

thank him for his moderation and forbearance ; while the Bishop of Salisbury and others remonstrated with him for having yielded. The American Bishops said they had expected to hear a full statement of the whole case, and were disappointed.

“ To this hour,” Bishop Gray wrote, “ I cannot decide for myself whether I did right or wrong. The opportunity of freeing the Church from all complicity with heresy may have passed away for ever ;—on the other hand, calm inquiry, delay, caution, and forbearance, will give greater weight to ultimate proceedings in the eye of the world, if the Report of the Committee should lead to Church action at our adjourned Conference. I did what I deemed right at the moment in the sight of God. If I have erred, may He forgive me. Upon me be the blame, and not upon the Church, which was ready to have done its duty.”

After the meeting the Conference was so dissatisfied with the proceeding, that fifty-five Bishops signed the following Declaration : “ We, the undersigned Bishops, declare our acceptance of the sentence pronounced upon Dr. Colenso by the Metropolitan of South Africa, with his Suffragans, as being spiritually a valid sentence.”

On Thursday, September 25th, the Conference debated the Bishop of New Zealand’s Resolution as to a Board of Reference or Spiritual tribunal of final appeal and decision in all matters of faith, for all branches of Anglican Communion, which after some discussion was withdrawn from want of time. The Conference next discussed the question of a Court of final appeal for all Colonial Churches, and referred the matter to a committee intended to consider “ the constitution of a voluntary spiritual tribunal in England, to which cases involving doctrine might be referred by appeal from tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each province of the Colonial Church.”

“ S. David’s and London were, as usual, the chief objectors. Adopted the amended form of Declaration ; which now satisfies me. The hope of future union is to be found in the maintenance of the faith in its purity and integrity as taught in the Word of God ; summed up in the Creeds, and defined by the undisputed

General Councils of the Church, thus excluding the Seventh, which sanctioned image-worship, and was disputed by the Council of Frankfort.

“Friday, September 27th, Pastoral read and unanimously adopted by the Synod, all standing up to express assent; then the Archbishop called up each Bishop according to his seniority to sign it.¹ . . . A discussion arose about printing; it was

¹ The Pastoral Letter is as follows :—

“To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, the Priests and Deacons, and the Lay members of the Church of Christ in communion with the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic.

“We, the undersigned Bishops gathered under the good Providence of God for prayer and conference at Lambeth, pray for you that ye may obtain grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour. We give thanks to God, brethren beloved, for the Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and the love towards the Saints which hath abounded amongst you; and for the knowledge of Christ which through you hath been spread abroad amongst the most vigorous races of the earth. And with one mouth we make our supplications to God, even the Father, that by the power of the Holy Ghost He would strengthen us with His might, to amend among us the things which are amiss, to supply the things which are lacking, and to reach forth unto higher measures of love and zeal in worshipping Him, and in making known His Name: and we pray that in His good time He would give back unto His whole Church the blessed gift of unity in truth. And now we exhort you in love that ye keep whole and undefiled the Faith once delivered to the Saints, as ye have received it of the Lord Jesus. We intreat you to watch and pray, and to strive heartily with us against the frauds and subtleties wherewith the Faith hath been aforetime and is now assailed. We beseech you to hold fast as the sure Word of God all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and that by diligent study of these oracles of God, praying in the Holy Ghost, ye seek to know more of the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour, ever to be adored and worshipped, Whom they reveal unto us, and of the Will of God which they declare. Furthermore, we intreat you to guard yourselves and yours against the growing superstitions and additions with which in these latter days the Truth of God hath been overlaid; as otherwise, so especially by the pretension to universal sovereignty over God’s heritage asserted for the See of Rome, and by the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as Mediator in the place of her Divine Son, and by the addressing of prayer to her as intercessor between God and man. Of such beware, we beseech you, knowing that the jealous God giveth not His Honour to another. Build yourselves up, therefore, beloved, in your most holy Faith; grow in grace and in the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ our Lord. Show forth before all men by your faith, self-denial, purity, and godly conversation, as well as by your labours for the people among whom God hath so widely spread you, and by the setting forth of His Gospel to the unbelievers and the heathen, that ye are indeed the servants of Him Who died for us to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice for the sins of the whole

ultimately agreed to publish only the Resolutions,¹ but the whole of the debates are to be laid up in the archives in Lambeth Library, and to be accessible to all; a wise conclusion in my judgment. I should be very sorry to see all the debates published.

“We referred to the Archbishop the preparation of letters commendatory. . . . Before I could consent to refer the question

world. Brethren beloved, with one voice we warn you; the time is short, the Lord cometh; watch and be sober. Abide stedfast in the Communion of Saints wherein God hath granted you a place. Seek in faith for oneness with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Hold fast the Creeds, and the pure worship and order, which of God’s grace ye have inherited from the Primitive Church. Beware of causing divisions contrary to the doctrine ye have received. Pray and seek for unity among yourselves, and among all the faithful in Christ Jesus; and the Good Lord make you perfect, and keep your bodies, souls, and spirits, until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

¹ “RESOLUTION I. That it appears to us expedient, for the purpose of maintaining brotherly intercommunion, that all cases of establishment of new Sees, and appointment of new Bishops, be certified to all Archbishops and Metropolitans and all presiding Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

“II. That, having regard to the conditions under which intercommunion between members of the Church passing from one distant Diocese to another may be duly maintained, we hereby declare it desirable—

“(1.) That forms of letters commendatory on behalf of Clergymen visiting other Dioceses be drawn up and agreed upon.

“(2.) That a form of Letters commendatory for lay members of the Church be in like manner prepared.

“(3.) That his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury be pleased to undertake the preparation of such forms.

“III. That a Committee be appointed to draw up a Pastoral Address to all members of the Church in Christ in communion with the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic, to be agreed upon by the assembled Bishops, and to be published as soon as possible after the last sitting of the Conference.

“IV. That, in the opinion of this Conference, unity in faith and discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican Communion, by due and canonical subordination of the Synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a Synod or Synods above them.

“V. That a Committee of seven members (with power to add to their number, and to obtain the assistance of men learned in ecclesiastical and canon law) be appointed to inquire into and report upon the subject of the relations and functions of such Synods, and that such report be forwarded to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury with a request that, if possible, it may be communicated to an adjourned meeting of this Conference.

“VI. That in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled, the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal;

of the election of Bishops to a committee, I said that I must ask the Conference to agree to one addition to it, which I had intended to propose—viz., That this Conference accepted and adopted the wise decision of the Convocation of Canterbury as to the appointment of another Bishop to Natal;—that I did not think there ought to be, and did not apprehend there would be, any opposition to this. The proposal gave rise to a warm

and that a Committee be now appointed at this general meeting to report on the best mode by which the Church may be delivered from the continuance of this scandal, and the true Faith maintained. That such report be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask for their judgment thereupon.

“VII. That we who are here present do acquiesce in the resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury, passed June 29th, 1866, relating to the Diocese of Natal, to wit—

“‘If it be decided that a new Bishop should be consecrated, as to the proper steps to be taken by the members of the Church, in the Province of Natal, for obtaining a new Bishop, it is the opinion of this House, *first*, that a formal instrument, declaratory of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of South Africa, should be prepared, which every Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, to be appointed to office, should be required to subscribe;—*secondly*, that a godly and well-learned man should be chosen by the Clergy, with the assent of the lay-communicants of the Church; and *thirdly*, that he should be presented for consecration, either to the Archbishop of Canterbury, if the aforesaid instrument should declare the doctrine and discipline of Christ as received by the United Church of England and Ireland, or to the Bishops of the Church of South Africa, according as hereafter may be judged to be most advisable and convenient.’

“VIII. That in order to the binding of the Churches of our Colonial Empire and the Missionary Churches beyond them in the closest union with the Mother Church, it is necessary that they receive and maintain without alteration the standards of Faith and doctrine now in use in that Church. That, nevertheless, each Province should have the right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the Church as its peculiar circumstances may require; provided that no change or addition be made inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Book of Common Prayer, and that all such changes be liable to revision by any Synod of the Anglican Communion in which the said Province shall be represented.

“IX. That the Committee appointed by Resolution V., with the addition of the names of the Bishops of London, S. David's, and Oxford, and all the Colonial Bishops, be instructed to consider the constitution of a voluntary spiritual tribunal to which questions of doctrine may be carried by appeal from the tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each Province of the Colonial Church, and that their report be forwarded to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is requested to communicate it to an adjourned meeting of this Conference.

discussion,—the Bishop of London vehemently opposing, aided by the Bishop of S. David's. I kept this time firm to my resolution,—expressed my great disappointment at the course already adopted by the Conference,—declared my belief that if nothing more than had been done took place, the Churches of our community would not be clear of complicity with heresy, and that I must ask his Grace to accept of my resignation, as I could not, however pained at the thought of severance from my Mother Church, hold communion with a body involved in what itself had declared in its own Synod to be heresy. Ultimately my Resolution was carried by a very large majority, three Bishops only holding up their hands against it. God be praised, but *mea culpa! mea culpa!* that my other Resolution was not also carried!

“We then referred all our other Colonial Resolutions, including that of the Court of Metropolitans and the election of Bishops, to our Committee. . . . We then repeated the Nicene Creed, sang the Gloria in Excelsis, received the Blessing, and the session closed, the Archbishop leaving it uncertain when the adjourned meeting would take place. A photographer was waiting to catch us as we emerged, and in a few minutes took pictures of the group assembled round the door.

“X. That the Resolutions submitted to this Conference relative to the discipline to be exercised by Metropolitans, the Court of Metropolitans, the scheme for conducting the election of Bishops when not otherwise provided for, the declaration of submission to the regulation of Synods, and the question of what legislation should be proposed for the Colonial Churches, be referred to the Committee specified in the preceding Resolution.

“XI. That a special Committee be appointed to consider the Resolutions relative to the notification of proposed Missionary Bishoprics, and the subordination of Missionaries.

“XII. That the question of the bounds of jurisdiction of different Bishops, when any question may have arisen in regard to them, the question as to the obedience of Chaplains of the United Church of England and Ireland, on the Continent, and the Resolution submitted to the Conference relative to their return and admission into Home Dioceses, be referred to the Committee specified in the preceding Resolution.

“XIII. That we desire to render our hearty thanks to Almighty God for His Blessing vouchsafed to us in and by this Conference; and we desire to express our hope that this our meeting may hereafter be followed by other meetings, to be conducted in the same spirit of brotherly love.”

"It was now five o'clock, and a large gathering for the conversazione had been waiting in S. James's Hall.¹ I walked round with Charlie to Westminster, to take the Bishop of S. Andrews' robes to Archdeacon Wordsworth's, and arrived later than the others. Selwyn was speaking, but as soon as I reached the platform, I was received with a great burst of cheering, which continued for a long time, and which was meant to express thankfulness for defence of the Faith. I was called upon to speak, and received another ovation. I announced the assent² which the Conference had given to the Canterbury

¹ This was held by S. P. G. . . . "The warmest greeting was reserved for the Bishops of New Zealand and Cape Town."—*Guardian*, October 2, 1867.

² The Bishop of London published the following letter in the *Times*, September 28, 1867 :—"Sir—As the Bishop of Cape Town was by some understood to say, in his speech at S. James's Hall yesterday, that the Conference of Bishops at Lambeth had given its approval to the appointment of a new Bishop of Natal, I beg leave to refer all your readers who are interested in this subject to the carefully guarded words of the resolution actually adopted by the Conference, which will, I believe, soon be published.—A. C. LONDON." To which the Bishop of Cape Town replied : "Sir—The Bishop of London has sent me a copy of a letter which he has addressed to you with reference to what I was supposed to have said at S. James's Hall as to the appointment of a Bishop to Natal. What I meant to say, and I believe did say, on that occasion, was that the Conference had approved and accepted as its own the conclusions arrived at by both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury on this subject. The facts are these." (Here the Bishop quotes the questions put by the Church of Natal to Convocation, see page 265 ; and the replies of Convocation, going on to say), "The Conference has now given the same reply. The state of the case is therefore as follows : Any Bishop elected and consecrated in conformity with the rules laid down in these replies will not only be recognised as a Bishop in communion with the Church of England, but by the Bishops of all branches of the Anglican Communion throughout the world. All doubt and difficulty, therefore, in the way of the consecration of another Bishop for the much tried and oppressed Church in Natal is now removed." A leader in the *Times*, reviling the Bishop of Cape Town, appeared October 4th, to which the Bishop replied as follows :—

. . . "As that article contains several mistakes, I address a few lines to you on the subject.

"I. I did not mean to say, and I believe did not say, at S. James's Hall, that the Primate recommended anything or anyone. I merely wished to say that his Grace concurred in the view taken by the Conference, and that there was now no further impediment in the way of the consecration of a faithful Bishop for Natal. The assent of the Churches of our communion was thought to be desirable, if not essential. That assent has now been given. Not only has the Convocation of Canterbury given its judgment in the matter, but the Bishops of all the Churches

Resolutions, and said that the Archbishop was now prepared to recommend one to go out as Bishop to Natal, and reminded the Church that an income was still needed. I also urged the claims of the great Church Societies to one common building worthy of the Church of England, and spoke with reference to what a previous speaker had said of the hope of the reunion of Christendom, the fair prospects so far as the East was concerned, the little encouragement from the temper of the Roman Hierarchy, the necessity of a general Council when men's

of the Anglican Communion assembled at Lambeth have now done the same. I did not allude to legal difficulties, because I believe there are none. The Colonial Churches are pronounced to be voluntary associations. They have all the rights of voluntary bodies. They ask no more. They will be content with nothing less.

"II. Next you say that three questions were put to Convocation, and that I ought to have given the answers to these three questions, whereas I omitted the first. My reply is that I had not to give the course pursued by Convocation, or to refer to the opinion therein delivered, but to state the course pursued by the Conference at Lambeth. The Conference was asked whether it assented to the opinion given by Convocation as to the appointment of another Bishop. It replied that it did, and it directed that the answers given in the two resolutions, or, as the Bishop of London supposed, in the third Resolution only, should be appended to its vote. You will see, therefore, that you are unjust to me when you say that a resolution with which the Conference did not concern itself 'ought not to have been omitted' by me, when stating what the Conference had done.

"III. Your comments on the proceedings of Convocation are precisely of the same character as those made by the Dean of Westminster, in his preface to his speech in Convocation, the errors of which I have already publicly exposed. With these proceedings, however, I have nothing to do. Convocation will, if needed, I doubt not, defend itself. Meantime, I would suggest that it is hardly worthy of the Dean's position to refer so frequently to them. If he doubts what the mind of Convocation is in this matter, I trust that he will refer the question again to it for revision.

"IV. It is not for me to defend the temper in which I have dealt with the very trying and difficult questions with which I have had to deal. I am quite aware that great imperfection attends upon all I say or do; but I can say before God that in the discharge of a sad duty I have felt not any anger or bitterness, as some of Dr. Colenso's friends are fond of asserting, but deep pain and sorrow of soul. At the Conference, when these trying questions were discussed, I was thanked by many Bishops, Dr. Colenso's brother-in-law included, for the moderation shown by me, and blamed by others for not saying more than I did.—Your obedient servant,

"R. CAPETOWN.

"Wolverhampton, October 4th."

There was a prolongation of this discussion in the *Times*; but as nothing new or important was said, or perhaps could be said, it is not thought necessary to reproduce it here.

minds should be ripe for it, which, however, we should probably not live to see. About £200 a year was promised in the room towards the support of the new Bishop.

"*Saturday, September 28th*, Service at Lambeth at 11 o'clock, the Bishops walking in procession from the Palace to the Church. The Bishop of Montreal preached a plain, sensible sermon. I think there were about 400 communicants."

Space forbids us to dwell at length upon this important Conference, the results of which may well be summed up in the words of the Scottish Primus (Eden, 1867), who, while remarking that these results will not all be immediately seen in their fulness, went on to say: "One such, however, is that it has for ever dissipated that erroneous and Erastian notion that the Church of England could not recognise any man for a true Bishop who was not made so by the authority of the Sovereign. In this assembly one-third at least of the Bishops present were not so made, nor was any distinction recognised between the Bishops of an established or of an unestablished Church,—all sat mingled together, all were alike equal as parts of the one Episcopate. Nor could the fact be passed over, which testifies to a principle of the first importance in considering the question of the revival of intercommunion between different Churches, that the existence of different liturgies in Churches is no bar to their intercommunion. One other result of this Conference will be to show that proved heresy separates a Bishop from communion with the Anglican Church in every part of the world. One chair was vacant in that assembly which should have been filled by a Bishop of the Church in South Africa. But that Bishop had been deposed for heresy by ecclesiastical authority. That deposition was recognised by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion assembled at Lambeth, and no sound of disapproval was heard from any quarter in that great assembly when the Archbishop informed us that he had sent no invitation to Dr. Colenso."

Directly the service at Lambeth was over, Bishop Gray went off to the Euston station where his wife was waiting for him, and they went to Wolverhampton, where the Church Con-

gress was about to meet. On the Sunday (Michaelmas Day) the Bishop preached at Penn in the morning, and at Wolverhampton in the evening, when a dense crowd assembled to hear him. It was said that 2,000 people were present, and hundreds were sent away unable to get in. The next day, September 30th, the Bishop preached at S. Michael's, Coventry, returning to Wolverhampton for the opening service of the Congress on October 1st. His Journal mentions "an admirable opening sermon from the Dean of Norwich. The whole day taken up with attending the meetings, receiving greetings, and answering letters. *October 2nd, Day as yesterday.* Read a paper on home and foreign organisation for mission work." The reporters say that the Bishop met with a most exciting reception, the entire audience rising and cheering him enthusiastically. On the next day there was a meeting for the purpose of presenting the Bishop with a pastoral staff. No public announcement had been made of it, but "the room was crowded to suffocation, and a tone of unusual enthusiasm characterised the whole assembly," according to the newspapers. The staff, designed by Mr. Butterfield, is ebony—cross and foot being of gold set with precious stones;—an *Agnus Dei* in relief on one side of the cross, and a very large carbuncle on the other.

Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., made a warm speech, which went to the hearts of all present. What the Bishop of Cape Town has been in the defence of the truth in his lion-like zeal, his energy, and his unselfishness, they all knew, he said; but he could go back to years and years ago, before all these late troubles had come, and remember how the Bishop gave himself then, body and soul, to his work. Presenting the crozier, Mr. Hope went on to say that, "Of old the good tradition of the Christian Church was that, as the Diocesan carries a crook, so the Archbishop or Metropolitan raises the Cross on high as the standard for all, as well Bishop, as well Priest, as well Deacon, as well Laity, to follow. With the cross in his hand and the cross in his heart, the Metropolitan is strong in his weakness, and powerful in the Blood of his Crucified Lord. . . . You, my Lord Metropolitan of Cape Town, will go forward with the

cross thus. In the southern hemisphere do we not see this touching symbol of our faith planted in the heavens themselves? What are the stars which guide the wanderer on the ocean when he has passed the equator and when the pole-star has vanished from his sight? It is the Southern Cross!"

Several other speakers followed, among whom we must only find room to specify the Bishop of Tennessee (Dr. Quintard). He said, amid much cheering,

"My dear Lord and Brother, it has been very truly said that great principles are dearly bought, and that great truths are only advanced by mighty struggles. In such a struggle you have been engaged, and you have, I believe, come off more than conqueror. I have followed you, as a multitude of your brethren have done in all quarters of the world, through the trials which have beset your path of duty; and we have felt how one after another of your sufferings have entered into your very soul. I stand here as a Bishop of that Church, which upon this point has given forth no uncertain sound. Not only at our General Convocation in 1865 was a resolution passed and a letter sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject, but on our arrival in this country, in the palace of Lambeth where our Episcopacy originated—for it was there that our saintly White was consecrated for the American Church—we put our names to a paper declaring that the acts of the Bishop of Cape Town were valid, and that Dr. Colenso is excommunicate. I have no hesitation in saying that we in America cannot exactly comprehend how a man can be excommunicate in the Church and not excommunicate in the State! Woe be to our branch of the Church, indeed, when she shall fail for any earthly considerations to stand up and give her approval clearly of such a pastor of Christ's flock as the Bishop of Cape Town! . . . I rejoice that I have an opportunity of giving him my assurance of the fact—for it is a fact—that his name is a household word in every Church family in America. I doubt whether there is a Bishop of the American Church better known among us than the Metropolitan of Cape Town. He will now go forth once more to his home and to his labour, but the con-

flict is not over, any more than in the Christian life the warfare is won by a single battle. This crozier will admonish him to do valiantly and right gloriously for the flock of Christ, and in all his trials and difficulties it will remind him that English hearts go with him,—ay, and better than English hearts, the heart of the Catholic Church throughout the broad world.”

The Bishop, in thanking the friends around him, characteristically told them that the prominent feeling in his mind was humiliation. He could not help thinking what a primitive Bishop would have felt at being praised by a body of the faithful, simply because he had done his duty to his Lord and the Church. In the early days of the Christian Church it would have been taken for granted that he would do so. The Metropolitan went on to say that no fitter present could be made to a Christian Bishop. He trusted he might ever take his own place at the foot of the Cross, looking up to Him Who hangs thereon. Bishop Gray then said that this was his birthday—he that day entered on his fifty-ninth year, and was in the twenty-first of his Episcopate. He could not but feel that it was drawing to a close. After dwelling a short time on the history of his special troubles in Africa, he pronounced a fervent blessing on all, and the meeting separated, deeply moved. His private Journal of that day says, “Enter to-day my fifty-ninth year. The time is short—may I remember this, and live in the recollection of it.”

Amid all the bustle and excitement, the Bishop found time to write the following letter to his little daughter left at the Cape with her governess:—

“Wolverhampton, October 3rd, 1867.

“My dearest Flossy—I write to you amid great distraction a few lines, during the sitting of the Congress, on my birthday. We are all here, and I wish, dearest child, that you could be with us. . . . I have had a very exciting and anxious time at the Conference, but I hope now that the chief troubles are over. There is, however, plenty of work before me. I have sermons

and meetings already fixed for nearly every day for a very long time, and I suppose that I shall continue at this work almost daily as long as I am in England, but I sometimes fear I shall not stand the work. To-day I am to receive a great address, and a Pastoral Staff, and other things. I would shrink from all this if I could, but I cannot. From here we go to South Wales for Sunday, then back to the north, for Durham, Northumberland, and Yorkshire; then to London for committee meetings, etc. We have no resting place, and shall hardly be two days anywhere at one time. . . . You can read the History of Philip II. I am glad that you like the Sunday school. You can give little prizes for me if you wish it, and Fanny will pay for them. Be earnest, my child, in prayer. Pray at other times than at night and morning. Watch over your temper. Give my kind regards to Miss Moir, and remembrances to the servants.—Ever your affectionate father, R. CAPETOWN.

“I send you my blessing on my birthday.”

To the Dean of Cape Town Bishop Gray wrote :

“Wolverhampton, October 2nd.

“It is impossible to write fully to you. I have not had five minutes to myself at any one time for a month past. . . . Under God, I think the indignation aroused when it was known that the question was to be shirked [at Lambeth], and the firm attitude of the Americans, saved us. I believe that I could have carried my amendment, if I had opposed the Archbishop. . . . I have a wide field for work if I can go through it; nearly all England is now open to me. I have had invitations from full 300 parishes. I have been nearly done up.”

“October 4th, Day as before, except that I had to go out to reply to a savage article in the *Times*, evidently by ——.¹ Much worn and wearied by continued excitement. People all very kind and hearty.”

¹ The *Times* now refused to insert the Bishop's replies to the attacks upon him which it admitted—a line suggestive of a consciously weak cause surely.

From Wolverhampton the Bishop went to Archdeacon Clark, near Tenby, for meetings and preachings;—thence to Hereford, staying with Lady Emily Foley. A tour in the North in behalf of his Diocese followed, the Bishop being received everywhere with a warmth and enthusiasm which could not but cheer him, while he was greatly struck by the advanced tone of religion which met him. "Ten years ago, one could not have had such a service or such a congregation on a week day," he wrote from Scarborough. "The religious mind of England is evidently going in for greatly improved and more hearty services." The visit to all his old haunts in Durham and elsewhere was marred by the annoyance of spiteful articles in the *Times*—vexatious, however false,—the more so as that paper "continued to refuse to publish the refutations to its slanders." It seems unnecessary to give the letters here (they appeared in the *Standard* and *Guardian* at the time), inasmuch as all they said and the points they met have been already dealt with. Sleepless nights, too, were as usual entailed by anxiety and over-fatigue, the inevitable result of incessant work and harass. At Remington (where he arrived sermonless, Mrs. Gray having by mistake carried off his bag containing the sermon when she left him at Alnwick) he found a somewhat unusual procession—some thirty volunteers having spontaneously joined the intended church procession, some of them throwing surplices over their uniform, and entering the choir.

Returning south, the Bishop went (October 30th) to Ely, where he enjoyed both the cordial kindness of the Bishop and Mrs. Harold Brown, and the beauty of the Cathedral. Amid all the toil in which he was engaged, a considerable addition came upon the Bishop at this time, in the unsettled state of the question who was to be the new Bishop of Natal. The Archbishop had recently counselled Mr. Butler not to accept his election, on the ground that he was looked upon by many as an "extreme" man, and that in the existing state of Natal, a supposed party man would have less power for good than another. Immediately after the Lambeth Conference separated Bishop Gray had written to Mr. Butler as follows:—

" 21 Norfolk Square, September 28th, 1867.

" My dear Mr. Butler—I give you the earliest announcement of what has passed, with regard to Natal and yourself, in and out of Conference.

" I. As to the Church of that place. We had a preliminary meeting of Bishops, before the Congress, to consider what should be done, and it was agreed to submit a resolution to the Conference on the subject, which included the appointment of a Committee to decide on what should be done, and report to the adjourned Conference. The Conference altered the resolution on points which left the question, as was thought, too open. The Committee is to report to the Archbishop, and their report to be submitted to all Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

" II. The Conference has accepted and abides by the counsel tendered by the Province of Canterbury last year, as to the election of a Bishop, and appends their two resolutions to its own. These say that the election of a Bishop by the Church in Natal will not interrupt the communion of that Church with the Church of England, and point out a course to be followed in the election, which has been followed in yours.

" III. The Archbishop and the Bishop of Oxford are prepared to tell you that the hindrances, which led them to hesitate as to your course, are removed. But, of course, you will hear from them, and my intimation is confidential. The Archbishop subscribes to the support of the Bishop; and steps are already being taken to provide an income.

" There is only one other point upon which I ought to touch. A brother Clergyman has been talking on the subject of your views on the Eucharist, wishing his fears to be communicated to me. You will, I am sure, frankly and freely tell me if you have come to the conclusion that you cannot subscribe to the teaching of the Church of England on the subject, as that teaching is to be gathered from her various formularies. I myself believe that while distinct and emphatic on the point of transubstantiation, her language admits of a wide range of view within her pale on what are called "pious opinions." I

have not the least wish to narrow the liberty which she allows, and all that I have a right to ask is, Whether there is a conscious departure from her teaching, or an overstepping of the limits which she permits? I do not believe there is. I am sure that you would have told me before this, if such were the case. But I ask, because of the responsibility which attaches to my office, and the great interests involved.

“Though I grieve very much for your dear wife and friends, you will, I trust, be my fellow-labourer in my feeble efforts to plant the Kingdom of our Lord, in the fulness of its strength and beauty, in Africa. I cannot lament for you. You will have a heavier cross to bear than you have ever yet borne. You will be called to fill up some portion of the sufferings and afflictions of your Lord. You will have to wrestle not against the world only, but principalities and powers. But you will win a crown, and witness for Christ; and hand on the faith in Natal unimpaired. One thing only, my dear friend, I am anxious about. You must feel how weak in the faith your future flock is, and must long continue to be. They must be regarded as babes in Christ—be fed with milk and not with strong meat, until able to bear it. I should deeply lament, if anything were to throw poor waverers, ill instructed in the Faith, into the arms of the unbeliever. But we can talk over all these things hereafter.

“Of course, at present, I cannot say what is the next step to be taken. All that I am anxious about is that you should be consecrated before the adjourned Synod reassembles, and take your seat at it. I have had no time to think yet. If you have any suggestions to offer, pray make them.—Believe me ever, faithfully yours,
R. CAPETOWN.”

On October 6th the Metropolitan wrote again from Tenby, expressing the same hope as in the last letter, and saying that he was in communication with others about the question of consecration in its legal aspect; and again from Stainton Grange, October 15th. November 3rd he wrote from Manchester:

"My dear Mr. Butler—I am deeply grieved by your note. The delay in hearing from you aroused my apprehensions. I have no right to press the Archbishop, or to seem to force his acquiescence, in a course which he does not approve; but I have written to him, and put before him the difficulties to which his decision subjects us, and your desire for an interview. Will you let me have a copy of their (Archbishop and Bishop of Oxford) last joint letter to you? I thought that it committed the Archbishop. I have told the Archbishop that I can see nothing in the paper which you have signed which exceeds the limits allowed by the Church of England. There are, however, I need scarce say, some that think otherwise. Some of these have written to me, and probably to the Archbishop.—Believe me ever," etc.

"Shrewsbury, November 13th, 1867.

"My dear Mr. Butler—I heard from the Archbishop yesterday, and by the same post wrote to the African Bishops to meet me to-morrow in London, that we might take counsel together on this grave matter. I did not wish to write to you till I had seen them, and until I had heard from the Bishop of Oxford, to whom I have written, but from whom I have not yet heard. I am anxious to know whether he thinks that all hopes about you must be given up, in consequence of the Archbishop's views, before taking any definite step. I have at the same time, I need scarce say, felt very much for you, and have been most anxious to write to remove all painful suspense, but I thought that you would feel that nothing but my own state of uncertainty kept me silent. I did not think that the Archbishop would change his view, and he has not. He expresses his deep regret that he could not 'recommend' you to go out,—thinks that your doing so 'would tend rather to complicate matters than to settle them;' and that owing to the step you took in signing that document on the Eucharist.¹ He says, 'I

¹ A document put forth in June 1867, by certain Priests of the Church of England, vindicating themselves from the charge of disloyalty to their Mother Church, and putting forward clearly their belief as to the Holy Eucharist. (Appendix No. IX.)

had no right to condemn the doctrine therein propounded, but neither did I choose to endorse it; nor has anybody a right to call upon me to do so. I told Mr. Butler that I was ready to answer his two questions in the affirmative, but beyond that I could not advance without compromising myself in a way that I had no right to be called upon to do.'

"He says that in your first letter you 'thanked him for his advice, and announced great acquiescence in it. He is sorry to find that you are hurt, but he does not think that any personal explanations would do away with the impressions of others; that they will form their opinion by the document you have signed, and not by private explanations to him; and that he still apprehends that your going forth would create 'division of opinion among the faithful members of the Church in Natal.' On this ground he 'could not recommend you to go forth. But' (he adds) 'I am still of the same mind that a Bishop ought to go forth, and I shall cordially support the South African Bishops should they proceed to consecration.'

"Dr. Pusey has written to me to propose that I should consecrate you as my coadjutor, and that as such you should take present charge of Natal. But independently of the fact that you are less likely to be willing to go forth when 'dissuaded' by the Archbishop than you were when you felt that something more than acquiescence was needed, and that a positive recommendation was required, I have told him that (if he differs, of course I am wrong) such an act has always appeared to me to be uncanonical. I do not see that I have any right to supersede an election, or to substitute some other arrangement for a Diocesan Bishop. I am sure that the Natal Clergy and Laity would resent our doing so. And the more so because they have themselves limited our authority in this matter. They have elected you; the Bishops of the Province have confirmed the election. I cannot set these acts aside; but they have decided that if anything should prevent your going out, the Bishop of Graham's Town and myself, with the concurrence of the Archbishop, are to choose another. This, it seems to me, is the only course open to us, if you cannot go out as

Diocesan Bishop. I fear that it is coming to this, that we are not to have you, and I need hardly tell you that I *very* deeply regret it; for, in spite of the document (and your signature *would* have been a hindrance to your influence in the present state of things), I should have been thankful if it had been decided for you to go. . . I would wish that any [published] letter from me should be written after I had taken counsel with the other Bishops of the Province.—Believe me ever, my dear friend, faithfully and affectionately yours,

“R. CAPETOWN.”

On November 12th Bishop Gray records in his Journal the receipt of “a very nice letter from the Archbishop, saying that he felt unable to *recommend* Butler to go out, believing that his having signed the paper on the Eucharist would tend to complicate rather than settle matters in Natal. All that he could do would be to acquiesce. This practically settles the matter. All must be begun *de novo*. The Archbishop still thinks that a Bishop must go out, and will give every help in his power to the African Bishops.”

On the 14th he wrote to Mr. Butler: “If you publish the Archbishop’s letter to you, ought you with it not to publish the joint letter of his Grace and the Bishop of Oxford acquiescing in your going? It seems important for the sake of the Church that it should be understood that what the Archbishop shrinks from is the responsibility of *recommending* you to go. . . . His letter to me puts his view in a fair light. . . . God help us and guide us. I feel much down-hearted at having to go over the whole work again, and I feel also the pain caused to you.”

Mr. Butler sent the following letter to the *Guardian* of November 21, 1867:—

“Sir—Will you have the kindness to publish the accompanying extract from a letter received by me from the Archbishop of Canterbury?

“When, at the end of last year, the news of my election to the See of Pieter Maritzburg first reached me, the circumstances

of the case appeared to me so novel and so important that I felt myself bound in common prudence to look to those for counsel who, from their position of authority, were most able both to give it, and also to assist in meeting the difficulties which could not fail to surround an effort, made in the face of keen and intelligent opposition, to win for the Church in the Colonies her true and rightful privilege of unfettered religious action. I therefore placed myself unreservedly at the disposal of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. He has come to the conclusion, after—it cannot be doubted—much careful consideration, that some other than I will best satisfy the requirements of the Diocese, and it would be both ungrateful and unbecoming in me to dispute his decision. It will be seen, therefore, that, whatever regret or pain this somewhat unexpected result has caused, I have no course left but to decline the honourable, if anxious, post of Bishop over the orthodox members of the Church of Natal.

WILLIAM BUTLER.

“Wantage Vicarage, November 18th, 1867.”

“Addington Park, October 29th, 1867.

“I have come to the conclusion that I ought to dissuade you from availing yourself of your election to the See of Pieter-Maritzburg. To my mind, the appointment of any one of very marked opinions to the See, would be open to serious objections, and it would be better to select some one more calculated to meet the various shades of religious opinion that exist among faithful members of the Church of England in the Colony of Natal’”

The Bishop of Oxford wrote: “No doubt, so far as we can see, if our dear Archbishop had seen his way to stand firm, Butler would wonderfully have restored all things.”

It was a heavy time, and Bishop Gray felt sometimes as if he stood almost alone. “Though I have been called to defend the chief matters which Evangelicals pride themselves on maintaining more than others,” he wrote (November 7th), “*e.g.* the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the doctrines of Original Sin, the sacrifice of our Lord upon the cross as an expiation for sin;

justification by faith, etc.—that school not only stands aloof and renders me no support, but even strives to induce others to do so. It was only the other day that I was told that a party of Clergy of this school met together and denounced one of their number who had expressed his intention of being present at a sermon and meeting of mine. Oh the power of party spirit!”

On November 15th the Metropolitan met the Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State, and they agreed to lose no time in seeking for some one who might be able and willing to go to Natal in place of Mr. Butler. But it was a grievous disappointment to him, and he did not scruple to say so.¹ While diligently seeking a substitute, his innumerable engagements had to be kept, and the strain of perpetual preaching, and worse, talking, to be kept up. Now and then some unexpected outburst of genial love and sympathy would cheer him up (who was ever so open to cordiality and affection) as, *e.g.*,

¹ The Bishop wrote to Mr. Butler :

“February 7th, 1868.

“My dear Butler—I should hardly have thought that any one would put an unfavourable interpretation on my remark that ‘circumstances of a personal nature’ had led you after all to decline ; but as this has been the case, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe you were fully prepared to make the sacrifice which the going out to Natal would have demanded of you, had it not been for expressions used by the Archbishop in a private letter to yourself, as to your individual fitness for the post in consequence of your having signed a certain document. The Archbishop formally announced to you, that in his judgment the difficulties which he and the Bishop of Oxford had raised to your acceptance of the post were removed. This letter you felt to be cold, as it undoubtedly was. You then wrote to his Grace seeking earnest counsel and encouragement in a great and trying undertaking. And this drew from his Grace the private letter relating to yourself personally, which led you, to our great regret, to feel that some other person than yourself ought to go forth to the work. That you were fully justified, under the circumstances, in coming to the decision which you did, I have never doubted ; and that most men would feel that no other course was open to them, I am fully persuaded. I am very sorry that any expression of mine should have caused you uneasiness.”

The Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Oxford :

“November 8th, 1867.

“Butler writes me word that he is still ready to go, if his Grace's difficulties can be removed. It is as unfair to him and his character, as it is to us, that all allusions to these personal disqualifications should have been reserved till the last.”

when in the same dreary season some deputations from the Wells, Bristol, and Monmouthshire Church Unions came to offer their hearty thanks for the Metropolitan's defence of the Faith, a great deal of most warm and deep feeling kindling those who presented themselves. "Dear Bishop Gray!" (a member of that deputation of November 18th, 1867, writes) "How well I remember going over to Clifton from here and back in one day with a deputation from Monmouthshire we had got up, to present him with a red velvet purse containing some sovereigns and an address illuminated on a small piece of vellum (which pleasant task fell to my share); and how cold and foggy the weather was, and how hot and enthusiastic we were, and how tired we were afterwards; but all so pleased at having had a word with the champion of the Faith, and a shake of the hand from the good Bishop."

The Metropolitan returned to London, where meetings and committees at S. P. G. occupied him largely. In his Journal these are briefly recorded:—

"*November 21st*, All day in committee at S. P. G. Got through a fair amount of work. Great Ritual meeting in S. James's Hall.

"*22nd*, Another long day at S. P. G. Settled the Spiritual Court of final Appeal for Colonies, America, and Scotland. The Bishop of Illinois representing the United States, and urging strongly their desire for one common final Court of Appeal on matters of Faith. The whole battle was on the point as to whether Bishops and Priests could be judged by any other than their peers; whether any but Bishops could constitute the Court. Oxford, Gibraltar, Bishop Chapman, Christ Church, Free State, and I, were main supporters against—some were on neither side, but leaning against layman judging Bishops. We are indebted to the Bishop of Oxford for our existing Court, which is much the same as I at first proposed:—Elective by Bishops of Provinces: Canterbury, and York, each 3; Ireland, 2; Scotland, 2; America, 5; each Colonial Province, 2; Dioceses not included in a Province, 1. We have now gone through a great deal. Our Metropolitan Court was fixed upon

this principle. In each case we are to have assessors *as advisers*. In the final Court 3 theologians and 3 learned in the law.

" 23rd, Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State to breakfast to discuss men for Natal. Went over all the names in my book and letters about them. Resolved that I should in first instance write to the Bishop of Gloucester about —— and —— . Went to meet Miss Mackenzie and Mr. Williams about a Missionary Bishop to Zululand; took them a paper signed by the three African Bishops commending the effort to the Church.

" 26th, S. P. G. Long day in Committee over Synods. Bishop of Ely helped us much. Offered Natal to How.

" 27th, Meeting again at S. P. G. Discussed the subject of a future General Council of the Anglican Communion; agreed upon terms, etc.

" 28th, Morning given to Advent Sermons and letters amid interruptions. Afternoon seeing Badnall, Hawkins, Sir W. P. Wood, Mowbray, and Gladstone. Went at Gleig's request to War Office to settle about military Chaplains coming under Bishops of Dioceses. S. P. G. Standing Committee.

" 29th, S. P. G. at 11. Committee agreed upon the principles of a Bill respecting Colonial Churches to be laid before Government; also upon Declarations to be made by Colonial Bishops at Consecration, and by Clergy at Ordination and Consecration. How declines Natal. Wrote to offer the post to Mr. Hamilton of Bristol. Was told confidentially that New Zealand is to go to Lichfield. He was offered it a month ago and refused. Professor Lightfoot and Cookson, head of a House in Cambridge, were then offered it and declined. Then New Zealand was asked again, and said he was the servant of the Church, and that if the Archbishop asked him, he would do what was desired. The Archbishop has asked him, and he is to see the Queen to-morrow.

" *S. Andrew's Day*, Early Celebration at S. Michael's. The daily prayers are very fairly attended at eight o'clock every morning in this church. Service at S. Andrew's, Wells Street.

Crowded church; afterwards tea-drinking in the New Music Hall, Langham Place. I suppose 1200 present. Mission Women, Confraternity of Young Girls, of which there are three degrees, Adult Night Schools, Day Schools, Infant do.,—all very hearty. Then speeches; then music. Lord Nelson in the chair. He and Hope made effective speeches. Bishop Tozer and I said a few words.

“*December 1st*, Preached in the morning at S. Andrew's Church. Crowded to excess. A very glorious service; the finest choir, I believe, in London. There were three celebrations to-day, and six services. 330 Communicants. Dined with Mr. Webb, and had some talk about the condition of the Church in London, and Ritualism. . . . Walked to St. Cyprian's for the evening service. This is a little Mission Chapel constructed out of two small houses, a coal-shed, and a stable; would not hold 200. Mr. Gutch has a district of 3000 taken out of Llewellyn Davies' district of 29,000—itself a district taken out of Marylebone. Out of Mr. Davies' district 11,000 have been taken off and given to a church capable of holding 500, and this is all the provision for the spiritual needs of these souls which the Church has yet made. Mr. Gutch has a small Sisterhood living in part of the building;—the Clergy live in a Clergy house. Three are maintained by the Offertory. They cannot get a site for a church, and doubt whether Lord P——, who holds nearly all the property in the district, will sell one to them, though he has just done so for the Jews. The little chapel was crowded.

“*2nd*, Letters for Cape and Natal mail communicating the failure as regards Butler, and the steps now being taken.

“*3rd*, Interview with Mr. Dodd, who laid his views respecting legal proceedings *in re* Natal before the Archbishop, Bishop of Oxford, and myself. Committee afterwards all day *in re* legislation by Imperial Parliament for Colonial Churches.

“*4th, 5th*, Committee again all day.

“*6th*, Committee. Went down to Eton for dinner on Founder's Day. Five Eton Bishops present; much speechifying. Back late at night with Walpole.

" 7th, Preparing Advent Sermons. To Cambridge in the afternoon; guests of the Master of Clare.

" 8th, Long day. Celebration at 8 for Members of Propagation Union at S. Mary's. Sermon at 11 at All Saints' University Sermon at 2. Dr. Prichard, President of the Astronomical Society, preached one of the Hulsean Lectures. Dined in Trinity College Hall. Service again at S. Mary's; preached for my Mission. Afterwards attended a meeting of the Propagation Union in King's; talked for an hour and a half. Got home very tired. Day intensely cold; thermometer down to 14°; snow falling, which affected the congregations.

" 9th, Returning calls. Looked at the beautiful chapel in S. John's which Scott is building. It is to cost more than £40,000. Also at the New Courts of Trinity, for which the late Master left £70,000. Chapel at Kings'. Dined in hall afterwards, and attended a gathering at G. Williams' rooms of an Association for Theological Study and Good Works; addressed them. Public meeting afterwards at 8.30; Master of Magdalen in the Chair. . . . Religious feeling in Cambridge said to be lukewarm. Broad Church views somewhat spread, but no very definite unbelief; the younger men better than their immediate predecessors. The members of the University increasing. No great number of dissenters avail themselves of increased facilities.

" 10th. Off at 7.30 A.M. to London for Lambeth Conference; reached just before 11. Twenty-nine¹ Bishops were present, fairly representing the body of English Bishops—Archbishop, London, Oxford, Ely, Lincoln, Chester, Rochester; of Colonials, the three Metropolitans, Graham's Town, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Perth, Gibraltar, Bishop Smith, Hobhouse, Free State, Honolulu, Tozer, Christ Church, Chapman, Labuan, Huron; of Scotch Bishops only the Primus. There were three Americans; Illinois, Tennessee, and ———.

" The first subject after prayer was the bringing up of the

¹ The printed report by the *Colonial Church Chronicle* says that there were forty Bishops present; but it seems probable that the Bishop of Cape Town is more nearly accurate.

Reports of Committees. The Archbishop first laid the Natal Report upon the table, and seemed to think that nothing could be done with it, or the eight other Reports. He and the Bishop of London had evidently been conferring on the subject and come to this conclusion, for the Bishop of London made a strong speech in support of this view, objecting on principle to the rump of the Conference settling anything, and urging that we could not discuss the Reports in a week. I rose to object, and to move the adoption of the first Report. Others spoke strongly to the same effect as myself, declaring that if we met only to receive reports and do nothing, we had better not have met at all: Primus of Scotland, Bishops of Oxford, Rochester, Nova Scotia, Montreal, Illinois, and others taking this view. Ultimately the Bishop of Montreal drew up a substitute, which the Bishop of Oxford seconded, to the effect that each Report be read and received, published, recommended earnestly to the consideration of the Church, and that the Committees be thanked for their care and labour. As the Bishop of London and others felt that there must be considerable discussion in each case, if the Reports were debated point by point, and many felt that there would not be time for this, I consented to withdraw my motion in favour of the Bishop of Montreal's. Each Report was then read, slightly canvassed, and the Resolution agreed upon adopted with regard to each. After going through eight, not including Natal, the Archbishop consulted the Synod whether the American Church should have a copy of the whole proceedings, including the debates. This was agreed to, but not for publication. As the proceedings seemed likely to close without any further reference to the Natal Report, I rose, and in, I fear, rather a warm speech, urged that it should be treated precisely as the other Reports had been dealt with; pointing out that if it were not done, and this were the only Report of which the Conference took no notice, it would be said that it had disapproved of it, and that it would go forth to the world at a great disadvantage as compared with the other Reports; that the shelving of this Report would be an act of injustice to the South African Church, and give fresh moral support to Dr.

Colenso; that he owed his present position very largely to the course pursued by the Bishops of the English Church, and that I trusted the Conference would never consent still more to weaken our hands; that I did not think there was anything in the objection that the Conference had ordered the Report to be made to the Archbishop and communicated by him to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion—this would still be done, but that if no action were taken with reference to the Report, we should feel aggrieved. The Bishop of Rochester seconded my motion; the Bishops of Nova Scotia, Illinois, Oxford, Montreal, and others warmly supported it.

“The Archbishop very graciously conceded the point; the Bishop of London offered very slight opposition, and altogether to-day acted nicely. It was resolved also that this particular Report should be communicated to the Colonial Bishops Council.¹

“The only subject fully debated in the afternoon was the Bill to be introduced into the Imperial Parliament, with reference to the position of Colonial Clergy and the property of the Church. All the conclusions arrived at by the Committee were assented to, and a Sub-committee appointed to see to the drafting of a Bill, and submitting it to the Government. Little more remained to be done. The Primus of Scotland moved, and I seconded, a Resolution asking the President to express to the Russian Church the sympathy of the Anglican Communion with it, under the loss it had sustained by the death of its eminent Metropolitan Philarete. I would have done more with reference to the subject of intercommunion with the Greek Orthodox Church, but other Bishops thought more could not now be done. The Bishop of Graham’s Town and his assistant secretaries were heartily and unanimously thanked for the important services which they had rendered in preparing matter for the Committees; and the Archbishop was once more warmly thanked for summoning the Conference, and his conduct of it. And then this most important gathering, whose conclusions are destined

¹ These Reports were officially published under the title “Meeting of Adjourned Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion.” (Rivingtons.)

to exercise so great an influence on the whole future of the Churches of our Communion, both at home and abroad, came to a close, the Archbishop giving the final blessing."

Interesting as are all the Reports which went forth as the result of this Synod, and important as regards the whole Colonial Church, and therein to the South African Church, we can only find room here to insert that one which most especially concerns the subject of these memoirs, *i.e.* the

"Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution VI. of the Lambeth Conference.¹

"By the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference, two questions were referred to the Committee:—

"I. How the Church may be delivered from a continuance of the scandal now existing in Natal?

"II. How the true Faith may be maintained?

"I. On the first question, the Committee recommend that an address be made to the Colonial Bishops Council, calling their attention to the fact that they are paying an annual stipend to a Bishop lying under the imputation of heretical teaching, and praying them to take the best legal opinion as to there being any, and, if so, what, mode of laying these allegations before some competent Court; and if any mode be pointed out, then to proceed accordingly for the removal of this scandal.

"The Committee also recommend that the address to the Colonial Bishops Council be prefaced with the following statement:—

" "That whilst we accept the spiritual validity of the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Metropolitan and Bishops of the South African Church upon Dr. Colenso, we consider it of

¹ The Resolution was, "That, in the judgment of the Bishops now assembled, the whole Anglican Communion is deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal; and that a Committee be now appointed at this general meeting to report on the best mode in which the Church may be delivered from a continuance of this scandal, and the true Faith maintained. That such Report shall be forwarded to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that he will be pleased to transmit the same to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and to ask their judgment thereon."

the utmost moment, for removing the existing scandal from the English Communion, that there should be pronounced by some competent English Court such a legal sentence on the errors of the said Dr. Colenso as would warrant the Colonial Bishops Council in ceasing to pay his stipend, and would justify an appeal to the Crown to cancel his letters patent.'

"II. On the second question: 'How the true Faith may be maintained in Natal?' the Committee submit the following report:—

"That they did not consider themselves instructed by the Conference, and therefore did not consider themselves competent, to inquire into the whole case; but that their conclusions are based upon the following facts:

"1. That in the year 1863, *forty-one* Bishops concurred in an address to Bishop Colenso urging him to resign his Bishopric.

"2. That in the year 1863, some of the publications of Dr. Colenso—viz. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined, Parts I. and II.*—were condemned by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

"3. That the Bishop of Cape Town, by virtue of his letters patent as Metropolitan, might have visited Dr. Colenso with summary jurisdiction, and might have taken out of his hands the management of the Diocese of Natal.

"4. That the Bishop of Cape Town, instead of proceeding summarily, instituted judicial proceedings, having reason to believe himself to be competent to do so.

"That he summoned Dr. Colenso before himself and Suffragans.

"That Dr. Colenso appeared by his proctor.

"That his defence was heard, and judged to be insufficient to purge him from the heresy.

"That, after sentence was pronounced, Dr. Colenso was offered an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as provided in the Metropolitan's letters patent.

"5. That this act of the African Church was approved—

"By the Convocation of Canterbury.

“ ‘By the Convocation of York.

“ ‘By the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States in 1865.

“ ‘By the Episcopal Synod of the Church in Scotland.

“ ‘By the Provincial Synod of the Church in Canada in 1865.

“ ‘And, finally, the spiritual validity of the sentence of deposition was accepted by *fifty-six* Bishops on the occasion of the Lambeth Conference.’

“Judging, therefore, that the See is spiritually vacant, and learning by the evidence brought before them that there are many members of the Church who are unable to accept the ministrations of Dr. Colenso, the Committee deem it to be the duty of the Metropolitan and other Bishops of South Africa to proceed, upon the election of the Clergy and Laity in Natal, to consecrate one to discharge those spiritual functions of which these members of the Church are now in want.

“In forwarding their report to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, as instructed by the resolution of the Conference, the Committee request his Grace to communicate the same to the adjourned meeting of the Conference, to be holden at Lambeth on the 10th day of the present month.

“G. A. NEW ZEALAND, *Convener.*”

The Bishop of Cape Town continued his persevering efforts to find a fitting Bishop for Natal—an undertaking the difficulty of which became only too apparent. What was there to induce any man to leave home and friends, and everything precious to him—body and mind—for that unhappy, distraught, wellnigh despairing country, save indeed the consciousness of throwing himself into the breach for the sake of his Lord and the Faith? And how natural it was that one good man after another should mistrust his own capacity for the fearfully difficult and responsible post; or doubt whether he was called by God to it!

The Bishop’s Journals are full of his attempts¹ and disap-

¹ “I need not say that I am in active correspondence about men,” he wrote (December 2nd, 1867) to Archdeacon Thomas. “I have heard of thirty, but the

pointments ; he and his brother Bishops, English and Colonial, working together indefatigably. Meanwhile he was not idle in other respects.

" *December 11th*, Colonial Church Council Committee. Subjects, appointment to the See of Gibraltar, foundation of the South American See at the Falkland Islands, discussion as to legal proceedings *in re* Natal. Agreed that there should be a day fixed for the discussion of this, but that I should first wait to see the course pursued with regard to legal proceedings in Natal.

" *13th*, Letter from Hamilton declining Natal. Meeting at Freemasons' Hall of members of E. C. U., they having intimated through their president a desire to help forward the endowment fund for a Bishop in Natal. About 200 members present. . . . S. Alban's Guild brought a subscription list to the extent of £40 for five years.

" *14th*, South African Bishops met to discuss Bishop Tozer's proposition about separating his Mission from the Province of South Africa, and annexing it to the See of Canterbury, and also to consider who next to be invited to go out to Natal. Agreed that I should write to the Archbishop to request his Grace, if a vacancy should occur in the Central African See, to consecrate, without waiting for communication from Cape Town. Did not agree to separate at present that Mission from the South African Province, chiefly because the Church of England has as yet made no provision for regulating unattached Missionary Dioceses, and had established no system for the trial of a Missionary Bishop. Agreed to inquire more fully about the

misfortune is that for this very delicate and trying post almost every gift and grace are required, and the men who are fit for it have either found their work or are too young. . . . I doubt whether I shall be able before this mail leaves to say Eureka ! " Among the priests proposed was the Rev. A. R. Ashwell, now Canon of Chichester, and Principal of the Theological College there, of whom the Metropolitan writes to Bishop Wilberforce, "There is no doubt about his ability and soundness." And again he writes to the same: "My experience makes me feel very strongly that men are looking for *calls*. Our system has been that they shall be *candidates*. . . . Several men would have gone to Independent Kaffraria, if *called*."

Rev. W. K. Macrorie for the See of Natal,¹ and agreed also upon a list to be invited in succession. Left in the afternoon for Warminster.

"15th, Preached morning in the parish church: afternoon in a new church by Street.

"16th, Inspected the Mission Institution. Meeting, then large party of parishioners. Not a moment's quiet the whole day.

"17th, Wantage. Long talk with Butler about men. Barff, strongly recommended by Bishop of Oxford, and H. Barter, strongly recommended by Butler, came over to see me. Barter is very nice, but too young to be put over — and —. He told me that he felt so much that he would go out if called (as I thought) to any post. I liked very much all I saw of Barff. . . . Very large meeting in the evening, and parishioners in afterwards till midnight."

Thence the Bishop went (after an early celebration in the Home) on the 18th to the Rev. Sir George Prevost at Stinchcombe, and after a service and meeting at Dursley he mentions having "walked back with old Mr. Davis, aged eighty-two, called the George Herbert of the Forest, a very good old man full of life and wisdom." Both here and at Gloucester good men were mentioned to the Bishop for Natal. At the latter place he visited the Sisterhood of S. Lucy and its Children's Hospital with great interest, saying Nones in the Chapel, preaching both at S. Mark's and S. Aldate's, and going on to Highnam Court, where on S. Thomas's Day he attended the services in "the beautiful church built by Mr. Gambier Parry, perhaps the most highly decorated church in England. He himself has painted the chancel, etc.; he finished the roof of Ely Cathedral, has just finished a chapel in Gloucester Cathedral, and has built the Home and Hospital."

"It requires some effort to keep up," the Bishop writes December 22nd, "preaching on one subject unceasingly." Nevertheless he went on, now to Taunton, where, as in so

¹ "I have written to Macrorie, even the Bishop of London approving of him."
—*Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, December 23rd, 1867.

many places, he was met with an address of thanks for his defence of the Faith. Bournemouth followed, where he preached on Christmas morning in the parish church, one which the Bishop always specially admired, and in which he frequently expressed his delight. Hastening to London with the intention of meeting Mr. Macrorie (who, among the six or seven men now proposed for Natal, was first), he and Mrs. Gray found so dense a fog that they could scarce get to Norfolk Square; but Mr. Macrorie had been delayed, and they did not meet until the 28th, when, together with the Bishop of Graham's Town, they had a long conference. Going on the 29th to preach at Tottenham, the Bishop was struck by the number of large dissenting chapels which he passed on the way. "Our system is radically defective," he remarks, pondering over this, "through overgrown Dioceses. Theoretically we have the most perfect system—Bishops, Archdeacons, Rectors, Parishes, Synods,—but all are fast becoming mere names."

The year 1867 was ended at S. Leonard's, where the Bishop and Mrs. Gray were Mr. Vaughan's guests; and after services and a meeting, they returned late at night in intense cold to London, and on the Circumcision 1868, the Bishop preached at Ealing. On January 4th Mr. Macrorie's¹ decision to accept the Bishopric in Natal was received; and now began a series of fresh annoyances and difficulties as to the place of consecration, involving days of harassing toil and many a sleepless night for him on whom thus fell the care of his poor African Churches. He was continually moving, too, from one place to another, for services and meetings, involving occasional delay in receiving his letters,—*e.g.* "January 8th, All early morning spent in hunting over Oxford for my bag of documents, which was not taken out of the fly last night. Heard that yesterday's letters, probably including letters from the Archbishop, Macrorie, and others of great importance, were mis-

¹ The Rev. W. K. Macrorie had been a Master at Radley, after which he held the living of Wapping, and at the time of his appointment to the Bishopric he was incumbent of Accrington in Lancashire. "You see I have my Bishop," the Metropolitan wrote (January 16th). "Everybody—Moberly, Burgon, etc.—that I meet with who knows him, speaks most highly of him."

sent. Cannot now write definitely about the consecration of a Bishop by this mail to Natal or the Cape, or make a single step in making arrangements. Knocked up with anxiety.

"*January 10th*, Leamington; Celebration. Sermon. Letters from Macrorie finally accepting,¹ and from the Archbishop approving. Wrote to the latter for leave to consecrate in his Diocese.

"*January 11th*, Letter from the Primus of Scotland promising help, if need be, for the consecration in Scotland, and recommending Edinburgh. Letter from Archbishop at night, consenting to the consecration within his Province, and if desired, within his Diocese.

"*January 13th*, Bishop of Graham's Town to breakfast. Satisfied with Archbishop's sanction of consecration in his Province and Diocese. Wrote to African Bishops for formal confirmation of the election. At 10 to Windsor. Called on Carter at Clewer, and at the Home upon Mrs. Monsell, about Sisters. Marvellous are the works which Carter has erected—the Home, Orphanage, Convalescent Hospital; now a new building close to Windsor, and a new church.² The Sisterhood is spreading all over England. I told him that he was becoming the General of an Order; and he admitted it. Went to the Courtenays in the Cloisters. Windsor Castle to luncheon. View of Eton Chapel and the reaches of the river very fine.

"*January 14th*, Cuddesden. The Bishop of Oxford wrote to the Dean of Canterbury about the Cathedral, I to Bailey about the consecration at St. Augustine's. Invited Bishops of Montreal, Nova Scotia, Christ Church, and Tennessee, to assist. Prepared the formal deed for the consecration in concert with S. Oxon and Woodford.³

"*January 15th*, Finished the consecration document with the Clergy now gathered. Burgon offers S. Mary's, and eager to help. Rode with S. Oxon to Newnham. Much confidential

¹ Since Mr. Macrorie's acceptance on the 4th, his family had urged him to reconsider the step, and although he had not retracted, some doubt had been left on Bishop Gray's mind as to whether, after all, he might go.

² St. Stephen's Mission Church, Clewer.

³ Now Bishop of Ely.

talk with him about questions under consideration relating to the Church." Bishop Gray next visited Hungerford, Newbury, and Hambleden, where, on January 20th, he received "anxious letters about the consecration. Primus of Scotland writes that the Bishop of London has sent a long and grave letter, of so weighty a character, remonstrating against our consecrating in Scotland, that he has summoned a Synod of Bishops for the 23rd, to consider the question, and urging a postponement. Violent articles in the *Times*, *Spectator*, and *Pall Mall* and a furious letter from 'an enraged Priest.' Verily Satan sees his kingdom shaken!

"*January 21st*, Wrote to Burgon, to accept his offer of S. Mary's for the consecration; to Bishop of Oxford to say that I see no other course open. Evidently the enemies of the truth and of the freedom of the Church are on the alert."

Difficulties and hindrances were thickening. On January 13th, 1868, the Metropolitan wrote to the *Guardian*, to satisfy the general desire to know that a Bishop for Natal had been found:—

"Sir—There are many who will rejoice to hear that one has at length been elected to the office of Bishop of the Church in Natal. The appointment has been made by the Metropolitan and the Bishop of Graham's Town, in concurrence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, in accordance with the following resolution" [here the resolution passed at Pieter Maritzburg, October 25, 1866, is given]. "The person chosen for this difficult post is the Rev. W. K. Macrorie, M.A., of Brazenose College, Oxford, formerly a Master of Radley College, afterwards Incumbent of Wapping, and since presented to the living of S. James', Accrington, by the Hulme Trustees. The place and time for the consecration have not yet been definitely fixed.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to state what has been done towards making a provision for the new Bishop until the endowment shall revert to the Church. A committee has been formed for the purpose of raising the required income. The Rev. and Hon. H. Douglas, Hanbury, Bromsgrove, and the Rev. Canon Seymour, Kinwarton, Alcester, have kindly consented to

act as secretaries. It has, however, almost of necessity, fallen upon me to guarantee an income. I have promised that £600 a year shall be forthcoming so long as it may be needed, and that the expenses of passage, etc., shall be paid.

“The committee has received promises of subscriptions amounting to about £700 a year for five years, and nearly £1000 has been given in donations. The subscriptions, owing to deaths, removals, and other accidental circumstances, can hardly be estimated as producing £600 a year for five years. At the expiration of that term we may, therefore, be placed in very difficult circumstances, if a better provision be not made. I am sure that Churchmen would not wish this responsibility to remain with me. What we most need at this time is a guarantee fund in case of its being required. Some have suggested that an annuity should be purchased for the period of Dr. Colenso’s life. I should be thankful if this could be done, as it would relieve all parties from anxiety.”

The result of this was that on January 22nd the Bishop of Cape Town received a letter in Norfolk Square from the Bishop of London, which was in the *Times*, together with a leader to back it up before the Metropolitan received it. He was going to Hereford for a confirmation, but feeling the importance of meeting this attack from so high a quarter in the best way, the Bishop telegraphed to put off his engagement at Hereford, and went at once to Cuddesden to consult the Bishop of Oxford, who, meanwhile, was on his way to London! The Metropolitan went to Oxford, where he found most of his friends absent; and while consulting with Mr. Bright, a telegram came from the Bishop of Oxford urging him to come at once to London, which he was just able to do by the last train, and reach Norfolk Square too late to do anything that night, except to find that the Bishop of Oxford and Graham’s Town had been telegraphing for him in every direction.

The next morning (January 23rd) the Metropolitan, the Bishops of Salisbury, Graham’s Town, and Free State, and Mr. Macrorie, met at the Bishop of Oxford’s at breakfast, and discussed the whole matter, after which the Metropolitan wrote a

private, and also an official letter, signed by the other African Bishops, to the Archbishop on the subject of the consecration. Sir Roundell Palmer had expressed his opinion "that Colonial Bishops' consecration in England would be a violation of the Act of Uniformity." The Bishops took their letter to the Archbishop themselves, "saying we meant to apply to the Scotch Bishops, and had a right to ask his strong support. He concurred, and said that he would send an official reply as speedily as possible; was then going to the Ecclesiastical Commission, and from thence to the Ritual Commission. Telegraphed to Scotch Bishops asking leave, as their Synod was to meet to-day. Wrote letters in every direction, announcing that the consecration would not take place on Saturday,¹ and to most of the Scotch Bishops. Telegram in reply from the Primus asking further information as to election,—legal hindrances,—reasons why we should not consecrate in Africa. Got my reply off by 9 P.M.

"*January 24th*, Breakfast at S. Oxon's—Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State and Macrorie there. Received letters from Bishops of Edinburgh and Brechin speaking of their great difficulties, evidently intended to lead me to withdraw my application, but saying that, if necessary, the Scotch Bishops would, they trusted, do their duty. The Bishop of Oxford concurred with me in not withdrawing my application. Read my reply to the Bishop of London to the Bishops—they all approved of it, and S. Oxon helped me to improve it. Back home to see if there was any letter from the Archbishop, and down again to meet Bishop of Oxford. Long talk with Sir R. Phillimore about legal proceedings. He strongly dissuades proceeding in Queen's Bench by *scire facias*. Thinks the Trustees might, when Colenso's new book comes out, take proceedings on the score of being compelled to pay heresy. Very tired with labour of body and mind, and much anxiety. Late in the evening a messenger left a letter at my door from the Archbishop of York, remonstrating as to the consecration.

¹ It had been proposed to consecrate the new Bishop on S. Paul's Day (January 25th), 1868.

“*January 25th*, The Archbishop of York’s letter appeared in the *Times* this morning, with an article in support of it. Very meanly and uncourteously do these great Prelates treat a brother in thus sending their agitating letters to the public press before they send them to him! This morning came a public, and also a private letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury. He wishes to publish the reply to our letter to him, but not our letter itself, as it would show his vacillation! I wrote to tell him I could not be the medium of so doing . . . and quoted my correspondence with his Grace, showing how he had changed his mind. Wrote also a private letter to the Archbishop of York, rebuking him for his want of courtesy, and telling him that I would reply publicly.” The whole of this correspondence was published at the time, and will be found in an accompanying volume containing Bishop Gray’s printed letters and Charge. It is therefore unnecessary to quote more of it here than is required for historical purposes. The Metropolitan’s reply to the Bishop of London is grave and dignified. He states—

“I. That I think there has been nothing in our past conduct which would warrant your assuming that we should proceed to consecrate without that assent of the Metropolitan and Bishop of the Diocese which alone would make it canonical. Most certainly we contemplated no such step.

“II. That throughout all these proceedings, I have been in consultation with the Primate of all England, your Lordship’s Metropolitan, and have in every question yielded a glad assent to his Grace’s decision.

“III. That the Church in South Africa having been declared by the highest Court of Appeal in England to be not established by law, but a voluntary association; in the same position, in no better, but in no worse, than other religious bodies; and the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury having in its resolution of June 29th, 1865, recognised its position as such; it is entitled to exercise all the rights and liberties of such an association, without interference on the part of your Lordship and others with those rights.”

“ IV. . . . Letters patent conveying no jurisdiction, there is no infringement of legal rights which Dr. Colenso might be held in law to possess.

“ V. That as there appears to be doubt in your Lordship's mind, and the mind of others, as to the legality of the consecration in England, in consequence of the Act of Uniformity, which ordered the Queen's mandate to be inquired for, it has been thought right to avoid all possible infringement of the law, and that the consecration should not take place where the Act of Uniformity is in force.

“ VI. That, inasmuch as it is highly inconvenient, and almost impossible, that it could take place at this time in Africa, in consequence of my own necessary presence in England, and other substantial reasons, we sought and should have obtained, as I have reason to believe, from the Primus, the permission of the Bishops of the Church in Scotland for the consecration to take place there, had not his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, counselled, at the last moment, delay.

“ VII. That we had no *locus standi*, as the Bishops of what the law has declared to be a mere voluntary association, for making such an application as you charge us with having wrongfully omitted, to the officers of the Crown, as to the legality of such Bishop's consecration in England without the mandate; but that we have, for our own satisfaction and guidance, sought privately the opinion of eminent lawyers;— and that, though they do not altogether agree in view, it has been decided, in consequence of their opinion, that the consecration should not take place in England or Ireland, where only it could possibly be held to be illegal.

“ VIII. I should not have felt myself at liberty to state publicly what passed at the recent Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion; but as you have done so, and appeal to me for the accuracy of your report, I am constrained to say that I cannot concur in your statement. The facts were these: The great majority of Bishops at the Conference were eager to adopt a Resolution accepting the spiritual sentence by which Dr. Colenso was deposed. The President, being appealed to by the

Bishop of S. David's, ruled that he could not allow such a resolution to be submitted, without departing from an understanding which he had entered into with certain members of the Conference previous to its assembling. The matter was in consequence, and out of deference to his Grace, not pressed by myself to a decision. Of what the decision would have been had a division taken place, your Lordship can scarce be ignorant, inasmuch as it has been publicly stated that (independently of his Grace and the African Bishops, whose views were already declared) fifty-five members of the Conference were so dissatisfied with the conclusion arrived at, that they signed a Declaration at the time, and in the room, affirming and accepting the spiritual sentence, and placed the same in my hands; and I am at liberty to state, that several other Bishops were prepared to add their names, if they could have done so without apparently separating themselves from the President, who was debarred from joining by the possibility of having to sit in the highest Court of Appeal in judgment on the question."

" IX. Refutes a mis-statement as to the Report upon Natal already entered upon.

" X. You say, as you have frequently said before, that you believe Dr. Colenso's teaching to be 'dangerous;' that his See is not vacant; and that you believe that he can be and ought to be 'legally deposed.' In common with nearly the whole Episcopate of the Anglican Communion, I hold that, although he retains the title of Bishop of Natal by the Queen's letters patent (as the late Duke of York, though no Bishop, had the title of Bishop of Osnaburgh), he has been canonically deposed from his spiritual office. I could not therefore adopt any proceedings with a view to do what I hold to be already done, even if I believed that there was any Court in England which has by law a right to try and depose him, which I do not. It would be uncanonical and unprecedented for a Metropolitan, under any circumstances, to apply to a purely secular Court to depose one of his Suffragans. In this case I have throughout acted as judge, and not as accuser; and I do not think it consistent with my duty to ignore the functions of my office.

With your views, however, I cannot understand why you have not taken legal proceedings. You were urged to do so five years ago, at our Conference on the subject. You then strenuously affirmed that it was my duty to proceed in my own Metropolitan Court. I have done all that could be required of me; but inasmuch as all Dr. Colenso's heretical writings have been published in your Lordship's Diocese, and within your jurisdiction, it would seem that if proceedings can be taken to deprive him of his letters patent, the duty of moving in the matter rests upon your Lordship far more than upon any other Bishop of the Church.

"XI. I do not see any force in your objection drawn from the words of the Consecration Service,¹ provided that there be no illegality in the act of Convocation—the only sense in which they can be used by any voluntary society being that there is nothing in the act which those who use the words are doing which is contrary to the laws of the realm. The Rubric, which requires the consecrating Bishop to demand the Queen's Mandate is, and only can be fulfilled, where no Mandate can issue, by the statement of that fact in answer to the question. This must be the case for the future, after the decision of successive Governments to issue no more Mandates wherever the Church is not established in the Colonies.

"XII. Your Lordship is pleased to intimate that the consecration of a Bishop would create a 'schism for which there is no precedent from the days of the non-jurors.' There is no parallel between the two cases. Ever since the return of the deposed Bishop, he has been at the head of a schism. On your argument, the Bishop who is in separation from us must be in the position of the non-jurors, as we are, beyond question, the ancient church who have separated him from our Communion, because we dare not recognise in him a teacher come from God, bearing a commission from Christ our Lord to rule His Church and feed the souls of His people. Since that teacher's

¹ *i.e.*, "that the Bishop-elect is called upon to declare that he is persuaded that he is truly called to the office 'according to the order of this realm.'" See Bishop of London's Letter.

return, your Lordship has officially (if my memory does not betray me) addressed him, I hope inadvertently, as your 'Dear Lord,' 'your faithful brother in Christ;' and he has taken good care to give publicity to your letter.

"You have asked me, in the name of the Church of England, a question, to which in this letter I give my answer. In return, I venture, in the name of the same Church, and in my own as Metropolitan of a Province which you have deeply and grievously wounded by your whole course of proceedings in this matter, as I have shown in my published 'Statement,' to ask you whether you do hold communion with Dr. Colenso or not? Whether you regard him as the representative Bishop of the Church of England in Natal or not? Whether he is entitled, in his character of teacher, to speak in the name of their great and ancient Church or not? Vague phrases about disapproving of his teaching evade the question, and do not meet the necessities of this crisis. The issue at stake is simply this:—Have we received a Revelation from God, of which the Scriptures are a written and infallible record? or have we not received any such revelation? Is Christianity, as it has been delivered to us from the first, true, or is it a lie? Are we to exchange it for a new religion or not? Nothing less than these are the questions raised by Dr. Colenso's writings. We must take our sides on these great questions,—we cannot be neutrals." . . .

To the Archbishop of York's letter the Metropolitan replied that "from the first having opened our whole case to the Church at home, and being in full communication with the Archbishop of Canterbury, he knew of no reason why he should have made any special communication to the Archbishop of York."

In reply to Archbishop Thomson's desire for delay in order to ascertain whether the Bishop of Natal was rightly and canonically deprived, and whether the consecration can lawfully take place, the Metropolitan not unnaturally observes that if these questions trouble his Grace, it seems strange that he should not have endeavoured to satisfy his mind during the last four years, but have reserved them till the last moment, when their intru-

sion might obstruct the consecration, and he refers his Grace to the proceedings which had been before the Church and the world for all that time.

"Your Grace," the Metropolitan says farther on, "has most justly observed that any false step taken on the present occasion might inflict a wound 'on the Church of England from which it might suffer for many generations.' I myself go farther than you do in my apprehensions. All Churches have their seasons of trial, when they are weighed in the balances. A time of trial has come upon the Church of England. She has to decide whether she will hold communion with one of whom her gravest Synod has declared that his writings 'involve errors of the greatest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God;' and whose deposition the great majority of the Bishops of our Communion have recognised, or with the Orthodox Church in South Africa, which has separated that teacher from her communion, and has deposed him from his office. She cannot hold communion with both; so strange an attempt would only expose her to the scoffs and derision of Christendom.

"Would your Grace allow of such a compromise with heresy in your own Province or Diocese? Would you suffer one holding your commission to publish to the world open contradictions to the Faith of Christendom, and permit the powers of your high office to slumber over his delinquencies?"

"The Church in Natal has been weakened, and Dr. Colenso's moral position greatly strengthened, by the substantial support which has been given to him by some English Bishops during the last two years, and which is now being practically given by your Grace. . . . Your Grace, I am fully persuaded, rejects these blasphemies for yourself; but that is not the point at issue. The question forced upon you at this time is, Whether as Primate of one of the Provinces of the Church of England you do now recognise, or are prepared to recognise hereafter, should a civil court require you to do so, this false teacher as a true pastor of the Church with whom you are in communion? You cannot escape from a decision on this point. Sooner or

later it will be forced upon you, and upon your Province; and the very existence of that Province, as a portion of the Church of Christ depends upon the answer that it gives. Had your Grace been present at the late great Conference, you would have seen how, with one or two rare exceptions, that whole body felt that the maintenance of the Faith and the witnessing truly to Christ was the first great duty of every portion of the Church. I trust that the Bishops of my own loved Mother Church will not betray their Lord in this hour of trial. If they do, I am persuaded that the days of the Church of England are numbered. If I read aright the messages of our Ascended Lord to the Angels of the Churches, they cannot allow the courts and powers of the world to interfere between them and their duty to that Lord, without an entire forfeiture of His Presence and favour, and of their own standing as living branches of His Church and Kingdom. Your Grace will permit me to say that the course which you seem prepared to adopt at this crisis fills me with anxiety and alarm."

The Bishop was engaged at Exeter on the Sunday, January 26th, to preach at S. David's, S. Leonard's, and S. Sidwell's,¹ and he fulfilled his promises, weary and worn as he was.

"I feel just now," he wrote (January 27th), "as S. Paul may have felt when he had to fight with beasts at Ephesus, 'cast down but not destroyed.' Verily without are fightings, within are fears, but no doubts, thank God, as to what our duty to Christ and His Church requires us to do." A letter from the Coadjutor Bishop of Edinburgh, almost supplicating me to release the Scotch Bishops from their position, but saying that if they must do their duty, he thinks they probably will. Replied to him that no step would more strengthen his Church

¹ The Metropolitan on his arrival was shown a correspondence between the Bishop of Exeter and some of his Clergy—the aged Bishop (then in his ninetieth year) having been over-persuaded by certain persons who wished to annoy the Metropolitan, that he was in a position of antagonism to the Church, and that the Bishop of Exeter ought to inhibit him. One would gladly pass over this episode out of respect to Bishop Phillpott's memory, but in so doing one might be supposed to have a different object in silence. Suffice it to say that he altogether withdrew an act which would indeed have been in glaring contradiction to the whole of his past career.

than doing its duty at such a crisis to God and the whole Church. Meeting full and respectable. Archdeacon Freeman took the chair, and made an admirable speech vindicating the deposition of Dr. Colenso, and the course pursued by me. Archdeacon Woolcombe also present. Very hearty.

"*January 28th*, Letters private and public this morning from the Primate, counselling the abandonment of the consecration, on the ground that he feared that some of the English Bishops would not recognise the deposition or the new Bishop. I have now no option. The responsibility for the present is shifted from me to the Church of England. It is my duty to let the Scotch Bishops know at once that the Archbishop has changed his mind at the last moment. Wrote to all these, and the African Bishops. Telegraphed to S. Oxon for an interview in London, offering to go up to-morrow, breaking away from a meeting. Hearty letter from the Primus, telling me that he had a Church ready for me, and offering hospitality to us all. . . . Left Exeter at 1.30, having received every kindness from our dear old friends.

The Archbishop's public letter is printed in the correspondence already alluded to. Its somewhat timid utterances close with a paragraph clearly showing that the Primate's private opinion remained unaltered.

"With reference to the proposed consecration of Mr. Macrorie, while, as I have already intimated, I must withhold my consent to its being performed in my Diocese or Province, I still adhere to the opinion expressed in the letter addressed by the Bishop of Oxford and myself to Mr. Butler, that there is nothing in Dr. Colenso's legal position to prevent the election of a Bishop to preside over them, by those of our Communion in South Africa who, *with myself*, hold him to have been canonically deposed from his spiritual office."

The Metropolitan hurried from Ilminster, having just left Shepton Beauchamp, where he had gone at the request of the Rev. S. S. Coles, who asked him to come early, his people being unable to attend at night; and the Bishop's comment in his Journal is: "Service at 10. Crowded with farmers and

labourers. I have not been struck with anything in England more than this—the way in which a congregation came together on a week-day. What a testimony to the Priest's work and influence!"

Reaching town that night, he sought the Bishop of Oxford at eight the next morning. "He was not up when I arrived, and no breakfast on the table. He took me to Lord Beauchamp's, where a caucus of the Ritual Commission—Hubbard, Phillimore, Dean of Ely, Hope, Perry—met to discuss their day's work. However, they made me open out, and read the Archbishop's letter. Then drove with S. Oxon to Richmond's, to whom he was sitting for his portrait; there revised with him my three replies to the two Archbishops and Bishop of London, and discussed the Bishop of Exeter's matter. Went to S. P. G. about Madagascar Mission, and in the late afternoon went to Salisbury."

Before leaving London, the Metropolitan's reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury was sent.

"21 Norfolk Square, January 30th, 1868.

"My Lord Archbishop—I submit my proceedings as to the consecration of an orthodox Bishop for Natal at this time, whether in England or Scotland, to your Grace's judgment, feeling that I ought not, in this country, to act without the hearty consent and support of the Primate of all England. So long as your Grace had no objection to offer to our consecrating within your Province or Diocese, or in Scotland, I was prepared to proceed without hesitation with the consecration. But as your Grace, upon fuller information, deems it to be the course of Christian wisdom to postpone the act, I acquiesce. Your Grace, I am fully persuaded, feels the gravity of the present crisis. The opposition of those Bishops to whose objections your Grace has thought it right to yield, seems to me to remove the responsibility of delaying this consecration from the South African to the Home Episcopate. Upon the course which the Bishops of the Mother Church shall now take must depend the unity of the Church of England herself, and her

own standing in Christ's Kingdom. It is that Church which is now really on its trial at the bar of Christendom. Her greatest Synod has declared that Dr. Colenso's teaching contains 'errors of the greatest and most dangerous character, subversive of faith in the Bible as the Word of God.'

"At her call, and by the urgent counsel of her whole Episcopate, assembled in Westminster five years ago, he has for these errors been tried and deposed by the Bishops of South Africa, and separated from the communion of the whole Church. I do not myself understand what further action is contemplated by those Bishops who, your Grace informs me, have counselled this delay, since the Convocation of Canterbury has already, in delivering its 'judgment' in this matter, ruled 'that the acceptance of a new Bishop' by the Church in Natal 'would not involve any loss of communion between it and the Mother Church; would not impair the connection or alter the relations existing between the members of the Church in the Province of Natal and the Church of England, provided the Bishop be canonically consecrated,' and certain other conditions observed. It was upon this judgment of Convocation that the South African Church has acted. The conditions have been fulfilled, the Bishop chosen and presented to your Grace, as desired, and accepted by you. The Bishop has been beforehand recognised by the Church of England's highest Synod. He has been recognised in spirit, if not in express words, by the great Anglican Conference, lately assembled in your Grace's Palace at Lambeth.

"I shall wait with trembling, in common with tens of thousands of its most devoted members, for some Synodical decision which may rescue the Church of England from the false position in which some of its Bishops have placed it. Should no further action be taken, it would, I fear, leave the Church of England burdened with the alliance of heresy, by the endurance of the deposed heretic as a Bishop in Communion with itself. Whatever the decision of the Bishops of the Church of England may be, the duty of the Church in South Africa is clear. It is bound, if it can, to provide a faithful pastor for the souls of the people intrusted to its care; and, God helping,

I trust, on my return to my Province, with the aid of my Com-provincials, to be able to consecrate there. We hold that the maintenance of the Faith is the first and highest duty of every Church; that that duty must be preferred before any other consideration; and that nothing can release us from the obligation to discharge that duty at the present crisis.—I remain, my dear Lord Archbishop, your Grace's faithful and obedient servant,
R. CAPETOWN."

Bishop Gray returned to town, February 1st, and preached at S. Mary Magdalene, Paddington, and S. Saviour's, Highbury, on the Feast of the Purification. His Journal records a continued pressure of work:—

"*February 3rd*, Finishing off correspondence. Wrote a long letter to the Bishop of Ripon in reply to one published by him reflecting on the course pursued by the African Bishop's letters with respect to Convocation.

"*4th*, Endless interruptions from callers. Natal and Cape letters. Consultation with the President of the E. C. U. about a case to be laid before the Attorney-General as to the legality of Consecration in England, and petitions to Convocation. To the Soho Refuge to see a Sister about going out. . . .

"*5th*, Interviews. . . . Letters to F. Grey and Dean of York for Convocation. Cape letters.

"*6th*, Farewell service at Hammersmith for Bishop of Free State. S. P. G. Madagascar Mission. Bishop of Graham's Town and Free State took leave. Agreed to important Resolutions empowering me to act in the matter of the consecration, and, if need were, the selection of another of the men whom we had agreed upon for the office of Bishop. Also as to the summoning of a Convention and Synod of Bishops. The Bishops wrote me a joint letter. . . . Went at 6 P.M. to preach at Denton's Church, in the City, for Swellendam Mission Chapel. Very tired.

"*10th*, Visited S. Peter's Home, and addressed the sisters."

On February 11th the Bishops of Graham's Town and Free State, as also the Bishop's daughter and her husband, Arch-deacon and Mrs. Glover, sailed for the Cape. "Sermons, letters,

S. P. G., etc. In spite of bad cough and cold felt much refreshed by a respite from work, which has left me without a moment to myself. Still quite unable to read anything, but able to get sermons ready.

" 13th, Sandford. Confirmation in afternoon. Service evening.

" 14th, To Torquay.

" 15th, Dined with the Bishop, now in his ninetieth year, very feeble and blind, but his mind still clear. He was very kind, and talked a good deal of old times. Preached at S. John's, Torquay, and after at Babbicombe, and a third time at S. Luke's, Torquay.

" 18th, Spent the whole day in Lower House of Convocation. Discussion about Lambeth Conference and reading the Encyclical.

" 19th, All day in Convocation—subject Colenso's trial, deposition, etc. etc. Dined at Mr. Gladstone's. Afterwards to a *conversazione* at the Bishop of London's to meet the members of Convocation. He and Mrs. Tait specially courteous.

" 20th, All day again in the Lower House. Discussion still on Mr. Seymour's *gravamen*. Dean of Ely proposed an amendment, after the Dean of Westminster's and Canon Blakesley's had been almost unanimously rejected. His expressed great sympathy with me, but declined to enter into questions so full of legal difficulties. Stanley also deliberately prayed the House not to place reliance on my statements, as I was utterly unworthy of credit, and gave his reasons. . . . My name during these two days has been unceasingly before Convocation; the kindest expressions used by every one except the Dean of Westminster. I can take no notice of his imputations until they appear in the papers, and perhaps then they will not appear in full or correctly. The Dean (of Ely's) amendment, seconded by Dean of Canterbury, was rejected by forty-five to twenty-six. Canon Seymour's *gravamen* was then adopted without a division. The Lower House has now, at least, cleared that portion of the Church which it represents from all complicity with heresy."

Not to dwell at any length upon these debates, it yet seems necessary to say that on February 19th Canon Seymour (after presenting a petition from more than 500 Clergymen and laymen of the Diocese of London, and another from Worcester, praying for some authoritative statement which might clear away the anxieties raised in men's minds by the contradictory opinions which had fallen from Bishops and other eminent persons as to the heresies of the Bishop of Natal) moved the suspension of the standing orders, that his *gravamen* might be discussed with a view to making it an *articulus cleri*. The first two paragraphs of the *gravamen* recapitulate the acts of Convocation in June 1866, after which it says: "That this House, having in mind that the Church of England is in true and close communion with the Church of South Africa, of which the Bishop of Cape Town is Bishop Metropolitan, believes it to be the plain duty of this Provincial Synod to declare, on behalf of the Church of England, so far as they are competent to do so, their acceptance of these acts of the Bishops of South Africa, and that the omission of such a declaration is not only a cause of grief and perplexity to many both in and out of this House, but is also a wrong done both to the Church at home and to the Church of South Africa, and a scandal to all branches of the Anglican Communion. They therefore earnestly pray your Lordships to take measures for declaring—first, that the Church of England accepts as valid the excommunication of Dr. Colenso, and that, until he be reconciled and received into the Church by proper authority, they will, as by the 33rd of the XXXIX. Articles they are solemnly bound, hold Dr. Colenso to be 'cut off from the Church and excommunicated;' and 2ndly, That they accept the spiritual validity of the act of the Lord Bishop of Cape Town in deposing Dr. Colenso from his Bishopric."

Canon Seymour went through the whole history anew, expressing, at the conclusion of his speech, the strong feeling of many that when "we had last year a great opportunity of having the case thoroughly examined and tried by a majority of the Anglican Bishops, it was opposed by the very Bishops

who had the greatest difficulty in assenting to what was done at Cape Town. With the opportunity before them of meeting the African Bishops face to face, and submitting the question to the decision of that great Conference, they appear to have hindered this most desirable issue." Canon Seymour also spoke of the perplexity, both in England and Africa, as to how Dr. Colenso was to be received, concluding with these words:—"Nothing of late years has occurred in the Church which has caused so much pain and uneasiness. It is a scandal not only to our Church but to religion generally, and I believe it is felt to be so in those foreign churches and also those nonconforming bodies which have been alluded to to-day. If any orthodox dissenters had such a teacher among them, would their governing body hesitate to depose him from their pulpits, and put him out of their communion? I do not know how we can read our Lord's words recorded by S. Matthew in regard to how those who will not hear the Church are to be treated and avoided, and not say that one who has been so solemnly and deliberately excommunicated must be so recognised by the Church, until it shall please God to bring him to repentance and restore him to the Church."

Archdeacon Denison, Archdeacon Harris, Canon Blakesley, the Dean of Westminster, the Rev. J. W. Joyce, Dr. Fraser, Archdeacon Wordsworth, the Dean of Ely, Lord A. Harvey, Sir G. Prevost, and others spoke—Sir G. Prevost mentioning that the late Mr. Keble said that if any one wanted to see how trials were conducted in the ancient Church, he could not find a better model than the trial lately conducted by the Bishop of Cape Town.

Canon Blakesley's amendment "That, under the circumstances of the case, it is inexpedient that the *gravamen* of Canon Seymour be converted into an *articulus cleri*," was then put. Only five hands were held up for it, and it was lost by a large majority.

On the following day, February 20th, the Dean of Ely's amendment occupied the whole sitting. It was couched thus:—"That, while fully sympathising with the Lord Bishop of