

CHAPTER XI.

CORRESPONDENCE AND WORK.

1880-83.

MR. GLADSTONE'S determination to retain Sir Bartle Frere in his post at the Cape of Good Hope seemed to leave little chance indeed of a satisfactory, still less of a righteous, settlement of the great Zulu controversy. The arrangements made by Sir Garnet Wolseley removed no difficulties, and introduced many new ones.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June 6, 1880.*

"I send you some information obtained from the Zulus, with which, I think, you will be much interested. . . . It is the most important deputation that has ever reached Maritzburg. . . . In fact, it is clear to me that something must be done. Either the country must be 'annexed,' or Cetshwayo must be restored under some such conditions as those I inclosed to you, else before long there must be an uproar in Zululand. We have broken it up into thirteen independent kingdoms. But who or what is to prevent a revolution in any one or more of these kingdoms, by which the people will throw off Sir G. Wolseley's kingly, and choose one for themselves, or perhaps 'consolidate confederation' of five or six kingdoms? Some of Sir G. Wolseley's kinglys are already *deprived* of their subjects, and things cannot possibly remain as they are for any length of time."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *July 17, 1880.*

- . . . "When Sir H. Clifford came up here to take leave, I asked him to tell me what reply he would give if he were asked officially to state what he thought about the possibility of restoring Cetshwayo to Zululand. He said that, if asked, he should reply that in his opinion the very best thing that could be done for the settlement of Zululand, which is now very far from being settled, would be to restore Cetshwayo, if a good Resident were placed by his side."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *July 22, 1880.*

- . . . "War has broken out in Basutoland, in consequence of the policy of Sir B. Frere and Mr. Sprigg, . . . and it is impossible to say what may be the result of this disturbance. . . . It is a most lamentable result of Mr. Gladstone's miserable folly in keeping Sir B. Frere at the Cape; and I should not be at all surprised if he now made the Basuto War an argument for *keeping* Sir B. Frere at the Cape, on the old principle, 'It is difficult to swop horses crossing a stream.' What I hope is, that Sir B. Frere will be recalled, in which case Mr. Sprigg will fall; and with a new Governor and Ministry at the Cape I do believe it would be possible to bring about amicably the confederation or amalgamation of both Pondoland and Zululand."

TO THE SAME.

"*August 15, 1880.*

- "The new Commandant (Colonel Hawthorn, R.E.) and Mrs. Hawthorn are warm friends of ours, he most friendly, and she a very superior woman, whom I found, on making my first call, deep in Blue-books, and expressing herself in a very satisfactory way about the wrongs of the Basutos. They are a great addition to my strength here, and they speak also highly of Sir H. Robinson and his lady, with whom they are intimately acquainted."

A few weeks later the Bishop made the voyage to Capetown to see the Zulu king, whose fate had not yet been determined by the British Government, and the Hlubi chief Langalibalele, in whose case British good faith seemed to have been trodden deliberately under foot.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

“CAPETOWN, *November 7, 1880.*”

“On Wednesday last we visited Langalibalele at Uitvlugt—a miserable place, so dry in summer that scarcely anything will grow there, except that one patch of ground produces some pumpkins for the prisoners, and in winter much of the land must be a swamp or under water. Everyone speaks of the place as a wretched home for Langalibalele. He made no complaint. . . . But he put into my daughter’s hand secretly at parting a scrap of paper on which his young son (whom we sent from Natal to write for him, &c.) had written in his father’s name complaining of the manner in which one of his keepers swore at him. . . . The principal guardian does not live on the spot, but some two miles off, at Mowbray.

“We have had three long interviews, and shall probably have another before we leave, with Cetshwayo. He is . . . at present under the charge of General Clifford and Major Poole, to whom he is much attached, as he recognises gratefully their kindness towards him. You know General Clifford is a friend of my own, and I need not repeat the warm expressions of my esteem and regard for him. . . . But it will show you how closely Cetshwayo is kept, when I mention these two little facts. Having arranged . . . to pay a second visit, I wrote subsequently to say that I presumed I might bring with me the daughter of my host. My host, Mr. Fairbridge, may be known to you already as the head of one of the chief law firms in Capetown, . . . lately M.L.A., and spoken of as likely to be made Attorney-General on a change of Ministry. . . . I received a note in

reply from General Clifford, permitting the young lady to come, as my daughter's friend, but strongly warning me against bringing any persons who merely wished to see the king out of curiosity,¹ as none were allowed to see him unless he himself desired it. . . . It did seem to me that such a notification was hardly necessary for me, inasmuch as Cetshwayo regards me as his 'father,' and would joyfully welcome everyone I brought or sent to see him. . . . However, I concluded that General Clifford wished to be able to say that he had replied to me as he had replied to others.

"But Mr. Fairbridge was willing also to receive the king at his house and to give him a luncheon. . . . General Clifford refused leave. . . . I must say I cannot understand General Clifford's objection, under such exceptional circumstances, which are never likely to occur again, *e.g.* our presence and a kind and sympathising host and family. . . . My one chance of ameliorating his captivity by some act of special kindness has passed away. However, I replied that I acquiesced cheerfully in the General's decision, being sure of his kindly feelings both towards Cetshwayo and ourselves. And I do believe that he is sincerely desirous to say and do all he can on behalf of Cetshwayo in England. . . . On Friday I dined (privately) with Sir G. Strahan. . . . He expressed a strong feeling of pity, and even regard, for Cetshwayo, a determination to get at the truth or falsehood of the charges made against him, and an inclination to recommend his being sent to England for a time. 'What did I think about this last?' Of course I very strongly commended his view; and I now would urge with all my might upon our friends the expediency of making a point of pressing for this to be done."

The Bishop availed himself of the same opportunity to do, by the wish of the Dean, the work of a Bishop of the Church of England at Grahamstown.

¹ See page 534, note.

TO MISS J. G. HUGHES.

“CAPETOWN, *November 9, 1880.*”

- “I have been preaching and confirming (as no doubt you will have heard in England) in the Cathedral at Grahamstown, in consequence of an urgent request from the Dean and congregation, who have been excommunicated by Bishop Merriman from the Church of South Africa, and the Supreme Court at the Cape having pronounced that Church to be ‘root and branch’ separate from the Church of England. And I have (much against my own wish and purpose) been constrained to publish the four sermons which I preached there, and the address which I delivered to ninety-nine candidates for Confirmation (seventy-five over twelve, two over eleven, two over ten; facts which I mention lest the falsehood should be propagated in England, as in Capetown, that the age of the candidates ranged from six to sixty; there was one of sixty, and one older still, who had been a communicant for thirty years, but had never been confirmed; and the next in age was forty years old). I send you also a copy of these sermons, and on pages 47-48 you will find some of your own words, which I mentioned to you I had copied at the end of a sermon of mine which I was writing at the time when I received your letter communicating the death of your dear brother. Please excuse this act of plagiarism.
- “We (myself and daughter Harrie) came on from Grahams-town to Capetown in order to see Langalibalele and Cetshwayo; and we have visited both of them, and gained a great deal from the latter which throws light on the past, but does not in the slightest degree modify my views as to his character and conduct—rather confirms entirely my good opinion of him, and increases my detestation of the gross calumnies of Sir B. Frere, which have done so much to poison the minds of the English people against the king, and so furnish an excuse for his own policy. . . . My hope now is that Sir G. Strahan (the Cape Administrator of the Government) and General Clifford will recommend that

Cetshwayo may be sent for to England on his way *back* to Zululand."

The Bishop was rejoiced to find not only that his own impressions of Cetshwayo's character were confirmed, but that personal acquaintance with the captive was beginning to create convictions in his favour in the minds of those in authority who were not interested in maintaining Sir Bartle Frere's theory concerning the ex-king. It was important, the Bishop felt, to prepare Cetshwayo for what would appear to him a formidable adventure, and asked :—

"What would be his own feeling supposing that at any time he were sent for to England to see the Queen and the authorities there?"

Cetshwayo at first looked distressed, and said :—

"The sea would kill me."

But on the Bishop's explaining that

"the journey is not so bad, really; and we, for our part, if we heard that you were sent for to England, should be very glad; for we should say, 'It shows kindness to him, and is a step forward: for he would not be sent back just as he now is—a prisoner.'"

"Do you really think that?" said Cetshwayo. "And you wish me to go? I will agree, then, at once, if I am asked, since you advise it, although I have a great horror of the sea;" adding, "And there is nothing I will not do if my Father Sobantu wishes it."

This was at the farewell visit, the last time that Cetshwayo was to see his "father" in this life. And it lends no small weight to the Bishop's estimate of his character that this "savage," his head and his heart full of troubles and hopes, for himself, his family, and his people, could yet, at such a moment, remember others.

"Do not forget Langalibalele"

was actually Cetshwayo's last word to Sobantu.

It may be well to state the circumstances which led the Bishop to comply with the request of the Dean and the congregation of the Cathedral of Grahamstown.

The see was vacant, and there was no other Bishop of the Church of England whom the Dean of Grahamstown could invite to perform the necessary work of Confirmation and Visitation. Four sermons preached in the Cathedral church of Grahamstown; together with an address to the candidates for Confirmation, remain as a memorial of this visit, and show not merely the earnestness and fervour of his teaching, but its sobriety, its forbearance, and its charity. It had been said of him that the faith of his earlier years had grown cold. Every line in these sermons contradicts any such supposition. The hardships of life pressed on his mind, no doubt, with increasing weight. If we think of the terrible struggle in which during the latest years of his life he had himself been engaged, how could we expect it to be otherwise? In one of these sermons he says :—

“ It is strange to see so many souls brought into this world, to be prepared, as we believe, for another life, in the midst of circumstances not unfavourable only, but almost preclusive of virtue or godliness—in the midst, for instance, of such grinding want as leaves no room for any thought or care but how to still the cravings which are scarcely ever satisfied ; brought up in gross ignorance—ignorance of good, but not of evil—with vicious, or at least morbid, tendencies inherited from vicious parents, and surrounded by an atmosphere of vicious feeling and example. Such we know to be the condition of multitudes in the great over-grown cities of Europe, the children being crippled and dwindled with want, and with toil premature and excessive. Must modern civilisation, we ask, in its triumphant onward course, pass like the car of Juggernaut over the heads and hearts of these little ones? Must the labouring poor be crowded together till light and air and water, the common property

of all animated nature, are hardly afforded them ? till, if they can scarcely herd together as beasts, it can hardly be expected that they should live as human beings—the home, the family, the centre and fountain of reverence, of self-respect, of love and moral excellence, having been obliterated and lost in the over-crowded lodging ?”

To this question the only answer to be returned is one of faith and trust. He frankly allowed that

“we cannot explain the apparently fruitless suffering, the helpless destruction, as it seems, of so many, before they have done service to God or man on earth, or ripened for a glorious hereafter ; yet we can leave them in the hands of Him of whom our own hearts bear witness continually as a righteous God, a faithful Creator, a merciful Father ; sure that, in other words, there must be a mystery which is not yet revealed—that in the cycles of eternity there must be more than compensation for each one of His creatures in the hand of Him whose justice and mercy and power are infinite.”

To the candidates for Confirmation he said :—

“You have come to confess the faith of Christians—that you believe the great God, your Maker, the Creator of all this mighty universe, to be, as Jesus our Saviour has revealed to us, your Father and Friend ; One to whom each of you may say, ‘Our Father,’ and may go in all life’s troubles as a child to a tender parent, to pour out the burdens of your hearts before Him, to tell Him of all your sorrows, to confess all your sins, which He knows—blessed be His Holy Name!—before you confess them. Here is no difficult doctrine perplexing to the intellect, passing all power of human thought even to conceive. . . . It is the simple truth—which our Saviour taught in all the actions of his life, as well as by all the words of his lips, and which he sealed for us in death—that God, our God, the living God, is a faithful Creator, a most compassionate and tender Father, of whose

love towards us all the tenderest earthly parent's love is only the faint foreshadowing.

“Bear this ever in mind, then, that you have such an ever-present Father and Friend—One who may lead you in His Providence through dark places, by rugged paths, over a desolate waste, so that He may prove, and strengthen, and perfect you for His work in this world and for that higher work which He has for you to do in the life beyond the grave, but who will hold you by the hand all along, and be near you each time of trial to comfort you with His presence and stay you with His everlasting love—One who will condemn the sin which is destroying His child, but yet will not cast off the sinner, will love and save, while He corrects and chastens.”

But the candidates had come to do something more than to confess their faith.

“You have come to make answer to the call of your Creator in the words of the prophet of old, ‘Here am I: send me!’ You have come, most of you, in the prime of youth, in the fulness of health and strength, God’s precious gifts, to acknowledge yourselves bound to carry out in life the duty of Christians; and that is, you know, to follow the example of Jesus Himself, of Him who taught His disciples, saying—not ‘Blessed are they who keep whole and undefiled all the articles of this creed or that creed,’ but—‘Blessed are the meek, Blessed are the merciful, Blessed are the pure in heart’; . . . to set Jesus Himself, the dear Son of God, before your mind’s eye continually, as the type of what true children of God should be; to be truthful and brave and loving, pure and innocent in heart and life, as He was, letting your light shine before men in all your daily intercourse, as He did, to the glory of your Father in Heaven. . . . Is this your resolve and expectation? Then *seek* that Divine help, in the strength of which alone you can lead such a life as this. Turn to your Heavenly Father at any moment—for He is ever near you—and with one simple

word or thought look up to Him for support in your duties, trials, temptations, in the struggle with evil within and without."

His return to Natal was not a return to peace and quiet.¹ The policy which Sir Bartle Frere and his supporters had professed to carry out was producing an abundant harvest of misery. The Zulu and Basuto Wars were followed by a war in the Transvaal. We have seen already that he could approve the action of the Boers when he believed them to be in the right,² as he could condemn it when he believed them to be in the wrong.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 9, 1881.*

"The Transvaal War—between two white Christian peoples, in the face of the natives—is horrible. But it seems to me that the Boer proclamation is very just and strong, and utterly condemns the action of Sir T. Shepstone and Sir B. Frere, as well as the mistaken policy of Sir G. Wolseley and the misstatements of Sir W. O. Lanyon."

The strife thus begun is described by Mr. Froude as a series of disasters culminating in Majuba Hill and the death of Sir George Colley.

¹ Within his own domestic circle there was at this time vouchsafed to him a source of unmixed pleasure in the birth of his first grandchild, in whose little existence he took an intense interest, amidst all sorrows, even admitting the charge of having once made the tiresome fifty miles' journey to Durban chiefly "to see Eric." His visits to Durban were, however, by no means periods of rest, including much walking to and fro under the Durban sun, and often two sermons on a Sunday.

² See p. 533. We have seen what was his ideal of the position and duties of "a great Christian nation." He hailed Mr. Gladstone's decision, not only as restoring peace, but as restoring, to some extent, our moral prestige, with some right to urge reforms when necessary on the Boers. In like manner he held that the boundary award, before he knew it to be a mere pretence, gave us a right to urge—peacefully—reforms upon the Zulus. See p. 513.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *February 10, 1881.*

. . . "It is useless for me to touch upon the incidents of this war, which you will have heard of by telegram before this. But Sir G. Colley must be in a very bad way at this moment, being cut off from his communications with the colony, as well as the Transvaal; and it is generally feared that some, at least, of the reinforcements now on their march to help him will be cut off, a strong Boer force having entered the colony on this (Maritzburg) side of Newcastle, it is believed, for that purpose.

"I need not say that I am utterly disappointed with Mr. Gladstone and Lord Kimberley, and particularly with the tone of the *Daily News*, speaking, I suppose, as the Government organ. I cannot help thinking that the present Government has lost a great deal of its power by the febleness they have shown in their action with regard to South African affairs, where, as far as I can see, they have not righted a single wrong committed by Sir B. Frere, and only withdrawn him under great pressure, and when he had already set on foot further mischief."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *February 20, 1881.*

"I have just received yours of January 20, with your pamphlet on the Basuto question (or rather on Sir B. Frere's falsehood with respect to it), which I have read with great satisfaction. I only marvel that you could keep such a restraint on your pen when dealing with one who seems incapable of speaking the truth on political matters.

"Inkosana¹ says that Cetshwayo would eat no food on the day he heard of Major Poole's death. We grieve deeply at the loss of so fine and true-hearted a soldier. And if his friends only knew how much he has done, while

¹ The chief captured with Cetshwayo, now, at the king's wish, expressed through the Bishop, exchanged back to Zululand.

custodian of Cetshwayo, to soothe and comfort him in his captivity, and how deeply he is mourned by the ex-king, even they might derive some consolation from the fact that his last months were spent in such truly Christian work. I saw him and had a few pleasant words with him while he was in Maritzburg, before he went to the front."

TO DR. MUIR.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *February 27, 1881.*

"I have just received your telegram of yesterday's date in time to thank you for your kind gift of £10 for 'distressed Zulus,' which I assure you is very welcome at this moment, and will be duly applied.

"It is useless to write to you about our South African troubles, as you will hear by telegraph occurrences of grave importance, which will have transpired in respect of Basutoland and the Transvaal long before this reaches you. I hope, however, that you will have been taught by experience to have a wise distrust of *first* telegrams—even official telegrams—until the other side has been heard. Here are the English papers reaching us, full of ravings about the treachery, cruelty, bloodthirstiness, &c., of the Boers; of which, when the facts are thoroughly known and fairly considered, hardly a trace remains. In fact, Sir G. Colley, I believe, has stated that there has been nothing unfair or unworthy of civilised men in the action of the Boers hitherto, except in the case of the death of Major Elliott; and that has been sternly denounced by the Boer Government, and, if the charge can be brought home to the guilty parties, shall (they pledge themselves) be duly punished. I know from good authority that the survivor of the two, Captain Lambert, has stated at Durban that he believes the person who shot Major Elliott was not a Boer at all, but a Scotchman, whose name he mentioned, and who may have fired 'loopers' as the Dutch call them, that is small bullets which scatter and wound—in fact, the bullets, I believe, recommended by high officials for use in Ireland, as not so

likely to *destroy* life. This might account for the victim being hit in several places, while his companion close by him was not struck at all. However this may be, it is clear that the act was not in any way contemplated or sanctioned by the Boer Government; any more than the act of some of our force killing eleven Zulus (who were captured by Lord Chelmsford's force on January 22 (day of Isandhlwana), and on January 23 were let go to return to their own land, as it was found not convenient to keep the prisoners, and who were shot down by our people—not *all* of them black—before they could cross the boundary-stream) could be charged on Lord Chelmsford; though I never heard that he expressed openly any abhorrence of the act, or made any inquiry about it."

It is a fact that Lord Chelmsford went off with all his staff to Maritzburg immediately after the disaster, leaving a number of mixed troops demoralised by that event, some panic-struck, others furious from desire for vengeance, all in great excitement, and without having appointed anyone to command after his departure. At length the senior of the officers left took the command; but in the meantime this great crime, for which no one was responsible, had been committed. One volunteer related how he had seen a comrade mount his horse, and, riding after the released prisoners, shoot one of them down with a revolver.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *March 20, 1881.*

. . . "To-day we hear that the only real obstacle to peace being made is Lord Kimberley's insisting on the garrisons being retained in the Transvaal. If this is the case, Lord Kimberley will be doing what Sir B. Frere did with the Zulus—demanding what he must know they *would* not, or, looking to the feeling of the people and the sacrifices they have made for their independence, *could* not, comply with. . . .

“Please read carefully Sir G. Colley’s Despatch, 2783, p. 10. You will see that he condemns the present ‘settlement’ in Zululand, and actually recommends *one paramount chief* with a Resident. This surely points to the restoration of Cetshwayo ; and I cannot but think that he may have seen a copy of my suggestions. I wonder if he wrote a late despatch on this subject. At all events, this one would seem to be an excellent basis on which to urge (when the proper time comes) the restoration of Cetshwayo.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *March 27, 1881.*

. . . “Well ! we have peace, thank God ! but at this moment you know more about the terms of it than we do, the most contradictory reports being in circulation. . . . But now surely is the time for us to move about Langalibalele and Cetshwayo. Mr. Gladstone, who is credited with having taken the Transvaal affair in his own hands, will not do less for the *natives*, who have scarcely any to speak on their behalf, than he has done for the Boers, in rectifying as far as possible the wrong done in the past. . . . I have read with great delight Sir W. Lawson’s speech at the public meeting about the Transvaal. I wish you could tell him some day, if you see no objection, how much I admired it, and how I look to him to take firm ground, when the proper moment arrives, for my three poor chiefs—Langalibalele, Cetshwayo, and Beje.”¹

TO MISS JANE HUGHES.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *April 9, 1881.*

“I thank you much for your P.O. order, to be employed in relieving any distress from want of food among the

¹ The Bishop refers to a petty chief who, having changed his domicile to Zululand some two months before the war, had been identified as having taken part in a retaliatory raid across the Tugela during the invasion (see p. 498). For this the chief and twenty followers were

Zulus. . . . At one time, no doubt, there was a great deal of suffering from this cause in Zululand, so that Sir G. Wolseley reported the fact to the Secretary of State, and was understood to be contemplating some measure of relief. But the extreme pressure is relieved, thank God, by an early and abundant harvest, and of course they are now eating the new grain. What I fear is that they may have consumed a great deal of it before it was really ripened, and so will not have stored sufficiently for winter use, and perhaps will have to eat their seed corn. I shall take measures to keep myself informed as to the real state of things in Zululand, and use the money which has been sent to me by yourself, Dr. Muir, and Mr. Chesson, in the best way I can for the relief of the people (when the proper time comes) which will be, I expect, by supplying corn for planting purposes.

“We here—that is, a respectable minority—are rejoiced at the peaceful settlement of the Transvaal difficulty. At least, we hope that all will be settled amicably, though there are wretched ‘Jingoes’ here who abhor the peace, and would, if they could, keep up animosity and kindle again the flames of war. I have very little personal acquaintance with the Boers, though I once met Krüger, and Joubert made a call at Bishopstowe, and I reckon Dr. Jorissen as a friend, being a Leyden man, where Kuenen, &c., live. But I sympathise heartily with them in their late struggle, in which I believe them to have been entirely justified. And it gives us hope that other wrongs may be redressed when Mr. Gladstone is ready—even in the midst of defeats at Lang’s Nek, Ingogo, and Majuba, besides that at Bron-Korst (Water-cress) Spruit—to hold back the hand of Great Britain from cruelly chastising these brave patriots, so unequally matched with our power, which, of course, could overwhelm and crush them.”

condemned to various terms of hard labour, from one year to ten; but the Bishop’s exertions led to Lord Kimberley’s taking a merciful view of the case, and ordering their release.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *April* 30, 1881.

. . . “It is an ominous fact, which I tell you confidentially, though I know it to be true, that Lord Kimberley has actually asked the Cape Government whether they would enact a law to detain Cetshwayo a prisoner again after his return from England, should that be thought desirable. One can hardly imagine such baseness. I feel certain that the Cape Government will refuse to do anything of the kind ; and I have a strong conviction that they have already expressed their willingness that Cetshwayo should go to England, or, in other words, be restored to Zululand. In fact, as something must be done to remedy the present miserable state of disorganization in Zululand, and as the *English people* will not allow (so Lord Kimberley told Mr. Grant) of annexation, . . . I think it possible that even Sir H. Bulwer will find himself compelled to recommend the restoration of Cetshwayo.”

In his efforts on behalf of the Zulu king and the Hlubi chief the Bishop had always taken the most scrupulous care to maintain the dignity of the British Government, and, so far as it might be possible to do so, to enforce the respect due to it. Of this the authorities were thoroughly well aware ; and yet they could employ against him the not very honourable devices mentioned in the following letter :—

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *July* 2, 1881.

. . . “Instead of allowing Cetshwayo ‘all the liberty possible, consistently with his safe custody,’ as was promised by Lord Kimberley, I think it appears that the strictest surveillance is exercised over the *letters* he sends and receives—at all events, to and from Bishopstowe. I have told you before how his letters to us have been kept back from us, and one or more of Langalibalele’s

altogether ; and now we hear that all *our* letters are cut open when they réach them. Can you conceive anything more contemptibly mean than such a proceeding, except for the policy it implies of keeping the outer world and the Secretary of State in ignorance of facts which might come to light if correspondence were free ?”

TO THE SAME.

“*July 16, 1881.*

- “On Monday came down our old friend Mfunzi, with several men of position, to make a fresh appeal in the name of the three chiefs for the restoration of Cetshwayo. This is the first communication I have had from them for more than six months. And they say that they have repeatedly asked leave from Mr. Osborn to come down, but for one reason or another . . . could never get it, and at last they started without any permission, and there they were, announcing also that when they get back safe . . . Mnyamana and other important chiefs are coming down.
- “On Tuesday they went in to Mr. J. Shepstone (acting S.N.A.), but he was unwell, and told them to come again. . . . On Wednesday they went in, but he said it was too late ; they must come earlier to have a long talk. On Thursday they went in, but found him sitting in the Native High Court, and were told to come again. . . . On Friday they had a long talk with him, and most friendly, when he took down part of their words, and told them to come again. To-day (Saturday) they went in, but found him too busy to attend to them.”

TO THE SAME.

“*July 24, 1881.*

- “But will they [their words] be sent to the Secretary of State ? I doubt it much. For after all had gone pleasantly for several days, they received a sudden ‘cold shoulder,’ and were told to go back [to Zululand] at once ; there would be no reply, as they had not been sent with a note from Mr.

- Osborn. I therefore fear that no report will be made to the Secretary of State about this deputation any more than about the first, or about the two intermediate deputations who asked leave to come down, but were refused permission.¹
- “If the king were to die, . . . and all hope were at an end of obtaining some reversal of their cruel wrongs by peaceful appeals to the justice and mercy of the Queen, and for the restoration of Cetshwayo, the whole land, I fear, would soon be deluged with blood through internecine quarrels between the appointed chiefs and the chiefs put under them in Sir G. Wolseley’s famous ‘settlement.’ At this moment there are serious disputes in five of the thirteen kingdoms. . . . This is exactly what was predicted by colonists generally, who had any real acquaintance with natives, as soon as the ‘settlement’ was announced.
- “I have learnt to-day, for certain, that Sir Th. Shepstone is quite of opinion that it would be far better that Cetshwayo should be restored than that the present disordered state of Zululand should be allowed to continue, from which he apprehends very dangerous results.¹ But he is strongly of opinion that Cetshwayo should be sent for to England without delay. I have heard this privately—indeed, I may say that Mr. Th. Shepstone and his wife are my informants.
- “I hope that there may be opportunities of urging the case of Cetshwayo upon some friends of ours in the present Government.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *July 31, 1881.*

. . . “It saddens me to find even a Liberal Secretary of State pleading ‘paramount considerations of policy’ against the claims of right and justice. So far from the false settlement

¹ *Digest*, pp. 777, 781.

² Yet Sir H. Bulwer, referring, in August 1882, to Sir T. Shepstone’s opinion two years before (viz. “I look upon the restoration of Cetshwayo as certain to produce most disastrous consequences”), says, “I have reason to believe that Sir T. Shepstone has not changed the views he then expressed. He certainly has not modified them.”

having been carefully considered, it is well known here that it was a hasty measure, hurriedly carried out by Sir G. Wolseley, who wanted to get away to the Transvaal and Sikukuni, on the advice of Sir G. Colley. . . . I fully believe that the Boers would not at all object to Cetshwayo being restored to Zululand under proper conditions.

“What right has J. Dunn to call out a large force—whether armed with *guns*, or not, remains to be seen—to put down a revolution in one of the kingdoms which is quite independent of his own? And will the British Government really allow this white Kafir to tax the people placed under him, not for their good—to make bridges, roads, &c.—but merely to shovel thousands of pounds annually into his own pocket. It is perfectly monstrous; and this to be allowed by a Liberal Government.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *August 7, 1881.*

“The Transvaal business, as you will have heard, is settled, and I think that we may be satisfied that the natives have been duly considered in the Convention, except that Sir G. Wolseley’s two annexations (of Sikukuni’s country, and the western portion of the disputed territory, which he took away from the Zulus after Sir B. Frere had given it to them) have been included in the Transvaal. . . . Since I wrote last Sunday, the Attorney-General has told me personally that the only thing to be done to settle Zululand was to send back Cetshwayo. He said this openly in presence of another official, who expressed his entire agreement with that view.

“I am delighted to hear (by telegram) of your splendid list of eighty M.P.’s, and I fully hope that by continuing the pressure, aided also by the course of events, we shall get some share of justice meted out to Cetshwayo, though, as in the case of the Transvaal, no credit will be due to Lord Kimberley. The point now seems to be to insist upon Cetshwayo’s being brought to England.

“You will hardly believe that the case of the poor native

sentenced to three years' hard labour at Durban, about whom I sent a cutting a fortnight ago containing the petition for his release from eight of the nine jurymen who convicted him, as they were now convinced by evidence they produced that he was wholly innocent, remains as far as I know *in statu quo*." ¹

The Bishop's *Digest* at this date deals with a large number of communications addressed by white adventurers in Zululand to Natal newspapers, for which they acted as "own correspondents." These narratives of events happening under the rule of the thirteen kinglets, amongst whom the country had been parcelled out, he compares with statements made to him by Zulus, and with the reports of the Resident. As we have already seen, the Bishop was indefatigable in scrutinising all available evidence of the real nature and tendency of occurrences under the settlement, but no attempt will be made here to follow him into the details given in his 2000 pages. A large quantity of matter taken from them will be found given in Miss Frances Ellen Colenso's *Ruin of Zululand*. It is necessary, however, to refer briefly to the leading events of the period preceding the second partition of Zululand enacted by Sir H. Bulwer towards the end of 1882.

It was with regard to these events that the Bishop wrote in November 1881 :—

"In point of fact, each of the appointed chiefs, Dunn and Hamu, has killed already men, women, and children, within the last few weeks in Zululand, and, in J. Dunn's case, with the express sanction of the English authorities, to an extent unheard of during the five years of Cetshwayo's reign. And Zibebu also has done his share of such massacres, for the purpose of maintaining Sir G. Wolseley's settlement." ²

¹ The man was ultimately released.

² Cetshwayo himself said at a later date :—"The blood that has been shed [since the settlement] is to the blood shed in my reign as a pond of water to an ant in it."

On the 31st of August, 1881, Sir H. E. Wood, who was temporarily administering the Government of Natal, summoned a meeting of Zulu chiefs at Inhlazatshe in Zululand. That he intended in what he did and said upon this occasion all that, from his point of view, would be likely to conduce to the beneficial working of Sir G. Wolseley's settlement, cannot be disputed. But this settlement was the work of those with whom Sir G. Wolseley took counsel, and these men were the last persons in the world likely to give effect to the conviction which was shared by conscientious men of all parties in England, that our invasion had been a cruel injury to the Zulus. Sir G. Wolseley himself was subsequently credited by the Bishop with having devised his scheme of settlement with a view to the better government of the Zulu people. This idea was, however, instantly repudiated by a military officer of high position to whom it was mentioned, and who assured the Bishop that Sir G. Wolseley's only object was to bring the military occupation of Zululand and the war expenditure in South Africa to as rapid a conclusion as possible. The fate of the Zulus was then practically in the hands of such politicians as Mr. J. Dunn and Mr. J. Shepstone, by whose advice the General was guided. The Bishop could not fail to see, from the outset, that these supporters of Sir B. Frere's views would aim at one thing above all others. The name and influence of the ex-king must be obliterated. The Zulus must be taught to forget him and to despise and degrade those of his immediate relatives and adherents who continued to show loyalty to him. The evidence collected by the Bishop shows that this policy was throughout consistently adhered to by the officials concerned in governing Zululand.¹

¹ The restoration of Zibebu during the past month (November 1887) to the corner of Zululand from which, in 1883, he dealt death and destruction among the Zulus loyal to Cetshwayo, may be proved to be due to the perpetuation of the same policy.

It is also due to Sir E. Wood to say that in explaining his views to the Zulu chiefs he was wholly in the hands of his interpreter. The following is a well authenticated report of the language addressed on the General's behalf before a large assemblage of chiefs and people, to Ndabuko, Cetshwayo's full brother:—

“Your offence, Ndabuko, is that you went down saying that you were going to ask for the ‘Bone’¹ Bone of what forsooth? Did we not kill that scoundrel (Cetshwayo) who was disturbing the land?”

The chief Zibebu went straight from this meeting to plunder and destroy the kraals of Cetshwayo's brothers and their adherents, while the chief Hamu, with European aid, soon afterwards accomplished the massacre of the Qulusi tribe as described below:—

“The action of these chiefs,” said the Bishop, “was directed expressly against those of their subjects who went down to Maritzburg to pray for the ‘Bone.’”²

The horrible events which followed Sir E. Wood's harangue to the chiefs, cannot be denied or questioned; and these events were regarded by the Zulus as the direct result of words supposed to be uttered by the General. This was also the view of Europeans. Thus the *Natal Mercury* of October 22nd, 1881, says:—

“We have received the following letter from a trustworthy Zululand correspondent:—‘October 13th.—I send a line at the last moment to say that things are going from bad to worse at railway speed. Up to the arrival of Sir E. Wood the chiefs did not fully realize that they were really independent at all. Now they do, and, if I mistake not, like a beggar on horseback, will ride to the devil sharp. Hamu

¹ A figurative way of referring to the ex-king.

² *Digest*, Vol. II. p. 276.

has begun by killing a large number of the abaQulusi people. My information is derived from native sources, and may be somewhat exaggerated. It is, that the killed at Isandhlwana were few compared with those killed by Hamu a few days ago. Zibebu also, and Ndabuko, are, I am told, on the point of coming to blows; and if they do, that will be worse still, for Ndabuko will find supporters throughout the length and breadth of Zululand.

“‘Ndabuko, the full brother of the ex-king, is the *protégé* of the Bishop of Natal. The Bishop, I find, has again sent one of his agents (Umajuba by name) calling for another deputation. The deputation is now on its way to Natal, and that, I understand, against the express refusal of the Resident to allow it.’”

On seeing this statement about himself, the Bishop wrote to the papers to say:—

“The above statement is absolutely false. I have sent no agent to Zululand, either lately or at any former time, calling for any deputation.

“I know nothing of any native called Umajuba. The two deputations came entirely of their own accord, and were as wholly unexpected by me as they were by the Government.”

Upon questions of fact within his knowledge we need nothing but the Bishop's word; and a citation of the following passage which concludes the above letter may seem superfluous, as the subject-matter of it may perhaps lack interest for some readers. But it is essential that some indication should be given of the nature of the conflict which at this time was beginning to tell upon the Bishop's strong bodily frame. He had in truth a powerful array of influences working against him. As far as communications between the British Government and Zululand were concerned, the Natal Native Department, whose method of working has been pretty clearly exposed in the preceding four chapters, were, with Mr. Osborn, the Zulu Resident, the eyes and ears of the Colonial Office. On their side

were ranged the colonial newspapers. The editor of one of these, Mr. J. Robinson, who had since 1873 played the part of a most bitter and uncompromising opponent of the Bishop, was also correspondent of the *London Times*. At the head-quarters of Zibebu and Hamu, the patrons of some of them, and elsewhere in and about Zululand, dwelt the men who contributed such items of news as that given above. The conclusion, which they jointly and severally wished to enforce was that the Bishop invited Cetshwayo's party to make up deputations to the Government which should have the appearance of representing a general national feeling, and that, even if the Bishop's denial of this accusation was to be accepted, the ex-king's party acted on their own account. The Bishop cared about the falsehoods directed against him in the Natal press only in so far as they might mislead the Home Government, and on this account he closed the letter just cited as follows :—

“Further, I observed that you published recently in your columns a letter from chief J. Dunn, in which he states that ‘There is no truth in the statement about eight of the appointed chiefs praying for Cetshwayo's return. This the British Resident can attest.’

“In reply I beg to state that on the first occasion (May 1880) when a deputation came down to make the above prayer, one of them, Nozaza, brought with him his chief, Seketwayo's ‘letters patent,’ that is to say, the document signed by Sir Garnet Wolseley, appointing him to be chief, as a guarantee that the man in question was a confidential messenger, and that the chief was a party to the prayer. And, as he certainly would not have come forward *alone* to make such a petition, this fact, by itself, guarantees the *bona fide* character of that deputation as having been sent, as they stated, by five of the appointed chiefs, afterwards increased to eight, to make the prayer in question.

“And the fact that the same confidential messenger, Nozaza, was sent with the recent deputation shows that this also

came to express the genuine wishes of the eight chiefs as they stated, whatever attempts have been made to discredit it.

“ I will add that if the chiefs under pressure have been brought to deny that they sent such deputations—Seketwayo among the rest—it only shows how unmeaning are such denials.

“ I have taken the proper measures for setting the true facts before the authorities.”

The British Resident himself, Mr. Osborn, became convinced by October 8, 1881,¹ of the need of appointing a paramount chief, as the only means of putting a stop to

“ the continuous state of unrest and rebellion against the present appointed chiefs, with the attendant ‘eating up’ and bloodshed ;”

the existence, he added, of such a central power as they were deprived of in their late king

“ being considered by the Zulus, as it is in fact, the only means of securing and maintaining peace and good order within the country.”

The instructions of the Home Government to Sir H. Bulwer in February 1882 were that if any representation should be made to him from Zululand that the chiefs and people desired that the country should be reunited under a paramount chief such representation would require careful consideration.

“ But in any case,” added Lord Kimberley, “ it must be remembered that the British Government cannot put aside the engagements into which it has entered with the Zulu chiefs as long as the chiefs on their part fulfil their obligations, unless in pursuance of the clearly expressed wish of the chiefs and people themselves.”

On reading the above, the Bishop wrote as follows, the references being to pages of his *Digest* :—

¹ See his Report of that date.

“ It is obviously of the utmost importance, in order to satisfy Her Majesty’s Government, that the facts should be clearly set forth as above (pp. 189-211, vol. ii.), as to eight of the appointed chiefs having taken part in the different deputations of May 1880, July-August 1881, and April 1882, and as to the extent to which other appointed chiefs have ‘ fulfilled their obligations,’ e.g. chief Dunn (pp. 261-271), Zibebu (pp. 280-292), Hamu (pp. 299-306).”

The Bishop’s references are guides to a multitude of harrowing statements, official and other, concerning the bloodshed already noticed.¹ Chief Dunn had taken up arms to help a neighbouring chief to put down a pretender to his chieftainship. Although the warfare which followed, and in which between 200 and 300 men, women, and children were killed on one side and three or four men on the other, had the sanction of the British Government, Dunn’s action at the outset, which, in the opinion of the Bishop, must have precipitated matters and rendered a peaceful solution of the difficulty impossible, was in violation of the conditions of his appointment.

The destruction of the Qulusi tribe by Hamu was also a merciless massacre of fugitives. In both cases white scamps assisted, and one of them states that, “ out of an army of about 1,500, but few escaped,” while “ our casualties are eight killed and thirteen wounded.” The women and children had upon this latter occasion been sent away into Transvaal territory, and so, with three exceptions, escaped.

The Qulusi tribe was one of the finest in Northern Zululand. They were devoted adherents of Cetshwayo, and hence obnoxious to Hamu. It would seem that he believed that he was acting throughout with the permission of Mr. Osborn, the Resident, and undoubtedly this had been given in the *negative* form.²

¹ See p. 568.

² Blue-book, C. 3182, p. 118.

Zibebu's worst crimes were yet to come ; but he "did his share," as the Bishop says, in these murders, the descriptions of which, and not the coarse abuse that was heaped upon his head through the columns of the Natal newspapers, tortured the Bishop's heart.

The knowledge of what was taking place in Zululand was rendered peculiarly painful to him by his insight into the real meaning of the events, and his personal acquaintance with Zulus who had taken part in the various deputations to Pietermaritzburg.

TO DR. JORISSEN.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *August 15, 1881.*

. . . "Now I trust that I may congratulate you and the Boer leaders on the settlement of the Transvaal question, which I do most heartily. And I want to ask you if nothing can be done for poor Cetshwayo, who, as you know, is doomed, by Lord Kimberley's last reply to his petition for release, to life-long captivity. . . . I want to know if the Boers, when, as I presume, they accept in Volksraad the terms of the Convention, would not be generous enough to couple with it an expression of the wish that as Sikukuni has been released,¹ and Langalibalele will be (so Lord Kimberley has promised in Parliament²) as soon as the Basuto troubles are over, so Cetshwayo may be restored. It would be a grand thing for the friends of the Boer cause in England, and would greatly strengthen their hands, by showing their friendly feeling towards the natives, if such a thing were done in spite of all the charges which have been made against them in this respect. . . . I am very sure that the Boers have no *dread* of the Zulus ; and now that the boundary is defined, I do not see the least ground to anticipate future disputes on that account."³

¹ By the Boers. He was murdered soon after.

² Langalibalele was not released until April 1887. See p. 405.

³ The *Natal Mercury* states (November 3, 1881), on the authority of the Transvaal *Volkstem*, that, "when the article of the Convention rela-

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"August 21, 1881.

"The point now seems to be . . . to insist upon Cetshwayo's being brought to England. Mr. Gladstone has no doubt been imposed upon, otherwise he would never have stopped the mouths and blinded the eyes of the eighty M.P.'s by talking of Cetshwayo's being allowed 'much more freedom' at Capetown! What possible arrangements can be made for this? As far as I can see, the promise is a mere farce, like Lord Carnarvon's about Langalibalele. I should be grieved to think that Mr. Gladstone, for whom I have great respect, should be knowingly a party to this. But what he says about Langa is equally absurd. What possible danger could there be in bringing him back to Natal. . . . To us, who know the real circumstances, it is perfectly *childish* to talk of Cetshwayo's undertaking *not* to return to Zululand, or Langa's disturbing the natives on our borders."

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

"BISHOPSTOWE, October 16, 1881.

. . . "J. Dunn sent down a week ago a request to be made 'Supreme Chief,' that is, king in Zululand. And I strongly suspect that Sir Evelyn Wood will support the request. But I fully hope that Sir Hercules Robinson will wholly disapprove of it, as he is acting towards Cetshwayo in the kindest possible manner."

tive to the release of Sikukuni was under discussion in the Volksraad, his Honour, P. J. Joubert, 'added that nothing would please the [Boer] Government more than to learn that the English Government had found it expedient to release Cetshwayo as well, as he also had never done anything against the Republic except by instigation from outside.'" And again, on November 22, "that the Boer Executive had requested the British Resident at Pretoria to despatch a telegram to Lord Kimberley conveying a request for the release of Cetshwayo as soon as possible, and to have his rights restored to him, on the ground that so only 'matters in Zululand and with the Zulu nation can be established on a satisfactory and sound basis, and that it is only by this act of justice that England can regain confidence.'"

VOL. II.

P P

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *November 5, 1881.*

“To-day I received a *quasi-private* letter from Sir E. Wood, asking if I would be willing to serve on a Commission which he is about to appoint—with the Chief Justice as president, and the Attorney-General as vice-president—to consider certain native questions.¹ Of course I expressed my willingness, and I *hope* that some good may result from this.

“But to-day also, to our great joy, came Beje, and fifteen others, who had been released yesterday, through an order which they were told (before they left the gaol) came from the Queen, *i.e.* of course from the Secretary of State.”²

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *December 10, 1881.*

“I have had a visit from ‘Father Rivington,’ who has been holding a ‘Mission’ for Dean Green at Maritzburg and Durban. He came professedly out of mere charity to

¹ This Commission had nothing to do with Zulu matters, but dealt merely with the domestic affairs of the natives of Natal. It entailed a good deal of work and fatigue for the Bishop in the long drive in and out to attend the sittings on several days of the week besides his Sunday expedition. But he did not allow it to put a stop to his work for the Zulus.

² The Bishop’s eldest daughter, Harriette, refers to this event as follows in writing to her brother in England:—“Beje and Co. *are out*, and are now at Bishopstowe, that is sixteen of them. One had worked his time out (one year—a mere boy), one had escaped, two had died in gaol, and one had been murdered—run to death by the policemen on the way down. That makes up the twenty-one. They are all suffering more or less from *ukufa kwe Tronk* [illness caused by imprisonment] one so badly that he has . . . not yet got *here*. They are turned out . . . with nothing on in the world but their *umutyas* [girdles] and . . . one blanket, one coat, and two shirts, and £1 belonging to one of the party, returned to them; *nothing* of either food or clothing from Government to get home to Zululand, sick men, crawling up, and with two ferries to cross (the rivers being full) each needing 6*d.* a head. It makes one’s blood boil. We are giving them 6*s.* and blankets. The state of things in Zululand is simply heartrending.”

“speak with me, as he always prayed for me (‘Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics’), and was grieved to find me shut off from the great body of Christendom. Yes, I said, as Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were at the second Reformation, or as the Apostles were cut off from the orthodox Jews at the first, together with their Head, who ‘had a devil’ and ‘deceived the people.’”

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *December 17, 1881.*

“The Native Commission met last Wednesday and Thursday. . . . My seat being next to the Attorney-General, I asked him how it was that no American missionary was put on the Commission, to which he replied, ‘Well, I did put down the name of one in Sir G. Colley’s time—Pinkerton—but he has since died.’ This shows that the Commission was not merely *contemplated*, but actually worked out in detail, by Sir G. Colley, instead of by Sir E. Wood as is generally supposed; and most probably the 120 questions which the President read to us, as questions to be put to the witnesses *vivâ voce* or otherwise, were altogether or mainly prepared by Sir G. Colley before the Transvaal troubles began. And *this* fact, I believe, accounts really for my name being put on the Commission, and not any special kindness of Sir E. Wood, though in speaking to my friends he has laid stress on the appointment as evidence of his regard or friendly feeling towards me. It was plain, from Sir G. Colley’s letter to me in reply to my own communication about natives buying land, &c., . . . that he *did* intend to place me on the Commission, and I feel sure that he actually did so in his draft preparations.”

TO MRS. LYELL.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *January 2, 1882.*

‘I thank you very much for your kind present of the *Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, of which only

the second volume, through some mismanagement in our post-office, had reached me when our last mail left, though the first volume turned up afterwards, when I made inquiry about it. I need hardly say that I shall read them with the deepest interest as a precious memorial of the dear friend who showed me so much kindness when I greatly needed it. "I am still, I am sorry to say, fighting with the Government here, as of old. This time it is Sir E. Wood, who is strongly opposed to Cetshwayo's restoration to Zululand, and has done here, and will do, I am sure, in England, whatever he can to prevent the wise and humane views of the Cape Governor and Government taking effect with the Secretary of State on Cetshwayo's behalf. . . . There can be no doubt that Sir E. Wood has been overruled by Lord Kimberley on several points—especially by the order which the Resident has evidently received, we suppose from England, to order the restoration of the cattle which had been 'eaten up,' from Ndabuko by Zibebu and from Mnyamana by Hamu, under the authority (I cannot doubt, though they are trying now to repudiate the responsibility) of the Resident—in other words, of Sir E. Wood himself¹. . . . We

¹ It must be remembered that the ukase which forbade in Zululand the discussion of Cetshwayo's possible return, and on which Sir E. Wood was doubtless acting, was, for obvious reasons, unpublished and utterly unknown to the Bishop. In this instance official caution overreached itself, as it left the Bishop free to advise the Zulus to make known their wishes to the Resident. If any corroboration were required of the abundant evidence that Zibebu's abominable conduct, which has certainly been consistent throughout, has had from the outset the secret sanction of British officials, it is afforded by the latest utterance of Sir T. Shepstone, who in a memorandum dated February 17, 1887 [Parl. Blue-book, C. 5143, p. 31], actually puts forward the statement that Zibebu and his followers owe their present downfall "to this chief's loyalty to the British Government," affirming that "the ability, energy, and courage which Zibebu exhibited when he overthrew Cetshwayo have made his name a terror to the Zulus," and that "he would most certainly take advantage of the first opening that might present itself to endeavour to recover his position, provided his action did not clash with what he might consider to be his loyal duty to the British Government." Sir T. Shepstone then proceeds to suggest that something should be done to "conciliate Zibebu's loyalty" as "his influence [causing *terror*] on the side of the Government would be *worth a*

can only hope that the measures taken by Mr. Chesson and our friends in England will thwart his endeavours, and that the injured king, and Langalibalele also, will before long be sent back, in spite of the raging hostility of some of our colonists, with whom Sir E. Wood is immensely popular. As we are now in the very crisis of the struggle, you will not wonder that our minds are anxiously watching by each mail for signs of what is being done in England, or likely to be done in this matter as soon as Parliament meets."

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *March 12, 1882.*

. . . "Sir H. Bulwer has just dissolved the Legislative Council, and will presently summon a new one to take into consideration the question of responsible government, . . . which is now offered under certain conditions not yet published. I doubt very much if it will be accepted, as there are many here who do not think the colony is ripe yet for it, though it may be when Zululand is settled, and the railway is completed to Newcastle, some four or five years hence. Not a word has leaked out yet about Cetshwayo's destiny."

Among the most discreditable incidents of the war with Cetshwayo was the rifling of the grave of his father Mpande, to which the following letter refers:—

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 2, 1882.*

"Last Thursday I attended . . . the inquiry by General Drury Lowe and H. Shepstone about Mpande's grave. . . . The result was that the Commissioners, I believe, were convinced that the deed was done about three days before the capture of Cetshwayo, by soldiers (from ten to twenty), *considerable armed force.*" That Sir T. Shepstone should deem the employment of such an influence desirable is significant of the state of the Zulus at present.

not secretly or at night, but at midday, in full view of the camp, at a distance of five or six hundred yards, with the ground perfectly open between, so that what was done must have been known to very many officers and men, and, according to the witnesses, it was freely talked of in the camp by soldiers, who said, 'We have done it to take the head home to the Queen.'"¹

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 10, 1882.*

. . . "I am grieved indeed to hear of the death of our friend Dr. Muir, which is a loss to us, and especially to myself personally, as he sympathised warmly with me on theological matters, though I don't think he cared much for Zulu politics, even when stretching out his hand to relieve the needs of the famished Zulus."

The publication by telegram of the Prime Minister's reference to Zulu wishes coincided, curiously enough, with the arrival in Pietermaritzburg, in spite of all adverse influences, of a deputation which more than fulfilled his conditions. It consisted of 646 chiefs and headmen, with their attendants—2000 persons in all—including representatives of all ranks from every quarter of Zululand.²

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"*April 16, 1882.*

"An important occurrence since I last wrote is that of the arrival of a very large deputation from Zululand, headed by three . . . of the appointed chiefs—I mean by their representatives—Seketwayo, Faku, and Somkele—to ask for the restoration of Cetshwayo. As usual they have sent ahead messengers to report that the great men are on their way, and from them we must have heard of whom the party consists. I have taken measures to secure that they shall not come to Bishopstowe, but go at once to Maritzburg

¹ See p. 489.

² See p. 541.

to the authorities.¹ Fortunately, Mr. Osborn is still here, though he was about to return to Zululand to-morrow. And they have already gone into town and seen Mr. Osborn, and announced the coming of the deputation. He was very much displeased at their coming without his permission; they had sent to ask for a pass before he left Zululand, and he had told them to wait till he returned. But when he heard that the three appointed chiefs were bringing down the others—who, by one of Sir G. Wolseley's conditions, are free to come without a pass from the Resident—he . . . told them to come again to-morrow."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June 18, 1882.*

"We are rejoiced to hear that Sir Wilfrid Lawson has promised to bring on a motion in favour of Cetshwayo in the House of Commons, in which he will be supported, . . . I sincerely trust, by a number of true-hearted Englishmen on both sides of the House. . . . (Please excuse any defects in this letter, as I am writing under difficulties, having suffered for some days past under a rather sharp attack of 'influenza,' fever, with bronchial affection, sleeplessness, &c.; which, although passing off, has left me not very strong for using my head in letter-writing at this moment.) . . . As regards Sir H. Bulwer, I am, of course, utterly disappointed. He is not the man I hoped to find, whose love of truth and sense of justice would compel him to overcome his violent prejudices against Cetshwayo and in favour of Sir G. Wolseley's settlement when the facts of the case were clearly laid before him. . . . Sir H. Bulwer loses sight of the fact that, in giving the advice I did—viz. to let the wishes of the Zulu people, and especially of the appointed chiefs, be made known to the authorities by peaceful means—I have probably done the very thing which has most helped to keep the Zulus quiet through these weary months of waiting for 'justice' from England. . . . But then I did also what has

¹ To avoid offending official susceptibilities.

not only been confirmed *ex post facto* by the words of Mr. Gladstone, but was (as I believe) in full accordance with the wishes and views of the High Commissioner for Zululand, Sir H. Robinson. . . .

“Do not believe a word of what you may hear about the Zulus having expressed a wish to be governed by a white Resident, &c., *without the restoration of Cetshwayo*. They wish nothing of the kind. . . . It is clear now that Cetshwayo has been sacrificed in the wild attempt to . . . force responsible government upon the colony, with entire control of natives inside and treatment of the Zulus according to the wishes of [some of] the colonists, . . . which offer, however, the better voice of the colony, pronounced by the recent election, has happily rejected.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, July 2, 1882.

. . . “I expect that this will reach you only a day or two before they (Cetshwayo and his companions) arrive. And then I quite agree with you—setting all philanthropy aside—there can be no other rational policy but that of restoring him under proper conditions to Zululand, unless the English Government is prepared to undertake the consequences—in expenditure of blood and treasure—of complete annexation of Zululand.”

TO THE SAME.

“DURBAN, July 17, 1882.

. . . “Since I have been here, I am more than ever convinced that what the Shepstones are all aiming at is the *annexation* of a large part of Zululand, fully one-third of the country I should say, and including John Dunn’s district—in fact, the territory between the Tugela and the Umhlatuze. Of course, H. Shepstone will have a splendid opportunity of convincing Cetshwayo, on the way home, of the necessity of his accepting the arrangement as the *only* means of his being restored to Zululand.

- "I doubt if Sir H. Bulwer has recommended it—at least, the Shepstones have led me to suppose that he has not in any way consulted Sir T. Shepstone.
- "After taking from Zululand, under Sir G. Wolseley's settlement of the (English) Transvaal boundary, the portion which the Boers had appropriated and the Commission had given back to the Zulus, it will be rather hard to take from them a further section of one-third of their whole territory, as now proposed. You may remember this very proposal was thrown out by Sir T. Shepstone in his interview with the Zulu indunas at the Blood River."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, August 27, 1882.

- "Your letter of July 27 (to my daughter) has just reached us. And by the same mail we got a 'White-book' (C. 3293) containing a most extraordinary despatch from Sir H. Bulwer, dated May 25, which I think Lord Kimberley himself must have judged at its true value. It is indeed surprising that Sir H. Bulwer should have based such a serious attack upon me on the statements of two Zulus, *whose names are carefully suppressed*, and of two Natal natives, who are also left *anonymous*. As these four natives, especially the last two, under the protection of Sir H. Bulwer himself, can hardly have feared the vengeance of 'the rival *quasi*-authority against this Government that is often set up by the Bishop of Natal' (p. 5), I can only conclude that the names are withheld on purpose that I may not find out who they are, and ascertain whether the last two informants are, as he says (p. 4), 'both of them trustworthy men.' How could he know that? Only from Mr. John Shepstone, who brought forward his own induna, Nozithina, and other 'trustworthy men,' at the Matshana inquiry, to testify solemnly to the truth of certain statements made by himself, with respect to which the Commissioner, Colonel G. Colley, reported that 'Matshana . . . came in good faith, and that the accusations against him,



Bishop Colenso and his Grandson
1862

From a Photograph by Mr. B. E. De la

. . . which are made in Mr. Shepstone's statements, are entirely without foundation.'¹ Yet this is the official upon whom Sir H. Bulwer must wholly rely in such matters as the above.

"In point of fact, as you will see, these four natives do not say that they had seen with their own eyes or heard with their own ears the supposed messengers said to have been sent by me. And I need hardly say that the rumours they had picked up as to my doings are to a great extent utterly unfounded and false, and such, I think, as should not have been forwarded to the Secretary of State, until an opportunity had been given to me of explaining or contradicting them. However, as Cetshwayo is to be restored, I do not at present think of taking any notice of this despatch, unless any remarks in the *Mercury*, &c., should compel me to do so."²

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *September 10, 1882.*

"Robert³ came up yesterday (Saturday) for the second Sunday to vaccinate. I am staying at home to-day, being under the hands of Dr. R. J. C. (It is nothing serious.) Hence I have in my ears in the study all day the din and hubbub of a great number of people and the wailings of their babes. Last Sunday he vaccinated 199, and to-day he has done 410. Those who were vaccinated last Sunday are doing very well, except the Hlubis and others whom he treated with Government lymph—a small supply sent up to Bishopstowe, which seems to have been faulty in some respect, as only in one out of ten cases has the operation succeeded. *His own* supply of lymph has been thoroughly successful.

"I sent in to the office of the Vaccination Board appointed under the new law, gazetted August 29, for 500 copies of

¹ See pp. 411, 412.

² The Bishop investigated the matter however to the end, and thoroughly exposed the Governor's informants, whom he identified. See *Ruin of Zululand*, vol. ii. p. 357.

³ His elder son.

the scheduled form, . . . and I found that the Board was to hold their *first* meeting yesterday (September 9)—I suppose stirred into action by my application—and this with the small-pox at our gates, and no time to be lost in vaccinating such multitudes of people, white and black!

“Sir H. Bulwer *was* to start on Friday last for his tour, not into Zululand, but through the north of the colony, taking Rorke’s Drift on the way, where Mnyamana is to meet him. “Your reply to Sir B. Frere was first rate.”

TO MRS. F. COLENSO.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *September 24, 1882.*

“I need hardly say that, after our late experience of Sir H. Bulwer’s doings, we doubt very much that any good will come out of his visit—not to Zululand, but—to Rorke’s Drift, in order to settle the Zulu country. The latest report about him informs us that he is encamped on the Natal side of the [Border river] and Mr. Osborn on the Zulu side; and what information of any value as to the real feelings of the Zulu chiefs and people can be obtained in this way?

“We have a *magnificent* comet in sight every morning about an hour before sunrise.”

The answer to the Bishop’s question is that Sir H. Bulwer and his advisers, the little knot of permanent officials and their dependents with whom the Bishop had been in conflict since 1873, did not desire to recognise any expression of the real feelings of the Zulu chiefs and people.

Small-pox was at this time raging at Capetown. It was of great moment to the credit of the English nation that no underhand manœuvres should be resorted to, in order to delay the restoration of the Zulu king. But there were ominous rumours which seemed to show that a deliberate plan had been formed to land Cetshwayo at Capetown, in order that he might be detained there and then sent on to Natal, where he would undergo a further detention in quaran-

tine. The Bishop was slow to believe even in the possibility of such dastardly intrigues and such un-English conduct ; but his fears of a double detention were removed. Although the king was taken into the midst of the small-pox and left in danger for months,¹ he was ultimately landed on the coast of Zululand.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

" October 2, 1882.

. . . " We are exceedingly sorry that the poor king has been ordered to be landed at Capetown, and taken back to Oude Molen, while the steamer which brought him is on her way up with all his fellow-passengers for Natal, who, the *Nubian* having had no contact with the pest-stricken city, will be landed here at once without being quarantined. It is a most cruel and inhuman decision . . . to arrange this terrible disappointment for him. . . Of course, whenever Cetshwayo is sent to Natal, he must now be quarantined, which, for one in his position, will in itself be a terrible trial. Why could he not be sent up here at once and put in charge of the military, who would have put up a good tent for him, and taken care of him till Sir H. Bulwer had hatched his report ? "

TO THE SAME.

" BISHOPSTOWE, October 29, 1882.

. . . " It seems to me that (Cetshwayo) is kept under stronger surveillance than ever—I suppose through the action of Sir H. Bulwer when he came out, which has not yet been set aside—though Cetshwayo is now a free man and a king. I say this because the only letter we have received from him since he returned has had to pass through the custodian's hands first, then through those of the Cape S.N.A., then through the Cape Governor's, then through Sir H. Bulwer's,

¹ He had been vaccinated in England ; but the outbreak was a very

in consequence of which, though dated October 9, it did not reach me till October 26. It is possible that the small-pox may have caused some of this delay ; but obviously he is not allowed to have free intercourse with us for fear of 'intrigues.'

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *December 3, 1882.*

"H. and I went to town Friday ; and, just as we were about to leave for home, Mr. Tom Reynolds met me and asked if I had seen the telegram which had just arrived. I went at once to the *Witness* notice-board, and read 'Sir H. Bulwer is ordered to reinstate Cetshwayo without loss of time.' Thank God for that ! It gave us new life, you may believe, for we are quite sure in our own minds that Sir Henry Bulwer has been doing all he can to delay Cetshwayo's restoration, if not to prevent it altogether even at this late hour. A month ago the Cape authorities (the Mayor first, and more recently the Government) have announced that the (small-pox) epidemic is over. But our people have not relaxed the very stringent quarantine laws here, and I fear that if he arrives within a week or two he will be detained in the outer harbour three weeks. Let us hope for the best, and that commercial pressure may in this respect help the king."

The two years which had passed away since the catastrophe of Isandhlwana had been a discouraging time, the dreariness of which was rendered still more dark by the disaster of Majuba Hill. At last there seemed to be a prospect of happier and more peaceful days ; but the sky was again to become overclouded. The principles by which the white rulers acted in their dealings with their darker neighbours remained the same ; and a wretched experience was to verify again the old adage that the same fountain cannot give forth sweet water and bitter.

CHAPTER XII.

THE EVENING OF HIS LIFE AND WORK.

1882-83.

THE evening was come. The work of the day had been for the Bishop a long and hard warfare ; and although he was as ready as ever to spend and be spent in the cause of truth and righteousness, the natural weariness of mere muscle and nerve led him sometimes¹ to express a desire for some rest. When his life's toil came a few months later somewhat suddenly to its end, those who knew and loved him best were led to think that his words had reference to a deeper rest and peace than any may look for in this world of trouble. But although the thought of this rest was always present to him, there can be little doubt that he yet hoped for a time of tranquillity during which he might feel the sense of refreshment and perhaps even of new vigour before his departure hence. It would be pleasant, if time and leisure were spared to him, to make a retrospect of the region which lay behind him, to recall old familiar scenes, and to see what remained, if not for himself, yet for others to do. The harder the battle of life, the more natural will this feeling be ; and the Bishop may well have wished for a little of such well-earned repose, as he

¹ As he said in a letter, presently to be cited, " My *body* and soul are crying out for rest, *before* I go hence."

became gradually more and more conscious of the failure of bodily power.

But he was surrounded still by the elements of division and strife. Bishop Gray had committed the diocese and the colony to the bitter controversy, in which those who love the freedom and quiet of the Church of England are drawn out against the upholders of ecclesiastical independence—in other words, of sacerdotal tyranny. It is hard, indeed, to see in what quarter Bishop Gray's policy and course of action could produce the fruits of peace. To that policy, the Dean of Grahamstown, Dr. Williams, could not reconcile himself, more than the Bishop of Natal. The Church Council of Natal was summoned to meet in 1882, and the Bishop had invited Dr. Williams to this, the last session of that Council over which he was to preside. Dr. Williams, unable to come, replied by a letter in which the following sentences occur :—

“I should have had no little satisfaction in hearing your lordship thanked for the noble, patient, dutiful, and exemplary stand which you have made for so many years, through evil report and good report, for the liberty of thought which has made the Church of England, at home or abroad, such as it is to-day, the nursery and guardian of a rational tolerant Christianity, which knows how to embrace parties, and be patient of speculation, while witnessing to eternal truths, valuable alike to the educated and the lowly, to genius and mediocrity, to the lights of the age and to the willing crowd.

“I should have been glad to hear the voice of one more Christian assembly in South Africa, raised against the clumsy and libellous weapon of private, unauthorised, and impotent excommunication, claiming to be authoritative. . . . I should have been glad to see any prospect of the door being opened . . . to a reconciliation of both parties on the footing of comprehension and not exclusion, both in Natal and the Cape Colony. And lastly, I should have

prized the opportunity of confessing with regret, but without shame, that in former years and with less experience I had more confused notions of the Constitution of the Church of England and of its value, and had inclined to the wish that it should be governed by parties and majorities like the State, and that certain views and critical inquiries, such as those which have made your own name famous, should be crushed out by votes rather than by time and by confutation if they are wrong,—but also of adding that I have lived long enough to reach the conviction, long ago, that such aspirations are against the interests of a rational and potent Christianity, as much as they are opposed to the spirit of our national Church. One principle, however, I always maintained, and never swerved from, from the day I first contemplated colonial church life; and that is, that, exactly such as the mother Church of England is at home, so should the daughter Church be in her colonies, and that separation or independence should never be thought of.”

The Dean wrote under the pressure of “severe and protracted illness,” which ended in his death not long after the Bishop rested from his own toil. But like the Bishop, he was resolved to maintain the order of the Church of England as against that of the Church of South Africa. The case might be not so clear in Grahamstown; but the question was whether property set apart for the uses of the Church of England could be diverted to the purposes of other religious bodies.

TO THE DEAN OF GRAHAMSTOWN.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *May 14, 1882.*

. . . “I shall be very much surprised if you are right in supposing that Bishop Merriman will be judged capable of holding or acting in respect of properties in question, so long, at all events, as he adheres to the Church of South Africa, which forbids on pain of deprivation any of its clergy performing the marriage service for a divorced person,

however innocent. And last week Dean Green stole a march, I expect, upon the main body of Macrorie's clergy by getting *their* resolution to the above effect amended (in, I imagine, a small house of clergy, as many who met originally had gone home for their Sunday work and had not come back) by the addition that all such marriages shall be judged to be *adulterous*. This is impudence truly. The law of the land is to be over-ruled, and wretchedness sown in families, at the pleasure of these arrogant ecclesiastics.

"I doubt, as I told you, whether you can maintain your claim to refuse access to the Cathedral to a Bishop of the Church of England, if you were under such a Bishop in the diocese of Grahamstown. But I cannot believe that the Privy Council will decide that Merriman is a Bishop of the Church of England, or can exercise the powers and claim the rights of such a Bishop against a lawfully appointed Dean or minister."

Dean Williams, in his turn, was anxious to have once more the help of the Bishop of Natal at Grahamstown ; but to this request the latter found himself reluctantly constrained to reply in the negative.

TO THE DEAN OF GRAHAMSTOWN.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *September 10, 1882.*

. . . "As to the point of my going to Grahamstown, it is, of course, utterly out of the question that I should do so before October 10, when I hope to see you here, and we can then talk over any future plans. But I must warn you not to expect too much from me—*non sum qualis eram*—and even since my visit to Grahamstown, two years, bringing me to nearly sixty-nine years of age, and two years pretty full of anxious care and hard work, in respect of various matters, have taken, as I feel, a good deal of strength out of me. I have neither the physical power, nor, at this time of life, the inclination, to take the place of leader in the

struggle of sacerdotalism against the liberties secured by law in the Church of England. My body and soul are crying out for *rest*, before I go hence. And I feel as if I could not *bear* even the exertion of making such a trip as I did two years ago.

“You must not, therefore, please, pledge me to visit Grahamstown, as you propose; and you yourself will be aware that a change of sees is out of the question under existing circumstances. It appears to me that what you have to do is to get the *laity* of the Grahamstown diocese, as far as possible, to address the Archbishop, pointing out to his Grace the difficulties of the present position,—how the churches and incomes of the Bishop and clergy belong to the Church of England, and cannot be alienated to, or allowed to be claimed by, the Church of South Africa,—how the vacancy of the see allows of a Bishop of the Church of England being appointed,—and requesting his Grace to appoint one, or else to advise what steps should be taken to obtain one under the present emergency. This will at any rate draw out the Archbishop’s views, and I should not be surprised if he worked in a friendly way with such appellants. You will have noticed, of course, that in reply, I suppose, to Bishop Jones’s inquiry, the Archbishop says that he recognises the South African churches as ‘in full communion’ with the Church of England, so that its clergy and laity are welcomed in England as members of the English Church; but the same is true of the American Episcopal Church. The Archbishop does not say that a clergyman of the South African Church, *e.g.* ordained by Bishop Macrorie, would be able to marry a couple or be presented to a living in England.

“I feel sure that, until Bishop Jones and the South African clergy have distinctly committed themselves to a reassertion of the principles which have separated them from the Church of England according to the recent judgement, it would not be well or right for me to intrude into the diocese of Grahamstown, even if all the other hindrances were out of the way. But I should have no scruple in giving Dr.

Davies a license to officiate as a Presbyterian of the Church of England within the diocese of Grahamstown, pending the appointment of a new Bishop of Grahamstown bound by the standards of the Church of England and also by the legal interpretation of them. I have a strong conviction—though I cannot, of course, be certain—that Archbishop Tait would work for the appointment of such a Bishop one way or other.”

The next letter refers to the question of the letters patent¹ granted to the Bishops of the three sees of Natal, Grahamstown, and Capetown. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had over-hastily concluded that all were alike invalid. It was found that this remark, if it applied to the others, did not apply to those of the Bishop of Natal. The coercive jurisdiction which was supposed to be conferred by these letters was a matter for which the Bishop of Natal neither cared nor wished; but at least it could not be endured that such power should on the strength of these letters be claimed by prelates who at the same time repudiated the supremacy of the Crown, and rejected the interpretation of the formularies by the Sovereign in Council.

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *January 12, 1883.*

“In the *Guardian* of December 13 there is an important letter from Lord Blachford (formerly the Permanent Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office) upon Colonial Bishoprics, which is to be followed by another. In this first letter he brings down the history of Colonial Bishoprics just to the time of the Privy Council judgement (pronounced by Lord Westbury), which mistakenly assumed that *my* letters patent were invalid, as well as Bishop Gray’s, because Natal as well as the Cape Colony had a representative Legislative Assembly at the time when they were issued. This, as you know, was erroneous; but as the main question was

¹ See p. 167, and also Appendix A.

not touched by the error, it passed for fact without being corrected in England, and very probably Lord Blachford will assume it to be fact in his next letter. I want to lose no time in contradicting any such false assumption in the present crisis of South African Church affairs, and the more so as even Mr. Gladstone's secretary, in his reply to me about Langa, addresses me 'Right Rev. Sir,' instead of (as he ought to have done under my letters patent) 'my Lord Bishop.' I therefore post to you a copy of the judgements of the three judges of the Supreme Court of Natal, in which the mistake of the Privy Council is pointed out, and the complete validity of my letters patent is affirmed by the majority of the Court, and the decision, never having been appealed against, stands as law in this colony at this moment. Should Lord Blachford either adopt the current mistake (as he already has done towards the close of his first letter), or should he altogether ignore the decision of our Supreme Court, I wish you would send to him the copy of the judgements, in which I have marked some of the more important clauses, 5, 6, 7, 8, 31, 39, to which you might draw attention, both as a son of the Bishop of Natal, and as having formerly practised at the Natal Bar, and being therefore cognisant of the proceedings in question, and express your hope that he would call attention to the fact of this judgement having been pronounced, and standing at present as law in Natal."

Dean Williams had, as we have seen, indulged the hope that the evils under which the Grahamstown diocese was suffering might be removed by the translation of Bishop Colenso from Natal. On this point the Bishop could not allow him to indulge in expectations which must be vain.

TO THE DEAN OF GRAHAMSTOWN.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *March* 19, 1883.

. . . "I must repeat what I said before, that you must really dismiss all idea of *my* going, if elected, to Grahamstown. I

am too old (in my seventieth year), and I begin to feel the infirmities of age. I am not equal to such a conflict as must be manifestly waged by any new Church of England Bishop at Grahamstown. I have my heart in the work as strongly as ever; and I should deem it a grand position to be elected to if I were ten years younger. But it would be folly for me to undertake it now, conscious as I am of failing physical powers. Nor can I even use my head as I did in the days of yore, though, thank God, I am still able to do some work with my brain, though I feel weaker on my legs.

“Dismissing, then, this idea once for all, the question remains, ‘What are you to do?’ There is no doubt, I imagine, that under peculiar circumstances, such as ours are, *one* Bishop can consecrate a Bishop. Thus Bingham writes, *Ant.* I. p. 48, a section about ‘ordinations by one Bishop allowed to be valid, though not canonical;’ and he goes on to say that ‘Siderius, Bishop of Palæbisca, was ordained by one Bishop; yet Athanasius not only allowed his ordination and confirmed it, but, finding him to be a useful man, advanced him, as Synesius says, to the metropolitanical see of Ptolemais. Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch, ordained Evagrius his successor, without any other Bishop to assist him.’ And as the only condition which the law, as now declared by the Privy Council, would require of such a Bishop in order to his being a Bishop of the Church of England would be that he should have declared his acceptance of the laws of the Church of England, so far as applicable to the colony, ‘together with the interpretations thereof declared from time to time by the Privy Council,’ I presume that, on making such a declaration, a Bishop so ordained would be recognised by the law as entitled to the income provided for the Church of England Bishop in Grahamstown. Without at present committing myself to any *promise* to consecrate a Bishop for Grahamstown, should I be asked by yourself and your people, and perhaps other clergy and people, to do so (for in case of there being any probability of such a request being made to me I should wish first to consult my legal and other friends at home), I may say that I do not see at

present any sufficient reason for declining to consecrate, if you can find anyone suitable to the office and willing to be so consecrated."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June 11, 1883.*

. . . "You must remember that our people here have to do everything for themselves—supporting ministers, building churches, &c.—getting no help from any Society, and that they were set free from the Church of South Africa before the recent judgement, which practically concerns only their *future*, in respect of the appointment of a Bishop after me, whereas it affects the *present* as well as the future of the dioceses of Capetown and Grahamstown."

The following letter is the last which relates to the subject of his life's chief work :—

TO THE REV. R. COMPTON JONES.

"*May, 1883.*

"At my time of life, and distracted as I have been from critical studies by the political events of Zululand, in which I have felt it my duty to concern myself (much against my personal wishes), I can hardly expect to be able to compose and publish another critical work, though I still take a deep interest in such labours, and at intervals, amid great interruptions, I have pursued my researches. As, however, in my published volumes I have maintained that the Elohist narrative (Genesis i.—Exodus vi. 5) is the *oldest* portion of the Pentateuch, I wish to leave on record the fact that I have been compelled, by a thorough investigation into the linguistic evidence, to abandon this view, and to regard the Elohist narrative as a 'deposit' of the later 'priestly stratum.' . . . But it appears to me still to stand by itself, *i.e.* broken off at Exodus vi. 5, and separated from the Exilic and post-Exilic priestly matter, and to be of older age than Ezekiel, to whom Exodus vi. 6-8 appears to be due, and perhaps even to be older than Deuteronomy, which would

account for Deuteronomy x. 22, Exodus i. 5, Jeremiah iv. 23, which seems to be a reminiscence of Genesis i. 2, Deuteronomy iv. 32; compare Genesis v. 1, &c."

In other words, the Elohist narrative took shape at some time before the reign of Josiah, during which, if not in the reign of Manasseh, the Book of the Law, commonly known as Deuteronomy, was composed. The difference is one of detail, which does not in the least affect the main conclusions reached by the Bishop in the course of his inquiries into the origin and growth of the Pentateuch.¹

For further researches into this ground there was to be no leisure; and there were immediate and more pressing cares which from the beginning of this year absorbed all his thoughts.

Writing on January 1, 1883, to Mr. Chesson, on the subject of Sir H. Bulwer's "settlement" of Zululand, the general features of which had been to some extent made known, the Bishop refers to the intended "reservation" of the country south of the Umhlatuzi, a district

"which may be regarded as nearly half of Zululand, and the very best part of the country now that the Boers have

¹ It may be well to mention here that Dr. Delitzsch, whose efforts to maintain the traditional notions of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch have been already noticed (I. 577, 580, 585), now in his *New Commentary on Genesis* rejects them all, pronouncing untenable his former position that the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant were the work of Moses himself, and that the rest of the Pentateuch was put together by one of his immediate successors. He now holds that the Book of Deuteronomy, although containing some old matter, belongs, as a whole, to the reign of Hezekiah, and, in short, that the Pentateuch is a composite work, of which some part was not written for a thousand years after the supposed age of the Exodus.

It is, perhaps, still more important to mark the motive which has impelled Dr. Delitzsch to make these admissions.

"The love of truth, submission to the yoke of truth, abandonment of traditional views, which will not endure the test of truth, is a sacred duty, an element of the genuine fear of God."