







A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO

THE DIOCESE OF NATAL,

IN THE

Cathedral Church of St. Peter, Pietermaritzburg,

AT

HIS PRIMARY METROPOLITICAL VISITATION,

MAY 18, 1864,

BY

Robert, Lord Bishop of Capetown,

AND METROPOLITAN.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF THE CLERGY AND LAITY.

PIETERMARITZBURG :
PRINTED BY P. DAVIS & SON, 21, LONGMARKET STREET.

1864.

A CHARGE, &c.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

AND

MY BRETHREN OF THE LAITY,—

Commencing, as I do to-day, my first Metropolitan Visitation, it may be well that I should briefly touch upon the position which the Metropolitan fills in the Church of Christ, and upon the grounds upon which I claim to discharge the functions of that office.

At what time the office was first instituted in the Church of Christ has been a matter of some doubt. Archbishop Usher, Bishop Beveridge, Dr. Hammond, and other learned men, believed it to have been co-eval with the Apostles. Dr. Cave, Bingham, and others, have regarded it as of somewhat later appointment. All are agreed that it was in full operation before the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325); the sixth famous canon referring to it as part of the existing constitution of the Church, and commanding that the privileges which belonged to it by ancient custom should be maintained. The thirty-fourth of the Apostolical Canons is, probably, the earliest authority which speaks distinctly of the office, and of its true position in the Church of God.

The functions of the Metropolitan, as defined by the Canons of the Church, were: To regulate the elections of Provincial Bishops, and ordain them; their appointment being null without his consent (Bingham, Book II., chap. xvi, sec. 12; Van Espen, Part I., Titulus xix., chaps. 3, 4, 5, 6): upon this point, all the Canons are express,—to decide controversies between them,—to compel them to residence,—to hear appeals,—to call and preside at Provincial Synods,—to take care of all vacant Sees within

their Province,—to administer the affairs of the Church during a vacancy (Bingham, ch. xvi., sec. 20),—to secure the revenues of the Bishopric, and procure the speedy election of a new Bishop,—and, lastly, with the aid of his com-provincials—and, probably, under peculiar circumstances, without that aid (Van Espen, Part I., Tit. xix., *De Metropolitanis*, cap. iii., sec. 3)—to hear charges against any Bishop of his province; to correct, suspend, and, if need be, to deprive him.

These duties, powers, responsibilities of the Metropolitan are largely discussed and laid down by Bingham, Van Espen, *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique. Institutionem Canoniconem*, lib. iv., *Juris Canonici Compendium*, and indeed all writers on the subject.

The office has been in existence in our Mother Church from time immemorial; and the spiritual functions belonging to it, or assigned to it by the Canons, have been in exercise there, some of the more secular duties having been provided for otherwise by statute.

In the Churches of the Roman obedience, 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.

To such an office, at all times full of responsibility, at this time burdened with great anxieties and difficulties, I have been called.

The want of that office was not felt within the missions of the English Church while they were few and feeble. When, however, it pleased God to stir deeply the slumbering zeal of our Mother Church, and fill her with a desire and determination to provide for the spiritual needs of her children scattered abroad over the face of the earth, and to extend the Redeemer's Kingdom over heathen lands, it became clear, that if order and unity were to be maintained—if the laity were to partake of all the rites of the Church, and enjoy the full blessings which it was instituted to convey—if a ministry was to be provided, and a new life thrown into these distant extremities; in a word, if the infant Churches throughout and beyond our empire were to be perpetuated and enlarged, it would be needful to plant among them the Church, in the completeness of its constitution.

Bishops were, therefore, in the first instance, gradually placed in all our Colonies. At first, the dioceses were of

immense extent. Mine was, from one end to the other, 3,000 miles in length, and comprised five civil governments. Duties were thus imposed upon Bishops which they could not discharge; and it was soon felt that the dioceses must be divided. Before this subdivision was effected, the Bishops of Churches in the Colonies were all regarded as suffragans of the See of Canterbury. When they began to multiply, and the Churches to grow stronger, it was seen that they ought to be gathered into provinces, and possess the complete framework of the Church as it exists at home, and has always existed in the Catholic Church. 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; and proclaimed, by Letters Patent, the See of Cape Town to be the Metropolitan See of this Province; and declared the Bishops of Graham's Town and Natal (the other Sees were not then founded) to be under the jurisdiction of the same.

By the concurrent action of the Church and of the Crown, and at their united call, I hold the office which I now fill.*

* As the subject is one which at this time excites some interest, I extract from the Letters Patent issued at the foundation both of the Metropolitan See and of the See of Natal, and published by Government in the *Gazette*, the passages which relate to the office of the Metropolitan:—

Extract from the Letters Patent of the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town.

And we do further will and ordain that the said Right Reverend Father in God, Robert Gray, Bishop of the said See of Cape Town, and his successors, the Bishops thereof for the time being, shall be and be deemed and taken to be Metropolitan Bishop in our Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, and its dependencies, and our Island of St. Helena, subject, nevertheless, to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and subordinate to the Archiepiscopal See of the province of Canterbury. And we will and ordain that the said Bishops of Grahamstown and Natal, respectively, shall be Suffragan

Jurisdiction of the Metropolitan over the Bishops of his Province.

What legal force the Letters Patent of the See of Cape Town or of the See of Natal may have in this Colony, issued as both were before the granting of a Constitution, it is not for me to decide. Let them be absolutely worthless as legal instruments—which, however, I believe not to be the case—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:

Bishops to the said Bishops of Cape Town, and his successors. And we will and grant to the said Bishop of Cape Town, and his successors, full power and authority as Metropolitan of the Cape of Good Hope, and of the Island of St. Helena, to perform all functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of Metropolitan within the limits of the said Sees of Grahamstown and Natal, and to exercise Metropolitan jurisdiction over the Bishops of the said Sees, and their successors, and over all Archdeacons, Dignitaries, and all other Chaplains, Ministers, Priests, and Deacons, in holy orders, of the United Church of England and Ireland, within the limits of the said Dioceses. And we do by these presents give and grant unto the said Bishop of Cape Town, and his successors, full power and authority to visit, once in five years, or oftener, if occasion shall require, as well the said several Bishops and their successors, as all Dignitaries and all other Chaplains, Ministers, Priests, and Deacons, in holy orders, of the United Church of England and Ireland, resident in the said Dioceses, for correcting and supplying the defects of the said Bishops, and their successors, with all and all manner of visitatorial jurisdiction, power, and coercion.

And we do hereby authorize and empower the said Bishop of Cape Town, and all successors, to inhabit, during any such visitation of the said Dioceses, the exercise of all, or of such part, or parts, of the ordinary jurisdiction of the said Bishops, or their successors, as to him, the said Bishop of Cape Town, or his successors, shall seem expedient, and during the time of such visitation to exercise by himself, or themselves, or his or their Commissaries, such powers, functions, and jurisdiction, in and over the said Dioceses, as the Bishops thereof might have exercised, if they had not been inhibited from exercising the same.

And we do further ordain and declare that if any person against whom a judgment or decree shall be pronounced by the said Bishops, or their successors, or their Commissary, or Commissaries, shall conceive himself aggrieved by such sentence, it shall be lawful for such person to appeal to the said Bishop of Cape Town, or his successors, provided such appeal shall be entered within fifteen days after such sentence shall have been pronounced.

And we do give and grant to the said Bishop of Cape Town, and his successors, full power and authority finally to decree and determine the said appeals.

And we do further will and ordain that, in case any proceeding shall be instituted against any of the said Bishops of Grahamstown and Natal, when placed under the said Metropolitan See of Cape Town, such proceedings shall originate and be carried on before the said Bishop of Cape Town, whom we hereby authorize and direct to take cognizance of the same.

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.

The following is the oath which was taken by your late Bishop:

I, John William Colenso, Doctor in Divinity, appointed Bishop of the See and Diocese of Natal, do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop of Cape Town, and his successors, and to the Metropolitan Church of St. George's, Cape Town. So help me God, through Jesus Christ.

Extract from the Letters Patent constituting the See of Natal.

And we do further ordain and declare that the said Bishop of Natal, and his successors, shall be subject and subordinate to the See of Cape Town, and to the Bishop thereof, and his successors, in the same manner as any Bishop of any See within the province of Canterbury, in our Kingdom of England, is under the authority of the Archiepiscopal See of that province, and of the Archbishop of the same. And we do hereby further will and ordain that the said John William Colenso, and every Bishop of Natal, shall, within six months after the date of their respective Letters Patent, take an oath of due obedience to the Bishop of Cape Town, for the time being, as his Metropolitan, which oath shall and may be ministered unto him by the said Archbishop, or by any person by him duly appointed or authorized for that purpose.

And we further will, and do by these presents declare and ordain, that it shall be lawful for any party against whom any judgment, decree, or sentence shall be pronounced by any of the said Archdeacons, or by the Vicar-General, or other officer or officers of the said Bishop, or his successors, to demand a re-examination and review of such judgment, decree, or sentence, before the Bishop, or his successors, in person, who, upon such demand made, shall take cognizance thereof, and shall have full power and authority to affirm, reverse, or alter the said judgment, sentence, or decree; and if any party shall conceive himself aggrieved by any judgment, decree, or sentence, pronounced by the said Bishop of Natal, or his successors, either in case of such review, or in any cause originally instituted before the said Bishop, or his successors, it shall be lawful for the said party to appeal to the said Lord Bishop of Cape Town, or his successors, who shall finally decide and determine the said appeal: Provided always, that in any such case of appeal or review, notice of the intention of the party to make such appeal, or demand such review, shall be given to the Bishop or subordinate judge by whom the sentence appealed from, or to be reviewed, shall have been pronounced, within fifteen days from the promulgation thereof.

And we do further will, and by these presents ordain, that in all cases in which an appeal shall be made, or review demanded, as aforesaid, a copy of the judgment or sentence in such case promulgated or given, setting forth the causes thereof, with a copy of the evidence on which the same was founded, shall, without delay, be certified and transmitted by such subordinate judge to the said Bishop, or his successors, or by the said Bishop, or his successors, to the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, as the case may require.

As Metropolitan I have been received by the Church of South Africa. For nine years I have exercised that office. All have acknowledged it. None have questioned it, until 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. Upon this point I do not think it needful to say more. If Dr. Colenso claims to be Bishop over the clergy and laity of this diocese, he can scarcely question my authority as Metropolitan over him. We derived our respective jurisdictions from precisely the same source, with this only difference,—that it was with his express concurrence and consent that I became his Metropolitan, but it was not with the expressed concurrence and consent of the clergy and laity of this diocese that he became its Bishop.

Relation of Civil Courts to the Tribunals of Religious Bodies.

It is, in my view, a matter of no great importance whether the Metropolitan and Bishop sit for the exercise of their judicial functions in a court clothed with the authority of law, or merely "*foro domestico*." In either case, the aid of the civil power might be needed to give effect to their decisions, if questions of property were involved.

I have never, in the exercise of discipline, affected to do more than to put in force a jurisdiction or authority over those who had voluntarily submitted themselves to that jurisdiction and authority. I have claimed the same right, but no greater, to administer the laws of this Church, whether in my capacity of 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, or than was conceded to the Church of the early ages by heathen Emperors, or is conceded to the Church in America in these days by the civil power. And this right has been acknowledged, as it could hardly fail to be, by the highest Court of Law in England. We are pronounced to be (Judgment of Privy Council, *Long v. Bishop of Cape Town*) "in the same situation with any other religious body; in no better, but in no worse position." They are allowed to exercise their laws in their own way, through their own

officers ; and it is conceded that we are entitled to do the same. The principles laid down by Lord Lyndhurst on this subject in the case of Dr. Warren, with regard to the Methodist community, are declared by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, "to be founded in good sense and justice, and established by the highest authority," and to be the principles to which our Courts of Law will "strictly adhere."

The language of that great Judge is as follows :—

*The district committee had a power to regulate their own proceedings. They had a power to do so ; and upon whether it was duly exercised or not I wish to give no opinion. Upon whether it was a discreet exercise of that power, I give no opinion ; but they exercise that power that no stranger should be present. They have authority to do that ; and that does not therefore render the proceedings illegal or invalid. It is again said that the publication * * * * was in reality not an offence ; not an offence entitling this body to exercise the jurisdiction ; and that it did not support the charges that were preferred against him, copies of which were handed to me. The evidence does not appear to have been gone into. I presume that was because he was absent and did not attend. Whether it did support those charges or not was a question for the district meeting. I have no jurisdiction with respect to it. A particular tribunal is established by the agreement of those parties to decide a question of this kind. I therefore have no authority to say whether, within the meaning of the rules of this Society, this pamphlet was or was not an offence ; that was peculiarly for the decision of the district committee. I therefore am of opinion, not only that the district committee had the power to suspend, but I am of opinion that they acted legally. I am not called upon to say more. Whether they acted wisely, discreetly, temperately, or harshly, these are matters with which I have no concern, and upon which I desire now to express no opinion. Therefore, upon these grounds merely, the regularity of the proceedings, and being satisfied of the authority of the body, I am bound to affirm the decision in this respect of the Vice-Chancellor.*

With our highest Court of Law, I believe that in these words are laid down true principles for the guidance of all Civil Courts with regard to all causes brought before them by members of religious bodies not established by law. They have only to inquire whether, according to the rules of a particular religious association, certain parties are entitled to sit in judgment upon certain causes. If they decide that they are, and there is no evidence of "mala fides," there the function of the Civil Court ends. If it proceed further, and inquires into the merits of a particular cause, more especially in matters relating to the faith, it invades religious liberty. It constitutes itself a judge on matters of which it is not entitled to take cognizance, and its assumption of such a right should, and wherever there is life in a Church would, be resisted.

To these principles the Civil Courts of America strictly

adhere, and there are, consequently, no collisions between religious bodies and civil authorities. In England, I may venture to observe that the establishment of the Church has so habituated the minds of civil judges to entertain ecclesiastical questions, and of the people generally to acquiesce in such a state of things, that there is some danger lest the Courts, when matters involving temporal rights are brought before them by religious bodies in the colonies, should overlook the fact that civil judges are not judges in ecclesiastical causes for non-established Churches, and while professing to adhere to the principles involved in Lord Lyndhurst's judgment, should gradually and insensibly set them aside, and thereby violate religious liberty. That ecclesiastical causes should be tried and decided by ecclesiastical judges, has been the law of the Church from the beginning. It is embodied in the Canons. Freedom in this matter was secured to the Church from which we have sprung by the provisions of Magna Charta. "*Liberâ sit Ecclesia habeatque sua jura libertatesque illæsas.*" The right is recognized in the preamble of the great Statute of Appeals, which is the foundation compact between the State and the Church of England at the Reformation. Its maintenance is essential to the independence and religious liberties of those voluntary religious associations which exist in the colonies, and has never been surrendered by them.

Upon this matter I should not have thought it necessary to say another word, had I not found that there are some members of the Church in this Diocese who are perplexed as to the true relation of the several offices of the Church to each other, and to the civil power. I therefore venture to put forward at some length what I believe to be our true status and position as a Church.

Our colonists, when they go forth from the motherland, carry with them all that it is possible under the circumstances, of the Church of their fathers. They are not, in the home of their adoption, the established Church of the country. They do not carry with them the Statute Law of England, by which the Church is established there. They 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 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, as it would seem, the *de facto* Patriarch of all Churches of the English communion.

Each of these possess in or over the Churches in our various dependencies the spiritual authority given to him by the Word of God, or by the Canons of the Church; and the Crown, by Letters Patent, assumes to grant external jurisdiction,—*i.e.*, coercive power, as distinguished from authority, to each of these offices in the Church, in exact accordance with the functions as defined by the Canons. There is thus secured by the Canons and by the Letters Patent, in cases of discipline, an appeal from the Bishop to the Metropolitan, from the Metropolitan to the Patriarch. In the case of Dr. Colenso, an appeal was allowed by the sentence to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as *de facto* Patriarch of the Church, because to him the Letters Patent seemed to assign authority over the Metropolitan, who was to exercise his office “subject to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and subordinate to the Archiepiscopal See of the Province of Canterbury.”

His Grace has informed me that no appeal has been lodged with him. I have been informed, however, that Dr. Colenso has written out to say, that he contemplates an appeal either to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, or to the Court of Queen’s Bench.

The Judicial Committee of Privy Council could not, and I feel assured would not, venture to entertain his appeal. That body is a Court of Appeal from the Supreme Courts in our Colonies, on matters involving civil rights. But the tribunal of the Metropolitan in a Colony is not a court known to the law, from which an appeal could lie. The late Bishop seems to have been advised that such is the case; but to hope that, by petition, Her Majesty the Queen might be induced to refer his case, by a stretch of the prerogative, to that body.

The Crown, however, is *intra leges*, not *ultra leges*; and its advisers are not likely to consent to an attempt to extend the jurisdiction of the Privy Council to persons and things not contemplated by the Act which gives that body its powers. Such a proceeding would be to constitute, by the sole act of the Crown, a new Court for the Churches in the Colonies; to assume powers over those Churches expressly taken from the Crown, as regards the Established

Church, by the Acts of 16 Car. I., cap. x., s. 3; 16 Car. I., cap. xi., s. 3; 1 Wm. & Mary, cap. ii., s. 36; in fact, to revive the Courts of Review, Star Chamber, and High Commission, with all their arbitrary powers; and thereby to adopt a course which would be destructive of the liberty of the subject.

But it may be asked,—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 his place in the House of Lords,) it has been so; and 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. It is, however, only for the Establishment, and purely because it is an Establishment, with its whole status defined by statute law, that it is a Court of Appeal at all. With it, the non-established Churches of the Colonies have absolutely no concern.

To the Court of Queen's Bench Dr. Colenso can undoubtedly appeal, if he should see fit; not against the sentence of the Metropolitan, but against any persons who may withhold funds from him to which he many think himself entitled. With questions of property the sentence of deposition does not directly interfere. It simply pronounces the Bishop to have erred from the Faith, and to be deposed from his spiritual office. With that sentence the Court of Queen's Bench could not, and would not, interfere. It might give, or it might withhold, lands or monies; that is within its jurisdiction. I have no fear that it would deprive the living Church in this land, which means to abide in the faith of Christ, of endowments given by myself, and by others whom I have induced to provide them; but if it did, we should but be in the position of the Church for the first three hundred years of its existence, not only unsupported but persecuted by the world; with the right, however, still allowed to us, of placing true and faithful pastors over that portion of the flock that resolved to abide in the faith of Christ.*

* I add the following note, in the hope that it may relieve the anxieties of some who have spoken to me on the subject. The fear is expressed

Bishop Colenso's Trial and Condemnation.

I have touched upon these points here, my brethren, because they bear closely on the sad subject, which, on this occasion, will be uppermost in your thoughts,—the trial and condemnation of your Bishop.

Upon the grounds of that condemnation you will not expect me here to enter. They are given fully in my judgment, copies of which I have placed at your disposal.

Sufficient it will be to observe, that the painful duty which I have discharged has been deemed unavoidable by the Bishops of this Province, as well as by the whole Episcopate of the Church; and that the condemnation and deprivation were agreed upon in our Provincial Synod before sentence was pronounced in open Court.

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, 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 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 this 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. And next, it would thereby declare that the Church in this Colony, which is a branch of the oldest corporation in 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. But if it did, it could 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.

The Church in this present case dare not leave the flock to be devoured by the wolf. It would betray Christ. It would forfeit, and deservedly forfeit, His presence and blessing if it did. 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.

Dr. Colenso's Writings.

I must not, however, forget that I have solemn responsibilities towards this portion of the South African Church beyond those which I have fulfilled as Judge. Speaking to you, as I do to-day, in this Cathedral Church, as Metropolitan Bishop on visitation, at such a time as this, I am bound most solemnly and earnestly to warn you, and through you the whole flock of Christ in this land, against the writings of which a portion only have been formally condemned. For it would be mischievous indeed were it to be imagined that the Bishops of this Province, in reviewing the works which have been brought under their consideration, meant to imply that they were sound and orthodox, with the exception only of the passages which were submitted to them for judgment.

Unhappily, Dr. Colenso has expressed himself on many other points, besides those on which distinct charges were brought against him, in a way to shock the minds and sadden the hearts of many of his brethren. It is with reluctance, and only from a sense of duty to yourselves, that I allude further to the subject.

The questions which have really been raised by these writings are nothing less than these—Have we a written Revelation or not? Is our Lord, God Incarnate? Is Christianity true? This is strong language; you will see as I proceed that it is not too strong.

I understand Dr. Colenso to affirm, that there is a light within a man—within every man—by which he can try, and ought to try, the very words of our Lord Himself, whether they teach truth or not. “By that light,” he says, “the words recorded to have been uttered by our Lord Himself must all be tried.”

He supposes that there is an infallible guide to truth, an unerring capacity to test truth, in every man—a gift, or an instinct—by which he can, not merely interpret Scripture so as to be certain that he has arrived at the true meaning of it, but try Scripture itself, whether it is to be believed or not, whether it teaches truth or falsehood,—and this apparently upon any and every subject; for he expressly says that “every question of morals or of faith is to be brought before it for judgment.” And this upon the ground that “the voice of the inner witness is closer to him than any that can reach him from without, and ought

to reign supreme in his whole being. 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." (Comm. P. 188, ch. viii., 18—23). What is this but to place man's mind above God's Holy Word—human reason above Divine revelation? On this view man is the standard of truth to himself. That is truth which seems to a man to be truth. There is no external standard by which to measure it. Each man is to try it by the inner light. If of two men, one believes our Lord to be God Incarnate, another believes him not so to be—the contradictories are apparently both true. In other words, there is no such thing as external, objective truth, outside a man, which all ought to believe. There is no such thing as positive truth; it has no existence. If it is not received, it is not truth. The truth is a lie, and a lie is the truth. This really is the logical result of the system of this new teacher; and this is the fanaticism of unbelief.

Reason and Faith.

Our God has given us many great and precious gifts,—gifts which we have marred and abused. Amongst the highest of His natural gifts and endowments is Reason, which has its place in matters relating to God and revealed religion. It is the office of reason to examine the grounds, to weigh the evidence, of there 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, and the Divine mission of our Lord. When the Saviour sent back the messengers of John Baptist, who came to ask him, "Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?" and bade them report to their master how "the blind received their sight, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the dead were raised,"—he appealed to their reason. They were to judge whether these things did not furnish sufficient evidence of His being the Messiah.

When the understanding is convinced that the Bible is the record of 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. Here is the turning point between faith and unbelief. Faith embraces things shown to be true, whether

reason can comprehend them or not. Unbelief rejects what does not commend itself to the individual mind. The disciples who were offended, and walked no more with Jesus, saying, "How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat?" brought reason to bear on a subject matter which was beyond it, and was within the province of faith. The Apostles who continued to follow our Lord, though they understood not His teaching better than those who forsook Him, because His miracles proved that He was the Christ, the Son of God,—were guided by reason on matters within the province of Reason; and by Faith on matters within its province.

In man, however, *the Will* is often stronger than reason,—overpowers and masters it,—leads it captive. It was in vain that our Lord appealed by miracle to the reason of the Priests and Pharisees. They willed not to believe, and closed their ears against all such appeals. It is to the want of will that He attributes unbelief,—“Ye will not come to me that ye might have life.”

Reason, then, has its place as a guide to God, and the things of God; but it is not an unerring guide. It is the channel through which Divine truth is conveyed to the soul; but it is imperfect in all. In many it is most dull and feeble. And God has no where told us that it is, by itself, a sufficient guide to Him, and His truth and will. On the contrary, he has shown us to what depths man, left to his own unaided reason, has fallen; and all the history of the past, and the present condition of the heathen world, too sadly testifies to the truth of the picture: “They became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened, professing themselves to be wise they became fools;” they “changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever.” “They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.”

In truth, however, it is not reason that Dr. Colenso so extravagantly exalts. Reason would teach him to weigh the external evidence which proves the Scriptures to have come from God. No where does he do this. He slights and disregards this kind of evidence. It is not reason that he follows, but what he calls the “inner witness,” “the light of the Divine Word,” “the voice of His Lord.”

With many other unbelievers, he is purely a fanatic. His system is a false mysticism, based upon assumption. It is Divine illumination he claims for himself and others,—for the heathen, it would seem, quite as much as for the Christian,—for it is not to any special gift of the Spirit in consequence of our Lord's promise that he lays claim. What he asserts for himself, and apparently for "every living man," is that he has within him a light and a voice which are infallible, "an unction from the Holy One to guide him unto all truth." "The light in which he sees light, the voice which he hears, is the light of the Divine Word, is the voice of his Lord."

What he strives with all his might to do, is to break down the authority of the Bible as a written Revelation; and he does this by claiming for man in his natural state a higher enlightenment than was vouchsafed to the writers of the Bible, even on matters of "faith and morals," which places him above them, and above the written word. "We are not," he says, "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."

He says, indeed, that God's word is in the Bible, but he does not point out what part of it is God's word, and what not. He does not provide any certain guide to this, any test whereby to try it. On the contrary, he claims for each man the right to decide for himself how much or how little of it is God's Word. One man may believe the whole to be so, with the Church of Christ in every age. Apparently, in Dr. Colenso's view, he is the only one in the wrong. Others may reject this portion or that. They may differ greatly as to what they reject and what they receive. One may repudiate the very parts which another regards as specially Divine. And each does it by the "voice which he hears within," which is "the light of the Divine Word," "the voice of his Lord." When it is objected to him that language like this "constitutes each individual the judge to decide what *is* the Word of God, and what is not," he boldly replies, "no doubt it does, the responsibility *must* lie on every living man to know when

he feels in his heart the penetrating force of God's living Word * * * * to know when he *hears* the word of God, that he may receive it and obey it." (Part iv., 297—8). So that what, to use a homely phrase, does not come home to him as God's Word, does not appear to his inner man to be such, may be, and ought to be rejected, for it does not come from God. And "every living man," however ignorant or incompetent, is to try any and every portion of God's Holy Word by this most delusive test.

Is it possible that one who puts forward such views can believe in a written Revelation of God's truth and will? If God has revealed Himself in His Word, as the writer still professes to believe, that word is above him, not he above it. It *is* to him an "infallible external guide." Man is not left to the uncertainty and darkness of his poor fallible reason. God speaks to him through His Word, and he must bow himself reverently before Him.

The real question between the Church and this her fallen son is, whether what the Scriptures proclaim as to faith and duty is a Revelation from God, is to be received by every man as such or not. He has not told us what residuum of truth there is in the Bible,—what is to be believed, and what is not; but he has intimated to us that we may sit in judgment upon the very words of Him whom he still professes to regard as God Incarnate.

But this is not the only question at issue between Dr. Colenso and the Church. The reality of the Incarnation itself, notwithstanding his assertion that he still retains his belief in it, is really denied by him. Nothing can be clearer than that our Lord stamps the Old Testament, and especially the Pentateuch, with His authority as Divine. Take one passage alone as evidence of this. On the very day of His Resurrection,—“that same day,” St. Luke says—He thus addressed two of His disciples: “O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, He expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.”

Now these words were spoken to men who had the Old Testament in their hands, just as we have it, by the Saviour, immediately after God, by the stupendous miracle of the Resurrection, had set His seal to the truth of His mission and His words.

If the Scriptures of the Old Testament are not Divine, our Lord either knowingly deceived others, or was Himself deceived. If He was raised from the dead by the power of God the Father; if He were Himself God, who had taken man's nature into the Godhead, He could neither deceive nor be deceived.

Compelled to make a choice by this dilemma, and not being willing to surrender his own speculations, and acknowledge that,—whatever might be the seeming difficulties and obscurities in the oldest book in the world, arising, to a very great extent, from the brevity with which it relates events, and possibly from errors in the text, which, from from multiplied transcriptions, may have crept in, but which are of no great moment,—it is, as a whole, God's Word; he challenges the knowledge of his Divine Master,—assumes to himself a superiority over him,—sets his Lord right on matters on which he pronounces him to have been in error,—classes Him, the Eternal Word, with other devout Jews of the day, thinks it no blasphemy to doubt whether He was not as ignorant as they, and far more ignorant than Dr. Colenso himself. "It is not to be supposed," he says (Pref. Part I.), "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."

And this is He whom the writer professes still to regard as "God manifest in the flesh,"—the everlasting Son of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God,—who came down from Heaven, and took our nature in the Godhead.

Upon the heresy of these awful and profane words I do not here dwell, because I am sure that you are shocked and pained by it, and because I have gone into the subject in my judgment, which is in your hands; but I cannot refrain from pointing out to you how destructive it is of the whole of Christianity. The Christian Faith is derived wholly from Christ,—rests altogether upon him. He is the source of it. If it proceeds from a fallible being—from one so liable to error as to be corrected by Dr. Colenso, upon so grave a point as whether the earlier part of the Revealed Word, which is bound up with all the rest, came from God, or did not,—what is it worth? What claims has it to our devout

and reverent acceptance? If our Lord was incompetent, mistaken, in error, all that derives its authority in any way from Him may be equally mistaken and unworthy of credit. If He were not infallible, how can the Scriptures of the New Testament be the certain repository of Divine Truth? If the Church was not in its earliest days the pillar and ground of the truth, how could it ever be? Of what value, if the Saviour's words are not to be trusted, is His promise that He would, when He ascended up on high, send down upon it the Spirit of Truth, to guide it unto all truth? or that He Himself would be with it always, even unto the end of the world? If we may neither look to our Incarnate God, nor to His written word, nor to the Church, guided, inhabited, by the Spirit,—to what can we look? Is all dreamy uncertainty—are we still at sea without a compass, as to matters of deepest moment to us?

You have heard the answer, and to what it leads. Man's spirit is the ultimate judge before whose bar all that claims to be Revelation must be brought. - He is to be a guide,—a Revelation to himself. One man may believe that the letter of the Bible is the "revealed word of God;" another's conscience may bind him to the "dicta of the Church." Both are wrong. "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," we are to "judge for ourselves whether this or that portion of the Bible has a message to our souls or not," "though a thousand texts of Scripture should be against us." (Comm. 187—8.)

Your late Bishop's theories, my brethren, are destructive of all Revelation,—of Christianity itself; and they have not been put forward with that modesty and reverence which a good man should have felt in dealing with a book which, for thousands of years, Jew and Gentile have alike believed to be the Word of God,—but with that reckless arrogance which marked the infidels of the preceding century. There has been no careful balancing of opposing arguments,—no fair appreciation of the weight of external testimony against his speculations; scarce a word of reply to those who have exposed his many errors, but one strain of self-complacent triumph over the success of his performances,—the vigor of his assaults upon the faith of Christendom. But upon these points I will not dwell, further than to observe that while all would have felt sym-

pathy for a mind oppressed with difficulties which it could not surmount, and seeking earnestly to know the truth, they cannot but be repelled by the language of the boaster and the scorner. It is for the publication of works subversive of the Christian religion that he has been tried and condemned; and you will, I am sure, feel with me that no other course was open to the Church but to depose him from an office which ought long since to have been freely surrendered by himself.

How far he may yet go I know not. One who regards his own dim perceptions as "the light of the Divine Word, as the voice of his Lord,"—may follow wherever his distempered imagination may lead him. Already, though he seems scarce conscious of it, his religious standing ground appears to be that of pure Deism, and whether he will rest there none can say, for he has thrown from him all objective truth, derived from an external infallible Revelation,—and is, as we have seen, really his own revelation,—a law unto himself. There is a downward tendency in each successive publication. How one who still believed in Christ at all could have written the closing paragraph of his second part on the Pentateuch, is to me incomprehensible. He there expresses a hope, not that "the Hebrew race," "shaking off the superstitious belief of ages," shall believe in Christ, and embrace him whom they have too long disowned, for their Lord and Saviour, not this, but "yield to the demands of modern science, and give up the story of the Pentateuch," and then, manifestly without embracing the faith of Christ, "may missionaries of their race go forth, as well as ours, far and wide, as *heralds of Salvation*, proclaiming with free utterance the name of the living God," (not the faith which is in Christ Jesus also,—not that "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace." This forms no part of the message of the mission. It is wholly unnecessary, if not untrue)—but only "the name of the living God, whom their fathers knew and worshipped, telling the nations of His grace, His truth, His righteousness."

Could one who had not really, if unconsciously, abandoned Christianity have written thus? What, a Christian Bishop invites the Jew—not to believe that the Scriptures of the New Testament, and the Saviour whom they reveal, are worthy of all acceptance—but to cast off his belief in

the Old Testament as a superstition, and then go forth with him—the man who regards the Christ as an impostor and deceiver, with the man who believes him to be his Incarnate God, the Saviour of the World, and has bound himself by the most solemn oaths to witness to the world of Him—as joint heralds of salvation; proclaiming in the ears of a listening world, not the Gospel, but a re-publication of natural religion; the being, unity, love, majesty of God,—not the Incarnation of the Son of God, which the Jew abhors still, and denounces as a lie—not the Love of the Atonement, upon which he pours contempt—but that only which the Jew, who has rejected Christianity, has believed all along and believes to this hour.

The world has never seen a sadder sight than this. A Christian Bishop, not building up and seeking to enlarge the faith of the Jew,—not leading him on through the study of his own Scriptures, to Christ, of whom they are full; but seeking to destroy his faith in those Scriptures through which alone, humanly speaking, he can be led to discern the Christ. Alas! that Jews and even Mahomedans should have had occasion to vindicate, as they have done, the authenticity and inspiration of the Word of God against the unbelieving assaults of a Bishop of the Church of Christ.

I have said that in each succeeding publication there are traces of a wider departure from the faith. In his 3rd Part (Pref., p. 4) he shows as little respect for the New Testament as for the Old. He says: “If there is any part of the Church’s teaching depending on the New Testament which will not bear the test of truth (you will remember what is *his* test of truth—the approbation of the inner light—the voice of God within every man—the unction from the Holy One which is to guide him into all truth) we shall, of course, as servants of the God of Truth, be bound to reject that also.” “Every living man” is at liberty to do this, nay is “bound to do it.”

Again (page 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, 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.

In his 4th Part (Preface, xiii.), after having spoken contemptuously of the Creeds, which express the faith of all Christendom from the commencement of Christianity to the present hour,—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, he proceeds (page xxx.) to give us the views of himself and other "men of learning and science" with regard to Revelation: "They believe that God reveals himself to the spirit of man; though they do not suppose His revelation of Himself is confined to one nation, or *one set of books*. There is, in our days, a general acceptance of the highest and deepest truths as revelations in themselves, the communication of the Divine Being to His children, without a slavish adherence to the forms in which they have appeared, or to the authoritative ecclesiastical system of doctrine to which some would limit their existence for us."

First, we have it here affirmed that the Bible is not the exclusive record of God's Revelation. There are other "books" which contain revelations. I know not what the books are to which he alludes; whether we are to understand him to mean the Koran, or the sacred books of the heathen, or the writings of men of genius,—Milton, Shakspeare. At all events, the Bible is not classed above other books, which Christians have ever regarded as of purely human composition.

Next, there is a claim put in in behalf of modern science to be a revelation from God, and this claim is repeated elsewhere still more strongly (pp. 299, 300). While "our religious duty" is now "not any longer to receive" the Pentateuch as the Word of God, it binds us "to be ready to receive, with devout faith and humble adoration, that wondrous Revelation of Himself, which God is manifestly making in these our days, by giving us the glorious light of Modern Science,—which that light displays to us;" and

it is suggested that, in place of their present teaching, consisting of the "dry routine of dogmas, or the stereotyped improvements of Scripture texts," the clergy "should bring before their flocks freely" * * * * * "the views which the great scientific discoveries of our own time unfold to us."

Lastly, we are to get rid of "formal dogmatical theological teaching" (p. xxxiv), that "slavish adherence to form," and to the "authoritative ecclesiastical system of doctrine," *i.e.*, the Creeds, in which have been handed down to us from the first ages, "the Faith once for all delivered to the saints," in "the form of sound words."

All positive, definite statements with regard to those truths which the whole Church of Christ has ever received, believed, taught, as the faith which God has revealed, and which all who would be saved must believe, must be thrown from us as worn out, obsolete, false symbols of the true faith, that man may soar up, unfettered by such clogs into the sublimer regions of science, and take counsel only, as to the things of God, with "the voice within, the light Divine, the unction from the Holy One, which will guide them into all truth."

But as he proceeds he goes further still than this. He insinuates that not Apostles only, but the Lord himself, borrowed His language, ideas, truths which He announced, from an Apocryphal writing. He gives us the choice of believing either that our Lord's words were not spoken by Him, were not correctly given, and therefore that we cannot trust what the Scriptures report as delivered by Him; or else that His teaching was at least in part derived from the book of Enoch, an acknowledged spurious work. (Part iv., page 323). "*In the language,*" he says, "*attributed to our Lord Himself,*—in that of St. Paul, especially in his *early* Epistles, or that of St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude,—we can distinctly trace an intimate acquaintance with it, and recognise its form of expression;" and he adds—"The writers of these Scriptures * * * * * appear to have been all acquainted with this book, and more or less imbued with its teaching." To it we are indebted, he tells us, for a portion of that which we have hitherto believed to be part of the Christian faith; for "it must have exercised considerable influence upon the minds of devout persons in the first age of Christianity, and must have helped to fashion many of the ideas which prevailed

at that time, especially as regards the popular conceptions about hell, and the endless torment of the wicked." (Page 314). "Especially it deserves notice that almost all the language of the New Testament, in which the judgment of the last day is described, appears to have been directly derived from its language," (page 325), and being such, "the fact" (as he says) "is of great importance," and the words, therefore, of our Lord, and of his Apostles, were "popular expressions" * * * * and "must be interpreted according to their general spirit, and not be pressed too far in literal meaning." (Page 326). We must not, therefore, suppose that "they are meant to convey to us accurate information about the details of the invisible world." (Page 327).

What is left to us? Apostles' words cannot be trusted as conveying to us the sure truth of a Revelation from God. The words attributed to our Lord, whether spoken by Him or not, are not all to be received as coming certainly from a Divine source. We must try His words, as those of His Apostles, by the inner light,—the voice of God within us; but we may congratulate ourselves that we have still left to us (page 303) "our modern Christianity," "developed by degrees" "by the quickening influence of the Spirit of Grace," out of "the Gospel of Jesus Christ," not, however, without contributions from the gifts bestowed on other portions of the great human family,—to be developed, I presume, still further into a newer and more spiritual creed by our modern unbelievers.

Upon these awful writings you will not expect me here to dwell further, nor indeed is it needful; but you will, I am assured, feel that on such an occasion as the present it was my duty to refer to them; and earnestly warn the flock against their impiety. The earlier portions of these criticisms on the word of God, which, from their startling nature, and the high office in the Church of Christ of him who hazarded them, excited general attention,—have been met and exposed by not less than seventy writers, in publications of, I need scarce say, very different degrees of merit. How far it is possible, or worth while, to follow a writer who pours forth his objections with such rapidity, and so voluminously, borrowing for the purpose from all sources of German infidelity, must depend upon circumstances. 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. For it may be, perhaps rather I should say it always will be, that in the Word of God there will continue to exist, “things hard to be understood, which they that are unstable, will wrest to their own destruction.”

Difficulties and obscurities there are. As knowledge advances, however, old difficulties are removed, as has been remarkably the case of late with the history of the Bible; but from the same cause new difficulties are discovered, as may be the case, in connection with our present stage of scientific inquiry. But the difficulties of past ages are not difficulties to us, and ours will be made clear to succeeding generations. It may be that these are allowed to arise for the trial of our faith,—and to lead our thoughts to the earnest and reverent study of the Written Word, which is even now, with all the attention which is drawn to it, too much overlooked by us; but which, if all were smooth and easy, and no assault were made upon it, would incur great risk of being altogether forgotten by us.

Present Duties.

Let me next turn to the consideration of our present duties and responsibilities. You are aware that the Bishops of this Province, assembled in Synod, declared—“That this Synod is of opinion that, should the Bishop of Natal presume to exercise episcopal functions in the Diocese of Natal, after the sentence of the Metropolitan shall have been notified to him, without an appeal to Canterbury, and without being restored to his office by the Metropolitan, he will be *ipso facto* excommunicate; and that it will be the duty of the Metropolitan, after due admonition, to pronounce the formal sentence of excommunication.”

It is due to you that I should state the grounds upon

which we came to this painful conclusion. We deemed this to be our duty, because it was the course marked out for us by our Lord in such cases, practised by His Apostles, confirmed by the very earliest Canons of the Church, as well as by our own Canons.

The command of our Lord is conclusive on such a matter. We are bound to do what He declares to be the duty of the Church. His injunction is, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him of his fault between him and thee alone; if he shall hear thee, thou has gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

The spirit of this command has, I believe, been acted up to in this case. Amongst yourselves, brethren, there are those who have privately pleaded with your Bishop, and sought to convince him. Upon the appearance of his first work, assailing the faith through his commentary, I wrote a letter, earnestly entreating him 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 there 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.

Then came the appeal to him from the Bishops, resolved upon at an assembly of all the English, Irish, and Colonial Bishops, summoned by the Archbishop of Canterbury, calling upon him to resign a post which he could no longer with honor fill. Then, upon his refusal to resign, their inhibition of him. And last of all, the charges brought against him by the Clergy of this Province, the trial, and the condemnation.

Time was allowed for the Bishop to consider his position, and to withdraw, if he saw fit, the teaching which, I may truly say, not I alone, but the whole Church, has condemned.

All, however, has been in vain. He perseveres in maintaining and propagating heresies, greater and more numerous than have ever been imputed to a Bishop before; and he has publicly declared that he will treat all spiritual sentences of the Church as a nullity, and attempt to resume the exercise of sacred functions and government over the Church of God, without renouncing his errors, and without being restored, either by the Metropolitan or the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Should he carry this threat into execution, not only will the clergy and the faithful laity stand aloof from him, and hold no communion with him; but all other methods having failed, it will be the duty of the Church to fulfil her Lord's command, and separate, by solemn and open sentence from the communion of the faithful, one who in spirit and belief has already separated himself from them.

We are bound to this by that command of Christ, the Head of the Church, to which I have already referred;—by the command of His Holy Apostles;—and by the Canons of the Church. “A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject” (Titus iii., 11), is the injunction of God's Word. “There be some that trouble you,” says St. Paul to the Galatians, “and would pervert the Gospel of Christ; but though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other Gospel to you than that ye have received, let him be accursed” (Gal. i., 7—10).

“If any Bishops, Presbyter, or Deacon,” say the Apostolical Canons (Canon 28), “having been justly deposed

upon open accusation, shall dare to meddle with any of the Divine offices which have been entrusted to him, let him be altogether cut off from the Church."

"If any Bishop," say the Canons of Antioch (iv.), which have been received into the code of the Universal Church, and were confirmed by the General Council of Chalcedon, and form part of the Canon Law of the English Church, "If any Bishop being deposed in Synod * * * * shall dare to perform any part of the Divine service * * * * he shall no longer be allowed to do so, nor shall he have any hope of restoration or defence in another Synod; moreover, all those who communicate with him shall be cast out of the Church."

This was the course adopted by Archbishop Tension when he deposed Bishop Watson. Bishop Watson appealed in vain in succession to the Court of Delegates, the Court of Queen's Bench, and the House of Lords. His case was a complicated one. The Archbishop's sentence deprived him of his peerage. He was warned, under the penalty of the greater excommunication, not to resume the exercise of spiritual functions within his diocese. He was afterwards excommunicated.

The Past Career of Bishop Colenso.

I need not say, brethren, that it is with the deepest distress that I have felt compelled to speak as I have done, of one once a brother beloved in the Lord, with whom I have taken earnest counsel as to the things to be done for the advancement, in this land, of that faith and Kingdom of Christ, of which he now seeks the overthrow.

A noble field lay before him when called to the Episcopate. The Church was planted here in its completeness almost from the foundation of the Colony. All, or nearly all, welcomed the arrival of its Bishop. The European population, at least equal in character, education, and zeal, to that within any other British Colony, were ready to exert themselves to provide means of grace for themselves. The soil was one in which the Church might have struck deep her root. One hundred and fifty thousand heathen in this small diocese were without the fold of Christ, waiting, as I deem, if any in this land of Africa, the call to enter in. Beyond it were many hundred thousand more. Upon the work to which he was called, I bear him willing

record, the Bishop entered with hearty zeal, and, I believe, with love and loyalty to Christ. Had he persevered,—had there been no falling away, first in his own soul, from the faith of Christ,—there had been now around you the fruits of his energy and zeal,—a sufficient staff of faithful clergy—multiplied missions,—churches,—schools. 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. 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 a 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 amongst 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.

Your Bishop's declension from the faith was felt first, my reverend brethren, by yourselves, as was natural. It is due to those amongst you who drew my attention to it years ago, to say, that I now perceive that there were stronger grounds for your apprehension than I was willing to believe at the time. I do not, however, regret the refusal to entertain your several presentations. It is well that we should be slow to believe, in days when men are made "offenders for a word," that there is ground for misgiving; and the delays which have occurred, and the rejection of previous

charges, will serve at least to show that, in this case, there has been patience and forbearance as long as it was possible that there should be.

Persecution.

It has, indeed, been said by some,—Why persecute a man for his opinions?—why make a martyr of him? Ought not, in these days, every man to be left to hold and teach what he believes to be truth? However true these remarks are in the abstract, as regards private individuals, they do not apply in this case. Persecution is abhorrent to the mind of all who love freedom. We are all agreed upon this. Men must have liberty to disbelieve, if they are inclined to unbelief. But this is not the question here. What we have to consider is, whether one who undertook an office of great trust and dignity, and received the emoluments thereof, upon a distinct understanding that he would teach certain things which the Church who commissioned him deemed to be of the very deepest importance as regards God's glory, the truth of Christ, the salvation of man,—her own life and being as a Church,—is to be allowed, now that he has changed his mind, and holds and teaches the very opposite to that which he undertook to teach, and at first did teach—to retain his position in the Church of God, and to enjoy the emoluments of his abused office and violated trust?

The change that has taken place in your late Bishop's mind is not a light one. It affects not minute points of opinion. It extends to the whole faith of Christ. It touches almost every question of unbelief. The Church's first office is to witness for Christ and His Truth. If she allowed her teachers to proclaim widely different views on all the great mysteries of the faith, she could have no faith herself. She would cease to be a witness. She would herself have fallen from the faith. She could not impress mankind, or win the world to Christ. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

Let us look at the circumstances in this particular case. 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.

The Church holds that Christ died to reconcile His Father to us. Dr. Colenso says that He did not.

The Church says that faith in Christ is needful to man's justification before God. Dr. Colenso says that it is not—that all men everywhere are justified.

The Church affirms that the Sacraments are generally necessary to salvation. Dr. Colenso teaches that they are not.

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.

The Church teaches that our Blessed Lord was God Incarnate;—That the Son took man's nature into the Godhead:—That Christ, in one person, was God and Man.

Dr. Colenso, while professing to admit this truth, implicitly denies it, by charging the God-Man with ignorance and error. How could the Church, without forfeiting her title to be a Church, through ceasing to witness for Christ and his truth, allow such wholly different teaching to be proclaimed in her name, and with her authority? She has no wish unduly to interfere with Dr. Colenso's liberty of thought, or teaching; but she says, that if he teaches directly contrary to what she 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,—he shall not do so in her name, or as a Bishop of the Church. He must do it outside the Church, not in communion with it. She cannot abandon the faith, because he has abandoned it. She cannot—because he has changed his mind, while she has not changed hers,—cease to witness as a Church for Christ, and for the truth; which she would do, by allowing him to continue as one of her representatives in her high places. Nor is this the only ground upon which she is constrained to deprive him of his office. The office of a Bishop is not merely that of a teacher. It involves government over the Church of God. He is a ruler over others. Can the Church allow one whom she has declared to have fallen into heresy, to be ruler over a body of faithful, orthodox clergy?—to enter their Churches when he pleases; proclaim from their pulpits, to their flocks, doctrines, upon fundamental points, the very opposite to those which they are teaching day by day; and

which both he and they have sworn that they will banish and drive away from the Church of God? Is a body of faithful clergy thus to be oppressed;—tyrannized over, for it comes to that, by one with whom they cannot hold communion without being unfaithful to their Lord,—driven out of the Church; and the Church itself ruined and destroyed?

Has the flock itself no rights in the matter? Are congregations to be 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? Are they to behold their Bishop ordaining men, and sending them forth in the name of Christ and his Church, to instil the poison of unbelief into the minds of their children, and their children's children,—and all under the plea of preserving the liberty of teaching? There is such a thing as the Truth of God,—“the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints,”—or there is not. If there be, it must be held, maintained, clung to, with the tenacity of men struggling for that which is more precious than life.

We hold that there is that truth,—that the Church has had it transmitted to her keeping, and cannot part with it without apostacy. And we are no less sure that your late Bishop, led captive of the evil one, has parted with it, and now seeks to destroy that faith which once he upheld. If the Church were willing to keep him company, and part with it too, she would un-Church herself,—cease to be a Church. She would be a dead branch of the living vine—would wither away—die out. She would be destroyed, and ought to be destroyed.

Our True Standing Ground.

Assaults upon the Faith, my brethren, like that to which we have been of late, and still are exposed, should lead all to consider upon what foundation their faith rests,—what grounds they have for confidence that it is the truth on which they stand.

I ought, perhaps, at such a time as this, to set before you what I hold to be the standing ground of our own branch of the Church, but I can only do so briefly and imperfectly.

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. If this be granted, our Lord died, rose again, ascended, promised before His ascension that He would send upon His Church the Spirit of Truth, who should guide it into all truth; did actually send down upon it the gift of the Holy Ghost. If the whole of Scripture were to perish, these facts would remain as facts in history. Out of them, nay, out of the simple truth of the Resurrection, is evolved the whole Christian scheme. If God raised Christ from the dead, He set His seal to the truth of our Lord's claims to have come forth from God,—to the truth of all that He did and said. But He promised supernatural gifts to His Church,—a Divine presence and a Divine guidance. The Divine presence was vouchsafed on the “very same day” on which He rose. In the “evening” He breathed on His assembled Apostles, and “saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” John xx. 19, 22. The Divine guidance was vouchsafed through the Penticostal gifts. Under its direction, the Scriptures were written. Under the promised help of the Spirit, the Church was guided by a Divine instinct (which Dr. Colenso claims for each individual of the human race, but which belongs only to the body of Christ) to distinguish between what was the Word of God and what was not.

If our Lord's words are to be believed, the Church was imbued, inhabited, filled by the Holy Ghost. It could say without blasphemy, “it seemed ~~God~~ to the Holy Ghost and to us.”

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.

We believe the Church to have acted under the impulse of the Divine Spirit, because our Lord promised that so it should be.

We believe our Lord's word, because God raised Him from the dead. On the very same grounds, we believe the Creed to be the true interpretation of the Word on all essential points. It was framed by the Church under the same guidance, vouchsafed in consequence of the same promises.

The Resurrection of our Lord is thus the truth on which Christianity and the Church depend. "If Christ be not raised from the dead, your faith is vain," ye are yet in your sins. But if He be risen, then does all that He taught, and that the Church holds and teaches, follow as a necessary consequence.

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.

Here is the Churchman's standing ground. 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. He who takes his stand upon the Church's principle, builds upon a foundation which cannot be shaken. He equally rejects the modern Roman corruptions of, and additions to, the faith, and the still more modern cavils of the sceptic and unbeliever.

If it be asked,—on what ground the Thirty-nine Articles were added, and in what light they are to be regarded? I reply that, to a large extent, they are a re-assertion of the Catholic Faith, called in question, on one side or the other, at a period of great religious excitement; and that, where this is not the case, they are the Church's protest against grave errors and mistakes, on matters rather of "opinion" than of "faith," at the period of the Reformation.

The Future.

And now, my brethren, one word as to the future.

This is a widowed diocese. The whole flock is without its pastor. The clergy without their guide, counsellor, friend. The Church without its ruler. What are our present common responsibilities? The duty of my office compels me, *sede vacante*, to take charge of this diocese. I have come amongst you for the express purpose of doing so. During the vacancy, the clergy will look to me for instructions as to all points of duty. They will hold themselves responsible to me. It is my earnest desire, my reverend brethren, to render you every assistance in my power, to share your anxieties and labors. to counsel you,

and, so far as in me lies, to strengthen your hands in the discharge of the duties of our common ministry.

It will not be long, I trust, before another shall be appointed in the room of him who has fallen from the Faith, to fill his vacant seat, and witness for Christ and for the Faith in this land. "His Bishopric shall another take," is the Spirit's rule for the Church in every age.

But should there be delay, as, in circumstances which are, happily, of so novel a character, and in which so many, and such complicated interests are concerned, may possibly be the case, I shall hold myself in readiness to visit you again, if my other duties will admit of my so doing.

Meantime, until another Bishop shall be consecrated, I have appointed the Very Reverend the Dean to act as Vicar General. And I may add, that I have asked J. W. Turnbull, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, to act as Registrar; and have placed in his hands the formal withdrawal of the power of attorney under which the late Bishop administered the property of this Church vested in the See of Cape Town.

In conclusion, suffer me, my reverend brethren, to set before you, what, amidst your present trials and anxieties is your duty.

To you, and to your conduct in this post, and at this hour of danger, the whole Church of Christ is looking,—for you it is praying; nay, from His throne in Heaven, your Lord looks down and notes how each of His servants comports himself at this crisis in the history of His Church. God be praised! ye are yourselves true and faithful to your Lord. It is a ground of deep thankfulness, that not one clergyman holding a spiritual office, in the whole Province, —throughout this Church in South Africa,—has been led astray from the faith of Christ by the false teaching that has been put forth.

But of you, my brethren, more is expected than this. It is your high privilege, if ye so will, to be Christ's living witnesses in the land in which your lot is cast;—to stand up for Him and for His truth,—for the living Word of God, and for the written Word of God,—against him who has forsaken both. Your trial is far less than His saints have endured in other days. Ye are not called to "resist unto blood, striving against sin." Ye are in no danger of bonds, or imprisonment, or death. Nay, the world, or all that would be respectable in the world, ignorant and careless

though some be,—all but the scoffer and the unbeliever, —avowedly are on God's side.

And the assault upon the Faith, on the part of him who was set over you in the Lord, has not come, as it might have come, in some subtle form, calculated to deceive even the very elect, and requiring the keen and practised eye of the theologian to detect; but it has come in the bare and naked form of a direct assault upon the foundation of all Revelation and of all Faith, to which even the unlearned cannot altogether shut his eyes.

Your first duty, my reverend brethren, is to witness, in this land of your adoption, for Christ, and for the Faith, once and once for all delivered. My charge to you is to stand fast in the faith,—to quit you like men,—to uphold, teach, maintain the good deposit which ye have received, and to hand it on unimpaired to those that shall come after.

This The first, and next,—to regard this sad falling-away of your Bishop, as a solemn call from God to watch more earnestly, lovingly, devotedly, over that portion of the flock which the Chief Shepherd has entrusted to your keeping. Labor amongst them in season and out of season. Pray for them with continual intercession night and day. Strive to shield them from the arts of the seducer, and to build them up in their most holy faith. Win for yourselves the rich promise,—the glad welcome of your Lord when you shall have finished your course: “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit down with Me on My throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with the Father on His throne.” “Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.”

Realise the fact, that unto you Christ entrusts the custody of His truth, the keeping of His faith in this land. Be not dismayed though some fall away, or are indifferent, or even should they oppose themselves. Through you, if ye are faithful, Christ will maintain His own cause, and bring future good out of present evil. He allows temptations to come upon His people for the trial of their faith, and patience, and love; but he never suffers anything to befall His Church, which will not, if it prove faithful, be turned to its good.

Let this Church, amidst its present distress, be true to its Lord,—hold fast the Faith which it has received from the Fathers,—stand by the Bible as God's Word, and by

the Creeds as containing the one unchangeable Faith of Christ,—and a blessing shall be poured out upon it from on high. It shall “lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes, burst forth on the right hand and on the left,” and even yet, through the mighty power and indwelling of the Spirit of God, become a praise upon earth.









