

Cape Town in the painful position in which he has been placed, and anxious to see the Church in Natal under the direction of an orthodox Bishop, this House is unable to adopt the *gravamen* proposed by Canon Seymour as an *articulus cleri*, because it involves questions of law upon which this House does not feel itself competent to decide." It ended in the rejection of the motion by 45 to 26—the largest division ever known in modern times. Canon Seymour's *gravamen* was then adopted as an *articulus cleri*.

To return to the Journal:—

"February 21st, Douglas came up last night. Walked down to Convocation with him. The Upper House had the Natal case before it. S. Oxon told me that he thought they would be in a minority in attempting to fulfil the request of the Lower House. Should he divide? He would do what I wished. I replied that he must judge for himself—that I could not dictate a policy for Convocation. All I could do would be to say that if I were a member I would divide; that I thought the hour had come for deciding the course of the Church of England; that if she failed to separate herself from an heretical teacher, she must abide the consequences. That I thought, we ought all to know precisely how and where we stood. He said they would first discuss the question in private, and he would then see what his strength was. That this would take some time. I therefore went down to Lambeth to consult the report of the proceedings of Conference in consequence of a letter from the Bishop of S. David's attacking my statements in the *Guardian*. Found my assertions fully borne out. When I returned to the Upper House they were just concluding their private discussion. The Bishop of Oxford said that he was in a minority of two. Read a resolution which he proposed to adopt. Asked me if I wanted any alteration. There were but ten minutes to spare. I told him that I did not like the course, but had no suggestion to offer. I then went in to hear the formal and hollow debate intended for the public. All very flattering to me, but I heard it with sickening. Had the opportunity of telling S. Asaph, Ely, Gloucester and Bristol, and Rochester,

that I thought the Bishops were ruining the Church of England. It appears that Colenso has just published a new volume of sermons, worse than those published before. The Archbishop was very warm about it, and said that he would take legal proceedings."

In the debate above alluded to, the Bishop of Oxford moved that the *gravamen* sent from the Lower House be read, and afterwards he spoke at some length upon it, saying that in his judgment it did great honour to that House, as showing their zeal in maintaining the truths of Christendom; nevertheless it was a document not easy for the Upper House to deal with. "The prayer," Bishop Wilberforce said, "is twofold, asking us to make a Synodical declaration, first, that we consider Dr. Colenso to be deposed from his Bishopric; and second, that we acknowledge and declare him to be an excommunicated man." He would deal first with the second of these prayers.

Excommunication, the Bishop said, as known to the law of England, is an act at once spiritual and temporal,—spiritual in its essence, and temporal in its inevitable accidents. An excommunicated man is not only what he would be in any voluntary society of Christians, a man cut off from certain privileges and rites of Christian communion, but is also a man subject to certain legal disqualifications. The consequence of this conjunction of temporal accidents with the spiritual sentence is, that any man being pronounced excommunicate suffers a temporal injury, and of course has a right to call upon the courts of the sovereign to remedy the wrongs which he asserts himself to have received, and to investigate the question whether he is or not—not spiritually, but according to the laws of the realm—an excommunicated man. A man cannot be pronounced excommunicate according to the laws of this land, except by a court of the realm, a court which is in itself competent to act, and is acknowledged as possessing power to enforce its decrees. The court of a voluntary society of Christians can indeed spiritually excommunicate one of their members, and so he may be deprived of spiritual communion with the body to which he belonged, and so with the whole Church; and yet he may not

be in the language of the law excommunicate, because he has not been so declared by a court which the law of this country acknowledges as having a right to pass a temporal sentence. Now the highest Court of Appeal has pronounced the court which passed the original sentence not to be a court which the law of England acknowledges, and therefore that its sentence cannot be acknowledged by law. This decision says not a word as to spiritual consequences not following the act, but it denies its legal power. While, therefore, the Upper House might believe that the man so sentenced had incurred all the spiritual consequences of excommunication, and while most, if not all the Bishops were prepared to act on this spiritual sentence in all lawful ways, yet it could not affirm the double meaning of the word; and though he (Bishop Wilberforce), and the greater part of his brethren entertained no doubt of the spiritual validity of the sentence, he thought that for these technical reasons it would be better to pass over that part of the prayer of the *articulus cleri*.

As to the deposition, while certain members of the House entertained doubts of its canonicity, the Bishop thought the House must deliberately consider and settle the doubt as a House. It would be most improper, he said, to suppose that this caution implied the slightest sympathy in any member of the House for the false teaching of the man sentenced, but there should be absolute technical certainty as to canonicity such as would satisfy every one. Therefore the Bishop proposed that a committee should be appointed to examine into it, and that the same committee should be instructed to examine Dr. Colenso's more recent works with a view to discover whether there were grounds for further proceedings, and also to address the Archbishop to take such measures as he might deem right to remove the existing scandal from the Church.

The Bishop went on to propose thanking the Lower House for their zeal, and observed that all present must agree that the character and spirit in which the Bishop of Cape Town had conducted this long struggle were marked "by the same magnanimity, which in the records of ecclesiastical history

causes the maintenance of the truth in times past by the great heroes and martyrs of the Faith to stand brightly forth, and commends their names and memories to our undying veneration."

The Bishop of London spoke more heartily than his wont with respect to the Bishop of Cape Town, saying he was sure "that he had acted throughout under a deep sense of his duty as a Christian man should," and that he admired this unselfish courage and devotedness, though disapproving of many of his individual acts. The Bishop of S. David's put in a characteristic "faint praise;" and the President put the resolution in these terms:—

"That a committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the canonicity of the deprivation referred to in the *articulus cleri*, and to examine and report on the more recent writings of Dr. Colenso. That his Grace the President be prayed to take such measures as he may see fit to remove the existing scandal from our Church. That these resolutions be submitted to the Lower House, with the expression of our thanks for the zeal they have exhibited in protesting against false teaching, and our assurance that we desire to strengthen to the uttermost the hands of the Bishop of Cape Town in his noble efforts for the maintenance of the truth of Christ. But that, in view of the canonical difficulties of the case, aggravated as we feel them to be by the announcement of the new judgment in the Supreme Court of Natal,<sup>1</sup> the particulars of which

<sup>1</sup> This alludes to the judgment given January 9th, 1868, by the Supreme Court of Natal in favour of Dr. Colenso against the Dean and the Rev. T. Walton of Pinetown, to the effect that he could take possession of all the churches and Church property in the Diocese. Dean Green wrote: "The Court has this morning given judgment and against us. We are to turn out of the Cathedral and all churches of which Dr. Colenso is trustee, and out of the Deanery. There can be no doubt it is a heavy blow. . . . The Court saw that we were resolute against acknowledging Colenso—that it was useless to try and worry us into so doing; and therefore there remained but two things, to let us turn Colenso out, or let him turn us out, and they naturally chose the latter. It is, however, a solemn thing for the churches to be thus given over to the enemies of the cross of Christ. . . . There may be an increase of infidelity and immorality. . . . Here will be a further sifting probably—new comers, strangers, and others, will go to the build-

are not yet in our hands, we think it right to postpone our decisions in the matters laid before us." This resolution was passed unanimously, and the proposed committee appointed, to be composed of the Bishops of London, Winchester, S. David's, Oxford, Llandaff, Lincoln, Norwich, Gloucester, Ely, Peterborough, Rochester, and Lichfield.

The kindly-worded expressions towards himself had no effect whatever in making Bishop Gray accept this line of action, which he felt to be an injury to the Cause of Christ and His Church. Through the next day it was weighing on his mind, while occupied with a meeting of "the old Madagascar Committee to revive the effort to raise funds for a Bishop for that island. The Bishop of Mauritius was also there. He and the Bishop of London prevented the carrying out this scheme after I left England five years ago. He is now quite convinced that the time has come for the appointment of a Bishop. Five years have, however, been lost, and he has not escaped a quarrel with the London Society, to appease which the appointment of a Bishop was abandoned. The old committee has survived, but has done nothing, even the subscriptions promised before I left England have not been collected." Bishop Gray went to Bath to preach at Bathwick and S. John's, and held a large meeting; and while there (February 23rd) he poured out his wounded feelings to perhaps the friend he loved best, and who now was the one wounding him.

"My dear Bishop—I feel that I must write to say how grievously I was pained by your speech in Convocation on Friday last, on the subject of excommunication. It distressed

ings, and not join congregations spoken against as schismatics, resisters of the law, defiers of the Queen's supremacy, and worshipping in poverty and discomfort. It adds very greatly to our trouble, not knowing whether the Mother Church may not resist our having a Bishop. . . . Of course Walton has to leave his Church, but if he puts up a large Kafir hut at his own gate, he will be able to assemble his congregation in a reverential manner." . . .

The righteous indignation felt by good men in Africa at this decision was freely poured out in correspondence public and private. It was resolved by Church people to build temporary churches at once, and that the Dean should go to England to collect funds for their succour.

me far more than the resolution, sad as I felt that to be. At the time I thought that I must have misunderstood your propositions. I have since read your speech in the *Times*, and can see no reason to hope that this was so.

“Your argument seems to me to involve an abandonment of the ground on which, as I conceived, we had been contending together for years, and a submission to the Bishop of London’s position. You appear to argue that the Church of England cannot recognise the spiritual sentence excommunicating Bishop Colenso, because in England that sentence could only be pronounced by a duly constituted legal tribunal, which has not been the case with our sentence. If this be your argument, how would you deal with a Bishop excommunicated by the American or by the Scotch Church? If you say that you would accept the spiritual sentence of one unestablished body, why not of another? How can you accept the deposition, if you cannot accept the excommunication? In the eye of the English law, both must be carried out through a duly constituted legal court. You seem to admit that you would accept the deposition if canonical; why not also the excommunication?”

“If the spiritual sentence in our voluntary association has been pronounced by those who have a right to pronounce it, it ought to be recognised by the whole Church. If you say to us, We in England can only excommunicate through a legal court, you have no legal court, therefore we cannot recognise your act; your argument seems untenable as an argument, and also to deny us the right of separating any from the communion of the Church.

“The real reason, I suppose, for refusing to recognise our sentence is, that it possibly might place the English Bishops in a painful position if Colenso were presented to a living, or were to bring an action for libel; but would not their position in such a case be better if the Synods of the Church had declared him to be out of communion? It would seem to me to be the greatest moral support for a Bishop to be able to say in a court of law, The whole Church has renounced communion with this man. But if not, ought this danger to prevent a Church from recognising so solemn an act as the separation of an heretical

Bishop from the communion of the faithful? And will its refusal to do so improve its position in the eyes of Christendom?

"I cannot tell you how depressed I am by this unanimous refusal of the Upper House to respond to the appeal of the Lower. It seems to me that the responsibility which it has taken upon itself is of the gravest character. I am going to write to the Archbishop to request that the committee, when they meet, will submit this question of canonicity to our most competent men; Dr. Pusey, for instance, Sir W. Palmer, Wordsworth, Joyce, Frazer, Bright, etc.; and I trust that that committee will deal with the excommunication precisely on the same principles as they do that of the deposition. I simply dread the effects of the course adopted by the Upper House. Already I have letters from others utterly shaken by the attitude assumed by the Bishops with regard to this whole case. Men whom you could little dream of are despairing of the English Church. I am quite sure that the salving over wounds which must be probed before they are healed will not do in these days. Men's minds would be far more strengthened by a bold and uncompromising course on the part of a minority, than by yielding points which weaken a position and save nothing.

"I do not want you to send any answer to this, but kindly to weigh the matter over in your mind. I feel that our position, as regards principles, which alone I care for, is worse than it has ever been, by this last act of the Upper House. It throws back the case, not hopelessly, or entirely, but nearly so, upon the decisions of courts of law.—Believe me ever, my dear Bishop, affectionately yours,  
R. CAPETOWN."

The letter alluded to above to Archbishop Longley was written in the railway, February 25th, on his road to Plymouth.

"Plymouth, Ash Wednesday, 1868.

"My Lord Archbishop—While I should think it unbecoming in me to offer any remarks upon the course adopted by the Upper House of Convocation with reference to the *gravamen* of the Lower House in the matter of Bishop Colenso, I may ven-

ture to submit to your Grace, with a view to prevent future complications, a few thoughts suggested by the resolution adopted by the Upper House on that subject.

“I. The Bishops of your Grace’s Province have appointed a committee to consider the question of the canonicity of the spiritual deposition of Bishop Colenso. When the Lambeth Conference formed its committee for the same purpose, I urged that the question should be submitted to our most learned canonists—Sir W. Palmer, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Joyce, Archdeacon Wordsworth, Dr. Frazer, Mr. Bright, Sir R. Phillimore, and others. I feel convinced that the committee would do well, in order to command the respect and confidence of the Church, to adopt such a course now.

“II. Your Grace will not suspect me of any desire to undervalue or detract from the weight of authority which justly belongs to the decisions of the Province of Canterbury. I have throughout an Episcopate of more than twenty years shown the greatest deference to that venerable body; consulted it on every occasion that I could; and have acted upon and abided by its counsel. I may be permitted therefore to say, that if the committee appointed by it is simply instructed to consider whether, in its judgment, the sentence which I have pronounced is canonically valid, and whether, as a consequence, the Church of England is in communion with Bishop Colenso, or with the Bishops who have deposed him, and separated him from their communion, the inquiry is a perfectly legitimate one, and one which I shall rejoice to see entered into and reported upon. But if the idea prevails in the Upper House, as I rather inferred, perhaps unwarrantably, from the resolution itself, and the debate upon it, that the authoritative decision as to the canonicity of my proceedings rests with the Synod of the Province of Canterbury or with the Synods of both Provinces, I must respectfully submit that I am unable to concur in such a view. I hold that the Province of South Africa is ecclesiastically and canonically as independent of the decisions of the Convocations of York or Canterbury, as these are independent of each other; and that the vastly higher authority which

attaches to the conclusions of your Grace's Province above those of the other Provinces of our Church, arises solely from the number, weight, piety, and learning of its members.

"Holding, as I do, that whenever and wherever the Bishops of the Church are gathered together in the Name of Christ for common counsel relating to the things of God, there is in all its essential features a Synod, I should gladly have submitted, had I been permitted to do so, my whole course of proceedings in the unhappy case which has caused such scandal, and which still threatens the entire overthrow of the Church of England, to the Conference of Bishops lately assembled under your Grace's presidency at Lambeth; and have abided absolutely by its decision, as that of the highest Synod of our Communion that could be assembled. Though not allowed formally to do so, it has nevertheless practically given its verdict in this matter, and I am not prepared to submit the question again to the decision of any inferior authority. Whether in communion or out of communion with the English Church for so doing, the African Bishops hold it to be a duty which they owe to the Great Head of the Church, to consecrate a faithful pastor in the room of him whom they have deposed for heresy; and nothing, if I know myself or my brethren, will, if we are permitted to meet again in Africa, prevent our discharging this our obligation to our Lord and to His afflicted Church. May I request that your Grace will be good enough to communicate this letter to the Committee when it meets? I have the honour to remain your Grace's faithful servant in Christ, R. CAPETOWN.

"The most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury."

The Bishop of Oxford was much troubled at the strong though loving condemnation of his line by one whom he so entirely loved and revered; for indeed their affection was no common one on both sides. Perhaps, too, he could not help feeling in his heart that he had somewhat temporised, and not held steadily to his principles. Anyhow, he wrote very regretfully to Bishop Gray, and was speedily met with a few lines of tender friendship in return.

“Plymouth, February 28th, 1868.

“My dearest Bishop—I write one line to say how deeply I am distressed to have given you so much pain: I did not mean to do so. I wished you merely to reconsider a line of argument which, if sound, I hold to be simply destructive of our whole position. Neither the sentence of deposition or of excommunication are legal. If the excommunication is not spiritually valid, because not legal, neither is the deposition, and Colenso is the true representative Bishop of the Church!

“If I have written urgently to you, and more strongly perhaps than was becoming, it was because I believed that you are the only man that can preserve the Church of England at this crisis, and that nothing short of maintaining its spiritual independence will save it. I believe there are few who hear and see more of the state of feeling among the Clergy than myself. (I suppose that full forty were present at the meeting here.) Evangelicals care little about the great truths at stake. Many others are supremacy men. But the men who constitute the marrow of the Church are more troubled, distressed, shaken, than they have ever been; and are asking what can be done. I am sure that there is a deep under-current pervading the Church, the force of which is not appreciated.

“If the legal difficulties are to prevent the Bishops of the Church of England recognising the spiritual sentence separating Dr. Colenso from the communion of the Church, that current will burst its bounds. I do not believe that there has ever been a question which has so tested the Church of England. Forgive me, my dear brother, to whom I owe so much, and whom I love very deeply. Ever affectionately yours,

“R. CAPETOWN.”

Verily it was an unrestful time, and nothing save God's Grace strengthening His faithful servant could have enabled the Bishop to bear up under the struggle. A correspondence with Bishop Thirlwall, and another with Dean Stanley, were just at this same time published; but as all they contained has been repeated in other ways, it seems unnecessary to fill up these pages with

documents which one can only regret should have appeared on one side, and made answers inevitable. The Bishop of Cape Town met with a more than usually enthusiastic reception at this time, probably owing to the general sense of Churchmen that he was very distinctly persecuted for the Faith's sake. Many of the Clergy, too, were "greatly disturbed at the present state of the Church and want of vigour and courage in the Bishops." The Metropolitan went on to West Alvington, Mr. (now Archdeacon) Erle's, of whose work he wrote in high terms, regretting that he had not gone out five years before as Bishop of Independent Kaffraria, as proposed. Thence to Oxford, where he stayed with the Master of University, his old College, and enjoyed (how seldom at this time anything like *enjoyment* fell to his lot!) the society of many friends—Mr. Burgon, Bright, Medd, Bramley, Rigaut, etc.

"*March 1st*, Long day; preached in the morning at Holywell Church; afternoon at S. Giles', evening at S. Mary's. Dr. Pusey preached at S. Mary's at 11, and Liddon at 2. I was able to hear half of his powerful sermon. Notwithstanding the University Church was crowded to hear these the two most distinguished men in the University, we had full congregations at each service. The University Church was crowded in the evening. After all was over, I went to Queen's to hear Liddon's lecture on Holy Scripture to young men. There were about eighty present. He was on S. Paul's description of the Tabernacle service and furniture, and met critical objections as to accuracy. He was evidently tired, having preached a great sermon also on Friday."

From Oxford he wrote to Archdeacon Thomas:

"*March 2nd*, 1868.

"The abuse which I get in the *Times*, *Pall Mall*, *Telegraph*, *Spectator*, etc., acts as an advertisement! Cold hearts, prudent men, stand aloof in consequence, but others are moved and warmed, and I speak out all the plainer. . . . You will see by the papers what has been done in Convocation. I was quite satisfied with the Lower House. . . . I was not satisfied with

the Upper House, but they too will come right. . . . I suppose that I have been as severe on Bishops as most men, but I really feel for the difficulties which both beset their position, and also entangle their minds, brought up as they have been under the shadow of an Erastian Establishmentarianism. The course of events is, however, working a great change in men's minds on this point. They are losing their love for Establishments, and God is perhaps preparing the way for the changes which political events are likely to bring with them. I look with confidence to the future. . . . In every direction I see tokens of the moving of His Spirit. Go where I will, I see a deeper faith, a more determined resolve, greater zeal. It is, as Newman long since said, the chains wound round us by the world which fetter our actions. But these will be relaxed or burst. Churches must not be judged by days or years. But looking back, and comparing the past with the present, how great the change! The life of the Church of England is a wholly different thing to what it was when I first traversed this land pleading for Africa twenty years ago. Regarding our condition as somewhat similar to that of the Church in the fourth century, in its struggles with Arianism, in how many respects have we the advantage. As a whole, I believe that our Bishops are more faithful. In that day they succumbed to the State more than in our day."

"*March 2nd*, Awake the whole night from too much talking. Calls—Dr. Pusey, etc.

"*3rd*, Moved to the Provost of Oriel's. . . . Attended and spoke at wearisome length at the E. C. U. They were very hearty and uproarious in their applause.

"*4th*, Morning at the Bodleian, reading and copying MSS. of the Bishop of S. David's trial. Long talk with Dr. Pusey; pressed upon him the giving up of other works, and return to his Commentary on the Minor Prophets and Isaiah. . . . Men in Oxford are anxious about it. Westcombe told me that he had attended Dr. Pusey's lectures on Isaiah three times, and that they were always full of new matter. The Bishop of Rochester preached the Friday Lent sermon at S. Mary's.

"5th, Called on the Crawleys at Littlemore—breakfast with Burgon in Oriel common room. Went to London—another night almost without sleep.

"6th, Pamphlets and speeches *in re* Natal from Brunel, Archbishop of York, Dean of Ripon. Fear I must reply, but I have no time. Spent the afternoon in Lambeth Library—wishing to see an MS. work on Bishop of S. David's trial, containing large arguments from the Canons. Professor Stubbs, late Librarian, had been to look out the book for me, but found it was missing. Examined instead Van Espen, and *Corpus Juris Ecclesiastici*.

"March 7th, All day writing Cape letters, and preparing for a month's journey to the north, reading pamphlets *in re* Colenso, and collecting materials for a reply."

The proposed northern tour began on March 9th, and the Bishop visited (and worked hard at) Shepton (Mr. Nevill), Stoke-on-Trent, Lullington (Mr. and Lady Adelaide Law), Derby, during which days he wrote a pamphlet in reply to the published speeches alluded to above, which will be found in the accompanying volume of the Bishop's Charges, etc. He says:—"March 12th, Derby. Finished my pamphlet to-day—it is the length of three full sermons, has been written, *corrente calamo*, at spare moments, in railways, and during these four days amid sleepless nights. I have suffered for it, and I suppose *it* has also!"

Masbro', Aberford, where, owing to an engagement at Leeds being thrown up at the last moment, the Bishop had a quiet Sunday, and enjoyed the rare rest of "hearing others preach." How much though is told in the Monday's entry: "Another night of sadness. Dearest wife got up twice to read to me."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In proof of how, amid all the fatigue and exhaustion of this season, the Bishop never failed to do a kind thing, the following letter may be mentioned. A lady writes how, "feeling most acutely the Colenso troubles, and looking with an intensity of veneration to him whom Canon Liddon called the Athanasius of our time," having hoped for long to see some prayer for the distressed Church of Africa put forth, she at last ventured to write to the Bishop of Cape Town himself, and ask if he would tell her of one. In a few days she received a most kind reply, in

Newton Bridge, near Manchester, came next; Mr. Greenwell's. "A great ritualist, but doing as these men generally are, a real work among the people." Liverpool, where the Bishop and Mrs. Gray were Mr. Cecil Wray's guests. Thence the Metropolitan went to Accrington, and spent a few cheering hours with the Bishop-elect, Mr. Macrorie, whom he found "in good heart, and growing in confidence;" then to Manchester, Mr. (now Archdeacon) Anson; Charlton-cum-Hardy, Mr. Booth; Helmslow, Mr. Cope; Liverpool again, Warrington, Middlesbro', Stockton, Durham,<sup>1</sup> Chester-le-Street, Coatham, Sheffield, Wakefield, Mirfield, "where (April 3rd) we were guests of my kind friend and supporter, Mr. Wheatley Balme."

The next point was the Deanery, York. "Preached three times, twice in the Minster. There were full 3,000 people in the evening. It tried me greatly to preach. At times I think that if I do not give in I must break down; but God supports me. The Dean very hearty and kind; I hear of his good deeds on every side." On April 8th the Bishop returned to London, where the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg had now arrived, and there was, of course, much to consider and discuss. This was the Holy Week.

"*April 9th*, Discussion with Dean Green till I had to go and preach at the one o'clock service at S. Lawrence. Church

which he says—"I had hoped that I might find among my papers printed prayers drawn up by others for the afflicted Church in Africa. This, however, I have failed to do. I have, therefore, at my first leisure moment written one myself, which I should feel thankful if you will use in our behalf. I believe in the prayers of the faithful, and feel assured that we have been greatly indebted to them." The prayer is as follows:—

"O most merciful God and Father, Who hast sent Thy Son into the world to redeem it, and to gather unto Thee, in one, Thine elect from all parts of the earth; look down in pity upon Thy torn and distracted Church in Africa. Heal the divisions of Thy people: Remove from them the scourge of heresy: Restore the fallen, strengthen the hands of the upholders of Thy Truth. Fill them with wisdom and courage; with fervent zeal and love; with a spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion unto Thee, and make them instruments in Thy Hand for the founding of Thy Kingdom, the building up of Thy Church in this dark land, and of winning the heathen unto Thee. Grant this, O Father, for Thy dear Son's Sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

<sup>1</sup> "*March 29th*, Preached to a densely crowded congregation at S. Oswald's in the evening. Service called here ritualistic, but very good."

full almost entirely of men. These services keep up in a wonderful way. Then to S. P. G., where the Standing Committee were discussing their right to interfere with special funds. Thence with Dean Green to the Bishop of Oxford, from whom I learnt that the Bishops had met and resolved on a course of action with regard to legal proceedings against Dr. Colenso, not only without communication with me, but with an express understanding that the lawyers, who were to prepare an opinion, and, perhaps, a case for them, were to have no communication with myself or Dean Green. The Dean went with me to a service at S. Lawrence at 6.30, where I confirmed about sixty—chiefly men—for the Bishop of London. Addressed them a second time, at Mr. Cowie's request, instead of a sermon.

"10th, *Good Friday*, Preached to a crowded church at S. Barnabas. In the evening to S. Paul's, where Liddon preached one of his remarkable sermons, 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me,' to a church crammed from end to end. Men say that on these occasions 7,000 can get in.

"*Easter Day*, Preached at S. Lawrence, not on Africa! Went again in the evening to hear S. Oxon, who preached in behalf of S. P. G.

"*Easter Monday*, Breakfasted at Mr. Noel's to meet the Bishop of Oxford and one or two Clergymen to discuss the question of union with the Wesleyans.

"*April, 14th*, Left early for Lichfield with Dean Green. Read and corrected Mr. Lee's essay in *Church and the World* relating to the whole Natal case. Arrived just in time for service. Cathedral very nicely restored. Much remains to be done outside. Primus of Scotland to dinner." A visit to Mr. Francis Paget at Elford followed; and after sermons and meetings the Bishop returned to London, then went to Brighton, Norwich, and Dereham.

One trouble and anxiety arose after another. April 27th, the Bishop writes from Norwich: "Having heard from the Bishop of Graham's Town that the Duke of Buckingham had written an extraordinary despatch to Sir P. Wodehouse about the consecration of a Bishop for Natal, I wrote to his Grace

for an explanation; and if he had written such a despatch, for the grounds of it; also to Lord Carnarvon and S. Oxon, etc., on the subject."

To the latter he says: "I was sure from the Gibraltar affair,<sup>1</sup> that the Duke, under the guidance of ——, meant to trample upon the rights of the Church. I have written to ask—I. If there has been such a despatch? II. If so, for a copy. III. The grounds of this interference with our religious liberties. When can I see you during next week? The discussion this action must raise is of a delicate matter, and most important; and I shall need your wise and loving counsel."

The despatch in question was indeed a strange one, more especially sent, as it was, without any communication on the subject with the Metropolitan. It was dated January 30th, 1868, and definitely threw all the weight that Government and law could give into the side of heresy and schism. The impression given in Africa, as expressed by letters public and private, was that the home Government was prepared to go any lengths against the Church! This despatch was retracted and withdrawn by the Duke of Buckingham, May 23rd, 1868.

Bishop Gray could not immediately consult over this fresh embarrassment, as he was engaged to be in the Eastern Coun-

<sup>1</sup> "If the Duke of Buckingham refuses to issue the Mandate for the consecration of Archdeacon Harris, on the ground that he is entitled to *select* a Bishop for Gibraltar, he is urging claims which were not put forth at the time when the Colonial Bishopric Council was called into existence. Circumstances led me to know a good deal of what then was agreed upon. The Church was to recommend and select; the Crown formally to appoint. . . . The Duke of Newcastle, on the last vacancy of the See of Gibraltar, set up claims similar to those apparently advanced by the Duke of Buckingham. An appeal was, I believe, made to Mr. Gladstone as to the terms of the understanding with the Government. He confirmed the view here taken, and the Duke gave way.

"There seems to be strong reason for not issuing letters patent in the present case. There are, I believe, no Clergy in Malta and Gibraltar except military and naval chaplains. Over these the letters patent do not even affect to give the Bishop jurisdiction or control. The only other Clergy are ministers of voluntary associations outside her Majesty's dominions. Over these the Crown cannot give the Bishop any jurisdiction. The present move appears to indicate a desire to set aside the course openly adopted by Lord Carnarvon, and to re-issue letters patent, where they can only hamper and can be of no possible use."—Bishop Gray to S. Oxon, January 31, 1868.

ties for some little while longer; and accordingly he visited Diss, and went on to Colchester, Braintree, Halsted, Ipswich, Rushford College, Thetford, and S. Neot's. Mr. Wilkinson had organised the round, and it was arranged that the money collected was to be shared by Cape Town and what was already called Miss Mackenzie's Zulu Fund. The Bishop was much pleased with Mr. Wilkinson, and was speculating whether he would do for the Missionary Bishop.

" *May 2nd*, The Bishop returned to London, preached on the 3rd at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and S. Saviour's, S. George's Square.

" *May 4th*, To the London Society to talk over their intentions with regard to Adam Kok and Riversdale. Pleasant talk with secretaries. They gave me some interesting papers relating to their proposed changes as to their South African Missions. Thence to a law consultation relating to my appeal *in re* property in Natal. Hence to House of Commons to hear Dizzy's statement as to the course Government would pursue under their defeat about the Irish Church.

" *May 5th*, At one o'clock to Lord Carnarvon about the Duke of Buckingham's despatch. He had had a talk with Palmer. Went over much of the whole case with Lord Carnarvon, who was very kind and earnest. He proposes to ask a question of the Duke in the House, and I promised to send him all pamphlets bearing on this case. . . . Very strong, almost reproachful letter from Dr. Pusey about delay in consecration—the danger to souls and to the Church. Answered him to say there has been no delay. I had scarcely done that before Macrorie came to say he must give up, chiefly on account of his wife, but also on account of doubts as to whether the Church of England will recognise him!

" *May 6th*, Up soon after 4 A.M. Wrote to the Archbishop, telling him of my new anxieties, and asking for information as to the course which the English Bishops mean to pursue as to—I. Legal measures; II. Question of canonicity. Called at Colonial Office to see Sir F. Rogers about Natal consecration. Great meeting at S. James's Hall about Church and State. Crowds unable to get in. . .

" 7th, To Hitchin—meeting, and preached.

" 8th, Saw S. Oxon about the Duke of Buckingham's despatch. Back in time for discussion with Butler, Green, and Macrorie. Wrote again to the Duke, from whom I have not heard.

" 9th, On reaching home found a reply to my first letter from the Duke, inclosing a copy of the despatch, and curtly declining to enter into the ground of it. Went off at once to Phillimore—gone to Court; next to S. Oxon, who had received a sympathising letter from the Duke on the subject, but agrees that the only course open is to move in Parliament. Went to Lord Carnarvon,—agreed to move in consultation with Lord Salisbury, Palmer, and others. On returning home wearied and worn, found a very kind note from the Duke in reply to my second letter, inviting me to come and see him before two o'clock, when he must go to a Cabinet Council. Took a cab at once, and had a long interview.<sup>1</sup> He knows but little of the subject. I told him my view of the matter with the utmost plainness, and of the wrong which I think the Government (the real cause of all these legal blunders) had inflicted on the Church, by doing nothing except to interfere when the Church resolved upon ridding itself of this alliance with heresy. He told me that the meaning of the despatch had been misunderstood,—that it was not meant to affect any save those who were paid by the Home Treasury and held warrants under the Crown,—that he quite agreed that we had a right to consecrate a Bishop for congregations who could not own Colenso as their Bishop,—that he would get up the whole subject by Thursday next, when he invited me to another interview. Wrote to Lord Carnarvon to advise delay."

On the 10th May, when the Bishop preached at Tooting and Beddington, and Trinity Church, Whitehall, he says: "Drove twenty-five miles to-day in different people's carriages, talking

<sup>1</sup> The Metropolitan wrote (May 11th, 1868) to the Bishop of Oxford: "I had a pleasant interview with the Duke, who bore with me while I spoke of our grievances and wrongs with the utmost plainness, and argued our right to have our civil liberties respected. He told me that he largely agreed with me, and admitted that we had a right to consecrate," etc.

to fresh people all the time. Dead beat at night after thirteen hours' incessant talk!" But the next day the same sort of thing began again;—meetings at Windsor, Sunningdale, and Dorking, in succession.

"*May 14th*, By appointment to the Duke of Buckingham to discuss the Natal case and the memorandum which I sent him in. Two of the Under-Secretaries, Mr. Adderley and Sir Frederick Rogers, were present during our discussion, which lasted an hour. The Duke was considerate and conciliatory. Sir F. Rogers took the line of guarding the Government, now that it had taken action, against doing anything that might commit itself. I maintained my ground, as taken from the beginning, and without mincing matters. The Duke seemed to feel my statement that by his course of action he had placed me in a state of collision with the Government under which I live; and that he would throw society into confusion, and cause great divisions in the Church. He came to no conclusion. I am to see him again this week. On leaving the Colonial Office went to S. P. G. Standing Committee. Found, just as I was compelled to leave, that they were about to discuss and recommend a reduction of the grant to my Diocese to the extent of £225. Went afterwards to the House of Commons. Heard Disraeli, Gladstone, Hardy, Lowe, Bright, Cardwell, etc.

"*15th*, S. P. G. Board to argue against the reduction of the grant to my Diocese to the extent of £225 a year. From thence by appointment to the Admiralty Court to see Sir R. Phillimore about the despatch. Events are fast leading many Churchmen to desire a disconnection of the Church and the State. Then to a consultation with Sir R. Palmer in the Earl Marshal's room. He spoke freely on—I. The Duke's despatch. He thought I should be neglecting my duty if I allowed such a document to exist without bringing the matter before Parliament. II. My lawsuit. Advised strongly to push the appeal; said without doubt the judgment of the Court below would be reversed. Was doubtful whether it would be wise to seek a decision on the points as to whether the original letters patent were in force in Natal. He thinks it probable that it would

be ruled that Natal was a Crown Colony,—that as such the original letters patent were good there ;—that their supercession by Colenso's letters patent was also good, *if* the Crown was in the habit of legislating for Crown Colonies (which I told him I thought was the case) by letters patent and not by Orders in Council ;—that it would be ruled that Natal was a *quasi* Established Church, with Colenso its legal Bishop ;—that I had no legal jurisdiction, in spite of such jurisdiction being provided in the Natal letters patent, because the Court would say that it was intended by the Crown to give this jurisdiction to a Bishop of Cape Town who would have a legal jurisdiction through his own letters patent, and that not having them by such letters patent he could not have it in any other way.

“He further said that he did not advise that any legal proceedings should be taken to cancel Colenso's letters patent ; that if these were taken, it could only be by *scire facias*, through one of the Chancery Courts ; that probably such Court would, if the ground pleaded was false doctrine, declare that it had no jurisdiction ; that possibly it would declare that Colenso's doctrine was very good ! that it would be impossible to proceed by *scire facias* against me, Colenso, or Graham's Town, as holders of invalid patents ; that this could only (I think) be done with the consent of the Attorney-General ; that probably it would issue in the cancelling of my letters patent and Graham's Town's, and the upholding of Colenso's as good in law. He scoffed at the idea of taking proceedings by petition to the Crown, as Dr. Colenso had done—could never understand how the Privy Council had ever given the judgment they did ; believed that all that body could do constitutionally was to give counsel to the Crown ; that it really gave a judgment ; that another attempt to get a judgment would lead to a repudiation of the right to give this ; that it would be *coram non judice*. He spoke very strongly on the subject of Lord Westbury's judgments. Looked in afterwards at the House, and heard part of the debate on Lord Shaftesbury's question as to whether Government meant to legislate on the subject of ritual.”

Then came another long Sunday, with sermons at Chislehurst, Hayes, and Bickley; and May 18th a rush to Chester; and the next day came an oasis at Ilam and Dovedale with Mr. and Mrs. Mackarness, where the Bishop and Mrs. Gray spent Ascension Eve in peaceful enjoyment of the lovely scenery and fine weather—the third day's holiday, as he remarks, since they came to England! Holidays, indeed, were rare events in that much-trying life. Ascension Day<sup>1</sup> had sermons to be preached at Ilam and Leek, but it brought a satisfactory letter from the Duke of Buckingham, saying that he proposed virtually to withdraw his despatch, though objecting to the title of the future Bishop being taken from Natal.

Bishop Gray returned to London on May 23rd, and "drove at once to the Colonial Office; discussed the despatch with the Duke till 6 P.M. Agreed upon its terms; it goes off this evening to the Cape. He told me that he was prepared to accept my suggestion about the consecration taking place in England by mandate from the Crown; that he had spoken to the Archbishop on the subject. . . . Reached home hot, in bare time to dress for dinner at the Duke's, being the Queen's birthday."

The Metropolitan wrote to the Bishop of Graham's Town:

"May 22nd.

"My dear Bishop—The Duke virtually withdraws the despatch. He writes another to say that he sees no reason why we should not consecrate a Bishop for the congregations that cannot acknowledge Colenso. Our only remaining dispute is about the title. He wishes us to take none in Natal. I reply that the question is left for the Bishops of the Province, but that we shall probably take Maritzburg, and remind him that in doing so we shall only follow the example set us by his

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop was much interested in the old custom of well-dressing at Tessinden. "Drove to see the wells (May 22nd) in their dresses. They were all very beautifully dressed with flowers and appropriate inscriptions. On Ascension Day these wells are always thus dressed, and services out of the Prayer Book for the day are held at them. The custom of dressing is said to be from Danish times. All the country crowds to look at them."

Grace himself, who has issued the Queen's mandate for the consecration of Bishops in Australia, who take titles from places within letters patent Dioceses, and that if Romish Bishops in England who, in open violation of the law, assume titles—*e.g.* Archbishop of Westminster—are not molested, we may well be borne with who violate no law. He has been very kind and courteous; I infinitely plain and outspoken. I am sure we must be so in such cases. . . . He invites me see the despatch to-morrow. Outward pressure and the state of political parties have done a great deal. Lords Carnarvon and Salisbury have been most kind, also Roundell Palmer. I trust that we may consider this point settled, and that our position is strengthened by the unwarrantable interference."

"*May 24th*, To Egham: preached in morning in Dr. Monsell's new church; in the afternoon had something between a service and a meeting in the mission schoolroom at Staines, Mr. Furze. Preached again in the evening at Egham—very tired.

"*25th*, Back to London by 10 A.M. Went to S. Oxon, who quite agrees about the wisdom of pressing the Government for the mandate, and adopting the title of Bishop of South-east Africa, taking Natal and Zululand for the present Diocese. Went from him to Lambeth: wrote my views down for the Archbishop, who quite concurred in what the Bishop of Oxford and I had agreed upon; and promised to write at once to the Duke of Buckingham. . . . Endeavoured to stop a motion in the House of Commons on the Duke's despatch. Reached home just in time to get off by 5 o'clock for Furneaux, Spensham.

"*26th*, Ill in the night from yesterday's excitement, and the continual rush from one place to another. Wrote to the Duke of Buckingham about the mandate. Early celebration. Service at 12 o'clock, then public luncheon. Many Clergy. Service with sermon at 3. Mr. Wigram drove us to the station. Reached town at night.

"*29th*, Brighton. . . . E. C. U. meeting at 2 P.M. Preached at S. Michael's at 5. Mr. Sanderson there with a carriage to drive me to Lancing. The masters and boys were at the foot

of the hill to present me with an address. Spoke to them; all then knelt down for a blessing. Ran up to the College afterwards cheering. Got to dinner soon after 8. Chapel with an address to the boys at 9 P.M. Late to bed.

"30th, Confirmation at 8 A.M. Sixty candidates. Celebration, full 120 communicants. Service choral, not over till 10.30. Then breakfast, then a view of the buildings; laid a corner-stone of an arch, and off for London at 12.30."

Sermons in London, and *rushes* to Reigate, Butleigh, Williton, and Nettlecombe, ending in Oxford on June 6th, where the next day, Trinity Sunday, Bishop Gray preached the Ramsden sermon and received the fee appertaining to it, which he enters as "the first money I ever earned for myself." He preached in the evening at S. Philip and S. James, and June 8th, after calling on friends and taking turns round Christ Church Meadow and Magdalen Walks, he went over to Cuddesden, where a large party of old friends,—the Archbishop of Dublin, Deans of York and Ely, Lord R. Cavendish, and others—were gathered for the Theological College Festival of the next day. That was one of the brightest and most marked among the many gatherings with which Cuddesden is so happily associated to most of us. The Rev. H. P. Liddon preached there for the first time since he had ceased to be Vice-Principal of the college, and there was a strong feeling of cordial welcome to him, which told more or less upon every one. "Liddon preached one of his great sermons," Bishop Gray wrote; "his account of the state of Oxford and its prospects, most distressing and alarming, but borne out by all I heard from the Vice-Chancellor, Rector of Exeter, etc."

At the usual luncheon after the service, at which some 400 people were gathered in the tent, the Bishop was among the speakers most enthusiastically welcomed, and most earnestly listened to. To himself it was a day of almost incessant talk, and, though full of encouragement in the way of warmth and sympathy, most fatiguing. The next day, June 10th, the Bishop went to Beckley for the consecration of a new church built by Mr. Cooke, at which "S. Oxon preached one of his

most happy sermons, which he made as he rode along, of which nothing was written but his text on the back of a letter. . . . I preached in the evening very tired and wearied in spirit."

On S. Barnabas' Day there was a meeting in Oriel Hall, and a service at Witney; and on the 13th the Bishop returned to London, where all manner of vexations and cares still beset him;—letters from Africa concerning the "extraordinary persecutions of the Church by the Natal Government in consequence of the Duke of Buckingham's first despatch;"—"fierce letters from friends" about what seemed to them needless delay;—real delay about matters connected with the consecration, over which the Bishop had no control;—worries at S. P. G., where the African grants were being reduced;—business matters connected with the transfer of his own and Mrs. Gray's tithes for the creation of a new district at Stockton; and perhaps most trying of all to him, difference of opinion between himself and the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg concerning the course to be adopted in Natal. They went together to Hedingham Castle on the 18th, and the Bishop held a meeting in "the fine old Norman keep" there, which interested him, returning to dine at Fulham on the Accession. "Most of the Bishops present. S. Oxon told me that most of them had agreed to a satisfactory report on the canonicity of the Natal deposition; the Bishop of London not concurring, but presenting a report of his own. Told me also that Sir Stafford Northcote was prepared to offer the See of Bombay, vacant to-day, to the Dean of Cape Town."

The Bishop wrote to Dean Douglas:

"Hull, July 6th, 1868.

"My dear Dean—On hearing that the offer to lay your name before the Queen went out on the 25th, I went to see Sir Stafford Northcote, to learn all I could that may be useful to you. . . . Both Sir Stafford Northcote and Sir Bartle Frere (formerly Governor of Bombay, a very nice pleasing man, and an excellent Churchman) advised your coming home. You would thereby get acquainted with men connected with India;

*e.g.*, the Council, on which Sir Bartle now is;—interchange opinions, and perhaps learn a good deal. I told Sir Stafford that you probably might wish to be consecrated by your own Metropolitan, and that a consecration in India would probably do much good. He seemed to concur in this. . . . Sir Bartle Frere said that you would have the work of three Bishops, and probably travel five months in the year. . . . You will be interested in your legal position. Abbott's *Practical Analysis of the Diocese of Calcutta*, which you will find in the lowest shelf behind the door in my study, will give you interesting information on this point. I need scarce say that I am looking out for a man to succeed you. I have several good men in view, but none equal to yourself. . . . You will see the proceedings in Convocation, and thank God for them. At last the greatest Synod has spoken, and the Church of England is cleared, so far, from an alliance with heresy. There would have been a disruption had the Bishops faltered. . . . — is making me feel what I have often told you, that Deans are the greatest natural enemies of Bishops!!”

“*June 21st*, Preached three times in the suburbs of London—Blackheath, S. James' Hatcham, and Forest Hill.”

June 24th, the Nativity of S. John the Baptist, was to have been the day of consecration for Mr. Macrorie as well as for the new Bishop of Hereford (Dr. Atlay), but the question of the Mandate<sup>1</sup> was still unsettled, and once again the ceremony had to be delayed. The Metropolitan was staying at Albury, where he had a meeting, at which “the Duke of Northumberland took the chair, saying that he came down purposely to show his respect for me as a maintainer of the Faith who had met with but little sympathy or support from the Bishops of the Church. Returned to town in the evening in time to hear the Bishop of Cork preach the anniversary sermon for S. P. G. in Westminster Abbey.”

<sup>1</sup> “The Duke has proposed to the Archbishop that he should consider whether it would not be well for his Grace to ask for a mandate to consecrate another Bishop for South Africa. Will you think whether it would not be well to do this, and advise the Archbishop?”—*Letter to Bishop Wilberforce.*

" 27th, Morning spent, 1st, in communication with Lord Carnarvon about his motion relating to Natal; 2nd, Talk with S. Oxon about the same; 3rd, Unsatisfactory conversation with Sir F. Rogers about the issue of the mandate.

" *S. Peter's Day*, Twenty-first anniversary of my consecration. Twenty-one troubled years! During that time a great change, thank God, has taken place in the Church of South Africa. How much greater might have been the change, how much deeper the work, had another been in my place! I trust that I am deeply conscious how much personal defects have impeded the work. God give me more grace. . . . Went to S. Augustine's, Canterbury, for their anniversary. S. P. G. meeting in the evening. The Dean of Canterbury, who took the Chair, made me very angry by intimating, through the Secretary, that he hoped I would not touch upon Colenso! I replied that I was quite willing not to go to the meeting, but that if I went, I should certainly touch upon the subject; and I did so amid the loud applause of the meeting.

" *June 30th*, The Committee of Bishops' Report on Dr. Colenso's deposition was read in the Upper House of Convocation after many petitions, all praying the House to acknowledge the validity of the sentence, had been presented by the Archbishop, by the Bishop of Rochester from 14,800 Clergy and Laity; by the Bishop of Oxford from 1,300 Clergy, and by others. The Report was as follows:—

" ' I. That although on the supposition of the invalidity of the letters patent the Bishop of Cape Town can claim no coercive jurisdiction as Metropolitan, yet regard being had . . .

" ' 1, To the early existence and authority of the office of Metropolitan in the Church; and

" ' 2, To the acceptance of the Bishop of Cape Town as Metropolitan by the Church at home, and by the Church in South Africa, and to the assent of the Crown as witnessed by the letters patent, we must consider the Bishop of Cape Town to have been fully entitled to act as Metropolitan of South Africa in the question of the Bishop of Natal.

" ' II. That the Dean of Cape Town and the Archdeacon of

Graham's Town and George Town having delivered formal charges against the Bishop of Natal for heretical teaching, the Bishop of Cape Town, in virtue of his office as Metropolitan, cited the said Bishop of Natal before him.

“ ‘III. That with regard to the proceedings before the Metropolitan in the Cathedral Church, we are of opinion that they were conducted with due reference to the functions of a Metropolitan presumed to have been conferred by the letters patent, and with due reference to the principles and precedents furnished by the English Church since the Reformation, and accepted by that Church as canonical ; and further, we are of opinion that the granting of the appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury was in due accordance with the tenor of the letters patent in which the said office was presumed to have been conferred.

“ ‘IV. With regard to the proceedings in Synod, which were superadded with a view to meeting any question which might be raised as to the coercive jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cape Town as presumed to have been conveyed by the letters patent, we are not equally agreed, some of us doubting whether these proceedings fully satisfied the requirements of a canonical trial before a Provincial Synod.

“ ‘(1.) Because the accused was not formally cited before the Synod as a Synod, but before the Bishop of Cape Town as Metropolitan, with the advice and assistance of such of the Suffragan Bishops of the Province as could conveniently be called together.

“ ‘(2.) Because the Comprovincial Bishops were not cited to the Synod as a Synod, because they were not all personally present, and because the number of those actually present was less than that required by the early canons of the Church.

“ ‘(3.) Because an appeal was granted, after the proceedings were concluded, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which, on the assumption that the Synod was duly convened and the proceedings canonical, could not have been so granted in accordance with the decisions of some important early canons.’

“ ‘Others of us again do not consider these objections suffi-

cient to invalidate the canonicity of the proceedings in the Synod:—

“(1.) Because we deem that the alleged necessity of a double citation is purely technical, and that such double citation was not essential to its validity, the accused having been duly cited to appear before the Metropolitan with his Suffragans, whose advice and assistance it was intimated would be given at the time and place mentioned in the citation.

“(2.) Because all the Bishops of the Province were summoned to the hearing of the case, and those who could attend were present during the trial, and expressed their opinions; whilst, of the two absent Suffragans, one sent afterwards his adherence to the judgment, and the other accepted the sentence as spiritually valid.

“(3.) Because, before the sentence was pronounced, it was submitted to and approved by the Bishops present in a Synod which had been summoned by the Metropolitan.

“(4.) Because we consider that the allowance by the Bishop of Cape Town of an appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury was made by him as Metropolitan, from his Court, in obedience to the possible requirements of his letters patent, and could not affect the judgment of the Synod; and because we believe that the allowance of an appeal, which was never prosecuted, cannot affect a precedent sentence; and further, because we believe that the Patriarchal character of the Metropolitan See of Canterbury would justify the allowance of an appeal from the decree of the Provincial Synod.

“V. With regard, however, to the whole case, with its extreme difficulty, the various complications, the grave doubts in reference to points of law yet unsettled, and the apparent impossibility of any other mode of action, we are of opinion—(1.) That substantial justice was done to the accused. (2.) That though the sentence, having been pronounced by a tribunal not acknowledged by the Queen's courts, whether civil or ecclesiastical, can claim no legal effect, the Church, as a spiritual body, may rightly accept its validity.”

The Bishop of London (who read this Report) stated, that

in accordance with the same rule which had guided the Committee, he had appended his own views of the matter, which were as follows:—"I am unable to append my signature to the foregoing, inasmuch as it does not set forth those grounds which have chiefly prevented my acknowledging the validity of the trial and sentence:—

"(1st), I consider the trial to have been altogether set aside by the decision given by the highest Court in the Empire that it was null and void in law.

"(2d), I consider that, if it had been thought right that a trial of a purely spiritual character was to take place, without reference to any binding legal authority on the part of the Metropolitan or his Suffragans assembled in Synod, such trial could only be held in virtue of a compact; and I find no proof that Bishop Colenso entered into such a compact with Bishop Gray, otherwise than on the supposition that the letters patent were valid, and that Bishop Gray possessed coercive jurisdiction.

"(3rd), Independently of my views as to the general invalidity of the trial, I entertain grave doubts whether, in conducting the proceeding, Bishop Gray did not, in several important points, so far depart from the principles recognised in English courts of justice, as to make it highly probable that, if the trial had been valid, and had become the subject of appeal on the merits of the case to any well-constituted court ecclesiastical, the sentence would have been set aside. These difficulties have all along made me feel that the case of Bishop Colenso cannot be satisfactorily disposed of without fresh proceedings, in lieu of those which I understand to have entirely failed.

A. C. LONDON."

The Bishop of Llandaff (Ollivant) was the first to speak in strong support of the Metropolitan's line, going into a learned disquisition in refutation of the Bishop of London, ending by affirming that it was not possible "to come to any other conclusion than that the Bishop of Cape Town did everything that he could that was essential to the justice of the case;"—and he moved the adoption of the Report. The Bishop of Lichfield

(Selwyn) seconded the motion, saying that it seemed to him that the Bishop of Llandaff had entirely exhausted the subject. What they were asking for was simply a confirmation of the spiritual sentence. It was not pretended that there was any legal remedy; but he might say that the sentence was passed with the universal consent of the Anglican Church, and they were there assembled to give their assent to it simply as a spiritual act. Of course practical results would follow. One result would be, that the faithful in Natal, who were now deprived of an orthodox Bishop, would have their wants supplied.

The Bishop of Ely (H. Browne) agreed with the Bishop of Landaff's conclusions. He thought, however, that the African Church was entirely disconnected from the Province of Canterbury, as well as from the State, and that all the English Bishops had to do was to accept the deposition her Bishops had made, not to assert any power or voice in the case.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Hamilton), (whose health was failing, and whose last appearance in Convocation was at this session) did not agree in thinking it would have been well if no appeal had been made to the Upper House of Convocation. He did not believe that synodically they had anything to do with the matter, but placing it on another ground, he was thankful that, wherever the Bishops met together, whether at the Lambeth Conference or in Convocation, they should have the opportunity of expressing their deep sympathy with and cordial approval of the course which the Metropolitan of South Africa had adopted. He thought there ought to be no doubt that the sentence of deposition was a legal deposition. He was quite sure that the feeling which had animated himself throughout was that of their Lordships. They would have been more ready to speak and vote on the subject, more ready to offer the expression of their sympathy to the great Metropolitan of South Africa, if they had not felt that Dr. Colenso had inflicted so grave and serious an injury on the Church, that they could hardly trust their feelings to act with justice towards him. The conduct of Dr. Colenso had, he feared, shaken the faith of many of the members of our Church, and the consequence was that persons

who had been obliged to deal with such cases felt it difficult to deal strict justice to Dr. Colenso. That he could distinctly affirm to be his own case. The Bishop ended by saying that the conclusion to which the Committee had come would strengthen the Metropolitan's hands and comfort his heart, for he would have the assurance of the Convocation of Canterbury that they believed him to have acted most wisely, and that substantial justice had been done, and that his brethren were prepared to support him in any future action he might take to give legal validity to the sentence passed on Dr. Colenso.

The House then adjourned; and when the debate was renewed the following day, July 1st, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Ellicott) made a long and able speech in support of the decision. Concluding, he said the inability to get rid of a man holding heretical opinions might be supposed to be an evil which seemed inherent in our theory of any kind of connection between Church and State. But it was not so. It might be the result of such a connection that he may still hold his titular designation and his salary, but there is no ground now for asserting that the State intended to recognise him in his spiritual position. Far otherwise. He believed that now all parties would see that the justice of the case required the sending a rightful pastor to Natal, and he hoped and believed that the highest powers in England felt that whoever was sent forth upon that mission should carry with him their fullest recognition of his spiritual authority.

The Bishops of Lincoln (Jackson) and Bangor (Campbell) spoke in support of their adoption of the Report; and then the Bishop of London entered upon his own peculiar views, which were resisted by other Bishops, especially the Bishop of Oxford, who corrected one expression, which seemed to imply that the House adopted his individual report. A little discussion ensued as to the way in which that was to be sent to the Lower House, "communicating" it being objected to, as implying that the Lower House was asked to *agree* to it. Finally the motion was framed thus: "That the Report be adopted and communicated to the

Lower House, and that the remarks thereon of the Lord Bishop of London be also sent to the Lower House." The Bishop of Oxford spoke afterwards at length in correction of an expression used, most likely unintentionally, by the Bishop of London as to the proceedings having been "illegal," which he emphatically showed they were not. After some short observations from different Prelates, the venerable President (who was never to assist at another session) expressed his cordial and hearty sympathy in all the efforts made to put an end to the sad state of affairs in Natal. He had always considered that the nearest approach which could be made to primitive proceedings had been made (by the Metropolitan); and he could not but believe that although the proceedings which had been taken in this case might not have all the weight which some might wish, yet, so far as ecclesiastical power and the spiritual power of the Church were concerned, those proceedings were justified, and ample justice had been done. "So far as regards our own position," his Grace said, "we are practically a Synod of this Province of the Church of England; and although it may be perfectly true that we owe submission to the State, and as a Synod have no power to make canons except we receive the sanction of the Crown, yet as a spiritual Synod we still continue to be the ancient spiritual Synod, and we have a full right to act as such." The motion was then put and carried unanimously.

The Lower House was occupied with the Irish Church Bill that day, and it was not till Friday, July 3rd, that the Natal question could be heard there. Canon Seymour then moved a resolution thanking the Upper House for communicating their Report, and "declaring the concurrence of the Lower House in their Lordships' judgment as to the acceptance of the sentence."

He was seconded by the Rev. J. W. Joyce, who thought everything to be said on the subject had been already said, and therefore only alluded to the pain every generous heart must feel at having to carry what was virtually a sentence of excommunication. The Rev. J. Bramston spoke next, the Dean of Westminster (Stanley) at some length opposing the Resolution;

Lord Alwyne Compton supporting it. Canon Blakesley moved an amendment, which would make the Lower House merely thank the Upper House for giving them information, without accepting their decision, and the Dean of Westminster seconded it. Dr. Fraser, the Dean of Ely, (Goodwin) and Chancellor Massingberd, took part in some discussion, and the amendment was put to the House and negatived. Afterwards, some further conversation as to how the Bishop of London's note was to be acknowledged occurred; the Dean of Westminster affirming that it came down to the Lower House with exactly the same authority as the Report, and there was no distinction between them. "Excepting," the Prolocutor remarked, "that the Report of the Committee *had* been adopted by the Upper, and the note of the Bishop of London had *not* been so adopted, and obviously would not be adopted by the Lower House." Thereupon the Resolution was passed, and the House proceeded to other subjects.

The Metropolitan was in the Upper House on both days during the debate. His comment is: "It is not what I should have prepared, and is, I think, a feeble production, but it saves the Church of England from complicity with heresy." On the 3rd he heard the debate in the Lower House likewise, and writes: "There was no division—there could not have been more than three or four noes. We have thus a synodical decision of the Province of Canterbury affirming the canonical deposition of the Bishop of Natal."

On Friday, July 3rd, Lord Carnarvon brought forward the subject of the two despatches sent to Natal, in the House of Lords. He observed that the Natal authorities had "so far mistaken the tenor of the first despatch as to convey a most extraordinary warning to all civilians in the Government employ to take no part in the consecration, and give no countenance to it, under pain of the displeasure of her Majesty's Government. He need not point out how improper it was that such a communication should have been so addressed. He was further informed, though he confessed he was very reluctant to believe that such a thing could have occurred, that the military officers in the place were induced to sign a document pledging

themselves to take no part in the consecration. From some other circumstances which had reached him, he was afraid that the local authorities had gone, not only beyond the instructions of his noble friend, but beyond all constitutional limits." Lord Carnarvon then alluded to a Clergyman who had been deprived of a grant for his school, because he declined to acknowledge Dr. Colenso as his Bishop, and went on to say that "there were a large number of poor men dependent in a great degree on the local Government, who had been prevented attending certain churches to which they would otherwise have gone, in consequence of their fear of giving offence to the local Government. . . . From these facts he apprehended that there was much going on in the nature of religious persecution, and he thought the matter was well worthy the consideration of his noble friend the Secretary for the Colonies."

The Duke of Buckingham spoke in a very straightforward way, agreeing that the occurrences in the Colony to which Lord Carnarvon had alluded could be called by no other name than persecution; but they had occurred without any authority from home, and some, at least, during the absence of the Governor. The Duke further said that having had an interview with the Bishop of Cape Town, and learnt his Lordship's views as to matters, he had felt it his duty to write the second despatch, which he had endeavoured to make more acceptable. "He could only say that he regretted there had been the slightest misconception on the subject; not one word had been intended to give the slightest offence to his Lordship."

Lord Houghton having expressed it as his opinion that Dr. Colenso had been treated with injustice, was rebuked by Lord Lyttleton and the Bishop of Oxford, who gave tolerably strong evidence to prove the contrary, and concluded by saying that he "could not let the statement of the noble Lord go uncontradicted, though of course it had been made in that absolute ignorance of the subject which it was natural he should possess, and equally natural he should express."

A few days before (June 29th), a deputation from the

English Church Union, headed by Earl Nelson, went to Lambeth to present a Declaration signed by upwards of 20,000 communicants of the Church of England to the Archbishop, renouncing all communion with Dr. Colenso, until such time as he might repent of his errors. The Archbishop made a brief, but energetic speech in reply, saying he thought his own opinions concerning Dr. Colenso were sufficiently well known. "I have repeatedly declared that I believe him to be in grievous error, and that I think he has been spiritually deposed from his office. Undoubtedly," his Grace ended by saying, "my sympathies go entirely with those who repudiate his doctrines, and have done their best to stop the mischief."

On July 3rd the Metropolitan held a meeting of friends at S. P. G., to consider about the formation of an association for providing, I. An income for the orthodox Bishop, so long as it might be needed; and II. The support of his own work. It was unanimously agreed to form the association, with Lord Nelson as Chairman, and H. Dunell, Esq., Treasurer; the Rev. the Hon. Henry Douglas and the Rev. E. Harston, secretaries. The Bishop mentioned the fact of the Duke of Buckingham having invited the Archbishop of Canterbury to apply for a mandate, stating that he would issue one in order to relieve all concerned from the dangers of *premunire* if the new Bishop were consecrated in England; which the Metropolitan said it was very desirable he should be, as the distances which the African Bishops had to travel were so enormous. Moreover, those who had been deluded by the assertion that Dr. Colenso was "the Queen's Bishop," would be undeceived if a Bishop went out with the full sanction of Crown and Church of England. The Archbishop had expressed his anxiety to render all assistance in his power, but he had left England now.<sup>1</sup> On this same busy Friday, July 3rd, the Bishop of Cape Town also had an interview with the Duke of Buckingham. "He was very pleasant, read me part of his despatch about the school in

<sup>1</sup> "His Grace's last act was to write to the Queen's Advocate, his Vicar-General, expressing his desire that arrangements might be made for the consecration of the new Bishop in this country."—*Colonial Church Chronicle*, September 1868.

Natal, promised as soon as he got the law officers' opinion to write to me fully."

These important days over, there were more engagements all about the country to be fulfilled. July 5th found the Bishop at Hull: on the 6th he and Mrs. Gray "went in seven different vehicles to Louth, distant only 30 miles,"—thence to Holbeach, Lincoln (where they were the guests of Chancellor Massingberd), Gainsborough, and back to London on the 11th.

For some little time past, a great anxiety already alluded to had come upon the Metropolitan in the shape of Dean Green's difficulties in connection with the Bishop-elect, Mr. Macrorie. Loving the Dean heartily as he did, admiring his character, and the stedfast battle he had fought for the Faith (how often he had called him "a true Confessor, if there ever was one!"), it was intensely painful to him to find any want of harmony in their views now, when the struggle seemed well-nigh over, and the conquest over evil won. There are frequent and sorrowful allusions to this subject in the Bishop's Journals, notes of conversations with the Dean concerning the matter—he objected to the mandate, to the Archbishop's assisting the Metropolitan, instead of *vice versa*, etc. etc.,—objected so strongly that he even declined making a joint appeal with the Bishop-elect for funds, because doing so would imply recognition of him, for which he was not prepared. Dean Green further wrote to Mr. Macrorie to say that if he were consecrated under mandate, he would publicly protest in the name of the Church of Natal. All this was very harassing, and led to numerous consultations and discussions with the Bishop of Oxford, Mr. Butler, and others, during a round of visits to Chilton, Stanford, Reading, Hadbury, Farnbro', Banbury, Kidderminster, Lancing (for the laying the first stone of the School Chapel), and Salisbury, where, on July 30th, the Annual S. P. G. Festival took place; and besides all the public functions, two private meetings were held in the Bishop of Salisbury's library, between himself, the Metropolitan, Bishop of Oxford, Mr. Macrorie, and Dean Green, in order to talk over the latter's objections to the consecration in England by mandate, and by the Archbishop.

"The Bishop of Oxford answered him kindly, and I hope removed some of his scruples.

"31st, Long talk with Green before leaving. . . . Afterwards he came round and was his own self again. We had much conversation about it all, and he promised that he would act heartily with Macrorie. Left P.M. for Glover's, Brading, Isle of Wight."

Bishop Gray went on to Rownhams, Exeter (where a few hearty friends formed a Branch Cape Town Association, as also at Plymouth), Barnstaple, Ilfracombe, Lynton, Ashperton, Stoke-Edith, Bristol (where again a Branch Association was formed, and where the Bishop was the guest of Mr. Gibbs at Tyntesfield). On Sunday, August 16th, the Bishop preached at All Saints, Clifton, and the next day returned to London, being now really anxious about the delay at the Colonial Office, which bid fair to hinder his return to Africa. He wrote to the Bishop of Oxford:

"Bristol, August 15th, 1868.

"The Archbishop says: 'If the mandate comes, telegraph to me, and I will order the commission to be prepared at once, and sent to me for signature.' I cannot, however, bring the Duke to do anything. I wrote a week ago to say that I had taken the passages for my party, and must immediately come to a decision as to whether I went on the 9th or postponed my voyage, and asked his Grace to let me know what he intended to do. I have not heard from him. He is really behaving very ill. The Attorney-General says that the law officers sent in their report long ago. We should fix on Bishops to take part in the consecration. Macrorie says in a letter to-day that you ordained him Priest and Deacon, and he hopes that anyhow you will take part. He would also like the Bishop of Rochester, and the Primus of Scotland, who behaved so well about consecration there. I suppose that you or I might ask these, and Colonial Bishops too, and that these would not be in the commission. I believe that I shall have to postpone my voyage, to my great loss. I must give notice in a day or two, or forfeit my passage money, about £500."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

“ 21 Norfolk Square, August 20th, 1868.

“ My dear Bishop—I have just had a conversation with ———, which has satisfied me that the Duke is merely putting off a decision to wear me out and get me out of the way. ——— tells me that his last act was to draft a further reference to the law officers. He said that he did not know whether it was still under consideration of the Duke, or sent to the law officers, that Karslake was in Scotland, Twiss away, no Solicitor-General—at the rate they were going at the matter might not be settled for a year! I replied by telling him that I would postpone my voyage, but that I felt it a great grievance that I could not get yea or nay out of the Duke, he having invited the Archbishop just three months ago to apply for the mandate. I am at a loss to know what to do, but am writing to the Company to ask leave for a few days to decide. I am persuaded that all this trickery will recoil upon the Government. I do not want to worry you with my troubles, but I thought you should know that I see no prospect of the consecration being in England. I should have respected the man, if, two months ago, he had said that it could not be done. I have written twice to the Duke, telling him of the position in which I stood, and of the necessity of my deciding about my voyage. He has given me no answer.”

S. Bartholomew's Day, August 24th, had been the last day on which it was hoped the consecration would take place, but once more it had to be deferred owing to these tedious and incomprehensible delays at the Colonial Office.

The Metropolitan went that day to Lavington, after a morning spent in business connected with the supplying the place of the Dean of Cape Town, now going to the See of Bombay. The Bishop of Rochester met him there, and the three Bishops took much helpful counsel together, enjoying walks before breakfast and rides over the downs. The Metropolitan was at times sorely worn and exhausted in spirit, for it seemed as if

in some way or other every one disappointed or hindered him, while he was working with the one single desire to do his Master's work.

"*September 2nd*, Letters from Mr. Brett, Dr. Littledale, Carter, etc., about withdrawing aid from the fund for support of Macrorie, because he had not put down evening communions in his parish, which he found there. Wrote strong remonstrances, pointing out that Macrorie had no taste or sympathy for such practices, but felt difficulty in putting them down at once. Complained of the disposition of Churchmen, after urging me on, and inducing me to commit myself to the guaranteeing an income for a new Bishop, to back out and leave me to bear the punishment arising from trusting too much to others.

"*3rd*, Madagascar Committee meeting.

"*8th*, Wrote to the Bishops of Graham's Town, S. Helena, Free State, and Tozer, fixing S. Paul's Day, January 25th, 1869, for Macrorie's consecration at Cape Town, and summoning them to a Provincial Synod on the 27th. . . .

"*11th*, To Mr. T. Keble, at Bisley, near Stroud. Much talk with him about his dear brother, and Church matters. . . .

"*13th*, Preached in the evening at S. Lawrence, Jewry, on the anniversary of the Mission Services established last year with reference to the Lambeth Conference.

"*16th*, Wrote a strong letter of complaint to the Duke of Buckingham as to his conduct, he not even condescending to answer my letters. Shall not send it for a day or two.

"*18th*, Sent in to-day a formal letter of complaint to the Duke, which I may have to publish. I state that I, and the Church through me, are aggrieved by the course pursued by the Government with regard to the issue of the mandate, and I assign my reasons. I complain also of the way in which he has treated me with regard to filling up two Ecclesiastical appointments in my Diocese."

All this time Bishop Gray was moving about as usual, preaching and speaking in various places—often "wearièd out"—and worn in spirit, as his Journal tells. At Yarmouth, September 20th, he "preached twice to more than 3,000 people in

the noble parish church; the effort to make myself heard was great, and I was very tired." He was sleeping badly, and was much worn and depressed, and all the more so by a renewal of difficulties with Dean Green, and by anxiety as to the provision made for his people at Cape Town, Dean Douglas having arrived in England. On the 24th, Mrs. Gray left him for the first time since they had been in England, to receive the Dean and Mrs. Douglas. She had shared all his harassing journeys and anxieties, often ill and exhausted herself, but conscious that her presence and sympathy, her care of details taken off his mind, and often her reading to him through those weary sleepless nights, enabled him to get through a pressure of toil which would otherwise probably have overwhelmed him. On the 25th he followed to London, and there met Dean Douglas, Mr. Macrorie, and Mr. Wilkinson. There was much to discuss that was painful; and the weak staff left in Africa filled the Bishop with consternation. "Thus anxieties pour in upon me," he wrote, "when already overwhelmed. Arranged with Wilkinson to remain in England working up the endowment of the Zulu See. Much talk with the Dean."

"26th, Bad night. Preached at S. Cyprian's.

"27th, Preached at Forest Hill in morning. S. John's, Hammersmith, in evening."

To the BISHOP of OXFORD.

"October 1st, 1868.

"My dearest Bishop—Before I leave I must write you one line of brotherly love, to thank you once more for all that you have done and laboured to do in behalf of our struggling Church in Africa these many years. We shall, probably, not meet again here below. May we do so there where we hope to be, where God shall wipe away all tears from every eye.

"I wish that I could report anything comforting, but I cannot.

"I. The Bishop-designate of Bombay has been with me for some days. He brings me painful news from Africa. The worst is that dear Thomas has resigned his Archdeaconry.

“II. On the 18th September I wrote a letter of complaint to the Duke, who has four letters of mine before him unanswered, including one recommending Alder to succeed the Dean. Two days ago Elliot wrote at the Duke’s request to say that he had never received my letters!!! and asking again for Alder’s name. I meant him to understand that if he did not treat me fairly, I should publish that letter, which will do the Government no good. I am reproached on all sides for not consecrating in England. I must, before I leave, assign the reason.—Ever, my dearest Bishop, most affectionately yours,

“R. CAPETOWN.”

To this Bishop Wilberforce replied with characteristic warmth. He wrote from

“The Palace, Armagh, October 6th, 1868.

“My dearest Brother—Your letter filled my eyes with tears. I cannot bear to believe that I shall never see you and your dear wife again on earth. I feel a strong conviction that we *shall* meet. But that and all is in His Hands. May His blessing, my very dear and most honoured brother, rest upon you. To you it has been given indeed not only to believe in Christ, but to suffer for Him as few have suffered. Yet He sees you toiling in rowing, for the wind is contrary, and He will at the fourth watch give you a calm. I am utterly sick at heart as to this whole treatment of you and the cause by the Government. . . . I should like very much to know if anything has passed between you and the Archbishop. How strange and entangled is the whole Ecclesiastical state! This Congress most unequivocally showed the great rise in the Irish Clergy in Church principles. It was they who, after welcoming—— most cordially, would not patiently hear him declare the Ministry to be a human arrangement. Everywhere where I have been in Ireland I see signs of life and growth; and that at this moment this blow should be dealt it, and from the hand which deals it, is one of the darkest things I have lived to see. My dear dear friend, may God bless you! I have your kind loving voice ringing in my ear as I write; your anxious, your happy countenance

floats before my eyes, and I long once more to grasp your faithful hand." . . .

The friends never did meet again in this life.

"*October 3rd*, Entered to-day upon my 60th year. What a year of controversy, anxiety, and toil this last has been! May God so overrule events that hereafter His Church in Africa, and here too, may serve Him in all godly quietness. May He give me more grace that the short remainder of my life may be more pure and holy and self-denying, and that I may give myself more entirely to Him and to the work which He has given me to do. We had a family party at Edward's, who has come up to town to see us off."

That last week was a full and trying one. People were coming up to town to see the Bishop once more, some on business matters, some on spiritual concerns, some out of affection or friendship. On October 4th (17th Sunday after Trinity) he preached at S. Matthias', Stoke Newington. On the 5th there was an important meeting at S. P. C. K. of the secretaries and treasurer of the Bishops' Association. A series of farewell services were held at S. Lawrence, Jewry. October 6th was the principal day, beginning with celebration at 7.30. At 11 o'clock there was a second celebration, when the Bishop of Rochester preached the first sermon, from words which fell on many a heart as peculiarly fitting: "And now behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things which shall befall me there" (Acts xx. 22). At 1 o'clock Litany, and a sermon from the Bishop-elect, Mr. Macrorie; and at evensong, 8 o'clock, the Bishop of Cape Town preached, taking as his text, "My Kingdom is not of this world" (S. John xviii. 30). Those who were present at this service will not soon forget how, when it was ended, the faithful crowded round the Bishop of Cape Town seeking his blessing, so that the whole passage-way was stopped, and it was only slowly that he could get through the church from the sacristy to the door, giving the benediction sought to the lines of devout men who knelt awaiting it. The Bishop wrote of the services as "very glorious," though he was well-nigh exhausted by the end of the

day. Meetings of various kinds—S. P. G.,<sup>1</sup> S. P. C. K., and Cape Town Association—connected with his African work; visits to the Colonial Office, etc. etc., filled up every hour.

On the last day he wrote to the Bishop of Oxford :

“ 53 Cambridge Terrace, October 8th, 1868.

“ My dearest Bishop—I had no very important conversation with the Archbishop. He complained of the Duke of Buckingham’s treatment of him. I believe that he has three letters unanswered relating to Labuan, and the See of Mauritius is nowhere. The Archbishop complained of the Duke’s conduct about Gibraltar. He suggested nothing to me, and knowing him, I hardly looked for this. . . . I mean to try and see Disraeli to-day, and complain to him. . . . We had most hearty services on Tuesday, and I had a most affectionate meeting of associates afterwards. . . . 4 P.M., I have seen Dizzy. He says there has been no refusal upon the part of the Cabinet about the Mandate,—was very courteous and kind. Promised to see the Duke. Did not pledge himself to any particular course. Asked how he should communicate with me. Is to do so through Mowbray, who will send his letter to Douglas as my Commissary. I have told Douglas to take no public step without communicating with you.

“ We have had several abortive Madagascar meetings. The Bishops of London, Mauritius, and myself, were to select a Bishop. On leaving I have said that no one so represents all my views as you do, and asked that you might be elector in room of me. I hope you will consent.—Ever affectionately yours,  
R. CAPETOWN.”

In his Journal the Bishop says: “ Interview with Mr. Disraeli. Complained of the Duke of Buckingham’s treatment of me, and of the Church through me, in the matter of the Mandate, and of the appointment of a successor to Dean

<sup>1</sup> Canon Hawkins, so long Secretary to S. P. G. and to the Colonial Bishops Council, died October 5th, 1868, warmly regretted by his many friends, one of whom (also a staunch supporter of Bishop Gray’s) had already passed from this life since the Lambeth Synod, September 1868—Bishop Fulford of Montreal.

Douglas. Left him a copy of my letter to the Duke, of September 18th, in which I had made a formal complaint on these matters. He was frank, cordial, and free-spoken, and promised at once to look into matters, and settle them. He pledged himself to nothing, but to lose no time in coming to a decision." . . . That morning the Bishop and his belongings attended "a large choral celebration" at S. Mary Magdalen, and a farewell gathering took place in the evening at Cambridge Terrace. The next morning, October 9th, they went to Plymouth, where at the very last moment the Metropolitan received the long-delayed letter from the Duke of Buckingham. On a large sheet of blue paper stamped "The Wharf, Millbay, Plymouth," he wrote a few hasty lines to the Bishop of Oxford:

"My dearest Bishop—At the wharf I received the enclosed from the Duke, and another letter saying that he approves of Alder for Dean. It is clear from the Duke's message that —— has been at him. I think that the best thing now, if possible, would be for the Government to say they are prepared to issue the Mandate, and that the consecration should take place in Africa. Will you write to the Archbishop? You will see that the Duke now rests his doubts not upon law, but upon difference of opinion within the Church.—Ever affectionately yours,  
R. CAPETOWN."

This letter, and one to the Archbishop, were entrusted to the Bishop's son, who in posting the former adds in pencil:—"I have seen them safe on board—they started about 11 this morning (Saturday, October 10th), a fair wind and a nice day." That letter to the Archbishop was the last. The gentle, loving, and well-loved Primate, Archbishop Longley, died on the 27th of that month, of bronchitis, to the real grief of numbers far beyond his immediate family circle, and to the infinite loss of the Church, which, if his gentle hands sometimes failed to guide with unerring firmness and decision, he at least ruled in the loving spirit of an Apostle, and with staunch fidelity to her ancient Creeds and Faith.

## CHAPTER XII.

OCTOBER, 1868, TO SEPTEMBER, 1872.

GATHERING A SISTERHOOD—VOYAGE OUT: MADEIRA—BEGINNING OF S. GEORGE'S HOME—RULE OF LIFE—ADDRESS—INNER RULE—SPIRITUAL DIRECTION—LETTERS ON SPIRITUAL SUBJECTS—CORRESPONDENCE WITH BISHOP WILBERFORCE—CONSECRATION OF BISHOP MACROBIE—SYNOD—VISITATION—FOREST FIRE—TROUBLES—CHURCH PROPERTY IN NATAL—FRAMING OF CANONS—IRISH CHURCH—DEATH OF MRS. GLOVER—PROVINCIAL SYNOD—DECLARATION OF FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES—CONSTITUTION—CANONS—SEVERE ILLNESS—BISHOP OF ZULULAND—LETTERS TO MISS MACKENZIE: TO BISHOP WILBERFORCE—SUDDEN VOYAGE TO ENGLAND FOR MRS. GRAY—DANGEROUS SYMPTOMS—WORK IN ENGLAND—BISHOPRIC OF MADAGASCAR—CONSECRATION OF BISHOP WEBB—RETURN TO CAPE TOWN—ROUGH VOYAGE—INCREASE OF MRS. GRAY'S ILLNESS—CALAMITIES OF FRANCE—MRS. GRAY'S LAST ILLNESS AND DEATH—CORRESPONDENCE—DEPARTURE OF BISHOP COTTERILL FOR EDINBURGH—RITUALISM—PURCHAS JUDGMENT—PATIENCE AND GENTLENESS NEEDED—S. THOMAS, MALMESBURY—BISHOP'S REPLY ON RITUAL MATTERS—VISITATION IN NAMAQUA LAND—CONSECRATION OF BISHOP MERRIMAN—EFFORTS AT UNION WITH THE DUTCH CHURCH—GENERAL REUNION—THE DIAMOND FIELDS—GRAND DUKE ALEXIS—BROTHERHOODS—VISITATION TOUR—ATHANASIAN CREED—PROPOSALS TO CREATE A SEE OF GEORGE—DEATH OF MR. WILLIAM GRAY—LAST ILLNESS—LAST CONFIRMATION AND SERVICE—DEATH—BURIAL.

**D**URING the last year spent in England Bishop Gray had, amid all his other more public labours, been diligently engaged in looking out for the material wherewith to carry out the resolution expressed by his Synod of establishing penitentiary work at Cape Town; as also to effect the many good works among his people which the Bishop felt could be more effectually carried out by a Religious Community than in any other way. To this end he had visited nearly all the Communities working in England, and had consulted with their founders, superiors, and Wardens. He had also seen a large number of ladies in all parts of England who felt a desire to work in this way for God, and who were prepared to put

themselves into the Bishop's hands for that purpose. Of course a great many such fell through from a variety of causes—health, objections of friends, reasonable and unreasonable; and an absence of real fitness for the work in the candidates themselves on closer investigation. However, before the time for sailing arrived, the Bishop had arranged to take eight ladies out with him, none of whom had been members of any existing Community, but whom he hoped to train and mould into a Sisterhood himself. It was a considerable undertaking, and he owned afterwards that he felt himself to be a bold man! However, the first start was prosperous. When off Madeira he wrote to his brother Mr. Edward Gray:

“October 15th.

“I send you a line just to say that we are all well, and that the weather has been as favourable as it could be, and that I am not quite overwhelmed with the charge of my eleven daughters! We have already got tolerably intimate with most of them, and like them very much. Some of them are clearly very sterling women, very sensible, and very nice and high in tone. They have their different gifts, and some will probably be more useful than others, but I am very hopeful about them. I think that most of them will agree. We do what we can to make them feel at ease, and are already getting to know them well. How we shall get over thirty-five days together I do not yet know. There is a great want of occupation on board ship. There is an old Scotch Churchman on board, whose whole soul is in Church matters, who is greatly impressed by seeing this array of self-supporting ladies giving themselves to the work.” And writing the same day to his son, the Bishop says: “Your mother and I have been quite well. Blanche very unwell, also some of our ladies. We have got daily prayers established morning and evening, and nearly all the passengers attend; and we shall, D.V., have weekly communion. . . . After prayers we have singing lessons, and after that I give lessons in Dutch, which takes up till luncheon time. Then we read and talk and walk. The kind of life is dull enough, but

in spite of short nights we are getting rest. Your mother is, I think, improving in good looks daily."

And in a letter to Mrs. Williamson, dated "At sea, October 31st, 1868," the Bishop says: "At Madeira I took all my party on shore, and gave them a ride into the hill country and a dinner, which refreshed them greatly. After a hot ride, the Chaplain came to beg me to hold a Confirmation. So I had to hurry through dinner, and take the service. I confirmed there twenty-one years before, the Queen Dowager being present. What years of deep anxiety have intervened! It is a fortnight since we left Madeira, and we are now drawing near to S. Helena. Nearly all are very weary, and some of our party are sick every day. Most of them are all I could wish, and will, I hope, be very valuable workers. They are very varied in their tastes and characters, and there is a little disinclination in some to any rule, but I trust that they will get on well. We are a party of twenty-one. . . . Have a good deal of reading; but life on board is monotonous and uncomfortable, and we shall be very thankful when we reach our destination. . . . The Bishop of Rochester's text at S. Lawrence is frequently present to my mind. I know not what shall befall me on my return to my Diocese; but I see by stray papers which we got on the wide sea that Colenso is going to invoke the aid of the Supreme Court, which will, I doubt not, be given him. . . . The treatment which I have received from the Duke of Buckingham is an encouragement to all to do what they can to thwart and annoy me. There seems not a weapon that Satan can use to defeat this consecration which has not been forged and cast." In the same spirit he wrote to his brother: "We are getting the rest now which is to fit us to meet the many difficulties and distresses which I know await me at the Cape. Oh when, my dear brother, shall I be permitted, like others, to serve God and work in peace! No one knows what it costs me to be always contending, struggling, warring with others! However, it *is* my proper work, because given me, and not, whatever men may say or think, of my seeking."

Just off S. Helena the Bishop wrote to his son: "I like

my ladies. . . . There are some a little against any rules. I have been preparing these, and also counsels, for when I formally pledge them to observe the rules in my chapel. I am able to work about seven hours a day. Rise at 5.30. Walk till 7.30. Read till 9, when we breakfast. Prayers at 10, then practise hymns, and I give my Dutch lesson. Work from 12 to 4, when I have my bath. After dinner at 5 we can do but little. I am getting through a good deal of reading, and have written one sermon."

The Bishop and his party landed November 11th. The day had been cloudy,<sup>f</sup>so that the ship was not signalled till the evening, and it was quite dark when they landed, much to the disappointment of the people, who had intended to give the Metropolitan a hearty reception. Even so, there was a goodly crowd gathered to greet him, and the Cathedral bells were set pealing, but the triumphal arches and decorations prepared by the poor coloured people were passed in darkness, and it was far on in the night when the Bishop and Mrs. Gray reached Bishop's Court, with the large family they had brought to that "hotel," as the Bishop truly called it. Overwhelmed with occupation his letters announce him to be, and truly it was so; yet he managed to give up November 17th to the Sisters and their work—the rule<sup>1</sup> which he had drawn up for them. He writes :

"November 18th, 1868.

. . . "There had been little alienations and differences among them, but I have been greatly comforted. They are all, I trust, of one heart and mind, and have behaved very nicely. All here seem disposed to welcome them heartily." On December 2nd the Bishop installed his Sisters in a small house which he had taken temporarily for them, and held a special service in their oratory, which was made as nice and devotional in appearance as they could make it. The few words which he spoke to them on this occasion will never be forgotten by any of those to whom they were addressed.

"My dear Daughters in Christ," the Bishop said, "I

<sup>1</sup> The External Rule will be found in the Appendix X.

have thought it desirable, on the eve of your entering upon the work to which you are about to devote yourselves, to join with you in special prayer and communion, and to offer to you some fatherly counsel. The life upon which you are about to enter is a most blessed one, and will bring with it, I doubt not, its great reward; for you have undertaken to devote yourselves to the immediate service of your God—to the advancement of your Lord's Truth and Kingdom amongst the Heathen and Mohametans, to the care of Christ's poor and sick, to the instruction of the ignorant and young, and, it may be, to the recovery from a life of sin and shame of poor fallen sisters. You have for Christ's Sake left the comforts of home and those dear to you in the flesh, that you may serve Him in all humility in the persons of those who so greatly need your loving ministrations. I cannot doubt that you and your work will be accepted and blessed of Him, Whose you are, Whom you serve; that you will be instruments in God's Hand of great good to the people amid whom you shall dwell; that many in this land will, through you, be led to the foot of the Cross, and find rest and peace and salvation there; that God will, through your endeavours, be glorified, and some little done, at least, towards the accomplishment of those purposes of love which led our Dear Lord to lay down His Life for the world.

“You will, however, I am sure, be yourselves the first to feel how much of your success and usefulness will depend upon what each one of you in herself is before God in the secret life and spirit. We tell upon others for good just in proportion to what we are in ourselves; every fault of ours mars the work of Christ by the effect which it produces on those around us. Your work requires the very highest spiritual gifts and graces,—humility, faith, zeal, love, devotion, heavenly-mindedness, tenderness, gentleness, self-sacrifice, forbearance towards others,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The lesson of meekness and forbearance was the one which the Bishop always seemed most anxious to put before his spiritual children. One of these writes: “He one day said to me that he so often remarked that the meek seem to be always giving up everything, and yet they win everything; ‘The meek have the world at their feet.’ I asked him if he had always been humble; and I can

watchfulness over self; and Satan is ever at your side to rob you of such of these as you possess, to lower your tone, to instil worldly motives and feelings, to undermine God's work in your own souls, to prevent the Spirit working His perfect work within you. I have thought in what way I could best help you in your work and service of love, and in your own souls also. As you are my fellow-helpers amid the flock which the Holy Ghost has committed to my care, so would I be your servant for Christ's Sake, ministering to you as I may be able, praying for you daily, and fulfilling as far as may be the office of your Father in Christ. In the discharge of this my duty I have, chiefly from other sources—availing myself of the experience of those who have been long engaged in works of mercy and of love—gathered certain counsels or suggestions for the advancement as well of your own spiritual life as of the work in which you will engage, which I now set before you."

The Inner Rule of Life, which the Bishop proceeded to give the Sisterhood of S. George's, though of course containing nothing new, will be interesting to many, as a specimen of Bishop Gray's more intimate teaching, as well as valuable in its suggestions to all who are seeking to make their own lives more interior.

"**RULE I.** Do all for God alone—all for the increase of His Glory, and from love to Him. Strive ever to realise His Presence,—to feel that all you do is done in His Sight. Look up to God even more than into yourselves. Dwell upon Him, upon His love to you, more than upon your own shortcomings or sins.

never forget the quick earnest way with which he replied, 'My dear, I have never been humble in my life!' When he was being told of the wrong-doing of others, his manner was not to be forgotten. When it was of importance that he should listen, I can see him now, his eyes fixed, a soft expression of sorrow on his face, combined with an anxious look, as if he were trying to take it in, and a prolonged and wonderfully gentle 'Ah!' which seemed to come from the very bottom of his heart. If I alluded unnecessarily to faults in others, or spoke impatiently of them, he would take my hand in his and say, 'We must remember, my child, that we have this treasure in earthen vessels.' This was quite one of his sayings; he spoke as if it were one of his most settled experiences."