because it contradicts itself in matters of the most ordinary sort, nothing can be gained by pretending that the objection is urged on the score of narratives of wonders, portents, or prodigies which may happen to be contained in it. The early history of Rome as related by Livy is discredited, not on account of the stories of wonderful and extraordinary incidents related in it, but because one part of the narrative is inconsistent with, or contradicts, or excludes another, in matters which come within the range of every-day experience. It would be ludicrous to represent Sir G. C. Lewis as rejecting the history of Romulus because he is said to have been taken up into heaven like Elijah. He lays immeasurably more stress on the inconsistent accounts given of the Ramnes, Titienses, and Luceres. The attempt to ascribe to a disbelief in prodigies, or to a dislike of them, objections bearing on the internal evidence or on other points in debate is as dishonest as any shiftiness of which any may well be guilty. It is scarcely a whit less dishonest to attempt to shut up his readers to the great dilemma of complete acceptance or total rejection. According to Mr. Espin, the narrative of the Book of Joshua must be taken as it stands or rejected in toto, for, if the bed of Jordan was not laid bare by the piling of waters in flood-time into a mountain, if the walls of Jericho did not fall at the trumpet-blast and the shouting of the people, the writer who could give the narrative of these incidents as it is given in the Book of Joshua is utterly untrustworthy." He may be so, but this must be proved; and Mr. Espin knows perfectly well that this does not follow merely because his narrative contains many stories of marvels and prodigies. Had he taken the trouble, he must have remembered that the attempt to treat the histories of Herodotus in this fashion would be received only with derision and contempt. The materials which make up the Herodotean history are of very diverse

---

1 See Vol. I. pp. 302, 303.
kinds; but the rules of evidence will guide us with abundant safety through what may often seem an inextricable tangle. If the credit of the Book of Joshua be rated lower than that of the history of Herodoto, this will be only because a thorough examination reveals less that may be trusted in the one than in the other. With neither is the task an easy one; but in both we must insist on applying the same canons of criticism, and it is impossible to allow that the writers in the Book of Joshua are to be treated with more indulgence than the great historian of the Persian War.

The Bishop of Natal was indeed too lenient in his judgements on writings like those of Bishop Browne and Mr. Espin. He had regarded it as "unfortunate" that the former in his *Introduction to the Pentateuch* could find no place to discuss the genuineness and antiquity of the Book of Joshua. No doubt it was convenient for Bishop Browne or for Mr. Espin to separate the two; but the question of the genuineness of Joshua is determined by that of the Pentateuch, while that of the Pentateuch is determined by the age of the Book of Deuteronomy. On this point, therefore, the contentions of Mr. Espin deserved no consideration. But it may be well to see what violence he does to truth and the plain sense of right and wrong by his efforts to uphold the traditional notions at all hazards. He is necessarily confronted at the outset by the wholesale slaughter of the Canaanites; but instead of applying tests to ascertain how far the slaughter was carried out, or whether it was carried out at all, he is anxious only to justify it. The Canaanites were wicked, apostate, and idolatrous; and "what," the Bishop of Natal asks, "were the Hebrews," by the unanimous testimony of all their prophets? Even Mr. Maurice, as we have seen, found himself obliged to resort to the same evasions; and more valuable, therefore, than his purely historical criticisms were the true prophetic utterances in which

1 See Vol. I. p. 437.
the Bishop of Natal denounced these monstrous blasphemies against the righteous impartiality of God. He expresses (and perhaps too leniently) the bare truth, when he says that

"the Hebrews fell away again and again, as the Book of Judges tells us, into all kinds of gross idolatry, immediately after they had been put in possession of the Holy Land; they practised the vilest abominations, and 'shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, and the land was polluted with blood.' Yet, they were only chastised, not exterminated. Is God unrighteous, who taketh vengeance in this way? Is not the Commentary doing its best to perpetuate a gross and pernicious superstition, such that one mistake of this kind will poison all the wells of truth, and affect with fatal error the whole circle of our thoughts? Happily the idea of the Canaanites having been ruthlessly exterminated by express Divine command is a mere fiction of the tender-hearted Deuteronomist, by which he desired to express his abhorrence of the sins of Israel."  

It is, indeed, happy that it should be thus; but symbolical exterminations may serve as two-edged weapons. They may have served to point a moral lesson in the days of Jeremiah; they have suggested some dreadful perversions of moral principle to Mr. Espin. The slaughter of the Canaanites served, in his judgement,

"various important purposes besides the mere removal of

1 New Bible Commentary Examined, Part VI. p. 18.
2 The Minute of Sir B. Frere forwarded to the Colonial Office, November 16, 1878, has been already noticed, Vol. I. p. 519, note. Had Sir B. Frere merely mentioned the fact that the Boers regarded themselves as having by the precepts of the Pentateuch a higher title to the Zulu lands than that of the Zulus themselves, the remark might have been allowed to pass with an expression of surprise that Sir B. Frere should not have a word of censure for this wretched superstition. But Sir B. Frere does more than mention the fact. He draws an inference from it. "They had," he says, "at least, a sincere belief in the Divine authority for what they did, and, therefore, a far higher title than the Zulus could claim for all they acquired." The italics are mine.
...them from the face of the earth. No more effectual means could be adopted for inspiring God's people with an abhorrence of Canaanitish sins, to which they were not a little prone, than to make them ministers of Divine vengeance against those sins."

But according to the whole Hebrew history the means thus adopted were a total failure. The Canaanites were not exterminated, and the Hebrews were not in the least cured of their proneness to run into their sins; and are we really to infer that God's people—in other words, all good men—can be inspired effectually with an abhorrence of vices only by slaughtering those who are guilty of them? that Wilberforce, Clarkson, and their fellow-labourers would have more thoroughly felt the heinousness of slavery, if they had set to work to cut the throats of the slave-owners? But, not content with this, Mr. Espin goes on to say that

"had the sword of Joshua done his work more sparingly, the heathen would have been left in larger numbers mixed up in the land with God's people; there would have been intermarriage, and in no long time a melting down of the whole into one nation. Looking at the strong tendency which the Jews manifested all through their history to imitate those round about them, it is clear that in such a case the pure and high idea of God, which is the very heart and soul of revealed religion, would have been lost; the worship of Israel would soon have become as debased as was that of the Phoenicians and Moabites."

The sophistry which could lead us to believe that the history of Israel was the reverse of what is here pictured, is sufficiently bold. If the mere tendency of the Jews to imitate their neighbours produced the abominations for which Jeremiah wished that he could weep an ocean of tears, we can only suppose that, if they had had their way, they would have achieved triumphs of brutality compared with which the
exploits of Phoenicians and Canaanites would have been tame indeed.

But, if we give the smallest credit to the prophets, the history of the Jews was precisely that which Mr. Espin says that it was not. There was intermarriage, in which Solomon, in David's lifetime, it would seem, and with his sanction, led the van. As to the pure idea of God, they did not lose it, for the simple reason that they never had it, and their worship was fully "as debased as was that of the Phoenicians and Moabites." They "were mingled among the heathen and learned their works," and if we are to give the least credit to the words of Jeremiah and other prophets, they became such apt scholars in this accursed school that we must betake ourselves to Mexico in the days of Montezuma, if we would find more loathsome developments of devil-worship. In order, therefore, to bolster up the historical credit of the narrative in Joshua, Mr. Espin directly contradicts Jeremiah and his fellow-prophets; and in the same way he speaks of the

"fact that the whole host crossed the Jordan at the [flood] season, as no small proof of the miracle"

of the parted waters. In the Bishop's words,

"he assumes the truth of one part of the story in order to prove the truth of the other;"

just as he appealed to Deuteronomy to prove the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But, adds the Bishop,

"If the whole host did not cross the Jordan at this season what then becomes of this stupendous miracle?"

Having insisted on the historical character of the narrative

1 *New Bible Commentary Examined*, Part VI. p. 25. See also *supra*, pp. 292, 293.
Mr. Espin proceeds to minimise the wonder. The waters were

"held back and accumulated by the hand of God."

But

"they would need to be so but for a brief space."

"The waters were cut off," the Bishop remarks, "as soon as the ark reached the brink of the stream, when the people were yet a mile off. And so during all the time which it took three millions of people—men, women, and children, following in a column many miles long behind the priests bearing the ark—to travel over this mile of ground and cross the river-bed, the river, flowing on bank-full, in full turbid stream, was rising up by Zarthan into a 'heap' of water, towering up continually higher and higher every moment above the neighbouring lands, without flowing over them, as it had previously flowed over all its banks. And this would only need to be so but for a 'brief space.' And then Mr. Espin says, 'The typical significance of this wonderful narrative will be found drawn very fully in Bishop Wordsworth's commentary in loc.' And among these, I presume, is included theological rubbish such as the following, which is tossed, instead of the bread of life, to the hungry soul athirst for the Living God:—'Nor must in this point of view the name 'Adam,' the place whence flowed to the people the stream which cut them off from the promises, and the failure for the time being under the rule of Joshua of the full and rapid stream which supplies the Dead Sea, be overlooked.'"

It is needless to say that Mr. Espin's "short space" would be protracted into days; and both of his utterances and of those of Bishop Wordsworth, so far as we can attach any meaning to them at all, it may be said that to find their like we shall in vain search the whole Hindu literature of the Puranas. We may be forgiven if, having persevered thus far,

1 New Bible Commentary Examined, Part VI. p. 27.
we begin to be surfeited. But one or two more instances must yet be noticed, if we would estimate accurately Mr. Espin's regard for facts.

"Never, perhaps," he says, "was a miracle more needed than that which gave Jericho to Joshua. Its lofty walls and well-fenced gates made it simply impregnable to the Israelites—a nomad people, reared in the desert, destitute alike of the engines of war for assaulting a fortified town, and of skill and experience in the use of them, if it had them. Nothing but a direct interference of the Almighty could in a week's time give a city like Jericho, thoroughly on its guard and prepared, to besiegers situated as were Joshua and the Jews."

To these words the Bishop quietly replies:

"According to the story the Israelites numbered 600,000 warriors, and they had captured in about a fortnight Sihon and his host, and 'three score cities, all the region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan, all these cities fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, besides unwalled towns a great many,'—not to speak of the conquest of Midian, when, without any miracle, 12,000 Israelites killed in fighting 88,000 men, and butchered 88,000 women and 32,000 boys without the loss of a single man. But what if none of these things really happened, and Jericho also was not given in a week's time into Joshua's hands, as described in the story?"

But according to the story the whole Hebrew army was to march round the city once a day for six days, and seven times on the seventh day, while the priests were to blow their ram's horn trumpets, and then when the whole people shouted on Joshua's giving the signal the walls were to fall. It is, of course, quite clear that during these seven days the commandment to keep holy the Sabbath day must have been

1 *New Bible Commentary Examined*, Part VI. p. 32.
wholly set at naught; but, putting this aside, we may ask whether it would have been less an act of "direct interference of the Almighty" if the destruction of Jericho had been brought about by an earthquake, which might have thrown down the walls in a second of time without all this ceremonial of priestly processions, trumpetings, and shoutings? Mr. Espin can scarcely contend that an earthquake would not be the work of God. If it be not His work, will he say whose work it is? and will he deny that the destruction of towns is a common consequence of these acts or interferences? The fact is that we are here plunged into an ocean of fiction. In the case of Jericho we have a fictitious success; in that of Ai a fictitious defeat. The repulse of the detachment sent against Ai is followed by a command to send against it "all the people of war," *i.e.* the 600,000 fighting men. Such is the tale which Mr. Espin accepts, and on which the Bishop remarks:—

"Though they had smitten Sihon and Og, and taken sixty cities fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, and 12,000 had killed 88,000 fighting men of Midian, and had just ... taken Jericho, and had received the express promise of Jehovah, 'I have given into thy hands the king of Ai,' yet the people are so 'discouraged' that Jehovah saw it to be expedient to send 'all the men of war,' 600,000 warriors, to attack a little town whose population all told, men, women, and children, numbered only 12,000 altogether, and against which Joshua had thought it enough to send about 3000 men." ¹

The story of pitiless slaughter is interrupted by the alleged sparing of the Gibeonites, and of Rahab.

"Others, doubtless," Mr. Espin believes, "might have been spared likewise, had they sought for mercy in the right way."

¹ *New Bible Commentary Examined*, Part VI. p. 34.

X: 2
But what was the right way? Rahab, the Bishop remarks, sought it by treason against her own king and people, and the Gibeonites by fraud and lying.¹ Fear alone, according to Mr. Espin, prompted the action of the Gibeonites.

"Rahab’s motives were higher. She did not wait for the coming of Joshua, but believed in the word of God before its promises began to be accomplished. Hence she was adopted into Israel: the Gibeonites remained for ever bondmen to Israel."

But Rahab and her people, we are told, had heard "how Jehovah had dried up the water of the Red Sea for Israel," and "what Israel had done to Sihon and Og, whom they utterly destroyed," and "as soon as they had heard, their hearts melted, and there remained no more courage in any man."

To one of the prodigies recorded in the Book of Joshua Mr. Espin refused to give credit; but his rejection was determined, not by scientific considerations, but solely by the fact that there is no corroborative evidence for it in the records of other countries. The stopping of the diurnal rotation of the earth, and the consequences which might be supposed to follow it, involved for him no difficulty.

"The Agent here concerned is omnipotent and omniscient, and could, of course, as well arrest the consequences of such a suspension of nature’s working as He could suspend the working itself."

It is strange, indeed, that any can see reverence in such remarks as these. At this rate we might imagine “omnipotence” as sending the whole galaxy revolving in different directions, and arresting the regular consequences of this irregular dance. As to the idea of a Kosmos, as to the

¹ New Bible Commentary Examined, Part VI. p. 39.
notion of order, this is put aside altogether. Any upsetting of His own work is, it seems, imaginable in Him "who cannot deny Himself," and in whom is "no shadow of turning." But although in itself the story seems to him perfectly credible, he felt

"that any such stupendous phenomenon would affect the chronological calculations of all races of men over the whole earth, and do so in a similarly striking and very intelligible manner."

Yet of such disturbance there is elsewhere no record. We must therefore, he concludes, look upon the narrative as poetical, and on the prodigy as a metaphor.1 Accordingly he tells us that

"this explanation is adopted by Maurer, Ewald, Von Lengerke, and, what is more important, commended itself also to such men as Hengstenberg, Keil, and Kurtz—theologians whose orthodoxy upon the plenary inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures is well known and undoubted;"

"a statement which," in the Bishop's words, "lets us incautiously behind the curtain, and betrays to us the secret purpose and principles of the contrivers, editors, and writers of this Commentary. For them, it appears, not mere learning and love of truth are the things of most importance, but 'a well-known and undoubted' reputation for 'orthodoxy upon the plenary inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture.'" 2

But though Mr. Espin may have the countenance of these critics in explaining away the matter, there remains a difficulty with the writer of Joshua x. 13,

1 But if so, why may not the whole story of the Exodus be a poem, and all its prodigies metaphors?
2 New Bible Commentary Examined, Part VI. p. ix.
“who evidently believed that the miracle was real and not imaginary. Mr. Espin, however, having taken one downward step, boldly throws the text in question out of the ‘inspired’ record.”

It breaks the continuity of the narrative. It is, therefore, a gloss which later copyists have interpolated into the text. The argument may be urged with equal, if not greater, force for the rejection from St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians of the two passages, xv. 3-11, and xi. 23-32. But after all these pretensions of belief, and all this exercise of critical freedom, the prodigy seems to be superfluous. The day may have been prolonged to enable the Israelites to slaughter on; but it seems that

“they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword,”

so that, the Bishop adds,

“one hardly sees why such a miracle, or indeed a miracle of any kind, was needed at all, or what purpose it served.”

We have thus seen how the Bishop was compelled to deal with a Commentary published with a profession, not of talking about, but of really meeting, difficulties and answering objections. We have seen that not one difficulty has been met, not one objection really and fairly answered. The task is impossible; but the question is one of unspeakable moment. The struggle, in the Bishop’s words, is “an internecine conflict.”

“Upon the success or failure of this Commentary—upon its being allowed to impose on the great majority of English readers a mass of fallacies, assertions, and assumptions, in

1 New Bible Commentary Examined, Part VI. p. 42.
the place of solid reasoning and sound criticism—on its being exposed from the first in its proper character, and neutralised in its effects by the juxtaposition of the truth,—it depends very much, as I conceive, whether the reign of traditionary falsehood shall or shall not be brought to an end within the Church of England in the present generation—whether educational efforts shall or shall not be any longer cramped and inthralled under the slavish yoke of ignorance and superstition—whether missionaries in heathen lands shall or shall not for the time to come continue to give them stones instead of bread, and to pour down their eager throats the poisonous doses with which hitherto they have been commonly drugged, and which must assuredly result in the next generation in numberless cases, here as elsewhere, in incurable, hereditary scepticism and unbelief."

It is the battle between sacred books and the direct eternal guidance of the Living God.\(^1\) In every country the tyranny of sacred books, as such, has become a curse. It is our duty to fight with it until it be utterly put down; and when it has been destroyed it will be seen that no combatant in this

---

\(^1\) *New Bible Commentary Examined*, Part VI. p. vii.

\(^2\) The Hebrew Scriptures, it is unnecessary to say, are one of the sacred books of the East. They belong, therefore, to a class; and it is a matter for regret that they have not been published and commented on, as such, in the series undertaken and edited by Professor Max Müller. The intention to include them in that series has been frustrated; and it is, perhaps, easy to guess at the influences which have served to bar the way. These efforts, successful for the present, may defeat the purposes of those who have made them. A very wide interval, no doubt, separates the Hebrew Books from those of the Veda or Avesta; but, if the interval be as wide as may be conceived, the differences can only be thrown out in stronger relief by the comparison from which these persons unreasonably shrink. It is only by full and diligent comparison that the true relations of the Hebrew Scriptures to all other sacred books can be determined. The truth is that all these books have in greater or less degree done good—have made men wiser, better, and happier; and among them the Hebrew Scriptures stand pre-eminent.
"internecine conflict" has fought with more devotion and love of truth than the Bishop of Natal.¹

¹ It may be remarked that, in dealing with the momentous questions relating to the Book of Deuteronomy, great stress has been laid on the command that each king should make an autograph copy of the Book of the Law for his own constant perusal. See p. 298, note 1. Nothing more was needed; but perhaps the most important argument has been left unnoticed. Not only is each king to spend his time in constant study of his own copy; but once in every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before Jehovah Elohim, "thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing." Men, women, children, the stranger in their gates, all are to be brought together that "they may hear and learn and observe to do all the words of this law." Deuteronomy xxxi. 9-13. And this was the book which Moses wrote at the Divine bidding, and was for the first time discovered about a millennium later, in the eighteenth year of the reign of King Josiah.
CHAPTER VI.

THE GOVERNMENT OF NATAL AND THE HLUBI TRIBE.

1873.

When the Bishop of Natal returned to his diocese in 1865, he went back as a man branded by the anathemas of the parties which professed to form the "religious" public of England. He went back to fight a hard battle with those who wished to set up an independent ecclesiastical system under an irresponsible head; and on his side he had not merely the matured judgement of a few in the colony who had really thought upon the question, but the general feeling of the colonists. When he visited England for the last time nine years later, he returned to Natal an object of grievous suspicion and undisguised dislike to all who see the worst form of evil in what they stigmatize as political philanthropy. A certain part of the self-styled religious public had not forgiven him, and he had added to the number of his enemies by taking up what was called the cause of black savages. Some of the colonists who had approved his resistance to the Metropolitan of Southern Africa now maintained that he was betraying their best interests, and declared that in his eyes the rights and welfare of white men went for nothing in comparison with the foolish fondling of inferior races, impotent for good and powerful only for mischief. These critics, if by any stretching
of the term they may be so called, had discovered that the Bishop was a man born to give trouble; and troublesome men are for them men guilty of an unpardonable sin. Who was he that he should venture to judge the action and pass sentence on the policy of temporal Governments? Why, if the colony wished to be rid of some heathen chieftain, and if the course of events hurried this chieftain into captivity, should he presume to subject the motives, the words, and deeds of those who had brought about this issue to a stringent and searching scrutiny? Why should he insist that justice must be done to black and white alike? The plea might be true; but it was disagreeable to have it brought prominently forward, and to do so implied the grossest bad taste in a clergyman. Yet more, if he chose to take this course, why should he so obstinately persist in it? Why should he not make his protest, if he thought himself bound to make one, and then leave the matter for wiser heads and more long-sighted politicians to settle? Why should he dissect and condemn the policy of Government after Government? Why should he offend every English prejudice by speaking well of those who in English eyes could be only vile? Why should he say that English treatment of the native races of Southern Africa was little better than a tissue of mistakes, blunders, and crimes? Even now, when the Bishop's voice has been for four years silent, expressions of resentment may sometimes be heard when his strictures on the Zulu War are mentioned, and plain intimations are given that the patience of English readers may be too heavily taxed if the story is not cut short. It shall be cut short, so far as it may be practicable to do so. So long as justice was done and wrong redressed, the Bishop was the last man to desire that any stress should be laid upon his own share in the business. He would unquestionably have wished that his motives should be vindicated: he would have been untrue to his deepest convictions if he had not wished it;
and those who remain behind him are in their turn resolved that justice shall be done to him as fully as he strove that it should be done to Zulu chiefs and the meanest of their people.

Englishmen must listen to plain speaking not less than other men; and they must bear to be told that to blame one man for utterances which they condone or applaud in others is unfair. The Bishop of Natal is not the only man who has severely condemned the action of the British Government in Southern Africa. The language of Mr. Froude is not a whit less scathing, and Mr. Froude speaks with the authority of one who knows something of the country, and who has acted there as an agent of the Imperial Government. His convictions have been laid repeatedly before the public. They have been stated from time to time in the pages of Fraser's Magazine; they have been put forth again, as the final expression of his latest thought, in his volume on Oceana.

The Bishop of Natal has been charged with indiscreet zeal, at one time in palliating the misdeeds of the Boers, at another in exaggerating the good qualities of the native tribes, or in depreciating the dangers involved in their alleged or real turbulence, and still more in holding up to the reprobation of the world the underhand action of accredited English agents, the faithlessness of British Governments to their plighted engagements, and the deliberate falsehoods of English Governors. On each and all of these points it would be difficult for any one to use language more emphatic and more severe than that of Mr. Froude. His accusation against the working of British rule in Southern Africa resolves itself into little more than one long indictment for breach of faith caused by truckling to sections of public opinion in England.

In 1874, Mr. Froude himself travelled through Natal, the Free States, the diamond-fields, and the north of the Cape Colony. It was the year of the Bishop of Natal's last visit to
England, a visit arising out of a branch of the same series of evil-doings which had provoked Mr. Froude's indignation. It would have been well if, on this occasion, they could have met. It would have been well, also, if Mr. Froude had mentioned the Bishop's name as that of a fellow-worker in the righteous cause which both had at heart. Mr. Froude has, it seems, not thought it his duty to pay this tribute to his work, or to his memory; but he has at least set the seal of his approbation to the Bishop's motives and judgement.

The Bishop of Natal is further charged with something like factious opposition to many Governors. He is regarded as especially severe and especially unjust to Sir Bartle Frere. But to this officer Mr. Froude is at least as severe, and his condemnation is, of necessity perhaps, even more sweeping.

Mr. Froude's narrative traces the course of events to a time later by many months than the Bishop's death; but this circumstance serves only the more conclusively to show that he judges British policy and the conduct of British Governors in Southern Africa not less severely than the Bishop. If the judgement of Mr. Froude is in harmony with the best interests of Englishmen, then so also is that of the Bishop. An obvious difference between them is that Mr. Froude's verdict was based on the experience only of months, while the efforts of the Bishop were prompted by convictions acquired by the personal work and intercourse of half a life-time with both the white and the coloured population of the country.

Above all, there would be the further difference that the Bishop worked from the pure love of justice and truth, the justice and truth of the Living God—a motive to which Mr. Froude seems to attach but little importance, and almost to disclaim for himself personally.

In the whole series of the Bishop's letters relating to matters affecting the natives generally, and in particular to the cases
of Langalibalele and Cetshwayo, the characteristic which will probably most of all strike the reader is his absolute veracity. His good will to the natives none have questioned, and none can question; but this very good will may be regarded as involving very subtle temptations to the exaggeration, if not to the falsification, of facts. On this point the Bishop's utterances may fearlessly be subjected to the most rigid scrutiny. If at any time or in any way he may have been tempted to over-colour his picture in favour of those who, on any showing, were undergoing the most unjust treatment at British hands, it is the more credit to him that he has so thoroughly resisted the inducement. It would be true to say that he never felt it. His letters display everywhere an equal readiness to do justice to all; and, in examining the case of Langalibalele before and after the starting of the expedition for the Bushman's River Pass, he is careful to bring forward against Langalibalele all that he notices himself, or had heard from others, sifting of course the value of these reports to the best of his power, as he was bound to do. It is indeed a woeful tale; and as we think of the horrors of the tragedy, and connect it with the iniquities of the diamond-fields, it is impossible to forget that the danger of which Sir B. Pine and his adherents affected to be afraid might have been met by the simplest of expedients. It was notorious that Langalibalele's men had done their work steadily and well in the diamond-fields, and they were intitled to their wages. The white diggers chose to offer them payment in rifles and ammunition, and the offer was accepted. All who were acquainted with the natives well knew that throughout the colony their young men of all tribes used fire-arms with boyish delight, and prized them accordingly. It might be prudent to check the general acquisition of guns, although there was every likelihood that the attempt to use them in warfare in place of the assegai would only prove an embarrass-
ment to the natives, quite apart from the inevitable difficulty of obtaining suitable, or any, ammunition. But the danger was hypothetical merely, and any theory of ulterior design on the part of the natives was not only uncalled for, but wholly discredited by subsequent events. There was no general law in the British colonies forbidding either the offer, or its acceptance. The real wrong lay elsewhere. These men, like others throughout the colony, had not gone to the fields of their own will, nor had they been sent by their chief. They had been taken up in parties by Natalians who wished to profit by the new enterprise; and, as late as November 1873, the Government of Griqualand West said that such of them as apply for passports to return seldom take arms with them unless returning under the protection of their masters. In Natal

"no native can legally own a gun or other fire-arm until he has obtained the written permission of the Lieutenant-Governor, and the weapon has been duly registered."

The protection spoken of implied a pledge to aid them in getting this permission. They relied on receiving this aid, and they had good reason for so doing. According to the report of the Griqualand Government, 565 Zulus from Natal had been registered as servants at Kimberley from May 1 to October 31, 1873; and 615 between July 5 and November 18 at Du Toit's Pan. Most, or many, of these had been paid in guns; and the fact that some of their employers were Government officials seemed to sanction the supposition that the Government approved of this method of paying them; although, it is true, the Messrs. Shepstone stated publicly afterwards that they had striven to dissuade their men from buying the arms. Seeing that the guns so obtained could scarcely be confiscated wholesale, the Natal Government, in February 1872, and before the arrival of Sir B. Pine in the
colony, sent a circular to the magistrates, informing them that permission to hold the guns could be granted only “if the holders were favourably reported upon”; but in some instances guns produced or reported to the magistrate were not registered, and were not returned to the natives, who were thus robbed of their wages. It might be right in the Natal Government to insist on their surrender, but in this case they should have been bought at their fair value. Beyond this value the Government needed not to expend a shilling; and for this value, if they had no desire to keep them in Natal, they might sell them out of the colony, and recoup themselves for the outlay. To such a course the natives could have offered no objection; and if they had, they would have been in the wrong. But for a fair price the arms would, beyond doubt, have been surrendered, and all the misery and horror which ensued would have been avoided.

From this time to the end of his life a marked change is seen in the direction of the Bishop's energy. Thus far he had been fighting for freedom of thought in the search for facts on behalf of his fellow-countrymen; henceforth he was to be a champion striving to secure bare justice, if not mercy and forbearance, for the native tribes within and without the borders of Natal. In a letter to Mr. Froude, from which some extracts will hereafter be given, the Bishop says that he had with set purpose refrained for many years from anything which might be even considered as interference with the course of the civil Government. It was no longer possible for him to do so. He had hitherto received with implicit trust the accounts of native affairs given to him by Mr. Shepstone; he now found himself compelled to compare them with hints or utterances of the natives themselves, and to ascertain what measure of credence might be due to them. The year 1873 is thus, indeed, one of the most memorable years in his life; and in this year also he made an acquaint-
ance with Major Durnford, R.E., which rapidly ripened into
the most intimate friendship of his later life.

The extracts which will be given from the Bishop's letters
will tell in more full detail the story of the chief of the Ama-
Hlubi, Langalibalele,¹ whose tribe, having crossed over into
Natal² in 1848, had been placed in a "location" under the Dra-
kensberg Mountains, with the charge of defending the colony
from the raids of Bushmen—a charge which it is officially
admitted they had always faithfully fulfilled. Like the other
tribes, they were subject to the law forbidding them to have
unregistered arms. We have seen the circumstances under
which men from Langa's³ and other neighbouring tribes had
worked at the diamond-fields, and had been for many months
returning home with their wages in arms instead of money.
Langa's tribe was, however, singled out for failure in the
registration of weapons, and the chief was summoned to
Maritzburg to explain the fact. Such a summons had been
issued twice only during the last twenty years; and in each
case it had been followed by the outlawry of the chief and the
eating up of his tribe. It turned out, however, that there
was a further reason for the terror which led Langalibalele


² This was not the first settlement of the tribe in Natal. They had
occupied the territory, along with other aboriginal tribes, until they were
disturbed by Tshaka's (Chaka's) wars, which began to affect them about
1812. In his Elementary Grammar of the Zulu Language, third edition,
p. 2, the Bishop says:—"At the present time (1882) the district of Natal
is largely occupied by a very mixed population of native tribes. The
majority of them are sprung from the aboriginal inhabitants, who either
took refuge in the fastnesses of the country when the desolating wars of
Tshaka's invasions rolled over the land, and have since emerged into the
light of day; or had fled beyond his reach into the neighbouring districts,
and returned to settle in their own abodes as soon as the Dutch Boers
took possession of the land, before the proclamation of British supremacy."
Mr. Froude was mistaken in thinking that the Zulus were invaders not
known in Southern Africa before the last century.

³ This will often be found in these pages as a shortened form of the
name Langalibalele.
first into equivocation and then into disobedience, and that this reason was known to two at least of the Government authorities, although they had no idea that the secret would ever come out. The summons was repeated in more peremptory terms, and the chief, disheartened by this secret fear, became still more convinced that his life would be forfeited if he trusted himself to the hands of the English. He offered to pay a fine: the offer was refused. He then sent some mounted men to Maritzburg, with "a little bag of money all in gold, about as big as a man's hand," as an earnest of a larger sum to be paid hereafter.¹ The messengers returned to tell him that this offer also had been rejected, and that the Government force, with the Supreme Chief at its head, and accompanied by the Secretary for Native Affairs, was on their track. The scare was, in truth, mutual, if the Government feared, as they affected to fear, that Langa aimed at their destruction; but in spite of the alarm, real or feigned, at Maritzburg, one of Langa's most persistent opponents admitted that

"throughout this affair perfect quiet and order have prevailed. Farmers living within a few miles of Langa's location have remained calmly at their homesteads." ²

Langa's mind was made up; but it was made up to fly, not to rebel. The Bishop had been led to believe at first that there had been a plan for armed resistance; and this will throw light on some expressions in his letters.

Hurrying off in haste, Langa, on November 3, 1873, crossed the borders of the Natal colony, and was therefore according to Kafir law no longer under obedience to the Supreme Chief—

¹ Afterwards actually collected to fall a prey to the Basuto chief Molapo.
² The Mail, January 5, 1874. See the letter to Mr. Shaen, of December 14, 1873, below, p. 326.
i.e. to the Lieutenant-Governor. But a force of Natal volunteers and Basutos, under the command of Major Durnford, reached the Bushman's River Pass in time to come into collision, not with the main body of Langa's tribe, which had passed into Basutoland the day before, but with the men who followed with his cattle. These carbineers had never before seen active service, and many of them were mere lads. Ill-officered as they were, they were seized with panic, and began a movement in retreat, which tempted the Hlubi men to fire. Major Durnford, having vainly attempted to rally them, was brought off the field, severely wounded and fainting from loss of blood, by the Basutos who accompanied his force; and three out of the four volunteers who stood by Major Durnford when the others insisted on retiring, fell by the bullets of the Hlubis.

The death of these three young men called forth a general cry for vengeance; and an attempt was made to screen the carbineers by blaming Major Durnford for not allowing them to fire before they had lost their nerve. In fact, Major Durnford had strict orders "not to fire the first shot," and the three days' truce which had been announced had not yet expired.

"I do not see the papers," Major Durnford wrote to the Bishop, "but I am told that I am generally abused."

In his reply, November 17, the Bishop says,

"You have been and are abused in some of the journals, but not in all. I send you a copy of the Colonist, which will show what some think of you; and I need hardly say that we and a great many others perfectly well understand what was the real cause of the failure at the Pass, and we do not conceal our thoughts when occasion offers."

1 The Natal Colonist of November 14, 1873, speaking of "the foul and ungenerous aspersions cast upon Major Durnford," asserts emphatically "that for cool daring and manly endurance, for humanity and every quality which can adorn an Englishman and a gentleman on the field of battle, he is one of whom his countrymen may well feel proud."
In the letter which called forth these words Major Durnford had shown how deeply he felt the death of the three young volunteers. The state of the weather and of the land made it impossible to get at Langa's tribe, and he spoke of the delay as terrible.

"I have my comrades to avenge, but in this weather I am helpless;" and again, "It is useless now to talk; all that remains is to bury the dead and avenge them." 1

We need not say that Major Durnford had in his mind only a fair encounter with an enemy in an open field, and for the feeling so expressed the Bishop could make allowance. Not a few have thought and said that he would have made a first-rate lawyer; and his manifest military qualities led Major Durnford more than once to tell him that he was a born commander. But the very warmth of the friendship which the Bishop felt for this excellent and most conscientious officer impelled him to reply at once,

"There were one or two expressions in your letter which pained me, and I should not be a true friend if I did not say so. I mean those where you speak of taking vengeance for the dead. I am not a milk-and-water philanthropist who would have no blood whatever shed under present circumstances, though I should have rejoiced if, as on two former occasions, the chief and his tribe had been reduced and punished without it. But, where resistance is made to lawful authority, of course the consequences must follow. Still, I must confess it jarred upon my mind to find you, a brave soldier and an accomplished gentleman, talking like those whom I tried to teach on Sunday evening, November 9,2 when I spoke of the three gallant youths who

1 A Soldier's Life and Work in South Africa: A Memoir of the late Colonel A. W. Durnford, pp. 51, 52.
2 The Bishop had said in this sermon:—"It must be a comfort to the parents and friends of those who have fallen . . . that they died as brave youths should die, in the discharge of duty. . . . And a bright ray of light
fell, that the memory of their example should silence the cry for vengeance, which the blessed dead would never desire. . . . As for Langalibalele's men, it is impossible to help admiring the bravery they have shown; and I should have thought that you above all men would have admired it also, and only been saddened at the thought that so many fine fellows must be killed, not for vengeance, but because they will fight on till they are dead. . . . I, we all, look to you to check, where it can be reasonably checked, the effusion of blood. God help us if men such as you will not interfere to stop the brutal acts of such men as ——, who wanted to kill nine prisoners in cold blood. Don't be angry with me because I have written as above. If I did not care for you and value your friendship, you may be sure I should not have done so."

The Bishop's next letter shows how thoroughly the two friends understood each other.

"I return you many thanks for your kind letter, and you may be sure that we have all here absolved you from the first desire to wage war on women and children and hunted men. Only your language—forced from you, it is plain, by the great agony through which you had to pass in seeing three brave fellows shot at your side—would have helped to swell the cry for 'vengeance,' which seems to me utterly out of place under present circumstances."

must be thrown upon the gloom which has settled down upon each household where the dearly loved face will be seen no more, by the fact that to the last they were good as they were true, and by their latest acts have left tender memories behind; . . . that one, when it was proposed to find for him a substitute, refused to be relieved from the duties he had undertaken; . . . that another on that terrible night went gallantly down the dangerous path which had been climbed with so much difficulty, to minister to the needs of his suffering chief, while the third discharged the same friendly office again and again, . . . and brought at last the friendly natives who bore him fainting and helpless to the summit. . . . Such examples as these are good for us all to think of. . . . Good above all to check the cry for vengeance, which the blessed dead would never desire. It is one thing to put down with a strong hand the rebellious chief and his main supporters, and another to massacre his helpless tribe."
It will be seen that both in his letters and in his sermon the Bishop was speaking under the impression that there was a purposed resistance to legal authority, that there was deliberate defiance, deliberate rebellion. Of the real grounds and motives which determined the action of the Hlubi chief, and which will be made clear in the sequel, he was wholly unaware. When at length he got an inkling of the facts, it was, and he saw it to be, nothing less than his duty to unearth them and bring them to light. But although at the moment he had no reason for condemning the expedition itself, he did condemn emphatically the brutal way in which it was carried out; and so did Major Durnford.

"There have been," the latter wrote, "sad sights—women and children butchered by our black allies [too often, unhappily, by the permission and encouragement of the white leaders, one of whom is reported to have told his men that he did not wish to see the faces of any prisoners], old men too. It was too bad. But when one employs savage against savage, what can one be astonished at? The burnt villages—dead women—it was all horrible. And the destitution of the women and children left is fearful. The women are all made slaves! What will England say? Thank God, no woman or child was killed by [the force under] my command, no old man either; but others have committed these atrocities, for which there is no defence to my mind."

Oppressed by the tidings of all these horrors and this deep distress, the Bishop felt that they must cause no less pain to the friend whom during the whole time which he had spent in Natal he had delighted to think of as his colleague. Immediately on Mr. Shepstone's return from this scene he hastened to offer him in person his sympathy in this great sorrow; but he was simply "confounded" on finding that it was not required or wished for. Mr. Shepstone justified the expedition. The Bishop felt that his confidence in his friend had undergone
a severe blow; it was to be submitted shortly to an ordeal still more severe. Still the trust of so many years was not to be easily shattered. Nor was he, as his letters will show, obliged to believe Mr. Shepstone primarily responsible for what had happened. Writing, December 2, 1873, to his young friend, Mr. Alfred Hughes,¹ and after giving a narrative of the events which have been already related, the Bishop adds:—

"I will now proceed to make some comments on the above, from my own point of view, which you and your friends will take as coming from a strong adherent of Mr. Shepstone, and one who believes that very serious consequences would follow from any rash interference with his policy, which has preserved peace and prosperity within our border for so many years, in a population of 17,000 whites and 300,000 natives, of whom the latter contribute in taxes, direct and indirect, upwards of £50,000 a year.² Still you know that I have always advocated, and so does Mr. Shepstone himself, the gradual transfer of his personal authority into the hands of other Government officers; and you know also that I have been long strongly of opinion that this could best be done by appointing him Lieutenant-Governor of the colony, when the transference could be made under his own authority without any loss of prestige."

TO W. SHAEN, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, December 14, 1873.

"It has just occurred to me that you are the Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Society, and, if so, you are the very

¹ See p. 243.
² It is scarcely necessary to say that this policy, as the Bishop conceived it, was to raise the natives gradually in civilisation, not suddenly imposing upon them laws and customs which they could not appreciate, nor harshly interfering with their own laws and institutions, but preserving and using what was good in them, and modifying or abolishing others by degrees. To this policy the Bishop adhered to the last.
person to see that a thorough Parliamentary inquiry is made into the recent proceedings in this colony with respect to the chief Langalibalele. . . . Our information is more or less liable to error, as it has to be drawn from letters published in the colonial papers, and private conversation with some who have taken part in the transactions. But I do hope that someone will be willing to devote himself to the work of getting the facts properly before the English public. If so, the first thing he will have to do will be to study carefully the issues of our four colonial journals—Witness, Times, Mercury, Colonist—since the beginning of the affair; and as we have not yet come to the end of it, the chief not having been yet caught, or even found, as far as we know, it may be that for some weeks to come they will have to be consulted. I assume, then, that I need not repeat here what will be found sufficiently detailed in those journals. What I wish to do is to enable you and your friends to read 'between the lines' of published letters and Government proclamations, and I shall do this from my own point of view, as one who has the strongest confidence in the good sense, judgement, statesmanship, and benevolence of Mr. Shepstone. . . .

"When Mr. Pine was here in 1850-54, he was very hostile to Mr. Shepstone, and the latter was comparatively young, and had to give way to his superior. But now Mr. Shepstone has the advantage of twenty years' more experience, and when Sir B. Pine landed I had hoped that he had learnt wisdom . . . Gradually, however, he has fallen back into his old habits. . . . Mr. Shepstone is far too wise to contradict Sir B. Pine's measures when announced, and I suspect has had to assent to much which he would not himself have counselled, and it is certain that Sir B. Pine wrote a private letter to John Macfarlane lately, in respect of the conflict with the natives, to this effect, 'Go in and win; I'll take care that you shall not be interfered with again,' i.e. by Mr. Shepstone. It is this underhand work which I fear is going on, and I hope that the faults in the treatment of Langalibalele will be put upon the right
shoulders, however ingeniously Sir B. Pine may write his despatches, for which he has a special reputation. . . ."

After describing the Bushman's River Pass affair, the Bishop proceeds:

"Then came the 'cry for vengeance,' 'because,' as Sir B. Pine said in his proclamation, 'of the three men basely murdered.' It was the same with the Boers and the Basutos. Every Boer killed was basely murdered; but Basuto men and women might be killed and their homes ravaged, and they were only 'punished.' Sir B. Pine now let slip his dogs of war upon the defenceless remnant of the tribe. There was a regular system of bush-whacking and cave-smoking, of which you will see some accounts in the journals; but doubtless not a fraction of the horrors committed will ever be published. Hundreds of men were killed—shot or assegiaed—and hundreds of women and children were taken prisoners, and a proclamation announced that these were all to be distributed over the colony to white people who would apply for them as servants. I saw a number of them a day or two ago—mostly young women with little children; some, babies born since the catastrophe. But something checked Sir B. Pine's movements in this respect—perhaps an indignant letter in one of our papers. At this moment they have been torn from their homes, and are held as prisoners, but are not yet assigned, and it is said that Sir B. Pine does not know what to do with them. They found the huts full of Kafir corn, so that a large body of natives and volunteers' horses ate as much as they liked and left heaps behind—so little was the tribe prepared for active rebellion. Sir B. Pine indeed calls it rebellion; but what had the tribe, as a tribe, really done? It was a very powerful tribe, and for weeks past had all the neighbouring farmers at its mercy, and some of the farmers fled away in panic with their wives and families, while others stayed quietly at home and were never molested. Not a single outrage was committed, either before or after the expedition started, on any farm; not a horse or an ox was
stolen—so far as I know; and we surely should have heard if anything of the kind had been done. At the time the expedition left Maritzburg, I believe (on very good authority) that no overt act was known to have been committed by the chief which would have warranted such a movement against him. On the way, however, I believe they heard that the native messengers last sent by Mr. Shepstone with a final summons to him to come and report himself were ill-treated; but they were not injured or killed. What took place, I believe, was merely this. The chief had long dallied with them, pretending sickness, &c.; and when at last they insisted on seeing him, he ordered them to be searched outside his hut, lest they should have revolvers about them. For this purpose they were stripped, and some of the young men behaved rudely to them, touched them with their assegais, and talked about stabbing them, but were checked and reproved by an induna; and all this, I believe (but I may be wrong), was done without the knowledge or approval of the chief. But suppose again the worst, and that by this act the chief deserved to be deprived, and, if caught, to be sent to Robben Island. I ask again what had the tribe done to be so frightfully treated? They have made no armed resistance whatever in their location—except individuals here and there in the bush or in a cave, who, like hunted rats, have turned to bay. They have not (as far as I know) in any single instance attacked us, except at the Pass, and there the temptation of seeing thirty-five Englishmen—well armed, each with breechloader, revolver, and (what the natives did not know) forty rounds of ammunition—turn their backs to them and run away must have been almost irresistible. But, as I have said, if they had rallied and gone back and decimated them, or shot down most of them, that would have been intelligible; but to hunt these poor wretches, and drag them out, and kill them! An officer of volunteers told me that he brought in one evening seven prisoners, having killed three, and Sir B. Pine wanted to have these shot in cold blood. They would be tried by

1 These charges were all proved, as we shall see, to be mere lying.
himself and Mr. Shepstone; but better thoughts or better counsel prevailed. Putini's tribe was implicated by sheltering some of these unfortunates and some of Langalibalele's cattle; and so they have taken Putini's cattle (though the chief . . . is but a lad) to a very large amount, and some 5,000 are to be sold at auction next week. Two forces have been sent to hunt Langa beyond the colony, where he is supposed to be hiding among the mountains, in a savage district which scarcely a foot of civilised man has trodden, or even of savages, except Bushmen, and where multitudes of men, women, and children must perish from want, disease, and misery; but they have not yet found him. . . An Act of Indemnity is now being passed to cover all acts committed in putting down this 'rebellion' which Sir B. Pine may approve. Much was said at first about his having laid strict orders on Major Durnford 'not to fire first.' No doubt such an order was given, not (as his subsequent conduct showed) from any tender regard for the natives, but, I suspect, from fear of Exeter Hall. It seems to me to show that he had a misgiving that he had no right to fire upon the natives leaving the colony. . . The Zulus to the north-east possess any number of guns, and the Basutos to the north-west, and Adam Kok's people to the south-west. . . As a matter of prudence I believe that it would have been far better to let Langa and his tribe go, as many as chose to follow him, though probably many would have remained. He could not have settled down close upon our border, for there the region is wild and inhospitable; and he must have gone away to some considerable distance before he could have found a place to settle in, and even there he might have had to fight with other tribes. In order to make an inroad into this colony, he must have had to cross again this desolate country, far away from his supports and supplies, and leaving his women and children behind him; whereas now, by making prisoners of the latter, we have given him every incitement to revenge at any cost, if he is not caught or killed. In any case we must have a belt of faithful natives settled under the Drakensberg range of mountains, to serve
as a buffer between the white farmers and the Bushmen tribes, who have occasionally swept down upon that part of the colony and carried off herds and horses, and against whom hitherto Langalibalele's tribe was our barrier. But no! It was resolved that there must be a great military display... Sir B. Pine must win fresh glory, and Mr. Shepstone must be humbled, and responsible government inaugurated. And accordingly you will see what a cry was immediately raised against the 'Shepsonian policy,' as the cause of all this trouble; whereas never was a more striking proof given of the excellence of that policy than the fact that all our tribes have been perfectly quiet, and the Zulus and Basutos have refused help to the fugitive chief. It is really a triumph for Mr. Shepstone in spite of all his detractors."

It was thus that the Bishop wrote on December 14. Although at that time he did not see what was fully revealed to him afterwards, he perceived already some connexion between the destroying of the Hlubi tribe and the cry for responsible government, considered as a preliminary to confederation, though he did not then (and how could any Christian man?) foresee that this cruel "eating up" of Langa's people was but the prelude to the "eatings up" on a more terrific scale, now known conventionally as Kafir, Basuto, and Zulu Wars—all, as Mr. Froude says, "crimes and follies committed for the same shadow, confederation, which was no nearer than before."

"What right has Sir B. Pine to chase Langa and his people, as he is now doing, far outside the colonial frontier, in a wild district which no Europeans have ever trod, much less inhabited? Of course, he demands 'vengeance.' But has he not taken vengeance enough already in butchering hundreds, and making hundreds prisoners who were left behind in the colony? Had not Langa a right to say, 'The Zulus have guns, the Basutos, &c.; and, if you won't let me keep
them in Natal, I will go and live elsewhere? Had we any right to prevent his leaving the colony? Where is the British boundary—at the top of the Pass (suppose)?—but they were already at the top when the firing took place. . . . The question is an important one. Has not the whole idea of seizing Langa, . . . and inflicting condign vengeance on the tribe ‘pour encourager les autres,’ been an utter mistake in point of justice as well as of policy? If he had been allowed to go off with as many as liked to follow him, there would have been an end of him and his insubordination; and if we had shown that we meant to deal kindly with those left behind, they would have come out from their hiding-places, and all this butchery would have been avoided, and no bitterness would have remained in the hearts of the tribe, to lead to future acts of retaliation.”

On December 31, 1873, Langa was brought into Maritzburg, having been taken prisoner, without a shadow of resistance, with eight of his sons and some seventy-eight followers, by treachery arranged between the British Agent in Basutoland and one of the Basuto chiefs. He was at once placed in gaol, and kept there in solitary confinement until his trial (“to prevent his concocting a story”); the Lieutenant-Governor refusing to allow him to be defended by anyone, white or black, or even to be visited in gaol by anyone for the purpose of preparing his defence.

The colony had indeed, as the Bishop said, been “set on fire,” and varied passions and interests combined to fan the flame, and presently to turn the full blast of it on the Bishop himself. He had defended Major Dumford, who was precluded by his position (as being both Colonial and Royal Engineer) from speaking out for himself; and this could not be done without bringing to light some unpalatable facts. He had publicly expressed his disapproval of the treatment of the two tribes, and his indignation at certain specially horrible incidents of slaughter, as described by colonists in the colonial
journals during what was officially called “the campaign,” but was by one of these journals described as “hunting down the Kafirs like rabbits out of a warren.” He had spoken thus in Natal, and had written thus in his letters to England. People there, and especially the Peace Society, not less shocked by the same horrible incidents, expressed their feelings in less measured terms, and laid the blame for the “atrocities” on the colonists in general. The inference was naturally drawn from the language of three out of the four Natal papers, which on their side adroitly declared the Bishop responsible for stirring up the excitement in England in favour of “a slippery, mischievous, and dangerous customer, disloyal to a very extreme degree,” “who did his best to sink, burn, and destroy the country which had sheltered him,” while at a public meeting in Durban the Bishop was said to have held up “the colonists” to the reprobation of the whole world and of Christendom. At the time of this meeting the Bishop stood alone indeed; and even the editor of the Natal Colonist, honest and courageous as he was in supporting the truth when he recognised it, had not yet shaken off the notion that, whatever might be the wrongs of the tribe, the chief himself was “contumacious,” and a political offender of no small magnitude.

TO W. SHAEN, ESQ.

"BISHOFSTOWE, January 14, 1874.

... "I have not a single correspondent in the papers to support me, or, if any have written, their letters have been suppressed. ... For instance, one of my clergy, of Durban, writes me to-day saying:—'I had expressed sentiments very similar to yours about the "man in the cave" before your letters appeared in the Witness, but was so savagely set on for it from every quarter, that I made up my mind

1 Colonist, April 7, 1874."
never to refer to it again. However, I should have written to the Witness on the subject after your letters came out, only I knew that the editor would call me a "paid partisan," &c. I have no doubt that your letters will at least have the good result of making the volunteers and others more careful for the future—but at a great sacrifice to yourself.

"I learned yesterday, to my great surprise, that the Government really insist upon it as a proof of Langalibalele's 'rebellion,' and as a reason for so frightfully punishing his tribe, that they wanted to leave the colony without permission. In my simplicity I had supposed the blacks were free to leave as well as the whites. But it is not so. I find by Kafir law they cannot; that is, in Zululand they cannot. And when I observe that we have received thousands of refugees from Zululand, and still receive them, on condition that they are apprenticed for three years, I am told that we do not deal with the Zulus as a nation independent, and with equal rights, but as a dependent nation, the king being, as it were, a child of our Government, having been crowned by Mr. Shepstone. Therefore we receive his 'rebels,' but don't allow him to receive ours. It is true, natives who come here to work from Delagoa Bay and elsewhere, being foreigners, may go away as they like; but our own natives must stay, unless they get leave from our Government to go, and as a rule I understand they do receive such permission; therefore the people escaping by the Bushman's Pass were 'rebels' merely for running away, and might have been shot down as such. I confess I cannot see the justice of such a principle. But it is of importance to enable the Governor to prove that there was any 'rebellion' at all; and I feel certain that even this cannot be proved in the case of Putini's tribe. My full belief is that they have been most shamefully treated; and that by Sir B. Pine and his advisers, without the consent of Mr. Shepstone; but this is my conjecture from facts before me. . . . The preliminary examination in Langalibalele's case begins to-morrow. It is my firm belief that he cannot be condemned to death under native law—
according to the Ordinance No. 3 of 1849, under which the court will be held—though I think he will be sentenced to death, and his doom perhaps commuted to imprisonment and transportation. But these latter are unknown to 'native law.' A Zulu chief fines his subjects or kills them, but he has no gaol; he never imprisons or transports, though he may 'remove' them. I hope that this point will be well considered at the Colonial Office. Under colonial law he has committed no 'rebellion' or 'treason' whatever; but, of course, Cetshwayo 1 would assegai him at once, and all his headmen, and perhaps hundreds of his tribe, and carry off the women. But surely it was never intended that such practices as these should be carried out in a Christian civilised land; and I believe that the clause which I have quoted in the inclosed practically forbids it. Certainly this has been the mildest 'rebellion' that I think has ever been heard of, though without any trial it has been most cruelly punished. The fact is that the whole has been immensely exaggerated by the childish fears of some and the crooked policy of others, and now 'rebellion' must be proved in order to account for all that has been done in the matter."

When we remember that no armed resistance was attempted or offered to the Government of Natal, and that the whole controversy arose from the demand of that Government for the surrender of property acquired by honest and hard work in the diamond-fields, without proposing to pay one farthing to the poor people who were thus to be robbed, we may almost wonder at the moderation of the Bishop's comments. Some excuse may be pleaded for those who act under the overpowering passion of fear; but there is only too much reason to suspect that in some instances at least the passion was feigned in order to indulge feelings which seem to have for some Englishmen in new countries a strange fascination.

1 This was the Cetshwayo of the official imagination. The Bishop did not yet know what the man really was.
The following is the inclosure referred to in the preceding letter:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NATAL COLONIST."

"BISHOFFSTOWE, January 12, 1874.

"‘We have no pity to spare for the rebel chief, or his advisers, who well deserve the doom, whether of steel, lead, or cord, which they must undergo, but we tremble at the smallest act of injustice done to the innocent.’

"SIR,

"The above occurs in the Times leader of Wednesday, January 7; and, whoever wrote it, I do not hesitate to say that it is a sentence utterly unworthy of an Englishman, notwithstanding the mawkish sentiment expressed in the last clause. Here is a prisoner awaiting his trial, and about to be dealt with righteously and justly, as we trust, in a court of justice. And this writer takes upon himself beforehand the office of jury and judge, without any trial or even examination, and pronounces that the offender—not ‘may have to undergo,’ but—‘must undergo’ the doom of death, either by steel, lead, or cord. And the matter is of a much worse complexion if the writer is a member of the Government, and therefore a prosecutor in the case, who does not seem to care the least to hear what the prisoner may have to urge in extenuation of his offence; though most would consider it of importance to know what acts of ‘rebellion,’ properly so called—that is, of armed resistance to the Government—can be proved against him, and whether the degree of his ‘rebellion,’ if proved, has deserved that the extreme sentence of the law should be passed upon him. A hasty partisan may be ready to assume all this from mere rumour or private information; but the lover of justice will say, ‘Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?’

"Suppose, for instance, it should appear . . . that Langali-balele was not near the Bushman’s River Pass on the day of the affair there—that he was not two hours off, as two deserters are understood to have insinuated, but two days
off, as he and his body-guard assert? . . . In this case it would be certain that he did not communicate with his people at the Pass, nor order them to fire upon that occasion, as stated, and almost equally certain that he never gave such an order at all; for, if any such had been issued beforehand, it is difficult to see why the young men waited so long before they fired, or why their headmen were so zealous in restraining them. . . . But suppose it should further be proved that he had given his people strict orders beforehand not to fire on the white men, . . . that when the induna and native doctor, who were in command at the Pass, came up with him, he held a council to consider whether they should not be put to death for disobeying his orders, and that they pleaded that they had done all they could, and for a long while did restrain the young men, until, at the sight of the retreat, they could be held in no longer? All this may not be true; but it is, I understand, what the prisoner and his immediate followers assert; and it must obviously affect very materially the view which a just and righteous judge would take of his crime, whether the one account is true, or the other.

"It may suit the writer's temper of mind, or the native policy which he represents, to make short work of the case. . . . But Englishmen who are lovers of justice will take the above facts, if they can be proved on his behalf, into consideration, as well as those other facts—that he nowhere himself made any resistance; that none of his people did so in any force, but only in small numbers, when hunted or driven, or hiding themselves in bushes or caves; . . . and that for some weeks before the expeditionary force set out from Maritzburg . . . neither he nor his people, though armed with 'Enfields' and assegais, and having at his mercy the adjoining farms lying wholly unprotected, did the slightest injury to man, woman, or child—horse, ox, or sheep—homestead, stable, or barn. . . . And the character of the chief's 'rebellion' must affect materially the judgment to be formed as to the 'rebellious' conduct of the whole tribe (about 9,000 persons) which, however, has been
already most severely punished without any trial. . . . And the writer of the Times leader is one who trembles at the smallest act of injustice done to the innocent.

"No doubt Langalibalele has deserved punishment of some kind, very probably severe punishment—e.g. for his conduct towards the two native messengers last sent by the Government—and it is possible that he may be found to have entered also into some treasonable conspiracy with other chiefs. But all this will have to be proved.¹ Mere blustering words, without acts, . . . are hardly to be called 'rebellion,' and punished with 'death, except under the savage rule of Zululand.

"I assume that Langalibalele will be tried . . . under 'native law,' by which the facts could be more easily ascertained than in the ordinary course. But it is well known that some doubt has been felt as to the procedure to be adopted under Ordinance No. 3 of 1849, in cases of serious crime like the present. . . . This ordinance refers only to crimes committed by one native on another, except that, as regards offences against the Government, the fourth clause provides that the Lieutenant-Governor 'shall hold and enjoy, over all the chiefs and natives in this district, all the power and authority which, according to the laws, customs, and usages of the natives, are held and enjoyed by any supreme or paramount native chief, with full power to appoint or remove the subordinate chiefs or other authorities among them;' and the fact that nothing is said about any 'power to put them to death,' as a Zulu king might do in such cases, seems to exclude that power being exercised in this colony; so that a chief found guilty of 'rebellion' or 'treason' can be fined to any extent, or, as the phrase is, 'eaten up' or 'removed' by the Supreme Chief under native law, but can only be put to death in the ordinary course of justice.

"Yours, &c.,

"J. W. NATAL."

¹ What was proved in the end was the very reverse; but the Bishop had not, as we shall see, when he wrote this letter, the evidence which was brought out afterwards.
To this the Bishop adds, addressing Mr. Shaen:

"It may, of course, be that facts may be proved at the trial which will more distinctly convict Langalibalele and his people of treasonable practices; but I have heard nothing as yet which leads me to think that any satisfactory evidence of the kind will be forthcoming. I have heard it said that he had made preparations for quitting the colony by leaving his women mostly behind with a few men to defend them! As if a few natives left to take care of a lot of helpless women and children could have been expected to resist the Government forces. I had here to-day a family of Langalibalele's people. . . . They came to beg me to try to get them assigned to myself, that they may live here, which, of course, I could not promise to do. . . . And alas! there are perhaps 150 more on my land in the same piteous condition. . . . Hundreds of Putini's men have been swept up as prisoners, who were staying quietly at home or even working under English masters. . . . It is horrible to find the colonists generally, at the lead of the three editors, yelling on the Governor to imagine that he has proved himself a great man, and done a splendid work in suppressing this 'rebellion.'"
CHAPTER VII.
TRIAL AND DEFENCE OF LANGALIBALELE.
1874.

When right was to be done and wrong was to be redressed, it might with truth be said that toil and trouble were by the Bishop counted as nothing. He had spoken and written fearlessly when he had to deal with the Hebrew Scriptures; he was not less outspoken when he had to deal with injustice in the treatment of natives by the Government or the colonists of Natal. He was literally never weary in well-doing. There are many who will denounce ill-doing and enter vehement protests against it; but there are not many who will give up time and care and rest in their resolution to see that the poor and needy have right. Nothing could be so fatal to the welfare of the colony as the spreading of suspicion and mistrust among the natives; and the Bishop thought that he saw only too plainly the signs of this plague, and determined to do what he could to arrest it. It was only with reluctance and under great pressure that the Lieutenant-Governor, as Supreme Chief, made up his mind to allow counsel to speak for Langalibalele; but no sooner had he announced his intention than the Bishop began to prepare a defence for the prisoner, "wishing," as he says, "to lend what help I could to such an advocate, as I saw that he would be allowed very little time for preparation"—in other words, that fresh wrong would be committed.
When a few days before the trial the Bishop expressed his intention of being present at it, Mr. Shepstone had dissuaded him on the ground that the proceedings at the preliminary examination would have little interest or importance. This examination was held on Wednesday, January 15, 1874; but on opening the newspaper on Saturday the Bishop saw to his consternation a full account of "the first day of the trial," held the day before, which therefore he had no chance of attending. The second day, too, was half over. Mr. Shepstone, it would almost seem, had not intended that he should be present.

"I was shocked," the Bishop says, "as an Englishman, by the monstrous unfair way in which the prisoner was being tried; but I had no suspicion as yet of anything worse than this."

The court of first instance during these two days consisted of the Lieutenant-Governor and the seven members of the Executive Council, who, as the Bishop said to Mr. Shepstone on his usual Sunday visit at his house, would form the Court of Appeal provided for in such cases. The Bishop again protested against the prisoner's being left undefended; and Sir B. Pine on this point gave way, "much," he said, "against his better judgment." This declaration was made on the third day of the trial; and three days were allowed to pass before the fourth session on January 23.

One advocate, Mr. Escombe, declined to undertake the office of counsel for the prisoner, on the plea that the restrictions laid on him would make the proper discharge of his duty impossible; and Mr. Moodie, a brother-in-law of Dean Green, whose help Langalibalele wished to have, was not allowed

1 Lord Carnarvon wrote to Sir B. Pine, "I am aware that you refused to permit the employment of Mr. Escombe as counsel because he declined to confine himself to cross-examination and the statement of points of law." C. 1121, p. 89.
access to him, although a resident magistrate, brother of the Secretary for Native Affairs, had been employed for many days in getting up the case for the prosecution; and because Mr. Escombe had declined, Sir B. Pine announced that he “had made up his mind that it would not be desirable to allow or ask anyone else to say anything or act for the prisoner.”

In fact, the pretence of assigning counsel for the prisoner was a transparent sham. The Bishop says:

“Under these circumstances, I have felt it to be a duty which I owe to the unfortunate prisoner, whom I believe to have been unfairly treated in this ‘Trial,’ to complete this defence, with some additions bringing down the history of the case to the latest date, in the hope that he may obtain that justice from Her Majesty in England, which, as it appears to me, has been refused to him in Natal.”

There is something very impressive in this picture of the Bishop, working incessantly through the three days’ interval, in the preparation of this defence, struggling all the while against an attack of jaundice which showed how strongly the horror which he felt at the wrong being done under his very eyes was reacting on his bodily powers. But this defence was never used as such, and was never addressed to any court in Natal, though it was laid before Lord Carnarvon by his brother-in-law, Mr. Bunyon, and by Lord Carnarvon returned for Sir B. Pine’s and Mr. Shepstone’s comments.

It was the contention of the Lieutenant-Governor that, as Supreme Chief, he might not only have refused Langalibalele all aid of counsel, but might have regarded his acts as proved without further trial, and have put him to death accordingly. The Bishop denied that Kafir law would, as it was pretended, justify such a course.

“On the prisoner’s behalf I protest against,” he said, “and utterly repudiate, as inhuman and unjust, the notion that
he could have been condemned without a trial, or that he must accept the present trial as a favour from the Government."

It was a mistake to suppose that Kafir law left the prisoner generally without defence. His tribesmen, as a body, were his counsel, and all gathered round him with full right of speech. It was true that a Zulu chief might override law or custom; but Englishmen and Christians could scarcely with decency claim the same licence for themselves, and there was something utterly un-English and un-Christian in the mode adopted for dealing with the present case, a mode which was in accordance with neither English nor Kafir law. Not a few insisted that the only question before the court was, not the ascertaining of his innocence or his guilt, but, the determining the measure of the punishment to be still inflicted upon him. The Bishop retorted that his guilt had not been satisfactorily proved, and that, whatever his offence may have been, he had been more than amply punished already.

"The chief," he indignantly asserts, "has been deposed by proclamation, his tribe ravaged, hundreds of men killed and many hundreds more imprisoned, many women and children killed, and thousands taken captive, and announced in the Gazette as doomed to three years of forced servitude, his kraals all burnt, his family dispersed, his goats and oxen and horses, as many as could be seized, confiscated and sold by the Government—and all by the simple word of the Supreme Chief, without any trial, without any inquiry whether the facts had been correctly reported. . . . If this court is merely summoned to consider whether he has been already justly punished, and, in case the evidence is deemed sufficient, decides to confirm the judgement already pronounced and executed by the single fiat of the Supreme Chief, I have nothing more to say on this point. But he cannot be fined to a greater extent when he has lost all,
and been deprived of his land, his power, his people, and his property, and he stands a desolate, ruined, sorrow-stricken man, stripped to the very rags he wears, and by much hardship (dragged as he has been, mostly on horseback, handcuffed all the way, 250 miles, from Basutoland to Natal, and here imprisoned in a solitary cell) reduced to utter wretchedness. If, under these circumstances, the court overrules my objection, and decides to consider what further punishment should be inflicted on him, I protest on his behalf against such a proceeding, and appeal to Her Gracious Majesty the Queen against the acts of her representative in Natal."

But the constitution of the court was such as would never be allowed in England. Two of its principal members had lost a near relative in the affair of the Bushman's River Pass. The whole body of the executive, who, with the Governor, sat as members of the court, were committed to a foregone issue; the natives were mere helpless tools, of course. They must pronounce the prisoner guilty of open rebellion, if they would justify the measures already carried out against the people of his tribe and the adjoining and kindred tribe of Putini. The same charge of prejudice might be urged against the six natives included in the court. In short, under such circumstances, justice for a prisoner could not be looked for; and certainly thus far he had been treated with scant pity. For weeks and

---

1 Later on, it became clear to the Bishop that Mr. Shepstone had been practically the judge in this trial.
2 On the fifth day of the "Trial" (February 4), when the lies of the principal witness for the prosecution had, by the exertions of the Bishop, been fully exposed in the office of the Secretary for Native Affairs, to himself and his body of chiefs and indunas, the following is reported to have taken place in court:—"The Supreme Chief mentioned that evidence had been taken elsewhere which would throw some doubt on the statement of Mawiza with regard to the stripping. The other members of the court, however, thought it was clearly proved that the messenger of the Supreme Chief had been insulted, and that it was unnecessary [sic] to reopen the question."—Natal Witness.
weeks he had, for all the purposes of his defence, been kept in solitary confinement, which in England is regarded as one of the most trying punishments to which any prisoner can be subjected after conviction, and this had been done (so Mr. Shepstone stated) on the ground that if he could speak with any one, the result might be the concoction of a false tale.\(^1\)

"as if, supposing that one of his sons had been allowed to share his cell, any false tale contrived between them would not have been at once exposed by its contradicting the statements of the rest. Incredible as it may appear, it is literally true, that in a civilized and Christian land, under English government, in this nineteenth century, a prisoner was tried and judged on a capital charge without having had the slightest chance afforded him of finding witnesses for his defence."

But nevertheless, that which he could not do for himself another had succeeded in doing for him.

I am glad to say that by a mere accident—if I should not rather call it providence—I am able to produce such evidence, of which the prisoner himself knows nothing, and which will probably take the members of the court by surprise as much as himself."

Langalibalele was charged with rebellion aggravated by gross insolence and contumacy. The insult was shown, it was said, by his stripping naked the Government officials sent to arrest him. The evidence of Mawiza's companions proved that he had done nothing of the sort. He had made them take off their outer garments for the sole purpose of ascertaining whether they had any arms hidden about them; and his reason for doing this turned out to be fear of a stratagem like that by which Mr. J. Shepstone had attempted to effect

\(^1\) One result of these regulations was that Mr. Advocate J. B. Moodie, an old acquaintance, and one thoroughly familiar with the Zulu language, applied formally for leave to see him, and was refused permission.
the arrest of Matshana. When and how that incident took place, and how fruitful it had been of deeply-rooted suspicion and wide-spread distrust, we shall see in the sequel. The effects produced by this secret apprehension on the conduct of Langalibalele we have seen already.\(^1\) The fact was that he had no definite knowledge of the charge on which he was summoned. If it had reference to the guns brought from the diamond-fields, it was not in his tribe only that arms of precision were to be found. It was a venial offence under the circumstances; but it was contrary to the law, nevertheless, and the resident magistrate would have been justified in calling on Langalibalele to send in these arms for registration, provided that he did the same with all the other tribes under his

\(^1\) See p. 321. In a volume entitled *Langalibalele and the Ama-Hlubi tribe*, to be noticed more fully later on, published eventually by Lord Carnarvon's orders as an Imperial Blue-book, C. 1141, as the justification of the Colonial Secretary for recalling Sir B. Pine, and professedly upsetting his acts, the Bishop admits (p. 51) that the chief sent a false message in answer to the summons to Maritzburg. He declared that he had set out and advanced twenty miles on his journey when pains in a wounded limb obliged him to return. But the Bishop adds that on his behalf it should be remembered that he lived in an extreme corner of the colony, and had little personal knowledge of the Secretary for Native Affairs; that his brother had been summoned to Zululand and immediately killed (by the Zulu chiefs, in early days) and that he feared he himself would be treated in the same way; and, finally, that he knew such summons to chiefs to be extremely rare (see p. 320). Mawiza's tale was, however, not confined to the falsehood about his being "stripped." He said that he had been prodded with assegais. He dropped, in court, this more sensational part of the story. But the alleged insult was reported to Downing Street by Mr. Shepstone (p. 73); and the Bishop remarks—"If there is one thing more than another which excited (very justly) the indignation of the colonists—of myself, at one time, among the rest—it was just this supposed outrage;" and "from the moment it was believed that he had treated the messengers with such indignity, the cry was raised very naturally that he must be dealt with very sharply and summarily" (p. 75). The story was proved and confessed to be false; and it was abundantly established that, with the one exception of the two messengers being required "as a matter of precaution caused by fear," to take off their outer garments before entering the chief's hut, they were treated, during a week or ten days of good living, with all due respect.
control as magistrate. This was not done, while at the same time language was used which filled the chief with vague and wild alarm. He was told that “if he persisted in refusing to come down, the tribe would cease to exist.” It is not wonderful that he should give expression only to his perplexity and dismay. “I am afraid.” “I cannot go.” “What is really the charge against me?” “I am afraid to go, and you can tell the Governor I won’t come.” Both he and his people were, in truth, panic-stricken. Fear on both sides was producing its deadly crop; but “so far was he,” says his advocate, “from bidding defiance,” that, while the Government messengers were waiting to be summoned to his presence, “he had sent indunas expressing his willingness to pay any amount of fine that might be laid upon him; and if only this submission had been accepted, and such a fine inflicted as the case, when calmly considered, seemed to deserve—e.g. enough to cover all expenses incurred by the Government up to that time—how much misery and bloodshed, with all their train of future vengeances, might have been spared.” The terrified exodus of his people began on November 2, 1873, the fourth day after that on which the chief received the message through Mawiza; and to this woeful plight his tribe was now reduced after a quarter of a century spent on the soil where they had been permitted to live on condition of repelling the inroads of Bushmen. The duty had been faithfully done so long as there were any such inroads; but all fear of them had now long since passed away, and it was a refinement of cruelty to charge it to the tribe as an offence that they had treacherously “abandoned that position and those duties.”

The truth seems to be that no allowance whatever was made for the position and the difficulties of Langalibalele. According to Kafir law, the leaving of a location was no act of rebellion, and even the sentence declared:—
It cannot be too clearly understood that any tribe in this colony is at liberty to remove itself and its cattle out of our jurisdiction, if it does so peaceably and with the cognisance and previous consent of the authorities."

This was, in truth, a mere evasion of the question. Langalibalele went without this consent, but he did not know that, if asked for, it would be given. His conviction was that it would not.

"If only he had been told," the Bishop remarks, "that he was at perfect liberty to remove himself and his cattle, he would, no doubt, have gladly hailed the announcement as the solution of all his difficulties."

Even thus he would have been making an enormous sacrifice. A non-official record of the trial of the sons of the chief and of 221 members of his tribe was published in the form of a Blue-book, but without the Royal arms, and bearing the names of Messrs. Keith and Co. as publishers. To this work (published manifestly under the same authority as the Blue-book record of the trial of Langalibalele, though not openly avowed) was prefixed an introduction, bearing the signature "Keith and Co." This paper the Bishop considered an extraordinary document to be prefixed to an official record.

"It is thought," he said, "to exhibit in many places strong signs of an official pen. . . . It does certainly seem somewhat strange that 'Messrs. Keith and Co.' should have taken such a deep interest in Langalibalele's affairs, and should be acquainted with so many facts which have not been mentioned at all in the evidence, and some of which, one might imagine, could only have been known to official persons."

So put forth, the narrative could not fail to be regarded generally as both authoritative and trustworthy. The Bishop examined the whole document most completely in his Blue-
book. But even this document allows how much Langalibalele had to give up, when he made up his mind to leave the colony. He had some 200,000 acres of the

“finest arable land; his lowlands are described as very fertile; the grazing land was also superior, and cattle thrived remarkably well. The slopes of the Drakensberg, which bounded the location, were habitable to the very base of the mountains.”

The incidents at the Bushman’s River Pass have been described in the letters already given; and these all make it abundantly clear that Langalibalele never so much as dreamt of offering any resistance. For weeks before his flight “the neighbouring farms were entirely at the mercy of himself and his people,” and yet not a single outrage of any kind was committed.

From the above may be gathered, in substance, the defence offered for this unfortunate and most hardly-treated chief, to whom an appeal from the sentence of the court was, in the first instance, denied, in spite of the Ordinance, No. 3, 1849. On March 1, 1874, the Bishop began an appeal, of which he had warned Mr. Shepstone, by presenting a petition in the name of two old men of the Hlubi tribe, praying that such a re-hearing might be allowed to their chief. The old men were thereupon summoned by the Secretary for Native Affairs, and came back in a state of great alarm, saying that he had severely questioned them as to their presumption in venturing to ask that the case of their chief should be heard over again; and that the indunas of the Native Affairs Office had told them that what they had done was equivalent to going to law with the Supreme Chief and with Mr. Shepstone, and that they would be put in prison. They were then “under surveillance,” “awaiting trial,” and the more aged of the two was,

1 See pp. 322–31.
2 Death, commuted—to native eyes, aggravated—into transportation for life.