got possession of the disputed territory which Sir G. Wolseley annexed to the English Transvaal, and which was subsequently made over to the Boers."

The Bishop then proceeds:

"I need not say that the whole transaction is a breach of good faith and a disgrace to the English name, after the pledges that have been given that no part of the country should be annexed. They will not, of course, use the name annexation; but you and our friends, I hope, will not be deceived by this. — is convinced that Sir T. Shepstone is at the bottom of the whole affair, and has all along been working with Sir H. Bulwer for the end now published. . . . It is possible that this mail may bring a letter from you telling us what will, or will not, be done in England to frustrate this outrageous attempt to dismember Zululand after the gracious words spoken by the Queen to Cetshwayo (as Mr. Gallwey, the Attorney-General, told me): 'I respect you as a brave enemy, and now I trust you as a future friend."

In a letter dated January 9, 1883, an extract from which will be presently given, the Bishop warns his son to "look out for further trouble" if Sir H. Bulwer's plan for confiscating half Zululand should be really carried out. The partition was brought about, the troubles prophesied by the Bishop followed swiftly, and the loving fellow-workers in whose arms the Bishop breathed his last a few months later are as certain that these troubles hastened the close of his life as they are certain that they involved the death of the poor chief whose cause he had from first to last with unswerving resolution upheld.

Every phase of the conflict in which the Bishop was engaged up to his last hours on earth may be followed in the

1 The solemn pledges repeatedly given to Cetshwayo were, it would seem, as meaningless as Lord Carnarvon's promises to the AmaHlubi tribe. In Cetshwayo's case the British Government promised that "no more country should be reserved than was necessary to enable us to fulfil our obligations to the chiefs and people unwilling" to be subjects of Cetshwayo. For Lord Carnarvon's promises, see pp. 404, 405.
pages of his *Digest*. But the officials, who succeeded in frustrating the purposes for which he had so unselfishly worked, had at their command resources which we cannot properly appreciate without reading despatches which never reached his eye. Conspicuous among these is the long despatch, dated January 6, 1886, with which Sir H. Bulwer wound up his terribly disastrous administration of the affairs of Zululand. In this despatch, which is a final defence of his own policy, he utters his last words against Cetshwayo and explicitly charges the king’s "sympathisers in Natal" with having "led him fatally to his ruin." The misrepresentations and evasions in the historical sketch which is made the vehicle of this charge may be completely disproved by the help of the Bishop’s *Digest* and letters. It is enough to say, however, that in this paper the Governor of Natal passes over without even the slightest allusion the following important and undisputed facts.

It is not disputed that the murderous tyranny of Hamu and Zibebu during the three years of Sir G. Wolseley’s settlement had excited against them feelings of deadly hostility in the minds of powerful tribes living within and upon the borders of their territories.

It is not disputed that Zibebu had his men drilled, and an organisation more or less complete, although the condition of his appointment ran, "I will not permit the existence of any military system or organisation whatever in my territory." He was, in fact, allowed to arm and prepare his men, under Sir H. Bulwer as High Commissioner, for ten months before the restoration, whereas Cetshwayo was forbidden to establish any "military kraal or military system."

It is not disputed that Zibebu had also command of firearms and ammunition, and his men knew how to use them, while this advantage was not permitted to Cetshwayo.

But, worst of all (and this fact also is notorious), these two
chiefs were egged on and assisted by white freebooters, who, although only a handful of men, could not fail, with the help of arms of precision and horses, to render the result of the contest—in other words, the victory of their patrons—a foregone conclusion.

There remains the further fact, which Sir H. Bulwer's own emissary, Mr. H. Shepstone, acknowledges, that Zibebu's new boundaries were drawn so as to include

"not only the land occupied by him and his own people, but a large tract of land occupied by other headmen and their people, who were never subject to Zibebu, and who were required, unless they would submit to be ruled by him, to leave the country occupied by them, and which belonged to their forefathers before them."

These people were among Cetshwayo's most ardent supporters.

Sir H. Bulwer has yet to explain, moreover, how it was that, while he adopted readily any suggestion that Cetshwayo was disposed to disregard the conditions of his restoration, Zibebu was left free to act as he pleased, and was not even declared to need the restraint of a British Resident.

The following is from the pen of one who was well behind the scenes among English politicians, and never failed to express himself in studiously moderate language. The words were addressed to a correspondent in Natal:

"There is . . . a strong feeling here about Sir H. Bulwer's re-settlement of Zululand. The Liberal party is filled with dismay at the weakness of the Government in yielding to the influence of a man who was known to be hostile to their policy. What Sir Henry Bulwer fails to understand is that, while there are a hundred questions connected with South Africa which the British public are content to leave to men like him who belong to the official class, this is a subject with regard to which the nation has developed something
like a conscience. When Parliament and the country made up their minds to restore Cetshwayo, they intended the restitution to be complete, and had not the faintest idea that Sir H. Bulwer—a man whose official career is marked with the strangest inconsistencies—would be allowed to enact a new partition of Zululand. It now remains to be seen whether public opinion or official narrowness and conceit is destined to win the day.”

The following letters relate to the way in which the “restoration” was really carried out.

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

“BISHOPSTOWE, January 9, 1883.

“We trust that the king has passed Durban in the Britain, and will reach Port Durnford this evening and land to-morrow (the white day of the new moon, whereas this is the black day). But, strange to say, though different telegrams have reported that he left Oude Molen last Thursday, January 4, and was to sail that afternoon, we have not yet heard that he has actually embarked and left Capetown, or rather, we suppose, Simon’s Bay... It is also rumoured (Mercury) that the civil and military heads of the expedition are at variance, and that a telegram from England will be needed to settle the point in dispute. However, the reports of John Dunn from Zululand state that Sir T. Shepstone himself with about 100 of the troops (450 altogether) have actually gone to Port Durnford, which they would not have done, we think, were his arrival not imminent, as the neighbourhood is said to be unhealthy for troops. We shall soon hear, I suppose, whether Sir H. Bulwer’s and Lord Kimberley’s attempt to confiscate the whole of Zululand south of the Umhlatuzi (more than a third of Zululand, and the best part of it now that the disputed territory has been given up to the Boers) will really be carried out—in which case, look out for future troubles.”

In a letter of January 14, 1883, the Bishop speaks of the
"mystery of iniquity" which is being wrought out in Zululand, and subsequently says:

"I now shall discharge my duty to Cetshwayo by forwarding a statement which he has desired me to send to his friends in England, that they may all know the way in which he has been treated by the authorities out here, and more especially the fact that he has been made, under pressure and menace of perpetual exile, to sign away the land of his people without their consent, which he had no right to do. No doubt he agreed when in England, that room should be found in Zululand for any Zulus that might wish to be separated from his rule. But who, and how many are they? As far as we know, no thorough inquiry has been made on this point. . . . But it is now proposed to bring under English rule at least one-third of Zululand, . . . with the express object of providing an outlet for the (assumed) superabundance of our native population." 1

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

"January 21, 1883.

"You will see how well Dr. Seaton comes out in the reports he has made to the Mercantile Advertiser of Durban (and the London Standard). He began evidently with some prejudice against the king; . . . but he seems to have been quite overcome by the actual facts, when he had personal knowledge of Cetshwayo and of the character of his reception by the Zulus, in spite of the measures taken to prevent any warm demonstration by the Zulus on his landing."

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"Bishoftowe, January 21, 1883.

. . . "On February 7 there is to be a grand demonstration at Durban on the occasion of laying the foundation stone of a new Town Hall . . . it is plain to us that it is meant to

1 The recent Report of the "Natal Native Commission," speaks very doubtfully, the Bishop adds, as to this supposed superabundance of the Natal native population.
be a political demonstration in support of Sir H. Bulwer . . . on which, however, Mr. Escambe's presence will be a damper. I shall certainly not be asked to attend; and if I were I should be obliged to decline, as I shall then be in my seventieth year, and feel myself too old for public dinners, speeches, &c. . . . .

"I have heard from a military source that part of a regiment is to be kept permanently, or at all events for a considerable time, in Zululand. It cannot be wanted for the protection of the king, and can only be meant to support the annexation. And I need hardly say that any attempt to use force to coerce the Zulus in the annexed districts either to move over the border to Cetshwayo's territory—i.e. lowlanders to go and live in the Highlands, forsaking their own pasture lands which they have occupied for generations—or to pay taxes to the British Government, will be attended by disastrous consequences.

"January 22.

"Since writing the above, Notshuke, Langalibalele's son, . . . has come to say that he was called into town by Mr. Gallwey, who told him that he had seen his father at the Cape, and he was very well, 'and had he heard the rumours about his coming back? Well he was coming back—not immediately, but say after five months.' This shows what Sir H. Bulwer is doing—delaying the poor fellow's return as long as possible—of course, with reference to his own Zulu policy, when there is not the least reason in point of fact why he should not be brought back at once.

"I think with you that it is of the utmost importance that Cetshwayo should have always a respectable trustworthy white man at his side to conduct his correspondence with the Resident and Natal Government in writing, so that there may be no chance in future of his communications being misrepresented as they have been in the past. But on no account should a missionary be employed. I do not know one of them that could be trusted for such a duty. Mr. Grant would be willing to go, and would answer the purpose very well; but I fear that he would need, having
a very large family, too large an income from the king, at all events, in his present circumstances. But I shall not lose sight of the matter, and when the king next sends a messenger to me, I shall strongly advise him on the point."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, January 22, 1883.

... "It is very important to notice the difference between the conditions to which Cetshwayo assented in England ... and those which have been enforced upon him at Capetown, the result evidently of Sir H. Bulwer's cogitations. . . .

"I may as well jot down the answers . . . which may be made to any one who may express surprise at the Zulus not having flocked in much greater numbers to welcome their king . . . .

"(1) The time of Cetshwayo's landing (January 10) was kept a close secret from the Zulus and from the white people also . . . to the very last.

"(2) They could not go to Port Durnford in such a state of uncertainty, where they might have had to wait days, or even weeks, without food.

"(3) They have been so often disappointed as to the time of his return that they began totally to disbelieve it.

"(4) Even we ourselves could not feel sure of it, knowing the temper of Sir H. Bulwer, and we thought it quite possible that he would contrive some pretext for putting off some months longer.

"(5) Those who did come to Port Durnford to meet the king were ordered off by the authorities, and, of course, advised others not to go.

"(6) Mr. J. Shepstone was employed in Zululand a month before Cetshwayo landed, and as he rode about with J. Dunn and slept at his house, there can be little doubt that he was during that interval busying himself in preparing the people not to go to meet the king on landing.

"(7) The people were afraid of the soldiers, who were not sent in such force merely as an escort."
TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, February 5, 1883.

. . . "No one here expects that peace can be maintained long under the absurd 'Settlement' that has been made by Sir H. Bulwer.

"I hope that you will see the report of the Cape Native Commission. It contains an examination of Cetshwayo, whose replies are admirable and give (even to us) new and most interesting information.

"Hlubi, I believe, would at once submit to Cetshwayo if our Government advised him to do so, and I shall not be surprised if Zibebe, left to himself (i.e. not prompted by J. Dunn, &c.), does the same. If not, war, I fear, is inevitable at no distant date."

TO COLONEL EDWARD DURNFORD.

"BISHOPSTOWE, February 11, 1883.

"I have read through with the greatest interest and with complete satisfaction your memoir of your brother, which must, I think, produce a profound impression in England, and especially on the minds of all honourable military men."

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, February 19, 1883.

"I shall send by this mail forty copies of one, or perhaps two, sheets of printed matter, viz. the story of the Zulu messengers (who went back to-day), annotated chiefly with extracts from the reports of Dr. Seaton and Carter. The latter's . . . report would be of no importance, now that we have Dr. Seaton's, were it not that the editor of the Mercury will no doubt have sent it on—perhaps somewhat polished and retrenched—to the London Times. I hope, therefore, that these sheets may enable you to understand the character of the man, and, if necessary, to correct, from Dr. Seaton's reports, any falsehoods which may be likely to take effect in England. Mr. Carter asserts in one leader, after his
return from Zululand, that Dr. Seaton is a 'personal friend of Bishop Colenso,' in order, of course, to disparage, if possible, Seaton's whole report as influenced by me. I have contradicted this statement, . . . the fact being that I know nothing whatever of Dr. Seaton, and have no recollection of having ever spoken to him or seen him in my life; though it is just possible that I may have met him some years ago at luncheon at a friend's house. I have also contradicted Carter's statement, as reporter and editor, that I have had a white 'emissary' present in Zululand on this occasion, and also Natal natives, 'known emissaries from Bishopstowe.'

"I inclose an important note, as I dare say that Mr. J. Robinson will try to make capital in England of the lying statement that Cetshwayo had ordered Mfanawendhlela's crops to be destroyed. We hear nothing of what Mr. J. Shepstone is doing in Zululand; but I have little doubt that he has been riding about in the 'Reserve' trying to persuade men to come away from Cetshwayo under English rule, so as at least to find some excuse for Sir H. Bulwer's action in the number of isiqele, as the Zulus call men who withdraw from a person or party or cause to which they had been formerly attached."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, February 27, 1883.

'I have to take a wedding in ten minutes, so must be brief and hurried. But I wished to add a few additional facts which I heard last night from ---. (I give his name as my authority; but of course you will not publish it.)

'(1) M. Oftebro (Carter's interpreter) is a most bitter adversary of Cetshwayo, and lost no opportunity of pointing out to Carter anything that could tell against the king.

'(2) Carter's account may be regarded as Osborn's, who coached him throughout, and is utterly opposed to Cetshwayo's restoration.

1 One of Sir G. Wolseley's chiefs. The Bishop's conjecture was justified by the telegrams that followed in the London papers.
"(3) Zibebu was sent for by his 'whiteman' in the hope of getting up a row.

"(4) When Seaton's statement appeared, that 'from the Special Commissioner downwards every attempt was made to minimize the signs of welcome for Cetshwayo,' Sir H. Bulwer desired William Shepstone to go to the editor of the Advertiser and ask if he meant to include Sir T. Shepstone. . . . The editor next day said to the special correspondent, 'I inserted a leader in praise of Sir T. Shepstone to smooth matters down.'

"(5) Carter represents the feeling of the heads of the expedition."

**TO THE SAME.**

*BISHOPSTOWE, March 6, 1883.*

"I have little doubt that the setting up Zibebu is Sir H. Bulwer's own doing, whereas the 'Reserve' affair will be found to be carrying out Sir T. Shepstone's idea. That telegram is a mass of falsehoods, all drawn, however, from Carter's reports. It was really almost providential that, besides Mullins, Dr. Seaton went up for the Standard."

**TO THE SAME.**

*BISHOPSTOWE, March 11, 1883.*

... "I hope that you will have noticed that whereas Cetshwayo (1) has to pay £800 a-year for a 'British Resident' to be a constant check upon him, (2) is not to allow any trader in his country, unless approved by the Resident, who will probably be instructed not to approve of a friendly trader such as Mr. John Mullins, (3) may not ally himself with Swazis, Boers, &c., without leave from the Resident (i.e. Sir H. Bulwer), his former subject Zibebu, a 'common man,' as the Zulus call him, is left perfectly free of any check by the Resident on his proceedings, in respect of traders, or other matters, and at the meeting for the Restoration was accompanied by a troop of forty or fifty mounted men, so that the Editor of the Times of Natal says that Zibebu is an independent king, and Cetshwayo only a chief, in accordance, VOL. II. R R"
I suspect, with the intention of Sir H. Bulwer. The whole arrangements in respect of this settlement are perfectly monstrous—hideously unjust, and utterly false to the promises made by Mr. Osborn last September. . . .

"I have strongly advised Cetshwayo to secure the services (if only for a few months) at the present crisis of a trustworthy Englishman to act as his secretary in official communications and correspondence with his friends in Natal or elsewhere. . . . I think it to be of the utmost consequence that the king should have such a secretary at his right hand just now.

"The practice of postponing month after month the trial of prisoners committed for trial before the Supreme Court (of Natal) ought, as it seems to me, to be brought to the notice of Lord Derby."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, April 15, 1883.

"When notices of the present disturbances appear in the London Times from its Durban Correspondent (the editor of the Natal Mercury), they will be charged, I have little doubt, upon the king, as they are at this moment in the Mercury and Times, without a particle of proof. It is impossible, of course, to contradict their furious accusations until we get authentic information of what really has taken place. As I have said on former occasions, it is easy to snatch a temporary triumph by reporting hastily an erroneous or false statement from some anonymous and ill-informed correspondent; but it takes time and patience to ascertain the truth and demolish the falsehood.

"At the present moment, however, there is no evidence whatever to show that Cetshwayo has had anything to do with these disturbances. They seem to be merely the natural outcome of that most unwise portion of Sir H. Bulwer’s settlement, by which he not only set up Zibebu as an independent king without even a Resident to watch or guide his doings, to be a constant source of irritation to the northern Zulus (as appears from their speeches at the
restoration), but actually extended his former territory to include the warlike tribe of Masipula (Mpande's Chief Counsellor, and then, till his death in 1873, Cetshwayo's), and a large portion of Mnyamana's people, who all now find themselves put most unexpectedly under the rule of Zibebu, which they detest, being ardent supporters of the king."

As the Bishop had anticipated, the London Times received from Durban a telegram of some length, stating that the "king's regiments" had attacked Zibebu, but that he had defeated them,

"pursuing them to the border of his district, beyond which, in pursuance of his engagements to the Government, he would not go."

This message, like many others from the same source, was a plausible one, and was designed to support the official theory, according to which Zibebu was loyal and

1 See p. 450.

Masipula's tribe was put under Zibebu for the first time by Sir H. Bulwer's settlement, and the Sutu whom Zibebu had turned out of his district the previous year, and who had taken refuge and planted their crops among Masipula's people, thus found themselves brought back again under Zibebu's rule. The following confirmation (already given in part) of the Bishop's views seems wholly conclusive, coming as it does from the pen of one who was certainly no friend to the Zulu king. Mr. Henriquez Shepstone was sent by Sir H. Bulwer into Zululand at the beginning of May 1883, and wrote in one of his reports:—"I am not aware of the conditions under which the Reserve for Zibebu was made; but it strikes me that very little consideration could have been paid to the way in which the country was occupied in laying off the boundaries, as, from what I can learn, the country laid off for Zibebu includes not only the land occupied by him and his own people, but a large tract of land occupied by other headmen and their people who were never subject to Zibebu, and who are now required, unless they will submit to be ruled by him, to leave the country occupied by them, and which belonged to their forefathers before them." As to Mr. Osborn's responsibility for the adjustment of Zibebu's boundaries, see Ruin of Zululand, vol. ii. p. 382.

2 See note, p. 580.
"amenable," throughout, while Cetshwayo was a rascal. The Bishop received at this time, from the lips of messengers whom Cetshwayo sent to him, a detailed report of the fighting, and this a colonial newspaper published. Its appearance was the signal for a column of coarse abuse, directed against both the Bishop and the king, from the pen of Mr. Carter, the editor of the *Times of Natal*, and the Bishop met the attack as follows:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Natal Witness*.

"SIR,

"The *Times of Natal*, in its leader of to-day, with reference to Cetshwayo's account of the recent fighting in Zululand, published in yesterday's *Witness*, says that it has 'the best authority for announcing that it is a deliberate concoction of untruths from beginning to end.'

"On some important points, however, the king's statement has been confirmed beforehand by reports already made by correspondents of the *Times of Natal* and *Natal Mercury*. Thus the *Times* Correspondent, writing on April 9, says that the disturbance was begun by Zibebu, who 'had cut down all Ndabuko's crops and driven the people away out of his territory,' and 'afterwards, as far as I can hear, attacked and killed a lot of Mnyamana's people.' So the *Mercury's* Correspondent, on March 17, states that 'it was rumoured that Hamu and Zibebu were going to unite to attack the king.' And the *Times* Correspondent, on March 27, says: 'The people wait anxiously to hear what Mr. J. Shepstone will have to say to the proposed offensive and defensive alliance with Zibebu and Hamu, for this matter has also been referred to him'; the reply to which proposal is not given.

"Further, the two reports of the recent proceedings which appeared last Saturday—one in the *Times* and the other in the *Mercury*—are evidently from the same writer, who

1 Writing from Zululand itself.
identifies himself with Hamu by saying, 'We shall take care to locate them . . . so amongst our people,' and speaking of 'our impi.' And these letters teem with evidence that Zibebu has been 'in conjunction with Hamu attacking Cetshwayo in his own country;' which the Mercury doubts, since such an act 'would prejudice him seriously in the eyes of the Imperial Government;' while the Times says: 'We believe that Zibebu will commit no such suicidal act as that of making an aggressive movement against Cetshwayo.'

"The Times' Correspondent, April 9, states that Mr. J. Shepstone had replied to an application from Hlubi about making an alliance with Zibebu, that 'he was not at liberty to form an engagement to fight outside his own district.' And it must be presumed that Mr. Shepstone, in like manner, instructed Zibebu not to form an alliance with the king's rebellious subject Hamu, and on no account to attack Cetshwayo, or invade his territory. Instead of this, we find that Zibebu did ally himself with Hamu; that, immediately after the return of his brother Fada and Hamu's messengers from Mr. Shepstone, Zibebu attacked Cetshwayo by cutting down his brother's crops within his (the king's) territory; that on the day of the fight Zibebu's brother went (with young Mr. Eckersley) to Hamu, and stirred him to action, whose impis, either separately or united with Zibebu's, have ravaged the king's land nearly up to the Inhlazatshe [a mountain]. Such proceedings must have been in direct defiance of such orders, as above, of the High Commissioner, presumably delivered by Mr. Shepstone, and would show that Zibebu was an utterly unfit person to have been set up as an independent chief on the king's borders. In fact, his conduct could only be excused if he had received no such orders, but, on the contrary, had received authority from Mr. Shepstone for what he has done."

The following is extracted from a letter written to the Bishop by William Ngidi ("the intelligent Zulu"):
"I hear many bad reports from Zululand. It is said that there has been terrible fighting there. But what is true is that Cetshwayo has nothing to do with the impi. . . . There is much about which I could write to you, but I omit it because it does not run on all fours. But of this be sure, that the source and spring of all this that you hear of, and of all this which is being done, is that which I have mentioned; you will not find any other whatever. That kind of action is what we call 'knocking people's heads together.' He is knocking their heads together, setting them across with each other that they may dislike one another, and then he may enter in among them and make an end of them. . . . I quite hope that now you know that the Zulus are set at loggerheads by the cunning of white men, who want to eat up their land. My heart is very full of grief, I cannot find words to express it, for this splendid old Zulu people."

It would be impossible for any to say that the conduct of the English Government towards the Zulu chief at this time was straightforward and ingenuous. It had not been so before the days of Isandhlwana and Ulundi; and it is not easy to see that there had been any real improvement since that terrible time. The so-called restoration of Cetshwayo had been made the excuse for a series of intrigues, evasions, tricks, and downright wrongs, inflicted in a way which could not fail to irritate most sorely a high-spirited and imperfectly educated race. It was practically impossible to see what good ends the English rulers could hope to gain with their tortuous policy; and the only man whose counsels, if followed, would have avoided or averted all the disasters of the recent years was charged with attempting to set up a quasi-authoritative power in opposition to the Government, and with doing his best to hinder the public good. On the other hand, if Cetshwayo could not have access to this one man, he was cut off from all hope; and
there seemed to be little doubt that there was a set scheme for depriving him of such access. The messengers who arrived on April 7 had been three weeks on the road; and these men confirmed the fact that an armed watch was kept along the Umhlatuzi river to stop any passing to or from the king without permission from the Resident. It could not therefore be said either that Cetshwayo was a free man, or that our relations with him were those of peace. Meanwhile it was said that the reserved portion of the land was intended largely for Natal natives, some of whom had come in as refugees in Mpande's time.

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, April 24, 1883.

"Of course, this would be very good if the Reserve was scantily populated. But the contrary is the case, as Cetshwayo says 'there are more real Zulus living along the borders of John Dunn's country than are living elsewhere in Zululand. That is the best piece of the country. The original Zulus live along here.' Accordingly we find a number of powerful chiefs in this district expressing the warmest attachment to the king. Is the attempt to be made to crowd a number of Natal natives among these old inhabitants? And will they not inevitably quarrel with the new comers, and fight for their rich pasture and mealie grounds until subjected by some dragooning process and compelled to pay taxes to the British Government, . . . or else, by the same process, driven across the Umhlatuzi to fill to repletion Cetshwayo's diminished territory—just one-half of the territories held by him before the war, instead of the greater part of them, as the Queen's speech states . . . or else find refuge in his 'uninhabited' and uninhabitable swamps, twenty miles long by ten miles broad?"

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, April 28, 1883.

"At last we are enabled to send important information as to the state of things in Zululand, furnished by the king himself
through a messenger who managed to come down by a different route from that usually taken by messengers sent to Bishopstowe, and thus escaped Mr. John Shepstone's policemen . . . [The message thus brought] is a very satisfactory statement, which enables us to roll back the mass of lying abuse which during the last three weeks has been poured upon the head of the poor king by the Government organs incessantly, . . . and so violently that it is clearly the policy of the Government to let Cetshwayo's name be blackened as much as possible as the breaker of promises, the 'raiser of dust,' &c., before any correction can arrive from his friends, who must spend time and labour in demolishing falsehoods which can be propagated by his foes without check from a sensitive conscience, and based upon the first scrap of rumour sent to them by worthless white men, perhaps interested, and certainly hostile to the king. . . . This evening another letter has reached me from Cetshwayo—a very pitiful one, as you will see . . . It is clear that Zibebo's and Hamu's impis have gone ravaging into the very midst of his territory, while he, poor fellow, considers himself bound by his promises to keep himself quiet and not to send an impi against them. . . As you see, the king says, 'Give me back the land to the south of the Umhlutuzi, and all will come right.' It is there, in fact, that a great part of his strength lies, with which he must support his position.

"Sir T. Shepstone is evidently sent to England by Sir H. Bulwer to urge the annexation of all Zululand, in which I should think he will utterly fail with the present or any other Government. But you remember that he had the ear of Lord Carnarvon when I was in England about Langalibalele, who remains, of course, a prisoner still, in spite of all the hopes held out to him. But if the country is not annexed, the only remedy is to put the Reserve back under Cetshwayo, when he will be strong enough to keep his own; and though I am confident that he will have no wish to retaliate, the present actions of Zibebo and Hamu must leave them, I should say, out of consideration in this respect."

1 See p. 610.
The following extracts are taken from a letter addressed by Cetshwayo to the Bishop, February 26, 1883:—

"I am writing to you to tell you of my kingdom and how it is ruined. I do not see that I am set free unto this day. For my people lament greatly. They say that those across the Umhlatuzi are being persecuted on account of their having come to me.

"Another thing which is a great trouble to me is that I see nothing of my cattle, which are in the hands of those who took them. I am destitute. We are eating nothing, and my only hope is in you, that you will make an effort for me, that I may recover my cattle. You alone are my father in whom I trust to help me. You see all this which I am saying to you; I say it to you privately (in a whisper only), that you may be able to help me, speaking for me to the authorities concerning my cattle and the country. For all the people wish for me; but I have no space in which to put them.

"Again, when Sir Th. Shepstone laid down the laws he told the Zulus to set up for me temporary huts. But Mr. John Shepstone is fining them for this, saying where they have been delaying, and that they defy him. . . . The thing that I have to tell you particularly is this, that certain of my people living on the south side of the Umhlatuze have been hurt (bodily) by Mr. J. Shepstone's policemen . . . There is no happiness for me in this state of things, none whatever; . . . even at night I get no sleep for it. . . . I do not believe that any native has been harassed as I am. . . .

"I shall rejoice greatly if you can help me in this matter. This letter which I write to you, let it be for your knowledge and for mine only. And now I greet you much and your family.

"A Postscript.—My father, here is another affair. The people are stabbing one another with assegais again as they did before. Hamu sent out his impi; it killed among the AbaQulusi. There died the induna Nozitshada, and
three lads, together with two women. There are also two wounded. Their huts also were burnt. I do not know how many have been burnt in their huts. I tell you of this at once, because I know that it will be said presently that this is my doing, whereas I have nothing to do with the ruin of the country."

The following letter shows still more vividly the state of dire perplexity to which, in spite of agreements solemnly made in London, the Zulu king was reduced:—

FROM CETSHWAYO TO THE BISHOP OF NATAL.

"March 16, 1883.

"I am at a loss to know where to put the Zulu people, and I am at my wits' end. My trouble is greater than that which I felt when imprisoned. I might say that I was better off when I was in bondage than now. And I complain greatly of Mr. John Shepstone. All this trouble is brought about by him. But I ask now, such a law as this, is it an English law? Did it come from over the sea? Has ever a thing been done among yourselves such as this which is done to me? To me it seems as if I were out on the hillside. It is as it was before; for then he would not agree that I should be brought back, and now he is eating me up in the dark by stealth. . . . Ask for me, I pray, the country in which I am to live—where is it? For my people are wandering about (homeless) with me. They are homeless, and why? Because, whereas it was said that they do not wish for me, they are now without a place to live in through wishing for me. What now is the meaning of this? Speak for me according as you see it, and inform those who are with you over the sea that I am digging up roots by the river,¹ while my cattle are with John Dunn. I am not asking for those which were taken in the war time. No! I mean those taken afterwards from the people in Zululand. And I say that I cannot be at all satisfied, and the Zulu people too cannot be satisfied with this law which has been made by Mr. John Shepstone."

¹ Meaning that they have no food.
FROM CETSHWAYO TO THE BISHOP OF NATAL.

"April 6, 1883.

... "I should say, to begin with, that Fada (Zibebeu's brother) went to Mr. J. Shepstone to ask to be allowed to make an attack upon me (i.e. on my people), and verily he gave them leave. And on Fada's return to Zibebeu they set out and attacked my people. A messenger came to tell them, while these were here with me, that Zibebeu's impi was at their homes and cutting down their crops. I told them that they should let things be, to make it plain that it is Zibebeu who is the raiser of dust. They refused, saying that they were going to see for themselves after their crops. I forbade it, and afterwards I sent to Mr. Fynn to report to him that the people were going; and he made no reply to me, till the people went off at night without my knowledge. Next morning I sent again to tell him 'the people are gone: let us send people after them, some of his and some of mine.' He refused, saying that he had no one to send. So then I sent my own messengers to call them back from fighting. When they arrived, they found the fight going on, and Zibebeu slaughtering them.

Now I say that all this destruction of the country is the work of Mr. John Shepstone, the result of Fada's going to him. Also Hamu has been at it again, and has killed three people. This, too, I reported to Mr. Fynn, who sent his own man, Gabajana, to Hamu to stop him. Gabajana says that he found there with Hamu Fada, Zibebeu's brother, and Zibebeu's whiteman, who had also taken part in the fight on Zibebeu's side. I see, therefore, that Hamu is in alliance with Zibebeu. But, nevertheless, I keep quiet. Yet I know that presently it will be said to be my doing, whereas they are set on to fight by Mr. John Shepstone, both Hamu and Zibebeu. ... It is he who gives them authority to fight with me; it is he who arms them with boldness to attack me. I pray you by all your help to me hitherto and by the kindness of your heart towards me, that you would help me now and send all these words of mine
across the sea to Mr. Gladstone and to Lord Kimberley, and to him who has entered on Lord Kimberley's office. And let the Parliament\(^1\) know, and let the Queen herself be told that she may interfere to protect me in this misery in which I am."

\(^1\) There were some members of that Parliament who, if we are to credit the following report, which appeared in the *Times* of April 25, 1883, derived a good deal of amusement from the account given by the Colonial Office of Cetshwayo's troubles:

"Mr. Algernon Egerton asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government had received any confirmation of the report that there had recently been severe fighting between the troops (!) of Cetshwayo and those of some of the chiefs in the reserved territories.

"Mr. Ashley.—The news we have received is to the effect that the Usutu party—that is to say, the young and violent section of Cetshwayo's followers—made an attack upon Zibebe on his own territory, in the north-eastern corner of Zululand. Cetshwayo professes that it was done without his knowledge, but I doubt very much whether this is the truth. (Laughter.) The House may remember that when this chief, Zibebe, was for various cogent reasons left in possession of the territory over which he had been the appointed chief, it was understood that he was both able and willing to hold his own; and this turns out to be the case, because this attack of the Usutus has been most successfully repelled, and I hope that their defeat may be a lesson to them. ('Hear, hear,' and laughter.)

"Lord R. Churchill asked if the attention of the Under-Secretary had been drawn to a telegram from a correspondent of the *Daily News*, who was usually well informed, to the effect that Zibebe had attacked Cetshwayo.

"Mr. Ashley.—I am glad that the noble lord has given me the opportunity of saying that the correspondent in question is never well informed. (Laughter.) He acts as special correspondent to the *Daily News*... and it has been his practice for a long time to telegraph false news. (Laughter.)" [The Bishop characterised this statement as "monstrous."]

The news of Cetshwayo's escape a few months later seems to have been received in the same spirit:

"Mr. R. Yorke.—Can the Under-Secretary for the Colonies say whether Cetshwayo is dead or alive?

"Mr. Ashley.—Yes, sir; we have received a telegram this afternoon from Sir H. Bulwer. He says:—'Osborn has received information that Cetshwayo is now in the Reserve. (Loud laughter.) A reliable witness says he has seen him alive.' I think we may argue from that that Cetshwayo is still with us. (Laughter.)"—*Daily News*, August 10, 1883.
On April 16 and again on April 27 and on other days, Cetshwayo wrote in the same strain. The letters may be monotonous; but they exhibit a state of anarchy over which the Zulu king was allowed no control. It had been brought about, and it was beyond all doubt deliberately maintained, by Englishmen who were pledged by the word of their Sovereign to protect and strengthen him. It was manifest in fact to the Bishop, and to many others on the spot, even to Cetshwayo's foes, that the smallest show of moral support on the part of the officials by whom he was surrounded would have rendered the king's restoration an unmistakeable success. It was made equally clear to all, including the several parties in Zululand, that the destinies of the king, his family, and adherents, were in the hands of officials, who, in furtherance of their special policy, were bent upon his discomfiture and upon the triumph of those opposed to him. To Cetshwayo's letters the Bishop sent the following reply:—

TO THE ZULU KING.

"EKUKANYENI, April 29, 1883.

"We have received all your letters and messages, and have sent them all on to England as you have asked us to do.

"You may rest sure that we shall always report at once all that we can hear of truth, both about you and about Hamu and Zibebu, if the latter is still alive.

"You do right to tell Mr. Fynn all this matter, and to listen to his words. We still think that he is true, and that he is your friend, and doing what he can to help you.

"There is nothing wrong in your calling the people in your own territory to protect you. Speak to Mr. Fynn about this also.

"Somtseu said that all who wished to be under you are permitted to come over from the Reserve to live in your land, and bring their property with them.

"Please to remember us kindly to Ndabuko and to Mnyamana"
and to Shingana and our other friends. We, too, like you, are at our wits' end on account of this trouble of yours and of the Zulu people.

"Sobantu."

Once again Cetshwayo was powerful for mischief, had he chosen to use his strength. Zibebe was not, as it was supposed, dead. But in spite of border police, police-guards, beatings and confiscations, the fighting men from the Reserve came to protect the Zulu king from a mixed attack by Hamu's and Zibebe's men led by white freebooters. But of Hamu's force one half deserted to Cetshwayo, and Hamu himself was compelled to seek shelter or a hiding-place in the bush, as his own men had blocked his escape to his caves. The whole of Zululand was in Cetshwayo's power. But even now he stood firmly to his promises in a manner which would have been admirable in the most civilised and Christian ruler.

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

"BISHOPSTOWE, April 24, 1883."

"Do not believe any Mercury telegrams in the English Times about the fighting with Zibebe. We know nothing for certain up to this moment. But we believe that Cetshwayo has not been concerned in the matter—that Zibebe has been the aggressor—and that Zibebe has been killed. Of course, the Government knows all about it; but they keep the affair to themselves. Still their very secrecy implies that they have had news. I believe that Sir H. Bulwer has prevented any information reaching me for the last three weeks. But I may be mistaken: we shall know this certainly in a day or two."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, May 6, 1883."

... "The best thing of all is that the king is adhering nobly to his promises, in spite of the persistent lying of the
Government organs. Zibebu began the recent disturbance, and as you will see by the sheets the king did his best to stop it; but Ndabuko, &c., when they saw their crops cut down by Zibebu, would no longer be held in.”

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, May 7, 1883.

“Last Thursday, at only two hours’ notice, Henriquez Shepstone was sent off to Zululand. . . . That he went on no friendly mission to the king may be gathered from the fact that before he left Maritzburg he told Statham that Cetshwayo’s account of recent proceedings, as published in the Witness, was a ‘lot of —— lies,’ and said that ‘if Cetshwayo does not mind what he is about, he’ll get an assegai into him one of these days.’ . . . I am in my own mind convinced that John Shepstone has been at the bottom of all the late disturbances. . . . I believe that Cetshwayo is in no danger now from an open attack, since a great number of men have gone up from the Reserve to protect him; but they must be on the watch, or he may still be assassinated. . . . Hamu is a fugitive, . . . and will probably be killed before long. I have no doubt that Cetshwayo would wish his life to be spared. But how can he possibly, at such a time as this, hold in his people, furious at the wrongs just received at Hamu’s hands? If this is true about Hamu and Zibebu, there will be an end, I trust, of fighting on this north-east portion of Zululand, provided no attempt is made by Sir H. Bulwer to set up in Zibebu’s place one of his brothers hostile to Cetshwayo . . .

“Mr. Grant writes that he hopes to start (with two European companions) some day this week for Zululand. I wish that he had gone two months ago.

1 Although the tidings of Zibebu’s death, reported in the first instance by the Natal papers, and not by the Bishop, turned out to be mistaken, he disappeared for some time from the scene; some of his wives actually returning to their fathers’ homes as widows, under the assurance that he had been killed.
“I cannot say that I have more confidence than yourself in Mr. Escombe’s scheme of members of the Legislative Council being nominated by the Government to protect the natives. . . . I have had to advance Mr. Grant £50 for his expenses, which perhaps the king may be able some day to repay.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, May 14, 1883.

. . . “We hear that Mr. Osborn himself complains that Mr. John [Shepstone] has . . . [represented] the feeling of most of the Reserve people as hostile to Cetshwayo, whereas he found it strongly—indeed, almost unanimously—with him. In short, Sir H. Bulwer has made . . . a complete mess of the whole affair, Cetshwayo’s friends being overwhelmingly strong in that very district (the Reserve) in which he would insist on looking at him through a pair of green spectacles, and pronouncing their protestations of attachment to the king to be merely ebullitions of temporary feeling called out by intrigues fostered from Bishopstowe. . . . I leave you to imagine what will take place next month (June) when taxes (14s. a hut) are to be collected from these people.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, May 28, 1883.

“Please notice what is said on p. 560, and also in the printed matter sent by this mail, about the supplies of ammunition which Zibebu has received—J. Colenbrander (Statham tells me) had received 1,000 rounds before further supply to him was stopped;—about white men joining Zibebu, as two of Zibebu’s white men and seven of John Dunn’s fought in the first great fight of March 30; of Zibebu ‘mounting and arming’ his men, while the poor king is bound hand and foot by his promises, and Mr. H. Shepstone tells him, in effect, to sit still and be stabbed! which would be very convenient, no doubt, for Sir H. Bulwer and Mr. John [Shepstone].”
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TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, May —, 1883.

"I have heard something within the last day or two . . . which makes me suspect that in the next Blue-book Sir H. Bulwer will be found to have stated, in order to disparage my evidence on Zulu matters, that Mr. J. Mullins is my constant correspondent, and that from him I derived my first information about Mr. J. Shepstone and his men beating the Zulus.

"I wish you to be in the position, if anything of this kind is said, to be able to give it a flat contradiction. I have had no communication whatever with Mr. Mullins—though of course I should have been glad to receive any from one so well acquainted with Zulu affairs—since he came down after the Restoration, when I met him accidentally in town on February 1. If Mr. Vijn ['Cetshwayo's Dutchman'] should be named as another of my 'emissaries,' I have had no communication with him since he wrote to me, before the king's return, to ask if I would say a good word for him to Cetshwayo, to favour him as a trader, as he feared that his prospects may have been injured by the part he took in the king's capture—which I positively refused to do."

TO HIS SON FRANCIS.

"BISHOPSTOWE, May 29, 1883.

"To-day we received S——'s note, with a copy of your letter to Lord Derby, which I thoroughly approve except the praises of myself and my doings. As it is possible that Lord Derby, finding no record of the matter in the Colonial Office, may ask for your authority as to the Queen having 'thanked' me with reference to my action in the affairs of Langalibalele,¹ I may as well tell you what really happened (as I have no doubt told you at the time) in London.

"Dean Stanley informed me one day—I think in December 1874, when I took leave of him and Lady Augusta—tha

¹ See p. 393.
'Her Majesty had desired him to express her approval of my action in the matter of Langalibalele.' This was, of course, after the Secretary of State, Lord Carnarvon, had communicated to me, on December 2, the decision of the Government."

"I ought at this very moment to be on my legs returning thanks for 'The Clergy of all Denominations' at the Mayor's dinner, upon the re-opening of the Town Council Chamber, which has been enlarged, &c. But I declined the invitation, partly because my 'legs' are not as strong nor my voice as clear, as in the days gone by; but also because I was afraid that there might be some disturbance made in the presence of the Governor, which would not have been desirable.

'As to Sir H. Bulwer and Mr. John Shepstone, the Times of May 1, which Mr. Chesson has sent to me with Mr. Ashley's reply quoting Sir H. Bulwer's denial of the 'beating,' shows that they have delivered themselves into our hands. You will see by the printed sheets we have sent that the evidence against them is overwhelming. The idea of Mr. J. Shepstone's 'interposing to stop a fight between two factions,' when the only parties concerned were, on one side, himself and his police, and, on the other, the Zulus, who were all of one mind!"

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, June 11, 1883.

"I had not the least idea of Mr. C——'s feelings as regards either myself or the natives. If he saw my six printing boys at work he might modify his views a little as to the laziness of our natives. And among the white people he would find, on closer acquaintance, a good number who are not "scoundrels," and do not regard the natives as mere animals.

"Sir H. Bulwer has got himself into such a predicament by denying utterly the truth of Statham's statements that an independent inquiry must, I think, be ordered into the state of things in Zululand. . . . I met yesterday, in town, Mr.
Dakker, who lives, I think, in the disputed territory, who told Mr. Egner in Dutch (which Mr. Egner interpreted to me) that he left his home on May 28, bringing therefore the latest intelligence from those parts—that the Zulus (all except Hamu's people) say that Zibebu is dead—that all his native tenants, and almost all those of his neighbours, have gone off to fight for Cetshwayo—that Mnyamana's impi has shut up Hamu in his cave and surrounded Hamu's force, and that much more blood will be shed before long. Possibly Cetshwayo and Mr. Grant may not wish to send a message until they can report something decisive about Hamu and his impi. Or may their messengers have been intercepted and stopped or sent back, as Hozana undoubtedly would have been, if J. Shepstone's policemen had fallen in with them? However, we must wait a few days longer, before coming to any conclusion on this point."

TO F. W. CHESSON, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, June 15, 1883.

"I have just received yours of May 17. I hope that the letters and printed pages which will have reached you shortly after you wrote that letter will have long ago relieved your anxiety on several points, e.g. they will have satisfied you, I think, (1) that Cetshwayo has had nothing whatever to do with the first or with the second fighting, (2) that the disaster in respect of the second has been enormously exaggerated by the editor of the Mercury, the Durban Correspondent of the London Times, who telegraphs that 'Cetshwayo lost 6,000 men,' (though he judiciously admits that 'Cetshwayo's loss is possibly overstated'). The Advertiser, in its account of an interview with a white man just arrived from Zululand, reports him as saying that the Mercury's Zulu news affords 'both amusement and annoyance' to its white readers in Zululand—'the first because of the utterly absurd rumours that it gives about Zululand, and the latter because old correspondents and subscribers to the Mercury do not like to see their old friend so com-
pletely at sea as to the real facts of the case.' And these 'utterly absurd rumours' have been, ever since the Restoration, forwarded as 'true facts' by the editor of the Mercury to the London Times. . . . But the above losses no more suffice to show that the king's forces are inferior to those of Hamu and Zibebu joined together than the loss at Isandhlwana followed by that at the Intombe demonstrated the inferiority of the British army compared with the whole Zulu impi."

This was the last letter which the Bishop was to write to Mr. Chesson. In his efforts to get justice done to a miserably ill-used man and a grossly injured people his zeal and energy were in no way abated. He was as ready as he had ever been to spend and to be spent in promoting the cause of truth and righteousness; but his bodily vigour was impaired to a far greater degree than was at all realised by himself, or even, perhaps, by any others. A gleam of hope seemed for the moment to rest on the prospects of the unfortunate king who had found in Sobantu almost his only earthly helper. Mr. Grant had reached his kraal, had received from him the warmest welcome, and had been assured of his power to maintain peace and order in his country as well as to resist any force that might be brought against him. A few days later the Bishop's eldest daughter, Harriette, throughout many years, and more particularly since the troubles of 1873, his most devoted assistant, of whose zeal and judgement he had often spoken with just pride, had to send to Mr. Chesson the tidings that her father's work on earth was done. In a letter written June 24, the latter pages of which are devoted to details of Zulu affairs, taken up bravely where her father left them, she says:—

"I am sending you some Natal papers with many particulars, and I will tell you a little myself. On Thursday week he
was particularly bright and seemed well, went into town and attended to his Church business, . . . and I think that that was the day on which he wrote his last letter to you, though the mail was not to leave this till the Sunday night. . . . At any rate, by Sunday he was too unwell to write, and we sent for the doctor. He got weaker and weaker, but still took an eager interest in his work, dictating to me notes to be inserted in the printed sheets, and asking for the news from the daily papers, though on the Tuesday he said he did not care to hear the leaders in the *Times and Mercury* full of abuse. On the Tuesday night he wandered slightly in his mind, or rather spoke half asleep, recovering himself always after a few minutes. He often fancied we were doing up the mail, and asked if I had copied this or that thing for Mr. Chesson, or that he was speaking with Mr. — or Mr. — ; but our voices would always recall him if we tried to answer him. When my brother came up from Durban the next morning, his father was quite conscious and glad to see him; but his speech was then failing, and indeed all that morning he was just fading away from us. The end came very peacefully just before 2 P.M.” [on June 20].

His son, Dr. Colenso, who reached Bishopstowe from Durban on the morning of the day during which the Bishop died, writes:—

“Last week, whilst he was in Durban, I learnt from a chance remark, and then from a return of an old lumbago pain and a quickening of the pulse, that my father was unwell, and found him suffering from an attack of remittent fever, which, from his habit of endurance and uncomplaining nature, would otherwise have escaped my notice. I treated him for it, but could not persuade him to remain in Durban, and thereupon sent a message to Bishopstowe that he was to take quinine until quite strong. It appears now that he had been suffering from a rapid pulse, and therefore probably—
from fever, for some two or three weeks. On Tuesday, hearing that Dr. Scott had been called in attendance, I sent a telegram to him inquiring how my father was. His answer that the weakness was increasing alarmed me, and determined me to start by the next train. It was the first intelligence I had that he was seriously ill. I left by the 2.10 A.M. train, June 20, with the worst forebodings, receiving before I started another telegram in answer to mine, which contained no better news, but requested my attendance. On arriving, I learnt that my father had been taken ill on Friday, after having been in the gayest of spirits the previous evening. I found that Dr. Scott had seen him on Monday and Tuesday. I found him very weak, with no fever, and sleeping a good deal. He knew me, and spoke to me at once, rousing up and desiring that everything should be told to me. All that could be done by us to combat the extreme weakness and prostration was done, and at about noon Dr. Scott arrived. He pronounced his pulse to be better, but his general condition worse. It must, indeed, have been much worse, for on the previous day he had insisted on dressing and walking into the study, and had the newspaper read to him, whereas when I came he was so weak that he could hardly sit up with our arms around him. Shortly after Dr. Scott left he became suddenly worse, and at about 1.42 P.M. he gradually and peacefully passed away, preserving to the last an unclouded mind, and recognising and speaking to us, and although his speech became more and more difficult and indistinct it was perfectly coherent to the last. Up to the end his brain was busy with his work, political and religious; and it was only during Tuesday night that, owing probably to a narcotic he took, he was at all troubled with delusions (occasional wanderings, of which, between whiles, he was aware)."

The perfect quietness of these last hours is only what we might look for in the closing scenes of such a life as his. Mrs. Colenso writes:—
TO THE REV. SIR G. W. COX.

"I cannot tell you of any parting words. Only the day before did I and Harrie [Harriette] know there was imminent danger. The last night he wandered very much in his mind, kept addressing people who were not there, sometimes talking about a successor for Dr. R——, sometimes about some 'papers to be sent to ——' on Zulu matters. I do not think his mind was dwelling on his own prospects. He said to me the last time he got into his study, 'I should be so glad of a little rest.' I thought at the time he alluded to his two or three sleepless nights. Now I think it meant more. I cannot regret that we were not more alive to the situation these last few days. It would (it might) have distressed him, and what did he want with death-bed scenes, who was worn out in God's service? Rest was his great need."

His second daughter, Frances, who had been staying with her brother, Dr. R. J. Colenso, at Durban, hurried up on hearing of her father's increasing weakness, but arrived too late. As the Bishop returned from Durban she had passed him in the train, interchangeably a passing greeting only; but before he left Bishopstowe to visit his son he had, in his last conversation with her, suggested that she should write a "sort of sequel" to her History of the Zulu War, relating all that had happened since. With what utter unselfishness he had acted throughout the long series of events marking the recent history of British rule in Southern Africa she was indeed aware. Writing to Mr. Chesson, June 30, she said:—

"He died for the cause in which he has fought so long, the cause of justice, truth, and mercy, for truly it was the overwork in that cause, and the sorrow of seeing it still trampled under foot, that wore away his strength and took him from us. But I believe myself that he was victorious in death
and that the good he sought to accomplish will now be brought to pass, because he has died for it, sooner than he could have accomplished it living."

The sequel of which the Bishop spoke was given to the world a year later. Some of it had been already written, according to his desire; and the volumes on *The Ruin of Zululand* remain to tell a miserable tale of national wrongdoing. They are her last earthly work. Battling bravely to the very last moment with the disease which was consuming her strength, Frances Colenso has passed away, leaving behind her the remembrance of her indomitable bravery and unswerving truth. It is well to know how she expressed her thoughts of her father. Her judgement is summed up in a few words:—

"My father's interest in the Zulu question sprang from higher motives than even patriotism and a regard for his country's name and honour. His mission in the world was to follow in the steps of his Master, and to labour for the truth and for humanity, wherever he saw the need arise. Circumstances only made him the special champion of the African races. Wherever it had pleased Providence to place him, there he would have fought the same good fight—there he would have laboured, and would have died, as truly he now has died, for the truth against all falsehood, for justice against tyranny, for pity and mercy against cruelty and revenge."  

So ended the earthly journey of one whom the friend who of all men should have known him best denounced as maintaining the accursed doctrine that God has nothing to do with nations or politics. Had Mr. Maurice been spared to see the latter portion of the Bishop's career, he would have learnt a wholesome lesson indeed; and it is quite certain that he would have looked upon it with thankful and hearty rejoicing. Elsewhere we have had utterances of opinions of a very different sort. It has been taken for granted in some

quarters that of the work undertaken by the Bishop in behalf of the native chiefs and their tribes the disapproval of the colonists generally furnishes a sufficient condemnation. They must, it has been said, know their own interests; and in all cases affecting these interests *Vox populi vox Dei*. Even if there were no dissentients the assertion must be questioned; but the agreement of the colonists never was so complete as it has been supposed to be. In all the proceedings of the Bishop there is virtually one contention only—that the Zulu chief and his people had not been treated with justice by the British Government. Writing, July 28, 1883, shortly after the Bishop's death, Mr. W. Grant says:

“Our treatment of that people has indeed been cruel and disgraceful, the last act crowning all others. I do trust that all those who advocated the restoration of Cetshwayo will insist upon a full inquiry into the treatment to which he has been subjected since his return, and terminating in his death and the slaughter of his family. I have not yet received direct messages, which I am sure to, but it appears that the published accounts are fairly correct.”

We have also seen that, in the sad series of events about which he had spoken most warmly, the Bishop had never thrown any severe blame on the general body of the colonists. He had spoken of them as misled by those who should have been their guides, but he had never regarded them as animated by deliberately wrongful purposes in their dealing with the natives. His removal from the scene of his long toil seemed at once to reawaken in the colonists generally the consciousness of this fact. The truth is that few, if any, even of those who opposed him most, could in their hearts deny his transparent honesty, and that he acted as he acted solely

1 Mr. Grant was mistaken—Cetshwayo was not killed, but he was wounded, and some of his family were killed.

2 See p. 532.
from the desire that even-handed justice should be dealt out to all. It was this quality which pre-eminently impressed the natives who were brought in contact with him, or who felt the effects of his beneficence.

"The thing," they said, "which we admired in Sobantu was that he resisted all attempts at deceiving (imposing on, or betraying) other people. He resisted everything of this sort, and for this we all admired him greatly."

These words, spoken by Cetshwayo's brother in Zululand in 1883, were written down by a half-civilised native, and sent without any correction by Europeans to Miss Colenso. It might have been supposed that the Zulus would have dwelt most on his labours in their behalf; but they are impressed almost exclusively by his love of truth and his impartial effort that right should be done to all.

The following letter is copied from the *Brighton Herald*, in which it was published in August 1883, with the statement that it had been sent from Pietermaritzburg to his friends in Brighton by the Rev. Walter Witten, son of Mr. E. W. Witten, medical missionary of that town. After describing the course of the Bishop's illness, Mr. Witten wrote:—

"On Wednesday afternoon, I met Moses, Mubi, and several other Kafirs from the station. They said to me, 'Is there any other man that will care for us natives as the Bishop has?' 'No,' I said, 'there is not such another man living as the Bishop; he is the grandest, truest man that ever lived.' I could not speak more, and the poor fellows groaned and turned away.

"The last time the Bishop spoke to me, about a fortnight ago, was to offer me a kindness. I was walking out to Bishopstowe with my things, and the Bishop saw me and pulled up his carriage and told me to put my things in and get in myself. I thanked his lordship, but did not accept his kind offer, as I wanted to call at several places in
Maritzburg. Had I only known it was my last opportunity of talking with the Bishop, how gladly and eagerly would I have seized it. This morning the natives came trooping into the station from all round, and, about eleven o'clock, Miss Colenso came out with her brother, Dr. Colenso, and spoke to them. She was very brave, and bore up wonderfully; but it was a trying scene. I shall never forget it. All the natives wept bitterly. She came into the chapel, where we were standing, before she addressed the natives, and shook hands with us, as also did Dr. Colenso.

"Yesterday (Friday) we buried the Bishop, not in the cemetery, but in the Cathedral, within the altar rails, in front of the altar. The whole Cathedral was draped in black. Not a spot was uncovered, except the windows and memorial tablets on the walls. Flags were hoisted half-mast high all over the town, and every man, woman, and child in Maritzburg was in deep mourning. The body was brought in from Bishopstowe on a gun-carriage, with an escort of Royal Artillery and soldiers, and an immense number of carriages. At the entrance to the town we all put on our surplices and stoles, and headed the procession up the streets. There were only six of the Bishop's clergy present. Then came the Artillery with the body, and then a carriage with Dr. and Miss Colenso inside, and after that all the other people in carriages and on foot. The streets were packed with people, all in mourning. Such a sight I have never seen: there are grander spectacles in England, no doubt; but I have never before seen all the people of a city moved to tears as on this occasion. At the Cathedral the choir met us, also in mourning, and led the way to the altar. Each clergyman read a part of the service... The Bishop's two favourite hymns were sung during the service,

"'O God! our help in ages past,'

And

"'Through all the changing scenes of life.'

At this part of the service there was not a tearless eye in the Cathedral; men and women alike wept freely..."
"When a man can inspire such personal love and attachment in the hearts of friends and foes alike, surely all must acknowledge that there 'dwelleth the love of God in him' in no small measure. A more God-like, Christ-like man never lived, and never will live: grand, honourable, patient, kind, generous, and true as steel."

It is right to say that Mr. Green, who, as Dean of Maritzburg, had been the right-hand man of Bishop Gray throughout the crusade against the Bishop of Natal, spoke of the latter in a sermon on the Sunday after his death with considerable moderation.

"Last June," he told his hearers, "now a month ago, I had occasion to write to him; he replied in terms of very warm regard, saying, in respect of something I had written, 'which act of charity may God return tenfold into your bosom.' May this prayer for me, whom men might think he could not feel kindly towards, be returned a hundred-fold to him."

These words were necessarily followed, as they had been preceded, by expressions of a nervous anxiety lest by so speaking he should be supposed to make light of the duty of maintaining and fighting for what he took to be the Catholic faith. On this score, at least, Mr. Green might defy suspicion; but his utterance may be regarded, nevertheless, as a sign that his ecclesiastical prepossessions had left room still for something like kindly feeling. He had been with the Bishop a member of the Native Commission,¹ and at the close of its sittings he wrote to tell him that at the daily celebration of the Holy Eucharist at St. Saviour's he presented his name before God, praying that the Holy Spirit might guide him into all truth.

"From your manner of speaking to me," he adds, "at the Committee table I drew the conclusion, which I would fain

¹ See p. 574.
adhere to, that you would enter into my feelings in so remembering you. The last occasion on which I wrote to you was when my little boy was suddenly taken from me; then I had to acknowledge most kind expressions of sympathy from yourself and Mrs. Colenso. Being unable to forget that, I must now ask you kindly to remember me to her."

In his reply the Bishop made use of the expression quoted by Mr. Green in his sermon, adding that he could fully understand his spirit and enter into his feelings in this daily remembering him before God in the Holy Eucharist. In truth, though the Bishop was sorry for his antagonists, he had never felt any resentment towards them. But there is, to say the least, a singular implication of superiority in Mr. Green's announcement, as though his remembrance of the Bishop had a certain virtue, and would carry more weight with the Eternal Father of all than a similar remembrance of himself on the part of the Bishop.

At the first meeting of the Convocation of the province of Canterbury after the death of Bishop Gray, Dean Stanley said:

"What I am about to read is an extract (apparently the commencement) of a sermon preached in the Cathedral church of Natal, on September 22 of last year (1872), by the Bishop of Natal. It was sent to me by one of the congregation, and I now venture to read it, without the Bishop's knowledge or sanction:

"Before I proceed to consider the special subject of this day's discourse, it is impossible that I should pass over in silence the event which the last mail has reported to us—the decease of the Bishop of Capetown, once our Metropolitan, and possibly the first and last Metropolitan Bishop who will preside over the Church of England in these parts. We cannot, it is true, forget that for some years past a painful separation has existed between the late
Metropolitan and the members of the Church of England in this diocese—a separation for which we cannot hold ourselves to be blamable, but the history of which this is not the time to recall to our memories. It is enough that we all are sure that the departed prelate had, throughout his long and troubled course, one single object mainly in view—to advance what he deemed to be the cause most dear to God and most beneficial to man; and that in labours for this end, most unselfish and unwearied, in season and out of season, with energy which beat down all obstructions, with courage which faced all opposition, with faith which laid firmly hold of the Unseen Hand, he spent and was spent, body and soul, in His service. To him we owe that the foundations of the Church of England were laid in this diocese—that the first clergy were appointed, the first churches begun, the first mission work of our Church started, and the bishopric established and endowed. And what has been done here is only an example of what has been done elsewhere, by his untiring, self-sacrificing zeal, throughout the vast district originally placed under his charge. In one word, we all "know that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel." For myself, I remember that he was once my friend and my father, and that we took sweet counsel together; and the fact that since then he has felt it to be his duty to censure and condemn my proceedings has only added a special solemnity to this event which has removed him into a sphere where even now he beholds the truth in the clear shining of God's light, and whither God in His mercy grant us grace to follow him, by being faithful to the truth, as we behold it."

Having read these words, Dean Stanley added:—

"Those who communicated the passage to me assured me—what I trust no one here will doubt—that no one present there could fail to be impressed by the deep and genuine emotion with which the words were spoken. It is a testimony alike to the Bishop of Capetown, who could inspire such sentiments, and to the Bishop of Natal, who gave
utterance to them. And when he, the first missionary Bishop of Africa who translated the Holy Scriptures into the language of the natives, shall be called to his rest, I trust that there will be found some prelate presiding over the see of Capetown just and generous enough to render the like honour to the Bishop of Natal."

I am not aware that Dean Stanley's kindly wish has been realised.

It will be enough to preface the following extract with Miss Colenso's words concerning it. She writes:—

"It has escaped the fire at Bishopstowe because the Bishop valued it so much as to keep it apart from the shoal of papers belonging to that epoch, and finally placed it in his despatch-box with his will, where we could not fail to find it and understand its comfort. I had not seen it before, that I can remember:—

"'Mary and I are nursing each other in my bedroom. She chooses my room. She says she can better realise her father's face as he lay dead here than in any other room, and she likes to lie and think of it. . . . Truly the Gospel taught purely makes life blessed and death beautiful. The last mists of conventionality and paganism seem to have been cleared away from it for me by the Claybrook sermon.1 I thought of it incessantly from the day I read it to George. It seemed as if it made me just ready for what was coming. When you see Bishop Colenso I wish you would tell him for me that, thanks to him, I can now nurse my child as I nursed my husband, with hardly an over-anxious thought, and that I wish when death comes to take from him any one very dear to him God may give him as much peace as He has given through him to me. I can't wish him any­thing better.

"'M. Boole.'"

The following letter received from a Sinhalese Christian

1 See Natal Sermons, Series I. p. 356; also supra, vol. i. p. 254.
may to some appear as absurd as the questions of the intelligent Zulu who is said to have converted the Bishop. There are others who will think otherwise.

"Ramapanda, Ceylon, March 15, 1884.

"Dear Madam,

"I was agreeably surprised to receive the pamphlet containing three of the last sermons of good Bishop Colenso you had the kindness to send me. Please accept my best thanks for it. But for his lordship I should have renounced Christianity some time ago. Having for a long time found it difficult to believe certain passages of S.S. [Sacred Scripture] and in certain doctrines of Christianity as taught by its ministers, I, as a last resort, had recourse to your good husband, whose fame was known throughout the world, and whose explanations, both by letter and a printed copy of his sermons, which he had the kindness to send me, removed from my mind all the difficulty and anxiety I had felt. I am now thankful to be able to say that I endeavour to worship God in the Spirit as it was in Christ. . . . If we had a few ministers like him, millions who yet keep aloof from embracing Christianity might be easily brought over to us. What a field for working there is for such men among my countrymen the Sinhalese, who are all Buddhists.

"Dan. J. Layamane."

In the year 1878 the Bishop had answered some questions put to him about the Book of Job by the Astronomer-Royal, Sir G. B. Airy. Although they had been together at Cambridge during most of the Bishop's residence there, they had never met. Had the Bishop been Smith's Prizeman in 1835 instead of 1836, he would have had Mr. Airy as his examiner. But, although they had no personal acquaintance with each other, the Astronomer-Royal could throw himself heartily into the Bishop's work, and shortly after his death he wrote to his son:—
"I wish I could perfectly express my veneration for the character of Bishop Colenso,—the one man who could fearlessly publish the truth on the most important subjects (to whom intellectually I owe more than to any other person in my life), and the one man who could make an exertion in the cause of political justice which no other person would make."

There had at one time been some idea of transferring the Manchester New College to Oxford, instead of to London, and of inviting the Bishop of Natal to become the head of it. That notion was speedily given up; but when the Bishop's earthly toil was done, the trustees at their annual meeting, June 28, 1883, expressed by resolution their

"high appreciation of his work as a Biblical scholar during the last twenty-one years; deep respect for his unswerving love of truth, and his candour, calmness, and patience in controversy; for his faithful labours and humane sympathies as a missionary of Christ; and our admiration of his repeated and solemn appeals for the removal of ecclesiastical tests which enervate the thought and trouble the conscience of the clergy, cripple the advance of true learning, and intercept the natural union of Christian minds in love for each other and piety to God."

"I never saw Colenso," wrote an aged Lancashire clergyman,¹

"and I felt more joy for him than sorrow for others or myself when I heard of his departure. He is now where due praise and honour will be given him by millions of his equals."

¹ The Rev. T. P. Kirkman, Rector of Croft, Warrington. Mr. Kirkman himself is a thinker as truthful and fearless as the Bishop. His son is mentioned, Vol. II. p. 204.
APPENDIX A.

LETTERS PATENT.

See pages 167, 592.

The question of the validity of the patents to constitute legal sees, and to give the Bishops coercive jurisdiction over their clergy, turned on the condition of the colonies at the time when the patents were issued. If they were "Crown colonies properly so called"—that is, colonies which had nothing in the form of a representative legislature—then the Crown had in these colonies full power to mark out a diocese and define the Bishop's jurisdiction by means of letters patent. There was no question at all that this had been the condition of the Cape Colony at the time of the original foundation of the see of Cape-town, in 1847. When Bishop Gray resigned that see in 1853, the letters patent which appointed him Bishop of the present see were found to be not valid, because in the meantime the Government of the Cape Colony had been handed over by the Crown to a representative assembly. The argument of the Bishop of Natal made it very clear that at the time when his own see was founded, in 1853, the colony of Natal was a "Crown colony properly so called," although the matter had been rendered uncertain owing to the carelessness of those who drew up the original letters patent, not of the see, but of the colony. Lord Romilly, it seems, had suspected this, and used language which clearly pointed to the existence of this suspicion. In this case there could be no question as to the Bishop's jurisdiction over the clergymen whom he had been compelled to deprive; but the further consequence would at the same time follow, that an Established Church of some kind or other would exist in the colony.
"If there be," said Sir Roundell Palmer, "any meaning in the term 'Established Church' at all, it means that Church the law of which is established as a part of the law of the land, either for all or some purposes."

On these words the Bishop remarks:

"I am well aware that, with not a few, both within the Church of England and without it, the notion of any Church being 'established' in this colony is a great bugbear, and all kinds of evils are dreaded from it."

But in fact it would mean, and it would come to nothing more than this:

"that there would be a law, the law of the Church of England, by which the members of that Church would be governed here exactly as they are in England so far as the circumstances of the colony will allow, and there would be a judge appointed by the Queen, with a lawful court in which to administer that law."

One of the judges of the Supreme Court of Natal had spoken of the phrase 'Royal supremacy' as only another mode of saying that the Sovereign of England has exclusive sovereignty within the dominions of the Crown of England. The Bishop insisted that the expression meant very much more than this. It meant

"that the laws of the Church of England are made by the Sovereign, like any other laws of the land, 'with the advice and consent of Parliament, and not by convocations and synods—in other words, not merely by the will of the clergy; that the clergy of the Church are only public officers, and derive their authority from the whole body represented by its head; that the chief officers, or Bishops, whether with or without jurisdiction, must in all cases be appointed by the Queen, and are only removable by her authority for any breach of the laws as established for the Church of England and interpreted by her Supreme Court of Appeal, and not as they may be explained, enlarged, and sought to be enforced by the arbitrary will of an irresponsible Metropolitan."

This, and this only, would be the meaning of an Established Church in Natal or in any other colony; and although such an establishment would be a source of great good, yet the hopes of
the Bishop had not risen so high as to lead him to look for this. He says:—

"I had long ago acquiesced in the decision that all 'coercive' jurisdiction had been taken from me as well as from the Bishops of Capetown, and Grahamstown. And though fully aware for some time past of the grounds on which I might claim to exercise it, I had no wish to put forward that claim, if your Lordships had seen it right to maintain the judgement of the Master of the Rolls, which secured to me all needful power, through the civil courts of the colony, of enforcing that obedience to the laws of the Church of which I am the chief minister which is absolutely essential to the peace and welfare of the whole body." 1

It is unnecessary to say that in his whole action the Bishop of Natal was fighting for the cause of order in the Church of England. Bishop Gray and his partisans would, of course, have it that he was simply fighting against the Church of Christ; but it remained to be seen then, as it remains to be seen still, whether within the limits of its dominions the Crown will allow the law of the Church of England to be set aside by certain persons who style the order of the Church of England in any given colony as schismatical, and insist that the Church is represented only by their own so-called Church of South Africa, or of any other district. Defying all regular authority, one of Bishop Gray's supporters claimed, by virtue of his orders as a priest in the English Church, the power of ministering in any church in the colony, and had the hardihood to appeal to the Thirty-sixth Canon in support of his claim. The absurdity of this plea was exposed by the Bishop in his supplementary argument before the Supreme Court (November 7, 1867). Admitting that he had rendered canonical obedience to the Bishop of Natal before his so-called condemnation and deposition, this same clergyman declared that since that time he had refused to submit himself to him in any manner in spiritual things. But, as the Bishop pointed out, this was in itself a defiance of the judgement of the Privy Council, which declared all those proceedings null and void, and called on all whom it might concern to govern themselves accordingly. His plea, therefore, was nothing more nor less than an allegation that he had violated the law, and that he should continue to do so. The distinction drawn between

1 Argument, &c., p. 52.
things spiritual and ecclesiastical did not, in fact, exist in the Church of England. In the Thirty-sixth Article the two words are repeatedly interchanged in a way which clearly implies the invalidity of such a distinction. Nay, more, the term "ecclesiastical" must include the term "spiritual," as the greater includes the less, since Her Majesty's supreme authority "in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes" is often described as her authority in "causes ecclesiastical."

"In virtue, therefore, of the Queen being 'Supreme Governor of all Her Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal,' the Order in Council made on my behalf must be understood to mean that the judgment or sentence pronounced by the Bishop of Capetown against me is to be treated by Her Majesty's judges in the court of law, and by every loyal subject at home and in the colonies, as null and void in law in respect of all 'spiritual' consequences as well as temporal." ¹

Whatever, then, Bishop Gray might say to the contrary, this judgement of the Queen in Council was virtually a declaration of internecine war between the Church of England and the society styling itself the Church of South Africa.

In this interpretation of the Order in Council the Natal Supreme Court substantially agreed. Dean Green had stated that, having once regarded Dr. Colenso as Bishop of Natal by Divine permission, he had, at a given time, ceased to acknowledge him as such. Conceding to him full liberty thus to change his mind, Chief Justice Harding remarked that, having admitted this change,

"he cannot belong to the voluntary association, namely, the Anglican Church in this colony, of which the plaintiff is the head, and lay claim to use the property of which the plaintiff is trustee, and which is subject to the rules of the Church of England, when he sets the plaintiff's authority, and the rules vesting that authority in him, at defiance. . . . So soon as the defendant ceases to observe the rules of that Church, and on the contrary acts in defiance of those rules and of the decision of the Queen in Council, he ceases to be intitled to any rights in respect of those churches which he possessed under those rules."

¹ Supplementary Argument, p. 9.
For like reasons, drawn out with great minuteness, Mr. Justice Cope held that the court was bound to deprive the defendant, Mr. Green, of his office, and of the other functions which he assumed to hold or to be possessed of in this colony as a priest of the Church of England, in defiance of his lawful Bishop, and that, as marking its sense of such conduct, and as an additional penalty for the defendant's so doing, the court must condemn him in the costs of the suit. From this judgement Mr. Justice Phillips dissented, holding the Bishop's letters patent to be invalid, on the ground that at the time when they were issued the colony of Natal was not "a Crown colony properly so called." The Chief Justice had declined to confirm the Bishop's proceedings and the judgement delivered by him against Mr. Green and the other defendants; but for this refusal Mr. Phillips held that no explanation was necessary.

"To him it was as clear as possible. The Chief Justice held that the Bishop's letters patent were perfectly valid, and that, having been granted when this was a Crown colony, they were as effectual as if the powers assumed to be conferred by them had been embodied in an ordinance. This being the case, it was unnecessary to confirm the Bishop's sentence. If the opinion of the Chief Justice as to the validity of the letters patent were incorrect, the confirming of the Bishop's sentence would have been a further error. If the opinion was a correct one, it would be error to confirm that which had no need of support."¹

¹ Judgement delivered by the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Colony of Natal on January 9, 1868.
APPENDIX B.

DESPATCH FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES.

See page 201.

"DOWNING STREET, January 30, 1868.

"Sir,

"You will probably have read in some of the English papers a report that it is in contemplation by some colonial Bishops to consecrate a Bishop to take charge of the diocese of Natal, on the assumption that Dr. Colenso has been deposed.

"You will not be surprised to hear that Her Majesty's Government look upon this intention with great apprehension and regret. And in case you should learn that the consecration is intended to take place within your government, I shall wish you to use all the influence which legitimately belongs to you to prevent it.

"And I think it proper to add, that if, after being warned of the views of Her Majesty's Government, any ecclesiastical officer holding a salaried office during the pleasure of Her Majesty were to be a party to any such transaction, Her Majesty's Government would consider it their duty to advise the Queen to cancel his appointment.

"I have, &c.,

(Signed) "BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS."


APPENDIX C.

LETTER TO JOHN MILLER, ESQ., M.L.A., MAYOR OF PORT ELIZABETH.

See page 214.

"BISHOPSTOWE, September 21, 1868.

"Sir,

"I observe in the Cape journals that the Bishop of Grahamstown has published his reply to an address which has recently been presented to him by yourself and other members of the Church of England in Port Elizabeth, objecting to the consecration of another Bishop for the diocese of Natal while my letters patent remain unrevoked, and assigning various grounds for so doing. As there are some points in the Bishop's reply which require correction, and with respect to which you could not be fully informed, I think it my duty to make the following remarks upon the six reasons by which he supports his dissent from the views expressed in the address in question:—

"I.—The Bishop says:

"That the tribunal which tried Dr. Colenso on the charges preferred against him was a tribunal competent, and the only tribunal able in the first instance, to examine and decide on these charges according to the fundamental principles of the constitution of the Christian Church, to the analogy of similar proceedings in the Church of England since the Reformation, and in particular to the letters patent under the provisions of which the Bishops of the English Church in South Africa have been hitherto appointed, and which, although they confer no coercive jurisdiction, yet must be regarded as defining conditions on which their appointments were received."