the Kings, no doubt, contradict him flatly; but the chronicler had not the fear of the Hebrew canon before his eyes, or at all events hoped that his own version of the history would be read to the exclusion of the older books. In the same way he says nothing of the wickedness of Abijah, but makes him address Jeroboam’s host of 800,000 men “in most pious language,” declaring that in Judah the law was strictly obeyed, that God Himself was with the men of Judah for their Captain, and His priests with sounding trumpets to cry alarm against their enemies. The older writer again says that in Asa’s days the idolatrous high places were not taken away out of Judah, whereas the chronicler says that they

¹ Natal Sermons, I. p. 41.
² The honesty and integrity of Dr. Irons are beyond all question. It was, therefore, only to be expected that when he and the Bishop met they should be attracted to each other. The relations between them became very friendly. Dr. Irons gave him a copy of the Bible and its Interpreters, then out of print, or—must it rather be said?—out of circulation in obedience to dictates which the author naturally shrank from disregarding. In the book was a friendly manuscript inscription, which greatly pleased the Bishop, but which unfortunately cannot be given here. The volume was burnt in the fire at Bishopstowe, in 1884. See Vol. I. p. 77.
were. But it is in the glorification of the priests and Levites that the latter is most persistent and most barefaced.

"Thus the Book of Samuel," the Bishop told his people, "gives not the least indication of the tribe of Levi having been distinguished in any way for their numbers, dignity, or influence, in the time of David, and especially is silent as to any great body of priests and Levites having been present on the occasion of bringing up the Ark of God to Jerusalem. On the contrary, this supposition is distinctly negatived by the facts actually stated. Instead of the priests covering, and the Levites bearing, the Ark, as the Law enjoined, . . . . we read that the Ark was put upon a new cart . . . . and Ahio went before the Ark, while Uzzah evidently walked behind or beside it, and so put out his hand, we are told, to stay it when the oxen shook it, and met with his death while so doing. Not a word is said about priests or Levites in the whole narrative." 1

But according to the chronicler, the Bishop went on to say, 4,600 Levites and 3,700 priests attended David at Hebron, and with them Zadok and twenty-two captains of his father's house; that with these David took counsel for the bringing up of the Ark, charging these priests and Levites to gather together for the purpose of bringing it up to Jerusalem;

"and yet, even according to the chronicler, after all this consultation and gathering, David makes use of mere laymen—not of priests and Levites—to remove the Ark in the first instance, for it is only when warned by the death of Uzzah that David is made by the chronicler to say, 'none ought to carry the Ark of the Lord but the Levites,' "

But the numbers of the priests and Levites who attended on this occasion are carefully registered, altogether 862 Levites and two priests, although more than 8,000 had come to Hebron ten years before for the mere civil purpose of making David King.

1 *Natal Sermons*, I. p. 50.
“The whole story” of the chronicler, the Bishop added, as he was bound to add, “is obviously a mass of contradictions.”

If David forgot the Mosaic ordinances about the Levites, can it, he asked, be believed that

“not one out of so many hundreds or even thousands of the tribe of Levi—not one single priest or Levite—not one prophet, such as Nathan or Gad, who were at that time living, and doubtless were present at his side—came forward to warn the devout King that no man of any other tribe whatever should presume to intrude upon the sacred prerogatives of the priests and Levites, ‘lest he die’—nay, rather, lest there should break forth ‘a plague among the children of Israel’”? ¹

If he spoke of the authority of the Scriptures as writings at all, the Bishop was bound to say at least thus much; but, having said this, he added:—

“I have said enough to show you how the truth stands in respect of these Books of Chronicles. You will find much more of the same kind for yourselves, if you will only thoughtfully read the narrative, and compare it with what is written in other places.”

He was not afraid to trust their judgement, and he had no misgivings about shocking their faith, for he had assured them at the outset:—

“This I say—as the testimony of one who has resolved, by God’s grace, not to shut his eyes to facts of any kind which in these our days God’s wisdom is pleased to make known to His children, of one who has thoroughly examined one portion at least of the Sacred Volume, and and knows now, perhaps, almost as much as is at present known of its unhistorical character, its variance with scientific certainties, its discrepancies and contradictions—this I

¹ Natal Sermons, I. p. 52.
say, the more the Bible is studied, the more Divine it seems; the more august, and grand, and wonderful; the more full of real support and solid comfort for the soul of man." ¹

When criticism has done its work, the Scriptures remain still the oracles of God.

"They teach us about God and His doings; they speak messages from God to the soul; they are still profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness; they are a gracious gift of God's Providence, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." ²

Few things are more sad and instructive than the clinging to the letter rather than the spirit, which has characterized mankind in all ages; and one of the most signal instances of this disposition is to be found in the strange tradition of the restoration of the Pentateuch by Ezra, after it had been burnt at the time of the Captivity. This story, like that of the Book of the Law in the time of Josiah, starts on the assumption that there was but one copy; and it is for the traditionalists to explain how this could be. For them it seems that this story of the fiery draught which preternaturally brought back to his memory every word of the whole Pentateuch becomes the basis of their trust in the correctness of the Hebrew Scriptures as we now have them: but, as Dr. Irons insists with irresistible force, if we grant the truth of the tale,

"it is on the gigantic gifts and inspiration of the transcribers in Ezra's day that we are really depending—gifts and inspiration which yet are a mere hypothesis, of which the possessors tell us no single word. And before Ezra's day we are thus owning, unmistakeably, that the literary history of the Old Testament is lost. Let all those who would identify this with God's entire Revelation, see to what they have brought us." ³

"I agree entirely with this author," the Bishop adds, that "a more hopeless, carnal, and eventually sceptical position, it is impossible to conceive," than that "which identifies the Written Word with God's Revelation" of Himself to man. And because I believe it to be so unsound and dangerous, I have done my best, and shall still do my best, God helping me, to set you free from it, by showing you a 'more excellent way' in which you may continue to regard the Scriptures as a gift of God, a precious witness of His love to man."

"We are often," he says, "wishing to be wiser than God. . . . We want to have either an infallible Bible or an infallible Church—something to which we may have recourse in our perplexities—some infallible external guide, some voice from without, such as men often long to substitute for the voice within. But God knows best how to train us for Himself. . . . He will not supply us with an infallible external authority, which shall supersede the necessity of our listening to that Living Word which speaks within us, and witnesses with our spirits that we are born of God."¹

No doubt, the task of discrimination to which we are thus called is one which demands real effort of thought as well as singleness of purpose. But

"in using our best mental powers in such inquiries we are," he says, "best pleasing God, and doing the will of Him who has aroused this spirit of investigation in the age in which we live, and in which He calls us to do our part;" and we may be certain "that when all this work is done, no portion of Eternal Truth can ever be lost; it is safe in the keeping, not of Churches and Councils, enforcing belief in doctrines and creeds by excommunications and anathemas, but in the keeping of Him who is Himself the Truth, and by His Spirit will maintain a permanent supply of the true Bread of Life for the hearts of His children."²

But having said that God would let us have neither an infallible Book, nor an infallible Church, he would not use language which might leave the impression that the Church of England, while declaring that the Roman and other Churches had erred not only in questions of government and discipline, but also in matters of faith, was herself incapable of making a mistake. She had made many mistakes; and there were, as he had said in the preface to Part I., many points in her formularies which called for revision and alteration. Among these were the questions put to sponsors in baptism. On this subject he told his hearers:

"You will remember that it has now been ruled . . . that the words in the Ordination Service, 'I do unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures,' must be understood to mean simply 'the expression of a bona fide belief' that 'the Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation,' and that 'to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty.' If this is true of the Scriptures themselves, of course it must be true of the Creeds . . . the compositions of fallible men in former days, which are only based on Scripture. In other words, we are justified . . . in these days of wider knowledge and deeper thought in extending to the answer of the god-parents in baptism, who say of what is called the Apostles' Creed, . . . 'All this I steadfastly believe,' the same latitude of interpretation as that which is extended to the declaration of the deacon at ordination, when he says of the Scriptures themselves, 'All this I unfeignedly believe.' We may understand the answer in question to express no more than the belief that the Creeds contain 'everything necessary to salvation,' and that 'to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty.' Yet we believe also—at least I certainly do—that there are great eternal truths underlying most, if not all, the mere literal expressions of the Creeds; that, for instance, Christ will 'come from heaven' in a very living sense 'to judge both the quick and the dead,'
though we can no longer believe that heaven is a place above our heads, or that He literally 'sitteth on the right hand of God.'”¹

Much in Mr. Maurice's spirit, and with some likeness to his language, the Bishop spoke of the baptism of infants as

"a beautiful symbol of our faith that they are already in fact, —yes, from their very birth-hour,—the children of God. And in this way infant baptism in our Church is a protest, for which we may be thankful, against all exclusiveness, against all appropriation of the love of God by any. The Church declares by it that no merit—not even faith—is needful to make the human soul the object of the love and care of the Father of spirits.”²

The kindling of His love in the heart would be its rescue from bondage to freedom—a freedom which would tell in every direction, in the way of regarding the sacraments, and of dealing with all ordinances and with all things outward, such as signs and wonders. The superstitions connected with the latter he assailed by his remarks on the Book of Jonah. As to the supposition that in speaking of the sign of the prophet Jonah our Lord referred to the story of his dwelling in the whale's belly, he insisted plainly on the impossibility of supposing

"that our Lord in this very passage, while condemning his questioners for seeking a miraculous sign as a ground of their faith, would actually in the same moment give them such a sign, in direct compliance with their own request.”

The sign of Jonah was his preaching to the Ninevites, his warning to them of the consequences of sin, and his announcement that God willed not that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.³

The mischief of blind subservience to ordinances, as such,

he brought out powerfully in some very careful sermons on the Sabbath. He had no scruple in saying that the enforcement of this ordinance in Scotland had been productive of frightful mischief, and perhaps of nothing but mischief; but in saying this he was supported by the declarations of Scottish ministers whose eyes were at length opened to the folly as well as the wickedness of this wretched Judaism. He cited the words of one minister who referred to the time when

"no street lamps were allowed to be lighted on the darkest Sunday nights, because it was held that nobody had any right to be out of doors at such hours. The Assembly forbade any person taking a walk on the Sabbath, or looking out of a window, and therefore all the blinds were pulled down; and there is great reason to fear that the spurious conscience, thus created, indemnified itself, for all the gnats it was forced to strain at, by swallowing a variety of camels."¹

It is unnecessary to dwell on the iniquities, the hypocrisy, the misery, of the Scottish Sabbath under this Pharisaic discipline. It is enough to say that only fifty years ago the General Assembly dared to speak of walking on Sunday as "an impious incroachment on one of the inalienable prerogatives of the Lord's Day."² Here, too, the Bishop could point to all this horrible oppression and cruelty as being based on documents which were historically untrustworthy. Take away the Fourth Commandment, as given in the Books of Exodus and of Deuteronomy, and this miserable fabric of dead traditionalism topples to the ground. But not only do these two versions of the precept contradict each other, they are both the product of an age many centuries later than that of Moses. These facts the Bishop draws out very clearly and forcibly in his sermons;³ but we have had occasion to go into

the subject already. The point on which he chiefly laid stress is that we are under no paramount obligation to keep either the seventh day or the first.

"There is no ground for supposing that the adoption of the Christian Sunday, in place of the Jewish Sabbath, rests upon apostolical authority. On the contrary, the apostles themselves, as we see by many instances in the Acts, kept with their countrymen the ordinary Jewish Sabbath."

He remarked further that

"no writer of the first three centuries has attributed the origin of Sunday observances to any apostolic authority," and it needs scarcely to be said that he never felt the least scruple in pointing out the abominations arising out of or suggested by the mere ceremonial observance of one day out of seven. Thus, of the dreadful and at the same time absurd story of the man stoned to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath, he asks,

"Who can believe that such a command as this ever really proceeded from the mouth of the Ever-Blessed God? a command, too, which would appear to have been powerless to prevent the evil which it proposed to cure, which did not hinder the people at large from defiling the Sabbath with pollutions infinitely worse than that of gathering a few sticks for a fire. 'Your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot away with; your hands are full of blood.'"

Nor was this all. The proof of the falsehood of the story was lying ready to hand, only people would not see it, because they would not think, they would not look, they would not examine.

"What a noble work then," he says, "is that of modern criticism,"

which draws out this evidence like the Book of the Law from the hole in the wall into which it had been stowed in the days of Manasseh.\(^1\)

"See how in a moment the finger of criticism points to the proof, lying plain before our eyes, that this story is an insertion of a later day than that of Moses, and most probably was not ever a part of the original narrative of the Exodus. 'While the children of Israel were in the wilderness,'—how could these words have been written by Moses, who never came out of the wilderness, who delivered his last address, as we read, on the other side Jordan in the wilderness? Here, in short, we have another instance of those numerous insertions which have been made in the original narrative of the Pentateuch by writers of a later age."\(^2\)

In short, the plain issue of the matter is that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; that it was designed for his bodily, mental, moral, and spiritual health; and that, so far as it fails to promote, or so far as it interferes with, this health, or with any other obligations, the observance of it has for him no force whatever. That it does promote this health, and that the institution is, therefore, one of great value, no one was more ready to maintain than the Bishop.

"We need," he said, "at all events in civilised communities, where there is such continual tension of the brain, and draining of the nervous energy, the recurrence of a day of rest at shorter intervals [than those of the Greek festivals]—rest, not to be enforced upon us from the necessity of a positive law, but rest commended to us by the wise provisions of our gracious Creator, and approved by universal experience to be a source of infinite blessing, the right of the poor man as well as the rich, as needful, in fact, for the wants of our physical, social, moral, and religious nature,

---

1 See Vol. I. pp. 547, 628, 669 et seq.
2 Natal Sermons, I. pp. 255, 256.
as the rest by night after the toil of the day. But still the
glory of the Sunday is common worship. And, whatever
may be done, publicly or privately, to enlarge and to
elevate the enjoyments of the working classes on the
Sunday, God forbid that it should not be done with a due
regard to the worship of Almighty God, which especially
irradiates and dignifies the day, and casts a bright ray over
the week besides."

It is not easy to imagine an influence more potent for good,
for the dispelling of noxious superstitions, dreams, and fancies,
than that of the Bishop's teaching in these sermons—teaching
so well weighed, so considerate, so sober in expression, so
careful of the mental and moral powers of his hearers. To
many the old Satanic mythology may seem now like a thing
belonging to past ages; but over not a few we cannot doubt
that it has a very real and a very mischievous influence still.
Resolved on doing all that he could to knock these deadly
fancies on the head, he attacks the very root of the conception,
which has its origin in the attributes of the Vedic Vritra or
the Zoroastrian Ahriman.

'A will, or spirit, so malignant as to hate God, as God—as
goodness—and possessed of knowledge and power such as
is popularly ascribed to the devil, 'next to' omniscience,
'next to' omnipotence,—and all these attributes exercised
continually for the destruction of God's work and the ruin
of His creatures, . . . . such a being as this is utterly
inconceivable amidst the extended knowledge, and the
sounder thought and reasoning, of the present day. . . .
The 'devil' has long been, with most thinking persons, a
mere impersonation of evil, of the promptings of the selfish
nature, which conflict with the Divine Law of love and
purity; like the vast shadow on the mountain-side, in
which the bewildered traveller fails to recognize himself,
but sees a supernatural and monstrous foe. There is here
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a dark image of the man himself, but there is no centre of
darkness and of night, to be the opposite and enemy of the
radiant ruler of the day." 1

For Luther's ideas on the subject he had no indulgence.
If between ourselves and God

"a spirit of evil interposed, we should become mere helpless
victims; the battle would be over us between God and the
devil,—an idea almost blasphemous to a Christian mind,
and which would shock us more, if we had not been long
inured to it by traditionary teaching." 2

Nay, the very feelings which some, holding Satan to be a
distinct person, profess to entertain for him are terribly
mischievous.

"The thought of a creature of God, set apart for hopeless
wickedness and misery, and an object worthy of hatred, is
fraught with danger to the soul that entertains it. If a
person, a thinking being, may be hated, 3 why not also men,
his agents, or who seem to be so . . . . And, indeed,
what a large measure of the notorious curse of all times—
the odium theologicum—is actually due to the belief that
the justly-detested devil has inspired the 'heretic,' the man
who denies or doubts what we hold to be sacred truth!" 4

The Bishop is thus carried into a train of thought which is
worked out with singular clearness, strength, and beauty. It
is the ingrained habit of the so-called religious world to treat
the slaughtering of bulls and goats under what is styled the
Old Dispensation as the true sacrifice, the sanctification of
the man being a sacrifice only by a figure or a metaphor; and
in the same manner it is a common thing with those who

1 Natal Sermons, II. pp. 15, 16.
2 Ib. p. 17.
3 See the teaching of Gregory of Nyssa on the restoration even of the
4 Natal Sermons, II. p. 17.
profess to build everything on the "sacramental system" to charge those who, with Ignatius, Jerome, and Augustine, speak of the body of Christ as union with Him and of His blood as His love, with not "going far enough." They are ready to allow that what they say is true, if only, as they phrase it, they will go on to make the inward grace inseparable from and dependent on the outward sign. It would be impossible to show more clearly than their own words show how completely they are blind to the nature of the good news which St. Paul was never weary in proclaiming—how thoroughly they are still in bondage to the letter which kills.

Not less lamentable is the pretence that they who, as it is said, question or deny the personality of the devil, make light of the heinousness of sin. To get at the truth we must reverse the proposition.

"It is one reason," the Bishop said, "for attacking the popular superstition about the devil, that the absurd and grotesque ideas which belong to it are too apt to be associated in the minds of the young and thoughtless with sin, with guilt, with temptation,—things which should never be spoken of lightly."

The danger is not confined to the young alone. It was said of Southey that he could never think of the devil without laughing, and it is perhaps well that the conception which has its roots in the myths of Vritra, Ahriman, Set, or Typhoon, should be exhibited in its true colours. The mythology which has crept into Christianity—or rather has twined round it as a choking parasite—is formidable both in its quantity and its strength; and this mythology must be put down and cast away. It is generally supposed that the English word "devil" represents the Greek Diabolos, and is meant to exhibit him as the slanderer and accuser. The notion is quite absurd. St. Paul speaks of him as the prince
of the power of the air; and the name devil, in its almost endless variety of forms, shows that the Greek name Diabolos, applied to the supposed great enemy of God, is not the same word as Diabolos in the sense of a slanderer. The devil is as much a deity of the air as is the Vedic Dyaus, the Greek Zeus, and the Latin Jupiter; and the one word is the same as the other. The name devil is, in short, the same word with the Latin Divus, Dyovis, and the Sanskrit Deva. The Christian theology about the devil, so far as it has been formulated at all, is a mass of grotesque confusion. The idea of the devil as drawn out in the fully-developed traditional picture is an impossible one. This picture would make it necessary for us

"to believe that a creature purely evil draws every instant his being, and those wondrous powers with which the fancy of poets has endowed him, from our God and Father, the 'Father of lights.' Moral disorder may be endured for a time, if it is to issue in the victory of order—chaos before creation—but not otherwise. The mind refuses to grasp it; the heart revolts from beholding it in God's world." 

The mind of St. Paul rejected altogether any such idea. With him sin was the assertion of self-will, the principle of rebellion against God, issuing in alienation from God—issuing, in one word, in death, which is its wages and its recompense. But this very death, the only real death, he maintains, is being destroyed. It is the last enemy which is being conquered; and the assertion, surely, is self-evident, for when the principle of resistance, disobedience, and rebellion has been put down, what else can remain to be overcome?

1 It can be scarcely necessary to say that the subject here touched on is one of supreme importance. Christians have allowed themselves to be scared with shadows, while they have averted their eyes from the real danger. If the reader should wish to go further into the question, I may refer him to my Mythology of the Aryan Nations, p. 567, ed. 1882.
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This is the enemy which Christ reigns to destroy. When it has been destroyed, He will then surrender His kingdom again to the Father, so that God may be “the all in all.”

The Divine love, therefore, knows no weariness. The Divine will can never flag in its purpose. The work begun will assuredly be accomplished, for the simple reason that God cannot deny Himself. His gifts are without repentance; and His word will without fail accomplish the thing whereto He sent it.

“The work of God may be slow, but it will be sure. We wish to ‘make haste’ in remedying the evils of the world, in enlightening its ignorance, in casting out its sin. But this is not the process which the wisdom of our Father—ay, and His love—sees best to take. That very ignorance and sin which He suffers to exist are meant to be the means of exercising and purifying our souls, . . . of making us more truly conformed to our Father’s image. And to the same love and wisdom we must commend, while we work for them, the cause of our fellow-men, however steeped they may be in sin and misery. True love as St. Paul says, believeth and hopeth all things: it is only the weakness of our love which makes us so ready to despair—to despair of any. How great is “the patience and long-suffering of God let each of us answer for himself.”

The firmness with which the Bishop cast aside all merely material and carnal presentments of Divine and eternal truths is clearly shown in an admirable sermon on the Spiritual Resurrection, in which he examines the remarks of Dean Alford, and of Dr. Thomson, Archbishop of York, on the opening of the graves, and the reappearance of the dead saints at the moment of the passion, or after the resurrection, for the narrative leaves the time uncertain. As
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evidence of a spiritual resurrection, the resuscitation of ten thousand dead bodies is manifestly worth nothing. The two things belong to a different order; and it is astonishing indeed that any should have been able to blind themselves to this distinction.

The spiritual resurrection is a present and eternal reality; and it is on the reality of the Christian life that the Bishop's thoughts were always resting. This life must bring us to God, or it is nothing; and it can bring us to Him only by the path of love. Of this love he held that we are assured everywhere, and we are taught the lesson most of all in the Lord's Prayer.

"It is Christ who has taught us all, of every clime and country, of every age, of every character, the sinful and sin-burdened, the publican and prodigal, as well as the faithful and pure in heart, 'when we pray, to say, Our Father.' It is He who has taught us this, not only directly by His lips, but by His whole ministry in life and death, by His sympathy with human sorrow, His pitiful compassion for the fallen and outcast, the ignorant and wandering, . . . showing forth continually the 'kindness and love towards man' of the Father who sent Him, of the Father in whose name He spoke, of the Father who dwelt in Him! Thus our Lord teaches us concerning God and His relations to us, not by multiplying a list of attributes, which, though we strain our faculties to the uttermost to grasp them, one by one, transcend each, in its infinite grandeur, the power of the human mind to conceive and imagine, and are still more inconceivable in their union. Not by such abstractions as these does Jesus teach us respecting Him who is the fountain of our life and being. He bids us say to Him, 'Our Father.' The truest, nearest view for us of the Great First Cause of all, the Ruler of the universe, the Lord of the conscience and of the heart, is

\[1\] It would furnish no warrant even for expecting the bodily resuscitation of the ten thousand and first. Still less would it tell us anything of a moral or spiritual resurrection.