

THE LIFE
OF
JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF NATAL.

CHAPTER I.

RETURN TO NATAL, 1865-66.

SHORTLY before he left England the Bishop published the Fifth Part of his *Examination of the Pentateuch*. It was in his belief the most important part of his task so far as he had up to that time been enabled to carry it. Whether his countrymen might acknowledge it or not, he felt that he had demonstrated the worthlessness of an old superstition, which cramped and withered the religious life of the land. He left his fifth volume, therefore, as a token of farewell at once to his friends and to his adversaries. To the former he had to make acknowledgements for help and support in the struggle.

“Most heartily and sincerely do I thank those many friends in England, of the clergy and laity, who have aided me in these trying times, publicly and privately, with counsel and comfort, who have stood by me in the hour of conflict, and who have sustained me with kind words, and defended me

by generous deeds, the remembrance of which will never depart from me.

“ I now return to the duties which have been so long interrupted,—of late by circumstances not under my own control. In the midst of those duties I shall find frequent opportunity for acting on the principles which I have enunciated, and shall rejoice in breathing myself, and helping others to breathe, the fresh free air, which the recent decisions have made it now possible to breathe within the bounds of the National Church. I shall also, as I hope and fully purpose, find time to pursue these inquiries, and perhaps, hereafter, return to publish them. But all these things are in the hands of God. Should I never return, I bid my friends in England farewell, to meet them again, I trust, on another shore. But, if I should return, a few years hence, it is my firm belief that, as we are now all thoroughly ashamed of those trials and executions for witch-craft and sorcery . . . which disgraced the Christianity of our forefathers in the Middle Ages, nay, even down to much later days, . . . so I shall find in that day my fellow-countrymen and fellow-Churchmen ashamed of that religious fear and frenzy which has raged so furiously in these our times—ashamed of the violence with which they have maintained, in opposition to the plainest evidence of reason, the time-honoured traditions of former ages—ashamed of the attempt to break down and crush, under the weight of opprobrious names, and silence by arbitrary measures, fitted only for the dark ages of ecclesiastical despotism, honest and earnest endeavours, on the part of myself and others among the clergy, to relieve the religious teaching of the National Church from the reproach of being contradictory to the plain conclusions of science, and far behind the progress of the age. Nay, I am not without hope that some, even of those who have been most severe upon me, may learn meanwhile to entertain a kinder feeling, and come to see that, however unworthily, I have yet according to my light been labouring, as earnestly as they, to sow the seed of Life Eternal, and do the work to which my God has called me; and so may give to me

again the right hand of fellowship, which they have now withheld, as a fellow-labourer with them for the kingdom of God."

More than twenty years have passed since these words were written; and it may perhaps be safely said, that the conditions of the struggle have been materially modified. Whether the antagonism between the traditionalist party and the real thinkers in the country is really lessened, we have but inadequate means for determining. Startling books are written and startling things are said by the clergy as well as by the laity in the English Church; but on the self-styled orthodox side something like an agreement seems to have been made, by tacit consent, to offer no reply, and to treat so-called heretical arguments and conclusions with silence. Such a condition of things is not perhaps the most favourable for the progress of thought; but the longer the silence, the less will be the chance of anything like a return to the old dictatorial dogmatism.

In returning to Natal, the Bishop was returning only to active warfare under different forms. He might hope, indeed, to have the sincere adhesion of a laity resolved to obey the law of the Church of England, even if they could make no profession of adopting all or any of the conclusions to which the work of recent years had brought him. This he had no wish that they should do except from honest conviction. Had he wished anything else, he would have been committed to the same fallacy which led Archbishop Longley to declare that the members of the Church of England in Natal could not accept him as their Bishop without "identifying" themselves "with his errors." How long or severe might be the conflict betokened by these words, he could not tell. In England, although he met with neither sympathy nor help in some quarters from which he expected both, he had received tenfold elsewhere. From the friends who had thus rallied

round him he was now separated by eight thousand miles of sea, or between two and three months of time, while he had to face alone all the opposition which the whole sacerdotal party in the Church of England could bring to bear upon him. Even after he became assured of the support of the laity in Natal, he had none to whom he could look for advice, or with whom he could take counsel in his work of Biblical criticism. He knew, in short, that there was a hard fight before him ; but he faced it without misgiving, and the incidents of his landing at Durban were in a high degree cheering. Of the welcome prepared for him his daughter says :—

“ The first sign of friendliness [was] the dressing of the harbour with flags, as our ship came in sight round the bluff, our Captain being at first much puzzled to read the ‘ signals ’ thus being run up, until it dawned upon him, ‘ Why, they must know that we have the Bishop on board. ’ Next the pilot-boat came tumbling out, bringing two or three friends shouting, ‘ Well, my lord, we’ve come through the water to you, as you’ve come through fire and water to us ; ’ and then we landed, he, as usual, standing back to allow the women and children among his fellow-passengers to go first ; and so it happened that we stepped a little puzzled into a close-packed silent crowd, which broke into a hearty cheer a few minutes after, as he set foot on shore.”

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *November 17, 1865.*

[After mentioning the hearty greeting which he received from the laity at Maritzburg, together with an address signed by 171 persons.]

“ Then we proceeded to Bishopstowe, where we found all things right—the natives dancing and weeping in ecstasies

of delight, and the place looking very beautiful *and calm*, after the toil and battle of London life. . . . From other parts of the colony I have received most satisfactory letters. In fact, everything would go as well as possible, but for the action of the S.P.G., whose funds support the clergy in their rebellion, and may be withdrawn from them if they should recognize their lawful Bishop. It is scandalous conduct on the part of the Society and its instigators. . . . I am hard at work on Part VI., having done a good deal of preparatory labour on the voyage. How can I thank you sufficiently for all your kind help in so many ways? . . . On Friday last the two churchwardens of the Cathedral came out by appointment to Bishopstowe . . . On my entering my study, one of them arose and read a protest against my ministering in the Cathedral, evidently written for them by the Dean, and then presented me with another from the Dean, and a third from certain members of the laity. But I may as well say at once that the address of welcome at Durban was signed by 148, that at Addington by the two churchwardens and 30 others, and the address at Pietermaritzburg by 171; so that more than 300 have signed for me, and only 150 against me. . . . Then, looking at his (Dean Green's) list, we find a great number of names of people who are far away from Maritzburg, others who belong to St. Andrew's Church, others who are Dissenters, others who go nowhere to church, and others who are mere lads—minors. . . . Only a few of them are regular attendants at the Cathedral of a respectable standing; and though, of course, my Maritzburg list contains a mixture of all classes, yet my 171 names were all obtained hastily in Maritzburg itself in two days, whereas the Dean's list had been a month in preparation, he and Mr. Robinson having gone personally to everyone whom they hoped to influence, and charged them solemnly not to profess themselves 'heretics' and 'disbelievers in the Bible.' I have dwelt too long on this; but it is the Dean's only card to play in England, and I am certain that you will find in the *Guardian* some attempt to represent his address as a

bona fide protest from the Church people of Pietermaritzburg—which is simply ridiculous, or, rather, untrue.

“Well, having received the three documents, I put them quietly aside, and asked the churchwardens what now they expected. ‘They hoped that I should not now preach on Sunday.’ ‘Do you really *hope* that, Mr. Dickinson? Can you say honestly, as a Christian man, that you have any hope or expectation of the kind? Do you think that I should have come from England with a fixed purpose, announced beforehand—to discharge my duties as Bishop of this diocese—and be turned aside by such papers as these?’ Well, they *wished* that I would not. ‘Ah! that is very different.’ However, I assured them that, for their sakes and their children’s, I felt bound not to comply with their wish.”

On the next day, the churchwardens took upon themselves to close the Cathedral to both parties on the Sunday, and forwarded a message to that effect to the Bishop, who sent a note conveying this information to his registrar, the younger Mr. Shepstone. The Bishop himself

“determined to preach to the white people in St. Mary’s Kafir chapel. Accordingly, I rode in the next morning. . . . But just as I reached town, a friend met me, and informed me of what had passed, as follows:—Mr. Shepstone, on getting my note, rode out immediately to the Chief Justice, and applied for, and obtained, an interdict against the church being closed. At 10 P.M. the Churchwarden W—— was supping at the club, and announcing that the church would be certainly shut; only the law could interfere, and it was *too late* for that to do anything (hence, no doubt, their reason for sending out the message to me, instead of informing my registrar); but while he was speaking, to the great amusement of the company, in walked the sheriff and served him with the interdict. But where was the Dean? No one could tell. At last it was made out that he and the other churchwarden, and a policeman, were shut up in the church, where the Dean spent the whole night,

expecting some violent opening of the doors. On Sunday morning, it appears, there were great searchings of heart between the Dean and his officers as to what was to be done. I heard . . . that for some time they had resolved to set at naught the judge's order, and go to prison. But then it turned out that the Dean expected the churchwardens to go to prison, and the churchwardens expected the Dean ; and when this difference of opinion was betrayed, the churchwardens determined to obey the law, and open the doors. They kept them shut, however, to the last moment, up to 11 A.M., by which time an immense number of white people had gathered round them, and behind them numbers also of black people, who were intensely interested in watching the proceedings—the controversy being known throughout the whole land. . . . The effect upon the natives through the ingenious arrangement of the Dean and churchwardens was this, as William¹ tells me. They looked on, and saw the whole body of white people barred out of the Cathedral, till Sobantu arrived, when instantly a change took place : first the inner door is opened, and the churchwarden comes out and reads a paper (their protest) ; then the outer gate is opened, and the whole church is filled in a moment ; and then Sobantu, having had the doors opened, walks quietly in himself. As usual, their blunders have helped my cause immensely. The natives were at once perfectly satisfied that I had the power, and that the Dean had been misleading them all along in saying that I should never be allowed to enter the church. As I walked up the aisle, the churchwardens met me, and for the third time read their protest ; then the Dean ordered the Bishop's sentence of deprivation to be read ; then he himself, in a theatrical manner, warned me that what [the Church] ' shall bind on earth is bound in heaven. That sentence stands ratified in the presence of Almighty God. Depart ! Go away from the House of God ! ' All which I listened to quietly, only saying, ' I have come to discharge in this

¹ The "intelligent Zulu." See Vol. I. pp. 50, 87, 105, 156.

church and diocese the duties committed to me by the Queen.' Then the churchwardens read the judge's order, during which I robed in the chancel (the Dean refused to open the door of the vestry), and then I told the people I was going to read prayers. The crowded congregation, which thronged the aisle as well as all the seats, was stilled in a moment. They had tied up the bell-ropes, locked the harmonium, and taken away the Prayer Book and Bible; but the latter were brought back in time, and I read all the prayers, pitched the chant and hymn tunes, and had the whole congregation with me; the Dean and Mr. Robinson kneeling before the altar with their backs to the congregation. . . . In the evening, Mr. W—— promised all should be properly ordered: he would attend at a quarter past six, and see the church lighted, &c. At the time of service, however, I went up and found crowds of people outside, the rain falling, and the doors closed. The Dean, they say, stood by enjoying the dilemma. At six he had sent some away, saying that there would be no service to-night, because of the 'rabble' in the morning, and the desecration to the chancel by the people sitting in it. I had called up some of those who stood crowded in the aisle—as the chancel was almost empty—and some forty sat there; my principle being that the chancel was made 'for the people, not the people for the chancel. I waited some five or ten minutes, and at last, seeing that all were getting wet, and there were many ladies among them, I dismissed the congregation, and promised to preach next Sunday morning. Half an hour later, Mr. W—— came up, opened the church, and lighted it; but there was no service. He has written to me, and published a full and humble apology, saying that, fatigued with the exertions and anxiety of the previous night and morning, he had fallen asleep after dinner, and had not waked in time. Of course I accept his explanation, though the Dean's conduct is the more inexplicable. However, the result is that many of his own friends are disgusted, and nothing could have happened better for my cause."

“TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *November 30, 1865.*

“I send you Natal papers by which you will see how matters are going over here ; and in one word I may sum it up by saying the laity here are all right, and the Dean can do nothing with them. But the Archbishop of Canterbury has just written to him (in reply to the request for advice which he forwarded some months ago from the clergy and laity!) to say that they have a perfect right to elect a Bishop for themselves, and he says, ‘I cannot see how you can accept Dr. Colenso as your Bishop without identifying yourselves with his errors.’ This is certainly scandalous, though no doubt the Archbishop has been imposed upon by the reports which have been sent him by the Dean. . . . The Archbishop says the Convocation is to advise my clergy what they are to do, and they are expected, of course, to confirm the action of the Archbishop. If the liberal members of the Lower House would come up to the scratch, the whole plan might be defeated ; and I rather think that Stanley will be able to make some capital of my letter. I wish I could get my native, William, to put upon paper all he said to me a few days ago, when we talked about the present movement. I found him, and I believe all the [Mission] natives, perfectly^a prepared for all that I have to tell them. Indeed, Bishop Gray has made the way easy for me by saying what he did to them.”¹

TO SIR CHARLES LYELL.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *November 30, 1865.*

“Your very kind letter of October 8th duly reached me, and now I must send a very few words of reply. I say very few, because my time has been greatly taken up (when I should have been writing for the English mail), by the necessity of replying at length to a letter of the Archbishop

¹ See Vol. I. pp. 86-88.

of Canterbury addressed to my Dean.¹ . . . It is a monstrous act, as it seems to me, for one in the Archbishop's position. . . . Of course the Archbishop has been thoroughly deceived by the Bishop of Oxford, &c., as to the state of things in Natal, and probably the Bishop of Oxford himself has been deceived by the sanguine reports of Bishop Gray and Dean Green. I send to you, and to the two Deans (Milman and Stanley), and many of our friends, the Natal papers containing accounts of our proceedings, so that I need not enter into details about them. I will only say that all is going as well as I could desire. The great bulk of the laity are entirely with me. . . . I have not yet seen my special friend Mr. Shepstone, who has been upon the frontier for some months past, watching the slow work of the Basuto war. But I had a letter from him yesterday in which he says, 'I happened to see a private letter from Mr. Henderson (one of the most influential citizens, and formerly a close friend of the Dean's), in which he says, "If the Bishop will only conduct the services of the Cathedral himself for a time, he will carry everything before him."' This I do in the morning, leaving the coast clear for the Dean to annihilate my teaching, if he can, in the evening; but he has tied up the church bell, locked the harmonium, &c., so that I have to pitch the chants and tunes myself; but the congregation take them up very heartily, and yesterday I had an offer from some of them to put in another harmonium, and form a choir. I mean to *require* the use of the bell, &c., next Sunday. You will be amused to find that I have had to spend an hour or two to-day in refuting a certain great geologist who has been solemnly quoted against me at the head of a long letter in the *Times of Natal*, as follows:—'Sir Charles Lyell says: "On grounds which may be termed strictly geological may be inferred the recent date of the creation of man. All geological induction, indeed, demonstrates that man is not more than 6,000 years old."' I have asked for the reference,

¹ See the preceding letter.

and at any rate I have confuted the said authority out of his own mouth in his last published works, which, thanks to his kindness, I have by my side."

TO THE REV. C. VOYSEY.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *December 1, 1865.*

"I must write you a few lines to tell you and your good people that we have arrived safely, thank God; and one of the first things I did, on entering my study, was to open your letter, which lay there awaiting me. We had on the whole a very pleasant and favourable voyage, though very stormy from the Cape. It seemed as if a violent gust from those regions drove me away, with a sort of fury of despair, towards my own 'wretched colony' (as the Bishop of Oxford says), when, as soon as we got sight of the lovely coast, the storm lulled, the sky cleared, and everything became bright around us, with just a fresh wind at times to remind us that we had not yet reached a land-locked, peaceful haven of rest. We entered the outer bay on Monday morning, November 6, and the day before the mail had left for the Cape and England—greatly to our disappointment, as we hoped to have sent home by it news of our safe arrival. But it had this good result, that no tidings went to Capetown; so that up to this moment, though I have been nearly a month in the colony,¹ we have yet no anathemas from the Metropolitan of all South Africa. You will see, by the papers which I have ordered to be sent to you, how I have been received, and how entirely mistaken were those good people in England who prophesied for me all kinds of insult and of opposition. The Bishop of Oxford's words, I suspect, had a deeper meaning than people in England would imagine, when he spoke so bitterly of that 'wretched colony.' He probably knew from the reports which had reached him that all was not so smooth and serene as they had hoped to find it by

¹ There was at this time only one mail each month.

this time, after three years' assiduous efforts to blacken and defame my character. The fact is that they have roused here, as in England, the good old English feeling for fair play, and my position is really much stronger here at present than even I had been led to expect."

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 3, 1866.*

"The plot begins to thicken. On Christmas Day arrived a private letter¹ from Bishop Gray, telling me that he had sent an 'official' letter through the Dean on the subject of my excommunication. I have replied² to the first, and ignored the second. . . . I expect that I shall be excommunicated next Sunday; but I do not imagine that it will have the slightest effect in disturbing my position here. My congregation is large and attentive, and very respectable; the Dean's, I hear, is very small. You will see by the sermons which I send you what sort of teaching my people get from me.

"I see more and more clearly the importance of the step which I have taken in coming out here. It is quite clear that the whole of the proceeding against me is an attempt on the part of the Bishop of Oxford and Archbishop of Canterbury to *undo* the evil of the judgement in Wilson and Williams's case. If they could establish in my case that, but for the statute law of England, the 'Church of England' would 'cast out' such opinions as mine (which they would do if Bishop Gray succeeded in making my position untenable, while still holding the Queen's letters patent), then they will turn round upon the English clergy and say, 'You are in honour bound to renounce such opinions as inconsistent with the teaching of the Church.' I am happy to say my position is strong enough as regards myself personally. My only difficulty is with the S.P.G., which exercises a terrible thralldom over the clergy. At any rate, here I must stay at my post until the battle is

¹ See Vol. I. p. 375.

² *Ib.* p. 378.

fought out effectually; and that, I expect, will take some time longer. I have hardly been able to do anything to Part VI. since I landed, and I now see that I shall have very little time for such work with the present claims upon me. If my enemies had but known what service they were doing to me and to the cause by keeping me so long in England with nothing to do but to wait for the decision of the law! But every step of theirs hitherto has been a blunder; and so, I expect, will the 'excommunication' prove."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *January 2, 1866.*

"We are still surviving, thank God, and in very good spirits; though *now*, I expect, comes the tug of war. On Christmas Day the mail brought me a *private* letter from Bishop Gray, very characteristic, and telling me that I should receive through the Dean an 'official letter,' containing, it would seem, a warning of 'excommunication,' conditional upon my consenting or not to one of four propositions which he makes to me of submitting my books to certain bodies or persons, whom he named—all, of course, ecclesiastics pledged to the uttermost to condemn me. This letter reached me three or four days after I got the private letter, to which last I replied at once, saying that I could take no cognisance of any 'official' letter from him on such a subject. So when the 'official' letter came, I replied to the Dean that I could not take any notice of it, but had replied to the 'private.' I then sent the former to my registrar, and allowed him to look at it, and I know the contents so far as to be aware that, whereas the private letter gives me 'only two courses,' by which I may avoid the terrible catastrophe threatened, the 'official' mentions *four*, I think, and orders the Dean to read the sentence of excommunication if I do not accept one of the propositions within seven days. Accordingly, next Sunday I expect the grand blow will be struck, which, I need hardly say, will not in any way advance *their* cause in Natal. . . .

Bishop Gray has blundered here as usual. The Dean cannot know what reply I have made to the private letter, nor whether I have not accepted one of the propositions made; and, in fact, I have offered to submit my books to the judgement of the Archbishop of Canterbury (one of the parties named)—not in his personal capacity, which, after all his extra-judicial doings, would be absurd—but in his ecclesiastical court; reserving, however, the right, which I cannot agree to alienate, of appealing to the Queen; and I have asked him what right he has to assume beforehand that the Queen would nominate a mere civil Commission to decide on questions of doctrine, as these would be.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *January 23, 1866.*

“As I expected in my last, on Sunday, the 14th, I was denounced from the altar of the Cathedral church by order of Bishop Gray through the Dean, with the ‘greater excommunication,’—and the people were enjoined to treat me henceforth as ‘a heathen man and a publican.’ This was at the early morning service, which the Dean holds at 9 A.M., since I take the regular service at 11 A.M. I heard of this when I reached town, and, of course, took no notice of it, except that I gave notice that in future I should preach in the evening of every Sunday as well as the morning. This, I knew, the people had been desiring; but out of consideration for the Dean, I had hitherto forbore punishing him so severely. The effect of the excommunication on the people is just what you might have expected. It has only strengthened my hands considerably, driven away from Bishop Gray many who at first sided with him, and attached my own people more closely to myself. . . . By this mail I shall send certified copies of the excommunication to Mr. Shaen. My lawyers might consider at once . . . whether any steps should be taken to bring the matter under the notice of the Queen. I am told by our Attorney-General that I could bring either a civil or a criminal

action against Bishop Gray; and perhaps if he comes up here in person to fulminate, I may have to do something in this way. But I should most of all prefer, if they advise it, to represent the matter by petition to the Crown."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *February 1, 1866.*

"The judges have refused to compel the Dean to *register* the baptism of a child by me, on the application of the father, regarding the register as a sort of private note-book of the clergyman. There, of course, they are mistaken, not having had the canon brought before them. But I fancy the decision was right on another ground. The father should have complained to *me*, and I should have compelled the Dean to carry out the laws of our 'Benefit Society,' the Church of England. But in March, when the court sits again, I expect that I shall apply to have the church and its belongings made over to me as trustee. I have not been in any hurry about this, since I have had my services as I pleased, without interference."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *February 22, 1866.*

"You will be rather amused to find that you are appointed Proctor-for-Convocation-of-the-Church-Defence-Association of Natal. There is a German title of honour for you, and I assure you there is a good lot of Evangelicals among your constituents. . . . Our cause is gaining strength daily with the laity; and even some change is going on with the clergy. First, of the latter, I have heartily with me Tønnesen, of course, on all grounds; old Mr. Nisbett, the military chaplain, on constitutional grounds; and I am now certain that two or three others would declare themselves on my side but for the rein of the S.P.G. . . . Besides these, however, a very able Independent minister,¹ . . . who at

¹ The Rev. J. Reynolds, now Senior Presbyter of the Diocese of Natal.

first attacked me in his pulpit (I mean two or three years ago) has now come quite round to me, and has announced his intention to give up his office with his body, and will throw himself on his own resources for a time as a schoolmaster. Before long I hope to have him in my body of clergy. . . . Then the brother of *my* Mr. Robinson, who is the minister of Smithfield, that town in the Free State which threw off Bishop Twells's supremacy a year or so ago, has told me that he has written very strongly to one of the great supporters of the Colonial Church and School Society in England, to urge them to give me help for clergy,—Evangelicals, of course, who, however, shall mind their own business, and obey in all lawful things their diocesan. He feels that the battle now is not for or against Colenso, but for or against the very existence of the Church of England in South Africa. . . . The same feeling, however, is now shared by a great number of those who at first were opposed to me on religious grounds, poisoned as they had been by the talk of Gray and Green; and the result is that both at Durban and Maritzburg a strong body has been formed under the name of Church Defence Association, the first act of which will be to send home an address to Convocation. . . . I advised that they should send it to you as one known to them from my Defence Fund as a zealous co-operator, and give you *carte blanche* to act as their Proctor in the affair—to get it modified, if necessary, so as to adapt it properly for presentation. . . . Since the Dean has struck Tönnesen's name off the list of S.P.G. clergy for reading prayers for me, I have reported him (the Dean) to the Governor for reading the sentence of excommunication, and represented that, as he sets at defiance the Queen's authority, he is not fit to hold the office of Colonial Chaplain, for which he gets £100 a year. Of course, Bishop Gray or S.P.G. will soon make up the £100; but it is important now that he should no longer hold office under *Government*. On the 1st of March I shall apply for the Cathedral to be made over altogether to me. The time is now ripe for this."

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, February 16, 1866.

“ We are going on very well. In fact, our cause would be triumphant but for the S.P.G. . . . There is nothing that prevents the main body of the clergy in this diocese settling down quietly under me, but that they are afraid of losing their incomes, as they inevitably would if they said a word in my favour. You will see how the Dean has come down instantly on poor Tönnésen for only reading prayers in the Cathedral church at my request. Now Tönnesen is really a *first-rate* missionary, thoroughly practical, can turn his hand to any common work, besides being an excellent carpenter, and he has a thorough knowledge of Zulu,— better indeed than any one of us. I have no hesitation in saying that he is really the best missionary the Society has here; . . . yet at one stroke the Dean undertakes to dismiss him, without even consulting the Committee which the Society had named, and which I always told you was only a cloak, the whole power of the Society being really wielded in this diocese by the Dean, who utterly ignores the Queen’s supremacy, and defies and excommunicates his lawful Bishop. This is, of course, ‘*pour encourager les autres,*’ and it will have that effect. I know that several of the clergy would withdraw from the South African Church if they dared. . . . As old Mr. Nisbett said to me yesterday, ‘The Dean has got a rein round their necks, and at the slightest indication of a movement he throttles them.’

“ So with old Nisbett himself. For some years past he has been chaplain to the troops at Maritzburg, and is so at this time, besides being Government school-master there. Bishop Gray and the Dean both took good care to keep his name always in the back-ground, not choosing to regard him as a clergyman of the ‘diocese,’ because he is under Mr. Gleig, the Chaplain-General. On the Sunday on which I was ‘excommunicated,’ Mr. Nisbett at my request read prayers for me in the evening. . . . Yesterday to my great surprise I found that he too had received from the Dean a

letter couched in language quite as strong as that addressed to Tönnesen, and telling him that he should report his conduct to the Chaplain-General and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who would have to countersign his testimonials, if he ever returned to England. This last of course is 'fudge,' as any Bishop in England might receive him. Old Nisbett took no notice of it till after Tönnesen published *his* correspondence; and then he went down to the Dean, and after some warmish words, which ended with the Dean in a white rage bowing him out of his house, the old man turned round and said, 'As to that "excommunication," I think it is a scandalous libel. . . .'

"While the Society's funds are employed not only to support but to maintain my clergy in rebellion, to prevent them from obeying their Sovereign, and keeping their oaths of canonical obedience, it is clear that there will always be an *appearance* of unanimity among them, which is not *real*. As for the laity, the whole body of the more intelligent of them are with me. A very large majority of them are determined to receive me as Bishop, and reject the interference of the Bishop of Capetown. I preach twice on Sundays to large congregations, and last Sunday administered the Communion to more than thirty communicants, a large number under the circumstances, for of course the Dean has carried off *his* regular communicants, though in former days I have often been present with him when there were only nine or ten. But it is a monstrous thing that the Society should be allowed to *force* their South African clergy upon the diocese. They ought by their own principles to require them to acknowledge in all lawful things their lawful Bishop. But if they will not do this, they ought either to send a circular to their clergy in this diocese, and leave them at liberty to follow their own sense of duty in the matter; or else they ought to withdraw their clergy altogether from this diocese to the diocese of Capetown or Grahamstown.

"It is absolutely necessary to do everything that can be done to bring the S.P.G., and its manager the Bishop of Oxford,

to account in this matter. If every true English Churchman would refuse to contribute a penny while the Society is acting thus, it would soon be brought to its senses.

“ You will see that I am still going on with my course of sermons, and yet my congregation is not frightened nor diminished ; nor would they be in England, I believe, if such sermons were judiciously preached. But the composition of them in *this* climate, where head work as well as bodily work is very exhausting,—in addition to other duties of many kinds, correspondence here and at home, and the necessity of spending one day a week in town,—eats up my whole week. I cannot stir from home, nor put a single line to my Exodus, nor can I go on under this tension for ever. Still, I hope that, with the sermons of next Sunday and the Sunday after, there may be enough to make a little book for England, to remind the Bishop of Oxford of my being still in the land of the living. It is possible that by this mail an address to Convocation against the Bishop of Capetown and S.P.G. may go home from the Church Defence Association.

“ Perhaps the plain facts will be sufficient for Mr. Gleig, as he must know that all Bishop Gray's proceedings have been cancelled by the Queen, and that I have been excommunicated merely because I will not recognize what it is unlawful for me to recognize. For you know I am not excommunicated for my ‘heresies,’ but for my contumacy in not submitting to Bishop Gray's sentence of deprivation, I hope that Gleig will write Nisbett a few words of comfort, for the old man is exceedingly cautious not to interfere in diocesan matters. But really it was too much of a good thing to be ordered by the vicar-general of the Bishop of Capetown to regard the lawful Bishop of the diocese, holding Her Majesty's authority, ‘as a heathen man and a publican.’”

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, *March 1, 1866.*

“ By this mail I send my first series of Natal sermons. . . .

I have now the Cathedral full of my friends, who come

expecting me to speak the truth to them, and who sit out the sermon so attentively that you might hear a pin drop.

“You will see that these sermons are outspoken on the points touched upon. I could not hold my office on any other condition. . . . On the Sabbath question I take new ground, the only ground, as it seems to me, on which the battle can really be fought—namely, that the Fourth Commandment never was binding on anybody, for it is neither Divine nor even Mosaic.¹ It is curious that the Scottish discussion should have reached us just when I am in the middle of the subject. . . .

“My real difficulty here is the S.P.G., which is not only supporting clergy in direct rebellion, but instantly suppressing the least loyal movement in the hearts of its missionaries. At least, Dean Green does so in the name of the Society.”

TO SIR CHARLES LYELL.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *March 1, 1866.*

“I came home from the evening service last Sunday with the English mail in my pocket, and very refreshing it was to find and read your kind letter among the rest. You will be aware before this, I hope, that circumstances have compelled me, whether I wished it or not, to follow identically the course which Dean Stanley desired. On my way out I worked at the Book of Exodus, mastered it thoroughly for my purpose (and I may say that its phenomena are entirely in accordance with my previous conclusions); and during the first three days after reaching this place, where I had two sermons ready to be preached, which I had already preached at Durban, I did begin to put my notes in order, and filled a few pages of the analysis of Exodus. But from that time to this not a line have I written or been able to write. . . . You will, I hope, have received intelligence of all that has been going on here; and, of course, we shall be anxious to know in

¹ See Vol. I. pp. 655, 656.

what light things are looked at in England. But the necessity of writing a number of important letters without any counsellor but my wife at my elbow (for even my dear friend Mr. Shepstone has been 150 miles away, watching the Basutos, till very lately), as well as sermons regularly for the Cathedral, has absorbed all my time, and left me very little for my friends in England, . . . I have borne patiently all along the innumerable insults which the Dean has offered to me, so long as they affected only myself. But when he proceeded to attack the clergy who merely obeyed the law, and recognized their lawful Bishop, . . . I felt it to be my duty to report his conduct to the Governor, and to say that I did not consider him fit to retain any longer his office as Colonial Chaplain. . . . I believe that the Governor has sent the whole correspondence home to the Secretary of State. I wrote to Mr. Shaen by the same mail, sending copies of all letters, and begging that all might be done which could properly be done to secure the right decision in the case. For I cannot help feeling that if the Government will not support me under the circumstances my place is not here.

“I do not wish, however, to commit myself beforehand to any definite course, more especially as the laity here are very strong indeed on my side—many of them heartily on religious grounds, others, quite as heartily, on the supremacy question. . . . I send home by this mail my first series of Natal sermons, corrected, to Mr. Domville, for publication in England, if my friends think it desirable. In fact, they have no doubt been sent home by the enemy, and therefore cannot be kept from the public, and I am not without hope that they may be useful in England. I do not know whether Dean Stanley will approve of my speaking out so plainly. But I cannot help it. I cannot hold my present office under any other conditions; and so far from the *people* being disturbed or frightened by my preaching, the Cathedral is regularly filled with attentive worshippers. . . . You will see that I shall await with great interest—I don't say anxiety—the reply of the Colonial

Office to these communications. If they take my side, as I think they must, then I think the South African schism will receive a severe blow and discouragement, though it may still be pushed on by the frantic obstinacy of Bishop Gray and Dean Green, who are bent on having a Church independent of State control. And if he [Bishop Gray] will resign his patent, he may do what he likes.

“I saw the article in the *Athenæum* about Dozy, and wonder by whom it was written. I replied to it some weeks ago, and do not surrender an inch of my ground. While so exceedingly cautious and judicious a critic as Professor Kuenen believes that Dozy, with all his extravagances, has really made a great and valuable discovery on the main point, I am not disposed to give way before a mere blast of ridicule without a particle of real argument.¹ However, my criticism of the Pentateuch is not at all affected by his view of the Simeonite migration to Mecca, whether that be true or false. But as I (at present) believe it to be true—and as it might be used as an argument against me—I thought it my duty to face that possibility, and to show that, if it is true, it tends to support my view rather than the contrary.

“The notion that the Hebrews retrograded from a higher state from the time of the Exodus to that of David seems to me just as baseless as that which had a little while ago almost universally prevailed, viz. that the human race dropped by the Fall into a lower state, from which we have painfully struggled back. . . . The Pentateuch, no doubt, implies that the Hebrews were far advanced in civilisation when they entered Canaan. But where is there a particle of solid proof of this? The account about the ark and tabernacle, as I imagine most scholars would admit, is not earlier than Solomon; and I fancy it will be found that all the signs of (so-called) Egyptian civilisation . . . appear in passages written in or after the age of Solomon, who married an Egyptian princess.”

¹ See Vol. I. p. 223.

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *March 1, 1866.*

“I see the S.P.G. are advertising for clergy for this diocese. Their funds are raised on the express understanding that the missionaries they send out ‘shall conduct themselves as genuine missionaries of the Church of England,’ and yet they not only are being used in this diocese to support clergy who are in downright rebellion against the fundamental principles of the Church of England, but are also employed to check and suppress the least sign of a tendency towards a recognition of the Queen’s supremacy, and of their duty to observe their oath of canonical obedience on the part of the more loyal clergy.

“I send you now some extracts from letters written to me by the Bishop of Grahamstown in former days.¹ I see that my feeble-minded brother has been subservient to Dr. Gray’s behests, and writing about Natal affairs in England in direct contradiction to all he has written here. I do not feel at liberty to publish these extracts without his permission. I have repeatedly challenged him to allow me to print them, as for instance in my last ‘Letter to the Members of the Church of England in Natal.’ He deserves to be made ashamed of his present pitiful conduct after all he has written to me.”

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *April 2, 1866.*

“My second series of sermons is being finished, and I am glad to say that I have got through the Easter work satisfactorily. My congregations are as large as ever, notwithstanding the sermons which they have heard; and yesterday, Easter Day, they were excellent, although . . . a violent attack had just been made upon me with reference to my new Hymn Book. . . .

“I had from twenty-five to thirty communicants yesterday, a

¹ See Vol. I. p. 337, *et seq.*

very goodly number for this place. In former days, I have often, with the Dean, administered to only eight or nine ; and remember that I am an excommunicated 'heathen and publican.' Among them are some interesting cases—one, a gentleman of education and intelligence, Dutch by birth, a grandfather, who had never communicated in his life, and when I landed came to me and told me that he was floating on a sea of doubt, and did not believe in the being of God. He has been a regular attendant at the Cathedral ever since I began to preach, and, I trust, has been greatly comforted and strengthened, and, I need not say, is a very hearty and, I believe, not uninfluential supporter."

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 3, 1866.*

"Their course [that of Mr. Green and Bishop Gray] is contemptible. They made a grand profession of going out to worship in caves and dens, &c. ; and the Bishop of Capetown said to his own Synod at its last meeting, January 1865, 'The Church here would, as the Archdeacon [Badnall] had clearly stated, bow to the decision of that court [the Privy Council], so far as any temporal rights were concerned. It would not dream of contesting any rights which the law might resign to him, so far as things temporal were concerned. Titles and lands and houses and churches the civil power could give him [Bishop of Natal].' And yet they have been all along contesting in the most frivolous way every right which I have claimed to exercise, and compelled me to support by separate legal interferences, at considerable expense, the right to use the Church ; to use the bells, the harmonium, the Prayer Book ; to use the registers ; and, lastly, to use the church on Good Friday. Late on Thursday they notified to me that I should not be allowed to preach on Good Friday, though I courteously desired my registrar on the Sunday previous to inform the Dean, that there might be no collision, and he might make his own arrangements for a service at another time, if he pleased.

And but for the activity of my registrar (Mr. Shepstone's son), they would have stolen a march upon me, as it was almost too late to get the judge's order that evening. As it was, Mr. Shepstone had to ride out to me in pelting rain to get my order. . . ."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *April 23, 1866.*

"On the 1st of May the Dean will be presented to the Supreme Court for refusing to obey their order to allow me the use of the Baptismal Register of St. Peter's Church. He *wishes* to be made a martyr and sent to prison. We wish to avoid this if possible. However, the absurd course which he is taking as to these registers may bring him into one. It is not my affair, but that of the judges, and it obviously concerns the welfare of the whole colony that the law should be obeyed."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *May 3, 1866.*

"On Tuesday iast, May 1, the Dean was 'outlawed' by the Supreme Court, unless and until he produces the Baptismal Register for me to enter certain names in it of children baptized by me—in obedience to a previous order of the court. I do not think that he will submit himself, though the position he takes up is most ridiculous. He makes himself out to be suffering for conscience' sake. In reality, . . . he cannot bear the thought of a permanent register of the fact that I have actually officiated in the Cathedral church. If he stands out (as I fully expect he will), my path will be greatly cleared for future action, as he will have no place before the court at all."

TO SIR C. LYELL.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *May 14, 1866.*

[After mentioning the civil outlawry of the Dean, and the meeting for the election of a schismatical Bishop.]

“There is no honest above-board fighting [in the party of Bishop Gray]. Witness the following letter which the Secretary of the S.P.G. has addressed to Mr. Tønnesen about a fortnight after the meeting in February about releasing my clergy from their duty to me, which turned out abortive :—

“ ‘ March 8, 1866.

“ ‘ REV. AND DEAR SIR,—

“ ‘It is due to you to inform you that reports have reached the Society which have induced them to write to our Natal Committee with reference to you. The Committee are desired to report to the Society whether there has been on your part any and what *overt act of adherence* to Bishop Colenso; and further, whether there be any and if any what proofs of your holding or teaching anything at variance with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.’

“ This seems to me to be an attempt on the part of the Bishop of Oxford to get by stealth and an underhand action what was not obtained at the public meeting in February. I have written at full length on this and other points to Dean Stanley. . . . One of the two laymen, originally nominated by the Dean as a friend of his own, has openly joined my supporters, and communicated with me on Easter Day. He is thus a heretic in the eyes of these ‘saints’; and the Natal Committee will never meet again, until at least the obnoxious element has been expelled, and the small party brought into a state of complete unanimity and *subservience* to the Dean. This, in fact, has been their plan all along. They declare those who don’t act with them not to be Churchmen, which indeed in their sense they probably are not, though *bona fide* members of the Church of England.”

TO MISS COBBE.

“ BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL, May 4, 1866.

“ I need not say how refreshing it was to see your handwriting and to read your hearty lines of good-will and sympathy. . . . As to our affairs here, let me first say we are going

on very pleasantly, and as prosperously as is good for us, though some odd things will go home by this mail. Imprimis, what do you think of the Dean being 'outlawed'? Last Tuesday he was subjected to 'civil excommunication,' which (as one of the judges told him) 'if it did him no more harm than the ecclesiastical excommunication seems to have hurt the other party, would not trouble him very much.' That was the unkindest cut of all. To treat the *Excommunicatio Major* as a nullity! as a crowded congregation does every Sunday evening at the Cathedral by coming to hear my sermons.

"If any cry is raised in England about 'conscience' and 'persecution,' you may have an opportunity of saying or writing a few words about it. It is ridiculous to speak of conscientious scruples in the matter. The register does not make any baptisms valid, if they are not so in themselves. . . . The fact is, of course, that the Dean does not like to see my abhorred signature in juxtaposition with his own, and his remedy is easy—to get a new book. If the old book is of any consequence to him and his followers, it is quite as important that I should maintain their right for the far greater number of professed members of the Church of England who attend my services.

"On the day after this affair in court, but not at all in connexion with it, for the 'outlawry' took us all by surprise, the streets of Maritzburg were floating with clergy and black gowns (my wife says my metaphors will deceive you as to their numbers; there are only eight *bona fide* clergy of the diocese and four intruded by Bishop Gray), and the good citizens were equally taken by surprise by this phenomenon, as they had kept their counsel so very secret that no one in town but themselves seems to have had the least expectation of such a gathering, though a bird in the air prepared me the day before for it. They have not published any account of their doings. But it is pretty well known that they met (no doubt by directions from Capetown) to elect a Bishop, and that *they could not agree about it*, and separated only with a matter-of-course repetition of the old

dirge, *Delendus est Colenso*. I have written a long letter for the *Times* or some other paper, . . . which will throw light on some of the tactics employed against me. Still, thank God, we are making head satisfactorily against them all, including the poor dear old Archbishop of Canterbury, who does not really know what wrong he is doing ; and the laity are, as a body, strongly with me. About 200 *bona fide* Churchmen, many of them acting, elect, or ex-churchwardens, have sent by the mail an address to Bishop Gray, calling upon *him* to resign his office as Metropolitan by Royal authority.

“Mrs. Crawshay wrote that she had sent a copy of *Ecce Homo* to me by a previous mail, but it has not reached me. So I have only as yet seen reviews of it. My opinion of the book, formed from these reviews, is precisely the same as your own—that it is very able, contains many beautiful passages, but is not the work of a truth-seeking and truth-loving man, of one who desires to face the actual facts.”

TO THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER (DR. STANLEY).

“ 1866.

“I thank you most sincerely for your kind exertions on my behalf, or rather in support of the principle of fairness and justice in the proceedings of the Church of England, in the rooms of S.P.G. and elsewhere, since I left England. There is much which you and others ought to know, and which, I am afraid, the newspapers will only imperfectly communicate. Indeed, the reports in the *Guardian* and *Church Times*, which are now beginning to find their way back to the colony, are so grossly perverted, so false, and so dishonest, that I am really amazed at the impudence of those who write them—probably two clergymen intruded by the Bishop of Capetown into the diocese. Of course, *here* such statements receive the indignant ridicule which they deserve, but we are not a match for the adversary in this kind of warfare. So reports, I suppose, will still go home of the ‘Missionary Bishop’ shutting up the native chapel in

Maritzburg *up to this time* (the key was given up to me on Saturday, November 18: I found the church in a filthy state, and had all my arrangements to make; and the writer dates his letter *November 23*); of my congregations consisting of 'riff-raff,' falling off, &c.; of Mr. Tönnesen being only fit for a carpenter, &c.; and we must be content to let the *facts* speak by degrees for themselves. But I must give you some information which may be a guide to your own judgement, in case an opportunity should arise for your taking any further active steps in Natal matters. Let me copy a letter which Mr. Tönnesen has just received from Mr. Bullock. S.P.G. missionaries in this diocese are receiving their stipends *on false pretences*, if they do not recognize their lawful Bishop, as they are sent out bound voluntarily to do so under the Society's by-law, until that is relaxed or rescinded by the Society itself. . . . What then are we to think of the following letter? ¹

"As to the laity I may say now, after six months since my return to Natal, the great majority of them are with me. . . . At Easter, in every instance except one, the people elected churchwardens not only directly opposed to Bishop Gray but heartily supporting me. I need not trouble you with details, but such is the fact in every instance but one that has come to my knowledge; though there are one or two places from which I have had no reports as yet. However, the main result is certain; and it should be remembered that this has been brought about by the people themselves, without my presence or interference, and in most cases in direct opposition to their clergy, whom they allowed to nominate their own churchwardens. . . . The most important election was at the Cathedral: I have heard it described by persons present on whom I can thoroughly rely, as for instance Mr. Shepstone, and this is what took place:—

"The body of the church was thronged at the hour appointed, and the Dean nominated his man, one of the two old ones; and then some two of that party proposed and seconded another, Mr. Scott, upon which one of my friends named,

¹ Here follows the letter already given, p. 26.

and another seconded, Mr. Brooks.¹ Immediately, the Dean said, 'Mr. Brooks being disqualified, and no one being proposed but Mr. Scott, I declare Mr. Scott elected.' The people were indignant, and demanded to know why Mr. Brooks was disqualified; but the Dean would not utter a word. Now the fact is that there could not have been a more suitable person in every way, . . . filling the office at this moment of Government Superintendent of Schools; . . . but . . . he had communicated with me the previous Sunday. This was the real and only reason for the Dean's considering him disqualified; but the Dean was too cowardly to say so, when applied to by the Acting Attorney-General to say why he rejected him. You will be told, no doubt, in England, by my unscrupulous adversaries, that the opponents of the Dean at this meeting were 'rabble,' not Churchmen, &c. The facts are these. There were 167 present, of whom 29 supported the Dean. Among the rest were, no doubt, some Dissenters, and others who came merely from curiosity; but there were 70 who answered to their names when called from a church roll in which they had declared themselves 'members of the Church of England and Ireland.' They included some of the first men of the city. . . . While the people were indignantly demanding why Mr. Brooks was disqualified, and the Dean refused to give an answer, amidst the confusion it appears somebody proposed an auditor of the parish accounts, and the Dean, without putting it to the vote, declared him elected, and broke up the meeting, retiring with his friends to the other end of the church. Upon this the great body elected Mr. Henderson as chairman, elected Mr. Brooks as churchwarden unanimously, and elected also, as usual, two auditors,

¹ Mr. Brooks became and remained one of the staunchest friends of the Bishop, whom, as Sir Th. Shepstone said to Mr. Domville, he "worshipped." A Cambridge man, he had come to Natal while the Bishop was in England, and on the Bishop's return he was absent on the frontier. When he came back he threw himself heart and soul into the Bishop's cause, without wavering in his devotion even in the second great battle, the fight for Langalibalele, although he was then holding office under the Government of Natal.

including the one named by the Dean's party, and then asked for the books, which the old churchwardens, now reappointed by the Dean, refused to give up. Whereupon . . . they adjourned to the next day (Wednesday) at 3 P.M. At that hour a large number met, and found the church doors closed against them by the Dean's orders, and they adjourned to Friday at 3 P.M., in order to get an interdict from the Chief Justice in the interim, which they did. I appointed Friday for admitting the new churchwardens ; but only Mr. Brooks came and was admitted, and was served as such with the order of the Chief Justice to have the doors opened for the adjourned meeting. This order he was bound by *law* as a loyal citizen to obey ; and he determined to do so. Finding that the key had been pocketed and carried off (it is generally understood) by Mr. Robinson, Bishop Gray's nominee, Mr. Brooks had the lock taken off the door (acting under legal advice), and a new one put on ; and the meeting was held, very full and very orderly. But, the accounts not being produced, they adjourned again till May, when the Supreme Court sits again. The next day the door was unfortunately not opened in time for the Dean's morning prayer, and he had it broken open and carried away half of it, and so it has ever since remained. I detail this matter at length, that you may know exactly how things have really happened, and be able to judge of such reports as may reach you in England. . . .

"I sometimes almost wish that you or some London friend could see my congregation on Sundays. It contrasts singularly in one respect with those usually met with in England ; and that is, by the large proportion of men which it contains. Of late, indeed, this proportion has been considerably diminished, and probably in this way may be explained the crowding of the church, which has sensibly increased within the last few Sundays. The women come more freely now than they did at first, the fact being that the Dean and Mr. Robinson had been most diligently going about from house to house, warning the people against my

teaching, and using such language as thoroughly scared a great many of the females, and no doubt still keeps many away. For some time perhaps four-fifths of the congregation were males, who came, however, regularly, with all the appearance of thoughtful and earnest believers. Now, I suppose, two-thirds are males, instead of the reverse, which I suppose is generally the case in England."

From whatever point of view it be regarded, the ecclesiastical system upheld by Bishop Gray comes out as an irresponsible despotism. It is true, indeed, that the same, and even a worse, tyranny had, during the last three centuries, kept clergy and laity alike in bondage in England; but the restrictions, pains, and penalties which had produced the miserable harvest of Nonconformity, had been one after another got rid of until the laity were left virtually independent, and the clergy comparatively free. But whatever checks might still remain, every member of the Church of England had his appeal from the ecclesiastical tribunals to the Crown; and many, both of clergy and laity, who had left this country for the colonies, had gone in the perfect faith that the law which had protected them in England, would continue to protect them there. But the revolt of Bishop Gray against the Royal supremacy exposed all those with whom he might be brought into collision to risks of gross injustice and wrong, for which they would have no remedy, if he should be suffered to have his own way. In things ecclesiastical, as in things civil, it is intolerable for Englishmen generally to find that change of abode subjects them to a different law; and the final decisions of ecclesiastical tribunals have been found in England to involve legal principles which have been deliberately set aside by the Sovereign in Council. Among those who in England lent themselves to the theories and schemes of Bishop Gray, not the least considerable was the Chaplain-General of the Forces. The presentment of Mr. Nisbett by

Dean Green, for reading prayers at the bidding of the Bishop of the diocese, offered an opportunity for saying that allegations of errors in doctrine not condemned by a proper legal tribunal furnished no excuse for disobeying a lawful authority, and that therefore Mr. Nisbett had only done his duty in obeying the Bishop's order. Instead of taking this straightforward course, and declaring, if he thought good so to do, his own total disapproval of all views held by Dr. Colenso, he addressed to Mr. Nisbett the following tortuous communication, dated at the War Office, 19th May, 1866.

"I do not read your letter of the 26th of March as appealing to me for any judgement in the course which you have considered it your duty to follow. Neither indeed, looking to the relations in which you stand towards me, as officiating chaplain to the troops, should I consider that I had a right, under existing circumstances, either to approve or censure your proceeding; but, as a brother clergyman, I have no hesitation in saying that, had I been in your place, and not constrained by any official connexion with the Cathedral church in Maritzburg, I should have declined to read prayers for Dr. Colenso, after he had been subjected to Church censures of the severest kind.

"The decisions to which you refer appear to me to have placed the Church of Southern Africa in the position of a voluntary association. And it is probable that the Bill now before Parliament will sever all legal connexion between it and the Crown, as the head of the Church of England. The Church of Southern Africa will in this case fall into the same status with the Church in Scotland and the United States, being one with the Church of England in doctrine and form of worship, but apart from her as regards the Crown's supremacy. And when this comes to pass, then it will become your duty to separate yourself from a Bishop whom the Church has cast out from her, just as in primitive times the faithful held aloof from those convicted of heresy, whether they were prelates or laymen.

“Observe that these are my private opinions. Till the point of law now under discussion is settled, I neither censure nor approve what you have done. But if it be settled, as seems probable, by declaring colonial churches independent of the law courts at home, you will be obliged to obtain a licence from the Bishop whom the Church may appoint. Otherwise I would not myself sanction, nor advise the Government to sanction, your continuing to officiate to the troops.”

Here then was Mr. Gleig, holding office from the Crown, and possessed of the right of appeal to the Crown, speaking as though some pretended censure of the Bishop of Natal were valid in spite of the dissent of the Crown, and insisting with sardonic cynicism that men who had left England as members of the Church of England, and in perfect faith that they retained all their rights and privileges as such, must be compelled against their will to join a voluntary society styled the Church of South Africa, and that they must be constrained to do this by an Act of the British Legislature, which would become *ipso facto* guilty of a gross breach of faith to British subjects. He could write thus, although he knew that the Bishop of Natal, had he held an English see, would without question have exercised this right of appeal, and also that the Bishop had expressed,¹ not merely his readiness, but his desire, to plead before any lawfully constituted ecclesiastical tribunal from whose decision he could appeal to the Sovereign in Council.

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *May 24, 1866.*

. . . “I now despair of making anything of the present clergy. Through the help of the S.P.G. the Dean has got his nooses wound around their neck so many times that they cannot, if they would, get loose, unless S.P.G. will do what they

¹ See Vol. I. p. 349.

will not—require them to acknowledge my authority. The laity here, as I have said, are heartily with me; and the subscription list for a clergyman to help me is now made up to £206, at a time when the colony is suffering from serious depression,—though I am glad to say things are beginning to look much brighter, now that the Basuto war is over, and wool is coming down again. Also many additional names have come in for the address to Bishop Gray (calling on him to resign), and almost all the churchwardens in the colony are down in it. The Cathedral is still well filled; crowded in the evening when I preach. . . . Yet how can I leave Maritzburg? There is my great difficulty—the being tied to my work for want of a single English clergyman whom I can put in the Cathedral pulpit. It will be impossible for me to go on in this way long, for of course I must break down if I can never visit the outlying towns or villages, to show my face, converse, confirm, &c. It would not matter what Bishop Gray or S.P.G. did, if I had only such help for even a couple of years. . . . To-day (Queen's birthday) I dine at Government House, where we shall be a strange party. The President (Pretorius) of the Free State, and Adam Kok, the Griqua chief, are both here and will be present; and the Governor (temporary, Colonel B——) has shown his sense of duty to the Royal authority by asking the Dean to meet me. . . . The Dean never was asked before at any Queen's birthday: the rule has been only to ask *heads of departments*. . . . How the Dean will eat his dinner after my 'giving thanks' remains to be seen, and perhaps he won't attend at all; but he has been asked—that I know—and that is the insult offered, not only to me, but to the majesty of English and colonial law, since he is *here* declared an outlaw, and still remains so."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June 2, 1866.*

"I have this moment heard that the Dean has ordered a pair of horses to go down to Durban, and take the mail to

Capetown. For what purpose this is, no one knows at present; but it is evidently connected with some news which has reached them by the Mauritius mail this day from England. By the same I have received your very welcome letter, and one from Mr. Shaen and other friends, which have quite cheered us. Perhaps the Dean may have gone only to consult Bishop Gray, perhaps to be present at the consecration of the new Bishop, perhaps to be consecrated himself. Time will show. He expects to be absent for three weeks. It may be in connexion with the action which I have now brought, to get regular possession of the Cathedral, and which will probably come off on July 3rd. Meanwhile I have now ordered the churchwardens of St. Peter's Cathedral not to allow any clergyman not licensed by me to minister in the Dean's absence; and as this order is distinctly covered by the order lately obtained from the Supreme Court (since I formerly exercised this very right on a particular occasion) I expect that it will be obeyed.

"By this mail also, it seems, the S.P.G. has declined the services of a catechist, really a deserving and useful man, whom I had trained for years, and who had been got hold of by the Dean, and almost captured; and he has now formally offered himself to me. The grant by S.P.G. of one year's income as a free gift to Tönnesen is also capital. I think this is all of importance that I have to add, except to thank you heartily for your most kind exertions. Nothing can be better than what you have done about the address to Convocation."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June 30, 1866.*

"Your last letter, with the inclosure of Miss Burdett-Coutts's letter, was most welcome, and they came in the very nick of time, to strengthen the hands and confirm the resolution of our laity, who have given a very decided reply to Bishop Gray's reply to their memorial calling upon him to resign. . . . Copies, I believe, will be sent from here to

Mr. Cox in Tasmania, who is spoken of, or has been, very positively, as the new Bishop of Maritzburg.

'By this mail I have written to Mr. Shaen to say that Mr. Shepstone considers the time is now arrived for my bringing the Bishop of Oxford, Bishop Ellicott, and the Bishop of Sodor and Man, to task for setting on foot the resolutions printed in the *Guardian*, in which they say repeatedly that I have been excommunicated. The only question with me is whether it is worth while to do so, seeing that the laity out here stand so well by me. But I submit the whole to the judgement of my advisers in England. On some grounds certainly it does seem desirable to put a check on these lawless words and doings. . . .

"Since the Dean returned from his visit to the Cape, nothing has yet oozed out as to the express object of it. But two of the clergy have since said that they must give up the buildings, and one has said that they are quite prepared for separation from the Church of England, and that there is a large body of the clergy in England who intend to do so, and establish a Free Church independent of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. . . .

"A Bill is about to be brought into our Legislature for defining members of the Church of England, churchwardens, &c., by *law*. It is not desired or urged forward by me, but by the strong anti-Gray party at Durban. . . . And I only mention it to prevent your supposing that it is in any way *my* Bill. Very probably the enemy may try to represent it as such, for the reports they send to England of our doings are thoroughly dishonest. In that case you will be able, if necessary, *flatly* to contradict it. I do not need, nor even *desire*, the Bill; but, if the laity like to have it, I see no reason for objecting to it as a whole, though some of its provisions would require amendment, and no doubt would receive it."

TO THE REV. G. W. COX.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *June 30, 1866.*

"Your letters are always most refreshing, except that the last was less hopeful than they usually are. . . . I am not

without hope that we from this side of the world may help to cheer you in England a little. At any rate, we shall not die very easily, and are not at all frightened by the episcopal roars which come across the Atlantic to us. I send you by this mail some documents which will show you what our last deed has been—or rather it is the deed of the laity of the diocese, and not of the Bishop, except that he had to write the greater part of it for them, especially the parts *against* himself. Miss Coutts's letters were admirable, and arrived here just in the very nick of time to strengthen their hands for the work. The laity here are most grateful to her for the stand which she has made on their behalf."

TO MISS COBBE.

"BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL, July 27, 1866.

"Your kind present has only just reached me. . . . I thank you heartily for your kind remembrance of me, and I can assure you that your gift will be of great service to me. I have not had a penknife that could mend a pen for months, and the first use I made of it was to nib a pen for *Joshua*, upon which I am hard at work as well as my other labours will allow. The criticism of this book comes out exceedingly clear, and I am strongly inclined to complete it, and send it home for publication by itself, as an *instalment* of Part VI., in order to give a little help to our friends with the *Speaker's Commentary*. But who knows? Perhaps I shall be coming home myself to publish it. At this moment I am utterly in the dark as to the future, waiting patiently for the decision of Lord Romilly in the first instance, and then of the Government, to see if they intend to support the Queen's authority in respect of her letters patent, and then to hear how the matter of my 'new heresy' settles down in England. I do hope that I have effectually stirred *that* question. I am certain of this, that Dean Stanley has very little idea of the enormous force brought to bear against the progress of liberal views by the employment of such books as *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. It

would be *impossible* for me to preach such sermons as I am now preaching every Sunday, and have the people singing those hymns in my face. As to the laity here, I have a very strong hold upon them, and in fact have the great body of them with me, as I hope you will have been able to gather from the newspaper reports which have reached England, though those sent home from Maritzburg to the *Guardian* and *Church Times* (sent, it is believed by one of Bishop Gray's intruded clergy here) are specimens of the most deliberate theological lying that I have ever met with. They are *masses of falsehood*, of course based upon some foundations of fact, but utterly dishonest and misleading. The cause must be in a very bad way which needs such support.

"It is really a most touching sight to see the crowded congregation in the Cathedral on Sunday evenings. . . . If only the clergy in England *could* speak out as freely as I am able to do here, I am sure their churches would be equally filled. Numbers come regularly now to the service, both morning and evening, who used to go nowhere; and I humbly trust that some good work is being done among them."

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

"BISHOPSTOWE, August 3, 1866.

. . . "The Vestry Bill, as you will see, was thrown out by our Legislative Council—which, to say the truth, I am not sorry for. . . . I believe they are now going to frame a deed of registration, by which they may avail themselves legally, as a 'Voluntary Association,' of persons who agree to be bound by the laws of the Church of England, &c. And that, I think, will answer all practical purposes. Upon the whole, the lay feeling is, I think, as decided as ever; and it remains to be seen if Mr. Cox will think it necessary to come here when he gets the reply of the laity to Bishop Gray, which was duly forwarded to him a mail or two ago. One of the new S.P.G. clergy, as I hear from good authority, has preached Robertson's sermons to his people, and is very

much liked. . . . He has been strictly forbidden by S.P.G. to take my licence, and at present I do not think it desirable to interfere. . . . Bishop Gray has just put in an appearance to my summons to show cause why the lands, &c., held by him in trust should not be made over to me. But the case cannot be heard till next month. . . . There is no doubt, I think, that I can maintain my position here, so as to have the Cathedral to myself and my curate (supported by the people) on Sundays, and so as to make good my entrance once a year into the different churches of the diocese, with the hearty good will of some of the people, the secret satisfaction of many others, and the determined opposition of most of the S.P.G. clergy and their more bigoted supporters. Gradually, too, by the circulation of my sermons . . . prejudices may be removed, and a warmer feeling generated in the minds of many who still stand aloof, having never yet heard a word from me, or perhaps even seen my face, but who have been duly indoctrinated by the clergy. . . . I cannot do more, my whole time being taken up with such work as the above, except a few driblets which I can now and then snatch for pursuing my criticism of the Pentateuch. My friends in England may be of opinion that when I have fought out the battle with Bishop Gray, and stood my ground to see if Bishop Cox arrives, and what can be done against him, . . . I might retire from the contest, having done my part sufficiently in this position. And they may know (what I cannot) that English feeling is tending to the same conclusion—viz. that for peace and quiet I had better withdraw from the contest, of course assuming that the English Government will not play directly into the hands of Bishop Gray, and appoint my successor at the nod of the Bishop of Oxford. If they appeal to the House of Lords, perhaps in any case I ought to abide at my post till that decision reaches me, and then, if it is thought desirable, retire. But I do not see anything here at present which *compels* me to do so ; and, in fact, my people in Maritzburg would be exceedingly grieved, many of them, if I did. . . . The sort of feeling which must exist

even with my warmest friends as to the uncertainty of my continuing permanently here makes many, more lukewarm, hesitate to commit themselves, lest I should suddenly withdraw from the struggle, and leave them in the hands of the enemy. Hence the strong desire of such to get the legal barrier erected without delay now, as the prime mover in it (Mr. Saunders) said, *before* Lord Romilly's decision reaches us."

TO THE SAME.

"BISHOPSTOWE, *August 30, 1866.*

. . . "Matters are still looking bright here, so far as circumstances and the want of clergy allow. I have no doubt that with one or two more clergy of the right stamp, I should have all the diocese fairly in hand. Lord Romilly's decision will hardly reach us, I expect, by the mail due to-morrow; but a short paragraph overland from Capetown tells me that the great meeting of Convocation has come off, and the Bishops have declared in favour of Bishop Gray's proceedings by five to four. If this is true, it will strengthen my position here greatly, and will be regarded by my friends as a complete victory; since, if only nine attended, there were eleven absent, and not one of them can have desired to *support* Bishop Gray. I should think he ought to resign, and would do so, if there were any consistency in him. An Australian paper brings the news that Mr. Cox has accepted the bishopric of Maritzburg offered to him;—offered by whom? not till the clergy have elected him; and I feel pretty certain now that several would refuse to elect him. . . .

"To-morrow I have some distinguished natives coming to luncheon; one of Moshesh's sons, and his chief warrior, who have been sent here¹ with a formal letter from Moshesh himself (which I read yesterday), saying that, after five days' full deliberation with his chiefs, they had desired to surrender themselves and their land, &c., into the hands

¹ To Natal, not to the Bishop.

of this Government, and imploring that the Queen would receive them as subjects. It is a very important proposal, and perhaps must not be talked about publicly till it gets into the papers, as my information is private. They seemed to know all about *my* affairs, and spoke very cordially,—speaking English well.”

TO THE SAME.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *September 5, 1866.*

. . . “As to the sermons, I think you did quite right under the circumstances to defer the publication. . . . After the advice of my counsel, and the suspension of Lord Romilly’s decision, there seemed no doubt about the matter. By the time this reaches you, however, I suppose the judgement will be given, and my own feeling is that the book should then be published without delay. I am not so anxious to retain my post here as to wish to hold it if I cannot be allowed by law to say what I have said in those sermons ; and, as for the *odium theologicum*, I am not at all sure that it might not be diminished, instead of increased, by the publication.

“Now, I see, the most unscrupulous falsehoods are sent to England, and circulated in the Church papers about my teaching, as *e.g.* in the *English Churchman*, which reached me yesterday, and in which I see stated that I have said in one of my sermons that ‘it is blasphemy to say that we have any need of a Mediator.’ . . . The sermons themselves would show what my real teaching is.

“As far, therefore, as I am personally concerned, I should wish to face all the consequences of publishing the book as soon as the judgement is given. But I must leave you still a latitude of action, for there may, and probably would, be an appeal lodged regarding the judgement, if in my favour ; and if my counsel still strongly advised the delay of publication, it might be right to do so until the conclusion of the case in the House of Lords. Again, there may be plain signs that certain parties in England will apply for a Com-

mission to sit upon me ; and, if so, it would be wise not to publish till this matter is settled. One thing also I should like to say. If a Commission is issued *now*, because all other measures have failed, I should not in any way feel bound to adhere to the promise which I made when, *before* the excommunication, I challenged Bishop Gray and others to apply for a Commission, viz. not to interpose any technical objections. . . . ”

There is far too great a disposition in this country to regard what is called the Colenso controversy in Natal as a struggle on the part of the Bishop to secure freedom of thought and speech for himself to the slighting, or even to the injury, of others. His own utterances, both in letters and in other forms, have already given proof that his whole mind was set on obtaining for all the liberty which he claimed for himself. We have now to see that his motives and object were fully appreciated by the lay members of the Church of England in Natal, and that they looked upon him as fighting their battle not a whit less than his own. That the conflict should have arisen from expressions which are supposed to err in the direction of too liberal a theology, was a mere accident ; and until the question is dissociated from any personal interests of the Bishop of Natal, its full bearings cannot be rightly understood. If the Bishop had never written anything to create alarm, Bishop Gray would have striven none the less to create a South African Church independent of the judicial interference of the Crown.¹ For this the decisions given in the Williams-Wilson case on the one side, and in that of

¹ Indeed, not only had Bishop Gray begun to strive for these ends long before the Bishop of Natal had published anything likely to alarm him : but the people of Durban had themselves taken alarm at the policy and designs of the Metropolitan at a time when Bishop Colenso seemed scarcely to be awake to them, and when in fact they had convinced themselves that their Bishop was a willing instrument in the furtherance of Bishop Gray's plans.

Mr. Gorham on the other, would in his eyes have furnished ample justification ; and there can be no doubt that a bold and perspicuous enunciation of convictions such as those of Mr. Gorham, carried to their full length, would have roused on the part of the Metropolitan of Capetown feelings of disapprobation scarcely less vehement than those which were awakened by the criticisms of the Bishop of Natal. Nay, it was (as it is) quite possible that the Church of South Africa might come to be governed by prelates and clergy whose spirit might be in the closest harmony with that of men like Deans Close and M'Neile ; and in either case both clergy and laity would have to submit to the regimen provided for them, without any appeal, in cases of deprivation or excommunication, beyond the Archbishop of Canterbury in his personal capacity.

But in the foremost place, in the eyes of the laymen of Natal, was the determined resolution with which Bishop Colenso resisted and protested against the creation of a Church of South Africa, as a breach of faith both with himself and with them. He and they alike had left their old homes as members of the Church of England ; and members of that Church, and of no other, they were determined to remain. In accepting the office of Bishop of Natal, Dr. Colenso had no idea that he was giving up, or that he might at any date, however distant, be called upon to give up, any right which he had possessed as Rector of Forncett. In accepting the Royal letters patent which assigned him his jurisdiction, he was perfectly well aware that he acknowledged obedience to the Crown, and thereby claimed the protection of the Sovereign ; but he never for a moment dreamed that Royal letters patent would, or could, be used by any one else for the exercise of a jurisdiction which openly professed itself independent of the Royal supremacy, and as a bar to the exercise of a right to which every clergyman of the English

Church in England had an inalienable title. The laity of Natal felt that his cause, without the least reference to the particular matters in dispute, was their cause also, although not a few, and perhaps the large majority, among them expressed also their hearty satisfaction and thankfulness for the firmness with which he withstood and disclaimed the narrowness, exclusiveness, and intolerance of those who professed to adhere to an unchanging, and therefore to a dead, traditional theology.

No layman in Natal was, and is, more competent to express the feelings of his fellow-laymen than the friend whose kindness and zeal the Bishop always felt and acknowledged. It would be disingenuous to withhold here all reference to the antagonism of later years. But it is unnecessary to do more than refer to it, while we are dealing with a time when their friendship was as warm and active as it had always been since their first intercourse during the Bishop's happy "ten weeks in Natal." The following extracts from letters addressed by Mr. Shepstone to Mr. W. H. Domville show how deeply the laity of Natal were interested in the struggle between the Bishops of Capetown and Natal. The letters are written strictly from a layman's point of view. In the first, which is dated September 9, 1866, Mr. Shepstone speaks of the then recent debates in Convocation as having very much strengthened the Bishop's position and advanced the cause of liberty in the Church of England, and adds that

"great indignation is felt here at the remark made by the Bishop of Oxford, that those who attend the Bishop's services are nearly all professed infidels, and do not go to worship, judging from their demeanour. As he declares this statement to be made on the authority of a clergyman here, it is our intention to require a direct answer from every clergyman in the diocese on the subject; and I have no doubt we shall find out our friend. We shall then take

such measures as may be deemed most effectual for correcting in the minds of the Church at home the effect of such a malicious slander, and fixing at their true value any statements our friend may make for the future."

The trial before the Master of the Rolls, Lord Romilly, was then proceeding; and on one point debated, Mr. Shepstone expresses himself without hesitation.

"I do not," he says, "understand how the Privy Council could decide that Natal had an independent Legislature when its Bishop was appointed. It can only be called so in the sense that it was independent of that of the Cape, for it was made so in letters patent in 1847; but its Council consisted of three Government officers besides the Governor, the Colonial Secretary, the Crown Prosecutor, and the Surveyor-General. Surely there is no power of independent legislation in such a nominee body, while the fact of its small numbers, and all being Government officers dependent on the Crown, seems of itself to imply a reservation, on the part of the Crown, of concurrent legislation. It seems to be admitted on all hands that a Crown colony ceases to be such only when representation is introduced into its legislative body. As far as Natal is concerned, this took place for the first time in November, 1856, and in the Cape Colony in 1850. Hence the enormous difference in the values of the patents issued in 1853 to the Cape and Natal Bishops."

Mr. Shepstone's remarks on the Bishop's personal work are even more important.

"The Bishop goes on steadily increasing his influence among the people. Some of them almost worship him. Persons from the neighbouring colony, while visiting here, of course go to hear him preach, and all express themselves astonished at what they find. They seem to have received some extraordinary ideas of his conduct and sermons, and are little prepared to witness the quiet, earnest, reverent eloquence

of the preacher, and the breathless attention of the congregation.”

All ideas of separation from the English Church Mr. Shepstone indignantly disclaims, and he protests with special earnestness against any action of the British Parliament which may tend to bring about such separation.

“Surely we should not be cut off by Act of Parliament: we want all to belong to our National Church, and we hope that our Church will before long open her arms wide enough to include a much wider range of thought and belief than she seems inclined to do just now.”

Writing again, October 10, 1866, Mr. Shepstone mentions the report

“that on the 24th of this month the election of the Bishop of Maritzburg is to take place here, and that the laity are wished to take part in it. By the laity is meant, of course, all those who do not attend the Bishop of Natal’s services or recognize him as their lawful Bishop. I am amazed at the folly which prompts to such a proceeding. . . . This reminds me of the great uneasiness felt here as to the direction which Imperial legislation seems likely to take. No clergyman likes the idea of being made a Congregationalist by law, simply because he can be one any day he likes, without ; and, whatever may be thought in England, we in the colonies strongly dislike the idea of being cut off from what we consider to be our Mother Church.”

TO W. H. DOMVILLE, ESQ.

“BISHOPSTOWE, *September 19, 1866.*

“I have been waiting month after month for the decision in the Rolls, in order to begin a visitation of my diocese, having hitherto confined myself to the Cathedral, and not wishing to go to other places, if possible, without the prestige of a favourable decision. However, as we cannot

expect now to hear of the decision before Christmas, I have arranged to leave home for three or four Sundays. . . . I have settled to start to-morrow with Major Erskine, Colonial Secretary, and my two boys as travelling companions. . . . I think from all I hear that I shall find Mr. D—— all right. It so happens that a gentleman, whose house is almost next to his, and with whom he has formed a very warm friendship apparently, has also contracted a warm friendship for me, from some little kind attentions which I was able to show him when he lay very sick in Maritzburg a few months ago. It is a curious story, and shows what little things influence often very great movements. When I was in Durban last February, lunching at the Club, this gentleman, Mr. G——, came in, and took his seat next to me. We soon got into talk, in which he told me frankly that he was a strong opponent of mine. I asked if he had read my book. ‘No.’ ‘Would he allow me to send him the *Pentateuch*, &c.?’ ‘Yes; he would be obliged, and would promise to look at it thoughtfully.’ I sent it, and heard no more of him till after a few months I got a note from him to say that he had come to Maritzburg for change of air in consequence of illness. This led to my seeing him again, to his visiting my house, &c., and ultimately to my reading and praying with him in town, when he lay at a hotel apparently in a very dangerous state. These little acts of mine, the hearing some of my sermons, the reading my *Romans*, have made him a warm supporter of mine, although he told me, when I first saw him, he had then in his pocket a letter from a very dear relative, warning him not to come into any connexion with me.”

It is quite unnecessary to enter at any length into the discussions which took place at the meeting convened at the wish of Bishop Gray for the election of a Bishop who should take the place of Bishop Colenso. The chief facts connected with it are brought out with sufficient clearness in the Bishop’s letters. But the whole debate seemed only to exhibit

the fatal blunder committed by Bishop Gray from the very outset of all his action in reference to the Bishop of Natal. We will suppose that, on the publication of Dr. Colenso's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, he was shocked, startled, and grieved, and that this panic and alarm were indefinitely heightened on the appearance of his criticisms on the Pentateuch. He may, we will suppose, have felt the case to be as serious, and the danger to be as pressing, as Dr. Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, felt it to be when he arraigned Mr. Gorham for heresy. But every such case in England must come before the Crown, and must be determined, on appeal, by the Sovereign in Council. It should have been the first and last care of Bishop Gray that the question of Dr. Colenso's teaching should also be brought before that tribunal, and that any proceedings which he himself might take should be so arranged as to place no hindrance in the way of that issue. It is quite impossible to say that this course a quarter of a century ago might not have had for its result the condemnation of the Bishop on some points, although, in any event, it must have ended in his acquittal on some, or the greater number. The idea that the Crown in Council could condemn a man for batches of offences, in the jaunty fashion of the Metropolitan and his assessors at the so-called Capetown trial, is ludicrous. The effect of the trial might have been to widen the liberty secured to the clergy in England, or it might in some one or more directions have circumscribed it. In any case the judgement would have stood on the same level as the judgement in the Gorham, the Bennet, the Williams-Wilson, and the Voysey cases ; it would have become part of the law of the Church of England, and would have been acquiesced in, as all those judgements have been, even by those Churchmen who professed themselves at first most aggrieved by them. The complete condemnation of Dr. Colenso by the Judicial Committee would have removed