
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



5155.aaa.15
1-5

REMARKS

UPON THE

RECENT PROCEEDINGS AND CHARGE

OF

ROBERT LORD BISHOP OF CAPETOWN

AND METROPOLITAN

AT HIS PRIMARY METROPOLITICAL VISITATION OF
THE DIOCESE OF NATAL.

BY THE RIGHT REV.



JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1864.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE



CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Occasion of these Remarks	1
Proceedings of the Bishop of Capetown at Durban	2
Proceedings of the Bishop of Capetown at Maritzburg	10
The Bishop's Charge; his claim of Jurisdiction	15
The Bishop of Capetown's threatened Secession from the Church of England	21
The Bishop of Capetown's strong language	27
The Bishop of Capetown's own religious teaching	33
The Bishop charges the Bishop of Natal with reckless haste in publishing	38
The Bishop's personal observations upon the Bishop of Natal	40
List of Books prepared by the Bishop of Natal for the use of Missionary Students and Native Scholars	46
Another view of the charge of dishonesty	57

APPENDIX.

1. Extracts from the Bishop of Natal's Books	64
(i) On the Fear of Death, from the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p.144-7	64
(ii) On the Reading of the Scriptures, from the Pentateuch Critically Examined, Part III, p.628-32	66
2. Opinions of various Writers in the Church of England respecting the Authorship of the Pentateuch	69
3. Extracts from the Fathers and others, shewing their views as to the limitation of our Lord's knowledge as the Son of Man	79
4. Correspondence of the Bishop of Natal with the Bishop of Oxford and the Bishop of Capetown	81
5. Letters from native converts, received by the Bishop of Natal while in England	86
6. Proposed alteration of the Supreme Court of Appeal	94

REMARKS

&c.

Occasion of these Remarks.

I REGRET very much that it should be necessary for me to draw attention again in this way to the proceedings of the Bishop of CAPETOWN. My respect for his personal character, — no less than my sense of duty to the high office which he fills, — would assuredly, under any ordinary circumstances, have constrained me to keep silence, even though suffering from acts (as it seems to me) of undue hastiness and precipitancy on his part. But the present is no ordinary occasion; and the course of conduct which Bishop GRAY has pursued is so strange, that I can only regard it as a striking instance of the disturbing effect, on the purest mind, of strong religious and ecclesiastical prejudices.

As the circumstances which have transpired during the last two months in my distant diocese, though partially reported from a partizan point of view in certain journals, are probably unknown to the great mass of English Churchmen, — are certainly unknown to them in their naked simplicity, — and, as those circumstances are such as to justify fully to my own mind the present publication, — I have thought it right to place on record the main facts of the late Metropolitan Visitation of the Diocese of Natal, as I have gathered them from the colonial journals, from published documents, and from private communications.

It will thus be seen that not merely my own personal interests are here concerned, but that far graver issues have been raised,

of vital consequence to the whole National Church,—in fact, no less than this, whether Her Majesty's Supremacy shall any longer be maintained, in matters ecclesiastical affecting the Clergy of the Church of England, within the Province of CAPE-TOWN, and, by inevitable consequence, within the other colonies of the British Empire, if not, ultimately, within the mother-country itself.

Proceedings of the Bishop of Capetown at Durban.

The following extract from the *Natal Mercury* of May 3, 1864, will inform the reader as to the circumstances attending the Bishop of CAPE-TOWN's arrival in the colony on this Visitation. I may premise that Natal contains, at the present time, an European population of 13,990 (by the last *Blue Book*), of whom about 10,000 are English. There are only two towns—Durban, on the coast, which, regarded as a port, is known commonly as Port-Natal, with a white population of 2,567, and Maritzburg in the interior, the capital city and seat of government, with a population of 3,118, and a very small cathedral, consisting merely of a nave and chancel, and capable of holding, comfortably seated, about 250 persons. The remainder of this small European population is scattered about the colony, in separate farms or small villages, over 18,000 square miles of country—an area about *one-third* the size of England and Wales.

Bishop GRAY landed at Durban on April 27, and the *Mercury* reports as follows:—

On Sunday last, the 1st of May, the Bishop of CAPE-TOWN, as Metropolitan of the Church of England in South Africa, carried out in St. Paul's Church, Durban, his expressed intention of 'deposing' the Bishop of Natal from his office, and of prohibiting him from the exercise of his functions in the 'Metropolitan Province of South Africa.'

As his Lordship's views were generally understood after his arrival on Wednesday, and as a large number of Churchmen in Durban held strong opinions (wholly irrespective of Dr. COLENSO's theological views) regarding the illegality of the position taken up by Bishop GRAY, as opposed to Her Majesty's Letters Patent, the following protest was sent in on Saturday:—

‘To the Wardens of St. Paul’s Church, Durban. April 29, 1864.

‘Gentlemen,—We, the undersigned members of St. Paul’s Church, Durban, having heard that the Bishop of CAPETOWN intends to pronounce “sentence” or “judgment” against the Bishop of Natal, beg most emphatically to protest against any proceedings which interfere with the authority of the Bishop of Natal (pending the decision of the Queen in Council), and tend to disturb the peace and quiet of our Church.

‘EDWARD W. HOLLAND

‘And a number of others.’

To this document [which was handed to him by the Churchwardens] the Bishop made the following reply:—

‘Gentlemen,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the documents placed in my hand late on Saturday night. I regret that, when you found that any members of the Church were disturbed in their minds about the publication of the Sentence delivered in Capetown during Divine Service, you did not at once communicate with me, and that, when I was anxious, even at the late hour at which I received the memorial, to discuss the matter, they declined to accept my invitation. The publication of the Sentence in the diocese is a mere matter of form; but I am advised that it is essential to its completeness and validity. It will be published to-day in all the diocese. I could not revoke the order which I have given as regards St. Paul’s Church, on the grounds which Dr. COLENZO’s friends suggest, without stultifying my whole proceedings, and acknowledging the right of appeal to the Privy Council, which I formally repudiated. The appeal to Canterbury, provided for by the Letters Patent, and which I did recognize, I am informed by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has never been made. I have already mentioned to you that the Sentence is not one of excommunication of Dr. COLENZO, as one of you informed me was widely believed to be the case. It is simply the notifying the fact, that the Bishop has not retracted the opinions which have been condemned, and that the Sentence of Deprivation, therefore, takes effect. The Judgment itself requires that this should be done.

‘It is to me a source of very great regret that any misunderstanding should have arisen. I have come here at the earnest request of the clergy, who have all determined never to recognize Dr. COLENZO again as their Bishop, and to take charge, as my office of Metropolitan requires me to do, of a vacant, distracted diocese, which, as I believe you well know, is rapidly sinking into a lifeless condition. I am ready to receive your assurance that very few of the subscribers sympathise with Dr. COLENZO’s views: but you have candidly admitted that the document forwarded to me has been got up by those who have alas! through him been led into unbelief. It is clear that the subscribers will, unless they disclaim the imputation, be generally and fairly considered as having adopted the views of those who have been

forward in the matter. I need scarcely say that it deeply grieves me that, coming as I do with a sincere desire to help you, and to revive a languishing Church, my efforts should, as far as your parish is concerned, be greatly hindered by the misunderstanding which has arisen.

‘I remain, Gentlemen,

‘Durban : Sunday morning, May 1st, 1864.’ (Signed) ‘R. CAPETOWN.’

On Sunday morning St. Paul’s Church was crowded,—a large number of attendants of other Churches [*i.e.* members of other religious bodies] in town being attracted by the novelty of the proceedings. After the Nicene Creed was read by the minister of the parish, the Rev. A. W. L. Rivett, the reverend gentleman proceeded to read the following document. No sooner, however, had he begun, than several gentlemen (the number of whom is varyingly stated at from fifteen to forty) got up and left the Church.*

[Then follows a formal notice, ending with these words:—

‘Now, therefore, we do hereby adjudge and decree the sentence so pronounced on the Sixteenth of December, One thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, to be of full force, virtue, and effect, from and after this date; and we do, accordingly, decree and sentence the said Bishop of Natal to be deposed from the said office as such Bishop, and prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the Metropolitan Province of Capetown.

‘In testimony whereof, &c.

R. CAPETOWN.’]

After the service was over, his Lordship delivered a sermon, which is variously spoken of by many who heard it, concluding with a vehement exhortation upon the unhappy state of things existing in the Church of England in this diocese.

This Sentence of Deposition will be disregarded by a large body of the Church of England in this colony, and it is believed that the authorities will not recognize its validity. This attitude has reference to the civil aspect of proceedings only, and does not necessarily involve any concurrence in the theological opinions avowed by Bishop COLENSO.

There are some points in the above letter of the Metropolitan which may be noticed.

* An anonymous correspondent of the ‘Guardian’ states that ‘a few, who had come to church in order to leave it *when the Bishop entered the pulpit*, did so,’ whereas, in fact, they left because the officiating clergyman began to read the Sentence of Deposition. He speaks also of ‘home ideas of Church and State perplexing many minds,’ and of ‘some having *prayed* his Lordship, the night before, to stay the Sentence,’ whereas a number of the Laity had ‘*most emphatically protested*’ against the Bishop’s proceedings. It will be seen, as we proceed, that these are but instances of the *suppressio veri*, which characterises the communication of this correspondent throughout.

(i) It is not easy to see how the protesters could be quieted by being told that the publication of the 'Sentence' was 'a mere matter of form,' and yet that it was '*essential to its completeness and validity.*'

(ii) The Bishop says that he had '*recognized the appeal to CANTERBURY, provided for by the Letters Patent.*' But it must be observed that he did *not* recognize it as a *right* which the Patent distinctly allowed, but only vouchsafed it as a *favour*,—'*in this particular case, which is in itself novel, and of great importance to the whole Church.*' See my *Letter to the Laity*, p.2.*

(iii) It is impossible to avoid observing the undue pressure, here put upon the subscribers to the Durban protest,—which expressed no more than a simple desire on their parts to await, as loyal subjects, 'the decision of the Queen in Council,'—by the intimation that, if they did not openly 'disclaim the imputation' of sympathising with my views, they would be 'generally and fairly considered as having adopted them.'

(iv) It was also, as it seems to me, not worthy of the present grave occasion, to have stigmatized the gentlemen, supposed to have promoted the address, as 'having alas! through him (the Bishop of NATAL) been led into unbelief'—as if no layman in NATAL was capable of forming some judgment for himself, as educated men do, upon the relations of Science and Scripture.

(v) If, however, as the Bishop of CAPETOWN assumes, 'very few of the subscribers sympathised with my views,' there must be others of the Laity in Natal who do; inasmuch as I received from them some months ago a hearty expression of good-will, in an address numerous and respectably signed.

But I desire to draw attention, specially, to the following two statements which are made in the Bishop's letter:—

* The Bishop (WALDEGRAVE) of CARLISLE says in his recent Charge,—'*There has been on the part of the Bishop of CAPETOWN a resolve,—in the carrying out of which he has received no little encouragement from the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, at home, and also, of late, from his own Suffragans on the spot,—to vindicate for himself a Metropolitan Jurisdiction, independent, as far as possible, of that of the See of Canterbury.*'

The Bishop says—

I could not revoke the order,—[which had been issued for the publication of this ‘Sentence’ in St. Paul’s Church,]—without stultifying my whole proceedings, and *acknowledging the right of Appeal to the Privy Council, which I had formally repudiated.*

It should be observed that I have not appealed to the Privy Council, but to Her Majesty Herself as Head of the Church of England, who has exercised Her constitutional right in this matter, and referred my petition to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

But again the Bishop says—

I have come here at the earnest request of the clergy, *who have all determined never to recognize Dr. COLENSO again as their Bishop.*

This was a very grave statement for him to have made on an occasion like the present: and I must think that it ought not to have been made by the Metropolitan, without the most perfect certainty that it expressed the actual state of the case. No sanguine expectations of his own,—no mere assurances of eager and excited partizans,—as to what was, or would be, the state of feeling among the clergy,—could have justified, as it seems to me, so strong an assertion,—nothing but the fact, that he had actually received such a ‘request,’ and an expression of such a ‘determination,’ from *all* the clergy—from all, at least, who were in the colony, and accessible.

But how stands the fact? The total number of the clergy in the diocese is, as stated by the correspondent of the *Guardian*, June 27, at this time *eleven*,—besides two now in England, and two engaged as Missionaries, beyond the border of the colony, in Zululand. And by the previous mail I was made aware that this statement was certainly not correct, so far as *three*, at all events, of those eleven clergy were concerned. I very much doubt, also, if, at that time, *all* even of the remaining eight had expressed any such a determination. But the following letter from one of the clergy in question, which appeared in the *Natal Mercury* of May 19, 1864, will speak for itself:—

To the Editor of the 'Natal Mercury.'

Sir,—In the Bishop of CAPETOWN's letter to some of the inhabitants of Durban, dated May 1st, appears the following statement:—'I have come here at the earnest request of the clergy, who have all determined never to recognize Dr. COLENSO again as their Bishop.'

Allow me to state through your journal that I am not aware of having joined in that request, or expressed any such determination.

If the 'Privy Council,' to which Dr. COLENSO has appealed, recognize him as the lawful Bishop of Natal, I will do the same, or return my license. No real good can be effected by disobeying the law, or disregarding the highest civil authority in the land. And I hope, therefore, that some, at least, of my brother clergymen will pause before they lend themselves to any course of action, which in future they may have reason to regret.

We need not fear the result of investigation and criticism; for the doctrines of the Church, and the teaching of the Bible, have a solid foundation; and, when the storm has past, and the dust subsided, we shall see the truth even more clearly than before. 'If this Council or this work be of man, it will come to nought; but, if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it.'

I hope you will publish this without delay, as an accident, which I met with a few days back, made me unable to attend to it earlier.

Umgababa Mission Station, I remain, Sir, yours, &c.,

Umkomazi, May 7, 1864.

A. TÖNNESEN.

The anonymous correspondent of the *Guardian* writes of the above clergyman as follows:—

One [of the clergy], unhappily, did withdraw himself from his brethren,—not, it is said, because he has been drawn away from the truth, but on *some extreme views of Church and State*;—

that is to say, he still clings, it seems, to the good old English Protestant principle, of recognizing the Queen as supreme in all matters within her realm, spiritual as well as temporal, and of regarding it as the first duty of an Englishman, whether clergyman or layman, to render obedience to the law.

But, it is added by the same authority, this clergyman 'has since, we hear, *come in*.' This means that he has been obliged to succumb, to some extent, under the heavy pressure brought to bear upon him, and has published in his church, by the command of the Metropolitan, the 'Sentence of Deposition,' which he had at first refused to do. I have reason to know that the following arguments, among others, have been used to produce this effect with him, and, possibly, with others of my clergy:—

- (i) That they are wrong in disobeying the Metropolitan,—
- (ii) That the sentence is a *spiritual* sentence, which does not fall under the jurisdiction of the 'Privy Council,'—
- (iii) That the Bishop of NATAL had not appealed, and, therefore, they had no right to assume *that*, as a ground for any opposition,—
- (iv) If they would not obey the Metropolitan, their licenses would be withdrawn, and their names struck off the list of the Gospel-Propagation Society.

This, then, is the process by which dissentients are to be eliminated or coerced, and the unanimity of the clergy is to be secured in this matter! With respect to the arguments brought thus to bear upon them, I may remark as follows:—

(i) The clergy of Natal would have been perfectly justified in disobeying the command of the Metropolitan,—as Mr. LONG was in disobeying that of Dr. GRAY as Bishop,—if they deemed it unlawful, and were prepared to take the consequences of disobedience. But, being ignorant themselves of the real facts of the case, and having before them only the positive statements of the Metropolitan,—not corrected by the information, which my published 'Letter to the Laity of Natal' would have given them, had it by that time reached the colony,—I cannot wonder at the course which for the present the majority have taken.

(ii) The idea, that the Bishop of CAPETOWN'S sentence, being a 'spiritual' sentence only, will, therefore, 'not fall under the jurisdiction of the Privy Council,' will, I apprehend, be found to be a fallacy. The 36th Canon says distinctly:—

The King's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme Governor of this realm, and of all other His Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all *spiritual* or ecclesiastical *things* or *causes*, as temporal.

If the Bishop had first resigned his Patent, he might issue, no doubt, sentences of deposition and bulls of excommunication, as a Bishop of the 'Church of South Africa,' fortified by the 'Canons of Antioch, confirmed by the General Council of Chalcedon,' as quoted in p.29 of his recent Charge. And such proceedings would certainly not be referred by Her Majesty to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But they would be as harmless, and would as little trouble our

peace and order, as Members of the Church of England, as if they were issued by a Roman Catholic Bishop, or by the Greek Patriarch, or by the Pope himself,—by whom indeed, speaking in the name of all ‘the Churches of the Roman obedience,’ (*Charge*, p.4), the Bishop himself is, at this very time, condemned of schism and heresy, and excommunicated.

But, so long as the Bishop of CAPETOWN holds Her Majesty’s Letters Patent, he is, I apprehend, responsible to the Queen Herself for using the powers committed to him, whether spiritual or temporal, in relation to any of the Queen’s subjects, *rightfully* and *lawfully*. Otherwise it is plain that, by means of this new device of a distinction between ‘spiritual’ and ‘temporal’ judgments, (long ago used in defence of the Inquisition,) he might use his high office to condemn with a ‘spiritual sentence,’—to place under the ban and excommunicate, and so virtually deprive of his ministry,—any one of his own clergy, without being liable to have his proceedings brought under review, as they were in Mr. LONG’s case, before the Civil Courts of the colony, and finally before the Queen in Council.

(iii) I regret that any of my clergy should have been misled by the statement that I had not appealed,—a statement which, under the circumstances, would be naturally understood to mean that I was not intending, and had taken no steps, to test the legality of the Bishop’s proceedings. I had, however, given formal notice of my intention to do this; and it was perfectly well known that I was seeking to obtain a judicial decision upon the case from the highest Court of Justice in the Realm. But the Bishop of CAPETOWN has moved so precipitately in the matter, that there was no time for me to receive even a reply, as to the advice which would be tendered to Her Majesty with respect to my petition, before he proceeded to carry out his Sentence in Natal.

(iv) Such arguments as these, which threaten to take away

a man's means of livelihood, or in well-known Zulu phrase to 'eat him up,' for disobedience, must often be irresistible,—especially when coupled with positive assertions, as above, with respect to the extent of the Metropolitan's jurisdiction, and his independence of control. Yet the threat held out—of striking off the Missionary's name from the list of the Propagation Society, if he refused obedience to such a command of the Metropolitan—was, in fact, not justified by any vote of the Society, empowering the Bishop to pledge it to this course of proceeding, as a means of coercion in such a case. On the contrary, it is well known that, when the Bishop recently applied to the Society to grant him virtually such a power, the request was refused, in a great measure through the sound advice of some eminent laymen.

In fact, it is plain that, under the arrangement desired by the Bishop of CAPETOWN, the Society's funds would be employed to support the system,—not of the 'Church of England,' which it is generally understood to represent, but—of the 'Church of South Africa,' which, in the language of the Bishops meeting in Synod at Capetown, while 'receiving' the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England,—

is not bound by any interpretations put upon those standards by existing Ecclesiastical Courts in England, or by the decisions of such courts in matters of faith.

Proceedings of the Bishop of Capetown at Maritzburg.

The Bishop, having concluded his Visitation at Durban, proceeded to Maritzburg, and there, on May 18, delivered a 'Charge' in the Cathedral Church (which shall be considered presently)—after which the clergy then present, who appear to have been nine in number, signed and presented the following Address, drawn up probably by the correspondent of the *Guardian*, with the view of its being signed by *all* the clergy:—

To the Most Reverend the Lord Metropolitan of South Africa.

My Lord,—We, *the* clergy of the Church of England in the diocese of Natal, assembled in the cathedral church of Pietermaritzburg, to confer with your Lordship on the present state of the diocese, desire to express our deep sympathy with your Lordship in the painful duty you have been called upon to perform in sitting on judgment upon Bishop COLENSO, and gratitude for the fatherly care and help your Lordship has extended towards this portion of your province, in the perplexities and trials to which it has been subjected. We would also place on solemn record our emphatic repudiation of the erroneous teaching of Bishop COLENSO, and our conviction that, should it please GOD, for the chastisement of our sins, to allow Bishop COLENSO to return to the diocese with legal authority, he must still be regarded as lying under a righteous sentence of condemnation, and that we dare not acknowledge him as having authority in spiritual matters.

We would further beg to be allowed to offer your Lordship our most grateful thanks for the Charge your Lordship has delivered to us in this cathedral this day, and pray your Lordship to permit it to be printed, that it may be in the hands of every member of our flock, and to allow the MS. to be placed among the archives of this diocese.

St. Peter's Cathedral, Pietermaritzburg, 18th May, 1864.

The above was signed by 'the DEAN,' and eight other clergy.

Among the above signatures is that of one of the Missionaries in Zululand; and, accordingly, the informant of the *Guardian* writes—

You will remark that, whilst I give the numbers of the clergy as *eleven*, there are but *eight* signatures to the Address. One clergyman is in England; another, having broken a blood-vessel, is lying ill in bed, but is well known to believe (*sic*).

Thus this address has been signed by eight colonial clergy, of whom several are catechists, who have been ordained by myself. And these have been permitted by the Metropolitan—nay, encouraged, if not, in some instances, virtually commanded and compelled, to give their judgment on these great questions of the day, and pronounce condemnation on their own Bishop, who at any rate has been to some of them a Father in God, from whose hands they have received ordination. If it had been signed by *all* the clergy of such a diocese as that of NATAL, it is obvious that the weight to be attached to such a document would have been incomparably less than would belong to a like declaration, if made by the majority of the clergy of an English

diocese. And the value even of such signatures has been recently set very low by the Bishop of St. DAVID'S.

The Bishop of CAPETOWN replied as follows:—

Deanery, Maritzburg, May 19, 1864.

Reverend and Dear Brethren,—I beg to thank you very sincerely for your Address. The duty, which I have had to discharge, has been a most painful one. All personal considerations, however, must give way, when the faith of Christ is at stake. The questions, which your late Bishop has raised, are, as I have said in my Charge, no less than these,—Is there a written revelation from God? Is our Lord, God Incarnate? Is Christianity true?

We ought not to suppose for a moment that any Civil Court would, if appealed to on the question of civil right, venture to send back to this land one, whose teaching you yourselves, with the whole Church, have solemnly repudiated, with the right to take possession of the property of the Church, given for far different purposes; nor do I imagine that anyone would have thought it possible, had it not been for the confident tone of Dr. COLENSO himself, assuring those to whom he had written that such was about to be the case.

It rejoices me, my brethren, to receive from yourselves the assurance that, let the worldly position of Dr. COLENSO be what it may, you 'dare not acknowledge him as having authority in spiritual matters.' Maintain your ground as witnesses for Christ, and for 'the faith once for all delivered to the Saints,' and, in God's good time, all will be well. Our country's Courts will not commit the great wrong of giving a legal right to a bishop, deposed and rejected by the Church, to force himself into your churches, and proclaim from your pulpits 'erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's Word,' which he and you have sworn at your ordination 'with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away,' and thereby to compel your congregations,—who, I rejoice to hear, have no more sympathy than yourselves with the late Bishop's teaching,—to abandon the churches which they have erected for themselves.

But, if it were so, your course is plain. Christians have, before now, been driven to worship on the mountain-top or by the river-side, in dens and caves of the earth. I believe there is faith and zeal enough among yourselves, if driven to it, to do the same.

I shall have much pleasure in complying with your wish, by publishing my Charge, and by placing the MS. afterwards at your disposal.

I am, Rev. and Dear Brethren,

Your faithful servant and brother in Christ,

R. CAPETOWN, Metropolitan.

The Rev. the Clergy of the Diocese of Natal.

A similar document, almost the counterpart of the chief clause in the clerical 'declaration,' was subsequently signed by

the same nine clergymen as before, and also by *seven* laymen—six signing as churchwardens of four churches, but signing in their own names merely, without the authority of the congregations.

It is obvious to remark how positively in his reply, as above,—and we shall see that he does the same in his Charge,—the Metropolitan reiterates the statement, that ‘the *whole Church* has solemnly repudiated my teaching,’ that ‘I have been deposed and rejected* by *the Church*.’ But he must have been aware that my books have never been condemned at all by the *whole Church*, or by any competent authority in the Church of *England*, and that not a few of the clergy of *that Church*, and a very large body of the more intelligent laity, are so far from condemning me, that they have openly come forward to declare their disapproval of his proceedings.

Further, I maintain, as I have partly shown in my ‘Letter to the Laity,’ p.10–14, that all the charges brought against me at my (so-called) ‘Trial’ will fall to the ground by virtue of recent decisions in this country, some in consequence of recent Judgments of the Privy Council, others by reason of a decision in the Court of Arches—the very Court of the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, under whose ‘general superintendence and revision’ the Bishop of CAPETOWN bound himself to act, in accepting his Letters Patent from the Crown,—which decision, however, he distinctly repudiates, see *Trial*, p.388, declaring positively that he ‘cannot concur’ in it, and presuming to say that ‘it is a *wrong* to the Church’ of which he is still content to remain a Bishop.

With respect to the ‘questions,’ which, as the Bishop of

* Of the clergy in the diocese of Capetown, very many of them selected or ordained by the Bishop himself, several appear not to have signed the ‘Declaration’ of ‘rejection,’ lately published in the *Times*, Sept.1. But the signatures to this Declaration do not profess to be those of Clergy of the *Church of England*, but of Clergy ‘ministering in the *Church in South Africa*,’ and they address, accordingly, the ‘Bishops of the *Church in South Africa*.’

CAPETOWN says, 'I have raised,' or which, as he says elsewhere, *Charge*, p.14, 'have really been raised by my writings,' I cannot be responsible for inferences, which he or others may think proper to draw from my critical conclusions. I must refer the reader to the books themselves for the statements which I have really made; but I emphatically deny that I myself have raised these 'questions.' On the contrary—

(i) I have said of the Bible, Part I.p.13, that it has—

'through God's providence, and the special working of His Spirit on the minds of its writers, been the means of *revealing* to us His True Name, the Name of the only Living and True God, and has all along been, and, as far as we know, will never cease to be, the mightiest instrument in the hand of the Divine Teacher, for awakening in our minds just conceptions of His character and of His gracious and merciful dealings with the children of men. Only we must not attempt to put into the Bible what we think *ought* to be there, . . . and lay it down for certain beforehand, that God could only *reveal* Himself by means of an *infallible* book.'

(ii) I have done my utmost to show, Part I.p.xxix-xxxii, Part II.p.xv,xvi, Part III.p.xxxiii-xl, that the recognition of the results of the criticism of the Pentateuch 'is perfectly consistent with the most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's Divinity,'—whereas Bishop GRAY's view seems to lose sight of the human nature of our Lord altogether, or to trench on the *Eutychian* and *Monophysite* heresies, which confounded the two natures in one.

(iii) I fully believe in the Divine origin of Christianity, —not certainly of that Christianity, which may be blown away by a breath, which teaches that 'all our hopes for eternity are taken from us,' if one line in Esther or Chronicles is shown to be unhistorical or untrue, whose 'foundation' is the dogma, that 'the whole Bible is the *unerring* Word of the Living God,' —but a Christianity rooted and grounded in those 'words of Christ'—'the primal, indefeasible truths of Christianity,' as Dean MILMAN calls them,—'which shall not pass away,'—a Christianity which at once satisfies the deep wants and longings of the human heart, and is confirmed, as of Divine original, by

the whole course of human history,—a Christianity, to use again the words of the same writer, which is ‘comprehensive, all-embracing, catholic, which knows what is essential to religion, what is temporary and extraneous to it,’ and, being such, ‘may defy the world.’

And let me say further, it is not I who have said that Christianity will not bear a close and critical investigation, that it will not endure the searching eye of ‘free enquiry.’ I believe that it will, that it is essentially and eternally true. But I do not believe that all is true, which ancient or modern dogmatists have asserted to be essential to the creed of Christendom, and by which they always obscure, and not unfrequently put out of sight altogether, the grand truths, which alone are ‘indefeasible’ and imperishable. I hold with Bishop THIRLWALL, *Charge*, p.123, that—

The numbers, migrations, wars, battles, conquests, and reverses of Israel have nothing in common with the teaching of Christ, with the way of salvation, with the fruits of the Spirit. They belong to a totally different order of subjects. They are not to be confounded with the *spiritual revelation* contained in the Old Testament, much less with that fulness of grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ. . . . Such questions must be left to every one’s private judgment and feeling, which have the fullest right to decide for each, but not to impose their decisions as the dictate of an infallible authority on the consciences of others. Any attempt to erect such facts into articles of faith would be fraught with danger of irreparable evil to the Church, as well as with immediate hurt to numberless souls.

The Bishop’s Charge; his claim of Jurisdiction.

I come now to consider the Bishop of CAPETOWN’S Charge, which is described by the correspondent of the *Guardian* as—the greatest, some say who know England well, that had ever been delivered by an English Bishop.

In the first portion of it, p.1–12, the Bishop states his views as to the office and powers of a Metropolitan. These I need not here consider at length, as these points, no doubt, will come under discussion when my case is heard, as Her Majesty has ordered, by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I

remark only that I have no concern with, and do not in any manner recognize, the powers of a Metropolitan, as they may have existed at some time or other in the ancient Catholic Church, or as they may now exist 'in the Churches of the Roman obedience,' in which latter, says the Bishop, p.14— since the Council of Trent, the powers of the Metropolitan, as well as those of the Episcopate generally, have been, to a very great extent, merged in the Papacy.

I recognize them only so far as they exist in 'the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established,' in which, as is well known, the supreme powers, usurped by the Pope in the Roman Church, are restored by the Constitution to the Crown. And I note that the Bishop has entirely ignored the Act of Submission of the Clergy, 25 Henry VIII, which surrenders all those powers to the Sovereign, with respect to which Mr. A. J. STEPHENS says, *Laws relating to the Clergy*, i.p.23 :—

The grand rupture [with Rome] happened in the reign of Henry VIII, when all the jurisdiction usurped by the Pope in matters ecclesiastical was restored to the Crown, to which it originally belonged, so that the statute 25 Hen. VIII was but declaratory of the ancient law of the realm.

I may observe, however, that the Bishop repeats on p.8 the assertion, which I have already been obliged to contradict on p.6 of my 'Letter to the Laity'; for he says—

Your late Bishop, *who had for years recognized my jurisdiction, as has been abundantly shown by the documents produced at his Trial*, denied on that unhappy occasion that I had any jurisdiction over him, and protested against the exercise of it.

I have shown in my Letter—

(i) That I have never recognized in the Bishop of CAPETOWN any *jurisdiction* over me personally, though I have recognized his Metropolitan *dignity*, as my Patent requires me to do, in accordance with the system of the Church of England; that is, I have recognized (i) his *preeminence* and *precedence* as that of a Bishop *primus inter pares*, (ii) the right of any one of my clergy, who may deem himself aggrieved by any of my decisions, to appeal to him as Metropolitan;

(ii) That the documents produced at my so-called 'Trial' do not imply any recognition of the jurisdiction which he now claims over me as Metropolitan ;

(iii) That the Bishop of CAPETOWN himself, only a few years ago, was then, as he expressed himself,—
in doubt as to the extent of Metropolitan jurisdiction.

By this time, I hope, my 'Letter to the Laity' may have cleared up this matter of jurisdiction to the minds of many of my Clergy and Laity. In the absence of any such correcting influence, I cannot wonder that they should have been much impressed by the positive statements of the Metropolitan, and by his language at p.8—

If Dr. COLENSO claims to be Bishop over the Clergy and Laity of this diocese, he can scarcely question my authority over him. *We derived our respective jurisdictions from the same source.*

I have shown in my 'Letter,' p.5, that in my Patent, which is of an earlier date than that of the Bishop of CAPETOWN, I am placed by the Crown in the same relation to him as Metropolitan, that any one of the Suffragans of the Province of Canterbury stands in to the Archbishop of that Province. And if, as I am advised, the office of a Metropolitan in England involves no right or power to exercise an irresponsible jurisdiction over a Suffragan, without any right of appeal to the Sovereign, then neither has the Bishop of CAPETOWN any such right or power over me, nor could such a power have been given him by the *later* Patent which he has received.

The Bishop, however, says, p.6—

There remain the facts, that, if the Church and Crown united in the appointment of a Bishop, they were united also in the appointment of a Metropolitan,—that, if one office exists, the other exists also,—and that each of the eight South African Bishops, that have been appointed since the Province was formed, solemnly swore before God that he would render canonical obedience to me as Metropolitan at his consecration.

I have already shown, 'Letter to the Laity,' p.4, that according

to the principle laid down by the Privy Council in *LONG v. Bishop of CAPETOWN*, viz.—

the oath of canonical obedience does not mean that the clergyman will obey all the commands of the Bishop *against which there is no law*, but that he will obey all such commands as the Bishop *by law is authorized to impose*.— I am not bound by this oath to any obedience, except to such commands of the Metropolitan as he may be lawfully empowered to impose. And while I recognize his ‘dignity’ as Metropolitan, I deny that he is ‘by law authorized’ to summon me before him, and sit in judgment upon me.

Moreover, that the *dignity* of Metropolitan may exist, without his having any lawful jurisdiction, is plain from the following letter, which has been recently addressed by the Duke of Newcastle, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Governor-General of Canada.

Downing Street, 10th February, 1864.

My Lord,—A Correspondence, which arose out of the recent case of *LONG v. The Bishop of CAPETOWN*, has led me to submit, for the opinion of the Law-Officers of the Crown, the question whether any, and, if so, what, Metropolitan preeminence or jurisdiction was conveyed by the Letters Patent bearing date the 12th Feb. 1862, which constituted the Bishop of MONTREAL Metropolitan Bishop in the Province of CANADA.

The following is the answer which I have received :—

‘We think it was competent to the Crown to constitute his Lordship a Metropolitan, and thereby to give him *preeminence and precedence* over his Suffragans, but that, as to the coercive jurisdiction which the Metropolitan may exercise, and the manner in which it is to be exercised, these are matters which must be settled by the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church in a general Assembly of the Province, according to the provision of the local Act of the Canadian Legislature, 19 & 20 Victoria, cap. 121.’

You will be good enough to communicate a copy of this opinion to the Bishop of MONTREAL, adding, that it will be for his Lordship, in concert with the other authorities of the Canadian Church, to determine for themselves whether they would prefer to apply for fresh and amended Letters Patent, or to allow the existing instrument to remain in force, with the knowledge that, *so far as it assumes to invest the Metropolitan with coercive jurisdiction, it is of no effect.*

I have, &c.,

(Signed) NEWCASTLE.

It will be observed that the Patent of the Bishop of Montreal

did profess to give him, as Metropolitan, a power of 'jurisdiction,'—probably in the very same terms as those used in the Bishop of CAPETOWN'S. But this part of his Patent is pronounced invalid, by reason of rights already existing. And the Metropolitan of Canada has only 'preeminence and precedence' over the other Bishops of his Province—he is *primus inter pares*—but cannot exercise any jurisdiction over them. I believe that precisely the same state of things exists in the Province of Capetown, and that this will be made plain by the decision of the Privy Council upon the hearing of my case.

What would be thought, however,—or what would be said and done,—if the Bishop of MONTREAL were to throw to the winds this opinion of the Law-Officers of the Crown, and, in defiance of the Royal authority, were to assert, with the Bishop of CAPETOWN, that, in the exercise of what he pretends to call a *spiritual* jurisdiction, he will proceed to summon, convict, suspend, deprive, any one of his Suffragans—*e.g.* the Bishop of HURON,—and 'should he presume to exercise Episcopal functions in his diocese, after the sentence of the Metropolitan shall have been notified to him,' will further proceed, 'after due admonition, to pronounce the formal sentence of excommunication against him'? I apprehend that, in such a case, the Law-Officers of the Crown would have another duty to perform, and would vindicate in due course Her Majesty's Supremacy.

But the Bishop of CAPETOWN lays great stress upon the point that the Church, as well as the Crown, has conferred on him his office as Metropolitan, and from the former he seems to derive his 'spiritual jurisdiction.' But how has 'the Church' done this? The Bishop says, p.5—

The subject was fully discussed at a meeting of the English Bishops, and such of the Colonial Bishops as were within reach, summoned by the late Archbishop of CANTERBURY in 1853. At that meeting, at which I was present, it was resolved that Metropolitans should be at once appointed over the churches of Canada, New Zealand, South Africa (*Australia* and the *East Indies* being already under Metropolitans); and the concurrence and joint

action of the Crown in this matter was sought and obtained. *The Crown gave what force of law it was in its power to do to the decision of the Church.* . . . By the concurrent action of the Church and of the Crown, and, at their united call, I hold the office which I now fill.

It is obvious to ask, by what concurrent action of the Church and State were the Metropolitans of Australia and India appointed, *previously* to this meeting of the Bishops? Here, however, a resolution of certain Bishops is spoken of as a 'decision of the Church'! to which the Crown 'gave what force of law it was in its power to do'! Convocation had no voice in the matter: the Laity were not consulted: only a private conclave of Bishops, English and some Colonial, 'resolved' that 'Metropolitans should be at once appointed,' and then 'the concurrence and joint action of the Crown in this matter was sought and obtained.' And this is called 'the action of the Church'! I leave Archdeacon DENISON to settle this matter with the Bishop of CAPETOWN. But I maintain—and the Duke of NEWCASTLE'S letter abundantly shows it—that the *Crown alone* appointed these Metropolitans.

The Bishop again observes, p.10—

It is the Canons, which define the relations of the Priest and Deacon to the Bishop, of the Bishop to the Metropolitan, of the Metropolitan to the Primate and at present, it would seem, the *de facto* Patriarch of all Churches of the English Communion.

And then he proceeds to speak of the authority given him as Metropolitan by the 'Canons of the Church.' Not a word, however, is said in the Canons of the *Church of England* as to the relations of the Bishop to the Metropolitan, or of the Metropolitan to the Primate or Patriarch; nor are even the names of Metropolitan, Primate, Patriarch, so much as mentioned in any one of them. And, further, the appeal from the Archbishop of YORK is not to the Archbishop of CANTERBURY as 'Patriarch,' but to the 'Queen in Council.' The Bishop refers, no doubt, to certain ancient Canons, which, however, have no force in the Church of England, except that, as Lord HALE says, in STEPHENS, *Laws relating to the Clergy*, i.p.225,—

So far as such laws are received and allowed of here, so far they obtain, and no farther.

And this is made still more plain by Lord DENMAN, as quoted in STEPHENS, ii. p. 1449 :—

I think it necessary to reassert, what has so often been declared by our illustrious predecessors in this Court, and by the greatest writers on the English constitution, that *the Canon Law forms no part of the law of England, unless it has been brought into use and acted upon in this country.* Hence I am of opinion that the burden of proof rests on those, who affirm the adoption of any portion of it in England.

But the hearer or reader of the Bishop's words, if ignorant of ecclesiastical matters, would be misled by the context, and suppose that he was speaking of the Canons of the *English Church*, since the next preceding sentence of the Charge runs thus—

They [English Churchmen, who go out as colonists] carry with them their Bible and their Prayer-book, and with them *the laws of their Church embodied in the Canons*, so far as these are applicable to their new circumstances. It is *the Canons* which define, &c.,—

that is to say, in two *successive* clauses, the Bishop uses the expression 'the Canons' in two totally different senses!

The Bishop goes on to assure my Flock that the Law-Officers of the Crown were 'not likely to consent' to advise Her Majesty to refer my case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, —that the Queen could only do so 'by a stretch of Her prerogative,' p. 11,—that this would be—

in fact, to revive the Courts of Review, Star Chamber, and High Commission, with all their arbitrary powers.

The only answer to these assertions is the fact, that Her Majesty, by the advice of Her Privy Council, has so referred it, and, in so doing, has exercised an unquestionable right, derived from the first principles of our Protestant Constitution.

The Bishop of Capetown's threatened Secession from the Church of England.

But should Her Majesty, acting upon the advice that may be tendered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, be

pleased to decide in my favour, it appears that the Bishop of CAPETOWN contemplates in that case a formal secession from the Church of England. His language on this point is most remarkable, and cannot, as it appears to me, be understood to mean anything short of this.

The fear is expressed, that a Civil Court might send back Dr. COLENSO as Bishop of this Diocese, because there is no *legal* power in the Metropolitan to deprive him. The question, however, is, *not whether there is a legal power, i.e. a power conferred by some civil law*—[in other words, a power conferred by Her Majesty's Letters Patent],—but whether there is any *right* in the Metropolitan to deprive, and whether *I am Metropolitan*. I have shown above that, by the joint action of the Church and the State, I am Metropolitan, and that the Metropolitan has power by the laws of the Church [what Church?] to deprive. I do not believe that any Civil Court would deny this; because, first, by so doing it would declare that the Church, or, if the term is preferred, the 'voluntary association,' in this country, called the Episcopal Communion, is the only religious association, or the only society in the land of any kind, that cannot remove an unfaithful officer from his office: for, if the Metropolitan, with the aid of the other Bishops of the Province, cannot do it, no power on earth can. The Archbishop of CANTERBURY cannot do so. *The Crown cannot*. Were a Bishop to become an Atheist, or were he to believe in Mahomet, or to teach all Roman doctrine, it would by such a sentence be affirmed that there is no redress, no power of removal. pp.12,13.

Let us stop here for a moment, and consider the statement which I have above italicized, and in which lies the Bishop's whole misapprehension of his position. He *asserts* that the Crown *cannot* remove a Bishop: I am advised that the Crown *can* remove a Bishop, and that *no other power in the Church of England can*. Here, then, is the true remedy for the present supposed grievance. The Queen, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, can cancel my Patent, or, if necessary, can cancel that of the Bishop of CAPETOWN. If, then, as it is asserted, I have transgressed so grievously—nay, if I have transgressed at all—the laws of the Church of England, it is perfectly competent for the Bishops of CAPETOWN and GRAHAMSTOWN, or any Bishops of England my accusers, to make their complaint to Her Majesty, and seek redress at Her hands; they

may present, as I myself have done, a petition to be heard before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or any other Court which Her Majesty may see good to appoint, while accusing me of serious derelictions of duty, in the discharge of the high office which I hold by Her Majesty's authority. *I call upon them solemnly to do this*, and not to persist in the unjustifiable practice of uttering abusive and, in fact, libellous invectives against me. I will put no obstacles in the way of such an enquiry: I will raise no technical objections, nor interpose unnecessary delays. But, if they refuse to do this, then let them hold their peace as to the point, of my having broken faith with the Church of England, and violated her laws. Or, *if they reject Her Majesty's Supremacy*, and desire to shake off the control of those wholesome laws, which protect the clergy of the Church of England from the grinding oppression of mere ecclesiastical domination, *then let this purpose be distinctly avowed*, and so we shall understand more clearly the end which is aimed at, and the nature of the conflict in which we are engaged.

But the Bishop proceeds, p.13—

And, next, it would thereby declare that the Church in this colony, which is a branch of the oldest Corporation of the world, shall not be governed by its own laws,—laws which it inherits from the Church from which it derives its origin. I will not believe that any Civil Court on earth would so openly violate the religious liberties of any denomination of Christians.

Here, again, is the same fallacy as before. If the Bishop of CAPETOWN will surrender his Letters Patent, and, with any of the Clergy or Laity, who are willing to secede with him from the 'Church of England,' will form another Church—to be called, *e.g.* 'the Church of South Africa, in union and full communion with the United Church of England and Ireland,'—and to be modelled (if they desire it) after that of some ancient Church, with a complete mediæval system of ecclesiastical traditions, Priestly Authority, Episcopal and Metropolitan Courts, exercising jurisdiction over clergy and laity, issuing sentences of

suspension and deprivation for the former, and decrees of excommunication for both,—there is nothing to prevent their so doing: no Civil Court would interfere with them, or ‘violate the liberties’ of such an ‘association.’ But he cannot, I apprehend, retain his status as a Bishop of the Church of England, and then renounce the system of that Church, which rightly or wrongly—most rightly, as I believe, though the Bishop of CAPE-TOWN seems to think otherwise—declares by the 37th Article and the 36th Canon, that—

the Queen’s Majesty under God is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other Her Highness’s dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal.

The Bishop still proceeds, p.13—

But, if it did, it would only deprive the Church of its property. It could not give spiritual authority to any man. Christ has not given this power to Kings or Civil Courts. He has given it only to His Church: and, if any Church were to surrender this power to Civil Courts, it would un-Church itself—cease to be a Church.

But the Church of England notoriously asserts that to the Queen in Council rightfully belongs the power of allowing or disallowing the judgments, which may have been passed by Archbishops and Bishops upon their clergy; nor does it recognize the distinction, which the Bishop of CAPE-TOWN attempts to draw, between their ‘spiritual’ and ‘temporal’ jurisdiction. And, accordingly, Dr. WILLIAMS has been restored to his spiritual functions by the decree of the Privy Council, in direct opposition to the strongly-expressed sentiments of his own Bishop. It is obvious that, on the principle put forth by Bishop GRAY, Bishop HAMILTON might have condemned Dr. Williams ‘spiritually,’ in spite of the decision of the Privy Council,—he might have announced to him in the very language (*mutatis mutandis*) of the three South-African Bishops, in their 8th Resolution, adopted at the ‘Synod,’ Dec. 15, 1863, with reference to myself (see *Letter to the Laity*, p.31)—

Should [Dr. Williams] presume to exercise [Priestly] functions in the

diocese of [Salisbury], after [this *spiritual*] sentence of the Bishop shall have been notified to him, without an appeal to Canterbury, and without being restored to his office by the [Bishop], he will be *ipso facto* excommunicate, and it will be the duty of the [Bishop], after due admonition, to pronounce the formal sentence of excommunication.

Of course, the Bishop of SALISBURY, though feeling so deeply on this question, has never attempted to carry out such a measure. The notion of such a proceeding would not now be tolerated for a moment in England. Besides, the Bishop of SALISBURY knows that by the First Canon of the Church of England, he himself, as well as the Bishops of CAPETOWN and GRAHAMSTOWN, is bound—

To the uttermost of his wit, knowledge, and learning, without any colour or dissimulation, to teach, manifest, open, and declare, four times every year at the least, in his sermons and other collations and lectures, . . . that the king's power, within his realms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and *all other his dominions and countries*, is the highest power under God;—

and that by the Second Canon it is declared —

Whosoever shall hereafter . . . impeach any part of his regal supremacy in the said [ecclesiastical] causes restored to this Crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not be restored, but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of those his *wicked errors*.

If, however, such a proceeding be acquiesced in silently, while being thus introduced in a distant colony,—if it be once admitted, in any part of the Queen's dominions, that a distinction may be drawn between a 'spiritual' and a 'temporal' judgment of an ecclesiastical Judge of the Church of England,—I venture to predict that the experiment will be tried, at no distant day, at home.

But Bishop GRAY proceeds as follows, and I call special attention to these ominous sentences, which seem very distinctly to imply that he contemplates secession from the Church of England, should the Privy Council pronounce in my case (what he ventures to call beforehand) an 'unrighteous decision,' by which he means a nullification of his own judgment, and a

declaration of my right to retain—under the laws of the Church of England—the office which I hold as Bishop of Natal.

If this diocese, therefore, were to be deprived of its temporalities by an unrighteous decision, *the Mother Church would provide means for the support of another Bishop*, and send him out to minister to the faithful in the land. I would myself, were life and strength spared, undertake to return home, and rouse it up to the discharge of this duty, and *would, with my episcopal brethren,* consecrate another Bishop* to minister to the flock, and to witness for Christ, and His word, and His truth, in this land.

If the Bishop first resigns his See, and his connection with the Church and State of England, it is perfectly open to him to adopt the course proposed, and to establish this ‘Free Church.’ The Bishop, indeed, says, p.8—

I have claimed the same right, but no greater, to administer the laws of this Church, whether in my capacity as Metropolitan or in that of Bishop, than would be conceded to a Roman Catholic Bishop or a Wesleyan Superintendent, in the administration of the laws of their respective communities. This I deny. I think I have sufficiently shown that the Bishop claims the right, not of *administering* the laws of the *Church of England*, as they are laid down in her formularies, and interpreted by the decisions of her highest Courts of Appeal, but of *declaring*, by his own authority, the laws which he is to administer, or, at all events, the *interpretation* which he will put upon those laws, as Metropolitan of the *Church of South Africa*.

Besides which, the heads of the Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, Dutch Reformed, and other Churches, have never subscribed the Canons and Articles of the Church of England, and consequently are not bound by her laws, as the Bishop of CAPETOWN is. If Bishop GRAY really does what he has here threatened to do, without relieving himself by resignation of those grave responsibilities which he incurred, when he signed his adhe-

* Would the *English* Bishops, with the penalties of *præmunire* before them, venture to do this? or would even Bishop COTTERILL of GRAHAMSTOWN, or Bishop WELBY of SAINT HELENA, holding Her Majesty’s Letters Patent? Bishops TWELLS and TOZER, or any other *Missionary* Bishops, not holding office from Her Majesty, might possibly set at nought the Royal Supremacy.

rence to the 1st, 2nd, 36th and 55th Canons, and declared his unfeigned 'assent' to the 37th Article, and as the very condition of his being admitted to the Episcopate of the Church of England, 'solemnly swore before God,' to use his own words, that he would exercise whatever jurisdiction might be committed to him—

according to such authority as you have by God's Word, and as to you shall be committed by the Ordinance of this Realm,—

I apprehend that the act would be one of disobedience of the Law, violation of the Oath of Consecration, and rebellion against the Queen's Supremacy. I doubt, however, if there are many of the Laity, or even of the Clergy, of Natal, who would be prepared to follow the Metropolitan in this secession. I doubt also if all of those, who signed their names to the documents already quoted, appreciated fully at the time the nature of the act which they were committing, or saw clearly the course to which the Bishop of CAPETOWN was pledging them. For these remarkable passages were not uttered in their hearing as a part of the original Charge, but were added afterwards as a note, as the Bishop says, p.12—

in the hope that it may relieve the anxieties of some, who have spoken to me on the subject.

The Bishop of Capetown's strong language.

The Bishop has asserted on p.13 that my condemnation—
has been deemed unavoidable by the Bishops of this Province, *as well as by the whole Episcopate of the Church.*

I do not believe that he has any authority for this latter statement. I presume it to be of the same kind as that other assertion, into which his warmth of feeling has betrayed him, *viz.* that *all* the clergy of Natal had declared that they would never again receive me as Bishop. At all events, the language of the Bishop of LONDON and others in Convocation showed sufficiently that they, at least, would not for a moment justify

an act so unconstitutional and so unrighteous, as that which Bishop WILBERFORCE regarded with so much complacency, *viz.* the condemnation and deprivation of a Bishop of the Church of England by the single voice of a Metropolitan, without any right of appeal whatever,—not even to the Archbishop of Canterbury,—a right which is enjoyed by the humblest Deacon in the diocese of Capetown.

The Bishop then goes on to speak of the case on its merits. And here he certainly does not spare hard words, which, indeed, with thoughtful minds will not supply the absence of arguments, and would not be used, I imagine, in support of a really strong cause, but which produced, no doubt, to some extent, the desired effect for the present moment upon the feelings of those who heard them. He speaks of ‘the heresy of these awful and profane words,’ p.19, of my ‘reckless arrogance, like that which marked the infidels of the last century,’ p.20, of my using ‘the language of the boaster and the scorner,’ p.21, of my ‘distempered imagination,’ p.21, of my ‘awful writings, and of his duty to ‘earnestly warn the flock against their impiety,’ p.25, of my ‘being led captive of the Evil One,’ p.33, of my ‘instilling the poison of unbelief,’ p.33, of my ‘teaching the very opposite to that which I undertook to teach,’ and ‘enjoying the emoluments of my abused office and violated trust,’ p.31, of my—

‘teaching directly contrary to what She [the Church, *i.e.* as his hearers would suppose, the Church of *England*] holds on fundamental points, and directly opposite to what I undertook to teach when She gave me my commission, and for the teaching of which her faithful children have provided for me a maintenance,’ p.32.

Finally, he asserts, p.36, that I ‘have forsaken the Living Word of God,’ and, p.37, that—

all that would be respectable in the world, ignorant and careless though some be,—all but the scoffer and unbeliever,—avowedly are on God’s side,—and, therefore, he evidently means it to be inferred, are in direct opposition to ‘the Evil One’ and me.

These are, certainly, strong expressions. I cannot wonder that the Clergy or Laity of Natal, who were present, after hearing these terrible denunciations, enforced by the personal energy of the Metropolitan and the (supposed) authority of his office, signed at once the documents above quoted. Indeed, I found it necessary, after reading this vehement Charge, to turn for a while to the quiet reading of my own books, that I might know myself again, and satisfy myself that I was not really such a monster of iniquity as is here depicted. As some of those, however, into whose hands this pamphlet may come, may not have seen the two works of mine which have been so stigmatised, and may not be able to procure them, I have thought it well to quote a passage of some length from each of them in the *Appendix* (I), from which the reader will be able to judge in some measure how far such language as the above was really justified. I shall also, for my own protection from misrepresentation, publish, as soon as possible, an abridged popular edition of my work on the Pentateuch, so far as it has proceeded, which will enable many, I hope, to form a more correct opinion of its nature than they could gather from reviews, whether friendly or hostile. As before, however, I challenge the Bishop of CAPETOWN to present me by petition to Her Majesty, praying that the charges against me may be heard and investigated before a lawful Court, in such manner as Her Majesty may direct. And thus it will be decided, not by the arbitrary judgment of a single ecclesiastic, but by the rightful authority of the Sovereign, as Supreme Head of Church and State, acting through the recognised organs, whether I have in any way 'abused' my office, or 'violated' my trust.

But the Bishop also uses, as others have done, another class of weapons, in place of argument: he tries to cover me with ridicule and contempt. My writings—which I have 'poured forth voluminously, borrowing for the purpose from all sources of German infidelity,' have been 'met and exposed by

not less than seventy writers'; and he repeats the usual formulæ, p.25,26,—

The rapidly declining interest felt in his writings, now that the novelty arising from the author's position has worn away,—the wearisome length of full replies,—an objection, started in a few lines, requiring many pages for a thorough and efficient answer,—the little bearing that many of these sceptical questionings have upon the real point at issue,—may all combine to make theologians think that their time had better be devoted, as some are devoting it, to solid works, such as the two great Commentaries on Scripture, now in the course of publication, in which the chief doubts and difficulties, which not a single writer only, but others, whether in England or the Continent, have raised or felt, may be examined, and receive such solution as our present knowledge and learning may enable us to give them.

I am glad to find that in these 'two great Commentaries,' the 'chief doubts and difficulties,' which continental, as well as English, writers have 'raised or felt,' will be examined, and 'receive such solution' as the case admits of. But I venture to predict that, if this is really done, the result will be somewhat different from that which the Bishop of CAPETOWN anticipates. It is obvious that he himself is not personally acquainted with the criticism of the Pentateuch, or he would not have ventured to speak (p.19) of 'the seeming difficulties and obscurities' in it, as—

arising, to a very great extent, from the brevity with which it relates events, and possibly from errors in the text, which from multiplied transcriptions may have crept in, but which are of no great moment.

If he had personally devoted some time to the close examination of the matter, he would have found that the difficulties are not seeming, but real,—that they do not arise chiefly from any 'brevity' in the narrative, which is often, on the contrary, very diffuse, but from conflicting statements, written by different hands in different ages,—that any errors of the text, which may arise from transcription, are, indeed, 'of no great moment,' but they scarcely affect any one of the more important of these 'difficulties.' At all events, he would have found, as others have found already (*App.2*), who have honestly commenced the critical examination of the Pentateuch from the most orthodox

point of view, that the popular traditionary notion, to which he clings, of its being wholly the work of Moses, cannot possibly any longer be maintained.

But the Metropolitan has still other modes of describing me. He says, p.27,—

With many other *unbelievers*, he is purely a *fanatic*. His system is a false mysticism, based upon assumption.

The passage, which contains the evidence of my ‘fanaticism,’ is the following, from a letter to himself produced at my ‘Trial’:—

Another takes a different view of Inspiration, as I do myself, and believes that God’s Spirit is, indeed, speaking in the Bible to all, who will humbly seek and listen to His teaching,—but that, even when we read the different portions of it, we are to ‘try the spirits, whether they are of God,’ to ‘prove all things, and hold fast that which is good,’ to ‘compare spiritual things with spiritual,’—that it is a part of our glorious, yet solemn, responsibility to do this,—that, having the Spirit ourselves, an ‘unction from the Holy One, that we may know all things,’ having the promise that we shall be ‘guided into all truth,’ if we seek daily to have our minds enlightened and our consciences quickened, by walking in the Light already vouchsafed to us, we are not at liberty to shake off this responsibility of judging for ourselves, whether this or that portion of the Bible has a message from God to our souls or not; God will not relieve us from this responsibility; He will not give us what, in one form or other, men are so prone to desire,—an infallible, external guide—a voice from without, such as men often wish to substitute for the voice within.

I have quoted the passage at length, that the reader may see from the whole context, and not merely from the defective*

* The Bishop has more than once misquoted my expressions. Thus he speaks of me as having said that ‘a man can try, and ought to try, the very *words of our Lord Himself*, whether they teach truth or not,’ p.14, as ‘intimating that he may sit in judgment upon the very *words of Him*, whom he still professes to regard as God Incarnate,’ p.18,—whereas my words are these,—‘By that light the words *recorded to have been uttered by our Lord Himself* must all be tried.’ In like manner, he has quoted me, p.20, as saying, ‘though a thousand texts of Scripture should be against us,’—whereas I have written, ‘should *seem to be* against us;’ and I have further explained myself thus, *Comm. on Romans*, p.209: ‘Either we have misinterpreted the words of Scripture, or we have missed their connexion, or we have lost sight of the real point and spirit of the passage, insisting on the mere letter of the word, and some minor particulars, which were only thrown in to fill up the imagery, but were never

extracts quoted by the Bishop, what is my real meaning,—that I am speaking here of Christian men, devout students of the Bible, and am not claiming, as the Bishop says,—

for the heathen, quite as much as for the Christian, . . . an unction from the Holy One to guide him unto all truth.

But when the Bishop ridicules me as a ‘fanatic,’ p.16,17, for

intended to bind our consciences.’ Again, on p.19 he quotes my words thus: “‘It is not to be supposed,’ he says, ‘it cannot be maintained,’ that ‘He possessed a knowledge, surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch,’ that ‘He knew more than any educated Jew of His age.’” But my words are these, Part I, p.xxxi: ‘It is not supposed that, in His human nature, He was acquainted, more than any educated Jew of the age, *with the mysteries of all modern sciences*; nor, with St. Luke’s expressions before us, “Jesus increased in wisdom and stature,” can it be seriously maintained that, as an *infant* or *young child*, He possessed a knowledge, surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, &c.’ So on p.23 he says of me, “In his Part IV, p.xiii, after having spoken contemptuously of the Creeds, . . . regarding them, evidently, as venerable documents, which we may, if we please, altogether set aside, and quoting, in support of his unbelief, the language of one, who, even in the worst days of the last century, was, in his sense of duty towards his flock, and to the Chief Shepherd, far behind others, &c.” I do not intend to endorse the character here given of Bishop WATSON; but, at any rate, it would have been fair to have told his hearers that it was not I, but His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who brought him forward as a bulwark of the faith, one who had long ago ‘refuted my arguments,’ and that I had expressed no opinion whatever of my own respecting the Creeds, contemptuous or otherwise, but had merely quoted Bishop WATSON’S views.

But perhaps the most notable instance of this strange habit of misquotation occurs on p.22 of the Charge, where the Bishop writes as follows:—

“Again, p.629, he says: ‘They must try the spirit of the Prophet’s words by that law, which they have within them, written upon their hearts.’ . . . ‘If the words which that Prophet speaks to them come home to their consciences as right and true words, then, in God’s name, let them acknowledge and welcome them, and send them [on] with a blessing of ‘God-speed’ to others. If the voice which speaks within declares that the utterance from without is false, then shalt thou not hearken; the word is not God’s, and he, who hears it, must not obey it.’ In other words, every living man has a higher inspiration in him than the Prophet; or, as most plain men will think, the Prophet has none, *i.e.* he was not commissioned by God, not moved by the Spirit to deliver what he did deliver.”

The reader will scarcely believe that the Bishop has here left out the first and third clauses of a paragraph, of which he has quoted all the rest,—those two clauses distinctly showing that I am here only paraphrasing the words of a passage of Deuteronomy, xiii.1—3. See the whole passage quoted in App.1, p.67.

believing that there is in every heart a witness for God, and for saying that—

the voice of this inner witness is closer to him than any that can reach him from without, and ought to reign supreme in his whole being; for the Light in which he thus sees light, the Voice which he hears, is the Light of the Divine Word, is the Voice of his Lord:—

and when he asks—

What is this but to place man's mind above God's Holy Word,—human reason above Divine Revelation?—

I can only say that it appears to me to do just the very opposite; it teaches that man's mind must be *subject* to the 'Word of God,' to the Living Voice which speaks within him,—that 'Divine Revelation' is the very light of 'human reason,'—that, in truth,—

'There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding.' Job.xxxii.8.

At all events, I should say that such a view, if wrong, scarcely deserves to be derided as the 'fanaticism of unbelief,' p.15,—that it is one, at least, which is shared with me by multitudes of good men now, as it was held by many holy men of old, who were not ashamed to be stigmatized as 'fanatics,' because with ST. JOHN, I.4,5, they believed in 'the Life, which was the Light of Men,' 'the true Light, *which lighteth every man* that cometh into the world.'

The Bishop of Capetown's own religious teaching.

It would be impossible, as it would be useless, to discuss here at full length the different points on which the Bishop of Capetown accuses me, as—

teaching directly contrary to what the Church [of England] holds on fundamental points.

I have already touched upon these above, and in my 'Letter to the Laity': and I can only repeat that I have taught nothing, as I believe, which is forbidden by the laws of the Church of England, and I challenge him to bring the doctrines of my books before the only authority which has a right to try them.

But the reader will gather the position which the Bishop himself has assumed, in direct defiance to the recent decisions of the Privy Council, from the following extracts from his *Charge* :—

(i) ‘Our Church, in common with the whole Catholic Church, of which she claims to be a branch, holds that the Bible *is* the Word of God. Dr. COLENSO says that it is not.’ p.31.

[I have said, Part II, p.387, ‘The Bible is not itself “God’s Word” ; but assuredly “God’s Word” will be heard in the Bible by all who will humbly and devoutly listen for it.’

I have said also, Part III, p.28, ‘There is a sense in which I am quite ready to speak of the Bible as the “Word of God.” . . . But I prefer the language of the First Homily : “*In it (Holy Scripture) is contained the Word of God :*” and I agree fully with the language of Dean MILMAN : “The moral and religious truth, *and this alone*, I apprehend, is the ‘Word of God,’ contained in the Sacred Writings.”’

But *our* Church,—the ‘Church of England,’ not the ‘Church of South Africa,’—has declared, as the Bishop already knew, by the voice of her highest Court of Appeal, that she does *not* require her clergy to say that the Bible *is* the Word of God.]

(ii) ‘The Church teaches that the wicked perish everlastingly,—that this is our time of trial and probation,—that in the eternal world there is no more trial,—that the judgment fixes our condition for ever. Dr. COLENSO rejects this view, in the teeth of the Word of God and the faith of the whole Church of Christ!’ p.32.

[Though the Church of England does *not* require its clergy to maintain the endlessness of future torments, and I have given reasons why I should refuse any longer to do so, yet, in point of fact, I have not maintained the contrary. I have said that, ‘I dare not any longer dogmatize at all on the matter ; I can only lay my hand upon my mouth, and leave it in the hands of the righteous and merciful Judge.’ Nay, I have said further : ‘As many leave this world, whether in Heathen or in Christian lands, it may seem to us almost past belief that the vessel so defiled should ever be cleansed again, and made fit for the Master’s use. And it *may* be so : we cannot assert to the contrary, whatever hidden hope we may entertain.’—*Comm. on the Romans*, p.216.]

There is one point, however—the question, I mean, of ‘ascribing ignorance to Jesus as the Son of Man’—which has never been discussed before the Privy Council, and on which the Bishop lays very great stress, speaking of ‘the heresy of these awful and profane words,’ p.19, and not thinking it beneath the

gravity of the occasion to use (as he does more than once in the course of the Charge) a tone of mockery and scoffing. With respect to this point I assert once more, that I have said nothing which is not strictly consistent with the most orthodox faith—that my view *is* the orthodox view, and that the dogma, which my adversaries maintain, bears no little resemblance to that which was considered ‘heresy’ in Eutyches, who is said to have maintained—

That the Divine nature of Christ had absorbed the human, and that, consequently, in Him there was but one nature, *viz.* the Divine. MOSH. II.v.22.

In addition to the words of Bishop THIRLWALL, already quoted in my ‘Letter to the Laity,’ pp.35,36, I think it well to reproduce in the *Appendix* (3) some extracts from the letter of the Rev. W. HOUGHTON, printed at length in the preface to my Part III—since it may not be known to many of my readers.

The following are some further extracts from the Bishop’s Charge, &c., from which the reader will be able to judge how extreme are his views, on some of the great subjects which are now under discussion at home.

Thus he maintains the infallible truth of every statement in the Bible, as follows, *Trial*, p.390 :—

The Church regards, and expects all its officers to regard, the Holy Scriptures as teaching pure and simple truth: it is nothing to reply that they teach what is true in all things necessary to salvation.

And again he says, *Trial*, p.388 :—

‘The Ordinal does not ask of those, who are seeking to be admitted to the lowest office in the ministry, whether they believe that the Scriptures “contain everything necessary to salvation,” but whether they believe them to be *God’s Word*—whether they believe them [‘all the Canonical Scriptures’] to be *true*. This is the first condition of admission to the ranks of the ministry. The truth of the Scriptures [of every statement of the Book of Chronicles, Esther, the Book of Job!] lies at the foundation of Christianity. The first and most anxious enquiry, therefore, of those about to be sent forth in the Church’s name, though without full authority to teach, is whether they believe them—believe them to be *true*. Then, when the Priestly office is sought, when the position of *teacher* is to be undertaken, the Ordinal *goes further* (!), and requires *not merely* belief in the Scriptures

themselves, [as being in every line and letter infallibly true], *but* a belief that those Scriptures contain [N.B. the Ordination Service says "contain sufficiently"] all things necessary to salvation, and a promise to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but what [N.B. "you shall be persuaded"] may be concluded and proved by the Scripture.'

[I need hardly say, that these assertions are made directly in the teeth of the late judgment of the Court of Arches, which stands at the present time as Law in the Church of England, and by which it was ruled that the pledge given in the Deacon's Declaration at Ordination 'must be regarded as sufficiently fulfilled, if there be a *bonâ fide* belief that the Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation, and that to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty.' But their extravagance is at once apparent, when we find the Bishop attempting to maintain that the Declaration made by the Priest at Ordination *goes further* than that of the Deacon, the latter being understood in the sense in which it has just been interpreted by himself,—*i. e.* he asserts that the avowal, that the Scriptures 'contain sufficiently all things necessary to salvation,' *goes further* than the assertion, that every single statement in the Bible is divinely and infallibly true,—*e. g.* that the colloquies in Job i.6-12, ii.1-6, between Jehovah and Satan, literally took place in the courts of heaven, or that Jehovah 'answered Job out of the whirlwind,' in the grand Hebrew poetry of Job xxxviii-xli.

Let it be noted that the same Declaration, which is made by the *Priest*, is made also by the *Bishop*; so that it cannot be said that the Deacon's stringent declaration of belief is not repeated at the admission to the Priesthood, because, having been once made, the second declaration is only superimposed upon it; for, if this is the case, why is this second form of declaration required to be made again by the Bishop? Nor is there any ground for saying that the Priest has to make an *additional* declaration as a '*teacher*'; for 'it appertaineth to the office of the Deacon' also 'to *preach*, if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop.' . . . It is plain that the declaration of the Priest and Bishop really interprets that required to be made by the Deacon,—in accordance, in fact, with Dr. LUSHINGTON'S decision.]

The following is taken from the Bishop's 'Sermon, preached at Maritzburg, on Sunday, May 8, 1864,' p.10:—

The fact of the Resurrection is not questioned, nor yet the accuracy of the records which the Gospels furnish of our Saviour's life and teaching. But, if they were, it would not avail. Other records besides these abundantly testify to the historic Christ. *All the great facts concerning Him are preserved in other writings.* Were there no written and inspired record of the Christ, *uninspired history would, upon all fundamental points, supply the deficiency (!).*

The following are taken from the *Charge*:—

'We must commence by assuming something. We need assume for our

purpose no more than that the facts recorded in the New Testament are facts,—that the things were done, and the words were spoken, which are there declared to have been done and spoken.' p.34.

'What the Catholic Church, while yet one, during the first thousand years of her history (!), under the Spirit's guidance in her great Councils, declared to be, or received as, the true faith, that is the true Faith, and that we receive as such. More than this we are not bound to acknowledge. Less we may not.' p.35.

[What was it that happened at the precise moment indicated, A.D. 1000, to deprive the decisions of the 'Great Councils' of the Church of that character of *infallibility*, which is here ascribed to them up to that time? But the Church of England says in her 21st Article: 'General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And, when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God), they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.]

'It is the office of Reason to examine the grounds, to weigh the evidence, of their being a Revelation from God. *Prophecy and miracles are the grounds upon which Revelation rests its claims!* Through them an appeal is made to the reason of man in support of the truth of God's Word [*i. e.* of every line and letter of Esther and Chronicles], and the Divine Mission of our Lord. . . . When the understanding is convinced that the Bible is the record of God's Revelation ["? that the letter of the Bible is God's Revelation"], the functions of Reason end. It has no right to sit in judgment upon the contents of that Revelation, and reject what it dislikes, or cannot comprehend.' p.15.

[Alas for the multitudes of 'wayfaring men,' if the only grounds upon which the Bible claims our reverence, as 'containing God's Word,' are the external grounds of 'prophecy' and 'miracles'! But there is One who has told us that it is only 'an evil and adulterous generation' that 'seeketh after a sign': and the Bible itself teaches us, Deut. xiii.1-3, that 'if there arise a Prophet, and give us a sign or a wonder,' and the 'sign' or the 'wonder actually come to pass, whereby he has attempted to seduce us from our duty, from that which we know to be the right, the good, and the true, from the worship in heart and life of the One True and Living God,—we are *not* to hearken to the words of that Prophet.* Yes, truly! 'the Word of God

* Comp. the language of the Reviewer in the *Guardian*, Aug. 31, 1864, p.858:— 'Thus much seems to be clear, that a miracle *per se* neither has nor ought to have that infallibly demonstrative effect, which Mr. Row attributes to it. Has he forgotten that the Israelites in old times were forbidden (Deut.xiii.) to be led away into error by workers of miracles, and that we are no less expressly warned in the N. T. against "false Christs and false prophets, who shall shew great signs and wonders, and deceive the very elect"? How then can a miracle, simply as such, accredit an alleged revelation?'

is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.' Thank God! we have no need to 'examine the grounds' and 'weigh the evidence,' in order to believe that we have in the Bible a Divine Revelation,—in order to realise most fully 'the truth of God's Word' and the 'Divine Mission of our Lord.'

But, in fact, the Bishop, it will be seen, while professing to vindicate the authority of the Bible, really rests it all upon the authority of the Church, and puts the Creeds on a level with the Bible.]

'To sum up, we believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God, *because the Church, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, declared them to be such.* . . .

'On the very same grounds, we believe the Creed [he says afterwards 'the Creeds'] to be the true interpretation of the Word in all essential points. *It was framed by the Church under the same guidance, vouchsafed in consequence of the same promises.*

'One step further I will go. The Creeds, interpreted as the Church, which drew them up under the Spirit's guidance, intended them to be interpreted, contain the whole Catholic Faith.'—*Charge*, p.34–35.

'Even were there no Scripture, the truth would not fail. We should still have an independent witness to Christ in the teaching of the Apostles' Creed. That Creed, though in strictest accordance with Scripture, is a witness in addition to Scripture. *Both owe their origin to the Church, under the Inspiration of the Spirit of God.*'*—Sermon at Maritzburg, p.13.

[Is it Dr. GRAY that I hear, or Dr. WILLIAMS? the Bible 'owes its origin to the Church,' says the one—it is 'the written voice of the Congregation,' says the other.

The Bishop charges the Bishop of Natal with reckless haste in publishing.

On p.27 of his Charge the Bishop of CAPETOWN makes a statement which I am bound to notice.

Upon the appearance of his first work, assailing the faith through his Commentary [on the Romans], I wrote a letter, earnestly entreating him

* It is remarkable how exactly the Bishop of CAPETOWN re-echoes the words of the Bishop of OXFORD, who says in his last Charge (1863), p.58:—'We shall in the long run be unable really to maintain the Divine authority of Holy Scripture, if we give up the Divine authority, in its proper place [what does this mean?], of 'the Holy Catholic Church'; and again, p.60, 'Once received on *external evidence*, [i.e. on the authority of the Church], as the revealed will of God, soul after soul will have, in passage after passage, the inward witness, that, through it, God Himself is speaking to its inward ear. . . . But the Book, as a Book, must come to [the faithful soul] from the witness of the Church, before it is capable of receiving from his own spiritual experience these inward confirmations.'

It is obvious to ask, how did the 'Word of God' come home with piercing power to the hearts of men in those centuries, when the canon of Scripture was still

not to publish, and, when too late to hinder publication, sought to point out to him wherein he had taught amiss. When unable to convince him, I referred the book, and our correspondence, to the Fathers of the Church at home, who met, at the call of the late Archbishop, now with God, to consider it. Before I could receive their answer, the death of the beloved Bishop MACKENZIE compelled me to proceed to England. I then received the concurrence of the Bishops, generally, in the course which I had pursued; and, on the arrival of your late Bishop shortly after me in England, I communicated their views to him. At the same time I entreated him to meet three of the most eminent Bishops of our Church, who had expressed their willingness to confer with him on his arrival, and discuss his difficulties with him, hoping that he might thereby be induced to suppress his book so full of error. He, however, declined. He would not meet more than one, and then not as if he were in any error, but only as a common seeker after truth. At that time he had not published his open assault upon the Word of God; but, hearing that he had printed, for private circulation in the Colony, a work reputed to be sceptical in its tendency, I besought him not to put it forth in England, until he had met and discussed his views with the Bishops. But this also was declined, and the work was published.

I must first correct one statement in the above, which might lead to an erroneous impression. The Bishop says that he had '*heard* that I had printed' the rough draft of my work on the Pentateuch '*for private circulation in the colony.*' The information, which the Bishop had received, was not correct: and as I myself stated distinctly to him (see (i) in *App.* 4, p. 82) the reason for which I printed it, *viz.* to put it the more easily before learned and judicious friends in England, I regret that he has repeated the above misstatement.

The charge, however, is here made formally against me, that I wilfully rejected the kindly-offered counsel of my Episcopal Brethren in England,—that I rushed hastily and impetuously into publication, without caring for the advice of those eminent scholars on the English Bench, who might have rendered me assistance in my difficulties. This charge,

unsettled? But from the above principles the Bishop, of course, deduces the paramount necessity of believing in the Church, that is, as he says, of '*a hearty belief alike in her Sacraments, her Creeds, her Orders, and her Bible,*'—so that belief in the Divine authority of '*the Church's*' Bible is here put on exactly the same footing as belief in that of Episcopacy and Episcopal Ordination!

I am aware, has been insinuated in other quarters, and probably has done me some injury in the minds of fair-judging men. But I have never seen it openly made before; and I am thankful for the opportunity, which it gives me, of setting the real facts of the case before the eyes of my fellow-countrymen. As the Bishop of CAPETOWN has stated so circumstantially the course which he adopted towards me, I feel it incumbent on me also to state what occurred, and to support my statement with the necessary documents: *App. 4.*

The Bishop's personal observations upon the Bishop of Natal.

There is yet one other portion of the Bishop's Charge which I am compelled in my own defence to notice. And here I must, indeed, express my astonishment at the course, which the Bishop has thought it right to pursue. Holding the very strong opinions which he does on the subject of Church authority and Scripture infallibility, and other questions raised in the present day, I am not altogether surprised—however I may regret—that he has denounced so vehemently the views which I have expressed, that he has warned my flock solemnly against adopting them, and laboured zealously to build them up in the belief, which he himself holds to be essential to a true living faith. And, confident as he appears to be in the strength of his ecclesiastical position, I can understand—though I cannot justify—his hastening to anticipate any steps on my part, for bringing the matter, though with unavoidable delays, before the highest authority in the realm. He may be—and, I believe, he is—acting now illegally, and with undue precipitation. He has hurried up to Natal, and taken advantage of my absence to undermine my authority, and, in violation, as it seems to me, of the constitution and order of the Church of England, he has sought to withdraw my Clergy and my Flock from their allegiance to their lawful Bishop. And even now he is acting, as I apprehend, in defiance of the law, and in dis-

regard of Her Majesty's authority, by setting at nought the decision of the Court of Arches, and asserting positively, in his assumed office as Judge, that the Church of England *does* hold, and requires its Clergy to hold, two doctrines, which the late Judgment of the Privy Council has declared the Church of England *does not* maintain; and he threatens to go still further, should the decision of the Privy Council be in my favour.

But the Metropolitan manifestly transgressed the bounds of what could be proper and becoming on such an occasion, even from the highest view that may be taken of his office, when he proceeded to discuss my personal religious life before my Clergy and Laity in my own Cathedral, and to hold up to them—many of them my own children in the ministry, ordained by me to the Diaconate and Priesthood,—a picture of ‘the past career of Bishop COLENSO.’ As he has said of my criticisms that—

an objection started in a few lines requires many pages for a thorough and efficient answer,—

so here, in making these personal remarks upon me, the Bishop must have been perfectly aware that I could not reply to his charges, made in a few words, without entering at length into details, which, though well known to himself, would be wearisome to my readers, and would involve the characters of others. ‘I know,’ however, to use the words of the Bishop of OXFORD, on a recent occasion in the House of Lords,—however little he has acted up to the spirit of these words, in the language which he has used with reference to myself and others—

I know enough of the people of England to know that it is not by trying to produce a momentary pain on those who cannot properly reply to them, that great questions will be solved; but that it is by dealing with them with calmness, with abstinence from the imputation of motives, and, above all, with the most scrupulous regard to stating upon every point that which shall prevent any man being led to a conclusion other than that which the facts warrant.

The Bishop of CAPETOWN speaks, for instance, of the European population of the colony, as ‘a soil in which the Church

might have struck deep her root,' if I had only done my work more faithfully; he says—

the spiritual wants of the English population would have been supplied; an influence would long ere this have been brought to bear on the tribes within the colony, and the regions beyond; and, socially and politically, the condition of this land would have been sounder and safer than it is, and, religiously, nearer to God. p.30.

He does not mention that special reasons existed, independently of the Bishop, why the Church has not 'struck her root' more deeply in the white population,—that in Maritzburg the principal clergyman, one of Bishop GRAY'S own choice, holds views, described by the Bishop himself, as expressed in language 'going beyond that of the Church,' such views being utterly opposed to the general feeling of the whole community,—or that in the other chief town there existed an equally sufficient reason of another kind, which I cannot here mention, but which will be well known to every colonist, and especially well known to the Bishop of CAPETOWN himself, who warned me, when I took charge of the See, that I should find this particular difficulty. He well knows also that, of the Clergy now in the diocese, several are invalids—who either sought the colony at first because of their health giving way in England, or have broken down in their work in Natal. And yet these are still drawing their stipends as missionaries from the limited funds granted to my diocese by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and it would be impossible at present, through want of means, to fill up their place with others.

Then, as regards the heathen, the Bishop says, p.30:—

There is no saying what the effect of vigorous and extensive Church Missions might have been upon the mass of untutored heathenism around you, directed by one endowed with considerable gifts, who had prepared the way for great success, by mastering, beyond all others, the difficulties of the language, and making its future acquisition easier to all religious teachers. But there came a falling away. The subtle poison of unbelief entered in: the mind was turned away from the practical work which lay before it, and given to the working out of sceptical theories. Confidence was shaken. Works, begun well, were abandoned. Progress there was none. Instead

thereof there has been declension. The Clergy are reduced in number from what they were. Men are unwilling to remain under such a state of things as has existed among you. Others have shrunk from supplying their places. Whatever there is of real work, whether in the mission-field or in parochial work, was the result of first efforts, when faith was not undermined; and for the last few years has been carried on by zealous men,—apart from, almost in opposition to, him who might have been the soul of it, but from whom there has been of necessity a continually increasing alienation.

The statements in the above passage—the only object of which seems to be that of overwhelming the *merits* of my case with prejudices—involve, I assert it deliberately, a most unjust and cruel suppression of the truth. I will not stay to ask how the Bishop was authorised to pronounce so definitely about the direct consequences of my ‘falling away,’ as he calls it, in its effect upon my practical work, of which he knows nothing, but what he has heard from others, and those my adversaries. But I may state that the chief contents of my Book on the Romans, which he deems so ‘heretical,’ were present to my mind many years before I went to Natal,—that I have gone over the ground, again and again, with my own soul and with my pupils, while yet I ministered as a Parish Priest in England,—and that (as the memoir of Bishop MACKENZIE mentions) I expounded this very epistle—in substance, on almost all main points, precisely as I afterwards commented upon it—in daily lectures to the Missionary party who went out with me at first to the colony. The spirit of that book has been all along—and will be, I trust, to the end—the very life of my Missionary labours.

But what have those labours been? When I landed in Natal, there were no books in Zulu for the instruction of Missionaries, no dictionary, no grammar, (except an admirable sketch in Danish, which a lady of my acquaintance most kindly translated for me)—there were none for the education of the natives, no translation of the Scriptures or Prayer Book, (except a translation of St. Matthew by the American Missionaries,—an excellent first attempt, but very defective,—and a few scraps of

Genesis). The whole work had to be done from the beginning, the language having to be learned from natives who could not speak a word of English, and written down, and analysed, with infinite, intense, labour,—and this in addition to the other duties which devolved upon me, of preaching and ministering to Europeans and natives, visiting from time to time on horseback the different parts of my diocese, (one-third the size of England and Wales,) and keeping up a laborious correspondence.

The Bishop of CAPETOWN, I believe, has never set his hand to this branch of the Missionary work: and he, therefore, knows not what it is. When he had charge, at first, for several years, of the Kafirs and Zulus in his vast original diocese, he made no attempt, I imagine, to acquire the native tongue; nor now, I believe, has he done anything *personally* to acquire the language of such wild tribes as still exist within his own present diocese. The coloured people, who abound in the more civilised districts of his diocese, speak, more or less, the Dutch language: and I do not suppose that he has ever *preached* in Dutch even to them. But, if so, there were books enough in existence, from which *that* language might have been learned. Very far, indeed, am I for blaming him for this omission: he, too, has had intense, infinite, labour; but it has been labour of another kind, in building up the Church chiefly among a civilised European population. And hence the injustice of his remarks upon myself.

He speaks, indeed, of my being ‘endowed with considerable gifts,’ of my having—

prepared the way for great success, by mastering, beyond all others, the difficulties of the language, and making its future acquisition easier to all religious teachers.

But he seems totally unable to estimate the amount of work involved in this. I thank God for such ‘gifts’ as I have, and for the blessing of an University education, which has enabled me to use them more effectively. But I have no special gift for languages, but what is shared by most educated men of fair

ability. What I have done, I have done by hard work—by sitting with my natives day after day, from early morn to sunset, till they, as well as myself, were fairly exhausted,—conversing with them as well as I could, and listening to them conversing,—writing down what I could of their talk from their own lips, and, when they were gone, still turning round again to my desk, to copy out the results of the day.

In this way, and by degrees, I was able to force my way into the secrets of their tongue, and to overcome those difficulties which had to be encountered before *any* Missions could be set forward to any considerable effect among the natives. Instances of missionaries, indeed, may occur now and then—I am fortunate in having some at this time among my clergy, of whom, however, two are foreigners—by whom the native language may be acquired, without the aid of books, from mere contact with the natives, the Missionary himself having natural gifts, and devoting his whole time to the study and practice of it. But with the ordinary English teacher the case is different. He needs a grammar, dictionary, translations—by means of which he may correct the faults, which he makes in his first attempts at conversation, and increase his acquaintance with the forms of speech and vocabulary of the language. And the Missionaries will all need books for the use of their native classes, and these, not only portions of the Bible and Prayer Book, but books of instruction in matters of common life,—containing the simple lessons, which an English child should learn, in Geography, Astronomy, History, Geology, &c.

Before, therefore, any considerable number of Mission stations could be established, this work had to be done; and such books it has been my duty to prepare, for the use of the teachers, as well as of the taught. And, after the character which the Bishop of CAPETOWN has given me, I must ask to be forgiven for showing to what this labour has really amounted. I landed with my family in Natal on May 20, 1855: and it happened

that on the same day of the year, May 20, 1862, after a sojourn of exactly *seven* years, I re-embarked for England. Let it be remembered that, during this interval, a considerable time had to be spent in mastering sufficiently for myself the native tongue, before I could venture to undertake the work of preparing books for others. And then let the reader judge if the Metropolitan was justified in his remarks upon me, when he had, or might have had, before him the results of my labours, even in this one department, during these seven years.

*List of Books prepared by the Bishop of Natal for the use of
Missionary Students and Native Scholars.*

- (i) Grammar of the Zulu-Kafir Language, pp. 184.
- (ii) First Steps in Zulu-Kafir, an abridgment of the former, pp. 82.
- (iii) Zulu-English Dictionary, pp. 552.
- (iv) Three Native Accounts of a Visit to the Zulu King, in Zulu, with translation, vocabulary, and explanatory notes referring minutely to the Grammar, designed expressly for the use of Missionaries studying the language.
- (v) First Reading Book or Primer (in Zulu).
- (vi) Second Reading Book—fables and stories (in Zulu), some of which were communicated to me by one of the Missionaries.
- (vii) Third Reading Book—sentences and narratives, from the lips of natives (in Zulu).
- (viii) Fourth Reading Book—elements of Geography and History (in Zulu), 2nd Ed.
- (ix) First Lessons in Science, Part I—elements of Geology, written in easy English for Zulus learning English.
- (x) First Lessons in Science, Part II—elements of Astronomy, do. do.
- (xi) Common Prayer-Book, Morning and Evening Prayer, Collects, many Psalms, and all the Occasional Services, and Metrical Psalms and Hymns (in Zulu), 3rd Ed.
- (xii) Book of Genesis (in Zulu), 2nd Ed.
- (xiii) Book of Exodus (in Zulu).
- (xiv) Books of Samuel (in Zulu).
- (xv) Harmony of the four Gospels (in Zulu), 2nd Ed.
- (xvi) New Testament, complete (in Zulu).
- (xvii) Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, upon the proper treatment of cases of Polygamy, as found already existing in converts from heathenism, 2nd Ed., pp. 94.
- (xviii) Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, pp. 311.

I might add also the first rough sketch of my work on the Pentateuch, pp.720; for I believe that by this work, and by my Commentary on the Romans, I have done more to promote the cause of sound learning and religious education, than by all my other labours put together.

Of course, in preparing for each new edition of any book, the whole work had to be carefully gone over again with my natives. I make no mention here of first attempts, now thrown aside as imperfect,—though they may have cost much labour to produce,—but only name those books which are actually in use in our Missions in Natal and Zululand, or, at least, will be in use as soon as I return to the diocese: for I understand that in my absence it has been ordered that none of my books shall be circulated, for fear of their containing, I suppose, some portentous heresy.

In fact, among other attempts to defame my character, in order to dispose more easily of my arguments, I have seen in the *Guardian* statements to the effect that I have corrupted the Scriptures in my translations. It is ridiculous to suppose that I could attempt such a folly, which any Missionary of any Church might detect. I am far indeed from supposing that my versions are perfect; I may have missed the meaning of the original in some places, and failed to express it satisfactorily in Zulu in others. And I shall of course make it my duty, as new editions are required, to revise and amend them continually, giving all due heed to the suggestions of others now engaged in the Mission work. But I challenge anyone to point out a single passage, wherein I have dishonestly departed from the meaning of the text of Scripture,—not certainly as it exists in the English version, but in the Hebrew and Greek originals, as interpreted by the most able commentators.

And this also I can say with confidence, that these books are all written in correct idiomatic Zulu, and, as such, are very acceptable to the natives themselves. My plan to secure

this correctness was, never to trust to my own translations, but to pass every word through the mouth of some one or other intelligent native before I printed it. I would take, for instance, the Greek Testament; and, first representing in Zulu, as accurately as I could, the meaning of a clause of the original, I would then require my native to repeat the same in his own phraseology. In so doing, he would adhere, of course, generally to mine; but, having been trained to understand my purpose, he would introduce also those nicer idioms, which at once mark the difference between the work of an European and a native. Having mastered the Zulu tongue sufficiently to be able to know whether he had clearly expressed the meaning of the original or not, I would persevere in this way until the desired object was gained; although, perhaps, in the rendering of difficult passages, a considerable time might have to be spent in expressing perfectly a single verse. All Missionaries, of course, who have been personally engaged in the work of translation, know something of this labour, and are able to appreciate it: but the Bishop of CAPETOWN seems to make very light of it.

And who was the chief printer of many of these books? A Zulu lad, whom I took as a young savage from his kraal a few years ago, with a number of others, who were given up to us for education by their fathers for *five years*. The story of their being brought to us is very interesting, but it cannot be told at length here. Suffice it to say that we did keep them for five years, as agreed, and that during this time—with the usual drawbacks, difficulties, disappointments, failures,—which must attend any school, but especially a school of savages, whose white teachers at the best spoke only with stammering lips in the native tongue,—we made fair progress with them in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and the general elementary work of village schools. Some of them, besides, were taught the business of the printer and binder, and others made some progress in

other manual arts, though not so much as we had hoped and desired. The great difficulty was to procure the proper teachers.—steady energetic men, possessing manual skill of any kind, yet willing to work in instructing these lads in a colony like ours, where such skill and industry were much less easily obtained than in Capetown, and secured readily among the colonists a far greater remuneration than the Mission station could afford to give them.

At the end of the five years, when the term for which they had been sent to us had expired, their mothers, brothers, sisters, worried their fathers to reclaim them: and, just as in any English school, the lads, now grown many of them to the critical age, themselves desired to be released from thralldom. At that time, also, I had no efficient teachers skilled in manual arts, under whom to place them if they had been willing to remain; and I was about myself to return to England—as I should have had to do in any case, quite independently of my book on the Pentateuch, for the purpose of raising supplies of money and men for extending our Mission work. Of course, it was impossible for me to conduct the whole work of this primary Institution myself, or even to oversee it at all times, though it was carried on beneath my own roof. I felt this more especially when required to visit the different parts of my diocese, or when called to leave it for some weeks together, to visit the Zulu king, or to attend a conference of Bishops, 800 miles away, at Capetown.

Under all these circumstances, I had no alternative but, for prudential reasons as well as in answer to the expectations of the boys and their parents, to allow the children of the Institution to return for the present to their homes, about a year before I left Natal. They were most of them able to read and write and cypher, and had made some progress in other ways; and I trust that they have carried to their kraals the first seeds of a civilizing influence,—so far, at least, as to lead them to desire to bring their own children hereafter for training, and

leave them in our hands with more hearty readiness than their parents did.

And this is the work of which the Bishop says, 'works well begun were abandoned'—as if it were nothing that one of these very boys, now a youth of eighteen, is at this very moment conducting the whole work of our Printing Press, continuing steadily at his labour, during my absence, without any supervision in his office, correcting the sheets himself with the greatest accuracy, and sending me regularly, month by month, the fresh 'proofs' from the press, which mark the progress of his work, and not only labouring himself, but training others also, without any white man to help him!

Doubtless, during the last twelve months or more of my residence in Natal, my mind had been intensely occupied with the questions which had been raised upon the Pentateuch in the course of, and by consequence of, that very 'practical work' itself, in which I had been engaged. If I had never translated with my natives the books of Genesis and Exodus,—if I had been content merely to superintend the diocese, devoting myself to the more easy and pleasant occupation of riding about from place to place, visiting and preaching to the English community, addressing the native congregations by the dull, lifeless, process of speaking through the mouth of an interpreter, but letting the native language alone,—I should, perhaps, never have had my attention drawn so closely to the criticism of the Pentateuch. But so far was I even then from 'abandoning' my native work, that my very last act before leaving Natal was to revise carefully once more the Prayer Book, the New Testament, and the book of Genesis throughout, in order to give my boy steady employment during my absence in England.

I think it best to quote in the Appendix (5) some letters from this youth, received during my sojourn in England, which will not only show the steady industry and energy with which he carries on his appointed labour, but will also indicate

the course which the Metropolitan has thought it right to take with respect to my native converts. It was not enough, it seems, to brand me before my Clergy and Laity, generally, with all kinds of hard names, but my poor simple natives must be told that I have 'gone astray exceedingly,'—that I 'have rebelled,'—that I 'do not believe in God.' I translate also in the Appendix some letters which I have received, while in England, from native catechists, of whom also the Metropolitan says nothing. They will serve to show in what spirit these, too, have been trained, and to what temper they have attained, by God's blessing, under my instructions.

I repeat, it is unjust and reckless in the extreme in the Bishop of CAPETOWN, who went up to my residence, and saw this very work going on, to make these statements—and others like them—for the mere purpose of raising prejudices and causing pain. As regards the particular assertion, that—

for the last few years this work has been carried on by zealous men, apart from, almost in opposition to, him who might have been the soul of it, but from whom there has been of necessity a continually increasing alienation,—I do not think it necessary to descend into personal questions of this kind: but I may say, (i) that such alienation, wherever it may exist, may arise from other causes as well as 'sceptical theories,' and may be the fault of others as well as myself,—(ii) that the Bishop's statement is here, as I have shown it to be elsewhere, very heated and exaggerated,—(iii) that with respect to one, at least, of the most 'zealous' and able Missionaries in the colony, the Bishop, as appears from the facts already stated, is prepared to drive him from the diocese, notwithstanding the small number of the clergy which he laments so much, *because* of his dutiful attachment to me as his *Bishop*, whatever differences may exist in our religious views.

But the Bishop says —

The clergy are reduced in number from what they were. Men are unwilling to remain under such a state of things as has existed among you. Others have shrunk from supplying their places.

Doubtless, those among the clergy, who do not agree with those 'extreme views of Church and State,' which the correspondent of the *Guardian* naively calls 'home views,' and who are prepared with the Metropolitan to abandon the Church of England altogether, rather than submit to her system and her laws, may be 'unwilling to remain' under present circumstances. But the statement that 'the clergy are reduced in number from what they were,' coming from the Bishop of CAPETOWN, is again most unfair and unwarranted.

In the first place, the statement is not correct. The clergy under my charge are at the present moment *fifteen*, including two now in England, and two—*both ordained by myself, and drafted from my own diocese, but—sent by myself to labour beyond the border in Zululand, and there placed, by an express resolution of the Gospel-Propagation Society, under my charge as Bishop.* On reference to the lists of the Society from the year 1853, when I first took charge of the diocese, (though I only began to reside in 1855), to 1863, the numbers of clergy labouring under my direction will be found as follows, 4, 4, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 11, 12, 13, 13;—to which are to be added in each year two chaplains, military and colonial, who do not appear in the Society's lists, and also, from 1855 to 1860, my dear departed friend and fellow-labourer, Bishop MACKENZIE, whose noble services as Archdeacon, given gratuitously to my diocese, I need scarcely say, were not likely to be replaced. Thus the number of the clergy has been increased from 6 in 1853 to 15 in 1863. And I may add that, when I first landed in the diocese, there was *one* single small church approaching to completion; while in the case of the two principal churches, (the Cathedral at Maritzburg, and St. Paul's at Durban,) the works indeed had been begun, but they were stopped in each instance for want of funds, the walls being only partially raised, and suffering injury from exposure to the weather. At this time there are *fourteen* churches, not reckoning chapels on Mission Stations.

Thus the statement above quoted is not even accurate in

point of fact.* But, when I consider the circumstances under which it was made, I have still more reason to complain of it.

* The correspondent of the *Guardian* writes as follows: 'His lordship [the Bishop of Capetown] arrived by the mail-steamer on April 7th, to find the number of the clergy dwindled down to eleven, some of whom also from ill-health are incapable of work;—a sad sight to one who had just left nearly fifty clergy and thirty catechists, actively and zealously employed in his own diocese, containing a population inferior in number to ours.'

The audacity of this assertion is really amazing. In the first place, the number of clergy has not 'dwindled' at all, as appears from the above data; secondly, the fact, that some are in ill-health, is no fault of mine, but makes it more difficult to supply their inefficiency with more active labourers, as the invalids still receive the stipends of the Society; thirdly, as to the comparison with Bishop GRAY's diocese, let it be noted that (i) the diocese of Capetown (52,702 sq. miles) is nearly *four* times as large as mine (14,397 sq. miles); (ii) the white population of the former (54,477) is also *four* times as large as mine (13,990), while a very large proportion of the coloured people of the former (66,026) are comparatively civilised, living in towns or villages, and able to speak Dutch or English, whereas the 156,061 natives of Natal are almost all mere savages, living in their kraals, and speaking only some Kafir dialect; (iii) that the colonial government at the Cape allows for the clergy of the Church of England in the Western Province £2,032 per annum, and I presume that similar assistance is given in the matter of schools, while in Natal only £350 is allowed (of which £250 goes to the chaplain at Durban, and £100 to the Dean of Maritzburg), and the legislature has distinctly refused to grant more.

In short, such a comparison as the above may be hazarded in England; but it would simply be deemed ridiculous in Capetown or Natal. The whole grant of the Society in my diocese for heathen-work was £1,350 per annum, which (allowing for contingencies) would not support more than six or seven married missionaries, since their stipends must almost *wholly* be paid from home. And how far would the £500 allowed for work among Europeans go, in a colony like ours, where the white population are very much scattered, except in the two chief towns, and where other denominations are very strong? For some years, the Dean of Maritzburg absorbed £150 of this sum, and Archdeacon FEARNE another £100; and even in Maritzburg, the cathedral city, Dean GREEN, by the last Blue-Book, received only £50 from his congregation, whereas the sum raised by the Cathedral Church of Capetown in one year is returned by the last Blue Book as £1,288. For the diocese of Capetown, the Society paid, in 1861, £3,782; in 1862, £4,101; in 1863, £4,398, 'general, appropriated, and special funds'; and only two or three, I believe, of the clergy are engaged in work among the *heathen*; so that the amount granted—viz., £6,430 from the Government and the Society, that is, *thrice* as much as is granted to my diocese—is almost all effective in stimulating the exertions of the white population. And, I need hardly say, it is comparatively easy to secure those, who will be willing to minister among civilised people, white or coloured, in villages or towns. Whereas, even when the means of livelihood are provided, it is most difficult to find well-educated men, (i) willing to devote themselves to the study of a barbarous language, (ii) able sufficiently to master it, (iii) ready to bury themselves in the solitudes of savage heathenism, far removed from medical advice, congenial society, and the other blessings of civilisation.

No one knows better than the Bishop of CAPETOWN that the first thing needed for securing clergy in a colony is *money*—and then *men*—men of the right stamp, who will not be a hindrance to the work, instead of a help in it. Bishop GRAY, I believe, has once—if not twice—been in England, collecting money and obtaining men for his work, while I have been fastened to my desk in Natal, engaged upon Zulu nouns and particles. It would have been just to have remembered this.

And then, also, it would have been only fair to have borne in mind that my diocese is, as regards the European population, in very different circumstances from his own. The Cathedral city, Maritzburg, contains about 3,000 white inhabitants, while Capetown alone has more than 17,000, a population a fourth as large again as the *whole* white population of Natal. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had strictly limited for some years past, before I left Natal, its grant for the colonists to 500*l.* per annum, of which the Dean of MARITZBURG alone had been receiving 150*l.* (reduced of late to 100*l.*, and, perhaps, now to 50*l.*), so leaving but a small sum to be divided among the other clergy, in the more sparsely inhabited, and therefore poorer, parishes. Efficient men are not to be secured, except in rare instances, upon the narrow and uncertain incomes which colonial cures usually supply. Yet, for work among the white-men of a colony, such men are needed, as well as for work at home, not catechists of limited attainments, or clergymen going out in search of health, (though, for want of others, we should thankfully make use of these)—but gentlemen of education, intelligence, and energy, who will help to form the minds, and raise the tone of feeling, as well as guide the religious belief, of the next generation.

And for work among the heathen, too, such men are needed—men of large hearts, and abilities strengthened and refined by academical training, with the power of mastering a native language,*

* Of five catechists, sent out to me some years ago from England for native work, with the view of their being, perhaps, ultimately ordained, one only shewed

and, when they have mastered it, of sitting down to *talk out religious questions* with the native, entering within his heart, as it were, penetrating into its secret chambers of thought, and drawing out into the light of day the fears and hopes which are common to man,—the religious ideas which lie undeveloped in the consciousness of the veriest savage, ready to be quickened into life by Christian teaching,—the eternal laws, which are written by the finger of God on his heart as well as on ours. This work, I need hardly say, is something very different from the tame repetition, with babbling defective utterance, of the cumbrous, and often unintelligible and absurd, circumlocutions, which stand so commonly as representatives, in a barbarous tongue, of the grand expressive language of our formularies.

But this work requires men of a different stamp from the great majority, who are generally willing to give themselves to it. Admission to the ministry in the Church of England invests many a man on a Missionary Station with the social rank of a gentleman, who in England would have been but a second-rate schoolmaster in a National School, and who is utterly incapable of appreciating the grandeur, as well as the difficulties, of the work which lies before him. To such a teacher let the native bring his doubts, and he will be crushed with a severe reproof, and warned of the guilt of unbelief. And so the old evil will be repeated, and the futile attempt will be made to propagate, as the essentials of religion, dogmas, from which the native's own quickened intelligence, as he makes increased acquaintance with facts in our schools, will of its own accord revolt, and which he will hear also disavowed by many—not of loose-living and irreligious, but—of the most thoughtful and intelligent, white-men around him.

I believe that the Missions of the Church of England require much improvement in this respect, and demand the services of some of our best University men, and would any capacity whatever for learning the Zulu language. It was impossible to turn the others to account for our purposes, to my extreme disappointment, as at the time they were very greatly needed.

abundantly reward their labours. For myself, however, instead of employing a number of inefficient and illiterate clergy for this work, I would rather devote myself to raising up an intelligent body of native teachers, who, if precluded from being ordained as clergy—(for they might never be able to sign their adherence to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Athanasian Creed, which latter cannot at present even be expressed in their language)—would yet, I trust, do good work as catechists and schoolmasters, in spreading throughout their tribes the light of civilization and Christianity.

So far, then, as ‘practical work’ is concerned, I can assure my readers that the Metropolitan’s fears are unfounded. My mind is not ‘turned away’ from it. I never felt a more hearty desire to engage in such work than I do now. And I believe, as I have said, that no part of all my life has been better spent for the advancement of this ‘practical work’ of religious teaching, and more especially of Missionary teaching among the heathen, than that which I have devoted to the composition of my books upon the ‘Epistle to the Romans’ and the ‘Pentateuch.’ If, then, there has been any seeming intermission in my personal labour—as, of course, there has been during my two years’ stay in England—I have but recoiled for a moment, to spring to it again with more vigour than ever, and in the spirit of my books to carry forward the work of God among my people.

My labours in the Zulu tongue are now, to a great extent, completed—at least, those more pressing labours, which have kept me, as I am painfully conscious, during the past seven years, so closely engaged in work for the *natives*, as to seem—but only to seem—to have felt less acutely the wants of the European portion of the colony. The Bishop of CAPETOWN knows nothing, I imagine, of such distraction. But I shall be free now to expend more of my time, as I fully hope to do, in ministering to the wants of this part also of my flock, telling them the glad tidings of their Father’s Love, revealed to us in the Gospel of CHRIST, and teaching them that ‘having these promises,’

as 'sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty,' they should—
'cleanse themselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness
in the fear of God.'

Another view of the charge of dishonesty.

I have now concluded my review of the Bishop of CAPE-TOWN'S proceedings and Charge. There is nothing in his subsequent Visitation of the diocese which requires further notice at present. But I think it right to say one thing more. The Bishop has accused me repeatedly, in the plainest terms, of *dishonesty* in the course which I am pursuing. He has spoken of me, p.32, as one who is—

teaching directly contrary to what she [the Church of England] holds on fundamental points, and directly opposite to what he undertook to teach, when she gave him his commission, and for the teaching of which her faithful children have provided for him a maintenance.

And he says further, *Trial*, p.399:—

It appears to me to be of far higher obligation to maintain good faith in the keeping of engagements voluntarily undertaken with most solemn vows, than to remain in a post, the duties of which one can no longer fulfil, in the hope of bringing about a change.

I, in my turn, will now set before the reader two pictures, and will leave it for him to say which presents the portraiture of the more honest and consistent clergyman of the Church of England.

The Bishop of NATAL held, when in England, a College living, the reward of his exertions in earlier days, and which no Bishop could have taken from him for anything that he has written. He resigned this preferment, and accepted from the Crown the appointment to the See of Natal, knowing that he would be a Bishop of the Church of England, and, as such, would still be under the protection of her laws, whatever those laws might be. For the sake, however, of what he believed to be the truth, he was prepared to resign his See, if he had found that the laws of the Church of England forbade the publication of his views on the Pentateuch.

He now challenges his adversaries to point out a single

passage in his works, which is condemned by the existing laws of the Church, or else, if they are in doubt on any points, to bring them at once to an issue before the only lawful authority. He is ready also even now to resign his See, whenever he shall be satisfied that he cannot hold it conscientiously, or that it would be better for his fellow-men, and for the Truth itself, that he should resign it,—which he does not feel to be the case at present.

The Bishop of CAPETOWN has subscribed the 36th Canon, viz.—

The Queen's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other Her Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal ;

he has declared his 'unfeigned assent' to the 37th Article, viz.—

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, doth appertain ;

he has 'solemnly sworn before God' to 'correct and punish'—according to such authority as to him should be committed by the Ordinance of this Realm ;

and he has received his appointment as Bishop and Metropolitan, on the express conditions implied in the above acts. He was bound, therefore, to exercise any jurisdiction which he might claim as Metropolitan, in agreement with the above conditions.

But the Bishop of CAPETOWN, while still holding Her Majesty's Letters Patent, deliberately sets aside the existing Law of the Church of England, disregards the Queen's authority, and repudiates the judgments of the Privy Council, past and prospective. And he positively asserts, in the teeth of the late decision, that the Church of England holds all her officers bound to teach two dogmas, which, it has been declared on the highest authority, she does *not* hold them bound to teach, viz. that 'the whole Bible is the Unerring Word of the Living God,' *Trial*, p.382, and that 'the punishment of the wicked in hell is endless,' *Trial*, p.370.

Let Englishmen, lovers of fair play, judge between us. I do not accuse the Bishop of CAPETOWN of *downright dishonesty* in

the course which he is pursuing, though it is obvious that the very same language, which he has applied to me, may be retorted, and with, at least, equal force applied to himself: *e.g.* p.31—

What we have to consider is, whether one, who undertook an office of great trust and dignity [at the hands of the Crown, as Bishop and Metropolitan of the Church of England], and received the emoluments [and honours] thereof, upon a distinct understanding that he would [acknowledge the Royal supremacy in the Church of England, and act according to the laws and constitution of that Church, which the Queen of this Protestant nation, who appointed him], deemed to be of the very deepest importance [for the repression of ecclesiastical domination, and the promotion of true religion among her people], is to be allowed, now that he has changed his mind, and holds and teaches [independence of state-control,—a principle] the very opposite to that which he undertook to teach, and at first did teach—to retain his position in the Church [of England], and to enjoy the emoluments of his abused office and violated trust :

or again, p.32—

She [Her Majesty the Queen] has no wish unduly to interfere with [Dr. GRAY'S] liberty of thought or teaching ; but she says, that, if he teaches directly contrary to what she [in her constitutional office, as head of the Church of England,] holds on fundamental points, [enforcing, as doctrines of the Church of England, dogmas, as to the Bible and endless punishment, which she has authoritatively forbidden to be enforced within the Church of England,] and directly opposite to what he undertook to teach, [in respect of the Royal Supremacy], when she gave him his [appointment], he shall not do so in [her] name, or as a Bishop of the Church [of England]. He must do it outside the Church [of England] :

or again, as above :—

*It appears to me to be of far higher obligation to maintain good faith in the keeping of engagements voluntarily undertaken with most solemn vows, than to remain in a post, the duties of which one can no longer fulfil, in the hope of bringing about a change.**

* In like manner, it would be easy for anyone so disposed to retort upon the Bishop some of his other expressions. Thus he calls me a 'fanatic': but no fanaticism can exceed that with which, shutting his eyes to the realities around him, and to the circumstances of the age in which he lives, he appears to surrender his whole being to the worship of his own ideal of a Catholic Church, which, in defiance of the known facts of history, he assumes to have continued one and undivided 'during the first thousand years of her history,' and of which he seems to consider himself, by virtue of his 'Apostolic Succession,' the infallible representative and exponent in all South Africa. So, when he exclaims in his *Sermon at Maritzburg*, p.10, 'Conscience, Reason, Intellect—These be thy Gods,

As I have said, I would not ascribe such dishonesty to the Bishop of CAPETOWN, though he has not hesitated to ascribe it to me. I assume that, from his own point of view, his course of conduct appears correct and justifiable, however others may view it, who, perhaps, might say that, if he is not satisfied with the laws and constitution of the United Church of England and Ireland, and feels that he cannot conscientiously, in the exercise of his Episcopal or (supposed) Metropolitan jurisdiction, allow—as the laws of the Church of England do allow—a clergyman to say that ‘the Bible is not in itself God’s Word, though it contains it,’ or that ‘the punishment of the wicked may not be endless,’ his only proper course is to resign his office as one of that Church’s ‘representatives in her high places’—that he might still exercise jurisdiction as the Head of a dissenting community, but not as a Bishop of the Church of England.

But the Bishop, with the exercise of charity and courtesy, might have admitted the possibility that my course of conduct also, from my own point of view, appears to me at least as correct as his own—if not more correct—since that, which I and those who think with me have done, we have done in the very spirit of the Protestant Reformation, which proclaimed the principle of ‘free inquiry,’ and the right and duty of ‘private judgment.’ We have taken merely a step further in the very same direction. As the Bishop of LONDON said in his Charge (see my Part II, p. xxvi)—

As to free inquiry, what shall we do with it? Shall we frown upon it, denounce it, try to stifle it? This will do no good, even if it be right. But after all, we are Protestants. We have been accustomed to speak a good deal of the right and duty of private judgment. *It was by the exercise of this right, and the discharge of this duty, that our fathers freed their and our souls from Rome’s time-honoured falsehoods.*

But the course followed by the Bishop of CAPETOWN would lead us back to Rome: it is directly *opposed* to the spirit of the Reformation. Bishop GRAY speaks, indeed, *Charge*, p. 35, ‘O Israel!’ it is obvious to substitute ‘Tradition, Authority, Sacerdotalism!’ If some are in danger of unduly exalting one set of powers, others are, at least, in as much danger of making idols of the others.

of 'the *modern* Roman corruptions of, and additions to, the faith,' which, he says, the true Churchman 'rejects'; and even these he describes in very mild terms, as 'grave errors and mistakes on matters rather of *opinion* than of *faith*,' against which the Church 'protested,' in her Articles, 'at the period of the Reformation.' This is certainly strange language from a Protestant Bishop, the 19th Article of whose Church declares that—

as the Churches of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* have erred, so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in *matters of faith*.

In fact, the principle put forth by Bishop GRAY is the very same with that which was advanced in the celebrated Tract, No. 90, the author of which subsequently acknowledged his position in the Church of England to be untenable, by seceding to the Church of Rome.

'*Modern* corruptions of the Church of Rome!' We know, at all events, that the worship of the Virgin Mary, Saints, and Images, was in full operation in the Church of Rome at the beginning of the eighth century.* So much for the purity of the Catholic Church 'during the first thousand years of its history!' Nay, before the end of that same century, the portent of the Papacy itself loomed already, as a dark cloud, on the horizon,—and the minds of men were rapidly becoming familiar with the idea of an 'Universal Bishop,' by whose irresponsible decisions the whole Church was to be bound. And the fact is, that, of these papal pretensions, the claims, put forth by the Bishop of CAPETOWN, are, though on a small scale, the counterpart; and, if we are driven to compare them, the latter are as exorbitant as the former, and more preposterous, as resting

* See MILNER's *Church History*, iii. p.159, where he quotes from a letter of Pope Gregory III., as follows: 'We do not look upon them [images] as gods: but, if it be the image of Jesus, we say, "Lord, help us!" if it be the image of His Mother we say, "Pray to your Son to save us!" if it be of a Martyr, we say, "St. Stephen, pray for us!"'

on a less tangible basis, while they arrogate to the Metropolitan more than even papal irresponsibility. He claims, for instance, for himself, and for all Metropolitans and quasi-Metropolitans, absolute freedom from all control. He might be guilty with impunity of simony, felony, or treason; he might go over openly to the Church of Rome; or, to use his own words, p.22,—
 Were a [Metropolitan] to become an Atheist, or were he to believe in Mahomet, or to teach all Roman doctrine, it would by such a [principle] be affirmed that there is no redress, no power of removal.

Happily, the constitution of the Church of England, by recognizing the Royal Supremacy, forbids such a claim as this to be made within her pale.

Were there no other reason for my maintaining firmly my ground against his proceedings, I should feel bound as a Bishop of the English Church to do so, in order to vindicate the Church of England from any complicity with those essentially Roman principles, which are—perhaps unconsciously—maintained by some, and by none more persistently than by the Bishop of CAPE-TOWN, but which I believe to be antagonistic to the first principles of our reformed Protestant Church, as by law established.

And so, when he continually repeats that—
 ‘the faithful children of the Church of England have provided for him, as Bishop of NATAL, a maintenance,’ p.32,—

and speaks of the congregations of Natal being—

‘driven from the churches which they have built, in faith that the teaching of the Church, and of the Word of God, would be ever proclaimed within their walls, and compelled to seek refuge in other religious bodies, where discipline will at least secure to them the essentials of the faith,’ p.33,—

when he says, *Trial*, p.399, that—

the founders of the See filled by the Bishop were still living, and provided an endowment only ten years before, expressly for the purpose of teaching and maintaining those truths, which they still hold, but which he has abandoned,—

and talks [see above, p.12] of my being ‘sent back’—

with the right to take possession of the property of the Church given for far different purposes,—

I reply that, if any, in England or in South Africa, have contributed to the foundation of the See of Natal, and to the erection of the churches within the diocese, in the idea that that See would be abused by me, while holding Her Majesty's Letters Patent, to cooperate with the Bishop of CAPETOWN for the establishment of a 'Church of South Africa,' which should set at nought the decisions of the Court of Arches and the Privy Council, and disown the Royal Supremacy—or that those churches would not be opened as widely, for the utterance of free thought and the results of free inquiry, as is allowed to be lawful in the Church of England,—they deserve to be disappointed: I never have been, and never will be, a party to such a scheme,—to such 'wicked errors,' [see 2nd Canon]—to such (as it would seem to me) a treacherous abuse of my office.

But, as regards the churches in my diocese, I would remind the Metropolitan that there are some, at least, of the laity who have helped to build them, who do not agree with his views. Further, I would observe that they are almost without exception built on land granted as a free gift by the Crown itself, and that these sites, as well as the far more valuable tracts of land, which have been given by the Government for missionary purposes, and which are now beginning to become productive, were granted to me, as Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, in trust for the uses of *that* Church, and not for the 'Church of South Africa,' which disregards the decisions of the Supreme Court of Appeal (*App. 6*) in the Church of England, and disavows the Queen's Supremacy. For such a Church as this these grants were certainly never intended: *this* 'property,' at all events, 'was given for far different purposes.' And I should hold it to be an act of dishonesty on my part, if I allowed it to be diverted from the purpose for which it was originally bestowed, so long as Her Majesty retains Her hold upon the district of Natal as a British possession, and so long as I am entrusted with authority to act in Her name as Bishop of NATAL.

APPENDIX.



I. EXTRACTS FROM THE BISHOP OF NATAL'S BOOKS: p.29.

(i) *On the Fear of Death*, from the *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, p.144-7.

Death in itself is no sign of a curse. Death was in the world, for the countless races of animals and animalcules, ages before man's sin. There was no sign of curse in their death. Nor would the death of man be attended with any notion of a curse attached to it, but for the consciousness of sin. The less we know or think of sin, the less we dread death; the more we know and think of sin, the more we dread it, unless we have the Light of God's Love in the Gospel to cheer us. As human beings, bound by ties of tender affection to one another, there is, of course, connected with death, the grief of separation from those whom we love. There is also, generally, the anticipation, and the actual sense, of pain and physical distress. But the sense of grief and pain is not the sense of a curse. And feelings of this kind are often overpowered by nobler feelings, quickened within the hearts of men—even heathen men—by the grace of God, though untaught, by more intimate acquaintance with the truth, as we Christians know it, to understand more fully the baneful nature of sin, and to bless God for its antidote revealed in the Gospel. How many thousands die on every battle-field, or in the active discharge of life's duties in every land, without any dread of death, as necessarily coupled with a curse! What notion of a curse embittered the glorious hours of those who fell, fighting for their homes and their fatherland, at Thermopylæ or Marathon?

So then, the idea of death is not necessarily connected in the minds of men with that of a curse. But then comes the Law, and brings home to our consciences the bitter sense of sin, of evil that has been committed, against the light which we had, against our better knowledge and better resolves, before the Face of a most Pure and Holy Being. And the Devil—the Slanderer—the Accuser of God and the Brethren—makes use of this to fill our hearts with guilty fears, which keep us away from our Father's footstool. He teaches us thus to connect the idea of a curse with

death. And many go trembling along the path of life, with the gloomy grave at the end of it, afraid to look the ghastly terror in the face. And so they turn their eyes ever, as it were, to the ground as they go, and busy themselves closely with the petty things of this life, its business and pleasures, that they may for the present forget their fears, instead of making light of death, as they might, as they ought, and manfully pressing on to do the work of their Lord.

For how utterly unchristian, how utterly contrary to the whole spirit and letter of the Gospel, is this notion of death, as something to be dreaded, not merely for the pain, or present sense of separation from the objects of our love, which it brings with it, but for itself, for some idea of a curse attending it, as the carrying out of a fearful doom, a judgment from God, which Adam's sin has brought on his race! Separations take place continually in families, lifelong separations, for various reasons, in the common path of duty, with grief of heart, no doubt, and the dropping of natural tears of pure affection, sometimes with bitter pain and anguish, but yet without sense of awe or horror. Extreme pain is undergone under various circumstances, in the hospital-ward, on the battle-field, far exceeding in intensity that which we see to be generally connected with death. Often such pain is borne courageously and cheerfully, sometimes with fear and shrinking; but there is no sense of horror, no notion of a curse, mixed up with this fear. Now, if we read the New Testament rightly, we shall learn to look at the separation which death brings with it, and the pain which may attend it, in something of this temper. We shall learn to look upon death as a Christian should do, as St. Paul did, who takes but little account of it, and makes very small provision in his letters for the comfort of bereaved friends, and none at all for the dying Christian himself, except to tell him that he has fought the good fight, and finished his course, and may now hope to enter into rest. Indeed, we make far too much of death in these days. We crown him King of Terrors, when our gracious God and Father has bereft him of all his power to harm us, and deprived him of his sting, and made him a messenger of grace to us.

Will it be said that after death still comes the judgment? Why, yes, and before death too. And this is the point, which we ought to bear in mind, not to prepare for *death*, but to prepare for *our Lord's appearing*, for His coming to judge us, as He may do at any moment, as He actually does, from day to day, from hour to hour, in the ordinary work of common life, as well as on special great occasions. The reason why we are so prone to connect this judgment only with death is this, that we cannot conceive of its actually taking place in this blessed world, where on every side we find a Father's Love. And yet it is really taking place from day to day even here. A Father's Hand is blessing continually, or chastening, His children. But we feel as if we shall *then* stand before Him all alone, stripped of the countless gifts of His Goodness, which here relieve our fears,

and are meant to do so under the Gospel of His Grace, but which are too often perverted into reasons for sinning yet more, and turned into lasciviousness. In truth, however, the 'judgment after death' is but the carrying on of that which is going on in life,—the manifestation of that which is now taking place, it may be in silence and secrecy,—the revelation of that Lord, who is even now, daily and hourly, taking account with His servants. Those, who never bethink themselves now of their Master's Presence, will, indeed, then seem to see Him, perhaps, for the first time, who has been with them, speaking in their consciences, observing and overruling their doings, all along. And those, who have been consciously 'keeping back the truth in unrighteousness,' all their lives long, and have died, hardened in impenitence, may have reason to dread death, because it will bring them face to face with Him, whose Voice they have heard in their hearts, whose Light shone upon their minds, whose Love they felt on every side, and yet they chose 'the darkness rather than the light, because their deeds were evil.' But even to such as these death itself has no curse attached to it. It is but the gate, through which their Lord and Master calls them to Him, that He may pass the righteous sentence of His Love upon them—that is, that He, who knows exactly what they are, in consequence of what they have done, may appoint for them that lot, that degree of purifying chastisement, which they need. And this, indeed, may be something fearful and terrific, as the needful rod is to children.

But Christians should learn to make light of death, as St. Paul did. Indeed, he tells us, 'we shall not all die.' And, as we do not couple the 'change,' which St. Paul says, will pass on the bodies of some, by which 'this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality,' with any notion of a curse attached to it, so neither ought we to connect any such notion with death, as it will come to others. To 'die,' or to 'be changed,' it is all one, it should be all one, to the Christian. How courageously and cheerfully may we go to the duties of life, whatever dangers they may entail upon us, with this thought to sustain us, instead of shrinking and weakly wailing with fear at the idea of death! To the frail flesh, indeed, the form of death may often be terrible: but the thing itself ought not to be, even to the spirit. There are some, who will say 'good-night' to one another, and retire to rest, perhaps at early eve, perhaps at midnight, and who, on waking on the glorious morn, will put on their new apparel. There are others who will not go to rest at all, but, having watched all night, will rise up at once at the break of 'that day,' and be clothed upon, and mortality will be swallowed up at once in life.

(ii) *On the Reading of the Scriptures, from the Pentateuch Critically Examined*, Part III, p.628–32.

We must, then, even in reading the Scriptures, 'try the spirits, whether they are of God.' In this way only can we do the Will of God, and discharge

the true duty, and rise to the true dignity, of man as the child of God. We might wish, perhaps,—many do wish,—to have it otherwise, to be able to fall back upon the notion of an Infallible Book or an Infallible Church. But God has not willed it so. He will not give us,—at least He has not given us,—a Revelation of such a kind, as to relieve us from the solemn duty of judging, each for himself, what is right and true in His Sight. His Spirit has quickened us, that we may do, as living men, His work in the world: He will not suffer us to abdicate the glorious office to which He calls us. We *must*—not only claim and exercise the *right*, but—bear the *responsibility*, of private judgment, upon the things of the life to come, as well as of this world.

The Deuteronomist himself will teach us this lesson. He tells us, indeed, that God in all ages will raise up Prophets like unto ourselves, xviii.18, will kindle His Fire within the heart, and put His words into the mouth, of men, who, in all the weakness of humanity, shall speak to their fellow-men all that they feel commanded to teach in His Name,—who shall utter His Eternal Truth, and minister to their brethren the lessons of ‘doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness.’ And their brethren shall ‘hear’ them; they dare not neglect the Truth, of whatever kind, which God’s own grace imparts and brings home to them from the lips of a fellow-man, however high or humble.

But they must not listen to him with a blind unreasoning acquiescence, though He speak to them in the Name of Jehovah, and though the ‘sign or wonder’ come to pass, xiii.2, which he brought to them as the very credentials of his mission. They must ‘try the spirit’ of the Prophet’s words by that law which they have within them, written upon their hearts. Jehovah, their God, is proving them, to know whether they truly and entirely love Him, and love His Truth, ‘with all their heart and with all their soul.’ If the words, which that Prophet speaks to them, come home to their consciences as right and true words, then in God’s Name let them acknowledge and welcome them, and send them on with a blessing of ‘God speed!’ to others. If the Voice, which speaks within, declares that the utterance from without is false, then ‘shalt thou not hearken,’ xiii.3; the word is not God’s; and he, who hears, must *not* obey it.

In this spirit we must read the book of Deuteronomy itself, and we shall find the Living Bread which our souls may feed on,—we shall find in it the Word of God. And that Word will *not* be at variance with the eternal and essential substance of Christianity, with those words which ‘shall not pass away.’ Then we shall live no more in constant fear, that some rude stroke of criticism may shake, perhaps, the ‘very foundations of our faith,’ or that the announcement of some simple fact of science or natural history may threaten to ‘take from us our nearest and dearest consolations.’ We shall learn thus to have ‘faith in God,’ as our Lord has bidden us, Mark xi.22, and not in the written records, through which He has been pleased, by

inspiring the hearts of our brother men with life, to quicken and comfort our own. When we hear such words as these—

‘Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God doth man live,’ D.viii.3—

‘Thou shalt also consider in thine heart that, as a man chasteneth his son, so the Living God, thy God, doth chasten thee,’ D.viii.5—

‘If from thence’—from the very depth of sin-wrought misery—‘thou shalt seek the Living God, thy God, thou shalt find Him, if thou seek Him with all thy heart and with all thy soul,’ D.iv.29—

we shall joyfully welcome them as messages of truth, not merely because we find them in the Bible, but because they are true—eternally true.

It is true that God loves us as dear children, and that we may go to Him at all times, as to a wise and tender father, with a child-like trust and love, as with a child-like reverence and fear. Rather, we *must* go to Him thus if we would please Him, and act upon the words of our Lord, who has taught us all to say, ‘Our Father.’ We must ‘consider in our hearts’ that He, who has planted in our breasts, as parents, dear love to our children, a love stronger than death, does by that very love of ours shadow forth to us His own Eternal Love. *Our* love can take in every child of the family: *our* hearts can find a place for all; yes, and our love embraces the far-off prodigal, in his miserable wanderings, no less surely and no less tenderly, than the dear obedient child, that sits by our side, rejoicing in the sweet delights of home. He that has taught us to love our children in this way, how shall He not also love His children, with a Love in which the separate loves of earthly parents are blended, and find their full, infinite, expression,—the Father’s loving wisdom and firmness, to guide and counsel, and, if need be, to correct and chasten,—the Mother’s tender pity and compassion, that will draw near with sweet consolations, in each hour of sorrow and suffering, will sympathise with every grief and trial, will bow down to hear each shame-stricken confession, will be ready to receive the first broken words of penitence, and whisper the promise of forgiveness and peace.

Ah! truly, the little child may cling to its mother’s neck, and the mother’s love will feel the gentle pressure, and will delight to feel it: but it is not the feeble clinging of the little one that holds it up; it is the strong arm of love that embraces it. And we, in our most earnest prayers and aspirations, in our cleaving unto God, in our longing and striving after Truth, as in these poor enquiries, are but as babes, ‘stretching out weak hands of faith’ to lay hold of Him, Whom no man hath seen or can see, but Who, unseen, is ever near us, whose tender Love embraces all His children, those that are far off as well as those that are near, the heathen and the Christian, the sinner and the Saint.

Happy, indeed, are we, who are blessed to know this—to know the high calling and the glorious privileges of the children of God—not that we may be more *safe* than others, who as yet know it not, but that we may be filled

with hope and strength and courage in the assurance of this Truth,—that we may be more living and earnest and joyful in our work,—more brave to speak the Truth, to do the Right, to wage eternal war with all that is false and base and evil, within us and without,—more patient in suffering,—more firm and true in temptation and trial,—more sorrowful and ashamed when we have fallen,—more quick to rise, and go on again, in the path of duty, with tears and thanksgivings,—more eager to tell out the Love of God to others, whether to those who as yet are groping, ‘if haply they may feel after Him and find Him,’ Who ‘is not far from any one of them,’ ‘in Whom they live and move and have their being,’ or to those who *have* known Him, but know no longer now the joy of His children, ‘sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, fast bound in misery and iron.’

But, in all this, it is not our knowledge, however clear, or our faith, however firm and orthodox, or our charity, however bright or pure, that holds us up daily, and binds us to the Bosom of our God. ‘Our Father’ will delight in all the sacred confidences of His children,—their clingings of faith and hope,—their longings of pure desire for a closer sense of His Presence,—their holy aspirations and penitential confessions. But it is not our prayer that will hold us up. It is His Love alone which does this.

‘THE ETERNAL GOD IS OUR REFUGE,

AND UNDERNEATH ARE THE EVERLASTING ARMS.’ D.xxxiii.27.

2. OPINIONS OF VARIOUS WRITERS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND RESPECTING THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH: p.30.

It is interesting to observe that many, who have recently gone into the questions of criticism connected with the Pentateuch—not merely those treated of in Part I of my work, but such as are discussed in Part II, and especially in Parts III and IV,—though starting from the traditionary point of view, have arrived at conclusions more or less departing from it. This alone must be sufficient to show to any thoughtful mind that *that* view, at least—which ascribes the whole Pentateuch to Moses, except, perhaps, a few sentences, interpolated here and there by another hand—is, at all events, uncertain and disputable.

(i) Thus Bishop BROWNE, who has engaged to write upon the Pentateuch in the Speaker’s Commentary, has said in his reply to the clergy of Cambridge, in reference to my criticisms,—

‘The study of all the objections lately raised may, probably, oblige us to take a wider view of some points than we had at first expected.’

(ii) The Rev. W. H. HOARE has said (see my Part III, p.xiii)—

‘The general idea of dividing the documents in the manner that has been indicated [*i.e.* into Elohist and Jehovistic portions], has, I believe, been shown to be based on more than merely critical conjecture. Aaron or Eleazar may

fairly contest with Samuel the honours of the Elohist, and Moses, with "the promising young men of Samuel's time," the honours of the Jehovist.'

(iii) The Rev. W. HOUGHTON has said (see my Part III, p. xl)—

'I have diligently, conscientiously, and prayerfully studied the whole question at issue for the last six months, and am compelled to admit the *general truth* of your arguments, though differing in some particulars. You are aware that I published a pamphlet in reply to your Part I. I have withdrawn that reply from circulation.'

(iv) The Rev. J. J. S. PEROWNE has said (see my Part IV, p. xxxix)—

'So far, then, judging this work [the Pentateuch] simply by what we find in it, there is abundant evidence to show that, though the main bulk of it is Mosaic, *certain detached portions of it are of later growth.*'

(v) The 'LAYMAN,' whose book is *dedicated by permission* to the Archbishop of YORK, says (see my 'Letter to the Laity,' p. 39-41)—

'It must be confessed that the results we have arrived at *do differ very materially from the views commonly held.* . . . These are facts *very strongly at variance with the notions generally entertained.* Facts they are, however,—not mere theoretic fancies or unfounded assumptions.

'Much of it [the Pentateuch] is certainly un-Mosaic, some earlier, some contemporary, some later than Moses. Many portions of the Pentateuch *could not* have proceeded from his pen, or even have been written under his direction.'

It is true, the Archbishop of YORK has now stated, in his correspondence with the Rev. JAMES BRIERLEY, published in the *Times* of July 26, that he 'does not concur in the conclusions of the 'LAYMAN': nor do I. I believe that they are only the first conclusions of an honest and truth-seeking enquirer, which he will, perhaps, hereafter feel obliged to modify, as he becomes better acquainted with the subject, and, in so doing, he may find himself compelled to depart still further from the traditionary view, and approximate more closely to my own on some points. But, however this may be, these and other important statements are still allowed by his Grace to circulate under the authority of his name; and though they had been specially brought under his notice on May 18, by one of the clergy of his diocese, yet *two months afterwards*, on July 15, he had not 'found time' even to look into the book, of which (we must believe) a presentation copy lay upon his table.

The only inference, as it seems to me, that can fairly be drawn from this fact is, that the Archbishop is aware that these statements, though he does not wholly concur in them, are yet, more or less, and substantially, true,—that his Grace knows that an honest examination into the question *will* lead to results such as these, differing only in detail from my own,—that, at all events, he did not consider these statements, which were so severely judged when made by me, to be of so deadly a nature, when circulat-

ing in a book 'dedicated by permission' to himself. I may now, surely, predict with some confidence, that at no very distant day the main results of these criticisms on the Pentateuch, which have been scorned and stigmatised by many of my clerical brethren, both here and in South Africa, will be generally acknowledged as truths in the Church of England, and form part of the basis of all sound theological training.

Since the above was written, the 'LAYMAN' himself has addressed a letter to Mr. BRIERLEY, which appears in the *Guardian* of August 3, as follows:—

'July 26.

'REV. SIR,—My attention having been drawn to the letters which have passed between yourself and the Archbishop of YORK, (touching a work of mine on the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch), published in this day's *Times*, I desire to inform you that his Grace is in no sense responsible for any of the views there set forth, still less for the way in which they are expressed. For all this I alone am answerable. I have never regarded his Grace's acceptance of the dedication as in any way implying his sanction or approval of its contents, but merely as an expression of his kindly feeling towards myself. And I must confess that I am surprised that you should have put any other construction upon it. I may add that the Archbishop expressly declined to inspect any portion of this work before publication, doubtless from the desire to leave both himself and me entirely unfettered.

'With regard to the *matter* of your observations, I would recommend a more attentive study of the views I have set forth, in the *form* and *connection* in which I have stated them, before you hastily conclude them to be identical in tendency with those advanced by the Bishop of NATAL. The main point at issue in this controversy (as I apprehend it) is not whether every verse of the Pentateuch was actually written by Moses himself—a point of very little moment—but whether the Pentateuch is to be regarded as a true history, composed in or about the times of which it treats, or as a collection of utterly untrustworthy legends, wrought up into their present shape by writers many centuries removed from the events narrated. On this fundamental point the views advanced by the Bishop of NATAL and myself are as diametrically opposite as can well be conceived. Of this it will be easy for you to convince yourself, if, instead of trusting to a few extracts culled by the Bishop to suit a particular purpose, you should think it worth while attentively to peruse the books themselves. I remain, Rev. Sir, yours respectfully,

'A LAYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

'Author of *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch Considered.*'

With reference to the above, Mr. BRIERLEY has favoured me with the following communication:—

'Mossley Hall, Congleton, Aug. 25, 1864.

'MY LORD,—In the *Guardian* of Aug. 3, there appeared a letter addressed to myself from the "Layman," author of "The Pentateuch Considered."

'On Aug. 8 I sent the enclosed "Reply" to that letter to the Editor of

the *Guardian*. As this has not been published in that journal, either on the 10th or 17th or 24th, I can only conclude that it has been designedly, and, I must say, most unfairly, suppressed.

‘I now beg leave to forward it to you, requesting you to make any use of it you may think proper. I have the honour to be, my Lord, your humble and obedient servant,

‘JAMES BRIERLEY.’

‘Mossley Hall, Congleton, August 8, 1864.

‘SIR,—In reply to your letter addressed to me, and published in last week’s *Guardian*, I beg leave to make the following observations:—

‘(1) The question is not in what light *you* may have regarded the Archbishop’s acceptance of your dedication, but in what light the Church at large, and readers generally, will regard it.

‘(2) I put no “construction” upon his Grace’s acceptance of it, until I had drawn his attention to the extracts in question, had asked whether he approved of them, and had waited six weeks in vain for a reply, when I very naturally assumed that his Grace *did* approve of them.

‘(3) It now appears that it was not through some accident, or from want of time, that the Archbishop did not look at your book, before he allowed it to circulate under the authority of his name; but that he *deliberately “declined”* to look at it beforehand, “doubtless,” as you say, “from the desire to leave both himself as well as you unfettered.”

‘This course of proceeding *will seem strange*, I think, to many of the Clergy and Laity, with reference to such a book as this, at such a crisis in the history of the Church.

‘(4) I said nothing of the “tendency” of your views. I stated only that, assuming your statements to be in any degree well-founded, they are “extraordinary”; that “they make it impossible to deny the right of the Bishop of NATAL to maintain his theory of the composition of the Pentateuch, which only differs in point of detail from yours”; that we “must now make up our minds to admit the composite character of the Pentateuch, and the non-Mosaic origin of considerable portions of it.”

‘(5) The question at issue is *not* certainly whether *every verse* of the Pentateuch was actually written by Moses himself, but whether *large portions of it*—(you say, more than one-fifth at least)—were written “after the conquest of Canaan,” while, you add, “a variety of explanatory notes, additions, and occasional alterations, with a few passages of greater length, chiefly from other ancient narratives, were introduced by a writer of much later date, very probably, in the days of Saul,”—that is, I suppose, by a writer some centuries removed from the events narrated.

‘(6) Though I and others may admit that this point, of the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch, is “a point of very little moment,” yet you must be aware that this is a point considered to be of vital consequence

by numbers of the orthodox Clergy and Laity, as by the Rev. Sir H. THOMPSON, who says of your own statements, in the *Churchman* of July 14, that their "intended drift is to unsettle our belief that the *Pentateuch* is the "work of Moses," and that they are "scattering broadcast throughout the "land the seeds of doubt and infidelity."

'(7) As to what the Bishop of NATAL's motives in "culling" extracts from your book may have been, of course I know nothing; but it appears to me that he has done so for no other purpose than to show, as he says himself, in his letter to the Laity, p.38, that an honest enquirer (meaning yourself) has been obliged to admit "that the results which he has arrived at do "differ very materially from the views commonly held," that "these are facts, "very strongly at variance with the notions generally entertained," that "facts "they are, however, not mere theoretic fancies, or unfounded assumptions."

'At all events, the Bishop does not claim you as agreeing in his "views." He says in his letter, p.41, that "the author believes, apparently, in the "literal historical truth of the accounts of the Creation, Paradise, the Fall, "the Deluge, the Rainbow, and the Confusion of Tongues," which the Bishop, in his books, tells us plainly he does not believe in.

'(8) In conclusion, if I could only find time, I would gladly read your work: but you must pardon me for saying that it can scarcely be necessary for me to do so; since, however, your views upon the whole subject may differ from the Bishop of NATAL's, the admissions made by yourself (as proved by the extracts quoted) sufficiently agree with his statements, as to satisfy me that *in the main* the question as to the unity and authenticity of the Pentateuch is pretty much as the Bishop has stated it to be,—in accordance, I believe, with most of the great continental critics.

'I remain, Sir, yours truly,

'JAMES BRIERLEY,

'Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Mossley, near Congleton.

'To "A LAYMAN," &c.'

(vi) The Bishop of OXFORD, also, appears to have made admissions of some importance at the recent Conference of his clergy at Oxford, though it is somewhat difficult to gather the Bishop's exact meaning from the reports which have been given of his words by different hearers, and from his own statement as copied below.

(1) One report (*Standard*, August 10) says as follows:—

'The Bishop of OXFORD, in an elaborate address, enlarged with much force upon the anti-Biblical opinions enunciated by distinguished members of the University during the past few years, and by careful argument urged that the true explanation of the unhappy differences existing was to be found in a misconception of the manner in which inspired truths were transmitted to us. He contended that the apparent anomalies in Holy Writ were

in consequence of indirect revelations,—the persons, to whom many of the revelations were made, *having varied their rendering of them* to such an extent as to give grounds for objections on the part of those, who are disposed to look at the Scriptures with a severely critical eye. In proof of this position, his lordship pointed out that the Ten Commandments, which were inscribed by the finger of God on Mount Sinai, and the miracles He worked, and the parables He gave,—the whole of which acts were performed directly by God Himself,—had never been the subject of adverse criticism from the pen of the greatest infidel, from the proclamation of the Gospel to the present time. That anomalies did exist, no one was prepared to doubt. But the clear and only explanation was given in the fact, that *the messages from Heaven were not verbally transmitted*. And his lordship strongly urged that this construction was one that should be used by all members of the Christian Church, in refuting the attacks to which it was subject at the hands of those who were prepared to doubt, or to induce others to doubt, the inspiration and authenticity of the Divine Word.’

(2) The account in the *Guardian* of August 17, taken from the *Oxford Herald*, and having all the appearance of being a tolerably accurate report of the Bishop’s words, contains the following statements as coming from his mouth in the course of his address :—

‘Reverend Brethren,—It has been set down in the scheme of this afternoon that I should address a few words to you first upon a discussion of the Word of God, of which you are afterwards to hear from Archdeacon LEE and Dr. WORDSWORTH. But I am at a loss to know what to do in saying a few general words to the purpose; because, in doing so, I might be in danger of intrenching upon the deliberations of those, who have prepared papers for this Congress; and I almost thought it would be better to offer no remarks till the conclusion of your proceedings. But I have been told that you think I am under an engagement to offer some preliminary observations; and I therefore do not hesitate to respond to the wishes so expressed. Of course, the great matter before us is the consideration—not of that doctrinal question so admirably set before us in the sermon this morning, for which we cannot be too grateful,—it is not so much to discuss that, as it is to consider the question of the Inspiration of the Word of God, which some of the present members of the Church have raised into great prominence, so that we may be prepared with answers to objections so raised.

‘It is of great importance at the present time that these matters should have been well thought over by the clergy in considering the great and difficult subject of what is understood by the Inspiration of the Word of God. *In limine* it is of great importance to notice this question: for the fact, that all Scripture is written by Inspiration for our instruction, means that Scripture is inspired by the Holy Ghost; and, because that is true, we dispose of the most formidable objections, which stand in the way of any dispute.

'All truth is from God alone. Truth on any subject-matter being from God, shows that it must be inspired so far as it is true. . . . But now what is Inspiration? Because we all know that Holy Scripture has given us no definition of what it is, or what the Church has held it to be, and we are therefore led to decide what it is according to the ordinary latitude of interpretation. *And, first, in approaching that point, and in giving our interpretation of what Inspiration does mean, we can have recourse to no antecedent probabilities as our sure guide—nothing which would show what would be the precise message of God's thought to man, so that the only way is to take the Book as a fact, examining it as to the way in which God has been pleased to give us His inspired word.** And, if we do that, we are met by this view. Taking it as a message from God to man, knowing that it embodies thought, which man without the message could not have conceived, and knowing that he could not from antecedent probabilities have discovered the intentions of God, *we must examine it as we should any other message, and see how He, who has sent it, has been pleased to send it to us. . . .*

'As under the first message that was inscribed in stone, or that was spoken by the Prophet in a state of rhapsody, there would be the simple communication from God to the receiver; but in the other cases, in which the messenger was to deliver the message, there was room for admitting the presence of the human essence, in a way that, while it had the authority of God, *leaves room for the surrounding human element, in which there might be direct error, without touching the slightest truth of Inspiration.*'

(3) 'An Oxfordshire Rector' reports to the *Record* (August 10) as follows:—

'I was present yesterday and to-day at a conference of the clergy under the presidency of the Bishop of the Diocese. The subjects for discussion were "The Word of God and Inspiration." All the speakers recognised the fact, that these for the Christian are the great subjects of the day. The Bishop opened the conference with some general remarks, and *inter alia* propounded his theory of Inspiration. It was, I think, as follows,—"That the writers of the Old and New Testament might be either conscious or unconscious of the meaning, scope, and object of the message which they

* I need hardly say that it is very satisfactory to find the Bishop of OXFORD here using language, which is almost identical with that, by which on p.xix of my Part IV I have sought to justify my Critical Examination of the Pentateuch. I have said: 'We are utterly unable to judge *à priori* what parts of Scripture *must* be recorded with strict verbal accuracy. We can only do—what in these criticisms we are endeavouring to do,—that is, work out,—with all care, with all the ability which God has given us, and with all the help of our best critical apparatus,—*à posteriori*, from the documents actually in our hands,—the real substantial facts which the Bible contains, and take them as God's facts for our guidance.'

delivered ; that, if the first, as would, of course, be true in the case of Jesus, they could make no possible mistake, all which they said would be absolutely true, it would be without reservation the mind of the Spirit of God ; that, if the latter, *they might err, from the want of the power of comprehension incident to humanity.*" The Bishop explained, with his accustomed power and facility of diction, the opinion which he had formed upon the subject, and illustrated his meaning at length by adducing the simile of the servant sent by his master to convey a message to a friend, of the nature of which the two corresponding parties wished the servant to be ignorant : and, in the course of his remarks, the Bishop used the terms, "*the human element in the Bible.*"

'There was, of course, considerable discussion subsequently upon the remarks made by his lordship, and to-day the subject was again referred to. Many of the clergy present felt startled to find that one of those, who were foremost to denounce COLENSO and the Essayists, appeared to endorse the truth of the principle which they advocate. The Bishop attempted to explain his meaning to-day : he re-announced his opinion with this saving proviso, that as yet he had not found, and he believed he never should find, a particle of error in the Word of God. But what of the principle which he enunciated ? Many assert that they have discovered historical, geographical, arithmetical, scientific, moral, and religious error in the Bible. How does his lordship propose to answer them ?'

(4) Among the clergy, who 'felt startled' at the above remarkable admissions, appears to have been the Rev. W. R. FREMANTLE, one of the leaders in procuring the signature of the 11,000 clergy to the Oxford Declaration. He writes to the *Record* (August 17) as follows :—

'What I understood the Bishop to say [on the *second day*] was that *the whole Scripture had been written under the superintendence of the Holy Ghost, so that all and every part of it was absolutely free from error*,—that no error had as yet been found in it, and he believed no error ever would be found in it. He believed the Bible not because it contained the truth, but because it was given to us by inspiration of God. Then, in speaking of the two forms of inspiration referred to by the "*Oxfordshire Rector*," the Bishop said that, as regards the human element, he thought there were some points in which a man's natural reason and memory would suffice without a supernatural revelation, as, for example, St. Paul referring to his cloak being left at Troas (!) In this department of the subject, he could conceive the possibility in the surroundings of the man of the existence of inconsistency, contradiction, and error, if the writers had been left entirely to themselves. But, inasmuch as a revelation to the man was one thing, and inspiration to record truth was another, so the human element had been guided and kept from error by the general superintendence of the Holy Ghost.

'This explanation I accepted with much thankfulness ; for, after the state-

ment made by his lordship on the *first* day, I, in common with others of the clergy present, was in some doubt as to what he really meant.'

(5) So, too, the Rev. F. M. CUNNINGHAM writes to the *Record* (August 19) and states, *inter alia*, as follows:—

'On the *second* day, Mr. FREMANTLE called his Lordship's attention to the fact that the minds of his clergy were disturbed, and requested him to give an explanation of his meaning. He did so, and in such terms as led Mr. FREMANTLE to say that his mind was inexpressibly relieved. In this view of the case I am convinced that most of those who were present fully concurred.' But Mr. CUNNINGHAM also admits that 'in his Lordship's address on the *first* day, there was undoubtedly room for anxiety, and the minds of many were disturbed. I largely shared in their anxiety, though I felt assured that I had misunderstood the Bishop, when I heard him, at the end of the first day's proceedings, endorse with entire cordiality all that had fallen from Archdeacon LEE of Dublin.'

(6) Once more, 'An Oxford Rector' (the Rev. A. M. W. CHRISTOPHER) writes also to the *Record*, of the same date, stating that he had enclosed to the Bishop the *Standard's* report of what he had said, and also that of the 'Oxfordshire Rector,' asking his Lordship, 'if he thought fit to do so, kindly to write briefly his opinion on the subject on which he spoke, that this might be given accurately in his own words': and he also added, 'Your Lordship will not, I am sure, think me wanting in respect, if I say that I was not satisfied by what your Lordship said, as I understood it, on the *first* day of the Conference.'

(7) The Bishop replied as follows:—

'Many thanks for your very kind letter. I had not seen either of the newspaper extracts you send me. But if I had, I should not have answered them. It is a hopeless endeavour to set oneself right by answering anything: and, if you reply to one, you must reply to all. I therefore leave matters to right themselves. It is quite a different matter replying to you; and I do it with the greatest pleasure. *I said nothing of the sort attributed to me in these extracts.* Perhaps the subject was too abstruse to be treated so briefly; and this has led to misapprehension. In brief, my belief is this: The whole Bible comes to us as "The Word of God," under the sanction of God the Holy Ghost. We cannot pick and choose amidst its contents. All is God's Word to us. But, as I believe that this, which I hold as the only orthodox view, is encompassed with many difficulties by what is called the theory of "Verbal Inspiration," I desired to show how, in my judgment, a careful scrutiny of the Bible, which revealed the "divers manners" in which the Holy Ghost spake,—

'(1) Sometimes by the mere mechanical use of the human agent who

conveyed the message, as when (i) God wrote words on the first tables, (ii) dictated them for the second, or (iii) committed them to prophets simply to repeat, or (iv) spake them through the prophets,—

‘(2) Sometimes by possessing the human instrument with a complete knowledge of that he was to speak, and leaving him to express it, under the mere suggestions and guardianship of His own special presence, according to the natural use of the human faculties,—

‘I desired, I say, to show how this would greatly lessen these difficulties, and enable men to realize the essential difference between Holy Scripture and any other books,—namely, that as all truth comes from God, other books may be in a sense said to be inspired because they are true, but Holy Scripture alone can be affirmed to be true because it is inspired.

‘You are quite free to make any use of this you see fit.

‘I am, yours most truly,

‘S. OXON.’

The above, which ‘inexpressibly relieved’ the minds of Mr. FREMANTLE and others of the clergy, represents, we must suppose, what the Bishop said on the *second* day. It is very difficult to understand from the above letter what the Bishop really does hold on the subject of Inspiration. But it is singular that such a master of rhetoric, upon a subject of such grave importance at the present time, and which he himself, no doubt, had fixed beforehand for the consideration of his clergy, expressed himself on the *first* day so imperfectly, as to have been so seriously misunderstood—not only by the *six* above quoted, *viz.* the reporters of the *Standard* and *Herald*, the Oxfordshire and Oxford Rectors, the Rev. Messrs. FREMANTLE and CUNNINGHAM,—but, it would seem, by the whole body of the clergy. As the subject was known beforehand, it was not necessary that there should have been any ‘cloudiness’ in the original statement, however brief. But it is difficult to see how the view now put forth by the Bishop lessens any of the more serious difficulties of the theory of ‘Scriptural infallibility,’ which, it would seem, (if I understand him rightly,) the Bishop still maintains,—*e. g.* that which arises from Moses saying in D.v.22, ‘*These words Jehovah spake unto all your assembly in the Mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, and He added no more; and He wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me*’—compared with E.xx.1, ‘*God spake all these words, &c.*’ which latter ‘words’ differ materially from the former; comp. especially E.xx.11 and D.v.15.

(8) In the *Spectator* of August 27, a letter appears from OXONIENSIS, from which I quote the following extract:—

‘An article of great ability recently appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, which is almost universally attributed, in part if not wholly, to the Bishop of OXFORD. It contains statements about Inspiration, which I believe to be

perfectly wise and just. It is too long to quote, but its gist is that there is a "human" as well as a "Divine" element in Scripture, and that *humanly* the Scripture writers were liable to occasional error. The following are some of the words:—"In the utterance his own peculiarities will all be present, and so his ignorance upon matters lying wholly outside the message, *as to which, therefore, the sender of the message has not enlightened his messenger*. . . . When, for instance, St. PAUL reveals to us the depths of the Divine counsels, we know that we are listening, not to man, but to God. . . . But, when the same apostle writes that the cloak which was left at Troas should be brought after him, does any reasonable man really maintain that, if it could be made certain that the cloak was left—not at Troas, but—at another place, the veracity of Holy Scripture would be thereby impugned?"

I add another extract from the same article in the *Quarterly*, April 1864, p.552:—

'If the intention of the Almighty was through His word to reveal *religious* truth to man, what would be more natural than that He should pour into the minds of His instruments a flood of light upon *those truths, which He intended them to declare*, leaving them still uninformed as to matters, of which they were the bearers of no message to their brethren? . . . On this theory, as to whatever it (the Bible) professes to reveal, we know it must be absolutely true, because in *that* it is the result of the inspiration of God; whilst in *that*, which is the accident and not the object of the message, the messenger is left to his own unaided powers.'

I need hardly say that this is precisely the ground, which I myself have taken in all my writings. The '*religious truth*,' which God '*intends to reveal*,' that, and that alone, is the 'Word of God' in the Bible.

3. EXTRACTS FROM THE FATHERS AND OTHERS, SHEWING THEIR VIEWS AS TO THE LIMITATION OF OUR LORD'S KNOWLEDGE AS THE SON OF MAN: p.35.

For Mr. HOUGHTON'S letter, with the references at full length, see my Part III on the Pentateuch, p.xxxviii–xl. The following are some of the authorities which he quotes on the subject:—

'One must know that most of the Fathers—indeed almost all—appear to say that He (CHRIST) was ignorant of some things; for, if He is said to be in all respects of the same substance with us, and we are ignorant of some things, it is manifest that He also was ignorant, and the Scripture says of Him, that He increased in age and wisdom.'—LEONTIUS.

'To whom can it be a matter of doubt that He has a knowledge of that hour, indeed, as God, but is ignorant of it, as man?'—GREGORY NAZ.

'As on becoming man He hungers and thirsts, and suffers with men, so with men, as Man, He knows not.'—ATHANASIUS.

‘The ignorance, then, does not belong to God the Word, but to the form of the servant, which knew at that time such things as the indwelling Divinity revealed.’—THEODORET.

‘We ought not to accuse the Word of God, and rashly to impute any ignorance to Him. But we should rather admire His love towards man, who did not refuse, out of His love towards us, to bring Himself down to so great an humiliation, as to bear all things that are ours, one of which also is *ignorance*.’—CYRIL of Alexandria.

‘Just as CHRIST took this upon Himself in common with men, to hunger, thirst, and suffer the other things which are spoken about Him, exactly in the same way *there is nothing to offend any one, if He be said, as man, to have been ignorant also in common with men*.’—ID.

‘He is ignorant, then, according to His human nature, who knows all things according to the power of His Divinity.’—CHRYSOSTOM.

Dr. PUSEY, after stating what he considers to be the ‘doctrine of the Church’ on this point says, on *ATHAN. Diss. II. against Arianism* (Library of the Fathers), ch.xxviii :—

‘However, this view of the sacred subject was received by the Church after St. ATHANASIUS’s day; and it cannot be denied that he and others of the most eminent Fathers use language, which *primâ facie* is inconsistent with it. They certainly seem to impute ignorance to our Lord as man, as ATHANASIUS in this passage.’

‘But for the doctrine of those which . . . only affirm that, though as God He knew all, yet as man He was ignorant of some things, just in the same manner as He was passible and subject to all human infirmities which had not sin in them, . . . this sure is so far from heresy that . . . it is the [almost] unanimous assertion of all the Fathers.’—HAMMOND.

‘To say that the Second Person in the Trinity knows not something, is blasphemy; to say so of the Messiah, is not so, who nevertheless was the same with the Second Person in the Trinity.’—LIGHTFOOT.

‘Certainly, when the Apostle teaches that He (JESUS) was like to us in all things, sin excepted, without doubt he comprehends this also, that His soul was subjected to ignorance. . . . In fine, unless any one pleases to deny that CHRIST was made a true man, let us not be ashamed also to confess that He voluntarily took upon Himself all things which cannot be separated from human nature.’—CALVIN.

‘As it may be truly said of the *body* of man that it is *not immortal*, though the soul be, so it may be truly said that the *Son of Man* was *not knowing*, though the Son of God knew everything.’—WATERLAND.

In the face of all these authorities, however, the Bishop rules, *Trial*, p.345 :—

‘I must decide that in imputing to our Blessed Lord [the Bishop does not give my full statement, “as the Son of Man”] ignorance, and the possibility of error, the Bishop has committed himself to a subtle heresy.’

Let the reader notice that I have used identically the same language as

GREGORY NAZ., ATHANASIUS, CYRIL, CHRYSOSTOM, and 'others of the most eminent Fathers,' who, says Dr. PUSEY, 'certainly seem to *impute ignorance to our Lord as man.*'

4. CORRESPONDENCE OF THE BISHOP OF NATAL WITH THE BISHOP OF OXFORD AND THE BISHOP OF CAPETOWN: p.40.

Within a few days after my arrival in England, I received a letter from the Bishop of OXFORD, which, being marked 'secret,' I do not quote—except so far as is rendered absolutely necessary, for my justification under the present circumstances. In this letter, the Bishop said, with reference to some points in my *Commentary on the Romans*:—

'On these points I should greatly like calmly and prayerfully to talk with you, if you will let me. They are too long for writing. But what I mainly wish for now is, to pray you not to take any irretrievable step, until you have, in free discourse with some of us, reviewed the whole matter. . . . All I would ask for Christ's sake is, that you rest not satisfied until you have given us some such opportunity of free brotherly converse. . . . If you could come to me, to give a day or two to such a consultation, you would find a warm greeting, and, I hope, a loving and unprejudiced discussion of differences.'

To this affectionate appeal I was about to respond at once in the same spirit, accepting heartily the invitation given, when another post on the same day brought me a letter from the Bishop of CAPETOWN, which seemed to change wholly the character of the proposed discussion. It appeared to me, in short, that, instead of being invited to a friendly conference, I was about practically to be 'convened' by him, as Metropolitan, before a bench of Bishops for my offences. And that I was not wrong in this supposition, is shown by the fact, that the Bishop of CAPETOWN did not correct my own view of the matter, as expressed in my letters to him, copied below, and that he still says, in the extract cited on p.39, from his Charge,—

'He would not meet more than one [of the English Bishops], and the *not as if he were in any error*, but only as a common seeker after truth.'

This language may be compared with the expressions of the Bishop of OXFORD—'free discourse with some of us,' 'free brotherly converse,' 'loving and unprejudiced discussion of differences.'

(i) As by submitting to be thus called to account by him, I should have recognised indirectly the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan, I thought it my duty to reply to the Bishop of OXFORD and to the Bishop of CAPETOWN, as follows, Aug. 9, 1862:—

'To the Bishop of Oxford.

'I thank you most sincerely for your most kind and friendly letter. I should be most happy to discuss any points in my Book on the Romans,

either with yourself or any other brother Bishop, *singly* and *privately*; though I must confess that I do not anticipate much result from such a conference, as the views which I have expressed in that book are, generally speaking, not the result of a few years' colonial experience, but have been long held by me, have grown with my growth, and are, as I fully believe, quite compatible with a conscientious adherence to the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England. I do not think, however, that any good would result from my meeting a number of Bishops together upon the subject, and, therefore, would prefer declining your very kind invitation.

'Under any circumstances, I am sure that you would be the last person to wish me, for any personal reasons, to shrink from the confession of what I believe to be the truth.'

To the Bishop of Capetown.

'Just before your letter reached me, I had received one—a very kind one—from the Bishop of OXFORD, making a similar proposal. I should be most happy to meet *any* of my brother Bishops *singly*, and discuss with him any portions of my Book on the Romans; but for various reasons I do not think it would be productive of any good result for me to meet a number of them *together*, and I have written to that effect to the Bishop of OXFORD.

'With respect to my other book . . . it is quite true that I have been for some time past deeply engaged in the study of the Pentateuch, and have arrived at some startling results. I have had a portion of them privately printed, for the express purpose of laying them before such of my friends in England as would be most likely to be able to give me assistance and advice in this matter, by possessing sufficient acquaintance with the subject, and by being free from those strong prejudices, which would prevent their discussing calmly and dispassionately with me the points in question. I trust that I duly reverence both the Church and the Bible; but the Truth is above both. I have already taken measures for submitting my views on the Pentateuch to some of my friends, and shall be glad to do so privately to any intelligent candid, and truth-seeking student. *Among others, I had thought of asking the Bishop of ST. DAVID'S to confer with me upon the subject.* But I am not prepared at present to propound my views prematurely to *any* one.'

(ii) The Bishop of CAPETOWN replied as follows, Aug. 12, 1862:—

'I think you have not quite understood the object of my proposal. I have been placed in great difficulties by the book [Commentary on the Romans] you have published. People in England, and many of the Bishops who have read it, are pained and shocked by it. They have thought, and so have I, that the most Christian course was for those who were able to do so, to meet you, and endeavour to convince you that you were in error.

'If, by God's blessing, they should succeed in this, it might lead to your

withdrawing a book which so many think unsound, and *render all other proceedings unnecessary.*

‘I doubt much whether *one* Bishop would meet you (1), and I do hope that you will not decline to meet any who wish to discuss the language used, lovingly with you, as a Brother.’

As from the expression above italicised it was now plain to me that the proposed proceedings, under the guise of a friendly conference, were really intended to have a formal meaning, and to be, in fact, indirectly, an assertion of jurisdiction over me,—and as I did not believe that, in my Book on the Romans, I had written anything which could warrant such a course of conduct towards me, so that I must not so much as indulge the thought that any Bishop of the Church of England would be willing to meet me singly, in private, friendly, conference—I replied briefly, adhering to my former resolution.

(iii) I now quote the Bishop of CAPETOWN’S answer, dated Aug. 20, 1862 :

‘I am very sorry that you have come to the conclusion that you will not meet the Bishops ; and I do earnestly hope that you will reconsider your decision.

‘Just think what the position of this painful case is. You have published a work [on the Romans] which has distressed many, both in this country and in Africa,—which has led some of your clergy to communicate formally with me on the subject,—which, when examined, appears to me, and the other Bishops of the Province, to contain teaching at variance with that of the Church of which we are ministers, and which is, in consequence, referred by me to the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, and, through him, to certain other Bishops for their opinion. These Bishops, without pretending to sit in judgment upon the work, do, nevertheless, very generally [N.B. not unanimously] concur in thinking that its teaching is extremely painful, and apparently not in accordance with that of the Church of England,—so much so, indeed, that several of them have expressed themselves as unable, under present circumstances, to admit you to officiate in their dioceses. You may be able, at an interview, to explain much that shocks the minds of others ; or they may, if they should meet you, be able to convince you that you have expressed yourself unguardedly and unscripturally.

‘In the hope that by God’s grace they might be able to do this, men like the Archbishop of YORK, the Bishop of OXFORD, the Bishop of LINCOLN, and, I doubt not, others too, would meet you, and endeavour to show you where your error lies. If they should succeed, they would win a brother. If they should fail, they would at least have used every effort to lead him back to the truth, from which they believe him to have departed. Is not the course proposed, of ‘two or three’ meeting you, the truly Christian and Scriptural one ? And is it right to refuse to be a party to it ?

‘The case is not an ordinary one. You cannot but be aware that you have propounded views which are very startling—which you did not hold when

you were consecrated—some of which have just been condemned by a legal Court—and which it is impossible that the Church should silently acquiesce in. It is not we who are the first to move in this matter. It is you that have departed from your former standing-ground, and have been led to adopt views, which I am sure you are far too honest to maintain are those of the Church of England, and to propagate those views by your writings and by word of mouth. As the guardians of the Church's faith, we cannot but, under such circumstances, plead with you.

'Forgive the freedom with which I write. There is, I believe, on the part of the Bishops a very earnest desire to do what in them lies to recover one who . . . [I omit some complimentary expressions.] I venture to hope that, if you are willing to meet the chief Pastors of the Church at home in the same spirit in which they are prepared to meet you, and to discuss with them those views which you have recently adopted and propounded, good only would result from it. But I confess that *I do not see how they can consent to meet you, one by one, merely in a private way*, or treat the grave statements which you have made as open questions. Many of these statements, however qualified by a different language in other parts of your book, appear to all the Divines that I have met with, who have studied your book, to be both unsound and dangerous. You may be able to show them that you have been misunderstood, or you may be led to qualify statements which we regard as rash and erroneous. Do not lightly throw away the chance of setting yourself right, and settling a matter of very great importance to yourself and to the Church.'

(iv) My reply to the above was as follows, dated August 27, 1862:—

'I received your last letter before I left Cornwall, but have delayed replying that I might give its contents a due consideration. I thank you most sincerely for the kind expressions which you have used towards myself in it. I wish, indeed, that I were more worthy of them. But, as to the main question, I am sorry to be obliged to say that I feel it due to myself, and to my rightful position, to adhere to my resolution of declining to meet a number of Bishops together in the way proposed.

'I do so for the following reasons among others. I am so far from considering that the views which I have expressed in my Commentary on the Romans are contrary to the teaching of the Church of England, that—as, indeed, I have already stated in the first letter which I addressed to you from Natal in reply to yours, expressing your disapproval of my book,—I entirely believe that what I have taught in that book I am permitted to teach, within the liberty allowed me by the Articles and Prayer Book of the Church of England, and with a conscientious adherence to the letter and spirit of them. With, I think, two exceptions only, those views I held as strongly, and preached them as plainly, when I was consecrated, as I do now. On two points, I admit,—the Scripture doctrine of the Atonement,

and the subject of Eternal Punishment,—my mind has progressed with advancing age, experience, enquiry, and meditation, to my present views. But I have said nothing, as I believe, and as able and eminent divines assure me, which can justly deserve the censures which some have passed upon my book.

‘Of course, I am aware that the recent judgment of Dr. LUSHINGTON [in “Essays and Reviews”] brings me under condemnation on certain points. But you cannot surely believe that that judgment will be maintained in the Court of Appeal, when it obviously departs from the very principles which the Judge himself laid down, and which the higher Court has laid down in other cases. Mr. GROTE’s pamphlet makes this abundantly plain. If, however, it should be confirmed on these points, it will then be the duty of myself and a multitude of other clergymen, who have held and taught views like my own, to decide on our future course.

‘Believing, then, that there is no real ground whatever for the opinion that the views expressed in my Commentary on the Romans, however they may differ from those of some of my episcopal brethren, are in any way condemned by the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and having already entered into a full explanation on all those points, on which you expressed objection to my teaching, in a letter which (I presume) has been laid before the Bishops assembled to discuss my book, I feel that I should place myself in a false position, if I should consent to be convened before a number of Bishops in the way proposed, which would, in fact, amount to a recognition of their right to interrogate me.

‘Nevertheless, as I have said, I shall be most glad to meet singly and privately with any Bishop, who either from a sense of duty to the Church, and to what he believes to be the truth, or from a feeling of charity towards a brother whom he wishes to “recover,” would be willing to meet and discuss with me any of the questions raised in the Commentary. It seems to me that this course will be most truly in accordance with the Scriptural rule to which your letter refers.

‘I was wholly unaware that Bishop CLAUGHTON had joined in the condemnation of my book, (though I knew that he did not agree with some of my views), and certainly from his letters to myself I should never have inferred it.

‘The only pain I feel is that of causing to yourself so much anxiety and grief, in addition to your other vexations. But this God lays upon you (and upon me also) in the path of duty.’

(v) At the end of three weeks, I received this note from the Bishop of CAPE TOWN, dated Sept. 17, 1862:—

‘I think that I ought to tell you that the dear good old Bishop of St. ASAPH has expressed a readiness to discuss your views with you, if you chose to visit him with a view to that purpose, and that, although I have

no commission from the Bishop of OXFORD to say so, I cannot help feeling that he would be ready to do the same. I cannot tell you how deeply I grieve over the case.'

As the Bishop of CAPETOWN must have discussed the whole matter with the Bishop of OXFORD, and 'had no commission from him' to say that he would be willing to see me, of course the latter portion of the above note had no meaning for me under the existing circumstances. For the Bishop of St. ASAPH I have the deepest esteem and respect, and, perhaps, I ought to have gone to him for the purpose. But I was in London, he in Wales; and I hardly felt that, with a Prelate of his advanced years, a discussion upon my Commentary would be likely to lead to any practical result, and I had no reason to suppose that he had studied at all the criticism of the Pentateuch. To the Bishop of St. DAVID'S, whom I myself mentioned to Bishop GRAY, and whose learning might, indeed, have been profitably consulted by us, my proposal, as his Lordship has informed me, was never in any way communicated. The fact was, as I believe, and as the above correspondence, I think, will sufficiently evidence, that the Bishop of CAPETOWN was determined from the first to *bring me to account*, if possible, in some form or other, for my Book on the Romans,—which, though containing, as I maintain, no single statement at variance with the Articles and Formularies, was yet very strongly condemned by himself and others, holding extreme views in the Church on either side, both in England and in South Africa. If I had consented to be thus 'convened,' no doubt the act would have been quoted, as my private letters have been, to show that I had 'recognised' the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan.

5. LETTERS FROM NATIVE CONVERTS, RECEIVED BY THE BISHOP OF NATAL WHILE IN ENGLAND: p.50.

From a native youth.

(i)

'Feb. 2, 1863.

'MY FATHER,—I thank you very much for your reply to me about that matter which I told you about [his marriage], and I too for my part wish that you may come and settle that affair. We here are living very happily. We rejoiced greatly at the arrival of Dulela [sent back from England]; she arrived on Jan. 6; we asked of her the news about you, and she told us. But we shall be very delighted when we see you all, through the mercy of our God and Father. A little while ago I was sick for a time, Oct. 23, 1862; and I went away home, but returned here again, Nov. 3, 1862. I began to print the Gospel of Matthew, and finished it on Jan. 28, 1863. Now I am printing the Gospel of Mark. Lingane is working upon the Book of Genesis; and I think he works remarkably well. Llansi also is learning very well: as far as I can see, I should say that he will learn well presently. But I wish very much to hear when you will come back to us here; for we all remember you exceedingly, longing that you may come immediately. I

should like you to tell the Inkosikazi [Mrs. COLENSO] that I am now learning to play the harmonium ; but I teach myself by myself ; some tunes too I am now able to play well when we worship. Also the Inkosikazi [Mrs. GRUBB] said to me that she would like me to help her in teaching other people of an evening ; so I teach them, Umpiwa there, and Simoi, and Henry, another man of Mr. ROBERTSON the teacher in Zululand. Again, I have heard that now Umpiwa wishes to be admitted into the Church of the Lord, and be baptized. I rejoiced very much at that. Salute for me, &c. ; all of ours here salute you very much. But all blessing and gladness are in the hands of God our Father, who is Almighty, of His great mercy, to protect us well and all our brethren.'

(ii)

'March 20, 1863.

'MY FATHER,—I wish now to write to you about how we are going on at Ekukanyeni. I wish also to hear how you are going on in England. We are all well : but I am just now in great trouble, because Llansi is going away. I do not all complain of his being sent away : I am only very sorry for it : for I see that I shall be without any one to help me, since Lingane wishes also soon to go. But I have spoken with the Archdeacon, and asked him to send for Mankentyane. The Archdeacon consented, and I hope that M. will help nicely in what I want : besides I know that he is much more expert than either Lingane or Llansi. But, as for Llansi, I did hope that he would have helped me, and that I should have taught him thoroughly according to your word : now, however, I am quite grieved at the sad story of his going away. [Llansi had not committed any very serious offence : but he was in fault, and it was thought most prudent to send him away from the station, and he was then employed by a printer in town.] We are very glad to hear of your welfare at this time ; and we trust that God will grant us through His mercy to see you again.

'But, my father, about the matter of the gun, which I wished to buy, now I see that I don't much need it. I wish to leave it, and not to buy it now. I don't say that I leave it, because I see something else which I desire : I wish to leave it simply because I don't particularly want it. What I wish now is to *lobola* [deposit cows for a girl whom he wishes to marry] a little. Not that I want to marry immediately—I remember your advice to "wait till I am older." I quite agree to this : I only wish to begin by degrees. Therefore I should like you to tell — that I wish to use this money of the gun for this purpose, since this affair is to be settled by you as that of the gun was ; and, though I still wish for this gun, I wish also to restrain my heart with respect to it, lest, perhaps, I should injure any one with it.

'Salute for me Inkosikazi and all the children. Tell them that I shall greatly rejoice to see them again through the mercy of our Father.'

(iii)

‘April 29, 1863.

‘MY LORD,—I rejoiced exceedingly to-day because we heard of your life and your work there in England; for there arrived that letter of yours which you sent to William, and we heard it all clearly; it rejoiced us exceedingly. . . . But one thing will gladden us especially; we shall joy when we see you here again in Natal, since we have been looking for you exceedingly. . . . I am now at work with Mankentyane and Fani; Lingane went away a few days after Llansi’s departure; but presently these two arrived. They help me capitally. I am now in the middle of Luke: Mankentyane has printed Genesis: Fani is stitching Prayer-books. This is how we are working here. . . . A few weeks past Undiane made a call, coming to ask the Archdeacon [GRUBB] for a book, “First Lessons in Science”: I fancy the Archdeacon gave him one. . . .’

The above three letters are translated literally from the original, written in Zulu. I give now three letters in *English* from the same lad, *verbatim* and *literatim* (the spelling not altered) as he wrote them. The reader will judge whether there are signs here of any ‘progress,’ and any solid result of my labours, observing that these letters indicate the *present* state of things during my absence from the Colony, and that this lad was a little naked savage when I first took him from the kraal. If a well-educated Englishman finds it so difficult to write grammatical Zulu, how much more difficult must it be for a native to write English!—when he has first to be taught the very elements of grammar, and that by a teacher who can scarcely explain his own meaning in the native tongue, and often knows but little about grammar himself, or knows only the grammar of the English tongue, which differs totally from that of the Zulu.

(iv)

‘Ekukanyeni, June 29, 1863.

‘MY DEAR LORD,—I have no time now to write all what I wish to say to you, but I am very glad to see you writing, for I like very much to write every word in English tongue, but I can’t do that, for I know not all the sorts of English word.

‘At this time I am very glad to my work, I have only Fani who help me in the place of Mankentyane and Lingane. When Mankentyane was just came here, he was with us only one month and half, when he hears that the sickness of *small pox* will be at Natal he gone away, he left Fani in his place, but I hope that Lingane will come to me if Fani go home.

‘Jojo says that I better write and tell you that he is not at Ekukanyeni now, he saw that his wife is very ill, and go to his friend to help him by giving him (Jojo) medicines to give his wife for she was very ill. But he says that I tell you that he is not go away at Ekukanyeni, he only stay for a few months for he fears that his wife will be ill again. He has a child, her name is Unoziduli, I hope that she will grow very well by the might of God. Jojo and his wife Nomvuzo says that I may salute you for

them and Inkosikazi [and the children], as they hope that they will see them again by the power of our Father.

‘But, my Lord, the thing which I want to know about it, is this that I want to know that, if I done all the copies of the book of *New Testament*, what shall I do? I say that for I don’t like to go away to some body, I don’t like to leave Ekukanyeni. I say that for I see now I will done them at April or May, 1864, I don’t know yet, only thinking. I want to know if you will send some copies for me, for I want to work very much now, I am very oblige [desirous] to work my printing books in the printing-office.

‘All the people salute you, my Lord, every person which know you salute you. I hope to see you again, if God wills. Salute Inkosikazi for me, please, and ask her that [whether] she will glad if I marry? I think that I will marry for [in] few months, but I have no enough cows to give the father of *intombi yami* [my girl]. Tell Inkosikazi that, if I marry, I will ask something for my wife, for she is my mother indeed, and the *intombi* says that I may salute for her to Inkosikazi her mother.

Salute Inkosikazi and children for me, tell them that I will write for them all in next steamer. If God wills that we see you, we shall be glad.’

(v)

‘Aug. 23, 1863.

‘MY DEAR LORD,—I am very glad this day that you send me this letter, my heart is so fully rejoice to see it. At this time I know that you will come back to us again, for if I take this your letter and look at it, I see this to be sure that you wish for yourself to come again at Natal. . . . I have heard that Ngoza [a chief] want to bring here his boys. Now I am only [alone] in the printing-office. Fani has go home at the end of last July, and he left me alone, but though he is gone I am working comfortable, and need nothing. I just print only [alone] like my doing when you was here. You know that at that time I was only [alone] in the printing-office. If God helps me I will do all that you told me to do. Now I leave the *New Testament*, I want to [have] done the *Book of Genesis* before [first]; when I done it, I shall go on the *New Testament*, and when I done it, I will go on *Exodus*.

‘Salute Inkosikazi. . . for me, and tell them that I will be very glad to hear about them all right. All people who know you say ‘Good bye.’ I can’t count them for they are so many. If God of peace and love might send our friends back to us, as it pleased Him, we shall be glad and rejoice, through Christ Jesus, who is our Lord and Savior. Good by to every one. I am your faithful servant.’

(vi)

‘Bishopstowe [Ekukanyeni] : March 27, 1864.

‘MY DEAR LORD AND FATHER,—I want to hear of your coming very much at this time, for I heard not about your matter in England, only I know that you shall come back again as you told me in last month’s, but I don’t

know which time you will be here. But, my Lord, my work in this last month goes very slowly, for I sent my proof to — but he keep it for a long time, and then I thought in my mind, I said, “it is better that (am do)=[I do] for myself the *proves* which I printed,” and then I begin to print Exodus, for — got my proof of the book of New Testament; but I think to take that proof also to him, for it is right to me to do all which is my business and finish it. For I can do the proves for myself, if there is no man to take them. . . . But for myself I shall thank God if I see you here in Natal again. But all our doings are in the hands of God our Heavenly Father, to send our friends here again, that we may see one another by God’s seeing [providence] and love. That is all now. I shall be very glad to hear of your coming to us again. For we live here like as children who have not their father and mother.

‘This is the two sheets of the beginning of Exodus, which I had done for myself, and try to do right, all the words, that they may [be] without mistakes, as I try to do so.’

[In these two sheets, corrected by himself, there was only *one* small printer’s error.]

The following is a literal translation of a letter, which I received from the same youth by the last mail, reporting the proceedings of the Bishop of CAPETOWN, when he paid a visit to my residence.

(vii)

‘Ekukanyeni: May 29, 1864.

‘MY LORD,—I rejoiced greatly to hear your letter which you sent to William. I wish much that you would write to me also, that I may hear clearly whether these people are speaking the truth, or no, about you. The other day, May 10, there came the Bishop of CAPETOWN along with Mr. ROBERTSON: they reached Ekukanyeni both together. And so Mr. ROBERTSON called William, saying he wished to see him. They came in both together into the printing-office, and looked at my work. Afterwards we went out together with them in the afternoon; and we talked with Mr. ROBERTSON, and asked “Where is the Bishop [of CAPETOWN] going to?” Said he, “Aha! that Bishop has come to put all things properly. For Sobantu [the native name for the Bishop of NATAL] has gone astray greatly; I don’t suppose that he will ever come back here.” Again he said, “The Bishop has come to tell the people to abandon the teaching of Sobantu; for Sobantu has gone astray exceedingly; he has rebelled; he does not believe in God our Father, and in Jesus Christ our Lord.” William and I, however, contradicted, saying, “As to Sobantu, we know that he, for his part, is a man who believes exceedingly. When has *that* [which you speak of] come upon him?” Said he, “When he was in England he rebelled; his book, too, speaks badly.”

‘I wish, now, to hear plainly whether, indeed, they have spoken truth or not, Mr. ROBERTSON and others, to-wit, that you no longer believe. But I

know that there is not a word of truth in what they say. Just the one thing is, that we believe in God our Father, who knows everything.

'As to my work, it is going on very well indeed. I should say that in about another month I shall have finished this Book of Exodus which I am now printing. But I have only a part of it here: I don't know where the rest of it is. I have here Ch. i-xxix. I don't know anything about the rest. [I did not translate the description of the details of the tabernacle, &c.]. After that I shall print the New Testament, beginning there at Luke [where he had left off], and the others, until I have finished all that book of the Histories, and the Acts of the Apostles, and Paul's writings, and so on with the others. After that I shall print the Book of Samuel; when I have finished that, there will be an end of the work which you set out for me. But that will take some little time before I have finished those Books, because I am working all alone. For my part I ask very much for money, that I may have a boy to help me, that I may work well.

'Salute for me, &c.'

The following are literal translations of letters received from native catechists, and will serve to show the tone of thought which I have endeavoured to cherish among them, down to the last hour of my residence in Natal.

(viii) 'O Nkosi [Sir] do you remember us here? O Nkosi, I trust indeed that you do remember us. Ah! but, Nkosi, I am grieved because no tidings come to say when you will return. Do not delay, Nkosi, lest it should seem that you have gone away altogether. But, Nkosi, know this that there is a longing, I cannot say how great, for you, ever since you went away. In truth, there is a painful sense of desolation at your departure.

'Well, Nkosi, your people are living comfortably at present; but they are looking for your return. It seems as if, when you shall have come, what has now come short will be made to meet, what has bent down will be lifted up, what is unfinished will be completed, yes, and what is sleeping by the way will arrive.

'But, Nkosi, as to the people in Maritzburg,—I mean, those who worship in our chapel [whom he taught],—they are doing well at all times; their business goes steadily forward continually. There are also some of them who are particularly attentive. There are five, too, who wish to be baptized. But among those who wish to be baptized, one is very ill indeed in his lungs.

'I salute all those of your house, yourself, and the Inkosikazi, and the boys and the young ladies. All of my house salute; they look for your return; and I, too, am looking for a word to say, "I will return at such and such a time."'

(ix) '. . . Again, Nkosi, I hoped very much that, as soon as you reached England, you would send a man at once, coming from you, to help me in

Maritzburg, according to what we planned. And even now, Nkosi, if you send him, I should be very glad.

‘Further, Nkosi, know that we all here desire to hear your word, that you should send it among your people, and they may hear it, and rejoice at it. By that they will think that you still remember them, and will rejoice at it, just as that Paul did, you know, to his people. [The writer greatly admired “that Paul”; but he said that his epistles “always made his head ache,” while helping me to translate them.] For there are many who worry us, saying, “Sobantu will not return again”; others say, “Sobantu—he is now turned out”; others say, “Sobantu—he is no longer a Bishop; he is no longer a minister; he is just nobody. . . .”

‘Nkosi, farewell! May God, whom you serve, deal with you as He sees good,—help you with His glorious might in all which you are doing,—be a Father to you, and you be a child to Him, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, who gives to us all! Amen.

‘As to us here, we are living happily; but the one thing that we are looking for is your coming. That is the one great thing above all others. Farewell, my Lord.’

‘Jan. 28, 1864.

(x) ‘May it please you, Nkosi, to answer a little to this which I am saying. You know, however, that I would not urge you about answering if it cannot be done. I desire to ask, “When will you at length return? Can you not promise a little?” For you must know, Nkosi, from the time you went away, people are talking continually, saying, “Sobantu will never come back.” But we, your flock, are looking for you with red [straining] eyes all the days,—I say, all the months,—I say, all the years—of our life; we are looking for your return, Nkosi Sobantu. However, Nkosi, supposing that you will not return, say so, or supposing that you will return, say so, a little. But Nkosi, do not think that I shall be satisfied to *write* to you merely. No! I don’t desire that at all. For the one thing, which I look for more than anything else, is your coming—that alone, Nkosi. For, as to this your departure, in you is the very sole excellence of our work, as to which we had looked continually that it should go on and prosper,—I mean, of course, the excellent great work, which is through our Lord Jesus Christ.

‘So it is, Nkosi Sobantu, beloved by the band of faith! I have no wish to be [merely] writing to you continually. For I look for one thing, to be brought about through the name of the Living God, which is looked for by all the believers of ours—I mean, your return. For, Nkosi, it seems to me that, if your return shall only be heard of as certain, it would be as if the rain came, as if the sun shone, as if an eclipse happened, as if the earth were overturned, as if the rivers had run dry, as if the sea had stilled its roaring, as if all winds had ceased to blow, as if all were fair, as if all were clear. For, surely, it is plain that it is right that one, who is a Bishop, should be

here in the land; since he works for men, because that is his office, to manage men. For some, truly, are trusted with the management of men: others are trusted with the collecting of money. There are offices and offices established in the workings of men. Farewell, my Lord! I am still alive, and I am one of yours at Ekukanyeni.'

This is the last letter of the same catechist, just arrived, which will show the kind of work which the Bishop of CAPETOWN has thought it right to do among my poor native flock. *Quid non religio potuit!*

' May 29, 1864.

(xi) 'I have received your letter, Nkosi; I am very thankful for it. I rejoice also because I find that you are well, both in body and soul. For indeed, so it is, upon my word, that there is a great noise among all people about you: some say, "Sobantu has rebelled"; others say, "Sobantu goes astray": 'tis so continually with them all.

'But, Nkosi, see! do, I entreat, make a guess, and promise about your return. For, you know, Nkosi, to expect and wait for you is but a short matter: but, according to their talk, you will never more return at all.

'Also the other day there arrived the Bishop of CAPETOWN; he just came to have a look at Ekukanyeni, accompanied by Mr. ROBERTSON. They went also to the place of worship [St. Mary's Native Chapel] in town, going to see the people. We asked about Sobantu. But Mr. ROBERTSON [by the Bishop's direction, of course, the latter not speaking Zulu] made a long discourse to all the people: he said, "Sobantu will never again come back: Sobantu has rebelled entirely, he has gone astray. His going astray we white people don't wonder at; for it has been always so among the white people; there are always arising people such as he." Whereupon I asked, and said to Mr. ROBERTSON, "What then? do not you know Sobantu, that he is a man who believes entirely in God?" He assented. Then said I, "Well then, when did he begin to rebel, when he was in England, or here?" Said he, "At the time he left this country, he had already begun to rebel; but, when he arrived in England, he rebelled altogether." I contradicted. But, Nkosi, there was more which I cannot possibly write, the whole of it. . . .

'Nkosi, I salute you very much. I remember you every day; I don't forget you for one single day. But to see a letter coming from you is quite as if I were dreaming. Salute for me kindly to the Inkosikazi, salute for me to the young ladies, salute for me to the boys, salute all those who love us together with you. Our Father, who is over all, preserve you, deliver you from all, grant you that the wealth of the Holy Spirit may abound to you.'

Here, lastly, is a note from another native catechist, who has been equally disturbed by Bishop GRAY's proceedings.

(xii) 'My Lord,—It was pleasant to hear your words: for we were in a

state of great excitement, not knowing what is the real state of the case. I also said about you, Nkosi, it cannot possibly be true for us: for you had come to bring light among those in darkness. I say, your doing was not like a white-man; it was like the words which say, "He sends forth His sun upon evil and upon good,"—the way by which you came among us continually. But before God our Father we may be comforted about you until we see your face. . . . The sea is a great thing; because, although we love you so much, we cannot see you. Salute, &c.'

I venture to believe that the above letters give evidence of a solid and permanent work, wrought by God's grace, in preparing these natives for future usefulness among their people. Their intellectual powers have been cultivated, as well as their hearts: they have been taught to *think* about religion, and not merely crammed with dogmatic formulæ, although, in such exercise of their reasoning powers, they have compelled me to give close attention to difficulties, which in English teaching are too commonly passed over or altogether ignored. But the reader will perceive that a tone of true Christian feeling—of simple healthy piety—characterizes all these letters; and the steady industry of the young printer, amidst all his difficulties and discouragements, is to me most refreshing and hopeful, as a sign of real 'progress.'

6. PROPOSED ALTERATION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL: p.63.

The Bishop of CAPETOWN says of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, *Charge*, p.12:—'The Judgment, which it has just given, in opposition to the Archbishops and the voice of Convocation, has convulsed the Church of England, and is forcing her to repudiate its decision, and to demand an alteration in the Court of Appeal.*

* The Bishop also says, *Charge*, p.12:—'Is not the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council the final Court of Appeal for the Church of England? In certain cases it is so, with the presence of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London. For the last thirty years, by a mere oversight, as Lord Brougham has stated publicly in the House of Lords, it has been so.' It must have been, however, a happy oversight, even in the opinion of Lord Brougham, if the following statement of Dr. MANNING is correct, *Letter*, &c., p.7: 'The late Bishop BLOMFIELD introduced into Parliament a Bill to amend the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Crown in matters of Doctrine. By that Bill it was provided that in all such questions the matter of Doctrine should be divided from the matter of Law, and that the Doctrine should be adjudged by the Bishops, the Law by the Judges of the Privy Council. . . . Lord Brougham spoke against the Bill. He said, with plain English common sense, that the Bishops would constitute no sufficient tribunal for questions of controverted Doctrine, because they might divide in equal numbers, and give, therefore, no decision, or by a bare majority, which

There is certainly a *party* in the Church which 'demands' such an alteration, and in no very mild terms. Thus Dr. PUSEY writes in his recent manifesto, p.18:—'Will the Church of England require that the Court, which has shown itself so partial, so dishonest,—which, had it been a matter of human property, would not have dared so openly to profane justice,—should be reformed?' But the following are the views of the Bishop (WALDEGRAVE) of CARLISLE on this question, *Charge*, p.48:—'A third party have—without avowing the purpose, though I can hardly think without contemplating the result—availed themselves of the present season of disquiet, for advocating a modification of the constitution of the Court of Appeal, which would certainly issue, and that at no distant date, in the dis-establishment—and, be it well remembered, in the dis-endowment also—of our National Church. . . . This would be nothing less than to supersede the teaching of our written formularies, unmoved as they ever are and must be by the tempests of party and passion, by the opinion of living men, who *cannot but be liable to be swayed by all the tumultuous gusts of the fleeting hour*. Would our *Laity*, think you, for one moment tolerate the existence of such a tribunal? . . . I, for one, can have no sympathy with men, who had rather that all things should be brought to a standstill, than that any the least alteration should be made which does not fully and exactly tally with the day-dreams of their own ambitious imaginations. And such men there still are at work amongst us. They were, until recently, regarded with a just and an universal suspicion, as animated by that spirit of sacerdotal absolutism, which, more than two centuries ago, involved our Church and Kingdom in a common overthrow. The notable zeal with which, all the while retaining a cordial dislike to the distinguishing doctrines of the Reformation, they have thrown themselves into the anti-rationalistic movement, has caused too many to condone their errors, and thus given them the opportunity, of which they have been by no means backward to avail themselves, of silently urging onward their cherished scheme of un-protestantizing the National Church. Of this scheme it is difficult not to believe that this plan of ecclesiastical-law-reform is an integral portion.'

Among those, who are most violent in 'demanding' this reform, is the Ven. Archdeacon DENISON, one who signed the famous Anglican 'Declaration,' with reference to the 'Gorham Judgment,' in common with Dr. PUSEY, Dr. NEWMAN, Dr. MANNING, and nine others, of whom, says Dr. MANNING, *Letter to an Anglican Friend*, p.1, 'six afterwards submitted to

would carry no moral conviction to any one, or the majority, however great, would not tell by number against a minority, in which were found the few of known learning and influence, with whom public opinion would certainly go. The end of the Bill might have been foreseen. It was rejected with an overwhelming rejection, not only of opposition, but of arguments.'

the Catholic [Roman] Church, four are no more, and five are still Anglicans.' By the 'Declaration' it was affirmed, that, if the Church of England acquiesced in the Gorham Judgment, 'by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act' it would 'become formally separated from the Catholic Body, and could no longer assure to its members the Grace of the Sacraments and the Remission of Sins.' The Church of England has acquiesced in that judgment: but both Dr. PUSEY and Archdeacon DENISON still remain as clergymen of the Church of England. It is to Archdeacon DENISON; however, that the Bishop of CAPETOWN has applied, for six additional clergy to be planted in my diocese: so at least I infer from a letter in the *Guardian* of Aug. 31, bearing, as signature, the motto of the Archdeacon's journal (*Church and State Review*), 'PRO ECCLESIA DEI.' At any rate, it is plain that it is intended to take advantage of my absence, to force upon my diocese, if possible, a number of clergy holding 'extreme views of Church and State,' such as those which are held by Archdeacon DENISON and Dr. PUSEY, as well as by Bishop GRAY and the Natal correspondent of the *Guardian*.

With reference to this point, I think it right to say that, it is my purpose, with the Divine assistance, on my return to my diocese, both to maintain inviolate, as far as shall lie in my power, all rights, spiritual or temporal, belonging to me as its Bishop, and, at the same time, to consult for its religious peace and quietness, by overlooking, wherever possible, all offences against its ecclesiastical order, which may have been committed during my absence. These offences have mainly arisen from the intrusion of another Bishop into the affairs of my diocese.

The Bishop of CAPETOWN, however, has no more authority over my diocese, than I have over his, except so far as it shall have been lawfully given him by the Crown, of which the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council will be the judges. Accordingly, his appointment of clergy to minister in the diocese of Natal would, if illegal, give them no mission: in pretending to give it, he would be the author of a Schism: his own clergy, who might affect to support him, and any Society at home, which should furnish stipends to persons so nominated, and exercising their functions without my Licence, would be its abettors.

In many periods of ecclesiastical history we meet with examples of Bishops charging each other with heresy, and defying each other with mutual excommunications. I shall endeavour always to avoid following the example of this unseemly kind of warfare. But I feel called upon to caution some, who might, perhaps, otherwise be led away, against abetting proceedings ecclesiastically irregular and schismatical,—politically seditious,—injurious to the cause of religion and to the progress of Christianity,—and hurtful individually to the religious life of all who promote them.

Just published, the Third Edition, in 8vo. price 1s.

A
LETTER TO THE LAITY
OF
THE DIOCESE OF NATAL.

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

London : LONGMAN, GREEN, & CO. Paternoster Row.