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The Native Pastorate concept was largely formulated by Henry Venn (Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, 1841-1872), who enunciated the revolutionary theory that the "settlement of a native Church, under native pastors, upon a self-supporting system" was the ultimate objective of a mission. This study brings that concept under a microscope, and makes a thorough investigation of its implementation in Sierra Leone, which became the testing ground of the experiment.

After three failed attempts, the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate was established in 1861. Its first ten years, under Bishop Beckles (1860-1870), were anxious and problem-ridden. Beset by financial problems (which persisted throughout our period of study), plagued by enduring racial tensions, and undermined by episcopal absenteeism, the experiment made little progress. Also, the ideal of self-government ignited native aspirations, which collided irrevocably with European missionary dominance and ethnocentrism, and eventually erupted into a full-blown race controversy. Fuelled by a nascent nationalism, this controversy produced the first - albeit transient - calls for the establishment of a truly independent African Church, free from all foreign element.

The expansion and consolidation of the Pastorate under Bishop Cheetham (1871-1880) - occasioned partly by a complete (if hasty) CMS withdrawal - saw its evolvement into an all native affair (the European bishop excepted). In the period that followed - during Bishop Ingham's episcopate (1883-1896) - violent discords between Pastors and laity, rising lay agitation for greater representation (in the government of the Pastorate), and acrimonious contention over ministerial removals coalesced into a major constitutional crisis. Constitutional reform arguably brought the Native Church closer to full ecclesiastical independence, but internal strife left it embattled and enfeebled. Still, in thirty years of existence, the Pastorate had become largely self-supporting and self-governing to a significant extent. A native episcopate, the crowning glory of the scheme, seemed a doubtful privilege and remained an elusive ideal. Self-propagation was also a missing ingredient. Nonetheless, the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate was "the great experiment of modern Missions"; and its unremitting struggle to overcome inherent pitfalls made it a powerful paradigm of the bid for ecclesiastical independence.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is not without a sense of inadequacy - inadequacy because words can never say it all - that I take this opportunity to express my profound gratitude and heartfelt thanks to the many people who, in their various ways, contributed to the process of producing this thesis. I could not have received better supervision than that provided by Professor Walls and Dr Fyfe; and being under their watchful care has been a most enriching experience in many respects. I have benefited immeasurably from their guidance, wealth of knowledge and encouragement at every stage of my work; and it gives me great pleasure to acknowledge their great help. If I have been half as good a student as they have been such estimable mentors I would have done very well indeed.

Every researcher knows the great difference which a caring and helpful staff can make to the demanding and often frustrating job of data gathering; and I wish to express my gratitude to the archivists and librarians who provided much valuable assistance (sometimes beyond the call of duty!) and gave so much of their time, in response to my needs. In particular, Chris and Katie (CMS Archives: Birmingham University Library); Collin, Elizabeth and Rosemary Keen (Partnership House Library); and Norma and Eileen (New College Library). What debt of gratitude I also owe to the staff at the 'Centre' - especially Anne and Ruth - for their refreshing kindness and graciousness, which brightened many a day and helped to smoothen many a difficulty.

This work would not have been possible without the funding and support of The Langham Trust, who have been my sole sponsors for almost the entire period of study and research. I am deeply appreciative of their sponsorship, and especially thankful for the patience and kind consideration of the Rev Geoffrey Gardner (the Administrator) over the years. I must also mention the Whitefield Institute, who provided a one-of grant of £1000, and the Murrayfield Parish Church who employed me as Part-time Christian Education Worker for almost two years, and gave me so much support during that time. Again, I must make special mention of Clarence Musgrave (the Minister), who did so much to help.

My family and friends in Britain have been tremendously supportive, and a great source of encouragement, throughout the years. A special word of thanks to my mother, Ronald, Daisy, Becky, the Luke-Macauleys, Blanshards and D'Arcy Smiths. But most of all, I wish to acknowledge the endless care, matchless support and unceasing patience of my wife (Biffoh), who has been there through the highs and the lows - a shoulder to lean on, a partner, and a friend. No one could ask for more.

And to God, to whom I owe everything, I say THANK YOU Father.
CONTENTS

Declaration i
Abstract ii
Acknowledgements iii
Abbreviations vi

Introduction 1

Chapter 1
The Ideal of Independent Native Churches: An Examination of Venn's strategy in the context of the Sierra Leone Mission 9

A. Henry Venn and the Organisation of Independent Native Churches 14
B. Venn's scheme and the Sierra Leone Mission:
   Precept and Praxis 20
   (i) Native Pastors 21
   a. The Position of Native Ministers 21
   b. The Training of Native Ministers 34
   (ii) Supervision of European Missionaries 42
   (iii) Self-Reliant Native Congregations 52
      a. The Introduction of Self-Support and Self-Government into Elementary Schools 64
      b. The Native Church Fund 68

Chapter II
The Road to a Regular Ecclesiastical System: A State of Transition 76

A. Planting the Seed of a Native Pastorate 81
B. Structural and Constitutional Change 90
C. The Episcopal Challenge 103
D. The Sierra Leone Episcopate 109
   (i) Owen Emeric Vidal 109
      a. A Church Constitution 110
      b. Ordination of Native Ministers 114
   (ii) John William Weeks 124
   (iii) John Bowen 133

Chapter III
The Organisation of a Native Pastorate: The Mechanism of an Experiment 143

A. Bishop E H Beckles (1860-1870) 149
   (i) The Finance Equation 152
   (ii) The Church Committee 160
B. The Birth of a Church 173
   (i) The Ingredient of Self-Support 176
   (ii) Ecclesiastical Relations 195

Chapter IV
The Race Controversy and Nationalism: Interlude or Prelude 219

A. Race Conflict 225
   (i) The Asylum Affair 232
### Contents

**B. Race and Nationalism**  
(i) Bishop Henry Cheetham (1870-1882)  
(ii) E W Blyden  
(iii) John Pope-Hennessy  
(iv) James Johnson and Ethiopianism  
C. Bishop Cheetham and the Native Pastors  
D. The CMS Reaction  
E. Aftermath

#### Chapter V
Problems of Growth and Growing Problems: The Costs of Expansion  
A. The Articles of Arrangement  
B. Expansion of the Native Pastorate  
   (i) The Government grant  
   (ii) Class pence  
   (iii) The case for expansion  
   (iv) The case for Structural Adjustment  
C. Bishop Cheetham and the Native Pastorate  
   (i) The J C Taylor Case  
D. The Limits of Expansion  
E. Roots of a Crisis

#### Chapter VI
Constitutional Reform: An Experiment in Crisis  
A. The Question of a Native Episcopate  
B. Bishop Ernest G Ingham (1883-1896)  
C. Removal and Revision  
   (i) The Four Pastors  
   (ii) A Problem of Finance  
   (iii) The Moses Taylor Case  
   (iv) The Allan Deputation (1888)  
D. The Revision of the Articles of Arrangement  
   (i) CMS Involvement  
   (ii) The Patronage Board  
E. The Sierra Leone Church Constitution  
   (i) A Fading Vision

Conclusion  
Bibliography  
Appendices
ABBREVIATIONS

CMI - *Church Missionary Intelligencer*
CMR - *Church Missionary Record*
CMS - *Church Missionary Society*
PC - Parent Committee
PHL - Partnership House Library (157 Waterloo Road, London)
SLACMS - Sierra Leone Auxiliary Church Missionary Society
INTRODUCTION

"The leaven of Christianity has been introduced in different directions amidst the dense masses of the heathen: often hidden, still, in that hidden state, it is at work where the eye cannot trace it; until at length the mysterious process which had been going forward evidences itself... the torpid mass is agitated... [and] so from amidst the monotonous waste of heathenism Christian congregations rise to view, more beautiful to the mind of the believer than the most lively of the Polynesian isles to the eye of men."  

The phenomenal success which the operations of the Church Missionary Society enjoyed in the Sierra Leone colony (its first missionary field), during the nineteenth century, forms the backdrop to the following study. Freetown (the present capital of Sierra Leone) was founded as a Christian experiment in 1787, and subsequently became the home of thousands of freed slaves, who formed captive audiences for the European agents of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) from 1816 onwards. The transformation of that motley crowd of pagan ex-slaves into assemblies of earnest converts, in which the CMS played the most central role, is undoubtedly one of the most spectacular achievements in modern mission history. As mission stations and orderly congregations were established throughout the colony, the scattered communities of freed slaves "became remarkable for their deep, earnest

---

1 Article 'The Native Churches' in Church Missionary Intelligencer, xiii (June 1862), 121-130, p. 121f. This periodical will subsequently be referred to as CMI.


piety, and for their honesty, industry, and docility.\textsuperscript{5} Contemporary accounts were full of hyperbolic praise;\textsuperscript{6} and missionary propaganda proclaimed the Sierra Leone Christians "as model Africans who had leapt 'from cannibal to churchwarden' in one bound".\textsuperscript{7}

The Sierra Leone peninsula in which it all happened was only 26 mile long and 12 miles wide (about 300 square miles);\textsuperscript{8} with a population of 46,380 and 53,862, in 1871 and 1881 respectively.\textsuperscript{9} The significance of the size of the settlement is often overlooked. Its compactness facilitated missionary enterprise (and the supervision of converts) to a considerable extent, and helps to explain the rapid success which accompanied the early missionary efforts. However, the reproduction of British denominational sectarianism in the colony resulted in "a melancholy crush of sects", which weakened the capacity (financial and otherwise) of each Church, and arguably enfeebled Christianity's development. At the same time, the intimate ambience of the setting helped to counteract denominationalism; and fluidity of membership and inter-denominational cooperation persisted well into the


\textsuperscript{6} The interested enquirer is referred to the CMS periodicals - Church Missionary Record, Church Missionary Gleaner, Church Missionary Intelligencer, and Proceedings of the CMS. See also Robert Brewin, Among the Palms: or, stories of Sierra Leone and its Missions (London, 1890), and Henry Seddall, The Missionary History of Sierra Leone, (London, 1874).

\textsuperscript{7} P E H Hair, 'Africanism: the Freetown contribution' in The Journal of Modern African Studies, 5 (1967) 4, 521-539, p. 528. However, Hair's comment "that the missionary descriptions of abrupt cultural and moral changes in their Freetown converts were often exaggerated (and sometimes so ridiculously exaggerated that confidence was lost in both the intelligence and the moral integrity of the missionaries)" is worth bearing in mind.

\textsuperscript{8} The Church Missionary Atlas, (London, 1896), p. 30. It is worth bearing in mind that not all of this area was inhabited.

\textsuperscript{9} CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 45. Report on the Census of Sierra Leone and its Dependencies, 1881.
1870s. Still, the smallness of the territory created a claustrophobic environment in which disagreements and conflicts - between individuals or groups - often took on a more menacing aspect than they would in a situation where antagonists are separated by a greater distance. No secret - whether the lapse of a prelate, the incessant bickering of European missionaries, or the misconduct of the ordinary communicant - remained hidden; and, due to the activity of a flourishing and independent Press, every controversy was conducted in the full gaze of the public. In a word, the settlement had all the strengths and weaknesses of a sizeable, but compact, community. Anglicanism preponderated, mainly because the CMS (its sole purveyor) supplied more men and means than all the other missionary Societies put together, and educated some four-fifths of the population. That Sierra Leone was considered more or less a Christian country by the 1850s, with "no less than two-thirds of the population ...professedly Christian", was largely due to CMS effort. Within four decades after it commenced work in the colony, the Society occupied every important village in the colony, and had a missionary in every single one of its 15 or so parishes.14 Crowded churches became a familiar

---

10 Probably no incident illustrates this aspect better than the case of the Murray Town Church bell, in 1866. Removed to Wilberforce (where there was a much stronger Anglican Church), at the request of the European missionary superintendent and with the express approval of the government, the bell was forcibly retrieved (a Police constable was injured in the process) by a group of young men from Murray Town. A bemused Magistrate later discovered that not one of the culprits was an Anglican; all being either Wesleyans or West African Methodists. Cf. A1/0 141/2, 21 November 1866, Macauley to Venn; C A1/0 3/516b, 15 January 1867, Caiger to Secretaries).

11 Cf. C Fyfe's 'The Sierra Leone Press in the Nineteenth Century' in Sierra Leone Studies, (June 1857) 8, 226-236.


13 S W Koelle, 'A picture of Sierra Leone in the light of Christianity', article in CMI, vi (March 1855), 51-68, p. 62.

sight on the Lord's day; and in some of the larger villages "no fewer than 900 or 1000 people join[ed] in the responses, and... render[ed] a reasonable worship and service in the sanctuary". S W Koelle (a CMS missionary and linguist) enthused that "Christianity has gained such a footing in the country that... if at once all European Missionaries were to be recalled, all foreign support withdrawn, though it would receive a shock..., yet it would not die out, but would recover, would live, grow, flourish, strike root downwards, and bear fruit upwards". In view of the difficulties which plagued subsequent CMS efforts to establish an independent Native Church, this observation appears somewhat exaggerated; but the fact remains that contemporary observers were often struck by the hold which Christianity had on the inhabitants. Writing in 1888, Rev W Allan, a CMS deputation, remarked that "the contrast between Christianity in London and Sierra Leone is remarkable, and to the discredit of the former, in members who frequent church, have family prayer, contribute to Church expenses, etc". But possibly the most satisfying testimony, from the CMS point of view, came from Bishop Cheetham (1871-1881) soon after his retirement as Bishop of Sierra Leone:

Let any of the earnest, devoted members of our Church go on board a vessel at Liverpool and land from it at Sierra Leone... On landing at Sierra Leone what would he find? He would not find endowments... He would not find deans, archdeacons, canons, chancellors, registrars... But what, I say, would he find? Except these, he would find all else that he had left behind... He would find ministers having the same orders as our own; he would find Christian congregations, churches, day-schools, and Sunday-schools, anniversaries of religious societies, Bible-classes, prayer-meetings. He would find what we deem to be of such inestimable value in this England of ours, and which is of such immense social advantage, moral beauty, Christian civilization. He would find in every part of Sierra Leone

15 Article 'Sierra Leone: a general view' in Church Missionary Record, xxii (April 1851) 4, 73-81, p. 74. This periodical will subsequently be referred to as CMR.

16 Koelle, op. cit., p. 62.

17 CMS, G3/A1/P2, 7 April 1888, Report on the state of Sierra Leone.
those three valuable blessings, a church, a parsonage, and a school...\textsuperscript{18}

There was, however, another side to the story, for Sierra Leone Christianity had sad defects and glaring imperfections which provided ample fodder for its critics and detractors. European missionaries, who, as a rule, were deeply suspicious of practices and customs which were part of the African's pre-Christian past, and were convinced that these had to be up-rooted for Christianity to achieve its full development, indiscriminately condemned such practices, and despaired at their resistance to the sanctifying operation of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{19} But even neutral observers pointed out that alongside Christianity, and often happily co-existing with it, were the remnants of "heathenism" with its "degrading customs and practices, and other "revolting forms of pagan idolatry, witchcraft, and cruelty".\textsuperscript{20} Notwithstanding its idyllic sabbaths and over-crowded churches, the colony remained a thriving ground of pagan elements. At the Brookfields Mission, on the outskirts of the colony, it was reported that a goodly number of the "resident idolaters" were backsliders from Christianity; and that the clientele of the local "heathen" priests and oracles included "insincere" Christians, who consulted them in times of difficulty.\textsuperscript{21} In 1873, the Administrator of the colony informed an incredulous Bishop Cheetham that the worship of small-pox was prevalent in the settlement, and that there were partakers of the

\textsuperscript{18} Extract of an address delivered at Exeter Hall, London... at the Anniversary Public Meeting of the Church Missionary Society, by the Rt Rev Dr Cheetham the late Bishop of Sierra Leone (May 1882), in \textit{The Methodist Herald}, (24 November 1882).

\textsuperscript{19} One spoke of the "two-fold" or "antagonistic" influences emanating from Sierra Leone -"an influence for good and an influence for evil" - cf. article 'The Sherbro and Mende country' in \textit{CMI}, NS, vi (March 1870), 84-96, p. 84.; cp. 'The Mission field of the Native Church in Sierra Leone' in \textit{CMI}, xv (April 1864), 73-80, p. 74.

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Robert Brewin, \textit{Among the Palms: or, stories of Sierra Leone and its Missions}, (London, 1890), pp. 86 & 89.

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. \textit{CMR}, NS, 1 (January 1871), 3-18, p. 10.
Church's sacraments who offered sacrifice and paid homage to this [virulent] deity. A brief enquiry among churchmen "from all parts of the settlement" confirmed that this was "substantially true" - though it was pointed out that the people no longer rubbed themselves with the virus. Also, nominalism increased with each passing decade; and the emotional, but life transforming revivals at Regent under a W A B Johnson, and the soul-stirring worship and biblicocentric lifestyle of the early Nova Scotians gradually became ephemeral recollections of a distant past. Henry Venn (CMS Secretary, 1841-1872) observed that "the spread of nominal Christianity is manifestly the normal state of a Church which retains infant baptism", and that it could not be stopped; but many missionaries on the ground considered nominalism to pose an even greater threat to the spirituality of the Church than heathenism.

It is a matter of record that while maintaining outward forms of piety and aping their European mentors to an embarrassing extent, a goodly percentage of Sierra Leone Christians lived less than upright lives and also secretly embraced the traditional practices which they condemned publicly. Cheetham discovered, for

---

22 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 25E/49, 10 May 1873, Bishop Cheetham to Wright (CMS Secretary).

23 In 1855, the Rev F Bultman of Kent District recorded with irrepressible nostalgia that "in former days hardly a week would pass without someone coming in with 'Massa, my heart trouble me'; while now, the expression may not be heard in the compass of a year..." - cf. CMR, NS, 1 (January 1860), p. 16.

24 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 24, 23 September 1859, Venn to Ehemann.

25 Cf. Article 'The Sherbro and Mende country' in CMI, NS, vi (March 1870), 84-96, p. 84.

example, that at least 65% of children baptised in the Church were illegitimate, and that the majority of these belonged to Christian parents. But, with all its imperfections Sierra Leone Christianity was a monument to efficacious missionary enterprise; and by the mid-nineteenth century the Sierra Leone Mission had reached a state of ripeness which surpassed any other CMS Mission. The Parent Committee of that Society declared as early as 1848:

Our machinery is complete. Our day schools, our grammar school, our college for education, our churches are built; our parochial divisions are all occupied; our native agency is efficient; and now if the people of the Lord lift up their voice in faith and persevering prayer for the promised blessing, the spirit will be poured from on high...

The call for divine activity, however, did not preclude earthly initiative; and, mainly through the inventiveness of Henry Venn, the Sierra Leone Mission became the testing-ground of one of the greatest experiments in modern Missions – namely, the formation and development of a Native Pastorate Church. Venn enunciated the revolutionary theory that the "settlement of a native Church, under native pastors, upon a self-supporting system" was the ultimate objective of a Mission; and the Native Pastorate Church, as he envisaged it, was to become not only self-supporting, but also self-governing and self-propagating. The nature and thrust of this concept, and the dynamics of its implementation in Sierra Leone, form the focus of this thesis. No attempt is made to examine or re-appraise Venn's life and outstanding contribution to Missions or to mission strategy as a whole; not least because these aspects have been the focus of much


28 CMS, C A1/L4, pp. 116-117, Instructions to Rev. and Mrs E Jones, returning to Sierra Leone, on 12 June 1848.
valuable scholarship. But the study does bring Venn's theory under scrutiny and examines closely the continuity and discontinuity between precept and praxis in the Sierra Leone paradigm. The main objective is to explore the peculiarities of the Sierra Leone context (in relation to ecclesiastical independence), to analyze the impact and implications of the experiment, and to examine the various issues which it inevitably evoked. The vision of an independent Native Church involved such a radical departure from the spirit of missionary enterprise at the time (certainly CMS operations) - which favoured foreign domination and created dependency - that its realisation was inevitably attended by complexities and rupture. Although its apparently ripened state made the Sierra Leone Mission an excellent laboratory, the establishment of an independent Native Church proved to be a painful and perplexing process. The experiment faced unremitting difficulty - notably European missionary opposition and the financial incapacity of the Native Church - while the ideal of ecclesiastical independence inspired native aspirations which clashed irrevocably with European ethnocentrism. The peculiarities and constraints of the Sierra Leone situation forced Venn to make compromises and adjustments which had the effect of making the experiment a balancing act between dependency and independence and between European supervision and self-determination. The experiment also suffered from CMS policies - notably after Venn's death - while its ideals raised issues in the Native Church which tested its maturity and capacity for self-determination to the limit. In the end, the greatest challenge came not from outside factors but from internal forces, as clergy and laity struggled with the vision of an independent Native Church.

---

Chapter 1

The Ideal of Independent Native Churches: An Examination of Venn's strategy in the context of the Sierra Leone Mission

If the elementary principles of self-support and self-government and self-extension be... sown with the seed of the Gospel, we may hope to see the healthy growth and expansion of the native Church, when the Spirit is poured down from on high, as the flowers of the fertile field multiply under the showers and warmth of summer.¹

The Native Pastorate concept was a child of exigency and expediency. By the 1840s, Protestant missions with their raison d'être of propagating the gospel to "the heathen" in foreign parts, had become victims of their own success. The problem they faced was without precedent in the modern missionary era. Defined simply, it was one of over-extension: native congregations were rising much faster than either the man-power or means of Missionary Societies. This predicament was as much a product of the high mortality rate of European missionaries as it was of impecuniousness. But an added factor in the dilemma, which thrust itself so irrevocably on the attention missionary societies, was the spirit of paternalism which dominated missionary enterprise; and kept native converts and congregations in chronic dependence on European missionary aid, support, and leadership. The evils of this a system became manifest when the resources of missionary agency could no longer keep up with the demands and needs of the mission field.

This situation was especially true of the operations of the Church Missionary Society (CMS). For a long time, the Parent Committee of the CMS² had been confronted with the vexed

¹ Venn, Second Paper, CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 116.
² C Peter Williams, The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church: a study in Victorian missionary strategy (Brill, 1990), explains that the Parent Committee (PC) was an umbrella term, "indicating the official committee voice of the Society"; and was capable of referring to either the General Committee (GC) or the Committee of Correspondence (CC) - the two most
question of missionary shortage, which was caused to a large extent by the high mortality rate of its European missionaries; and "the failure of Englishmen to come forward in sufficient numbers for the growing work". With regard the former, a powerful case in point was the Niger Expedition of 1841, which bore ample witness to the deadly effects that the West African climate could have on the European constitution. Another aspect which gave the Society great concern was the fact that what few missionaries it had in the field were increasingly tied down by enormous pastoral responsibilities, and were involved in superintending numerous native congregations. In the words of Stock, "the sheep had to be shepherded, and the missionary was the shepherd. Evangelistic work was transformed into pastoral work, and the evangelist became the pastor... The result of it was that agencies and money designed to evangelize the Heathen were used to make provision for the worship and instruction of Christians...: they looked to the missionary for everything, and they were not disappointed".

---

3 This was particularly of its West African Mission; especially in the Sierra Leone colony. In the year 1823, for example, 4 out of 5 missionaries sent to Sierra Leone died within 6 months; and of the 87 missionaries who had gone out to West Africa (from England) in the course of 40 years, 38 died. see The Jubilee Volume of the CMS for Africa and the East, London, 1849. Compare Stock's claim that during the period 1949-1861 the health of missionary staff in Sierra Leone "was better preserved than of old"; yielding "long periods of service" (Stock, ii, p.99).


5 In that ill-fated expedition, 42 deaths and 130 cases of fever occurred among the 120 Europeans; whereas the African members got through practically unscathed. This fact prompted Rev J F Schön, one of the CMS missionaries on the expedition, to remark that such operations must "in the course of events, be carried out by Natives" (Rev J F Schön, 'Journal of the Niger Expedition', pp. 358-365).

6 Cf. Venn's "Second Paper" (CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 146, On the Organisation of Native Churches in Missions, 8 January 1866).

7 Stock, ii, pp. 412-413.
Such a state of affairs naturally subverted the Society's objectives. Its resources were "exhausted in maintaining ground already gained", while the task of evangelism - "making fresh inroads upon Heathenism" - was neglected almost completely. As a result, even its most promising mission fields were reduced to a state of arrested development.

In 1841, the CMS was beset by a severe financial crisis, which forced its Committee to give up several Missions and make drastic cut-backs on its expenditure and supply of men. But more importantly, the financial difficulties led the PC "to consider whether arrangements may not be made, by which... a large proportion of the expense may be borne by local resources in the several Missions; than has hitherto been the case". With this consideration in mind, it went on to proclaim what Stock maintains was "the first clear enunciation of the principle of self-support of Native Churches". It declared that,

all missionary operations should from the first, contain within themselves the germ of the self-support principle; and that Native Converts should be habituated to the idea that the support of a Native Ministry must eventually fall upon themselves...; that it may be reasonably expected, that they should, from the first, bear some portion, however small, of the necessary expenses of Native ministrations, and of the Christian education of their children.

It must also be noted that from the onset, the Society's expectation was that, in this manner, the way would be prepared "for the transfer of such Native Christian Congregations to the regular Ecclesiastical Establishment; and leaving itself at liberty to go forward in the work of breaking up the fallow-ground of Heathenism, which is the

---

8 Stock, i, p. 482.
10 ibid. Stock i, p. 483 is probably right; though the Report itself claims that it was "a maxim which has been often insisted upon".
peculiar province of a missionary Society." However, in as much as this report reveals a remarkable change in CMS policy, it was less a policy document than a series of proposals based on a pragmatic consideration of existing circumstances and economic expediency. One of the main concerns of the Society at this point was the need to secure Government endowment in its various missions; which would enable it to reduce its own financial commitments. It was anxious, for example, that Government in the colonies should "take measures for the endowment and establishment of a Native Church", and also provide buildings for public worship. The financial crisis notwithstanding, the proper organisation of independent, self-supporting, Native Churches was as yet an unarticulated and latent concept in CMS policy regarding its missions. As Stock points out, even the Society's Jubilee Statement (issued seven years later), which reviewed its whole work in some detail, was "absolutely silent on the subject". Nonetheless, the Society's predicament had produced a resolve and given birth to a process, which ultimately and inevitably led to the formulation of a plan for the organisation of independent Native Churches. It was a process which was determined largely by the requirements of expedience. For instance, the inadequate supply of men and the need to relieve its missionaries from overwhelming pastoral responsibilities, produced a decision that the best remedy was to be found in preparing a native ministry "capable of undertaking the pastoral charge of Native Christian flocks, under the general superintendence of the missionaries, whose time and strength will be proportionably released for the direct work of a

---

12 See Stock, ii, p. 413.

13 Cf. Stock, i, pp. 482-483. In Sierra Leone, for instance, the Colonial Government failed to live up to its part in an agreement reached with the CMS in 1824, that it would undertake to build churches and parsonages in each of the parishes in the Colony (see Proceedings of the CMS, 1847, pp. 33-34; cp. 24th Report).

14 Stock, i, p. 413.
Mission - the evangelisation of the Heathen". The Society reasoned that "in proportion... as such a Native ministry can be introduced, the Mission will become firmly rooted in the soil, and the resources of the Society will be set free for the regions beyond". This course of action, however, resulted in an increase in the number of native clergy and lay agents, and raised the question of whether their support should continue to be derived from foreign funds. In seeking to address this and other related problems, the Society was led to grapple with the issue of independent native Churches. Commentators such as Stock and Ridgeway are quick to point out that in seeking to address these issues the Society had no historical precedents to guide it. Be that as it may, in Henry Venn (one of its Secretaries, from 1842-1872), it had a powerful proponent who was not only committed to the ideal of independent native Churches, but also enunciated the revolutionary concept that the "settlement of a native Church, under native pastors, upon a self-supporting system", was the ultimate objective of a mission.

15 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no.71, "Minute upon the Position of Native Ministers in a Mission, and upon the distinction between a Mission and the pastoral charge of Native Converts".

16 ibid.

17 Stock explains that the number of ordained clergy in the Society’s missions increased from only 12 before 1849 (the Society’s Jubilee) to 63 in 1861; and a further 110 ordained in the next 11 years (1861-1872). See Stock, ii, p. 414. In the Sierra Leone Mission, the number of native ministers (both lay and ordained) increased rapidly from 24 in 1840 to over 75 by 1860.

18 Rev Joseph Ridgeway became an Assistant Secretary of the CMS shortly after Venn, and remained in that office until 1850, after which his labours were confined to its editorial department as editor of the Church Missionary Intelligencer (see Williams, pp. 16-17; and Proceedings of the CMS, 51st year, 1850, p. xliii).

19 Henry Venn, "Minute upon the Employment and Ordination of Native Teachers", (First Paper, 1851).
A. Henry Venn and the organisation of independent Native Churches

It is a significant historical coincidence that Henry Venn became an Honourary Secretary of the Society in the same year that it found itself in the midst of pecuniary difficulties; and also at a time "when the openings in the mission-field were increasing on every hand" in stark contrast to the woefully inadequate supply of European missionaries. Venn joined the Society as Honourary Clerical Secretary pro tempore in 1841, but became permanently installed in that office until 1872. It is generally accepted that Venn rather dominated the PC, and was accorded precedence over the other CMS secretaries (who were in reality his constitutional equals). Stock admits that he was virtually the Society's leader (in ecclesiastical matters), and its "official mouthpiece". Venn's commitment and singular contribution to the organisation of independent, self-reliant native churches has been the subject of much detailed study; and it is only necessary to review the relevant aspects here. Venn formulated the concept of a Native Pastorate: the settlement of a native church, under native Pastors; free from all supervision by foreign agency; and becoming, in his

20 See Stock, i, 375.

21 See Williams, p. 3. Stock, who confirms that Venn "was a great power in the Committee", explains that he was exercising "the natural and legitimate power of a master mind, and of an unequalled experience" (Stock, ii, p. 649).

22 Stock, i, 370. Though Venn himself, with typical self-deprecation, told one missionary that "all the influence which I possess in the Church Missionary Committee depends upon my consulting and anticipating their mind in everything, upon sinking my identity.." (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 74, 23 March 1853, Venn to Graf).

23 Notably, T E Yates, Venn and Victorian Bishops Abroad (1978); W R Shenk, Henry Venn - Missionary Statesman (1983); and, most recently, C Peter Williams, The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church (1990); P Beyerhaus, Die Selbständigkeit der jungen Kirchen als missionarisches Problem, Verlag der Rheinischen Missions-Gesellschaft, Wuppertal-Barmen, 1959 [A partial translation of this work into English could be found in the CMS Archives - the title translates 'The Independence of Young Churches as a Missionary Problem'].

[^See Stock, i, 375.]
[^See Williams, p. 3.]
[^Stock, i, 370.]
[^Notably, T E Yates, Venn and Victorian Bishops Abroad (1978); W R Shenk, Henry Venn - Missionary Statesman (1983); and, most recently, C Peter Williams, The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church (1990); P Beyerhaus, Die Selbständigkeit der jungen Kirchen als missionarisches Problem, Verlag der Rheinischen Missions-Gesellschaft, Wuppertal-Barmen, 1959 [A partial translation of this work into English could be found in the CMS Archives - the title translates 'The Independence of Young Churches as a Missionary Problem'].]
words, "self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating". This formula, which became known as the "three-selves", is now a commonplace; though its emergence represented something of a breakthrough in missionary thinking. It has been attributed to both Venn and Rufus Anderson (Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissions for Foreign Missions, 1832-1866); both of whom were almost certainly thinking along the same lines about the same time - though it has been argued that the concept probably has a pedigree going back to 1818. According to Wilbert Shenk (one of Venn's most recent biographers), both Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn carefully examined past and present missionary experience "with a view to identifying underlying principles of action"; and "came to certain insights amid crisis situations". He explains that they both struggled throughout the 1840s "to define and express in principles of action the selfhood of the church"; and "saw self-support as the starting point for the new church to gain a sense of dignity and autonomy from the mission". Both missionary administrators began to use such terms as "self-support", "self-propagation", self-governing", and self-sustaining" to describe the emerging concept; but it was Venn, according to Shenk, who first employed them in conjunction with each other (in 1851) to define aspects of the indigenous church. Whether Venn owed this inspiration to Anderson remains a moot question. By 1855, Venn had begun to use the "three-selves" as a unit; and through his powerful intellectual formulation and determined persuasiveness, the concept came to dominate missionary strategy for over three

24 For a thorough analysis of the "three-selves" formula, see P Beyerhaus' article 'The Three Selves Formula: Is it built on biblical foundations' in The International Review of Missions, liii (October 1964) 212, 393-407.

25 See Williams, p. 1f.


27 ibid., p. 171.
decades.

In time, Venn also began to employ the phrase "euthanasia of a mission" to describe the new process by which a mission became progressively indigenous and independent. This "euthanasia of a mission", he explained, took place "where the Missionary, surrounded by well-trained native congregations under Native Pastors... gradually and wisely abridges his own labours, and relaxes his superintendence over the Pastors, till they are able to sustain their own Christian ordinances, and the District ceases to be a Missionary field, and passes into Christian parishes under the constituted Ecclesiastical Authorities". This, in Venn's view, was the ultimate objective of a mission; and the preparation for such a "euthanasia" in the Missions of the CMS became the most important work of his life. Venn's thinking on the organisation of native Churches matured and developed over almost two decades. During that time, he produced three papers (in 1851, 1861, and 1866, respectively) in which he outlined his scheme for the development of a Native Pastorate, and sought to give it an ideological and theological framework. In his first paper, he drew an essential distinction between "the office of a Missionary, who preaches to the heathen, and instructs inquirers or recent converts - and the office of a Pastor, who ministers

---

28 Wright, Memoir of the Rev Henry Venn (London, 1880), attributes this phrase to a Bishop Shirley (see p. 277). It occurs in a CMS Minutes as early as 1848 - CMS, G/C1, (18 April 1848), p.391.

29 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 71. cf. "Minute upon the Employment and Ordination of Native Teachers" (First Paper, 1851).

30 Stock, ii, p. 412.

31 These Papers were produced in 1850, 1861, & 1866, respectively. The "Second" and "Third" Papers appear in CMS, G/AZ1/1, nos. 116 and 146. The "First" Paper could be found (together with the other two) in 'Missionary Publications Miscellaneous', vol. iii, no. 6 (Partnership House Library).
in holy things to a congregation of native Christians".\(^3\)

This distinction - which might appear so manifest to the modern observer - represented a new way of thinking at the time; and was fundamental to Venn's scheme. In the words of W Knight, "the one was the means, the other the end; the one the scaffolding, the other the building it leaves behind when the scaffolding is removed."\(^3\) Venn deprecated the old system under which both aspects were "dependent on the Missionary: and all agency is provided for at the cost of the Society".\(^3\) Such an arrangement, he argued, vitiated the corporate life and development of the native church; whose "life breath" depended on the principles of self-support, self-government, and self-extension. As an antidote for this stultified growth, Venn prescribed self-reliance: Native converts were to be trained, "at as early a stage as possible, upon a system of self-government"; and from its inception, arrangements must be made in a mission with reference to "the ultimate settlement of the native Church upon the ecclesiastical basis of an indigenous episcopate, independent of foreign aid or superintendence".\(^3\) This was the crux of the "new system". Venn was completely opposed to the paternalistic spirit of the old system, which enfeebled the missions and bedimmed the self-identity of the native churches. He saw that entrenched foreign agency, and a predominance of European ideas and structures, often became the bane of missions; and he wanted the training of native missionaries, for example, to be more in keeping with the needs of the Native Church and less by the canon of European Education. His faith in native ability, and vision of the indigenous church, made him unequivocally opposed to any

\(^3\) "Minute upon the Employment and Ordination of Native Teachers" (1851). Venn reiterated this point in his "Second Paper". Cf. Wilbert Shenk, Henry Venn - Missionary Statesman (Orbis 1983), p. 110; and Knight, p. 276.

\(^3\) Knight, p. 277.

\(^3\) "Second Paper", 1861.

\(^3\) ibid.
doctrine of European superiority and indispensability. Shenk states that

for Venn there was almost a desperate urgency to break down the racist barriers that were beginning to rise against the non-Western peoples. He insisted that every people had the potential to achieve the same level of competence as Europeans - if given the opportunity.\(^{36}\)

This conviction gave a farsighted edge to Venn's policies, and set him apart from most of his contemporaries. The CMI reports that his theories were introduced "in the face of great prejudice, of doubts on the part of the old missionaries", who hitherto exercised complete control of the missions; and, moreover, distrusted "native" character.\(^{37}\) In the end, Venn had to prod his missionary colleagues "to change their attitudes and approach in order to encourage self-reliance in the new churches.\(^{38}\)

In his second paper, Venn not only described the evils incident to the old system; but also outlined the principles under which the new, "improved", system was to be introduced. In this new system the Native Pastorate would evolve from a cluster of "Christian Companies", to individual congregations (under native teachers); which would coalesce to form a Native Pastorate, under an ordained native.\(^{39}\) The formation of several Native Pastorates would then necessitate the establishment of a District Conference, consisting of pastors, lay delegates, and European missionaries; and when such a district became entirely self-supporting, foreign agency must be withdrawn, making way for a native episcopate. Venn wisely refrained from imposing a rigid programme, or blueprint, to which each mission would have to adhere. He


\(^{39}\) "Second Paper", 1861.
rather advised operational flexibility, suggesting that the plan should "be modified according to the previous system which may have prevailed in a mission". Though he stressed that the scheme "must work upwards", he seems to have hinted that it may well work backwards "where ample funds exist in the hands of a Bishop and his clergy, for the evangelisation of a whole district, as well as for the future development of its native Church". He, however, cautioned that were a mission had been bred on a diet of dependency and European domination, progress towards an independent native Church must be gradual. Yet, for all its perspicacity and structural soundness, Venn's scheme (like all schemes based on ideological and theoretical analysis) was not without its practical drawbacks. Stock, for example, criticized three aspects of the arrangements proposed in his "First Paper": namely, that unordained catechists remained agents of the Society and supported by it; that it made no provision for the congregations having a voice in Church affairs; and that it gave no indication of how the "settled ecclesiastical system" was to be arrived at. But he then admitted that the first two defects "were remedied in due course"; while the third "was beyond the Society's power to deal with by itself". A deeper analysis is provided by C Peter Williams, who has pointed out certain "manifest weaknesses" in Venn's policy. These include: a heavy emphasis on European superintendence; the creation of "a hierarchy with the native missionary at the top"; an assumption that transfer to ecclesiastical authorities would be straight forward; and a failure to assess the impact an ecclesiastical establishment would have on the native church. It is difficult to fault the validity of these criticisms. The fact is that though Venn was an extremely able and visionary administrator, with

40 It is not improbable that in Venn’s thinking, the Sierra Leone Mission would fall into this category.
41 Stock, ii, pp. 415-416.
42 See Williams (1990), p. 8.
a *forte* for enunciating his schemes with clarity and compelling persuasiveness, he seems frequently to have underestimated the difficulties which had to be overcome before they could be implemented with any degree of success. This is not to say that he did not address problems when they did arise (for he often did this with penetrating insight); but each mission had its peculiar combination of intricate impulses which could act against the substance or timing of his proposals. In this regard, the Sierra Leone Mission presents a powerful paradigm. Stock has suggested that the scheme "was evidently designed more especially for the circumstances of the South India and Ceylon Missions". However, it is difficult to imagine that Venn's proposals did not have the Sierra Leone Mission in mind. For many reasons, it was the obvious testing ground. It was not only the Society's oldest mission, but also its most successful and promising field of labour; and, as the "eldest born", was the one which both Venn and the PC were anxious to secure on an independent footing, free from parental care. Moreover, Venn seemed clearly displeased at any indication that the native congregations in Sierra Leone were lagging behind those in India, for example, in making progress towards self-support - for they "were earlier instructed in the truth of the Gospel".

**B. Venn's scheme and the Sierra Leone Mission: Precept and Praxis**

The "three-selves" formula - self-support, self-propagation, and self-government - is often considered to be the cornerstone of Venn's scheme. Venn himself described them as the principles on which the life breath of the native Church

---

43 Stock, ii, p. 416.

44 Cf. CMI, 'The Native Churches', (June 1862), vol.xiii, 121-134. p. 126.

45 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 2, 19 September 1854, Venn to Bishop Vidal (Sierra Leone).
depended. But on the matter of the practical application of his proposals within a specific setting, three key interrelated elements were essential to the successful formation of the Native Pastorate, and formed the cutting edge of Venn's new system. These were, (i) the raising up of native pastors; (ii) European supervision; (iii) self-reliant native congregations. These three elements formed the framework for the organisation of the native Church; and it is crucial for an assessment of the efficacy of Venn's strategy that they are scrutinized in some detail.

(i) Native Pastors
The preparation and ordination of native pastors (who would be supported by their congregations) was integral to Venn's plans. He was convinced that the difficulties which the Society continued to face with regard to the men and the means could only be overcome by using the native ministry as "our grand resource".46 In his "Second Paper", he argued that "the progress of a mission mainly depends upon the training up and location of native pastors". Well-trained native congregations could well signal the success of foreign missionary enterprise, but without the training and raising up of native pastors the native Church would remain perpetually dependent, and there could never be the "euthanasia of a mission".

a. The Position of Native Ministers
Before the organisation of native pastorates, the bulk of native ministers in the Missions were employed as native teachers. The designation "Native Teacher" was an umbrella term within which there were different grades: in progressive order, Scripture Readers, Schoolmasters, Assistant Catechists, Catechists, and Inspecting Catechists. These Native Teachers were placed under the supervision of a Missionary, and progressed from one grade to another.

"according to the qualification they exhibit"; and after several years of such employment, the most advanced were admitted to ordination. Under Venn's administrative influence, the Society's policy on the position, salary, and training of native pastors came to be dictated by one object: "the progress of the Native Teachers toward their independence and establishment as Native Pastors of a Native Church supported by Native funds". In this regard, Venn also deprecated any process which alienated the pastor from the congregation, socially or financially.

In 1846, there was a furore in the Sierra Leone Mission when 31 native teachers signed a petition addressed to the Sierra Leone Finance Committee (and copied to the PC) complaining about the unkind treatment meted out to them by European missionaries, and the want of larger (and fixed) salaries. With regards the latter complaint, the PC called on the native teachers to consider that one day the CMS would "cease to give salaries to Native Teachers in the Colony, and that Native Teachers who live in the Colony must be supported by their country people". It declared that the Society would not give high salaries to Native Teachers "because it would be setting up a standard which might in future years be very injurious to the progress of a Native Church". This was one of the earliest indications of the new direction which the Society's policy was taking with regard the preparation of its native ministers for independence within a self-supporting native Church. Two years later, its first official statement reflecting this policy was made - after a

47 See 'Native Clergy: past, present, and future' in CMI, , (October, 1875), ns, vol. xi, 289-299. p. 298.
48 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 17, 9 July 1846, CMS Secretaries to Denton (Secretary, Sierra Leone Finance Committee).
49 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 25, 10 July 1846, CMS Secretaries to Native Teachers.
50 ibid., p. 26. The Society's only concession was that the native teachers be divided into fixed classes; with fixed salaries for each class.
similar confusion over the salaries of native clergymen in South India - in a Minute which was submitted to colonial bishops and circulated throughout the Mission. In that Minute the PC distinguished between "settled Pastors of native Christian congregations", who were to look to their own people for support and "the ordinary expense of living", and Native Evangelists (or Assistant Missionaries) who "must receive his support from a Missionary Society". It stipulated that a native pastor "should never be trained up in habits and expectations too far removed from above his country-men" (from whom he was ultimately to receive his support); and that even if he was supported by an endowment, "the amount of such support will necessarily be regulated according to Native habits and modes of life. This Minute is of some missiological importance because it embodied the first official directive of the Society endorsing the "euthanasia of a Mission". It also acted as a sort of reference manual in the Missions for decisions on the position of native ministers, until it was superseded by another Minute entitled 'Minute upon the position of Native Ministers in a Mission, and upon the distinction between a Mission and the pastoral charge of Native Converts'. This latter Minute upheld the distinction between native pastors and native missionaries, but stressed the importance of "preparing a Native Ministry capable of undertaking the pastoral charge of Native Christian flocks". It declared

---

51 CMS, G/C1, vol. 26, (18 April 1848), 'Minute drawn up after conference with the South India Missionaries..., respecting the proper amount of Salaries for Native Clergymen in South India, and respecting the position in which they should stand with respect to European Missionaries', (pp. 389-392).


53 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 71.

54 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 71. This Minute was based on a revision of the 1848 Minute on the salary and position of Native Ministers (G/C1, vol. 26, 18 April 1848); and is undated. But C Peter Williams argues convincingly for a 1850 date (p. 5). Contra M Warren, To Apply the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Henry Venn (1971), p. 43.
that "this view of a Native Ministry should be kept in sight from the first commencement of a Native Church, otherwise the Missionary will insensibly become the Pastor, and the Native Teachers who may be trained up will be employed rather as Missionaries than Native Pastors, and will, as agents of an European Society, imbibe European tastes and habits; instead of regarding themselves as ministers... of the Native population, with which they are to be in every way identified". These Minutes reveal, to a very large extent, the influence which Venn was beginning to exercise on the Society's policies. He was particularly chary about native ministers becoming Europeanised, and thereby losing touch with their grass-roots or being unable to identify with their congregations (who would, in turn, be unable or unwilling to support them). He advised that the utmost caution and consideration ought to be exercised in the first settlement of the salaries of native pastors, "that they may be such as the native Church ought to pay."\(^5^5\) Another Committee Minute of 1850 (again amending the 1848 Minute) required that the salaries of ordained natives be regulated not in reference to the salaries of European agents, "but in reference to the expenses of a native mode of living; respect being had to the proper position of a Minister of the Christian religion in native society and to the probable amount of an ultimate permanent provision from native resources".\(^5^6\)

The Committee's resolutions regarding the salary and position of native ministers is understandable in the light of its new objective of fostering independent native Churches. But in Sierra Leone, this policy exacerbated the differences between the native ministers and their European counterparts; and reinforced the feeling of inferiority and subordination which prevailed among the former. Even though it was based on a consideration of the pecuniary limitations of the embryonic

\(^{55}\) CMS, C A1/L5, (p. 25), 1 December 1852, Venn to Bishop Vidal (Sierra Leone).

\(^{56}\) CMS, G/C1, vol. 27, 8 January 1850, p.319.
native Church, it unwittingly sowed the seeds of discontent. Between 1840 and 1861, the Society was repeatedly assailed with complaints and petitions from native ministers about inadequate salary. Paid miserable salaries, the lives of native pastors were often subject to economic hardship (which probably made it difficult for the ministry to attract the most able candidates; especially as the colony became more prosperous and the social status of its inhabitants improved). Also, many native pastors found it difficult to win and maintain the respect of their congregations; who often compared them unfavourably with their European brethren, and showed a distinct preference for the governance of the latter. The irony of this situation was that any attempt to improve the lot of the native pastors produced the same effect - for entirely different reasons. Many parishioners tacitly rejected the Native Pastorate ideal precisely because they felt it was a ploy to keep the pastors living in a style, which they, as individual members of a congregation, could not possibly afford for themselves.

---

57 Even as early as 1842, the Local Committee was receiving "frequent applications for increase of salary" from native Assistants. See circular from the Local Committee 'To the Native Assistants of the CMS in Sierra Leone' (CMS, C A1/0 5/3, 24 February 1842).

58 In 1860, a letter from the Native Catechists to the Finance Committee, stated: "We cannot but candidly confess that we feel it very difficult, to manage with our present salary...; we find it almost impossible to maintain ourselves, and to carry on our duties... efficiently and without distraction...; for in no part of the colony can we manage to live conveniently with our present salary so as to provide in any way for our widows in case of our deaths, however economically we may live" (CMS, C A1/0 6/51, 21 September 1860, letter to the Finance Committee). Cp. letter from Rev T Maxwell requesting the PC to allow him the use of "surplice fees" collected in his Church to enable him to procure new robes, "for my present ones are very shabby..." (CMS, C A1/0 148/51, 22 April 1857, Maxwell to Major Straith (CMS Secretary).

59 This is hardly surprising among a people whose desire for "backstay" - i.e. a European missionary to rely on (see C Fyfe, 'The West African Methodists in the Nineteenth Century' in Sierra Leone Bulletin of Religion, June 1961, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 27) was appropriately matched by their proclivity for European ways.

60 CMS, C A1/0 25E/44, 9 April 1873, Bishop Cheetham (Sierra Leone) to Henry Wright (CMS Secretary).
1859, Bishop Bowen (1857-1859) told Venn (rather tongue-in-cheek): "The native minister is the richest man in the congregation - in the eyes of the people".61

However, some native teachers were appointed "Evangelists" or "Assistant Missionaries". Unlike native teachers, whose salary, status and habits were to be in keeping with the local environment, these "native missionaries" were rated with their European counterparts and remained paid agents of the Society. Committee Minutes make it clear that this was a special category of native ministers: "They are not Native Pastors but the agents of a Society foreign to their country; they possess qualifications and literary attainments of a higher order than those necessarily required in Native Pastors; they are brought into nearer connexion with European society, sit on the committees, and take part in the administrative affairs of the Society."62 If found competent and faithful, a native Evangelist could "ultimately be placed in charge of a Missionary district, having Native Pastors under his superintendence, and be in all respects recognized as a Missionary of the Society".63 However, the PC insisted that such a progression took time; for the native mind required many years of trial and development "before it can be safely trusted in a position of independent action and of the superintendence of others". This seems to have been the highest position native ministers could ordinarily aspire to in missions under the aegis of the CMS. As a general rule, native Teachers were trained with a view to their becoming ordained native Pastors; and native Evangelists or Assistant Missionaries were chosen from among those native Pastors who were outstanding in their "maturity of Christian character, and mental development".64 The elevation of a native teacher

---

61 CMS, C A1/O 25C/19, 13 April 1859, Bowen to Venn.

62 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no.71.


64 Ibid.
to native Evangelist or Assistant Missionary was an act reserved for the PC; to be made "upon the recommendation of the superintending Missionary or other representative Committees... with the sanction of the Bishop".\(^5\) In the earlier stages of CMS operation (in different missions), this position was held out as an incentive to ordained native ministers - a "reward for faithful service". The PC directed that native ministers were to be "encouraged to look forward to, and prepare for, the independent position when either by the advancement of the population in which they labour in Christian attainments, the Committee may be enable to place the District upon a settled ecclesiastical system; or by the diligence, faithfulness, and competency of the Native Pastor, he may be advanced to the rank of a Native Missionary in the independent charge of an assigned District".\(^6\)

But for all its usefulness as an inducement, and an indication of native advancement, the position was inherently anomalous. As C Peter Williams has pointed out, "the problem was that the native missionary was defined in terms of the European missionary rather than his congregation".\(^7\) It was thus at odds with the Society's stated object of preparing native ministers for their proper position as pastors of self-supporting native congregations. The implications of this irregularity weighed heavily on Venn's mind; and he later confessed to the Society's secretary in Madras:

> It must ever be borne in mind that Ordained Native Ministers, acting as the agents of a foreign Mission Society are not in their true position in relation to the Native Church. They are in danger of being trained up as exotics, and of becoming unfitted for holding the right position in the Church of their nation to which their first duty attaches them".\(^8\)

\(^5\) ibid.

\(^6\) CMS, G/C1, vol. 27, (8 January 1850), pp. 318-319.

\(^7\) Williams (1990), p. 8.

\(^8\) CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 113, 2 October 1860, letter to Mr. Royston (Secretary of the Madras Corresponding Committee).
In the Sierra Leone Mission, this position was the cause of frequent administrative confusion; not least because the European missionaries did not find it completely acceptable. Before the establishment of a Native Pastorate, only two native ministers - George Nicol and Thomas Maxwell - were in the employment of the Society; which by definition (or rather, according to the 1848 Minute) made them native missionaries. In 1850, the PC instructed the Finance Committee to appoint Maxwell to the pastoral charge of Kissy Road Chapel; and proffered the following explanation:

It appears to us desirable that Mr Maxwell should remain in Freetown rather than take any one of the village churches, chiefly on the ground that we cannot sanction his being placed as Superintendent over any of the native catechists of the first class, and that the class over whom he should especially seek to gain influence is that of the colony-born, the native merchants and the rising generation in Freetown.

It appears to us that many advantages might be secured by the appointment of Mr Maxwell to the pastoral charge of the Kissy Road Chapel congregation. Making some arrangement for the occupation of the pulpit by the clergymen who may reside at Fourah Bay, in conjunction with Mr Maxwell.

This appointment caused some consternation among the European missionaries in the colony; and occasioned a lengthy debate at a general meeting of the Local Committee, held on 2nd January 1851. The whole debate revolved around the question of whether Maxwell and Nicol were to be viewed as "missionaries" or "native pastors", and the precise meaning

---

69 Maxwell and Nicol were "colony-born" Christians, who had been educated at both the Fourah Bay Institute and the Church Missionary College at Islington. Ordained Deacons in 1849 by the Bishop of London, and accepted into Priest's orders the same year, they became the first Sierra Leonean native clergy (with the exception of Samuel Crowther) to serve in Sierra Leone. Nicol returned to serve as Mathematical Tutor at the Fourah Bay Institute (a position he held for several years); and Maxwell became a Tutor in the CMS Grammar School (but only briefly, until his appointment to the Kissy Road Church in 1851).

70 CMS, C A1/L4, pp. 297-298, 12 November 1850, CMS Secretaries to Graf (Secretary, Sierra Leone Finance Committee).

71 Maxwell (rather irregularly) included a detailed account of the Committee's deliberations in his 'Journal for the Half year ending 31 March 1851' (CMS, C A1/0 148/30) - an impropriety for which he was reprimanded by Venn.
of the term "pastoral charge" used in the PC' letter. The Local Committee's irresoluteness was as much the result of a confusion over the applicability of the Society's 'Minute on the Position of Native Ministers', 72 as it was occasioned by a certain opposition to the idea of having a native minister in pastoral "charge" of a church (and not under the direct European superintendence). The Rev J Beale, who had had pastoral charge of Kissy Road Church for about ten years - but who had also taken oversight of the newly built Pademba Road Church - was mortified by the PC's appointment, and denounced the removal of European missionaries, "in the midst of their usefulness" as "prejudicial to our great work". 73 However, in his own account of the Committee's proceedings, Maxwell singled out E U Graf (the secretary at the meeting) as the main objector to the PC's proposal. In the end, the PC's appointment was upheld, albeit by a dubious voting result. 74 The disarray at the meeting produced strident calls for the PC to clarify the proper position of the two native clergymen in the Mission. It is worthy of note that both men were convinced, at the time, that they were classed

72 That is, 'Minute upon the Position of Native Ministers in a Mission, and upon the distinction between a Mission and the pastoral charge of Native Converts' (the revised version of the 1848 Minute) - see note 54, supra. In fact, the reference to this Minute in connection with this meeting (held on 2nd January 1851) is further argument for an 1850 date. It also helps to explain Maxwell's complaint that when a copy of the 1848 Minute was produced at the meeting in question, it was "set aside as having no bearing on the Sierra Leone Mission" (see Journal, for Half year ending 31st March 1851).

73 CMS, C A1/0 36/16c, 7 February 1851, Beale to Knight. Beale could not conceal his feelings of antipathy towards Maxwell, whose spiritual and physical qualities he called into question: "The zeal and spirit of my successor", he wrote, "leaves me everything to fear and little to hope... Even in bodily strength, he is not equal to a European...". His defamatory statements against Maxwell were refuted by Rev Edward Jones (CMS, C A1/0 129/11b, 2 June 1851, Jones to Venn); but for a while, caused some excitement among the native ministers in the colony.

74 In a Committee comprising 10 members, 5 remained neutral; and only 4 voted in favour of Maxwell having charge of Kissy Road Church. Graf cast the sole dissenting vote.
as "native missionaries", on a par with Samuel Crowther. Graf, meanwhile, wrote a paper in which he outlined the reasons for his opposition to Maxwell's appointment to the Kissy Road Church. This paper was mainly a reply to Maxwell's allegations, but Graf's arguments help to throw some light on the confusion which seemed inherent in the Society's evolving policy on native ministers. He argued that the term "pastoral charge" (in the PC's letter) was open to interpretation, since the 'Minute on the Position of Native Ministers' stipulated that native pastors were to be "under the general superintendence of missionaries"; and added that the PC's own letter had not only proscribed Maxwell's superintendence over native catechists of the first class, but also prescribed that his labours be shared by other clergymen. These, in Graf's view, were "limitations" which suggested that Maxwell was to be a "native pastor" who would be subsequently promoted (according to the stipulations of the 'Minute') to the office of "native missionary", after he had proved himself. If Maxwell, he went on, had been considered a "native missionary", he would "as a matter of course have been appointed to Pademba Road Church, which is really a missionary field"; whereas an appointment to Kissy Road Church - "a well established Christian Church" - indicated that his proper position was that of a "native pastor". He ended by asserting that as long as he had been connected with the Mission, it had always been the Society's practice to place a new European agent, "whether clerical or lay, in conjunction with an older missionary" - a circumstance which had induced him conclude that Maxwell "should begin his ministerial labours under Mr Beale or

---

75 See Maxwell's Journal, op. cit.; and Venn's letters to both men (CMS, C A1/L4, pp. 374, 381-383).

76 CMS, C A1/O 6/42. Graf's paper was entitled 'Remarks on Mr Maxwell's entry into his Journal under date 2nd January 1851'.

another European missionary's superintendence".77

The PC was both astonished and saddened by the misunderstanding which its directive had provoked; and it was left to Venn to explain its policy and resolve the difficulty. Venn made it clear that the PC did not regard either Maxwell or Nicol "as Missionaries strictly so called, but as native Pastors"; for the Sierra Leone colony was "more of a Christianized district than of a Missionary district".78

In a letter to Nicol, he stated:

I have never regarded any of the helpers in Sierra Leone as Missionaries. You are all at home: a Missionary is one who is sent from home. In our Society we know nothing of the so-called home missionaries... You and Maxwell are Native Pastors, and your special duties are among those who have been baptised in their infancy... And for the sake of Africa, and for the future elevation of the native ministry, I long for the day when you shall be wholly detached from the Society and supported upon an endowment in a position in which you will be subservient only to the regular ecclesiastical authority.79

On the question of European superintendence, he explained that the principles laid down in the 'Minute upon Native Ministers' were applicable to all the Society's Missions. However, the meaning to be derived from this statement varied somewhat in accordance with whom Venn was addressing. He told Maxwell that all the native ministers in the colony were to be regarded as "under the general superintendence of the European missionaries until the ministerial charges are placed upon an independent footing",80 and added that the PC

77 He also pointed out that the voting results (which Maxwell had helpfully displayed) showed that only a minority of the Committee's members had voted in Maxwell's favour.

78 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 383, 15 September 1851, Venn to Maxwell.

79 CMS, C A1/L4 (pp. 374-376), 13 August 1851, Venn to Nicol. He also tried to convince Nicol that the office of Native Pastor was neither above nor below that of Native Missionary, but was rather "another and distinct office".

80 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 383, 15 September 1851, Venn to Maxwell. He explained that the reason the PC did not place a native minister under the superintendence of any particular missionary was "only because in so small
would not "divest itself of this control as long as it retains the Mission". However, in a similar letter to Beale, he stipulated that "such superintendence should be as slight as the interests of the Church will allow of, and should be gradually withdrawn."81 Far from being contradictory, the two statements reveal a tension - between how much responsibility to relinquish, and how much to retain - which pervaded this aspect of Venn's theory. But even Venn's skilful diplomacy failed to clear up the problem permanently. Three years later, the same Finance Committee contrived to remove Maxwell from the Kissy Road Church to the Pademba Road Church, reminding him that he was a "missionary" and not a "native Pastor".82 Maxwell, with the backing of Bishop Vidal, appealed to Venn. Venn upbraided the Committee for making such "an organic change" without prior consultation with the PC; but remarked (in a private letter to the Secretary) that "in the Colony of Sierra Leone, mission work and pastoral work are so mixed up together that it cannot be said whether Maxwell was one or the other".83 This remark rather suggests that Venn had either changed his mind, or was guilty of equivocation. Moreover, in his attempt to refute the decision of the Finance Committee, he also made the curious comment that the 'Minute on Native Pastors' could "only properly be applied to a missionary field such as the

a district the whole body of the Representatives of the PC were regarded in the light of superintendents".

81 CMS, C A1/L4, p, 337, 14 March 1851, Venn to Beale. He also informed him that "it had never crossed the mind of the Committee that one clergyman could hold two churches".

82 CMS, C A1/O 25A/1, 16 February 1853, Bishop Vidal (Sierra Leone) to Venn. This answer (as Bishop Vidal pointed out) was far from satisfactory, since the removal was not to a new mission field, but from one pastoral charge to another.

83 C A1/L5, 75, 23 March 1853, Venn to Graf (secretary of the Sierra Leone Finance Committee). The Finance Committee's decision was reversed; though Venn added later that the reversal was "on other grounds" - CMS, C A1/L5, (p. 66), 22 March 1853, Venn to Graf.
Yoruba Mission". This observation is puzzling not only because it is terribly inconsistent with his earlier statements, but also because three months earlier he had counselled Bishop Vidal to ensure that the initial settlement of the salaries of native Pastors was "according to the principles laid down in the 'Minute on Native Pastors'".  

This continuing confusion over the real status and position of Maxwell and Nicol probably originated from Venn's obvious desire to expedite the organisation of the native pastorate; and was probably compounded by his own belief that natives living at home and serving in their own country could not rightly be termed "missionaries" - even though the Society's policy made such a provision. With his vision of self-supporting, self-ministering, native churches, the perpetuation of a native ministry dependent on, and identified with, the Society was a troubling aberration. By retaining the most promising native ministers as "agents of a Society foreign to their country", the CMS was depriving the nascent native Church of its most able and competent pastors; and thereby defeating its own objectives. In the end, the Society was forced to revise its policy on native missionaries; and in 1866 it issued the following statement:

Experience has proved that the employment by a foreign Missionary Society of native ministers on the footing of English Missionaries impedes, in many ways, the organisation of the native Church. The native Church needs the most able native pastors for its fuller development. The right position of a native minister, and his true independence, must now be sought in the independence of the native Church, and in its more complete organisation under a native Bishop. At the same time the Committee reserve to themselves the

84 Almost certainly a reference to the "Minute upon the Position of Native Ministers, and upon the distinction between a Mission and the pastoral charge of Native Converts", CMS, G/AZ1/1, no.71.

85 CMS, C A1/L5, 1 December 1852, Venn to Vidal. It may be that Venn felt that the "Minute" did not apply in its entirety to the Sierra Leone Mission; which would make its application somewhat arbitrary, and problematic.

b. The Training of a Native Ministry

Between 1840 and 1860, the Society's policy on the training of native clergy suffered from a certain ambivalence; due to its equivocation over the merits of educational preparation, vis à vis the value of spiritual attainments. In the 1848 Minute, the PC remarked that educational training was of little gain if candidates did not have "certain fundamental qualifications both of nature and of grace". It went on to argue that "much disappointment had arisen "from expecting to obtain Pastors by dint of Educational Institutions". However, the same Minute endorsed "the advantage of having in every advanced Mission a Training Institution, into which Native catechists and promising Native youths from the schools may be admitted, to receive suitable mental and theological instruction"; an institution "devoted to the exclusive education of Native Teachers". But with the vision of a native pastorate very much in mind, the Society later declared that "the attempt to train a small class as native ministers by education greatly in advance of their countrymen had been repeatedly tried and always failed..."; and argued that Missionary Societies should be content to educate the community "on spiritual and Christian

87 This declaration was appended to Venn's "Third Paper".

88 CMS, G/C1, vol. 26. The "Educational Institutions" which the Society had in mind were the "Day Schools, Boarding Schools, and even Head Seminaries in Missions", which it regarded "rather as a means of general than of special education".

89 Though it added that "none should be admitted into it without sufficient evidence that they are subjects of divine grace, and suitable persons to act as agents of the CMS".

90 This comment appears to be general, and not a specific reference to any CMS Mission(s).
principles".\footnote{CMS, C A1/L5, p. 16, 1 November 1852, Instructions of the Committee of the CMS to Missionaries returning to West Africa.} Over twenty years later, this approach was still evident in CMS attitude; as the following abstract from the CMI confirms:

While there is still of necessity an admixture of the foreign with the native element in infant churches, the native Pastor should not be a 'novice' or painful complications may be the result. A young prig, turned out of a collegiate institution, inflated with self-sufficiency and the pride of learning, would be a poor substitute for a well-approved Catechist - perhaps his inferior in secular knowledge - but who knows his Bible and had for years been conversant with the wants and feelings of the flock.\footnote{CMI, 'Native Clergy: past, present, and future', Oct, 1875), ns, vol.xi, p. 299. Such an opinion, expressed long after the establishment of the native Church, may be redolent of the distrust with which European missionaries (in general) tended to view educated native ministers.}

This was an approach which was most detrimental to the future native Church, and was arguably fuelled by latent attitudes of racial superiority. It was most prevalent in the Sierra Leone Mission, where the training offered for the ministry was of a "contracted nature"; because of the widely held belief "that such and such things can be of no use for an African to know - they will become vain and proud, and despise their more ignorant countrymen."\footnote{CMS, C A1/0 129/1, 30 January 1841, Rev E Jones to Dandeson Coates. Jones, who had only just joined the Mission and taken up office as Principal of the Fourah Bay Institute, also added that he "never could see the force" of such arguments.} It is most interesting that it took the accession of Rev Edward Jones (a black clergyman) to the office of Principal of the Fourah Bay Institute - after over 30 years of CMS labour - before such attitudes were challenged. But no single incident played a more instrumental role in forcing a reassessment and readjustment of this position than the Niger Expedition of 1841. The tragic outcome of that expedition, demonstrated in the most emphatic and undeniable way possible that native agency had to be the chief means by which the Gospel could be spread in Africa. This conclusion was the main subject of a
Minute prepared by Venn and the other secretaries, in 1842. The Minute stated that "the results of that expedition had "afforded additional and painful proofs of the baneful influence of the climate of West Africa on European constitutions: so much so, that all parties are agreed, that to benefit Africa extensively, by imparting to her our religious and social blessings, Africans themselves must be the principal agents". In this regard, the Society was motivated to adopt "the most effective measures possible for training Africans as Religious Teachers"; and it acknowledged an important fact: namely, that both the Chiefs and people of the region were "willing to receive instruction from Black Men, even of such as they know to have been in a state of slavery; and that such Black Men, trained in the Schools and Institutions of the Society in Sierra Leone are acceptably capable of imparting it. This reference to Sierra Leone was not without significance. Sierra Leone had always been at the centre of the Society's educational plans for its West African Mission; and it contained its only institution in that region (the Fourah Bay Institute) for the training of native pastors and teachers.

Founded in 1814, as the Christian Institution, the Fourah Bay Institution (so named in 1827) had an uncertain and somewhat effete existence until 1840. But it is helpful to note that long before the 1841 Niger Expedition, the high mortality rate amongst European missionaries in Sierra Leone

---

94 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 34, 29 September 1842, Minute entitled "Fourah Bay Institution Buildings' Fund", signed by Venn and the other Secretaries.

95 ibid.

96 This was due partly to the Society's unsettled educational policy. The Society itself admitted that the inefficiency of the Institution arose "from the frequent changes in the Superintendents, and the inadequate period during which the Youths remained under instruction" (Proceedings of the CMS, 42nd year, 1842, p. 35) - the latter owing to "the great demand for schoolmasters in the colony rendering it necessary that a student should be removed from the Institution as soon as he was in any degree qualified for the office..." Cp Fyfe (1962), who reports that only "a few half-trained pupils became teachers", p. 236f.
had produced a determination in the CMS (as early as 1826) "of prosecuting by all means in their power in any place, whether in Europe or in Africa, the education of intelligent and pious natives with the view of their becoming Christian teachers among their countrymen".  

Also, by 1840, the Society had recognized the Fourah Bay Institution's "peculiar importance to secure the advantages of a well-trained body of Native Teachers;" and regarded it as "the most important of all the missionary operations" which were being carried on in Sierra Leone. For reasons stated above, the CMS revived the Institution in 1842, and determined that while "the course of study will comprise a good general education, the main object will be the sound Theological Training of the Youths and the diligent use of the means best calculated to promote, under the Divine blessing, personal Religion".

It reaffirmed its commitment not only to provide "a well-prepared native agency for the extensive propagation of the Gospel in Western Africa", but also to improve the qualifications of native teachers and increase their usefulness. It was in pursuance of this objective, that the young Nicol and Maxwell, who had already had the benefit of education at the Fourah Bay Institute, were sent to the Society's Institute at Islington (in 1844) for further training. It was also during this period that the CMS opened a Grammar School in the colony, ostensibly to provide a higher education for native boys than that provided in the primary schools; but also with a view to its supplying the


98 Proceedings of the CMS, 40th year, 1840, p. 31.


101 Proceedings of the CMS, 44th year, 1844, p. 28.
Fourah Bay Institution with students. Both Venn and the Society entertained the highest hopes of the Institution as a means of providing native teachers for the West Coast of Africa. The PC urged the Local Committee in Sierra Leone to increase the number of pupils of the Institute, "if suitable individuals can be selected"; and Venn, who was particularly sensible of the need for trained native agency to carry on work of European missionaries, envisaged Sierra Leone as a "Christian nursery", which would train up Pastors and Teachers "to supply the colony and other colonies on the Coast." But the Institute failed to live up to these expectations; and, in fact became something of a bugbear. By 1857, its number of students had declined to eight; due to what the Rev E Jones described as the great want of young men in whom the two qualities of "godly simplicity and mental ability" were found combined. In a desperate bid to resuscitate its flagging output, the Society considered throwing the Institute open to fee-paying students, who would receive a general education; while it still maintained divinity students supported by the Society. For some reason this plan was never implemented, and in 1859, with only six students remaining, the Society closed the Institution. Its closure revived CMS doubts about the efficacy of formal theological education; and reinforced the

102 Founded in 1845, this school played an important role in the training of native ministers. By 1866, it had "educated wholly or in part 13 out of the 27 native clergymen" on the West African coast (in connection with the Anglican Church). It had also "furnished the several stations of the Society's Missions with catechists and schoolmasters, and provided hundreds of clerks, etc, for offices under Government and for mercantile purposes" (CMS, C A1/O 8/32, Jubilee Report of the Sierra Leone Auxiliary Church Missionary Society, 1866).

103 CMS, G/CI, vol. 27, 24 June 1852, p. 27.


105 Proceedings of the CMS, 56th year, 1855, p. 34.

106 Proceedings of the CMS, 57th year, 1855, p. 38.
view that the "collegiate system" of training the youths for the ministry was a failure "in providing a supply of humble-minded spiritual agents". This verdict may have had some justification when it is considered that of the 89 students who were admitted between 1841 and 1859, only 24 proceeded to become ordained clergymen of the Anglican Communion. But even more damning was the fact the calibre of men it had produced was so inferior that native clergy were generally objects of disdain and disrespect in the colony. Bishop Beckles (1860-1871) discovered that there was "a great desire to look down on the native clergy", and that they were not "sufficiently respected" to be placed in full charge of the churches. Between 1861 and 1864, he repeatedly urged that candidates produced at the Fourah Bay Institution must be sent for a short time to the CMS Institute at Islington, to be "properly trained". Beckles was adamant that unless attempts were made to improve the quality and status of the native ministry, and provide the native Church with a "superior class of men", the Native Pastorate scheme would be ineffectual. He was completely dismissive of the training which the Fourah Bay Institute had provided; and wrote,

> The College at its best state has never produced the class of men we ought to have if the Pastorate is to be a success; and in its present state the results must be far worse... As Bishop I cannot but feel how important it is that we should have a proper class of men if ever we hope to have them respected and to see the Lord's work prosper in their hand.

107 *Proceedings of the CMS, 60th year, 1859, pp. 23-24.*


109 CMS, C A1/O 25D/5, 15 April 1861, Beckles to Venn.

110 CMS, C A1/O 25d/7, 19 June 1861, Beckles to Venn.

111 CMS, C A1/O 25D/37, 9 August 1864, Beckles to Venn. Beckles pointed out that the disparity - in quality and influence - between Maxwell and Nicol (who had been educated at Islington) and the rest of the native clergy, was all too evident.

112 *ibid.*
He went on to argue that it would be much cheaper to send the six students at Fourah Bay to the college at Islington than to pay the salaries of the three clergymen "occupied in instructing them in a very partial manner". He added that his opinion was shared by "every one of importance" in the colony; "except those who dread their [the native clergy's] superiority". Beckles' pleas and arguments were largely unheeded. Venn admitted that the low opinion he had formed of the students was "very discouraging"; but averred that it only proved "the necessity for the Institute as a test or preparation for those who may be hereafter selected to come to Islington", and "the necessity for taking a larger number of pupils into the Institute in order to give us a wider selection". With this in mind, the Fourah Bay Institute was re-opened in 1864 (from which time it was given the name Fourah Bay College); with plans to put it on an "improved footing". Venn was probably the prime mover behind the re-opening of Fourah Bay College. He remained optimistic that it would "become a radiating centre of intelligence and knowledge for all West Africa"; and wanted European missionary labour to be "multiplied a hundred-fold by native agency". He especially desired that the Institution, "while open to all who seek a Christian and liberal education", should be a "Missionary Institution" - comparable to the CMS training Institute in Islington - and raise "many valuable native Missionaries to the interior, as well as

113 ibid.

114 CMS, C A1/L7, pp.466-467, 23 November 1864, Venn to Beckles. The Institution had been built to contain 30 to 40 students.

115 A completely exasperated Beckles vigorously protested that the "improvements" were inadequate (CMS, C A1/O 25d/48, 24 March 1865, Beckles to Venn).

116 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 463, 23 August 1864, Venn to Beckles.

117 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 148, 8 October 1866, The address of the Committee and Secretaries to the Sierra Leone Church Missionary Association. This Address was almost certainly drafted by Venn (see Warren, pp. 71-74).
With this in mind, he asseverated:

Let the Native Church in Sierra Leone avail herself of such a precious opportunity. Let the Clergy, while they press home upon their flocks, the duty of Native Missions in Africa, remind them of the advantages of the Fourah-Bay Institution. Let them seek out their best young men as candidates for admission, and do their part to raise the Institution to such a position of honour and usefulness in the Colony as to make it a real blessing, not to Sierra Leone alone, but to Africa itself.

However, Venn's optimism and exuberance were a little wide of the mark. The college remained at a low standing in the community; and parents were reluctant to send their sons there, as long as its curriculum was devoted to preparing men for the - much derided - ministry. Bishop Cheetham (1871–1881) felt that the college's low image would be largely remedied if it were expanded (and upgraded) to become the University of West Africa, providing both religious and secular education. He argued that whereas the present practice impoverished the ministry, and hindered its gaining the respect of the people; a new programme which allowed students for the ministry to be trained alongside those who were not, "would be helpful to the raising up of a higher order of ministry". Like Beckles before him, his verdict on the quality of the native clergy was severe. "The present race of pastors, speaking generally", he wrote, "is of the lowest of the people, and the present system tends to perpetuate the misfortune". CMS reaction to this proposal

118 ibid.
119 ibid.
120 CMS, C A1/0 25E/7, 6 May 1871, Bishop Cheetham to Venn. Cheetham told Venn: "Parents think that if they are to pay for the education of their sons they must put them to something that will pay, rather than God's work...".
121 ibid.
122 ibid.
123 ibid.
Venn's Strategy Examined - 42

for a West Africa University was luke-warm; for reasons which shall be dealt with later. The fact remains that until it was affiliated to Durham University in 1876 (15 years after the establishment of the Native Pastorate), Fourah Bay College produced native ministers of an inferior calibre (though with some notable exceptions). This had direct bearing on the development of the native Church, which needed well-trained native pastors and ministers for it to be authentic and efficacious. Such ministers tended to be in short supply. Many candidates for the ordained ministry were rejected by one bishop or another, because of their unfitness; and the bishops were often reluctant to allow native pastors greater independence and responsibility - a circumstance which bore direct relation to the thorny question of European supervision. Ultimately, the Native Pastorate came into existence with a sad deficit of well-trained native ministers; a fact which cast a shadow over its development, and arguably undermined its success.

(ii) Supervision of European Missionaries

Venn has been accused of being so preoccupied with the policy of the "euthanasia of a mission", and with the progression of the missionary to "the regions beyond", that he failed to see the missionary's place within the native Church. This criticism has some validity, but rather ignores the significance of European missionary supervision in Venn's scheme. It is true that Venn felt strongly that the pernicious system, in which every activity and institution in the mission was dependent on the missionary and the Society, could only be remedied by maintaining a distinction "between evangelizing the heathen, and the ministering to the Native

---

124 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25E, 13 March 1873, Cheetham to Henry Wright (CMS Secretary, and Venn's successor). The idea of a West African University was taken up with even greater vigour by African Nationalists like E W Blyden and James Johnson, who denounced the Institution's Euro-centric curriculum. See Chapter 4.

Venn's Strategy Examined - 43

Church"\textsuperscript{126} - the former being the primary occupation of the missionary. It is also true that he urged the missionary to look forward to the time when he "gradually and wisely abridges his own labour and relaxes his superintendence over the Pastors, till they are able to sustain their own Christian ordinances".\textsuperscript{127} But the problem was that Venn placed inordinate emphasis on the instrumentality of European missionaries in bringing about the establishment of an independent native Church. He insisted, for example, that "until the congregations are given up by the Society and placed upon a settled ecclesiastical system, the Native Pastors should be under the direction and superintendence of the Missionaries of the Society, in a position analogous to that of Curates to an Incumbent".\textsuperscript{128} Judging from his "Second Paper" he envisaged the evolvement of a Native Pastorate as being predicated on the judgement or supervision of European Missionaries.\textsuperscript{129} He felt that as long as the Native Church Fund (out of which native Pastors were paid) remained under the management of the Society, the native Pastors "must remain under the general superintendence of some missionary of the Society".\textsuperscript{130} In short, European missionaries were the handmaids whose superior ability and experience was indispensable for the full development of the nascent Native Church. This heavy reliance which Venn placed on European supervision and judgement, for the organisation of independent native churches, must be seen as a serious weakness in his scheme. C Peter Williams states that "for a period the phrase 'Native Agency under European Superintendence' became a slogan", and also confirms that European supervision became "one of Venn's most intractable

\textsuperscript{126} "Second Paper", (1861).
\textsuperscript{127} CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 71.
\textsuperscript{128} CMS, G/AZ1/1, Vol. 71.
\textsuperscript{129} This is abundantly clear from the section entitled "Practical Suggestions for Carrying out the Improved System'.
\textsuperscript{130} "Second Paper", 1861.
problems".\textsuperscript{131} There was always a danger that such supervision could very well impede the very goal (in this case, a self-reliant native ministry) it was meant to expedite. That instead of promoting self-reliance, it would perpetuate dependence; and instead of serving to elevate the native ministry, could very well depress it. This possibility constituted one of the main objections to Venn's proposals; but he dismissed it as a "misapprehension". He argued:

Though, in the first instance, and while the tentative and transition stage lasts, it may be advisable to give a preponderating influence to European Missionaries, yet as the Native Councillors become efficient, and as the native contributions enlarge, and the Society's grant in aid is diminished, the European element will be gradually withdrawn, until the Native Church becomes wholly free and independent.\textsuperscript{132}

This response rather oversimplifies the case; and suggests that Venn underestimated the negative impact which a prominent European element might have on the new system. The fact of the matter was that European supervision, which was deemed so advisable in the early stages, was prone to perpetuate itself and undermine the ascendency of the native ministry. Furthermore, as long as the Society remained main provider and sole manager of the funds in the Missions, its self-assertion, and propensity for long-distance control was infinitely augmented. In Sierra Leone, for example, the financial difficulties which bedeviled the Native Church enforced dependence on the Society and increased the authority of its representative committees in the mission, in no small measure. So much so that in 1865 Bishop Beckles complained to Venn that the "Finance Committee..., and not

\textsuperscript{131} Williams (1990), p. 8.

\textsuperscript{132} CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 151, January 1867, letter to the Corresponding Committee in Madras on Native Church Organisation, dealing with some misapprehensions about proposed changes. Extracts of this letter could also be found in M Warren (ed), To Apply the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Henry Venn, (1971), p. 74ff.
the Bishop of the Diocese, is to be the authority." This is not to suggest that Venn favoured foreign domination and European missionary control. He was all too aware of the danger for the Native Church if it remained under direct control of foreign missionaries. He urged that European missionaries had no permanent place as "Pastors" within the mission; and argued,

... when the Missionary is of another and superior race than his converts he must not attempt to be their Pastor; though they will be bound to him by personal attachment and by a sense of the benefits received from him... if he continues to act as their Pastor they will not form a vigorous Native Church, but as a general rule will remain in a dependent condition, and make little progress in spiritual attainments. The same congregation, under competent native Pastors, would become more self-reliant, and their religion would be of a more manly, home character.

To a missionary in Sierra Leone, he wrote, "We long and pray for the time when European missionaries may be released from all pastoral ministrations in the Colony; when they shall break up other fallow ground in the interior; when the PC shall only have to support the Educational establishments". Nevertheless, as Max Warren rightly remarks, "missionaries were the only instruments Venn possessed for translating his ideas into practice". And in this regard, their presence, involvement, and compliance was vital to the new system. This of course meant that difficulties were bound to arise when the European missionary element was resistant to the genius of his scheme, or was in less than complete harmony with their native brethren.

It is not that there was anything inherently wrong with the sort of supervision European missionaries were suppose to

133 CMS, C A1/0 25D/48, 24 March 1865, Bishop Beckles (Sierra Leone) to Venn. The bishop also repeated a boast he claimed was commonly made in England: "that the Society is the Bishop as it holds the purse strings".

134 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 152, January 1867, Venn to the Bishop of Jamaica.

135 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 204, 23 May 1854, Venn to Jones.

provide — for in the early development of the Native Church it was both useful and needful. The PC exhorted them "to induce the natives to provide for their own support and temporal amelioration by incessant urgency, practical counsel, occasional aid"; and to exert the utmost ingenuity to discover the possible channels that would "stimulate the flow of native industry." European missionary agency was also crucial for the skilled labour necessary in educational institutions (where native ministers were trained), in evangelistic enterprise, and in what Venn once referred to as "the three great desiderata" for growth in a mission: "the early settlement of the orthography of a new language,... the preparation of valuable elementary and reading books in the vernacular,... the early circulation of God's pure word among the converts." But problems arose when such agency was emphasized at the expense of the ascendancy of the native ministry; and European supervision became a stronghold, built on the conviction of native incapability. It is worth remembering that both the Sierra Leone Colony and the Sierra Leone Mission were reared on English philanthropy and depended on foreign agency. By the time of Venn's "Second Paper" on the organisation of native Churches (1861), the Sierra Leone Mission had been under foreign domination for over forty years. Indeed, Venn once had occasion to remark that the supply of Missionary brethren and sisters to that colony "never failed"; that "whatever other heathen fields waited, Sierra Leone never waited long for the faithful labourer". If the new scheme was partly occasioned by a need "to relieve over-worked Missionaries from the position of Pastors, secular agents and paymasters", then the Sierra Leone Mission had made more than a fair contribution to that

137 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 4, Instructions of the Committee to Missionaries returning to the mission field...

138 CMS, CI.1/L5, (p. 67), 1 October 1858, letter of instructions to a missionary proceeding to India; extract found in Warren (1971), p. 88.

139 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 148, 8 October 1866, address of the Committee and Secretaries to the Sierra Leone Church Missionary Association.
need. It is very important that the organisation of a native Church in Sierra Leone be seen against this background of an entrenched European missionary agency. The CMI aptly described the relationship in which European missionaries stood to the native congregations thus:

They have an influence of a peculiar kind, other than that which is the result of past labours, difficulties, and trials, endured in the Mission's work. The native Christians view them as identified with all the changes which they have experienced; and they can trust them, and look up to them for guidance and direction. They thus place authority in the hands of the missionary for their own good, and they are prepared that he should use it... Such influence and importance was certainly well earned, and no doubt had its place; but the domination that went with it had to be relinquished for an authentically independent native Church to be created. In such a situation - where native congregations had become accustomed to the authority and rulership of the European missionaries, to whom they owed their very spiritual existence - the emergence and establishment of an authoritative native ministry of necessity involved a certain tension and realignment of allegiance. Some of the congregations regarded the move from European to native leadership as more or less a retrograde step. The Waterloo church, for example, informed Bishop Beckles that "the district was too large and important for a native", and requested a European to be sent (possibly with a native assistant).

The "euthanasia of a mission" involved a simple objective: namely that European missionaries progressively render themselves dispensable (as far as the native Church was concerned), and relinquish the control, which they exercised

---

140 See S W Koelle's 'A Picture of Sierra Leone in the Light of Christianity', in CMI, (March 1855), vol. vi, 51-65. p. 63. cp. CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 151, January 1867, letter to the Corresponding Committee in Madras on Native Church Organisation.


142 CMS, C A1/O 25D/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn.
over native congregations, to men who had once been subordinate to their authority; and who were themselves the "fruits of missionary labour". Venn's farsighted scheme may have overlooked the understandable human failing which made such an action on the part of the European missionaries so difficult; and which, if performed, was likely to be done with ill grace. This fact may help to explain the bitter antagonisms, distrust, and incessant conflict between European missionaries and native ministers, which the organisation of the Native Pastorate in Sierra Leone evoked. Almost all the European missionaries were strongly opposed to the establishment of a Native Pastorate. When Bishop Beckles introduced the subject immediately after his arrival, he met with "many discouragements and fears about success" from the Europeans in the colony (especially the governor and the Finance Committee). The general feeling among this group was that the former labour of the Society would be lost and rendered void by such a step. They therefore refused to lend any support to the new system, and declined to collect the subscriptions (necessary for the scheme) from their districts. Beckles also discovered that the poor relations between European missionaries and native ministers was a great hindrance to effecting Venn's proposals. In fact the bad feelings and chronic disunity, which existed between the two groups, seems to have been exacerbated by the preparations for a Native Pastorate; and became more significant as the Pastorate developed. The very idea of a

143 CMS C A1/O 25D/2, 18 January 1861, Beckles to Venn. It is interesting that Venn had warned Beckles this would be the case.

144 CMS, C A1/O 25/7, 19 June 1861, Beckles to Venn.

145 CMS, C A1/O 25/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn. The Finance Committee proved most uncooperative. Venn informed Beckles that apart from urging them "to greater activity", there was very little the PC could do, and added that the "backwardness" of the European missionaries in this regard, had been the same in all the Society's missions (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 158, 24 June 1861, Venn to Beckles).

146 He told Venn that there was "by no means the good fellowship that ought to exist between the Native and European clergy" - ibid.
Native Pastorate cut against the self-importance, and sense of indispensability which was so much a part of European missionary self-image. Up to the time of the establishment of the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate, and for long after, successive Bishops clamoured for Europeans to be sent out; and made frequent reference to the need for their superior ability. Bishop Bowen, who felt handicapped by the lack of a European missionary to act as assistant Chaplain, insisted that unless more Europeans were sent out, the mission would decline.\(^{147}\)

Venn was later to admit that it had been an error not to make greater use of native agency,\(^{148}\) but he was most anxious that European missionary supervision should cease with the establishment of a Native Pastorate. The "Article of Arrangements" (drawn up in 1852), which was meant to be a working constitution for the Pastorate, stipulated that "the charge and superintendence of the Native Pastors and Christian congregations which have been, or may hereafter be raised up through the instrumentality of the Society's Mission in Sierra Leone, be placed under the Bishop of Sierra Leone, assisted by a Council and Church Committee". Venn made it clear to Beckles that European superintendence over 'settled' native ministers was "an anomaly in a Native Church supported by local funds"; and should be avoided.\(^{149}\) Such supervision could only be continued over native ministers who had not been absorbed by the Native Pastorate; and who therefore remained in the "unsettled Districts".\(^{150}\) However,

---

\(^{147}\) CMS, C A1/0 25E/6, 7 July 1858, Bowen to Venn. Bowen displayed a tendency to be distrustful and dismissive of native ability; and made a point of requesting Europeans - "a superior man or two" - to be sent to the mission. He declared that the ordination of natives was of no help to him (CMS, C A1/0 25C/8, 17 August 1858, Bowen to Venn).

\(^{148}\) CMS, C A1/L7, p. 156, 24 June 1861, Venn to Jones.

\(^{149}\) CMS, C A1/L7, p. 127, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles. Cp. CMS, G/A21/1, no. 151, January 1867, letter to the Corresponding Committee in Madras on Native Church Organisation.

\(^{150}\) See CMS, C A1/L7, pp. 126-127, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles.
Venn's Strategy Examined

Venn may have overlooked the problems inherent in revoking a practice which had been in operation for over four decades. Even Bishop Beckles, who showed a great determination to organize the Pastorate, displayed some uneasiness about the native Pastors being independent of European supervision. He feared that the Pastorate's development would be stunted, for few of the native ministers possessed sufficient competence and experience to be given independent charge of ecclesiastical districts (especially outside the colony).

With characteristic optimism, Venn responded that "the native Pastors will rise to their position through many failures and struggles." With respect to supervision, he urged Beckles to appoint one of the Society's missionaries as a "Bishop's Commissary" and made it clear that once a Church Committee came into activity it could provide added supervision. However, when the Native Pastorate was eventually established, it caused native agency to extend over 50 miles without supervision. Instances of misconduct and deception, caused widespread dismay; and seemed to justify the opinion prevalent among the European element that the withdrawal of European supervision was a

---

151 CMS, C A1/O 25d/7, 19 June 1861, Beckles to Venn.
152 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 159, 4 July 1861, Venn to Beckles. He added that the Society was in no position to send more missionaries to Sierra Leone.
153 CMS, C A1/L7, pp. 146–147, 23 March 1861, Venn to Beckles.
155 All the churches in the Pastorate were located outside the Freetown District (and centre of the Mission), which remained under CMS control.
156 Beckles reported that in three years since the establishment of the Pastorate "four or more cases" had come to his notice (CMS, C A1/O 25d/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn).
colossal error. It is difficult to say how much of these
instances of misdemeanour were due to Bishop Beckles' repeated absences (ostensibly due to ill health).
However, when he returned to the colony in April 1864, he came under great pressure from his European colleagues to reinstate European superintendence. Both the governor and the colonial secretary, who had made no secret of their disapproval of the withdrawal of such superintendence, offered to assist with a government grant "to the extent of £300" if such supervision was assured. In a fit of frustration (which began to characterise his correspondence around this time) Beckles declared to Venn that unless a change was made in the system, "failure would be the result.
He declared that "the stations in each of the three districts, viz., the Sea, the River, the Mountain, ought in the opinion of all to have the advantage of European supervision, example, and intercourse... if the Church and ministry are to be under God's blessing kept from disgrace and contempt''.
Since these were the three districts in which all the churches of the Pastorate were located, Beckles was in effect recommending de facto European supervision of the Pastorate. Later arguments will show that one of the contributing factors to the unhappy situation in the Pastorate, was the undue haste with which Beckles (and to some extent the CMS) tried to incorporate ill-prepared churches into the scheme. It is a credit to both Venn and

Venn's tended to take the failure of the native Pastors philosophically; and stated on one occasion: "it shows that if such failures exist they will be brought to light; and therefore we feel more confident in the success of all the rest" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 314, 23 June 1863, Venn to Rev Binns).


ibid.

CMS, C A1/O 25D/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn.

ibid.
the PC, however, that his proposals were rejected outright. 163 Venn suggested that "native supervision should be first tried by appointing the most worthy native ministers superintendents of Districts, either as Commissaries or rural Deans". But Beckles made it clear that even if such were to be found the idea would be completely unacceptable to the Europeans. 164

There appeared to be no easy solution to the dilemma. European supervision would all too readily handicap the nascent native Church; yet it was clearly necessary (at least in the early stages) to strengthen an inchoate Pastorate. In any case, European missionaries were ranged in opposition to the new system; and must have felt threatened by the ascendent native ministry (for not all the pastors were incompetent). It is inconceivable that they would have submitted readily to native leadership at this stage; or at any stage in the century, for that matter. But Venn insisted that "the process of training the Native Church to self-government would be frustrated by the re-introduction of European missionary superintendence". 165 As we shall see, this issue remained a vexed question, which was little helped by the chronic sectarian rivalry and disharmony which bedeviled the life of the Pastorate.

(iii) Self-Reliant Native Congregations
One of the chief lessons which the CMS derived from the pecuniary problems which beset its missionary operations in the early 1840s was that native congregations, in its older missions, had to be moved "to a proper sense of their Christian obligations". Stock admits that "as it was the

164 Ibid.
165 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 500, 20 January 1865, Venn to Beckles. It must be added that this was the first clear statement Venn made about the self-government in the Native Church.
inadequate supply of men that led the Society to employ more Natives, so it was the inadequate supply of funds that led it to throw the Native Churches on their own resources".166 There is even a suggestion in the CMI that "if European missionaries increased so slowly when compared with the rapid progress of the work, the increase of finances was still more tardy".167 The Society was forced to an apprehension of the fact that the paternalistic nature of its missions fostered such a degree of complacency and dependency in its converts that "agencies and money designed to evangelize the Heathen were used to make provision for the worship and instruction of Christians".168 It noted that in India at least, "converts who in their heathen days had paid heavily for their religious rites now got them for nothing."169 With this in mind, the PC reiterated the principle - one which it claimed has always been recognised by the Committee, in carrying on the operations of the Society - that "Native Converts should be habituated to the idea that the support of a Native Ministry must eventually fall upon themselves".170

It is impossible to over-emphasize the centrality of self-supporting native congregations in Venn's new system. He was all too cognisant of the somewhat dysfunctional inertia which characterised the attitude of native converts (with regard sustained acts of evangelism, for example) who were accustomed to total support from, and leading-strings held by, European missionaries. His "First Paper" identified "self-support" as an integral element in the ultimate object of a mission; and his Second Paper made it clear that a

166 Stock, ii, p. 414.
168 ibid., p. 414.
169 ibid.
170 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 30, 13 December 1841, Address of the Committee of the CMS on the present financial situation. See Warren, p. 60.
system in which converts "naturally imbibe the notion that all is to be done for them", was inimical to the Society's operations and placed the full development of the native Church in jeopardy. He argued that the element of self-support had to be introduced into native churches before that "elementary organisation which may give it 'corporate life' and prepare it for its full development under a native ministry and an indigenous episcopate" could be effected. He explained that "native converts should be trained, at as early a stage as possible, upon a system of self-government, and of contributing to the support of their own native teachers"; and that "contributions should be made by the converts themselves, for their own Christian instruction, and for schools for their children". He advocated the establishment of a "Native Church Fund", for assigned missionary districts, into which such contributions should be paid; and explained further, that such a fund must initially be sustained by grants from the Missionary Society, which would diminish as the native contributions spring up. Above all, he declared that "when a sufficient substratum of self-support is laid in the native Church, its fuller development will unfold itself, as in the healthy growth of things natural". Venn's expostulations on the pivotal importance of self-support were not limited to policy documents of the CMS, but were repeatedly stressed in personal correspondence with both European missionaries and native ministers with undiminished urgency, throughout the 1850s.

Again, Sierra Leone proved to be the most important testing ground of this aspect of Venn's scheme; and was, in terms of invoking self-support, its most successful example (at least in the initial stages). There were three factors which help to explain this. Firstly - in a general sense - there was the relative economic prosperity of the Sierra Leone colony.

171 "Second Paper" (1861).
172 ibid.
In 1849, the Rev. N Denton, on returning to the colony (after an absence of one and a half years) remarked on the "larger amount of property held by the Natives, and an increase in their capital" as proof of their advanced position. C Fyfe confirms that by 1853, the majority of large property owners in the colony were "recaptives". In his "Charge to the Clergy of the Colony", Bishop Bowen made reference to "the evident increase in the material wealth of the colony"; and Venn himself described the "pecuniary exertions" of its native congregations as bespeaking "a people of some energy and wealth. According to A Porter, the "material success of the Liberated Africans meant that the CMS had a core membership of rising citizens". The fact that the extent of the economic prosperity was somewhat misjudged, must not be allowed to distract from this point. The second consideration is directly related to this. The immense hold which Christianity (with its ascendant Anglicanism) had on the vast majority of the inhabitants, produced an attendant high level of devotion to Christian ordinances. As often as not that devotion revealed itself in a disposition to contribute to the material needs of the Church. Fyfe explains that,

Having made money quickly, the wealthy were ready to dispense it liberally, on church buildings, or donations to the

---


174 Fyfe (1962), p. 257. He explains that their "growing wealth" originated from trade; for "far more than England Sierra Leone was a 'nation of shopkeepers'" (p. 306).

175 CMS, C A1/0 25c/26, Bishop Bowen's "Charge to the Clergy of the Colony", 8 February 1859, p. 6.

176 See Warren, p. 124. Venn also argued, on one occasion, that "the Native Christians in Sierra Leone are probably richer than those of Tinnevelly" (CMS, C A1/L6, p. 2, 19 September 1854, Venn to Vidal).

missionary societies which had done so much for them.  

And according to T S Johnson, these nineteenth century Christians "considered the Church to have first claim to their possessions". Given this proclivity, there was every likelihood that any attempt to shift the responsibility for those ordinances to the shoulders of the native congregations would strick a chord in the heart of the community - a community which took enormous pride in its Christian image and heritage - and elicit a favourable response. Thirdly, and of even greater significance, was the fact that long before Venn began to enunciate his scheme, and long before the CMS first announced its intention to introduce the principle of self-support into its missions, the Sierra Leone Christians were manifesting a decided willingness to support the Society financially. In 1816, the same year the CMS commenced its operations in the colony, the 'Sierra Leone Auxiliary Church Missionary Society' (SLACMS) was founded by native Christians, "partly to show appreciation of CMS work on their behalf and partly to give themselves training in self-support". Contributions to this association rose from just over £18, in 1821, to £141.5.2 in 1842 (more than £70 of which was contributed by Africans); and £340 in 1865. The fact that these contributions were free and voluntary serves to illustrate, in equal measure, the native Christians' depth of gratitude.

---

178 Fyfe (1962), p. 306. He goes on to describe instances in which native Christians contrived to use their wealth in aid of Christianity, and even philanthropy.

179 Johnson (1953), p. 115f. He cites an instance in which one such Christian gentleman "was minded to bequeath his wealth for endowing the Sierra Leone Church". Although the account is anecdotal, it serves to indicate a not uncommon attitude among wealth and pious first and second generation Christians.

180 Johnson (1953), p. 113.

181 CMS, C A1/0 8/16b, Report of the Sierra Leone Auxiliary Church Missionary Society, for 1842.

to the CMS and their liberality. But an even more powerful illustration of the readiness of Sierra Leone Christians to support the Church out of their (sometimes limited) pecuniary means, was the "system of weekly payments of one half penny for each adult", which was collected at weekly class meetings, and paid into the general funds of the Society. By 1861, the returns from such weekly payments came to almost £250 a year. It was a foregone conclusion that such contributions would be used as a spring-board for launching both the Native Church Fund and a more comprehensive system of self-support. However, these positive factors notwithstanding, it must be borne in mind that the self-expectation and attitude of native congregations in Sierra Leone had been conditioned by almost four decades of dependence on CMS aid and European superintendence. Perhaps no native congregation provides a more useful illustration of the struggle, tensions, and mixed-blessings inherent in the movement towards self-support, than that of the Kissy Road Church.

Founded in 1839, the Kissy Road Church was still a struggling church in the 1850s, with about 300 communicant members. But as one of the only two CMS churches in Freetown, it was of strategic importance to that Society; and eventually

---

183 According to T S Johnson, (1853), the payment of class pence "for the support of the native ministry" grew out of the formation of a Sierra Leone Missionary Society by a meeting of missionaries at Regent in October 1818, when the sum of £68 4s. 11d was raised (p. 37). He adds that the contribution was at first "a farthing a week". The fact that "converts had... been trained from the first to contribute liberally, by weekly collections, to the funds of the Society" does seem to confirm that the practise dates back to the 1820s at least (cf. Proceedings of the CMS 56th year, 1855). G. Hewitt, The Problem of Success: A History of the CMS, 1971, claims that this weekly "class pence" was adapted from Methodism, and maintains that it "was still a major source of income for the Freetown churches in the 1920s" (p. 11). Cp. Porter (1963), p. 87; and Stock, ii, p. 445).

184 CMS, C A1/O 25D/3, Beckles to Venn, 19 February 1861. Beckles added that the average for five years had been £226.

became one of its most flourishing churches.\textsuperscript{186} It is an inexplicable historical irony that although it was the first church in the colony to come under the pastoral charge of a native Pastor,\textsuperscript{187} it was the last station to be handed over to the Native Pastorate. It was also the church which (throughout the 1850s) Venn was most anxious to see take the first step in the direction of self-reliance. He repeatedly urged Maxwell to activate his congregation in this direction, and told him (in 1857) that his church would be "the first to be put upon a self-supporting system", so that the Society would gradually reduce its salary to him and other native Pastors.\textsuperscript{188} Venn later declared that the PC regarded the Kissey Road Church "as an anomaly in our Mission which ought no longer to exist"; meaning that "the minister of that Church should be in great part at least supported by the funds of the Church of Sierra Leone, and that congregation should set an example to all others of a liberal contribution towards the poorer districts".\textsuperscript{189} It is difficult to explain Venn's insistence that the Kissey Road Church should be an exemplar of his scheme, except on the grounds that it was the only native church under a native Pastor; and therefore the only fitting prototype. Compared to some of the other churches, its yearly contribution to the Society was small: due mainly to the what Maxwell described as the "heavy weight" of yearly house and land tax was on its members – most of whom, he said, were "poor almost to destitution" –

\textsuperscript{186} CMS work in Freetown commenced in two places where it erected its first two churches – Kissey Road Church in the east, and Pademba Road Church in the west. See Johnson (1953), pp. 55-59. These two churches, and St George's Cathedral (the colonial church), were the only centres of Anglicanism in Freetown; whereas Anglicanism preponderated in the villages, were CMS efforts in the colony, commenced and concentrated for many years.

\textsuperscript{187} The circumstances of the Rev T Maxwell's appointment to that church have already been discussed (cf. pp. 28-33, supra).

\textsuperscript{188} CMS, C A1/L6, p. 208, 22 May 1857, Venn to Maxwell. Cp. ibid., p.367, 23 March 2859, Venn to Ehemann (Secretary, Finance Committee of Sierra Leone).

\textsuperscript{189} CMS, C A1/L6, p. 353, 24 January 1859, Venn to Bishop Bowen.
and also because of a proclivity among the members of the church to join a plurality of associations and private clubs, at great cost. Nonetheless, the congregation showed a willingness to give to projects related to the church; and in the years leading to the establishment of a Native Pastorate, the Kissy Road Church exhibited traits of self-dependence which would have predisposed the observer to believe that its congregation had attained the degree of maturity commensurate with independence.

By 1851, the increasing numbers attending the church had far outgrown its capacity to contain them, and the need to enlarge the church and improve its facilities became a pressing problem. As was customary at the time in such circumstances, the church turned to the Society for aid and support (though its members promised to do what they could to accomplish the desired objective). Venn replied that there was little possibility that the Society would help, and told Maxwell that the funds for such an operation must be raised among the congregation. By this time, the Society's intention to make native churches self-supporting was common knowledge in the colony, and Maxwell tried to ensure that his congregation should never trouble the Society for whatever expenses it could bear on behalf of the Church. However,

190 CMS, C A1/O 148/50b, 28 February 1855, Maxwell to Venn. Cp. CMS, C A1/O 148/33, Rev T Maxwell, Journal Extracts for the Half year ending 30 September 1852. The House and Land tax was imposed by Ordinance on 14 April 1851, and first collected in 1852 (see, Fyfe, 1962, p. 257). A B C Sibthorpe, A History of Sierra Leone (1970, 4th ed.), describes it as an "obnoxious measure" which "met with much opposition" (p. 66). There is more than a suggestion here that despite a rising middle class, a goodly number of the population were of indifferent means; though, in the light of their subsequent exertions, Maxwell may have been exaggerating the penury of his congregation.

191 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 382, 15 September 1851, Venn to Maxwell.

192 Early that year, the communicant members of the church had willing agreed, on Maxwell's instigation, to undertake the repairs of the Church yard fence themselves, by using money from a "small fund which they raised to by means of hiring out a pall" - CMS, C A1/O 148/30a, Journal of Rev T Maxwell, for the Half year ending 31 March 1851.
re-building on the scale that the case required was a daunting task, and one that had never been previously undertaken by any congregation in the colony. Maxwell himself reported,

The enlargement of the Church may be regarded as an experiment. Some of my people were at first unfavourable to the undertaking: this was to be expected. Originating as it does with ourselves, without European interference, our people, being never before put to the task of helping themselves, regarded the undertaking as a thing impossible, or a burden too heavy for them to bear...

Indeed, so extraordinary was the objective that when the church eventually embarked on its appeal, in November 1852, even Wesleyans ("dissenters") and others in the wider community responded; and the whole project took on the nature of an exercise in native self-determination. Even then, the whole operation depended on the Kissy Road congregation's own resolve and commitment to the rather novel idea of self-support; and on Maxwell's leadership. This latter aspect was not without significance, for as Maxwell himself explained (when the Finance Committee proposed his removal from that church – and replacement by a European – in 1853), the congregation's "speedy and hearty response" on the occasion, was due largely to the fact that (with him as Pastor) they regarded their church as "principally a native Church". Yet, after nine months of combined subscriptions and contributions from both the Kissy Road congregation and the inhabitants of Freetown, only £80 had been raised (with no prospect of additional contributions); though there was the added consideration that the work was going to be done "chiefly by the free labour" of the congregation. 194 Maxwell was forced to send an appeal to "certain friends in England"; and eventually the work got under way. But whatever financial assistance may have been solicited from outside, the actual work was embarked on, and completed, solely through the

193 CMS, C A1/0 148/5b, 16 February 1853, Maxwell to CMS Secretaries.
194 CMS, C A1/0 148/7, 15 August 1853, Maxwell to Venn.
exertions of the congregation.\(^{195}\)

On closer scrutiny, this incident - which appears to have been a primary exercise in self-reliance - provides some valuable insights into the problems and progress which the introduction of self-support into the native Church would bring. First and foremost, the entire project was undertaken, at an expense of £282, without any assistance from the funds of the CMS.\(^{196}\) But the fact that the aid of friends in England had to be solicited was sufficient indication that outside help could not easily be dispensed with; and that for self-support to be an effective ingredient it had to be introduced gradually, and with due sensitivity to the ability of native congregations. At the same time, the action of the Kissy Road congregation showed sufficient innovation and self-reliance for the Society to declare that they exhibited before the people "an example of the native pastorate".\(^{197}\) Secondly, the idea of self-sustenance, was not one that could possibly have met with unmitigated enthusiasm by the majority of members in the native congregations - especially after decades of dependency. In the case of the Kissy Road Church congregation, Maxwell was at pains to correct the impression that the "bulk of the people" were willing to espouse or contribute to the cause. He told Venn that "there are many grumblers, many miserly ones who cannot bear the name of 'collection'...; but we go on in patience, whilst I endeavour with the few faithful and enlightened who are my comfort to spread the leaven of Christian love and Christian liberality".\(^{198}\) Only time, and

\(^{195}\) Maxwell got the work to be completed by the simple expedient of apportioning different areas to different members of the congregation: "each defraying the expenses of that particular portion which is assigned to him, or which he himself might select..." - CMS, C A1/O 148/37, Report of Rev. T Maxwell, for the Half year ending 30 September 1854.

\(^{196}\) See Proceedings of the CMS, 57th year, 1856, p. 35.

\(^{197}\) Proceedings of the CMS, 56th year, 1855, p. 30.

\(^{198}\) CMS, C A1/O 148/8, 27 February 1855, Maxwell to Venn.
careful teaching, could activate a readiness in the mass of Sierra Leone Christians to lend the full strength of their support and munificence in favour of sustained self-reliance, and independence. Thirdly, the willingness of the minority to embark on an exercise in self-help - supported as it was by the wider Freetown community - was, by all accounts, due to a consciousness that the appointment of a native to the pastoral charge of the Church made it a "native church"; a consideration that arguably induced the congregation (and, indeed, every "native") to lend their full support to both the pastor and the undertaking. This line of reasoning was effective enough for Maxwell to declare his conviction "that had it been in their power to do more for the cause of religion among themselves, they would gladly have done it". Fourthly, the success of the venture served to awaken in the congregation a sense of their duty; and, in a sense, introduced them to the refreshing draught of self-achievement and the possibilities of their own liberality. It was no coincidence that within a year after the completion of the enlargement of the Kissy Road Church, the congregation - on its own initiative - had raised £25 for the purchase of a musical instrument for the Church; and by 1861, had not only embarked on plans for the building of a schoolhouse, but had also purchased lamps for the church at a cost of £71. The fact that all these efforts were rather more introverted than altruistic - and could more aptly be described as self-help rather than self-support - should not be allowed to detract from their efficacy; if only in deference to the time honoured principle that charity begins at home.


200 Maxwell described it as "the beginning of a better feeling among the people" - CMS, C A1/O 148/8, 27 February 1855, Maxwell to Venn.

201 CMS, C A1/O 148/48b, Report of Rev. T Maxwell, for the Half year ending 31 March 1861. These lamps, which were purchased from England, were admitted to be the best in the Colony; and made Kissy Road Church one of the brightest lit in Freetown.
It is difficult to describe Venn's reaction to the efforts of the Kissy Road Church as anything other than mixed. While applauding these green-shoots of self-support, he was more concerned about the long term impact and wider implications of self-support, not only for individual congregations (such as Kissy Road) but for the whole of CMS operations in the colony. When Maxwell first informed him about the project he replied that he longed "for the time when this Church may be separated from the Society by an endowment, in its expenses, the Society only retaining the appointment of the minister". Three years later, when the operation was well under way, he informed Maxwell that while he was well aware of his exertions for the enlargement of the church, he longed "to hear of the fruits of those your exertions in the missionary spirit which you excite among your countrymen - especially in supporting the whole burden of the work in the colony, that our funds may be devoted to the work beyond the colony". Clearly, Venn may have been more than a little anxious that such congregational acts of self-achievement should obscure the all-embracing objective of the establishment of a more permanent and extensive system of self-support, within the ambit of ecclesiastical independence. Yet, such initiatives in self-support could not be ignored; for they held the key to the implementation of a more comprehensive scheme. As Maxwell himself was quick to reassure Venn, his noble exertions would have failed if they terminated simply with the completion of the work (of enlarging the church), and if he neglected "to improve those opportunities which the undertaking opens to us".

---

202 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 382, 15 September 1851, Venn to Maxwell.
204 CMS, C A1/O 148/8, 27 February 1855, Maxwell to Venn.
a. The Introduction of Self-Support and Self-Government into Elementary Schools

The first real test of the Sierra Leone congregations' preparedness to take a concrete step in the direction of independence and self-support came in 1854, when the CMS introduced a scheme which gradually placed its "Day-Schools" upon local support. The lessons of the past had made the CMS particularly sensitive to any diminution of its funds; and when in the mid-1850s an increase in taxation and the rising cost of living in Britain (arising from the Crimean war) began to affect its income, the Society immediately imposed restrictions on its foreign expenditure, and insisted on a more sustained effort to throw as much of its work as possible upon the self-supporting system.\(^{205}\) By 1850, the Society was responsible for about 46 elementary schools in the Sierra Leone colony,\(^{206}\) providing education for some 2,895 children.\(^{207}\) Fyfe describes the insatiable desire of the inhabitants of the colony to procure the benefit of education for their children, thus,

Lack of schooling became a moral stigma: Europeans found their servants too busy writing to do house work. Schools overflowed: children had to be turned away; new schools were opened...\(^{208}\)

The CMS contributed about £800 per annum to the maintenance of its Day-schools; and an additional sum of over £500 came from the weekly "class" collections (appropriated for that

\(^{205}\) See CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 88, 20 November 1855, Circular to the Society's Missionaries. Cp. Warren, pp. 94-97. For the first time in years, the PC reported "a large increase of men, but a deficient income, and a debt, instead of a balance in hand" (Proceedings of the CMS, 56th year). In 1853 expenditure exceeded the receipts of the Society by £8000 (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 206, 14 June 1854, CMS Secretaries to the Finance Committee of the West Africa Mission).

\(^{206}\) Proceedings of the CMS, 53rd year, 1852, p. 44. By 1855, these schools had increased to over 55.

\(^{207}\) CMS, C A1/O 8/24a, Report of the SLACMS for 1851-1852. Fyfe reports that "by 1840 over 8,000 children, about a fifth of the population, were at school (at a time when in England only three-fifths of the population could read and write)" - p. 213.

\(^{208}\) Fyfe (1962), p. 213.
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purpose) and actual payments for schooling.\(^ {209} \) In 1847, the parents had willingly acquiesced in an increase of the payment for schooling from half penny a week for each child to one penny.\(^ {210} \) Recognizing the value of such local support (and liberality), and invoking the provisions of a new "Ecclesiastical Arrangement" with the recently appointed Bishop of Sierra Leone, the PC instructed the Finance Committee to place all its elementary schools "upon a principle of self-support", and to appoint a School Committee to take over the management of the schools.\(^ {211} \) It outlined a scheme in which its own annual grant of £800 was to be reduced by one-fifth each year (starting with the year ending September 1855); and all contributions from native Christians were to be appropriated for the self-support of these institutions.\(^ {212} \) By this plan, the schools were to attain a fully self-supporting and self-governing status by 1860. The PC explained that the its gradual withdrawal "allowed time for eliciting the resources of the Colony and for pressing upon the people that their first duty is to pay for their religious instruction"; adding that the Colonial Government may be induced to make grants in aid to the schools.

The fact that each village had its own elementary school, which was invariably attached to a church, meant that the implementation of the scheme rested on securing the assent and cooperation of the individual native congregations (on whom the financial burden would ultimately be placed). Reactions to the proposed plan were, generally speaking, a mixture of hesitation and muted enthusiasm. In many

\(^ {209} \) Of this amount, school payments accounted for over £390 by 1850 (see SLACMS reports).

\(^ {210} \) Proceedings of the CMS, 47th year, 1847, p. 30. This caused the collections from the schools to increase from £271 in 1846 to £382 in 1847.

\(^ {211} \) ibid. It has to be said that this provision was the first instance of "self-government" to be introduced into the Sierra Leone Mission.

\(^ {212} \) ibid.
congregations there were elements of strenuous opposition to the scheme, because of its financial implications and what was perceived as the virtual impossibility of operating without CMS support. But the abiding desire of the inhabitants to secure education for their children was most probably a deciding factor in producing a favourable response. The reports of many ministers indicated that once they understood the proposed plan, the people began at once to collect subscriptions and make preparations for the maintenance of their schools independently of the Society. Indeed, apart from the oft mentioned proclivity for education which the inhabitants of the colony evinced, the one other consideration which exercised a great influence on their reaction to the new scheme was a deeply felt gratitude to the Society for its labours and sacrifices on their behalf, in over four decades. School Committees were quickly formed in the different stations; and a School Fund was instituted. By any reckoning, this first exercise in self-support and quasi self-government proved to be eminently successful. Within two years "the whole expense of the primary schools including the salaries of more than 60 school-masters and school-mistresses" was being borne by the native church. The Sierra Leone Finance Committee informed the PC of the "very satisfactory exertions which the native Christians have made to support their Schools, and the very large amounts of their pecuniary contributions to this object". So effective was the self-supporting aspect of this new scheme that by 1858 there was a large balance (of £1200) in the Mission's

---

213 It is worth mentioning, for example, that by 1848, half of the pupils at the Grammar School paid for their own education (Proceedings of the CMS, 48th year, 1848, p. liii); a fact which made that institution to a considerable extent self-supporting.

214 See Proceedings of the CMS, 56th year, 1855, pp. 36-39.

215 Proceedings of the CMS, 57th year, p. 34. This report revealed that in 1856, "no less a sum than £786 was raised and expended by the people in the education of the young" - an amount that was £200 up on that collected in 1852.

216 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 113, 31 January 1856, Venn to Jones.
coffers, "on account of the School Fund";\textsuperscript{217} and by 1859, Venn and the other CMS Secretaries had begun to debate "whether the weekly payments from the communicants hitherto carried to the School account should not in part at least be carried to a Church Fund".\textsuperscript{218} Eventually, the PC recommended the appointment of a Central Committee to manage the School Funds; arguing that "a fair representative Committee of the schools" - and not its own Finance Committee in the colony - ought to be responsible for the schools.\textsuperscript{219} It stipulated that once such a Central Committee was in place, its functions were to include: making grants to the general fund; controlling the placing, removal, or dismissal of schoolmasters; and appointing and receiving the Reports of School Inspectors.\textsuperscript{220} Although this proposal reflected the PC's desire that management of the schools be local and independent of the Society, any suggestion that it constituted an important step in self-government has to be denied. Venn's own recommendation was that the Central Committee "should comprise the Governor and Chief Justice (not \textit{ex-officio} but elected as individuals) and some native gentle men... and a few Missionaries..."\textsuperscript{221} Such a composition could hardly be described as a tribute to native self-determination. But the fact remains that the introduction of the principle of self-support into the Sierra Leone Mission was, from the Society's point of view, completely justified; and an unqualified success. That principle was meant to serve a two-fold objective: to develop the resources of the Society's churches in the different

\textsuperscript{217} CMS, C A1/L5, p. 342, 23 November 1858, Venn to Ehemann (Secretary, Sierra Leone Finance Committee); which amount, on the Sierra Leone Finance Committee's suggestion, was invested in England.

\textsuperscript{218} CMS C A1/L5, p. 360, 24 January 1859, CMS Secretaries to Ehemann (Secretary, Finance Committee Sierra Leone).

\textsuperscript{219} CMS, C A1/L5, p. 347f., 22 December 1858, Venn to Bowen.

\textsuperscript{220} \textit{ibid.}, p. 348.

\textsuperscript{221} \textit{ibid.}
missions, by giving fresh impulse to their exertions; and to "sensibly and permanently relieve the Society of a large expenditure incurred in the maintenance of schools, in buildings and other matters, which should more properly be charged to the account of the Native Congregations themselves". The native churches in Sierra Leone gave every indication of being fertile ground for the fulfilment of these objectives. In the eyes of the PC, their exertions and liberality in the matter of supporting their schools was confirmation of their Christian maturity: "proof... that the native converts [had] reached a state of ripeness in which they may take an independent standing as a Church of Christ, able to sustain their own Teachers as well as to send out Teachers amongst their countrymen". Time, and the establishment of a Native Pastorate, was to prove that these conclusions were somewhat hasty.

b. The Native Church Fund

Venn never lost sight of the all important objective of placing the native Church in Sierra Leone on an independent footing. Indeed, the success of the elementary schools programme could have been seen as a testimony to the efficacy, and timeliness, of his new system. However, throughout the 1850s, his resolute efforts to secure the implementation of his plans for the establishment of a self-supporting native Church in Sierra Leone were repeatedly frustrated by the premature deaths of three bishops in succession. His anticipation had been that with the establishment of a bishopric the weekly class pence would be used as a basis for the institution of a Church Fund out of which the stipends of native ministers - and, indeed, newly ordained native Pastors - would be paid; thereby transferring

222 CMS, G/AZ1/1, no. 88, 20 November 1855, Circular to the Society's Missionaries.

223 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 113, 31 January 1855, Venn to Jones.
their support from the Society to the native congregations.224 In 1854, financial difficulties prompted the Society to declare that "Sierra Leone being the oldest established Mission, the Committee expect that the Home Funds should be relieved immediately from all charges save the salaries of the present missionaries..."; and "should any ordinations take place the salaries already granted to the catechists must be augmented by local means".225 Venn explained to Bishop Vidal that any candidates for ordination had to be regarded "as candidates for the Pastorate of the Native Church of Sierra Leone"; and therefore had to look to the Native Church - and not to the Society - for their support.226 The "Article of Arrangements" drawn up with this bishop, in 1853, had stipulated that "arrangements be proposed for providing the Native Pastors with a suitable income from local resources"; and that "a fund be instituted in Sierra Leone to be called 'The Church Fund'".227 But none of the first three bishops (of Sierra Leone) lived long enough to establish a Native Church Fund. An anxious PC, fearing that this circumstance may prove to be perennial, resolved that in the event a fourth bishop suffered the same fate as his predecessors, it would "take the course adopted in the schools and gradually withdraw the salaries of the native ministers".228

Between 1850 and 1860, all attempts to secure the institution of a Native Church Fund in Sierra Leone failed. In 1849, the

224 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 9, 1 November 1852, Instructions of the Committee to Missionaries...
226 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 1, 19 September 1854, Venn to Vidal.
227 Articles of a Proposed Arrangement between the Bishop of Sierra Leone and the Church missionary Society, in respect of the regulation of the Native Church in the Colony of Sierra Leone, (March 1853).
228 Communicated in a letter from the CMS Secretaries to Jones (Secretary, Sierra Leone Finance Committee) - CMS, C A1/L7, p. 99, 23 October 1860.
Society created a Special Jubilee Fund — with an initial amount of £10,000 — which, it declared, was "to be employed in assisting Native Christian Churches to support their own Native Ministers and Institutions".229 Each mission (or station of a mission) was encouraged to start a "Native Church Endowment Fund" — to be primarily "vested in the Society, and under the control of its Committee" — to which native Christians could make contributions to secure the self-support of the Native Church. Such contributions (for endowment) were either to be made "generally for the Native Church, or particularly to secure a Native Pastor to any particular field".230 But the crux of this proposal was the Society's declaration: "That as soon as £100 shall be raised by local funds for these objects, it shall be increased out of the Jubilee Fund, by a sum not exceeding an equal amount; the amount of the addition to be regulated by a consideration of the circumstances under which the sum has been raised; that is to say, the contributions of Native Christians to be met by equal amounts..." This was a rather circumlocutory way of saying that grants from the Jubilee Fund would be directly proportional to the contribution of Native Christians. In other words, where a particular mission to raise any sum, say £60, towards the Native Church, that amount would be increased by the Society (from the Jubilee Fund) to £120, and invested accordingly.231 This provision induced vigorous efforts on the part of native Christians in South India and Ceylon; but produced no response in Sierra Leone.232 In 1853, the CMS Secretaries intimated that they were "jealous for Sierra Leone that it may not prove behind hand in such an important step towards the establishment of

229 Miscellaneous Papers (PHL), vol. 1, no. 45, Minute on the Native Church Endowments in the Missions of the CMS (8 January 1866).

230 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 2, 19 September 1854, Venn to Vidal.

231 ibid. The sum of £100, to be raised by local funds, was afterwards reduced to £50.

232 CMS, C A1/L6, p, 153, 23 May 1861, Venn to Beckles.
the Native Church". But neither this nor subsequent hints about Sierra Leone's backwardness in taking advantage of such a useful provision for self-support, produced any response. In a further bid to encourage the "immediate institution" of a Church Fund in Sierra Leone, the PC declared its willingness "to meet sums raised in the Colony by equal sums, up to £100, during the first year"; quite independently of whatever grants may be made out of the Jubilee Fund to meet local contributions for endowment. Even this extraordinary gesture (which was never repeated) failed to elicit any kind of response. Venn, who was obviously disappointed by this tardiness, confided in Rev. Edward Jones that he had hoped Sierra Leone would have been the first to avail themselves of the Jubilee Fund. In one of his many references to the subject, he enquired (somewhat rhetorically) why the native Christians in Sierra Leone - who "are probably richer than those of Tinnevelly", and "were earlier instructed in the truth of the Gospel - should be behind those in India in taking this essential step in self-support.

A few explanations might be put forward to explain this initial inertia and unresponsiveness of the native Christians in Sierra Leone, with respect to the institution of a Church Fund. In the first instance, there were certain financial circumstances which militated against a readiness in the

---

233 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 167, 30 November 1853, CMS Secretaries to the Sierra Leone Central Committee.

234 By 1861, when Bishop Beckles sought to invoke the provisions of the Jubilee Fund, Venn informed him that it was no longer available for that purpose - CMS, C A1/L6, p. 153, 23 May 1861, Venn to Beckles (in reply to the latter's letter of 15 April 1861.

235 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 2, 19 September 1854, Venn to Vidal.

236 ibid., p. 204, 23 May 1854, Venn to Jones.

237 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 2, 19 September 1854, Venn to Vidal. This statement makes it all the more significant that some 12 years later Venn was to declare that "the greatest advance in native Church organisation has been made in Sierra Leone..." (Third Paper, 1866).
native congregations to respond positively to the appeal for endowments. Mention has already been made of Maxwell's complaint that the imposition of the "House and Land Tax" was "a heavy weight" on the people, which affected their contribution to the Church. Fyfe explains that this tax "tended to press most on the poor" — who most certainly constituted the greater proportion of the native congregations. The fact that the native congregations were required to take on the burden of supporting their schools a few years later, added to their financial constraints, and may have precluded a ready support for the Church Fund. It must also be considered that despite the success of establishing self-support for the Day Schools, the principle of self-reliance was still a very unfamiliar and unexplored concept. Indeed, there was some indication that many native Christians were fearful of a complete withdrawal of CMS missionaries. For unlike support for the schools, the Church Fund pointed more directly to a termination of the Society's aegis. Of even greater significance was the series of abbreviated episcopacies which characterized the period, and subverted the attempts of successive bishops to undertake any comprehensive ecclesiastical programme. Of the first three bishops, only Bowen endeavoured to address the issue of endowment and self-support for the native Church. But his constant pre-occupation with the need for more European missionaries, and his conviction that the ordination of native ministers — which was contingent to his own proposals — was not a pressing issue, could hardly have induced him to

238 Fyfe (1962), pp. 362, 375. As the tax became more strictly enforced it caused severe hardship to this group.

239 In 1847, the Rev J Beale reported that though the people were absolutely willing to make increased contributions to the education of their children (and even to the Society), "they expressed their horror" when he explained that the Society intended to withdraw its missionaries eventually and leave the Church in Sierra Leone with a native ministry (Proceedings of the CMS, 47th year, p. 30).
pursue such a system of self-support with vigour.\textsuperscript{240} In any case, like the other bishops before him, he did not live long enough to establish any proper ecclesiastical system within which a Native Church Fund could be properly set up and administered. Another reason for the initial failure to establish a Native Church Fund in the Sierra Leone Mission, could be derived from the fact that the Sierra Leone Finance Committee (which was the Society's managing body in the colony) did very little to foster that object. Throughout the 1850s, the PC repeatedly commended the urgency of making the native Church self-supporting to the consideration of this body. In 1854, the CMS Secretaries advised this Committee that "there should be immediately instituted a Native Pastor's Fund", and instructed that "each congregation should contribute to this Fund out of which the Pastors should receive their stipend".\textsuperscript{241} However, there is no indication that this committee ever sought to take action in this direction. Indeed, the tendency for many of the missionaries to regard the formation of a Native Pastorate as more or less a retrograde step - one that would undo the good work they had done\textsuperscript{242} - made it more like that they would be out of sympathy with plans for a Church Fund. In the end, therefore, neither the first three bishops of Sierra Leone, nor the Finance Committee, nor the native congregations seemed prepared, or able, to embark on this uncharted course. Another group Venn could have relied on to stimulate a readiness for self-support, or play an active role in the institution of a Native Church Fund, was the native ministers. One of the blind spots in Venn's planning (which was possibly a reflection of his essentially Anglican frame

\textsuperscript{240} He told Venn that until he got a European to relieve him of the duties of Assistant Chaplain, he could do very little about endowments (CMS, C A1/0 25c/11, 10 September 1858, Bowen to Venn. Cp. Memorials of John Bowen, Late Bishop of Sierra Leone (London, 1862), p. 579.

\textsuperscript{241} CMS, C A1/L6, p. 16, 22 September 1854, CMS Secretaries to the Finance Committee.

\textsuperscript{242} Note, for instance, reactions to Maxwell's appointment to the Kissy Road Church in 1851 (pp. 28ff., supra).
of mind) was that he appeared to regard this group as almost entirely subject to the Finance Committee, European missionary supervision, and later on the bishop, without much weight or influence of their own. Although he repeatedly urged the principle of self-support on Maxwell and Nicol (who were later joined by eight other native clergymen, ordained by Bishop Weeks in June 1856), his main hopes were pinned on episcopal activity or prerogative. He seems to have been less aware of the fact that there was abundant scope to utilise native ministers as expositors and promoters of the new scheme. For many reasons, including direct interest in the nature and purpose of such a fund, the native ministers could be easily motivated to persuade their countrymen to bestir themselves in support of such a cause. Venn, it must be said, recognized this principle, but failed to exploit it as a strategy. To be sure, he advised Bishop Beckles (in 1861) that if he were to hold out that there would be "no full salaries till the pastorate fund is complete", it would induce the native ministers to stir up their countrymen, and "double exertions will be used to raise contributions". But apart from making this argument, Venn gave very little indication that he expected the native ministers to play any significant role in preparing the native Church for self-support.

On the whole, the introduction of self-support was a process fraught with more difficulties than Venn could have imagined. The readiness of the native congregations to support their schools, compared to their reluctance to support their native ministers - in a colony which held both education and religion sacred - is a paradox which defies easy explanation. The irony of the case is that within eight years after the


244 Though, in 1861, he did encourage one native minister to use his God-given gifts to prepare his congregation and the "native congregations of the colony generally for the new position in which they will be placed when thrown upon themselves for self-support" - C A1/L7, p. 181, 22 October 1861, Venn to Jacob Cole (Kissy).
death of Bowen, Venn had occasion to declare that "the greatest advance in native Church organisation has been made in Sierra Leone". The circumstances behind this claim form the subject of the third chapter. But it is necessary to reiterate that despite the aptness and forceful logic of Venn's vision of a the Native Pastorate, the implementation of his "new system" was beset by unforseen and unforeseeable difficulties and consequences. The three elements discussed in this chapter - raising up native pastors, European supervision, and self-support - have only served to uncover some of the minor "road-blocks" which hampered the progress towards the organisation of the Native Pastorate in a specific setting. Unfortunately for Venn, various factors continued to conspire against the true independence and self-determination of the Native Pastorate; and throughout its existence in the nineteenth century, it never quite fulfilled the objectives of the visionary concept which brought it into being.

245 "Third Paper" (1866).
Chapter II

The Road to a Regular Ecclesiastical System: A State of Transition

It must be borne in mind that Missionary operations, are in their very nature, temporary and preparative; that they are to be gradually but eventually superseded by a different order of things, when the Heathen Nation shall have become Christianized... Now it must be expected that in proportion as this change advances, difficulties and perplexities will arise in our ecclesiastical relations, peculiar to this TRANSITION STATE...¹

At first glance, the advent of the 1850s seems distinctly to mark the inception of a new era in the Sierra Leone Mission. The institution of a new organisational structure in the Mission's administrative machinery; the establishment of an episcopacy; the emergence of a native ordained ministry; and the successful introduction of the principle of self-support were all epoch-making events which rather suggested that (after about thirty-five years) the Mission had eventually come of age. Moreover, the Society's own Jubilee celebrations, and its incipient policy on independent Native Churches (as enunciated by Venn), all helped to create a mood (albeit transient) of nervous expectation and optimism. But such propitious developments notwithstanding, the state of the Sierra Leone Mission throughout the 1850s may be more correctly described as one of 'transition'. Indeed, these very changes - which arguably heralded a new era - were more or less indicative of the attempts to move from a foreign dominated mission to an independent, self-supporting, native Church. In the process, an intermediate stage emerged (between 1850 and 1860) in which the whole Mission was caught up in an evolutionary mode of change and confusion. The Society's own determination to secure a settled ecclesiastical arrangement and foster the creation of an independent self-supporting native Church was repeatedly frustrated - notably by the brevity of the first three

¹ Proceedings of the CMS, 42nd Year, 1841, Appendix to the 39th Report, p. xiii.
episcopacies. Furthermore, the inchoateness of its policies often led to misinterpretation and misapplication by its representatives in the Mission, which added considerably to an aura of uncertainty and anxiety. In such a state of affairs, every trial and setback took on alarming proportions, and fuelled feelings of angst and despair. It is therefore a tribute to Venn's statesmanship that his remained throughout a singular voice of optimism: "One is far from taking a gloomy view of the Mission", he wrote in 1856, "the transition state from too great dependence upon the pecuniary prop of CMS to the more healthy condition of self-support and self-control, could not but be attended with some shakes."  

By 1850, CMS operation in the Sierra Leone colony had been thoroughly established, and was enjoying tremendous success. Stock attests that by this time the Sierra Leone Mission was characterised by "increasing numbers, regular attendance, and tokens of spiritual life".  

In 1849 the Society declared that it occupied every important village in the colony, and had a missionary in every single one of the parishes. The availability of European missionaries, as well as the increase of native Teachers had "enabled the Society to extend its operations to various villages and hamlets of the colony hitherto left destitute". The CMS sphere of labour

---

2 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 152, 15 October 1856, Venn to Millward (Grammar School).  
3 Stock, ii, p. 99. It is worth mentioning that until Samuel Adjai Crowther was consecrated Bishop of 'West African territories beyond British Jurisdiction', in 1864, the terms "Sierra Leone Mission" and "West African Mission" were used interchangeably.  
4 Proceedings of the CMS, The Jubilee Year (1848-1849), 1849, p. lix. Stock (ii, p. 99), remarks that "the health of the missionary staff was better preserved than of old; several men completed long periods of service; and for some years there were no deaths".  
5 These recent acquisitions included villages as close to the colony as Wilberforce, and others as far away as Russell and Tumbo in its south-east confines (see Proceedings of the CMS, 51st year, 1850, p. lii). Also, between 1840 and 1850, the number of native Teachers had almost doubled from 24 to 46.
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comprised 15 principal stations (and as many minor ones), in which there were 6950 attendants on public worship and a total of 2061 communicants. The Society had also succeeded in establishing a system of education in the colony "of a very extensive and complete character": each village had its Day-School where children (and adults) received an elementary education; and in Freetown, the Grammar School (and the Female Institution to a lesser extent) provided a superior education (mainly for the children of wealthier inhabitants), while the Fourah Bay Institute was specially devoted to theological training and preparing men for the ministry. All these accomplishments boded well for the future of the Mission; though the path of progress proved to be a very rugged one.

The Mission was not without its shortcomings; notably a distinctive operational imbalance. Historians of nineteenth century Sierra Leone invariably remark that while the CMS (and therefore Anglicanism) preponderated in the villages, its presence and influence in Freetown (the capital town) was feeble, and limited to the Kissy Road Church and St George's Cathedral (the state church). This circumstance was most undesirable in a colony where rapid social change, and various economic factors, caused more and more people to migrate from the villages to Freetown. The vast majority of these migrants were CMS converts who were forced to join one

6 Proceedings of the CMS, 51st year, 1850, p. lxx. Compared to 471 communicants in 1820 (see CMS, C A1/0 8/11, Proceedings of the 4th Anniversary of the SLACMS). However, the claim of Society's paper entitled "Bishopric of Sierra Leone" that "the number of persons attending public worship in connexion with the Church of England... exceeds 10,000", is most certainly an exaggeration.

7 Proceedings of the CMS, 51st year, 1850, p. lxx. By 1850, the Society was responsible for 46 schools, attended by some 6184 scholars; while the Grammar School and Fourah Bay Institution between them had 66 students. However, the declining fortunes of the Fourah Bay Institution, led to tentative plans for its amalgamation with the Grammar School, by the late 1850s (cf. C A1/0 3/397 & 401; C A1/L6, pp. 355-356).

8 To these two might be added the Grammar School, which conducted an active Sunday School.
"Dissenting" chapel or another, and, with some justification, reproached the Society "for the fact that they had no other place to worship to go to". Indeed, the disproportionate representation of the strongest Missionary body in the colony's increasingly populous administrative centre remained one of the ironies of nineteenth century Sierra Leone. In 1848, J Warburton, the Secretary of the Mission, argued that unless the Society established more congregations in Freetown its educational efforts and expense (as in the case of the Grammar School) would "be expended only or chiefly on dissenters", and the Fourah Bay Institution would continue to suffer from a want of pious young men - who could only be obtained from the Society's own churches. In this regard, the completion of the Pademba Road Church (often referred to, in its early days, as "Freetown Church") in 1849 represented a significant progress in the Mission. The PC were well aware that to have a solitary church (Kissy Road Church) in the very town from where it conducted all its missionary operations was unusual and invidious. They were also painfully cognisant of the misalignment between the Society's superior educational establishments and its main areas of influence, and suffered the ignominy of losing hundreds of its converts and adherents to "dissenting" bodies, who "rejoiced in [the] unlaboured for accession to their strength". It is not surprising then that proposals for

---

9 CMS, C A1/O 3/231a, pp. 5-6, Warburton (Secretary of Mission) to CMS Secretaries.
10 In 1869, Maxwell complained that "to a new comer just arriving in... Freetown, the Church of England is lost in the midst of overwhelming dissent" (CMS, C A1/O 148/15a, 25 October 1869, Maxwell [on behalf of the Native Pastorate Auxiliary] to Venn).
11 CMS, C A1/O 3/231, p. 6, 19 October 1848, Warburton to CMS Secretaries. The case of the Grammar School was particularly conspicuous. Maxwell reported that it was situated in a part of Freetown in which it was surrounded by "large bodies of dissenters, the Wesleyans and the settlers from Nova Scotia", and many small [non-Anglican] chapels; and added that the greater part of its "sabbath scholars" were Wesleyans (some of whom were leaders and exhorters) - CMS, C A1/O 148/1, 5 March 1846, Maxwell to Venn.
12 ibid.
building churches in Freetown were frequently mooted throughout the century. Warburton defended the building of a new Church in Freetown by arguing that the Society could only supply its educational establishments in Freetown by extending its labours there. "This", he opined, "will be the case with the Church in Freetown especially; besides the inestimable blessings of the Gospel which it will afford to a large population. It will strengthen and render more effective the Grammar School; it will be a fresh source of supply for Fourah Bay; and it will greatly add to the usefulness of the Society in Sierra Leone." Nonetheless, when the cost of building the Pademba Road Church led the Mission into financial difficulties, the PC disclaimed any commitment to such a project; and (somewhat disingenuously) went on to propose the "erection of a Church at Sierra Leone to be called 'Clapham Church'" (for which it claimed funds had already been collected in England). In the event, the Pademba Road Church was successfully completed and opened for divine service on 10 October 1849.

---

1 In 1869, Maxwell put forward strenuous arguments about the need for more Anglican churches in the capital - CMS, C A1/O 148/15, 25 October 1869, Maxwell to Venn.

14 ibid.

15 CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 136, 8 November 1848, Secretaries to Warburton. By April 1848 (after 2 years) an excess of £1000 had already been spent on the new Church (CMS, C A1/O 3/217a, p. 3, 7 April 1848, Warburton to Secretaries).

16 CMS, C A1/L 4, pp. 144-145, 8 November 1848, Venn to Warburton. Warburton replied that the work was well advanced and would proceed with the aid of local funds (CMS, C A1/O 3/235e, 27 January 1849, Warburton to Secretaries). He informed the Secretaries that the proposal for the building of the "Clapham Church" could not possibly be well received, in the light of efforts already being exerted to complete the Pademba Road Church; and suggested that any such Church would have to be erected in another part of Freetown, like Wilberforce. In the end, plans for the Clapham Church were dropped, and the Society was able, with the returns of the Jubilee Fund to assist in the completion of the Pademba Road Church.

17 Proceedings of the CMS, 51st year, 1850, p. lv. Warburton averred: "Beautiful for situation, is the Church, which contains a gallery on the two sides and the West End; and the whole is fitted up with pews, and comfortable benches with backs to them... the effect it produces on the mind of a visitor is that of pleasing surprise. And to see it filled with
populated district in the west side of Freetown, and built to contain a congregation of one thousand, it became the premier Church of the Society and attained great strategic importance in the Sierra Leone Mission. Its presence, however, did not obliterate the need for more Anglican churches in the capital; and in the same month it was opened the PC expressed its expectation that two new churches would be erected in Freetown (for Maxwell and Nicol) "at no distant period". But these expectations were never realized.

A. Planting the Seed of a Native Pastorate

The return of George Nicol and Thomas Maxwell to Sierra Leone (in 1849), as ordained native clergymen, marked a significant development in the history of Anglican Christianity in that colony. For never before had any ordained native (Sierra Leonean) Anglican clergyman served in the Sierra Leone Mission. The native Christians in the colony had already demonstrated, in the case of Samuel Crowther, that they had a special niche of affection in their hearts which only an ordained clergyman of their own race could evoke. On Crowther's return to Sierra Leone (as an ordained native clergyman) in December 1843, a large crowd was present to welcome him; and an immense congregation turned out to hear him preach and receive the administration of the Lord's free native worshippers is a delightful privilege" (CMS, C A1/O 3/255a, p. 5, 2 November 1849, Warburton to the CMS Secretaries).

CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 198, 30 October 1849, Secretaries to Warburton.

It must be acknowledged that Samuel Adjai Crowther (later Bishop), originally brought to the colony as a Recaptive in 1821, had been ordained on Trinity Sunday (11th June), 1843, and had received Priest's orders on 1st October the same year (see Stock, i, p. 457f). This was the first ordination of a native African in nearly 40 years of CMS operations in West Africa. But, though Samuel Crowther returned to Sierra Leone in 1843 as an ordained African clergyman, and served there for about a year, he could not be described as a native Sierra Leonean. Crowther was a Yoruba, and always identified himself as such. Indeed, he returned to spearhead a mission to the Yoruba country in 1844; and his real life work, for about 45 years was in connection with his native land. Venn certainly confused the issue when he declared that "Brother Crowther is a Missionary because he has been sent from Sierra Leone to Abeokuta" (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 374, 13 August 1851, Venn to G Nicol).
Supper from his hands. Even more emotional scenes occurred a few days later when he preached in the Yoruba language at Kissy Road Church – presumably the first Christian service ever held in Africa in the Yoruba tongue. Though Crowther left Sierra Leone to serve in the Yoruba Mission, his visits to the colony always created a stir among the native Christians, and were invariably treated as special events. The return of Maxwell and Nicol, as ordained clergymen, induced a similar response of eager approbation and expectation among the native Christians of Sierra Leone. It is also significant that in the early years of their ministry comparisons were not infrequently instituted between the two Sierra Leonean clergymen and the far more esteemed Crowther.

Maxwell and Nicol were colony-born Christians (sons of Liberated Africans), and representative of the up-and-coming middle class in Sierra Leone. Both were educated at

20 Stock, i, pp. 457-457.
21 Fyfe reports that the Muslim Aku headman sent his people to listen to him (Fyfe, p. 236); and Stock records that "after the benediction, the whole congregation burst forth with the cry of ke oh sheh, 'so let it be!'" (i, p. 458).
22 Stock, i, p. 458.
23 In 1851, his appeal for money to build a "Freetown Church" at Abeokuta was met with enthusiastic response. See Fyfe (1962), p. 236.
24 During the row (in 1851) over the true position of Nicol and Maxwell in the Sierra Leone Mission, for instance, it was argued that neither were on the same footing as Crowther (cp. CMS, C A1/0 148/30, and C A1/0 6/42).
25 See Fyfe (1962), p. 252. Nicol may have been a second generation Christian; but Maxwell's parents were Muslims from Bornu. His mother became a Christian in 1851 (cf. CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 382, 15 September 1851, Venn to Maxwell), but his father remained resistant to his son's efforts to convert him and preferred to pray "country fashion" (CMS, C A1/0 148/2, 22 April 1850, Maxwell to Venn).
26 Unlike the first generation Liberated Africans, who were more or less a struggling under class, the second generation – called the "colony-born" – were a rising class of educated, enterprising, ambitious colonists who were often described by European missionaries as proud, arrogant, and resistant to the tenants of Christianity. However, it was this class that Venn instinctively wanted the two men to influence.
the Fourah Bay Institute, and served as catechists and schoolmasters, before being sent to the CMS College at Islington (in 1844) for 18 months of study; where they reportedly "entered with spirit and success" into their studies.\(^{27}\) It is reasonable to infer that the act of providing two young native ministers with an education so far in advance of their compatriots or colleagues, represented a conscious effort on the part of the Society to activate an able, qualified, native ministry capable of replacing European agency. In his "Suggestions for the Improvement of the Social and Intellectual Condition of the Native African at Sierra Leone", Venn affirmed that the Society intended "to place the Native Catechists in situations of confidence and trust, by establishing them as Pastors of native flocks, providing them with suitable parsonages and small glebes, and making them partly dependent upon their congregations for their support; thus laying the foundation of a Native self-supporting Church".\(^{28}\) Maxwell and Nicol returned to Freetown in November 1845, amidst great excitement; and for the next two years served as Tutors at the Grammar School and Fourah Bay Institute, respectively.\(^{29}\) Both men returned to England in 1848, where they were ordained Deacons on Trinity Sunday, 1849, and made Priests on 29th September of the same year.\(^{30}\) The instructions given to them by the PC, on the occasion of their return to Sierra Leone, bears ample testimony to the

\(^{27}\) CMS, G/AZ1/1, No. 70.

\(^{28}\) *ibid.* Warren suggests an 1853/54 date for this paper; but an 1847/48 date seems much more likely. Mention is made in the document that both men were "now employed as Tutors, the one in the Grammar School and the other in the Fourah Bay Institute"; which indicates that it was certainly written before 1851 (in which year Maxwell became Pastor of Kissy Road Church). Also, the paper makes no mention of the fact both men were ordained; which (in the light of its subject matter) would be inexplicable, if it was written after 1849.

\(^{29}\) Their service seemed to fully justify CMS confidence. Venn wrote, "Since their return to Africa their conduct has been exemplary and satisfactory in every respect; and they have exhibited zeal for the conversion and improvement of their countrymen which they had never before felt..." - *ibid.*

\(^{30}\) Both acts were performed by the Bishop of London.
significance of the event, and its implications for the future of the Sierra Leone Mission:

The Committee look forward, as your ultimate position, to your having charge of a Church and congregation; and they will rejoice to see, not only yourselves but many more native clergy men thus discharging the regular pastoral and ministerial duties of the Colony upon a self-supporting native establishment; so that European missionaries may devote their time and labour to the extension of the gospel in the interior: and Sierra Leone become only a starting point and centre for the evangelization of western and central Africa.31

The Committee were also quick to point out that though they had not thought it fit to bring out the other (and senior) catechists to England for ordination, they regarded them "as candidates for orders, and worthy of being trusted as elders of the Native Church".32 In truth, the Annual Reports of the Society indicate that the burgeoning native ministry in Sierra Leone had developed to such a standard that native Teachers were often considered well qualified to relieve European missionaries "of a share, at least, of the pastoral care of the Christian congregations"; while the more "steady and experienced" catechists were located in different villages.33 But without the accession of "ordained" native ministers, neither the 'settled ecclesiastical system' nor the desired "euthanasia of a mission" could become a reality. The PC made it clear to Maxwell and Nicol that they had been provided with a superior education in order that they would seek to raise their countrymen to their own advanced level, and "strive to kindle and to cherish a missionary spirit

31 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 189, Instructions of the Committee to the Rev and Mrs N Denton, and the Rev George Nicol and Rev Thomas Maxwell, on the occasion of their departure to Sierra Leone, 5 October 1849.

32 ibid. They also urged the two young native clergymen not to seek to assert their ecclesiastical superiority over men who already had 30 years of faithful service behind them.

33 Proceedings of the CMS, 51st year, 1850, p. lxiii. By 1849, the CMS Secretaries were urging the importance "of having connected with each European Missionary one native helper who may be able in the occasional absence of the Missionary to carry on the ministerial work with the superintendence of a neighbouring Missionary - a kind of native Curate" CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 200, 30 October 1849, Secretaries to Warburton).
among the colonists". The Secretaries proposed the erection of two new churches in Freetown, so that "these two first Native Ministers may be soon settled with a Church and pastoral charge of moderate size amongst their countrymen of the same class with themselves, with the view of not only proving their spiritual guides, but also of raising them in their social condition, by their own superior attainments".

Though both men were initially placed in educational establishments, Maxwell was later appointed to the Kissy Road Church, in order that he would bring his influence to bear on the "the colony-born, the native merchants and the rising generation in Freetown". The PC was also at pains to emphasize that the two native ministers "should be rather identified with the upper classes of the native population then with the European brethren"; but later events indicated that this expectation did little to curb the desire of the two men to share an equal status with the European missionaries.

In a definitive sense, Maxwell and Nicol were the embodiment of the embryonic Native Pastorate. In them, a concept (which had thus far been only a theoretical abstraction) took on seminal reality. Inevitably, and maybe inadvertently, they became precursors of change and transition. The inclusion of two native ordained ministers into a sphere of labour that

---

34 CMS, C A1/L4, pp. 188-189, Instructions to... Rev George Nicol and Rev Thomas Maxwell, 5 October 1849.
35 CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 198, 30 October 1849, Secretaries to Warburton. The Secretaries went as far as to stipulate that a portion of the Jubilee Fund would be set aside for that purpose "in the hope that a corresponding sum may be raised upon the spot". But as already mentioned (see p. 81, supra) these plans were never brought to fruition.
36 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 297, 12 November 1850, Secretaries to Graf.
37 CMS, C A1/L 4, pp. 198-9, 30 October 1849, Secretaries to Warburton. "In this way", the Secretaries enthused, "we trust that a true missionary spirit will be kindled and cherished among the native merchants and other influential classes of the native population to a far greater extent than we have yet witnessed". The Secretaries added that they had explained these views to Maxwell and Nicol, and were "thankful to believe that they heartily respond to them".
had hitherto been almost exclusively the preserve of European missionaries was not an act that could be accomplished without a certain disruption and disturbance of the status quo. In fact, there was among some of the European missionaries a muted anxiety about being displaced; or, at least, a fear of losing their hitherto unchallenged pre-eminence or hard-earned territorial gains. Unfortunately, the attitude and expectations with which both Maxwell and Nicol were fired up on their return (as ordained ministers) did little to allay such apprehensions. For their part they were confident that their newly acquired status placed them on an equal footing with any European missionary. After all, they had been educated and nurtured (at considerable expense) for the very purpose of assuming positions of responsibility and leadership in their own country; and ultimately replacing foreign agency. Inspired by such convictions, their manner became distinctly abrasive at any suggestion that they were subordinate to (or subject to the supervision of) their European counterparts. Unfortunately, few (if any) of the European missionaries in Sierra Leone shared such a point of view; and many found the very idea of being displaced or replaced by native ministers an anathema - no matter what principles were involved. The commotion which occurred over Maxwell's appointment to the Kissy Road Church (in January 1851) was probably the first clear indication of the resistant, unsympathetic, even hostile attitude prevalent among this ruling group toward the notion of an active independent native ordained ministry. The reality of such non-acceptance and opposition filled Maxwell with

38 In the already discussed confusion over Maxwell's appointment (in January 1851) to the Kissy Road Church, Graf reportedly declared, "Never mind Mr Beale, what happens to you will happen to us all: our churches will be taken from us, and given to the natives" - CMS, C A1/0 148/4, 19 July 1851, Maxwell to Venn.

39 Indeed, Maxwell recalled that after their ordination they were assured by "a dear honoured friend in England" that they were "as good as any clergyman in England as respects the sacred office" (CMS, C A1/0 148/30a, Extract Journal of T Maxwell for half year ending 31 March 1851).

40 Cf. Chapter 1, pp. 28-33.
disappointment and frustration. He became convinced that not only had both he and Nicol been deceived in their expectations, but also that they were also being repressed because of racial bigotry. He declared in an impassioned vein:

If... the position of Nicol and Maxwell is always to be subordinate, if they can occupy no place of trust whatever, and if they are neither to act nor exert their influence in their own country but only at the will and pleasure of another; then what advantage is there to the Society for all the money spent for our visits to England, and education there! Surely, in the eyes of all Europeans and Natives, it would be care bestowed in vain. Educate for the sake of education - money thrown away! This Alas! is not all - the odium of inacceptability is affixed to poor Africans!¹¹

This lyrical outburst revealed more clearly than any argument would, the pain and disillusionment of the young native clergyman. The Mission was caught up in further unpleasantness and controversy a few months later, when Nicol's wife was left out of the Ladies Visiting Committee (which comprised the wives of missionaries).⁴² Nicol put the worst possible construction on her exclusion; and, in a strongly worded letter to the Secretary of the Mission, angrily declared that he would decline taking Mrs Nicol to the dinners customarily held in the house of a European missionary (before prayer-meetings), until he had heard from the PC on the matter - "for it seems we were assuming a position that does not belong to us".⁴³ Nicol was convinced that there was an even more important issue at stake than the question of equality. He defined the situation in terms of

---

⁴² The PC's direction on this matter was for a Visiting Committee "of Missionaries' wives" to be formed (cf. CMS, C A1/L4, 6 February 1851, Secretaries to Graf; 15 September 1851, Venn to Nicol); which Nicol had mistakenly taken to mean "the wives of all the missionaries". However, the fact that Mrs Nicol was the only wife not invited to the Committee, made it a conspicuous exclusion; and, under the circumstances, somewhat invidious. Again, the issue (from Nicol's point of view) was whether he shared the same status and position as the European missionaries.  
⁴³ CMS, C A1/O 164/65, 28 May 1851, Nicol to Graf. "I know", he stated, however, "that now in my ministerial capacity, I take my position with any clergyman of the Church of England".
a struggle, "not..., as some may think, for honour, precedence or superiority; but a struggle, and a noble one too, as to who shall do most for God and benefit most the natives of Africa". Expressing sentiments, which presaged the nationalistic feelings of the 1870s - but which the European missionaries found unpalatable - Nicol argued that no one could possibly do more for the Christianisation of Africa than Africans themselves. With more sincerity than wisdom, he told Graf: "The work is ours. You are strangers... We, the fruits of your labours, ought to take up the work warmly and carry it on. If then you put us in the background, and grudge us an entrance into any office where we may be useful, you deaden our interest; and you make our zeal flag". The Secretaries' reaction to the manifest distrust and disharmony between Maxwell and Nicol and the European missionary body was to condemn unhesitatingly what they perceived to be an attitude of undue self-regard and self-seeking in the two young native clergymen. The key-note of their reproof was "humility". "We cannot but regret", wrote Major H Straith, "the suspicious mind with which our young native ministers have commenced their work... I pray that the Lord may teach them and us to walk with all humility of mind, and to esteem others better than ourselves." Venn, as was his wont, waxed scriptural in his exhortations to the two native ministers; and described their "little trials" as tests of humility. He later criticised Nicol for describing the Missionaries as "strangers" who had come

44 ibid. Like Maxwell, Nicol attributed the actions of the European missionaries to colour prejudice; and added, in a letter to Venn, that those feelings were even more prevalent among the European merchants (CMS, C A1/0 164/5a, 17 June 1851, Nicol to Venn). It is significant that E Jones (an Afro-American) was the only missionary who defended Nicol's letter (cf. CMS, C A1/0 164/66, 2 June 1851, Circular to Missionaries, from Graf).

45 CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 377, H Straith (CMS Secretary) to Graf. Major H Straith was one of the Secretaries, who (along with Venn) were responsible for the West Africa Mission. He seems to have been particularly concerned with the financial aspects of the Mission affairs.

46 CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 374, 13 August 1851, Venn to Nicol; CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 382, 15 September 1851, Venn to Maxwell.
to his land, while complaining because he had not been "treated in all respects as the 'strangers' are!" - in connection with a matter that had nothing to do with his ministerial position. He pointed out to Nicol that his "proper position" and "true honour" lay not in identifying himself with European affairs, but in embracing native interests and looking towards the establishment of a self-governing native Church (when native ministers would take over the pastoral charge of the congregations in the colony; and free the "body of 'strangers'" to devote their energies to the evangelisation of Africa). But, for all his criticism, Venn was not lacking in sympathy and understanding for the reasoning and reaction of the two native clergymen. He told Maxwell: "I am well aware of the many practical difficulties which must arise in the present transition State of Sierra Leone. I sympathize with both you and Mr Nicol in your patriotic feelings - I hear from other missions of the difficulties which are experienced upon the first employment of Native Ministers". What is disappointing, however, is that Venn never seemed disposed to investigate allegations of racial prejudice; and habitually played down their significance. His response to Nicol's bitter complaint about the "feeling among our missionary brethren towards their coloured helpers" was avuncular but admonitory: "You feel as if the native race were slighted and thrust down by Europeans. Oh my dear brother, cast not such suspicions or

47 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 380, 15 September 1851, Venn to Nicol.
48 ibid. After sober reflection, Nicol repented of his angry words (having also been admonished by Samuel Crowther - his father-in-law). Cf. CMS, C A1/0 164/7, 8 October 1951, Nicol to Venn.
49 CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 383, 15 September 1851, Venn to Maxwell. He was, however, concerned that such troubles could defeat the establishment of a native Church.
50 In 1846, when Edward Jones intimated that the question of his colour had been mooted in the unhappy differences which were plaguing the Mission (CMS, C A1/0 129/5, 16 February 1846, Jones to Secretaries), Venn replied: "I have been very much pained at hearing from you that you have of late perceived a jealousy arising against your colour... I trust that you have been mistaken: or if there has been any ground, I trust that it will soon have passed away" (CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 29, 10 July 1846, Venn to Jones).
feelings, whatever foundation they may have. They will act as a canker into the cause of Christ."
What Venn may have overlooked was the fact that in a Mission where "great jealousies and suspicion" were endemic; and where the accustomed position of the natives was one of obsequious subordination; it was a foregone conclusion that an ascendant native ministry would precipitate conflict and friction. What is more, the disturbances surrounding the inclusion of Maxwell and Nicol rather foreshadowed the chronic disharmony and repeated conflicts which were to accompany the development of the Native Pastorate.

B. Structural and Constitutional Change
The introduction of two native clergymen into the Mission led to more comprehensive changes than mere occupational orientation. In the words of the CMS Secretaries, the return of the "two Native Missionaries", and the ripened state of the Mission (notably the increase of the missionary body), necessitated "a general review of the arrangements" under which its agents had been acting, and a "remodelling [of] the system of government of the Mission". Before October 1849, the Sierra Leone Mission was organised in a simple structure, in which the sole managing body was "The Local Committee".

51 CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 374, 13 August 1851, Venn to Nicol.
52 CMS, C A1/0 129/13, 17 November 1854, Jones to Venn. 8 years earlier, Jones had informed Venn that his own appointment to the Principalship of the Fourah Bay Institution had occasioned much jealousy; and had ventured the opinion that "the spirit of envy and jealousy of each other" was the "bane" of the Mission (CMS, C A1/0 129/7a, 14 April 1846, Jones to Venn).
53 It is worth stating at this point, however, that Venn later became very much alive to the inevitability and perniciousness of race conflict; as revealed in his paper 'On Nationality' – cf. Knight, (1880), pp. 282-292. See also, Chapter 4, pp. 251-253.
54 CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 134, 30 October 1849, Secretaries to Warburton. One cannot help but note that the term "Native Missionaries" was used here to describe the position of Maxwell and Nicol.
55 The details of the structure and machinery of the Mission were outlined in a paper circulated in the Mission in 1846, entitled 'A Summary of the principles which regulate the West African Mission' (CMS, C A1/0 5/6).
This Committee comprised the ordained Missionaries in the Mission; each of whom, except the Secretary, acted in turn as Chairman. The senior Native Catechist in the Mission was also a member - a practice that went back to the early days of the Mission when, due to the small number of missionaries, the PC had been requested to allow his attendance "to aid in counsel with his brethren". Apart from this arrangement, the native ministers had no say or formal representation in the administrative affairs of the Mission. According to the principles under which the Mission was run, the official channel of communication between the Native Assistants and the Local Committee was through the European superintendent of each station. Quarterly meetings, "composed of all the European Missionaries and Native Catechists", and General Prayer Meetings, were held every three months. But these appear to have been more interactive (and pastoral) than administrative.

According to the regulations governing the Mission, Maxwell and Nicol automatically became members of the Local Committee. But Venn and the other Secretaries argued that this was unacceptable on two counts: first, because it would increase the number of the Local Committee to 18 or 20, "which was far too large a number for the convenient transaction of business"; and second, because it was "on many grounds inexpedient" that Maxwell and Nicol should be admitted to the managing committee while the senior Catechists - who were "of tried fidelity and experience"; and who would have been presented for Holy Orders many years before, had there been a Bishop on the spot - were excluded. In order to avoid either eventuality, the PC passed a resolution that it was "expedient that a Sub-Committee for conducting the financial affairs of the Society

Cp. Shenk's statement that "the CMS constitution did not prescribe a field organisation"; but that "a field committee, usually appointed by the parent committee in London, managed the work of each mission" (1983, p. 49).

56 CMS, G/C1, Vol. 27, Committee Minutes, 2 October 1849, p. 200.
should be appointed at Sierra Leone..., consisting of six or eight of the elder Missionaries of the Society", to work in conjunction with a General Committee which would include two of the senior unordained Native Catechists". The Secretaries prepared new Regulations for the government of the Sierra Leone Mission, which included the following provisions:\[58\]

(a) "That a Finance Committee be formed at Sierra Leone, to consist of such clerical and lay members as the PC may from time to time place upon the same, to superintend and conduct all the financial affairs of the Mission, and to transact such other business as may be specially referred to them".

(b) "That the Committee for the management of the general affairs of the Mission consist of all the ordained Missionaries and European Catechists, together with the two Senior Native Catechists".\[59\]

(c) "That District Committees be formed of the members of the General Committee residing at convenient distances from each other, for the purpose of transacting affairs of minor and local interest, and for more frequent opportunities of mutual encouragement and prayer".

The Secretaries communicated the new Regulations to Warburton, in a lengthy communiqué which explained its various provisions.\[60\] They assured him that they had been guided in the arrangements "by general principles which have long prevailed in our home operations, and which have been found necessary for our foreign Missions as soon as they have

---

\[57\] ibid.

\[58\] CMS, G/C1, Vol. 27, Committee Minutes, 16 October 1869.

\[59\] The Secretaries explained that they could not contemplate the admission of Maxwell and Nicol to the General Committee while the senior native Catechists were not represented (CMS, C A1/L 4, p. 197, 30 October 1849, Secretaries to Warburton). "Besides which", they added, "we think it very important that the Natives should be trained up to the management of business".

\[60\] CMS, C A1/L 4, pp. 193-204, 30 October 1849, Secretaries to Warburton.
reached a certain extension". The focal point of the new arrangements was the interrelation between the Finance Committee and the General Committee; each of which was meant to be independent of the other. The Secretaries made a point of explaining that the Finance Committee was "not a sub-Committee requiring a confirmation of its Minutes", but a committee with a "concurrent jurisdiction". They conceded that there was likely to be "some perplexity in the first instance in distinguishing between the matters which belong to the one or the other Committee"; but expressed the hope that any initial difficulties would be surmounted by "Christian prudence and mutual confidence". However, in practice, the Finance Committee gradually assumed a position of extraordinary importance in the Mission (to the chagrin of the General Committee).

The new arrangements soon became a cause of tension and conflict in the Mission. Warburton returned to England, shortly after the new arrangements were instituted (on account of ill-health), and John U Graf was appointed Secretary of the Mission. Graf (one of the many German missionaries in the Mission) had been trained at both the Basle Seminary and the Society's Institute at Islington.

---

61 *ibid.* They also offered their earnest prayer that the proposed changes would not "engender elements of strife and envy".

62 Among other things, it was hoped that the Finance Committee would "relieve the general body of a variety of perplexing details". Its original composition was restricted to about five of the more experienced missionaries; but the Secretaries did not exclude "the possibility of placing upon that Committee persons who are not Agents of the Society, such as the Bishop, Chaplain, or some Christian Layman, or natives" (cp. CMS, C A1/L5, pp. 32-35, 2 December 1852, Venn to Justice Carr).

63 See CMS, C A1/03/289b, 2 May 1851, Graf to Secretaries. The fact remained that the General Committee (except for special meetings) was convened only twice in a year; and the Finance Committee which met at least once a month gradually took on the role of a decision-making body, and became the main arbiter of the affairs of the Mission.

64 Though their introduction had be achieved "with great cordiality" (CMS, C A1/0 3/258, 17 January 1850, Warburton to Secretaries). "I have seldom known more harmonious meetings", Warburton had written, "We anticipate difficulties; but we trust they will be overcome, and the system perfected by experience".
Ordained by the Bishop of London in June 1836, he joined the Mission in October the same year, at the age of twenty-four (24), and served it for nineteen years. He was appointed by unanimous vote (despite his own strenuous objections) at a General Meeting held in March 1850. By that time, Graf was one of the most experienced missionaries in the Sierra Leone Mission – though he had earned a certain notoriety for verbose criticisms. Unfortunately, his evident administrative ability was marred by a judgemental, querulous, and overbearing disposition. He also evinced an inordinate thirst for power and control, which earned him the sobriquet "little bishop", among his fellow missionaries. Many of the organisational squabbles which troubled the Mission in the early 1850s were due as much to his dogmatic and overbearing manner as they were the result of adjusting to the new arrangements. As Secretary of the Mission, Graf also acted as Secretary of both the General and Finance Committees; but it was the latter that he particularly sought to dominate. His letters to the CMS Secretaries were soon riddled with complaints about the administrative machinery of the Mission, and reveal a covert campaign to increase the remit and influence of the Finance Committee. In January 1851, the General Committee passed a resolution proposing the appointment of a "standing" Chairman, who would necessarily supersede the Secretary in the control of the Mission's

---

65 He later explained that his "great repugnance" at the new duties arose from the fact that he did not "possess that extreme guardedness and want of candour which appears to be a main requisite of officiality" – "My very soul loathes it", he declared (CMS, C A1/O 3/262a, 20 April 1850, Graf to Secretaries). Incidentally, he had acted briefly as Secretary from February to March 1840.

66 Jones reports that he often occupied the meeting "with his complaints..." (CMS, C A1/O 129/6a 10 March 1846, Jones to Secretaries).

67 See CMS, C A1/0 3/314, Secretaries address at the special General Meeting held on 9 February 1853, under the Presidency of the Bishop.

68 CMS, C A1/0 3/246a, 31 May 1850, Graf to Secretaries. He argued that the General Committee was too large, and met too infrequently, to act as a decisive arbiter in the Mission; and declared that the Secretary "should be able in all common occurrences of the Mission to consult a small, speedily accessible body empowered to transact other than Finance business..."
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affairs. Graf interpreted this move as a calculated bid to curtail his powers; and he mounted a vigorous opposition to its implementation. He declared emphatically that the Secretary was the "mainstay of the Mission"; and was the person most knowledgeable about its affairs, and best qualified to carry out most of its business. He threatened to resign rather than subject himself to the control of a Chairman, and requested the PC to allow either "his immediate retirement" or deliver him "from such shackles" as would prevent him from fulfilling the office effectively. The CMS Secretaries responded to Graf's protestations by providing a detailed explanation of the distinction between the offices of Chairman and Secretary. They made it clear that whereas the former's function only applied to business brought before the meeting, the Secretary had duties to perform for which he was "alone responsible to the PC": "We give the Secretary a degree of personal responsibility", they wrote, "which attaches to no other officer or member of the Committee".

---

69 Previously, a Chairman was appointed at the beginning of each General Meeting; and his duties were restricted to that of moderator at the meeting. It was left to the Secretary of the Mission to carry out most of the business of the Mission in between Meetings. Cf. CMS, C Al/O 6/43, 'Circular from Graf to Committee members respecting proposal to appoint a "standing" Chairman'. Cp. CMS, C Al/O 3/284, 15 January 1851, Letter entitled "Office-bearers of the Local Committee" from Graf to Secretaries.

70 He complained that "there existed a vague idea that the Secretary had too great a discretionary power and that the supervision of a Chairman would prove a solitary check" (CMS, C Al/O 3/284, 15 January 1851, Letter entitled "Office-bearers of the Local Committee" from Graf to Secretaries).

71 He was particularly incensed that after 14 years of service in the Mission, he was to now seek advice from, consult, and be guided by, a Chairman of arguably less experience - for James Beale, the appointed chairman, was a missionary of only 5 years standing - and denounced the resolution as "invidious".

72 CMS, C Al/L 4 p. 353ff., 16 May 1851, Secretaries to Graf. Their letter was ostensibly an attempt to reassure the agitated Graf that the appointment of a "standing chairman" in no way undermined his position as Secretary.

73 *ibid*. The position of Secretary (of the Mission) had always carried with it a certain authoritative distinctiveness derived directly from Salisbury Square; but the Secretaries' letter endorsed it in incontrovertible terms, and made the position virtually unassailable.
To all intents and purposes, this explanation unwittingly validated Graf's autocratic propensity; and gave hostages to the future.74

By the end of 1852, the successful appointment of a Bishop of Sierra Leone, and renewed expectations about the ordination of native pastors, induced the PC to introduce further changes into the management of the Sierra Leone Mission, and to make various amendments to the Regulations of October 1849.75 The new Resolutions proposed two important changes: the institution of a "Central Committee" (in the place of the "General Committee"), to undertake the "management of the general affairs of the Mission";76 and the handing over of all the Society's educational establishments in the colony (the Fourah Bay Institution, the Grammar School, the Female Institution, the Liberated African School, and the proposed Normal and Model School) to the control of the Finance Committee. The Resolutions were meant to fulfil two objectives: viz., "to render the organisation of the Committees in Sierra Leone more simple by throwing the business chiefly into the hands of the Finance Committee"; and to make the Secretary "a more efficient officer than heretofore, as in the case of the Secretaries of our

They told Graf that it was often difficult "to avoid suspicion, jealousy, and even collision between a Secretary and the Committee"; and added that they had themselves "felt this trial" (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 16 May 1851, Secretaries to Graf). Therefore, they commiserated, "a Secretary must not... be surprised when it comes upon him, or too sensitive, or suffer his own judgment to be swayed one way or the other by it".74 This uncritical and unreserved support of the Secretary of Mission - based as it was on an ill-advised comparison of that office with that of the CMS Secretaries - was one which Venn later was to regret.

75 See CMS, G/C1, Vol. 29, pp. 168f & 172-4, Committee Minutes for 16th and 23rd November 1852.

76 The membership of this Central Committee was to consist "of all ordained European Missionaries and such laymen or native Ministers as may be appointed from time to time by the PC, reserving the seats of those who have heretofore been members of the General Committee". Apart from the provision for the appointment of laymen, this amendment constituted little more than a change in name.
Correspondence Committee in India". These objectives suited Graf's purposes perfectly, and reinforced his already patent desire to assert his authority over the Sierra Leone Mission. Having consulted with the CMS Secretaries (while in England) on the nature and extent of the proposed amendments, he departed for Sierra Leone armed with a copy of the PC's Resolutions, fired with a determination to seize the high ground. A time of reflection on the return voyage convinced him that the Society's Resolutions "were worded in too general a language", and required "greater precision and amplification to meet the spirit and wants of the missionary body". Immediately on his arrival (at his Hastings parish), he wrote a letter to Jones (who had been temporary Secretary in his absence) outlining, in specific detail, the "chief alterations" to be implemented under the new arrangements. This letter was as dogmatic in its assertions as it was scrupulous in extending the Secretary's powers. Graf declared that the Secretary was "the special accredited representative... of the PC, with whom he was "in constant confidential communication"; and that he was (under the new arrangements) "the focus and rallying point of operation for the mission". At a special General Meeting held in February 1853 (under the Presidency of the Bishop), he re-asserted that when acting in his general capacity, "as representing the interests of the Society", the Secretary was

77 CMS, C A1/L 5, pp. 40-41, 3 December 1852, Venn to Graf. The PC even agreed to provide Graf with an allowance "for extra expenses" connected with the position he held (CMS, C A1/L 5, p. 47, 23 December 1852, Venn to Graf).


79 CMS, C A1/O 5/7, 31 December 1852, Graf to E Jones. The letter was circulated along with the PC's Minutes.

80 Graf was convinced that the Secretary (of the Mission) must necessarily "become the motive power as well as the legitimate and accredited exponent of the PC's principles and intentions"; and that "in the present transition movements", he "must not have his time and spirits wasted by 'beggarly elements' about the exact beginning and end of his authority..." (CMS, C A1/O 3/313a, 27 January 1853, Graf to Venn).
"accountable to none but the PC". Though Graf insisted that his claims were "in strict conformity to precise and well defined instructions" given to him before he left England, it is inconceivable that such statements (whether substantiated or not) would have been received without protest or disagreement. For one thing, his claims to overlordship necessarily involved the subordination of the entire missionary body, and the marginalisation of other committee members. His most controversial declaration was that he was under no obligation to "lay before any committee" the contents of the Secretary's letters "to and from the PC"; while, on the other hand, "all documents sent home must be covered with his signature and letters to the Home Secretaries must pass, unsealed, through his hands for transmission". All of Graf's pronouncements were made with the egotistical assurance of one who was sure of his ground, and cared little if he gave offence. Indeed, they created a general suspicion that the PC had given him private assurances, which no one else in the Mission (the Bishop included) was privy to.

The Secretary's proclamations precipitated a serious row in the Mission. Three members of the Finance Committee - E Jones, J Beale, and N Denton - with the backing of Chief

---

81 CMS, C A1/O 3/314, Secretary's address at the Special General Meeting held at Freetown, 9 February 1853, under the Presidency of the Bishop. He drew attention to the CMS Secretaries letter of 16 May 1851 (supra, Chapter II - 18); and asserted that it was for the PC to check his "waywardness into authorized paths".

82 He declared, for example, that "it was not competent for any member of Committees to bring and business or motion to the notice of the same except through the Secretary" (Hastings letter).

83 By Graf's own admission, this particular ruling gave "great offence"; and though he argued that he had not been its instigator, he upheld it vigorously - to the point of intimating that the CMS Secretaries should return private letters not sent through the Secretary (CMS, C A1/O 3/316, 16 February 1853, Graf to Secretaries).

84 For instance, Graf declared unctuously: "As regards the PC I have duties to perform which neither contempt, ridicule or opposition will deter me from" (CMS, C A1/O 3/314, Secretary's address..., 9 February 1853).
Justice Carr, immediately wrote to the CMS Secretaries querying Graf's assertions; and explained that there was "a general uneasiness at the extensive powers claimed by the Secretary". They argued that his claims were "of such a nature as to render the Finance Committee perfectly useless, and make them the mere agents of the Secretary, who, it would appear was the sole responsible person". They summed up their query in a single question: Was it "the intention of the PC that the Finance Committee should be a bona fide Committee for managing the affairs of the mission, or did they mean that Mr Graf should manage the managing body?"

Venn's reply was a lengthy, pedantic discourse on the role and function of the Secretary (of Mission) in relation to the PC on the one hand and to the Finance Committee on the other and revealed little of his concern over Graf's appropriation of such wide extensive powers. Venn was shocked to discover the extent of Graf's authoritarian assumptions, and troubled by his allegation that his statements were based on the substance of "their numerous conversations". He told Bishop Vidal: "It appears to us that Mr Graf has entirely mistaken his position - how this has

---

85 John Carr was an Afro-West Indian, from Trinidad, who had studied at University College in London. He came out as Queen's Advocate, in 1840, after being called to the English bar (Cf. Fyfe, 1962, p. 211).

86 CMS, C A1/O 24/4, 9 February 1853, Jones, Beale, and Denton to CMS Secretaries. The fact that this letter was written on the same day Graf addressed the Special General Meeting is significant. They explained that Chief Justice Carr concurred with them "in the necessity and desirableness" of referring the matter to the Secretaries' decision.

87 CMS, C A1/L5, pp. 61-64, 22 March 1853, Venn to Rev Messrs. Jones, Beale, and Denton. On the question of correspondence, he differentiated between "private" and "printed" communications: stating that the former was not meant to "be produced in Committee or shown to anyone, except at the discretion of the party to whom they are addressed"; while the latter were generally "written with a view to their being made public if any occasion should arise to make it desirable..."

88 Coincidentally, Graf's (unauthorised) bid to remove Maxwell from the Kissy Road Church came to the attention of the PC at the same time; and rather underlined the disruptive impact of an autocratic Secretarieship. It will be remembered that this decision was questioned by Bishop Vidal, earned Graf a sharp rebuke from Venn (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 66, 22 March 1853, Venn to Graf), and was subsequently reversed by the PC (supra., Chapter I).
been it is impossible to say. His letter from Hastings to Jones; his address to the Committee at which you presided; contain principles which would split into factions the most united Committee which existed". He emphatically denied any support for Graf's claims, declared that the PC took a completely opposite view about the position of a Secretary, and pointed out that it was quite impossible for relations which existed at Salisbury Square to be duplicated "at once" in Sierra Leone. With regard to private correspondence (between individual missionaries and the Secretaries), he reproved Graf by explaining that as Secretary of the Mission he was "merely their organ"; and that "they may write their letters by another hand if they determine to do so". Underlining his support for episcopal oversight, Venn admonished Graf to consult more with the Bishop and seek his Christian counsel. "You must... begin upon what may appear a lower position", he advised, "putting 'the Committee' forward in everything, and keeping 'the Secretary' in the background".

Venn's reproof and admonition may arguably have served to restrain Graf's more personal ambitions, but initially it did little to curb his desire to make an oligarchy of the Finance Committee. With the air of one betrayed, he criticized the Secretaries for "seeming of late to lose sight of the fact that the members of the Finance Committee form the marrow of the Central Committee", and were "in point of judgment and experience its leading minds".

---

89 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 77, 23 March 1853, Venn to Vidal.
90 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 74, 23 March 1853, Venn to Graf. He explained that far from being dominant figure, his own influence in the CMS Committee depended upon "my consulting and anticipating their mind in everything, upon sinking my identity and being much their mouthpiece as well as their thinker". Cp. CMS, C A1/L5, p. 97, 23 May 1853, Venn to Graf.
91 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 86, 23 April 1853, Venn to Graf.
92 ibid.
93 CMS, C A1/0 3/320b, 11 May 1853, Graf to Secretaries, p. 5. He contended that apart from the Finance Committee members, the majority present at the Central Committee were "sleeping members"; and that even
Committee was "evidently a consultative body" - for a body of men meeting twice a year could not possibly be "(as it was never intended) an executive, managing body, working side by side with the Finance Committee" - whereas the Finance Committee was and "necessarily must be the real managing body".94 The CMS Secretaries replied that Graf "had drawn inferences which they conceive are not warranted by the documents in his hands"; and proceeded to correct Graf on certain points of the Regulations.95 They emphasised that, according to the Regulations, the Central Committee was not merely a "consultative body", but "the management body of the general affairs of the Mission".96 The Secretaries' response was important; not least because ecclesiastical relations, in the Mission's transition stage, were as yet unformed, or ill-defined at best. There was, later, a tacit acknowledgement that the Finance Committee was indeed becoming a committee "of more general management than was anticipated";97 but, in the given circumstances, it would have set an unfortunate precedent to have allowed an individual (such as Graf) to determine the extent of his own authority, without reference to established Regulations. Graf was forced to accept the brunt of the Secretaries' censure; and admitted that it was "needful from duty as well as policy" for him to alter his previous course.98 However, his volte face in the matter was more an indication of his desire to avoid further

94 ibid. Graf had made this same assertion in his Hastings letter. He claimed that both the Bishop ("who at first could not understand this"), and the Chief Justice ("a good man of business"), saw things in the same light, and accused the Secretaries of having departed from the principles of the Organisation Minutes of 1849, and especially that of 23 November 1852.

95 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 106, 23 June 1853, Secretaries to Graf.

96 They emphasised, for example, that the Regulations stipulated that the Central Committee should meet "not oftener than two times a year, unless on occasions of special urgency" - thus making provision for additional meetings.

97 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 133, 23 September 1853, Secretaries to Graf.

confrontation with the CMS than a result of any change in his attitude to his missionary colleagues. His unilateral stance in the Mission's administrative (or official) affairs continued to be a talking point in the Mission - so much so that Jones described it a year later as a case of "one man versus the whole Mission".  

The contention over the powers the Secretary raises important questions about the extent and scope of episcopal authority over CMS missionaries, and, indeed, the whole Mission. The episode "called forth the most serious deliberation and prayers" of the PC, and prompted Venn to declare: "We have been taught a lesson which we shall not forget; never again to attempt to exalt a Missionary into a Secretary". Nonetheless, it must be borne in mind that even though a Bishop had been appointed by late 1852, there was no "settled" (Anglican) ecclesiastical establishment in Sierra Leone. Graf's wide-ranging assertions had left little room for any other authority in the Mission; especially when it is considered that the entire missionary body (ordained or otherwise) was in the employment of the CMS, and therefore answerable to its Local Committee. Strangely, Graf's authoritarian notions were nowhere interpreted as amounting to an encroachment on the powers of the Bishop. The reasons for this probably included the recent date at which the episcopate had been established, the ill defined nature of the episcopate's influence and power, the ambivalence of CMS policy (on the issue of overseas episcopal relations), the lack of an active Church constitution, and, to a lesser

99 CMS, C A1/0 129/12, 21 July 1854, Jones to Venn. The other missionaries eventually gave up any attempts to have access to Graf's official communications.

100 CMS/ C A1/15, p. 77, 23 March 1853, Venn to Vidal.

101 Until the Native Pastorate Church came into existence in 1861, Sierra Leone was, ecclesiastically speaking, a Mission field. As we shall see, the Society's attempts to introduce a Church constitution into the Mission were repeatedly forestalled throughout the 1850s.
extent, Bishop Vidal's oft acknowledged reticence.102 It is significant, therefore, that in the end the PC appointed the Bishop to become President of the Finance Committee.103 Whether this extended his control is difficult to say.

C. The Episcopal Challenge

By 1838, adverse criticism had forced the Society to define, and publish, its principles and policies with regards the relations of its missionaries to Anglican Bishops (in and without British colonies).104 Venn defended and defined the Society's position in a document which became entitled 'Appendix to the Thirty-Ninth Report'. He argued that the Society's Missionaries were "under Episcopal superintendence and jurisdiction", and that "spiritual oversight" rested altogether with the Bishop. However, he had to concede that the Society exercised a certain degree of supervision, in so far as it continued to pay the salaries of its Missionaries, and retained "the possession of all the temporalities of the Mission". That by "requiring accounts from the Missionaries of all their proceedings, and by giving them direction from time to time, which may bear upon their spiritual duties", the Society kept up "a kind of spiritual jurisdiction and oversight".105 Venn's analysis of the Anglican structure (in Missions) drew a basic distinction between "lay and

102 Although Venn cautioned Graf: "You must not infer that the Bishop is so easily imposed upon as he seems to be. He forms his own opinion of characters with the utmost firmness and decision; but he keeps that opinion in his own heart" (CMS, C A1/L5, 23 April 1853, Venn to Graf).
103 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 129, 23 September 1853, Venn to Vidal. Venn explained that since the Finance Committee was "becoming more important and exercising a more extensive influence upon the Mission" than was supposed, the PC was "not unwilling that it should thus pass into a Committee of general management".
"clerical" functions, as being the distinction on which CMS ecclesiastical relations were regulated. He wrote,

> The direction of the Spiritual duties of the Missions rests solely with the Bishop. The direction of the temporal affairs of the Mission rests solely with the Committee of the Society: and in this the Bishop only takes part as a member of the Committee.

... Such Committees are always appointed by the Parent Committee at home and all their minutes are subject to the revision of and confirmation of the Parent Committee. However, the conviction that "the harmonious co-operation between the laity and the Ecclesiastical authorities" was best preserved by "keeping distinct the spiritual and temporal affairs of the Mission", was often difficult to sustain in practice. As the Bishop of Calcutta observed, "the boundaries of the power of Committee, as they approach to those of the Bishop, can be ascertained, in many points only by time and observation". Thus (as the quotation at the head of this chapter concedes), "difficulties and perplexities" were prone to arise in the Society's ecclesiastical relations; and misunderstandings sometimes developed "between the Representatives of the Society abroad and Ecclesiastical authorities". It must be mentioned here in passing that Venn (and the CMS) strenuously opposed the concept of the "Missionary Bishop". As such, the operation and organisation of the church in CMS Missions was usually thoroughly established under the control of its Local

---

108 *ibid*.
109 This ideal of the Missionary Bishop was a mainly Tractarian proposition, which advocated that a Bishop ought to go out at the very beginning of a Mission, to organise the church, instead of being sent out after the church had been gathered. Venn constantly maintained that the Bishop was the "crown", not the precursor, of the infant church (Yates, 1978, p. 105). The Society's supporters pointed to its more prosperous Missions (begun without Bishops) - New Zealand, Southern India, Tinnevelly, and Sierra Leone - and argued, "the Bishop was not needed to sow the seed: he arrived to gather in the harvest" (CMI, 'The Memorandum of the CMS on the extension of the episcopate', February 1858, vol. ix, 158-167, p. 162).
Committee, before the arrival of the Bishop. The CMI, boasted, for example, that "the successive bishops of Sierra Leone, on their arrival, found themselves, not in the midst of benighted heathen, but in the midst of a Christian land, with its parochial divisions, where God's Sabbaths were observed, and God's ordinances honoured". This state of affairs almost invariably induced European missionaries to regard the arrival of the episcopate as an adjunct to the Mission - less an organisational necessity than an ecclesiastical expediency (indispensable for the rites of ordination and confirmation). As such, the Bishop's prerogative and usefulness tended to be sidelined. For instance, the repeated incidents of disharmony and dissension among missionaries, which did so much to undermine Bishop Vidal's episcopacy, caused Venn to moan that the Bishop had "not been valued in Sierra Leone as he ought to have been". Meanwhile, the Society's detractors argued that both the CMS leaders and its missionaries on the ground were predisposed to oppose the establishment of the episcopate in countries where the Society's missions were established. In 1858, for example, the Society was forced to defend itself against weighted accusations (presumably from the Tractarian camp) of concealing "a Presbyterian predilection", and possessing "anti-episcopal views". These criticisms may have been exaggerated, but even Stock admits that "the absence of the Episcopate for so long a period in many of the Missions... did accustom the rank and file of the Society to Missions without bishops, and therefore that they were slow to see the need of them, except perhaps occasionally for confirmations and ordinations". He, however, contends

---

111 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 212, 21 August 1854, Venn to Young; CMS, C A1/L5, p. 76, 23 March 1853, Venn to Vidal.
112 See CMI, (July 1858), vol. ix, 'The Memorandum of the CMS on the extension of the episcopate', 158-167 [article continues on pp. 169-177], p. 158.
113 Stock, i, p. 409.
that "the responsible leaders" of the Society had always valued highly "the actual benefits of the Episcopate"; and insists that the Society had advocated the extension of the Episcopate to foreign parts as early as 1839.\textsuperscript{114}

Undoubtedly, the phenomenal growth and success of its Mission in Sierra Leone had convinced the CMS, by late 1839, of the need for a bishopric in Sierra Leone.\textsuperscript{115} Unfortunately, the Society's efforts and stringent calls for the appointment of a bishop met with very little sympathy or cooperation from the British government; so much so that by 1845 the PC was doubtful of the prospects of a Bishop of Sierra Leone.\textsuperscript{116} In some desperation, the PC began to contemplate other expedients - including the erection of a Bishopric of St. Helena (to provide episcopal oversight of the Sierra Leone Colony), or visits from one of the West Indian Bishops.\textsuperscript{117} None of these measures were adopted, however, and lack of episcopal oversight for Sierra Leone remained an enduring problem. To some extent, the issue devolved on the matter of funds;\textsuperscript{118} so when the government showed no inclination to meet the need from the "Colonial Revenue", Venn turned his attention to securing the necessary funds for an endowment by other means. Warren has pointed out that this decision

\textsuperscript{114} ibid, p. 410.

\textsuperscript{115} Yates (1978), p. 44. This was notably before Venn's accession to the Secretaryship of the Society. But Stock's suggestion that it was especially with a view to the gradual withdrawal of the Society from the pastoral care of the Native Church in Sierra Leone, that the Society "persistently pressed on the Government the necessity for a bishopric", may suggest that his ideas had begun to come to the fore (Stock, ii, p. 100). Cp. Yates, (1978), p. 116f.


\textsuperscript{117} CMS, G/AC1/4, 19 November 1844, pp. 299-303, Venn to the Bishop of London (cp. Warren, p. 161). Venn also inquired "whether at least an Archdeacon might not be appointed as Chaplain... who might perhaps, after his constitution had been seasoned to the climate of Africa, be consecrated as a Bishop".

\textsuperscript{118} Only £800 was available for the support of a Bishop (of Sierra Leone): the Colonial Council had voted £300 a year for a Bishop; while the Chaplaincy (which was then vacant) afforded £500 a year - assuming that the Bishop undertook the duties of the Chaplaincy. Cf. ibid.
involved a significant change in Venn's thinking. But even more significantly, it was an indication of the value which Venn placed on the Sierra Leone Mission. Stock attests that his heart was in West Africa "in a peculiar sense"; and confirms that it was mainly by his exertions that an endowment was eventually raised. Indeed, Venn felt strongly that the accession of a Bishop would not only "crown" the missionary labours, but also curb the pastoral and constitutional problems which repeatedly troubled the Mission. About 1851, the Society published a paper entitled "Bishopric of Sierra Leone", which urged the immediate erection of a Bishopric in West Africa - stating inter alia that "the present advanced state of Missions upon the West coast of Africa renders its immediate erection a matter of urgent importance to the efficiency of those operations, and to their extension into the interior of Africa". The paper emphasised the great need for the rite

119 Warren (1971) explains that in 1842 he "still hoped that the Society would not have to budget for the support of bishops overseas"; but by 1844 "had accepted the necessity for such budgeting" (p. 144).

120 Venn was convinced that Sierra Leone held the key to the evangelisation of West Africa (both in human and spiritual resources). In 1850, he confessed to Jones: "My daily thoughts and prayers run continually upon the progress of the Lord's work in Western Africa" (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 243, Venn to Jones, 30 March 1850).

121 Stock, ii, 100 & 121.

122 See C A1/L4, p. 363, Venn to Jones, 14 June 1851. During the confusion involving Maxwell and Nicol, for example, he told Maxwell that the arrival of the Bishop would "set all to rights; and hasten the day when a goodly body of native missionaries will be 'sent forth' from Sierra Leone into the regions beyond" (C A1/L4, p. 383, Venn to Maxwell, 15 September 1851). When allegations of missionary misconduct plagued the Mission, he argued that with a Bishop on the spot "we shall have no such difficulties as this" (C A1/L4, p. 441, Venn to Denton, 14 April 1852). In the course of a misunderstanding between Peyton (the Principle of the Grammar School) and Governor Maxwell, he expressed the belief that a Bishop would provide "an authoritarian Head to the Missions to whom the government at home will look for authentic information" (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 363, Venn to Jones, 14 June 1851).

123 CMS, G/AZ/1, no. 64, "Bishopric of Sierra Leone". This paper is undated - though almost certainly drafted by Venn. An 1851 date seems most likely. A letter from the CMS Secretaries to Graf (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 343f., 14 April 1851) mentions that they had sent "proof" of a circular "which will show that the long talked of establishment of a Bishop for
of confirmation among a whole generation of Christians "who were baptized in infancy"; and argued, significantly, that "a Bishop was more especially needed for the ordination and superintendence of a Native Ministry". About this time, the Bishop of London and the Colonial Secretary (Lord Grey) gave their sanction to the proposal for a see of Sierra Leone, provided an endowment could be raised.\textsuperscript{124} To this end, Venn drafted a leaflet which made a public appeal for funds for the new see, and sent a copy to Sierra Leone.\textsuperscript{125} He made it clear that it would be well if Sierra Leone Christians would send a subscription - "the more numerous the better to testify the interest which the people take in the prospect".\textsuperscript{126} But the funds for the endowment of the Bishopric "came in slowly", and amounted to only about £4000 by October.\textsuperscript{127} However, by March 1852 subscriptions had reached £10,000, and were placed in the Colonial Bishoprics Fund. When the CMS applied to the Government "to attach the chaplain's duties and salary to the Bishop", the Secretary of State for the Colonies readily agreed, "upon the understanding that the Society's Missionaries should supply the duties of the Chaplaincy during the absence of the Bishop upon the visitation of his Diocese".\textsuperscript{128} The Bishop Designate, Dr O E Vidal, was duly consecrated Bishop of Sierra Leone on Whitsunday 1852; and given jurisdiction over all the clergy and congregations in West Africa.

\footnotesize{West Africa is at length before the public".  
\textsuperscript{125} According to Yates, Venn submitted this leaflet to the Bishop of London (by 1851); and later added the names of the three ordained Africans (on the Bishop's suggestion) "to remove all doubts respecting the fitedness of the African mind" (p. 117).  
\textsuperscript{126} CMS, C A1/L4, p. 363, 14 June 1851, Venn to Jones.  
\textsuperscript{127} CMS, C A1/L4, p. 395, 14 October 1851, Venn to Peyton. Venn had hoped that the prospect of a Bishop of Sierra Leone would be accomplished in the course of 1851 (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 363, 14 June 1851, Venn to Jones).  
\textsuperscript{128} CMS, G/C1, Vol. 28, 12 April 1852, p. 593; cp. CMS, C A1/L4, p. 436, 15 March 1852, Secretaries to Graf. The Chaplaincy provided an extra £500 (per annum) for the Bishop's support.}
D. The Sierra Leone Episcopate (1852-1860)

The brevity of Sierra Leone's first three episcopates, and the limited accomplishments of its first three Bishops, are well documented; and require little more than a summary of the relevant facts here. What is deserving of closer attention is their individual (and, in some respects, divergent) efforts to secure a "settled ecclesiastical system", and their response to Venn's scheme for the establishment of a Native Pastorate Church. In many respects, the first episcopate (that of Bishop Vidal) was the most crucial (and problematic); not least because of its inaugural nature. The subsequent episcopates, to varying degrees, built on the foundations it had laid.

(i) Owen Emeric Vidal

The appointment of Owen Emeric Vidal to the Bishopric of Sierra Leone was popular as much for his evangelical views as for his "singular linguistic gifts". Vidal, a country clergyman in England (a Rector in Sussex) had taken a great deal of interest in missionary work, and had distinguished himself with creditable contributions to its linguistic aspects. He had acquired the Tamil language "to encourage native teachers in South India by a correspondence in their own tongue"; had prepared a Malay grammar for the use of the Borneo Mission; had helped Samuel A Crowther (later Bishop) with his Yoruba Grammar; and had acquired the Yoruba language before sailing for his diocese in Sierra Leone. See Proceedings of the CMS, 1853 (54th Year), pp. 24-25.

Samuel Crowther personally vouched for Vidal's "evangelical" views, and proclaimed that "he would be truly a nursing father to our West African Mission". Venn's response was equally enthusiastic: "I regard it as a signal mercy that such a man as Mr Vidal has been found for the office of first Bishop, whose philological powers are so considerable, while his Christian character eminent for meekness and humility". On another occasion, he described Sierra Leone's first bishop as "a man singularly filled with

---

129 He had acquired the Tamil language "to encourage native teachers in South India by a correspondence in their own tongue"; had prepared a Malay grammar for the use of the Borneo Mission; had helped Samuel A Crowther (later Bishop) with his Yoruba Grammar; and had acquired the Yoruba language before sailing for his diocese in Sierra Leone. See Proceedings of the CMS, 1853 (54th Year), pp. 24-25.

130 Knight, (1880), p. 381.
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wisdom and grace, and sympathy with Missionaries to be their friend and Patron". 132 Before Vidal departed for his new see, he participated in briefing sessions, organised by Venn, and attended by "brethren from West Africa", where the "future prospects of the Mission" were discussed fully. One result of these sessions was that the ordination of native ministers was placed high on the Bishop's list. 133 It was therefore with the gist of a modus operandi, and amid a mood of calculated optimism, that Vidal departed for his new see. He landed at Freetown on the 27th December 1852, where an expectant population and a myriad of duties awaited his arrival. 134

Due to the inceptive nature of his episcopate, Bishop Vidal was forced to take the helm on two of the most cardinal issues related to the foundation of a Native Pastorate: namely, the construction of a Church Constitution and the ordination of native ministers. While he may not have been the prime mover with regards the former, the Bishop's earnest attempts to circumvent the problems inherent in the latter make for an instructive study.

a. A Church Constitution

Immediately after Vidal's appointment, the CMS Secretaries prepared a printed Minute "containing suggestions respecting the future ecclesiastical relations of the Mission". 135 A copy of this minute was forwarded to Bishop Vidal for his

---

132 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 441, 14 April 1852, Venn to Denton.
133 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 448, 13 July 1852, Venn to Jones.
134 Graf informed the Secretaries that "owing to the interference of a friend of his, the Bishop's landing took place privately instead of with public honours as had been concerted" (CMS, C A1/0 3/311, 10 January 1853, Graf to Secretaries) - an outcome which was no doubt in keeping with His Lordship's retiring disposition.
consideration and input;\textsuperscript{136} and in its completed form became known as the 'Articles of a Proposed Arrangement between the Bishop of Sierra Leone... and the Church Missionary Society'. This minute essentially laid out a new scheme of Church government in relation to the Native Church, and was an attempt to give it a constitutional framework. Venn explained to Chief Justice Carr that "upon the arrival of the Bishop" (and in view of "the advanced state of native improvement") the PC intended "to place the native Church upon a settled ecclesiastical system which may secure self-support - and also uniformity of government"; and, by so doing, "prepare the native Pastors for self-reliance and self-government, and ultimately for independence as spiritual rulers of their country men".\textsuperscript{137} To the PC's credit, they were (in the words of Venn) "deeply sensible of the risk and uncertainty attending all attempts to legislate at a distance" on such a "complicated matter", and left the details of the scheme to be worked out by the Bishop and other parties on the spot.\textsuperscript{138} By March 1853, the details of the new scheme of Church government had been finalised - with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London - and drawn up in a document entitled 'Articles of a Proposed Arrangement between the Bishop of Sierra Leone (Dr Vidal) and the Church Missionary Society, in Respect of the regulation of the Native Church in the Colony of Sierra Leone'.\textsuperscript{139} Its main provision placed "the charge and

\textsuperscript{136} CMS, G/C1, Vol. 29, 16 November 1852, p. 168; cp. CMS, C A1/L4, p. 21, 1 December 1852, Venn to Vidal. Another copy of the printed Minute was also sent to the Bishop of London for his consideration.

\textsuperscript{137} CMS, C A1/L5, p. 32, 2 December 1852, Venn to Chief Justice Carr (an Afro-West-Indian, who served as a judge in the Colony for over twenty years - cf. Fyfe, pp. 211 & 221). A copy of the scheme was also sent to the Chief Justice (whom Venn invited to join the Finance Committee at the same time) - CMS, C A1/L5, 2 December 1852, Venn to Carr.

\textsuperscript{138} CMS, C A1/L4, p. 21, 1 December 1852, Venn to Vidal. This was a clear indication that the PC regarded the scheme as experimental, and subject to trial adjustments.

\textsuperscript{139} Subsequently referred to in this Thesis as 'Articles of Arrangement'. A copy of this document (dated March 1853) can be found in a volume entitled 'Papers on Africa, Mauritius, New Zealand', pp. 43-49, PHL. See
superintendence of the Native Pastors and Christian Congregations... raised up through the instrumentality of the Society's Mission in Sierra Leone" under the Bishop of Sierra Leone "assisted by a Council, and by a Church Committee"; thus effectively removing native clergy from the superintendence of European Missionaries. It also stipulated "that arrangements be proposed for providing the Native Pastors with a suitable income from local resources, and also for giving them a status assimilated to that of Perpetual Curates or Incumbents at Home". In a proviso which anticipated Venn's 'Second Paper' (1861), it mandated the institution of a "Church Fund" to which Subscriptions and Donations would be paid, "and to which the weekly payments hitherto made to the Society of one half penny from each adult shall be transferred". Lay involvement and assistance was important to Venn - as he had indicated by inviting Justice Carr to the Finance Committee - so one of the most significant provisions of the 'Articles' was for the inclusion of lay representation and involvement in the government of the Church. Both the "Church Committee" and the "Church Council" were to be constituted by a composition of clerical and lay membership (the former in equal representation) - though the laymen in the Church Council were to be elected by the clergy and not by lay people themselves. The 'Articles' also laid down regulations respecting the formation of Parishes (or ecclesiastical districts), stipends of Native Pastors, judicial proceedings against Native Pastors, patronage of Churches belonging to the Society, etc. Significantly, its regulations did not affect the missionaries of the Society "whether Natives or Europeans", who were "wholly supported by the funds of the Society, and employed in carrying out its Mission, either

Appendix I.

140 Venn thought that finding "suitable laymen" for the office would be "the main difficulty" (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 24, 1 December 1853, Venn to Vidal). But as Yates points out, "the extent of trust in the lay African was in advance of that imposed in him by the State" (p. 123).
within or without the Colony". The 'Articles of Arrangement' had the merit of providing a firm constitutional framework for the government of the Native Church; but the fact remained that it was, by its own description, neither legally enforceable nor binding on either party. CMS attempts to ratify the 'Articles' were forestalled by governmental dilatoriness; and it became necessary to allow the matter to "remain in abeyance". In the end, the 'Articles' were never validated: a deficiency which was exploited later, and eventually precipitated a major constitutional crisis towards the latter end of our period of study. It is unclear whether the Society's neglect to validate the 'Articles' was caused by the confusion over the

141 This latter provision was clear testimony to Venn's influence; reflecting his desire to ensure that the office of Missionary was distinct from the pastoral concerns of the Church (see First Paper, 1851). On another occasion he told Vidal that it was "better to keep missionary relations distinct from ecclesiastical" (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 149, 24 October 1853, Venn to Vidal).

142 The PC recorded (in the concluding article) that they were fully aware that they could not "legally bind the Society, nor can the Bishop bind himself or his successors"; but expressed the hope that the arrangement would be maintained both by the Society and by the Bishop of Sierra Leone and his successors, "in a spirit of mutual confidence and good faith, unless there arise some manifest necessity for setting it aside". Yates (1978) suggests that "there were signs that they were never envisaged as more than a gentleman's agreement, after legal validation was shown to be so difficult to obtain" (p. 120, footnote). However, the Society's subsequent bid to get the 'Articles' ratified may indicate an intention to give it some legal substance.

143 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 77, 23 March 1853, Venn to Vidal. It appears that the Society fell out of favour with the Duke of Newcastle (the Secretary of State for the Colonies) when it mounted a vigorous opposition to the "Colonial Church Regulation Bill" - a piece of legislation which had the backing of the Duke. Venn, who was convinced that the Bill would be "disastrous to the Colonial Church" (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 128, 23 September 1953, Venn to Vidal), and had written a paper on the subject (largely objecting to the legislation), informed Vidal that the matter of the 'Articles') "has alas been connected with the general question of Colonial Church Legislation" (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 59, 28 February 1853, Venn to Vidal). Five months later (after the bill had been thrown out the House of Commons), Venn told Vidal that even the Bishop of London "is very angry with the CMS because we opposed the Bill when first brought into the House of Lords - and the Duke of Newcastle... threatens to show us no favour if we come in his way" (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 120, 27 August 1853, Venn to Vidal).

144 Cf. Chapter 6.
deaths of the first Bishops (as Fyfe suggests), or simply due to the fact that it never seriously intended them to be anything more than an "agreement". Nonetheless, the preparation of such a Church Constitution effectively signalled not only the Society's determination to bring the Native Pastorate into effect, but its belief that the arrival of a Bishop would secure its establishment almost immediately. However, due to a combination of factors, these expectations were repeatedly frustrated.

b. Ordination of Native Ministers

Venn regarded the ordination of native ministers as the first essential and definite step in the formation of the Native Pastorate. "We hope", he declared, "that upon the Bishop's arrival 10 or 20 native ministers will soon take the pastoral charge of the congregations of Freetown and the Colony, and that the Society's affairs will be conducted by a small managing body... with a view to the evangelisation of Africa". But ordinations were not the province of the Society. It could only present a Bishop "with the material in the rough state"; and leave the rest to the Bishop's discretion and judgement. Venn was all too aware of this fact. The Society may have had in Vidal a Bishop who entered fully into its objectives, but even he had to be allowed sufficient time to judge not only which students at the Fourah Bay Institution, or the Catechists, were "suitable for the sacred office", but also which of the "proper Districts" were to be recognized as "perpetual Curacies". Nonetheless, Venn made it clear to Vidal that a goodly supply of native Pastors in full orders was needed for the new

---


146 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 380, 15 September 1851, Venn to Nicol. The PC was later informed that there were "at least 12 individuals are prepared to be presented to the Bishop for holy orders", in Sierra Leone (CMS, C A1/L5, p. 9, Instructions of the Committee to Missionaries..., 1 November 1852).

147 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 363, 14 June 1851, Venn to Jones.

148 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 24, 1 December 1952, Venn to Vidal.
Church constitution to be implemented, and for the goal of an independent native Church to be realized.\textsuperscript{149} What he could not have foreseen were the difficulties which had to be overcome before the first step could be taken; for whatever the expectations, the situation in Sierra Leone did not admit of a simple or immediate implementation of the Pastorate plan.

There were ten candidates awaiting ordination in Sierra Leone - six native catechists and four European missionaries.\textsuperscript{150} Vidal examined all the candidates, but was forced to defer the ordination of the native catechists when he discovered that there were no funds available for the increase in their salaries.\textsuperscript{151} He held the first ordination in the colony, on 20th February 1853, in a crowded St George's Cathedral; where a significant section of its wealthy inhabitants gathered to witness a ceremony rendered conspicuous by the absence of native candidates (for lack of funds).\textsuperscript{152} The finance issue posed an interesting problem. The PC had insisted that the utmost care and consideration ought to be exercised in the first settlement of the salaries of Native Pastors "that they be such as the Native Church ought to pay... to prevent any European habits and expectations".\textsuperscript{153} This consideration gave rise to two problems: first, a low salary structure for the forthcoming native Pastors would make their income unaccountably close to that of schoolmasters and catechists, "as not to make the difference sufficiently great between a Pastor and a Schoolmaster" (unless that of the latter was

\textsuperscript{149} Venn explained, for example, that the Church Council could not possibly function, nor could the patronage of the Churches be called into exercise, until there were fully ordained native Pastors in place - \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{150} Three of these European missionaries - Messrs Gerst, Maser, and Kefer - were destined for the Yoruba Mission, and had travelled with the Bishop. The fourth, Rev Dicker was to receive Priestly orders.

\textsuperscript{151} CMS, C A1/O 25A/1, 16 February 1853, Vidal to Venn.

\textsuperscript{152} Both Kissy Road and Pademba Road Church were closed "to enable... people to attend the ceremony" - CMS, C A1/O 3/318, 18 March 1953, Graf to Secretaries.

\textsuperscript{153} CMS, C A1/L5, 1 December 1852, Venn to Vidal.
revised - at the risk of provoking great dissatisfaction). Second, in the event that all the eligible candidates were ordained, the financial burden of their salaries would have to be borne by the Society until such a time that "each shall have an independent existence rendered possible by the funds of the Church Committee". Graf's own suggestion was that "the Bishop should not accept any applicant for Orders, until an individual's application is sanctioned, on financial principles, by the Society". "Otherwise", he continued lugubriously, "we may overstock ourselves". These considerations were too weighty to be overlooked by the Bishop; even though he was originally disposed "to ordain as many as present themselves". However, the PC were unwilling to contemplate such an indefinite setback to its plans for an independent native Church; and it passed a resolution sanctioning "the ordination of any number of natives" whom both Vidal and the Finance Committee thought suitable. Venn's own reaction was particularly uncompromising: "Financial considerations", he countered, "must not for one hour impede the great object of creating a native ministry - we must venture - we must run the risk of some disappointment in the first instance". He argued that only "a moderate addition" ought to be made to the salaries of the Catechists when ordained, whether out of the Church Fund or in anticipation of its establishment, "so as to keep down the idea of a high fixed salary from the Society". In any

154 CMS, C A1/0 3/317a, 18 March 1853, Graf to Straith. This was a prospect which, Graf intimated, was "not likely to be for a few years to come".

155 Ibid. Graf told Venn that he had "hinted as much to the Bishop who now appears to see the difficulty..."

156 CMS, G/C1, Vol. 29, 20 September 1853, p. 596; cp. CMS, C A1/L5, 23 September, 1853, Venn to Vidal. This was obviously an indication that the Society was prepared to bear the financial responsibility.

157 CMS, C A1/L5, (p. 128), 23 September 1853, Venn to Bishop Vidal. "We shall need a large supply of men", he had remarked after Vidal's first ordination, "The three brethren who have received their commissions by the imposition of your hands will prove but a drop" CMS, C A1/L5, 23 April 1853, Venn to Vidal).

158 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 128, 23 September 1853, Venn to Vidal.
case, he continued, their salaries ought to be determined "in reference to the ability of the native Church to grant the required amounts", since the Society did not expect to pay the Pastors "for more than a few years longer". Vidal's response was that to fix the salary of the native Pastors as Venn required would degrade and devalue the native Pastors in a community were status counted for so much.\(^{159}\) His conclusion, after due consultation with the Finance Committee, was that it would be injudicious to "go below £60 for a single and £80 for a married man; at all events for such as are to be stationed in the colony".\(^{160}\)

The financial difficulty was resolved - at least temporarily - by the Society's promised assistance. But Vidal was confronted with a second, "no less considerable obstacle". The Bishop had arrived at the painful conclusion that the six Senior Catechists (whose long service gave them a prior claim above their juniors) were unfit to be ordained, in point of ability. He told Venn that the ordination of such men "would lower the ministry in the eyes of both natives and Europeans".\(^{161}\) At the same time, to pass over the more senior native ministers and ordain the younger catechists - whom, incidentally, Vidal had no objection to ordaining - was a step which could not be taken lightly. In order to overcome this difficulty, Vidal suggested that it was necessary "to make the office of Deacon really inferior and

\(^{159}\) The bishop explained that "neither native habits nor native houses, such as they are here would be at all consistent for native Pastors - because they necessarily involve a want of cleanliness and a tendency to immorality". "All who do pretend to be of the middle classes of society", he stated, "live in houses similar to those of Europeans; though generally smaller and less expensive" (CMS, C A1/O 25A/7b, 10 November 1853, Vidal to Venn).

\(^{160}\) CMS, C A1/O 25A/7b, 10 November 1853, Vidal to Venn. He added that these sums "could not be sufficient for Freetown, but ought to be made to answer in the villages".

\(^{161}\) CMS, C A1/25A/6, 20 October 1853, Vidal to Venn. Five months earlier, he had drawn attention to their need for "some instructions in the preparation of sermons" (CMS, C A1/O 25A/4a, 9 June 1853, Vidal to Venn.
subordinate to that of Priest more than it is at home, and to retain the Deacon in his office a much longer time". He argued that "if this were understood throughout the colony, it might obviate the danger of such ordinations". What the Bishop was really suggesting, was the creation of a "perpetual diaconate"; an ecclesiastical device, which, if sanctioned, would serve as an effective means of curtailing the ministry of native candidates who were considered unfit or unsuitable for the position of pastor or other ecclesiastical responsibilities. The question must therefore be raised, whether Vidal, a European Bishop who had no previous experience of life and conditions in the mission field, was being guided strictly by western parameters in his assessment of the native catechists. No doubt, as a bishop of the Church of England, he had a fixed view of the episcopally ordained ministry. But the situation required some adaptability. Not every Colonial Bishop possessed Venn's faith in native ability, or shared his aversion for the imposition of European ideas and ideals on the native Church. The attitude and expectation of European Bishops was often conditioned by the standards which obtained in England; and they were prone to be deeply disturbed by the relative incapability and semi-illiteracy of native ministers. Their instinctive response to such a situation often took the form of a strong inclination to delay the ordination or progress of the native minister until he had acquired such refinements. However, the perpetual diaconate was a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it was a useful device to ensure that only those of recognized ability would be

162 ibid.

163 In India, for example, Bishop Dealtry (1849-18610) refused to admit native deacons to the priesthood, "without their being able to pass an examination in the English language", or without their possessing some knowledge of Greek or Hebrew (CMS, C I2/0 4B/10a, 26 September 1853, Bishop Dealtry to Venn; cp. I2/0 168/87, 23 September 1853, Rev N J Moody [secretary, Madras Correspondence Committee] to PC). He declared that encouraging promising young men in the Society's schools "to cultivate western languages and literature" was one of the best and most direct means to secure "a competent native ministry". The inherent contradiction in such a statement was apparently lost on the bishop.
entrusted with higher responsibilities in the Church; but on the other, it was a tool of discrimination which could be employed to subvert the establishment of a Native Pastorate. The irony of the Sierra Leone situation was that a significant proportion of the missionaries (mostly German) who had come out in the early days of the Mission — and subsequently ordained (though not by the Anglican Church, it must be said) — were poorly educated, by English standards, and had displayed embarrassing inadequacies. It was also possible that the educational deficiencies of these older catechists was the result of the Society's unstable educational policies in the early years (see previous chapter). An admonition issued in the CMI made a crucial point on the subject: "There is a danger lest we... so retard the ordination of the native until he become fashioned in some measure after our European notions; until he become more educated, more conversant with the European languages and modes of life. But the congregation is more injured than the candidate benefited by the delay..." However, Bishop Vidal's readiness to ordain the younger catechists (students of the Fourah Bay Institution) probably provides some vindication from accusations of culturally motivated episcopal prejudgment.

The fact that a "perpetual diaconate" was also being posited, in the South Indian Mission, in response to a similar problem, prompted Venn to seek the counsel of the highest ecclesiastical authorities on its acceptability. He was

164 A notable example was William A B Johnson (the famous Apostle of Regent), who had been a labourer in Whitechapel before his "call". Fyfe remarks that some of these missionaries (German Lutherans) "spoke indifferently the language [i.e., English] they taught their charges"; and mentions that "when Johnson once preached in Freetown the army officers burst out laughing" (Fyfe, p. 154). In fact, until well into the century, the Society was unable to send out European missionaries with a University education.


166 CMS, G/C1, vol. 29, (CM, 5 December 1853), p. 674; cp. C I2/0 168/87, 23 September 1853, Rev N J Moody to PC.
informed by the Archbishop of Canterbury that this measure (which "had been much discussed") was "inexpedient if not inadmissible" within the Anglican order for ordination. The Archbishop explained that within the Anglican structure there was very little distinction between the two orders - one being introductory to the other - and a Bishop of that Church could not "properly refuse ordination at the second step". It is doubtful whether Venn ever seriously considered this alternative, for he made it clear that he would "be disappointed" if the old catechists could not receive full orders as Nicol and Maxwell. He argued that however unfitted they were for town Churches, God had already "owned them as Pastors of souls" in the villages; and "even if under ordinary circumstances their ordination would have been inadvisable, their cases must be exceptional - and [could] form no precedent". To be sure, Vidal's rejection of the Senior Catechists was potentially an embarrassment to Venn, who had declared, four years earlier, that these Senior Catechists were men "of tried fidelity and experience, who would have been presented for Holy Orders many years ago, had

---

167 CMS, C A1/L5, (p. 159), 30 November 1853, Venn to Bishop Vidal (Sierra Leone). His Grace, however, added that the episcopal prerogative of giving authority to Scripture Readers "to perform a kind of Pastoral office... tantamount to an order of Deacons", was an ecclesiastically permissible way of circumventing the problem. In other words, the Bishop could avoid ordaining unsuitable catechists by making them Scripture Readers, and giving them authority to perform some pastoral duties. Venn explained that "such a measure would require a special form of license; and those appointed to it would be in a similar position to the Licentiates who preach in other churches as Scotch and Lutheran: and who may return to lay occupations if found unsuitable for clergymen".

168 Venn was under no illusions about the ability of these catechists. Years earlier, he had judged that "their attainments would be perhaps scarcely sufficient to warrant their Ordination in this country [meaning, England]; and also decided that "the risk to their health ad character would be too great to justify their being brought to England" (CMS, G/CA1/4, 19 November 1844, Venn to the Bishop of London; cp. Warren, p. 161).

169 CMS, C A1/L5, (p. 160), 30 November 1853, Venn to Bishop Vidal (Sierra Leone). Venn was being unduly optimistic. Two years later, the Finance Committee were compelled to remove Attara (one of the older native ministers in question) from Wellington owing to differences which had arisen between him and the congregation, on account of the fact that "he was too old" (CMS, C A1/0 3/350a, 2 March 1855, Jones to Secretaries).
there been a Bishop... on the spot".  

Even the PC must have felt itself, by virtue of past assurances, under a certain obligation to secure the ordination of these men. They all but ordered Vidal to ordain the Senior Catechists (both to Deacon's and Priestly orders), and couched its decision in the form of the following Resolution:

That adverting to the importance of raising up as soon as possible a body of native Ministers in Sierra Leone, the Bishop be requested to select and receive any of the native Teachers employed by the Society as candidates for Holy Orders, if the Finance Committee shall concur with his Lordship in recommending them; and that the Finance Committee be requested to state the amount of salary which they think ought to be given to native Deacons, regard being had to the principles laid down in the printed Minute on the Native Pastorate of Sierra Leone.

Vidal assented to the PC's request; but, with the air of one who felt duty-bound to safeguard episcopal integrity, he drew up a list of "Regulations for Deacons" to which each candidate for ordination was subject. These regulations included the presentation of testimonials; examination by the Bishop (and ordination on approval); the continuance in Deacon's orders for three years (instead of one, as was the case in England); superintendence by a missionary minister, or, when in full charge, by a Rural Dean; and the preaching of one written sermon every Sunday subject to instruction.

Venn diplomatically observed that the essential requirements

170 CMS, G/Cl, Vol. 27, (CM, 2 October 1849). By that time some of the Senior Catechists had begun to clamour to be brought to England for ordination (no doubt encouraged by the example of Nicol and Maxwell).

171 The PC had declared that a Bishop "could at once admit them to holy orders"; and, as an indication of its confidence in them, had encouraged "their taking the pastoral care of congregations" (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 187, Instructions of the Committee to... Rev Nicol and Rev Maxwell..., 5 October 1849). It was not unlikely then that these men would feel betrayed by a Society they had served faithfully for twenty, and more, years.

172 Cf. CMS, C A1/L5, p. 174, 23 December 1853, Venn to Vidal.

173 CMS, G/Cl, Vol. 29.

174 CMS, C A1/O 25A/7B, 10 November 1853, Vidal to Venn.

175 It is worth noting that six years later Bishop Bowen also wanted "to arrange a plan for giving some systematic instructions to the Catechists who are candidates for holy orders" (CMS, C A1/O 25C/20, 19 May 1859, Bowen to Venn).
of the regulations, including the length of the probation of a Diaconate, were the preserve of episcopal cognisance; but expressed the hope that "the ecclesiastical constitution... "may be shortly brought into operation".\textsuperscript{176}

Vidal's stand on the ordination question was by no means the tactical manoeuvring of one opposed to the establishment of a Native Pastorate. A visit to England in December, 1853 (on account of his wife's health), enabled him to enter into even fuller detail with Henry Venn on the matter of the Pastorate. As a result of their consultations, Venn produced a detailed plan for the immediate formation of the Native Pastorate which required four native Pastors (supported by four other catechists and four native curates) to take charge of five districts - Kissy Road, Kissy, Gloucester and Charlotte, and Wellington.\textsuperscript{177} Another five stations - Aberdeen, Leicester, Bathurst, Bananas, and Benguema, were to remain under native catechists, until "the zeal of the people" provided the means of erecting them into Native Pastorates. The native Pastors were to be given "suitable houses and residences", and paid out of the Native Church Fund and any endowments which may be given; while the native Curates would still be paid wholly by the Society at a lower rate than the native Pastors. However, Venn indicated that "the employment by the Society of native Catechists must be gradually discontinued, and the expenditure of the Society would be reduced in the Colony and become available for direct missionary work beyond it".\textsuperscript{178}

Whether Bishop Vidal would have succeeded in implementing this plan will never be known. After his trip to England, the Bishop sailed directly to the Yoruba Mission, where he confirmed six hundred candidates, and ordained two native ministers from Sierra Leone - Thomas King and Thomas

\textsuperscript{176} CMS, C A1/L5, p. 174, 23 December 1853, Venn to Vidal. Referring to the extension of the Diaconate, he observed that the CMS would never make itself a party to a stipulation of that kind "because it is purely an ecclesiastical question".

\textsuperscript{177} CMS, C A1/L5, pp. 191-195, 29 March 1854, Venn to Vidal.

\textsuperscript{178} ibid.
Babington Macauley. He died on the way back to Sierra Leone, on Christmas Eve, 1855.

The construction of a Church Constitution was Bishop Vidal's only tangible contribution to the Native Church. His linguistic ability and interest in translations bore little fruit; though his observation about the importance of Arabic was later echoed by Bishop Bowen. His only other notable episcopal initiative - apart from ordinations and confirmations - was to form an ecclesiastical division in his diocese. In September, 1853, he notified the CMS of his intention to form two Archdeaconries - an Archdeaconry of Freetown, and an Archdeaconry of Abeokuta - but subsequently ran into legal difficulties with his proposals. He was informed by Venn (who consulted legal counsel) that his Letters Patent did not authorize him to appoint an Archdeacon of Abeokuta; and he discovered, somewhat belatedly, that Graf (his appointee to the Archdeaconry of Freetown) could not act as Archdeacon "without an act of naturalisation as a British subject" - even though he had English orders. This latter difficulty was speedily cleared, and the Bishop proceeded with an ecclesiastical division.

179 Stock, ii, p. 122.
180 Vidal suggested that Missionaries to Africa would have to learn Arabic more and more, and become acquainted with the Koran; though he admitted that the spoken Arabic of Africa differed considerably from that of the Koran (CMS, C A1/0 25A/5a, 23 September 1853, Vidal to Venn.
182 CMS, C A1/L5, pp. 160-161, 30 November 1853, Venn to Vidal. Venn explained that the Bishop's Patent only took effect "in the dominions of Great Britain"; and though he had jurisdiction over clergy of the Church of England beyond British colonies, an Archdeacon was a "territorial office", which could only be authorized by an Act of Parliament.
183 Vidal explained that he had appointed Graf to the office because his "present position and duties so resemble those of an Archdeacon", and expressed the hope that his appointment would "stop the perpetual war" between him and the other missionaries about the Society's official letters (CMS, C A1/0 25A/6B, 20 October 1853, Vidal to Venn). What he did not say was that as archdeacon Graf would be directly responsible to the bishop.
plan, which included a further division of the Freetown Archdeaconry into four Rural Deaneries: viz, Freetown, The River, The Mountain, and The Sea.\textsuperscript{184} The CMS concurred with the Bishop's plans after prolonged discussion;\textsuperscript{185} and Venn expressed the hope that office of Archdeacon would "tend to the benefit and consolidation of the native Church", and bridge the gap between the Mission and the Pastorate.\textsuperscript{186} But these ecclesiastical arrangements had no lasting impact or value, and did not survive the death of the Bishop.

(ii) John William Weeks

Bishop Vidal's loss was keenly felt in the colony;\textsuperscript{187} and it was an especially cruel blow to a Church which had so briefly and tantalizingly partaken of the rewards and crowning glory of episcopal headship. The comments of a contemporary writer on the brevity of his first episcopate, were appropriately poignant:

We, in our shortsightedness, had ventured to entertain that hope that it might be long - sufficiently so, at least, as to afford opportunity for the consolidation of the Sierra Leone Church, the blending together of its infantile materials, the increase and the settlement of the native pastorate, the development and self-supporting principle, and the setting in order of the things that are wanting. But it pleased the Sovereign Disposer of all things to order it otherwise, and the brevity of his episcopate has precluded his giving practical issue to all that he had purposed in his heart.\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{184} ibid. Each of these Rural Deaneries was to have monthly meetings for prayer and consultation, and so fulfil the function of the discontinued District meetings.

\textsuperscript{185} Cf. G/C1, Vol. 29, 8 November 1853, pp. 648-650, Resolution on the proposed appointment of one of the Society's Missionaries to the office of Archdeacon.

\textsuperscript{186} Cf. CMS, C A1/L5, p. 165, 30 November 1853, Venn to Graf; p. 185, 20 February 1854, Venn to Graf.

\textsuperscript{187} In Maxwell's rather graphic account, the news of his death "was like a peal of thunder spreading a terrible and alarming suspense over the whole Colony"; and "a dead silence pervaded the whole of Freetown" (CMS, C A1/O 148/50a, Annual Letter, 28 February 1855, Maxwell to Venn).

The PC, and Venn, whose expectations had been so heavily invested in the late Bishop's endeavour, were equally shaken by his sudden and unexpected demise. But they hurriedly turned their attention to the appointment of a successor. In what Venn described as "the most unexpected and providential way", the popular choice was John William Weeks, a missionary who had already laboured in Sierra Leone.189 John W Weeks, a block-maker in Cornwall,190 went out to Sierra Leone (in 1824) as a mechanic and evangelist; and amongst other things taught the young Samuel Crowther carpentry.191 He was ordained in 1835 (on a visit to London),192 and served in several of the villages until 1844, when he was "compelled by failure of health, to return to England".193 Venn attributed the "consensus" about Weeks appointment to "the uncommon zeal and good sense which he has exhibited in working in the very difficult parish of Lambeth" - to which Weeks had retired. But another consideration which evidently influenced the decision was an instinctive inclination to appoint one who had become acclimatized to the West African climate. Week's health, and prospect of length of labour, was vetted by two physicians - one of whom, Dr Clarke, had attended him in Sierra Leone.194 Both gave him a "clean bill of health" (or, more accurately, described the

189 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 69, 11 April 1855, Venn to Jones. The Bishops of London, Oxford, and Winchester, and the late Rector of Lambeth, had all suggested his name. And E Jones (who had replaced Graf as Secretary of the Sierra Leone Mission) later remarked that Weeks had been "the man of our thoughts, whom we have been speaking of amongst ourselves as most suitable for the office..." (CMS, C A1/0 3/345a, 14 June 1855, Jones to Secretaries).

190 Stock, ii, p. 122.

191 See Stock, ibid.; cp. Fyfe (1962), who describes Weeks as "a former carpenter who taught the boys [in the Mountain District] to use the lathe" (p. 213).

192 Contra., Johnson (1953), p. 61, who places Weeks' ordination as 1840. J W Weeks was ordained Deacon and Priest on 20 December 1835 and 3 January 1836, respectively, by the Bishop of London (cf. CMS Register of Missionary and Native Clergy: 1804-1904, p. 19, no. 100).

193 Proceedings of the CMS, 45th Year, 1846, p. 33.

194 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 70, 11 April 1855, Venn to Jones.
ex-Sierra Leonean missionary as a good risk). Weeks was duly consecrated at his Lambeth parish on Ascension Day 1855, and arrived in Freetown on the 14th of November.

Bishop Weeks had none of the scholastic credentials of his predecessor; and he reportedly accepted the Bishopric "with great reluctance..., feeling himself utterly unworthy of such an office". But, from a pastoral point of view, it is difficult to conceive of a Bishop more suited for the Sierra Leone Mission - though Stock is probably guilty of hyperbole when he claims that "a truer Bishop in the Church of God never walked this earth". His heart and mind were finely tuned to the spiritual welfare of the colony (which he regarded as his fatherland); and his return produced all the emotional response of a re-union. It was most auspicious that a good many of the people already considered him a spiritual father; and a decided advantage that the missionaries received him as an "old friend and fellow labourer". It was also considered to be a matter of no small significance the new Bishop was bringing a perception borne of experience to the task before him. Jones remarked: "His knowledge of the people, of the work to be done, of the difficulties to be met with, and also of the favourable tokens for good - are all fruits of his personal experience. He is no stranger to us nor to our climate. We all know him and love him, and there is not one of us that will not bid him God's speed in his arduous undertaking". The CMS also reckoned that Weeks' "long training in the Mission field", would serve to good purpose and ensure an effective realization of the projects so rudely aborted by Vidal's

195 Though the Indian Physician ventured the opinion that he was "very likely to bear the climate better than a younger man" - ibid.
196 Stock, ii, p. 122.
197 Stock, ii, p. 122.
198 Venn reported that he had "seen his eyes filled with tears at the thought of revisiting his former scenes of labour" (CMS, C A1/L6, p. 76, 2 June 1855, Venn to Ebhemann. Cp. Fyfe (1962), p. 288f.
199 CMS, C A1/0 3/345A, 14 June 1855, Jones to Secretaries.
premature death. Concern for the state and proceedings of
the Fourah Bay Institution induced the PC to invest the new
Bishop with "plenary powers" to investigate (and rectify) the
decline of spiritual standards in that institution. But
they clearly expected Weeks to resume operations where Bishop
Vidal had left off. It was certainly no coincidence that
Weeks (even more than his predecessor) fully supported the
Society's plans for the Sierra Leone Mission. He was urged
by the PC to take speedy action on both the ordination of
native pastors (some of whom he may have taught or trained
himself) and the proposed Church Constitution (which had been
lying in abeyance over two years).

By the time Bishop Weeks arrived in the colony, the
successful introduction of the principle of self-support in
the Society's elementary schools had heightened expectations
about the plausibility of a Native Pastorate. From the
Society's point of view, it was "proof that ... the native
converts [had] reached a stage of ripeness in which they may
take an independent standing as a Church of Christ". However, the economic disadvantages of a sudden increase in
taxes (which coincided with this achievement) was enough to
sow seeds of doubt in the minds of the more discerning, about
the ability of the congregations to sustain a further
programme of self-dependence. Soon after his arrival,
Bishop Weeks embarked on a tour of inspection through the
villages, and saw much to encourage him. But he was soon
given a taste of the unsavoury aspects and hidden pitfalls in
the day to day affairs of the Mission, which were prone to
disarm the unwary. A notable incident was the Ehemann-

200 CMS, C A1/L6, pp. 108-109, 23 October 1855, Venn to Weeks; cp. CMS, C
A1/L5, p. 89, 17 September 1855, Venn to Jones.
201 CMS, C A1/L6, pp. 108-109, 23 October 1855, Venn to Weeks.
202 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 113, 31 January 1856, Venn to Jones.
203 Maxwell's experience at Kissy Road Church has already been discussed.
Jones was also worried about the difficulties which the new taxes posed
(CMS, C A1/0 3/359, 24 December 1855, Jones to Venn).
Macauley affair.²⁰⁴ In the village of Bathurst, C F Ehemann (a European missionary) discovered that Macauley, a young native schoolmaster, was methodically helping himself to the funds at the Society's store. Ehemann summarily dismissed Macauley, and informed the Bishop (on the latter's return from a tour of the colony). However, on discovering that the Finance Committee could not convene (owing to illness among the members), Ehemann took the matter before the Police Magistrate. This step seemed unnecessarily heavy-handed - specially since Macauley is reported to have admitted the crime (explaining that he meant to put the money back) - and, in the end, it backfired. The public - notably members of Macauley's own Aku group - reacted strongly to what they perceived to be the victimization of an African by a predominant European group. Matters were not helped when the Police Magistrate dismissed the case, on grounds of insufficient evidence; and that, after the Finance Committee had dismissed the hapless Macauley. The Bishop and his missionaries were vilified in the press; and the principal Akus gave notice of their intention to prosecute Ehemann in the courts. For a while, at least, public opinion was strongly against the Society's agents; so much so that it was considered "doubly important" that they exercise "due care and vigilance" in "their intercourse with the natives."²⁰⁵ The defence of the action against Ehemann cost just over £40, and had to be paid from the Store fund.²⁰⁶ The experience of being the object of antagonistic public feeling, and of being prosecuted by some of the most influential natives of Freetown, was a novel one for the Society's agents and representatives in Sierra Leone. Nonetheless, it was an unequivocal indication of the metamorphosis taking place in

²⁰⁴ Cf., CMS, C A1/O 3/363, 12 April 1856, Jones to Secretaries; and cp. CMS, C A1/O 164/60, n.d. [missing page], Nicol to [Venn].


²⁰⁶ However, the fact that (on Jones' appeal) the sum of £200 was "most readily contributed by friends, and members" of the church in different parts of the colony, to help service the legal the cost, would seem to indicate that the Society was not without its supporters.
the Freetown society. Over the last quarter of a century, the Freetown community had slowly transformed from a community of liberated slaves, whose collective mentality was predisposed to an unquestioning acceptance of CMS (or even governmental) actions, to one in which a significant majority were relatively wealthy, self-made, and generally suspicious of foreign overlordship. The Rev E Jones was more alert than most to this societal transition, and its implications. "It cannot be concealed from the Committee", he wrote (in June 1856), "that there is existing a state of things, on the part of some of the influential natives of Freetown, that does not bear a friendly aspect towards your accredited Agents of this Colony". He explained: "The character and circumstances of the Liberated Africans have undergone a great change, within the last ten or twelve years. Many of them have amassed comparative wealth; enjoy some consideration in the community, and have no small notions of their own consequence and importance... Men who lately were nothing are, now, becoming something; and it is quite natural that there should be disturbances..." However, even these unwelcome developments could not completely dampen the widespread rejoicing at the ordination of eight native catechists.

In March 1856, Bishop Weeks issued a circular to the Missionaries, announcing his intention to ordain the native catechists on Trinity Sunday.208 He rejected outright three of the oldest catechists - Attarra, Harding, and Bartholomew - whom he described (in words reminiscent of Vidal) as "wholly unqualified" to be admitted to holy orders. It is helpful to note, however, that Weeks also rejected a young European catechist - W H Charpentier - whose disgraceful and

207 CMS, C A1/O 3/365, 13 June 1856, Jones to Secretaries. Jones' contention that this group formed "ninety-nine hundredths of the population of the Colony", needs to be treated with caution.

208 CMS, C A1/O 25B/7, 5 March 1856, Circular to Missionaries regarding the ordination of catechists. The ordination date was later changed to 8th June.
abusive conduct resulted in his recall by the Society.\textsuperscript{209} With some justification, Weeks described the time of ordination as "one of the most important periods in the history of the Mission".\textsuperscript{210} The ordination took place on 8th June 1856 in a St George's Cathedral "filled to overflowing".\textsuperscript{211} The eight native catechists who were ordained Deacons on that day were: J S Wiltshire, John Campbell, Jacob Cole, John C Taylor (1st), Joseph Wilson, John C Taylor (2nd), Josiah Thomas, and James Quaker.\textsuperscript{212} For the very first time, Sierra Leonean ministers were ordained on Sierra Leonean soil to serve the Church in their country. This event was the culmination of years of CMS expectation and unabated longing on the part of the native congregations. In a very real sense, these men, six of whom were educated entirely in the Colony, were the first fruits of over half a century of CMS endeavour.\textsuperscript{213} Their ordination did not, strictly speaking, make the Native Pastorate a tangible and physical reality; but it certainly rendered its emergence a conceptual and ecclesiastical possibility. The PC readily agreed to Weeks' proposal that each of the newly ordained ministers should receive £50 per annum. But Venn declared, pointedly, that "they hope[d] to learn that some of them [had] at least a portion of their salary provided

\textsuperscript{209} Cf. CMS, C A1/0 25B/4, 8A; C A1/L6, p. 148, 23 September 1856, Venn to Jones. Charpentier had even contemplated bringing legal action against the Bishop for some unspecified wrongs (C A1/0 3/366, 13 August 1856, Jones to Secretaries).

\textsuperscript{210} See Circular (note 208, supra).

\textsuperscript{211} It must be mentioned that this was not Bishop Weeks first ordination in the Colony. Two weeks before, he had "held a private ordination at Regent on Trinity Sunday", and admitted the Rev Francis Pocock (a European Missionary, who was Colonial Chaplain from 1855 to 1858) to the Priesthood (CMS, C A1/0 3/364, 24 May 1856, Jones to Secretaries).

\textsuperscript{212} CMS, C A1/0 3/364, 18 June 1856, Jones to Secretaries. One European missionary, Rev J Millward (Principal of the Grammar School), received Priests' orders.

\textsuperscript{213} Bishop Bowen (Week's successor) later described them as "the children of the Mission Church", and "the representatives of a future Church" (CMS, C A1/0 25C/26, 'Charge to the Clergy of the Colony', 8 February 1859, p. 8).
independently of the Society";\(^{214}\) and urged the adoption of measures that would relieve the Society altogether from support of the native Pastors at as early a period as possible.\(^{215}\) Jones, the Secretary of the Mission, immediately enquired of the CMS Secretaries whether the newly ordained native ministers were to be considered members of the Central Committee.\(^{216}\) The Secretaries replied that as they were "to be regarded as native Pastors and not Missionaries, they [did] not strictly come under the description given in the Regulations of 16 October 1849".\(^{217}\) In any case, the Secretaries recommended a review of the role of the Central (and District) Committee, in the light of the changed circumstances of the Mission. They stated that the PC was "inclined to think that the Finance Committee will gradually become a Correspondence Committee and will transact all matters of business, and that the District and Central Committees, or some Committees in their place, will become Missionary conferences". Ironically, this was the very arrangement which the combative Graf had pressed for several years earlier.

In October, 1856, Weeks held nine confirmations in the colony. Disliking the idea "of dragging the candidates from the different villages to the Freetown Cathedral" (as his predecessor had done), he preferred going out to each congregation.\(^{218}\) He confirmed "upwards of fourteen hundred" candidates; and, afterwards, described the experience as "a soul-stirring season".\(^{219}\) This was the Bishop's last official action in the colony. Accompanied by the Rev C T Frey, he departed for Lagos (the Yoruba Mission) on 13th November. His party visited Badagry, where their visit

\(^{214}\) CMS, C A1/L6, p. 135, 23 May 1856, Venn to Weeks.

\(^{215}\) CMS, C A1/L6, p. 137, 24 June 1856, Venn to Jones.

\(^{216}\) CMS, C A1/0 3/367, 18 September 1856, Jones to Secretaries.

\(^{217}\) CMS, C A1/L6, p. 170, 24 November 1956, Secretaries to Jones.

\(^{218}\) CMS, C A1/0 25B/4, 17 September 1856, Weeks to Venn.

\(^{219}\) CMS, C A1/0 25B/5, 11 November 1856, Weeks to Venn.
occasioned considerable alarm among the native chiefs, who felt that they had come "to pull down the Mission House and Premises, and to remove the Native Catechist, and so leave them [those] who valued not the Gospel of Christ". And at Lagos, the Bishop baptised five adults and two children in a crowded church, and administered the Lord's Supper "for the first time in the history" of a town containing 8000 people. The Bishop's triumphant travels through the Yoruba Mission, however, ended on a sour note, when he fell so ill (at Accra) that it was thought he could not survive the passage to Sierra Leone. He was carried on shore at Sierra Leone, and died nine days later, on 25th March 1857.

Bishop Weeks' death left both the Society and the Church in Sierra Leone with blighted hopes. The ordination of the Native Catechists in Sierra Leone was the high point of an episcopate that had been too brief to fulfil all but a fraction of undiluted expectations. In truth, Weeks' term was a marked failure in the very area that everyone had hoped would prove a blessing; namely, an inuredness to the African climate. The Bishop suffered "several sharp attacks of fever" soon after his arrival, and was continually handicapped by an impaired health. In April, Jones reported to the CMS Secretaries, "I regret to say that the Bishop's health causes us all much anxiety. He has not actually been laid up with an attack of illness, but his inability to bear much exertion, with his active disposition and habits, begin to tell upon his general strength".

---

220 CMS, C A1/0 25B/6, 9 February 1857, Weeks (writing from Afropong) to Venn.
221 The Rev C T Frey, who had accompanied the Bishop and had also returned ill, died a month later (C A1/0 3/374a, 23 April 1856, Jones to Secretaries).
222 CMS, C A1/0 25B/2, 24 December 1855, Weeks to Venn.
223 CMS, C A1/0 3/363, 12 April 1856, Jones to Secretaries. Possibly due to a mistaken belief in his own strength the Bishop refused to cut down on his exertions. But, after suffering from diarrhoea during the whole of October, he admitted to Venn that had he not made the appointment for the confirmations he would certainly have "remained very quiet" (CMS, C
the Yoruba Mission amidst fears for his health; and, according to Jones, "fully alive to the possibility of his never returning". 224 Indeed, the Bishop's own last letter to Venn expressed a salutary point, which could not have been lost on that missionary statesman: "Africa is and I believe will be a trying climate to the health and lives of Europeans, hence the very great necessity for a larger staff of Native agents". 225

(iii) John Bowen

The appointment of Dr John Bowen as the third Bishop of Sierra Leone was described by a close friend as the result of "one of those strange perversions of logical deduction that are not uncommon". 226 John Bowen had spent some of his early life in Canada; and, after his ordination by the Bishop of Ripon in 1846, had travelled extensively in the Middle East, in connection with the Society (but at his own expense). There was, indeed, justifiable ground for doubting the wisdom of appointing a man who was perfectly acquainted with the habits and modes of thought of Eastern peoples, and spoke fluent Arabic, to a Bishopric in Western Africa. What is not widely known is that Bowen had actually made Venn an offer to go to Africa, six months before his appointment, when there was no thought of any vacancy in the Bishopric. 227 In any case, after the deaths of two Bishops in the space of five years, and each within two years after his appointment to the same sphere of labour, the CMS was determined that "in addition to all other moral and spiritual qualifications"

226 Memorials of John Bowen, Late Bishop of Sierra Leone, compiled from his letters and journals by his sister, London (1862), pp. 518-519.
227 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 217, 23 July 1857, Venn to Reichardt. This fact is not mentioned in the Memoirs of John Bowen.
Bishop Weeks' successor should be "strong in health". The unavoidable conclusion must therefore be that Bowen was chosen more for his robust appearance, and experience in foreign travel, than for any of his other undeniable qualities. For his part, Bowen was impervious to all the well-meaning efforts to dissuade him from accepting "that most perilous office, the bishopric of Sierra Leone". According to his biographer, "it was simply a strong sense of duty that induced him to go... a truer, deeper, more abiding courage than that which leads the warrior to the thickest of the fight, or urges him to advance to the most unequal contest". Bowen was consecrated on 21 September 1857, by the Archbishop of Canterbury; and stayed in England only long enough to be married, before setting sail for Freetown; where he arrived on the 13th of December 1857.

Bishop Bowen commenced his episcopate in Sierra Leone at a time when the ranks of the missionaries was thinned by death, sickness, and leave of absence. This state of affairs unsettled the Mission, and occasioned fears about maintaining spiritual standards in the various congregations. Bowen's early correspondence is peppered with repeated calls for the European missionary force in Freetown to be strengthened; for, in his words, the harvest was great and "the labourers few and far between". He told Venn that the whole force of the various Missions in Freetown seemed "barely to do the pastoral work of the congregations and the heathen and

228 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 211, 22 May 1857, Venn to Jones.
229 Fyfe, (1962), describes Bowen as "younger and robuster" than his predecessor (p. 289); and Bowen himself boasted, within three months of his arrival in Freetown, that the climate was "by no means as deadly as is supposed, to men of a tolerably robust constitution" (Memoirs of John Bowen, p. 534).
230 ibid.
231 The Finance Committee was reduced to three members (CMS, C A1/O 3/375a, 27 May 1857, Jones to Secretaries).
232 Indeed, Bishop Bowen's own opinion was that "the spiritual state of the congregations [had] declined since the Europeans were reduced" (CMS, C A1/O 25C/11, 10 September 1858, Bowen to Venn).
Muslims are left to themselves". Unless we get some more Europeans", he continued ominously, "we shall go back". But, for Venn, the paucity of European agents presented an excellent opportunity for "for bringing forward" native ministers like Nicol (at the Fourah Bay Institution), and James Quaker (at the Grammar School). That decision rested ultimately with the Finance Committee (of Sierra Leone); but Bowen, who showed no inclination to pursue that option, insisted instead that what the Mission needed was "a superior man or two". Venn replied that in the absence of European help (of the stamp Bowen required) every use must be made of native assistance; and that, moreover, the PC looked to the Bishop to admit to holy orders any of the catechists whom he deemed fit, and to "keep up the supply of native ministers". But Bowen accorded very little priority to the ordination of native ministers; and seemed to have suggested that they were just as useful as catechists. He declared bluntly: "The ordination of natives will not help me now". The Bishop also evinced a rather poor opinion of the native clergy; whom he described as "good and intelligent, but scarcely men of power".

The point at issue in this exchange of views between Bowen

---

233 CMS, C A1/O 25C/6, 7 July 1858, Bowen to Venn. The Bishop pointed out that with only three Churches in Freetown (two CMS, and one Colonial), the population was, in his words, "far beyond the our means" (Memoirs of John Bowen, p. 529).
234 CMS, C A1/L6, 23 February 1858, Venn to Bowen. Venn declared that he would himself "have no fear in placing Nicol in charge of the Fourah Bay Institution" - in the absence of Jones. The CMS Secretaries' also expressed the opinion that "the Institutions might well be left in their [Nicol's and Quaker's] care for a time" (CMS, C A1/L6, 23 February 1858, p. 283, Secretaries to S Black).
235 CMS, C A1/O 25C/6, 7 July 1858, Bowen to Venn.
236 CMS, C A1/L6, 21 August 1858, Venn to Bowen. On an earlier occasion, he had advised the Bishop solemnly, "If a few more ordained natives will relieve you, do not wait another day, but get the relief at once..." (CMS, C A1/L6, p. 300, 22 July 1858, Venn to Bowen).
237 CMS, C A1/O 25C/8b, 18 August 1858, Bowen to Venn.
238 Memoirs of John Bowen, p. 529.
and Venn was the timeliness of the Native Pastorate and the readiness of the native ministers to undertake an independent, self-supporting ministry. The PC made the CMS position emphatically clear: namely that the Society regarded its Missions "in such a Christianized Colony as Sierra Leone as altogether 'extra-parochial', and desired to "throw off all pastoral duties from European to native Agency". Venn asseverated: "The time has now arrived when the Native Church in Sierra Leone must receive a more regular establishment than it has hitherto had. In other words, the Native Pastorate must be separated from the Mission and must be supported by the native Church". He explained that the Society wished to retain only the pastoral charge of one Church in Freetown (Pademba Road Church) - which was to be regarded as "the Mission Church". "Kissy Road Church and every other Church in the Colony", he insisted, "ought as speedily as possible to be placed upon an independent footing under Native Pastors supported by local funds"; though "Missionaries must act as superintendents over several Native Pastors till the whole can be reduced to a regular Ecclesiastical system". It was in the light of this position that Venn repeatedly urged the ordination of native ministers, the implementation of the proposed Church Constitution, and the establishment of an endowment (or Church) fund. Whereas the first was left to the discretion of the Bishop, the last two admitted of greater difficulties and perplexities. Once he had time to assess the state of things in the Sierra Leone Church, Bowen himself became convinced about the necessity a Church Constitution, and requested Venn to provide him with a draft of the 'Articles of Arrangement'. Venn warned him that none of the

---

239 Instructions of the Committee to Rev Caiger, and Messrs Hamilton, Knödler, etc, proceeding to the Sierra Leone Mission, 16 October 1857.
242 CMS, C A1/0 25C/12, 11 October 1858, Bowen to Venn. He felt that with such a constitution, the proposition for endowments could be more effectively introduced. On another occasion, when faced with the
"parties on the spot" (meaning the members of the Mission) had as yet been consulted about the proposed constitution; but pronounced himself "persuaded that the more the scheme was looked into and discussed the more it will be found to meet the wants of the case".243 He suggested that the scheme be gradually introduced; that instead of a Church Council, for example, the Bishop could act with the Finance Committee for a time. But he was insistent that "the pivot" on which the whole turned was "the formation of a Church Fund"; which ought to be "immediately set on foot".244

The introduction of the self-supporting principle into the native Church greatly exercised the mind of Bishop Bowen. Whether in an attempt to regulate the increase of ordained native clergy, or in a genuine bid to activate the support of the native congregations, he decided to "make a call from a congregation a ground for ordination to the Native Pastorate".245 He proposed the following scheme to Venn: that when a congregation came forward to state that they wanted one of the deacons to be their minister, and would contribute something towards his allowance, he would then ordain him priest. Under this plan, a congregation should contribute £5 or £10 for a catechist to be ordained deacon, and £15 or £20 for a deacon to be ordained Priest - based on the assumption that the Society continued its payment of £50 for catechists. This, he argued "would give the native pastors an object or interest in the self-support system"; though "it will be long before most of the congregations come

unexplored problem of providing a fund for the widows and children of native clergy, he asserted, "We are anxiously waiting for the Church Constitution you spoke of... we want some rules and principles to guide us" (CMS, C A1/0 25C/14, 18 November 1858, Bowen to Venn).

243 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 347, 22 December 1858, Venn to Bowen.

244 ibid. He argued that the establishment of a Church Fund and Church Council would have been imperative, even if a Church Constitution had never been thought of.

245 CMS, C A1/0 25C/8B, 18 August 1858, Bowen to Venn.
up to the mark". Venn agreed with the principle of Bowen's proposal, but suggested that it was "far better [in the PC's opinion] to institute a general fund", which would be under the direction of a central committee of missionaries, out of which Native Pastors would receive grants-in-aid, "than to let any congregation pay direct to their ministers". It is well to point out that this response was given some three years before Venn articulated his ideas on the establishment of a Native Church Fund in his 'Second Paper' (1861). It is equally interesting to note that Bishop Bowen, who did not have the benefit of Venn's 'Second Paper', based his own proposal on the system which obtained in the England, where it was a necessary condition that a candidate to be admitted to holy orders "be possessed of a title": namely, "a definite sphere in which to exercise his ministerial calling", and "an adequate maintenance while doing so". In the event, Bowen's scheme did not call forth any immediate response from the native congregations; and its practicality remains in doubt. Moreover, his untimely death prevented the realization of any of his (or CMS') plans. The road to the establishment of a Church Fund was also strewn with difficulty. The immediate, and unmitigated success of the School Fund - which in five years amounted to "upwards of £1500" - in itself contributed to the problem. For it arguably precluded, in the given economic climate, any significant response to appeals for the support of a Church Fund. The fact that weekly class payments were still being paid into the School Fund further undermined its effective creation. The PC's warning that "all the native ministers should know that the Society [was] not bound to continue their stipend any longer than it may

246 ibid. He suggested that a small endowment would help to facilitate the scheme.
247 CMS, C A1/L6, p. 315, 23 September 1858, Venn to Bowen.
248 The Bishop explained this in his 'Charge to the Clergy of the Colony' (CMS, C A1/O 25C/26, 8 February 1859, p. 36).
249 CMS, C A1/O 3/395a, 18 October 1858, Ehemann to Secretaries.
appear to them desirable" had little effect; and the Native Pastorate Fund (as it was also called) only amounted to £235.12, by the time of Bowen's death.

However, Bishop Bowen's episcopate was not unfruitful. On 28th March 1858 he ordained two European missionaries - J Hamilton and S Black - Deacons, and a third - G R Caiger - Priest. Two months later, on 15th May, Hamilton and Black were admitted to the Priesthood; and two native ministers - W Quaker and J Robbin - were ordained Deacons. And in the only response by a native congregation to his scheme, J C Taylor was ordained Priest (as minister of Gloucester), "with only £5 or £6 promised by the people for an addition to his salary". More importantly, Bowen made the most useful comments, recorded by a Bishop, about the language handicap existing in Freetown, and the "great need of men knowing the African languages". According to Bowen, the Aku language was widely spoken in the colony, and was much better understood than English. In probably one of the earliest references to the Krio language, he complained about the "corrupt dialect as spoken by the original negro settlers from Nova Scotia", which was prevalent among the inhabitants; and caused, he surmised, by "the carelessness of the negro mind", and "the influence of the of the native mind and language". The Bishop paid two visits to the Río Pongas;
where he was entertained by children who "chanted the 'Venite', 'Jubilate', and 'Gloria Patri', in a very respectable manner". Nonetheless, he argued that "each missionary ought to know one African language"; and argued that the inhabitants could only be reached "through their native languages". His most innovative recommendation was that "a system of vernacular schools" should be set up beyond the colony as a means of reaching the native population. He advocated that both English and the native languages should be taught in the schools near the colony; though the English component should be reduced as the Mission progress into the interior. He argued: "Youths having received the rudiments in their native land, and having learned to read their native language, would retain them, and not become as Sierra Leone bred youths, who were almost as foreign to the native tribes as we are, except in colour". Consequently, youths sent to Fourah Bay would have knowledge of their native language; and so enable that institution to attain "its true character as a great Protestant propaganda for African". The Bishop was not a mere theorist, either; and he was seen "among the Mohammedans, freely and cheerfully conversing with them in the Arabic language on the wonderful works of God, trying if possible to convince them of their error, powerfully advocating the doctrines of Christ's holy religion".

---

256 Memoirs of John Bowen, p. 532.

257 CMS, C A1/0 25C/4, 24 March 1858, Bowen to Venn. Venn replied that the PC had always supported this step; but added that "unless a person has a taste for languages it [was] vain to expect that a missionary in Sierra Leone will study them" (CMS, C A1/L6, p. 280, 23 February 1858, Venn to Bowen). The fact of the matter was that few, if any, of the Missionaries in the Sierra Leone Mission felt that the a knowledge of the vernacular was essential.

258 CMS, C A1/0 25C/14, 18 November 1858, Bowen to Venn.

259 Memoirs of John Bowen, p. 618. These evangelistic outings were almost certainly of a limited impact; for the Bishop discovered that the large number of Muslim Foulahs in Freetown knew little Arabic, and few could translate the Koran (CMS, C A1/0 25C/1, 18 December 1857, Bowen to Venn). Though Fyfe helpfully records that "on a visit to Magbele he confounded the indignant chief by quoting the Koran in Arabic" (Fyfe, p. 289).
If Bishop Vidal provided the Native Church with a Church Constitution, and Bishop Week's provided it with its first ordained native ministers, Bishop Bowen sought to merge the two; and, arguably, came closer than any of his predecessors to the establishment of the Native Pastorate Church. Ironically, he did not "consider the result to be so near as some of the friends of Africa appear to hope"; yet he believed that "the time is come for taking a step in that direction".260 These were the Bishop's last official words on the subject – spoken, it must be noted, in the first episcopal charge in West Africa. Six days later he departed for the Yoruba Mission; and became the first Bishop to also visit the Niger Delta. Unlike his predecessors, he returned to the Colony in good health: a fact which encouraged hope on all sides that his was to be an enduring episcopate.261 However, in the early months of 1859, the colony was ravaged by disease – first smallpox, then yellow fever – which caused numerous deaths among both natives and Europeans.262 While hundreds of natives succumbed to smallpox, the Europeans were particularly susceptible to yellow fever. As the disease took its horrible toll, over 36 Europeans died in about 4 months; including the Bishop.263 Bishop Bowen, remained

260 CMS, C A1/O 25C/26, 'Charge to the Clergy of the Colony', 8 February 1859, p. 34.

261 Since Stock (ii, p. 123) might give the uninformed reader the impression that the Bishop's wife died while the Bishop was away on this trip, it must be mentioned that Mrs Bowen had passed away on 4th August the previous year (see Memoirs of John Bowen, p. 553 & 560). Her loss was a telling blow from which the Bishop never quite recovered. Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25C/12, 11 October 1858, Bowen to Venn; and C A1/O 3/411a, 18 June 1959, Ehemann to Secretaries; cp. CMS, C A1/L6, p. 313, 23 September 1858, Venn to Bowen.

262 Cf. Fyfe (1962), p. 296. The "unhealthy season" was apparently brought on by freakish climatic conditions; and the dry 'harmattan' wind (which normally blew in December and January) was blowing in April. According to one report, the colony was experiencing such a heat as it had not had "for the last 20 years" (CMS, C A1/O 3/408, 19 May 1859, Ehemann to Secretaries).

263 According to Fyfe, there were, in all, forty-two European deaths (half the European population). An entire contingent of Roman Catholic Missionaries (1 Bishop, 3 Priests, and 2 Lay Helpers) - whose arrival in the colony had caused Salisbury Square considerable alarm - was "swept
active until he took ill on the 22nd May, and died ten days later (on the 28th of May).

The epidemic left the Sierra Leone Mission decimated, and the hopes of the Sierra Leone Church in tatters. The death of Bowen threw all the CMS plans into confusion; and made even the customarily optimistic Venn despondent. Almost ten years and three Bishops after his First Paper, the scheme of a Native Pastorate - that "glorious consummation" of the Society's labours - was still an illusive ideal; an unfulfilled hope. But Venn remained undeterred. He declared: "The only point in all our minds at present is that the Society must take measures, such as may be within its powers, to put the native Church upon an independent footing. We have waited till the Bishops should take the initiative for the last ten years. We have had three successive disappointments; we must now ourselves take the matter in hand". These were purposeful words indeed; but if the end remained the same, the means were less than clear.

away within 25 days" (CMS, C A1/O 3/412, 20 July 1859, Ehemann to Secretaries). The only surviving Lay Helper fled the colony.

264 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 9, 23 July 1859, Venn to Ehemann.
The Organisation of a Native Pastorate: The Mechanism of an Experiment

Mr Venn... so long as you treat us like children, we shall behave like children. Treat us like men and we will behave like men. We spend our money upon ourselves because you don't invite us to support our clergy. Whilst the Church Missionary Society pays for everything in Sierra Leone, there is nothing for us to do. Let us share in managing our own Church affairs, and you will see that we shall soon be able to meet our own expenses.¹

The conversation between Venn and a native merchant from Sierra Leone, which led to the merchant's now well-known declaration above, has been given significant attention by Venn' biographers. The encounter reportedly took place when the merchant was on a visit to Britain with his family; and his recriminatory (or, as we must suppose, animated) response was given in reaction to Venn's challenging enquiry that if he could afford to spend so much money on his travels he ought surely to do more to support his own clergymen in Sierra Leone. The impact which the native merchant's reply had on Venn is often given as the main reason for its significance.² Knight, who pointedly used the story to conclude his biography of Venn, recalled: "To this conversation Mr Venn often afterwards referred as having proved to him that the colony of Sierra Leone had then become ready to pass from the elementary stage of missions to the settled state of a native African Church, self-supported and self-governed".³ It is therefore safe to assume that the encounter exercised considerable influence on Venn's attitude and actions towards the formation of the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate; and, as such, merits closer investigation. The

¹ Knight, (1880), pp. 545-546; cp. article 'The Rev Henry Venn' in CMI, vol. ix, (May 1873), 129-147, p. 141.
² The two main sources of the story (the Church Missionary Intelligencer and Knight's Memoir of the Rev Henry Venn) vary somewhat in detail. But both agree that the encounter left a distinct impression on Venn.
³ Knight, op. cit.
native merchant's reply, to be sure, was tantamount to a call for self-reliance, and the unavoidable implication was that the wealthier (Christian) inhabitants of the colony, at least, were prepared to embrace the scheme of an independent native Church. It is this implied readiness for the implementation of such a design, which makes any attempt to place the episode in a historical (if not chronological) context of some interest.

Unfortunately, the native merchant's identity has remained obscure, and the encounter itself has taken on an almost legendary aspect. However, Knight's claim that the encounter took place in 1855 poses ideological and chronological difficulties, and is almost certainly anachronistic. By 1855, the combined effect of various historical developments would have made the native merchant's declaration passé: viz., the composition of the 'Articles of Arrangement' (which outlined the principles of a self-supporting and self-governing native Church); the exclusion of native ministers from the first ordination in Sierra Leone in 1853 (ostensibly due to lack of funds); the successful introduction of the self-supporting principle into the Societies schools; and the native congregations' unresponsiveness to repeated appeals for an endowment fund. Indeed, it is hard to imagine that Venn could have been in any way impressed by the merchant's reaction when his own strenuous efforts, between 1852 and 1855, to call forth a native pastorate supported by local funds had been so unsuccessful.

\[4\] According to Knight, who worked with Venn as Lay Secretary, Venn made repeated reference to the incident; but the story became publicly known only after Venn's death. The writer of the article in the CMI claimed that it was "mentioned in an interesting memorandum kindly placed at our disposal".

\[5\] It is worth reiterating he was unable to conceal his disappointment that Sierra Leone remained (inexplicably, it seemed to him) "behind-hand" in the creation of an Endowment Fund for the support of native Pastors (CMS C A1/L5, p. 168, 30 November 1853, Secretaries to Central Committee; p. 205, 23 May 1854, Venn to Jones). In 1854, he exclaimed: "The Native Christians in Sierra Leone are probably richer than those of Tinnevelly.
Venn had already arrived at the conclusion that the Sierra Leone Church "has passed through its infancy and childhood when it leaned upon the CMS", and is "now called to act a more independent part". \(^5\) Contrary to Knight's dating, the spirit of the native merchant's declaration favours a conjecture that it was made either before Venn had articulated his scheme, or at a time when it was still germinal - at a venture between 1845 and 1851. Further, the rather intimate ambience of the exchange, and the direct reference to the CMS, strongly indicate that the native merchant in question was not only an active Christian, but also an Anglican. It is not inconceivable that a conscientious Methodist member could have put the same argument to Venn - considering the climate of inter-denominational cooperation and involvement which existed in Sierra Leone in the 1840s to 1860s. But the "you" and "us" references in the declaration are too emphatic and unqualified to have come from a Methodist adherent (no matter how liberal his views), not to mention the thrust of the conversation and the effect on Venn. The logic of these premises rules out prominent nineteenth century Sierra Leonean businessmen like William H Pratt and John Ezzidio; both of whom were staunch Methodists, and notable for their involvement in native Church affairs. \(^7\) For some reason, it was believed in the colony that the native merchant in question was William Grant, a wealthy businessman and strong Anglican. \(^8\) This appears strange, for Grant was only 24 years

---

They were earlier instructed in the truth of the Gospel - why should they be behind them in this good work of providing for their ministration of the Gospel in the Native Church" (CMS, C A1/L6, p. 2, 19 September 1854, Venn to Vidal).

\(^6\) CMS, C A1/5, p. 226, 19 September 1854, 'Instructions to Missionaries'.

\(^7\) It is, however, of academic interest that Pratt visited England in 1855 (the date Knight suggests) - reported in The African, 20 November 1855.

\(^8\) See The West African Reporter, (17 June 1882), no. 231, vol. 8, 'Death of Grant'. The fact that Grant was widely travelled, and had visited Salisbury Square several times, by the 1880s, probably helps to explain the reference. He features prominently in the latter period of our study (see Chapter 5, pp. 373ff.
old in 1855 (Knight's date), and is unlikely to have had any children, since he actually got married that year. On the whole, the available facts are inconclusive, and rather subject to interpretative analysis; but there is sufficient circumstantial evidence to suggest that the native merchant may well have been a lesser known Sierra Leonean businessman, James G Wilhelm.

James Godfrey Wilhelm was an Ibo Recaptive who started life in the colony as a servant of the CMS Missionary from whom he got his name. He later served as a clerk of the Works, but (like many Liberated Africans) took to trade and by the 1840s was one of the most successful property owners in Freetown. Wilhelm, as his background suggests, was a devoted Christian, and he showed special interest in missionary enterprise. In the early 1840s, for instance, he was closely involved with the movement among Liberated Africans to return to their homeland (to trade and to bring the Gospel to their countrymen); and he bought a vessel to aid the effort. He was also among the Freetown merchants

---

10 The information about the year he got married is provided in another issue of *The West African Reporter*, (4 August 1883), recording the death of his wife (Kezia Grant).
12 CMS, C A1/0 3/217, 7 April 1848, Warburton to Secretaries, p. 8. Warburton explained that though Wilhelm was valuable in this capacity "he would rather be in the Schools, improving others as well as himself".
13 Fyfe's *A History of Sierra Leone* (1962) provides a comprehensive documentation of the rise of the Liberated Africans, who supplanted both the Settlers and the Maroons as major property owners and successful businessmen. He also provides valuable snippets of Wilhelm's upward mobility in this work (cf. pp. 204-205, 211, 231, and 257), and in a paper entitled 'Four Sierra Leone Recaptives' in *Journal of African History*, vol. 11, no. 1 (1961), 77-85. Warburton (*ibid.*) declared that Wilhelm was "very clever in his business".
14 *ibid.*, pp. 212-213. There is no indication, however, that Wilhelm made the journey himself.
whose subscriptions enabled a missionary to be sent to Timbo,¹⁵ and (as Venn was to learn) had been solely responsible, with the help of another native friend, for the building of a large Chapel for the Ibo people, at a cost of about £800.¹⁶

In 1848, Wilhelm wrote a letter to Venn informing him of his desire to take his daughter to England, in order that she might have the benefit of a sound English education.¹⁷ He had already requested the Local Committee to provide him "with a recommendation to the Parent Committee at home" so that the Society might have charge of her education and place her with other children who were sent from the colony; and he explained to Venn that he was looking for "the best school where Godly scriptures might be had together with sound education". He added pointedly: "I myself will stand to the expenses of her instruction, only that she may be placed under the care and immediate control of the Society. Being brought up myself by them I wish my child should be brought up in the fear and love of God".¹⁸ The Local Committee (in Sierra Leone), were fully supportive of Wilhelm's intention and duly commended him to the "paternal care" of the CMS Secretaries.¹⁹ In April 1848, Wilhelm proceeded to England with his eldest son and daughter, armed with a letter of

¹⁵ ibid., p. 222.
¹⁶ CMS, C A1/L4, pp. 144-145, 8 November 1848, Venn to Warburton. The PC's ignorance of this fact was certain indication that the Chapel in question was non-Anglican.
¹⁷ CMS, C A1/0 23/6, 19 March 1848, Wilhelm to Venn. Wilhelm's intentions were not unusual. In fact it was quite fashionable for rich Recaptives (who placed such a high value on education) to send their children to England (cf. Fyfe, (1962), p. 305).
¹⁸ Another native merchant, Joseph Renner (named after one of the Society's earliest missionaries) also indicated his desire to send his daughter to England; though he did not intend to accompany her (CMS, C A1/0 3/217, 7 April 1848, Warburton to Secretaries, p. 7).
¹⁹ ibid.; cf. CMS, C A1/0 3/218, 8 April 1848, Warburton to Secretaries.
introduction from Warburton. There is no indication that Wilhelm travelled with his wife, or that he visited Paris; but this is not to say that he could not have done both. The point at issue is that not only did Wilhelm, a native merchant, interact with Venn at a time when his scheme of a self-supporting, independent native Church was inchoate, but also that he was perfectly cast, by virtue of his background and contribution to missionary enterprise, to remonstrate with Venn in the manner described. It is incontrovertible that the conversation took place; and, for the purposes of historical analysis, there is sufficient evidence that his interaction with Wilhelm had an immediate and clear impact on Venn's attitude to the Sierra Leone Mission. Venn was clearly impressed, for example, when Wilhelm informed him that he had, with the help of another native friend, built a large Chapel costing nearly £800 (for their own people); and he later remarked to Warburton that such enterprise was "an example and encouragement to us". His intercourse with Wilhelm also produced a "conviction that the Society has not hitherto called out the cooperation and liberality of the native population to the extent which might have been done and which has been done be other parties". The case for Wilhelm being the native merchant to whom Venn later referred to is therefore a very strong one indeed. The incident had an almost revelational value for Venn, and probably acted as a reference point for his plans to effect an independent native Church in Sierra Leone. However, the encounter may have also given him an exaggerated view of the capacity of the Native Church to be self supporting; or may have had a subliminal effect on his judgement in relation to the native congregations' readiness to embark on such a step. It will

20 The fact that William H Pratt, who had also taken his son to school (cf. Fyfe, op. cit., p. 232), was in London at the same time as Wilhelm, and was also received by Venn (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 144, 8 November 1848, Venn to Warburton) is an interesting coincidence.
21 See details of the story.
22 CMS, C A1/L4, p. 144, 8 November 1848, Venn to Warburton.
23 ibid.
be argued in this thesis that this was, to a greater or lesser extent, the case. Moreover, that the native merchants's fervent declaration was by no means born out in the experiences of the nascent Native Pastorate - the vast majority of whose members could barely afford the education provided in the colony; much less send their children to England.

A. Bishop E H Beckles (1860–1870)
After Bowen's death, the CMS Secretaries informed their missionaries in Sierra Leone that should their plan - which had been "a dead letter in the hands of three successive Bishops" - fail again, they intended to "take the course adopted in the Schools and gradually withdraw the salaries of the native Ministers". Even Venn's indomitable spirit was not proof to the sense of helplessness and frustration which the failure of a third successive Bishop to implement the scheme of a Native Pastorate evoked; and he canvassed Jones' opinion about the possibility of introducing the scheme "independently of the Bishop or rather in anticipation of the Bishop". The thought was borne of desperation; and it was soon replaced by an attitude of philosophical optimism. Nonetheless, the appointment and consecration of Edward H Beckles as Sierra Leone's fourth Bishop did little to revive CMS hope. The Society's faith in Bishops was at a low ebb; and the PC's reaction to the nomination of Beckles was decidedly lukewarm and subdued. There was a mood of despair at Salisbury Square which was nurtured by the thought that he was unlikely to succeed where three others had failed before him. The fact that Edward H Beckles was the first Bishop of

---

24 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 97, 23 October 1860, Secretaries to Jones.
25 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 6, 23 July 1859, Venn to Jones.
26 He assured Ehemann five months later that he was "in no sense disheartened by the late trials of the African Mission"; and added, stoically: "I feel that God has granted great success to our efforts: infinitely more than we deserve to witness..." (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 23, 20 October 1859, Venn to Ehemann).
Sierra Leone who had no connection or previous involvement with the CMS — and was therefore something of an unknown quantity\(^{27}\) — did little to allay CMS fears about the likelihood of its plans being achieved by the favoured route. Venn admitted that Beckles possessed "the most essential qualifications for the office", but added somewhat pessimistically that he was not "a second Bishop Bowen"; and that he was "cast in a very different mould".\(^{28}\)

Edward H Beckles had lived all his life in the West Indies (his place of birth); and was ordained deacon and priest (in 1843 and 1844, respectively) by the Bishop of Barbados.\(^{29}\) He served in Trinidad — as "a devoted Pastor to negro congregations"\(^{30}\) — until 1851, when he became a Curate at Holy Trinity, Mile End (in London). His career in London (from 1851 to 1859) seems to have been limited to work in two slum parishes — Mile End and Hammersmith — until his appointment to the Bishopric of Sierra Leone. It has to be assumed that Beckles' first-hand acquaintance "with a tropical climate and habits", his pastoral experience with "native" congregations (in Trinidad), and possibly his work among the London poor, were the crucial considerations in his appointment. His episcopate (1860–1869) was a mixed blessing for CMS plans, and, from the point of view of the native Church of Sierra Leone, left a great deal to be desired. But

\(^{27}\) Beckles closest connection with the Society was that his brother-in-law was an active member (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 36, 23 November 1859, Venn to Ehemann); though Venn claimed that Beckles himself was "a thorough supporter of the CMS". It is rather noticeable that Stock credits Beckles with only a few lines in his three volume work on the history of the CMS (cf. Stock, ii, 446). The Society's strained relations with the Colonial Office, at the time, meant that it was deprived of any say in the appointment of Bowen's successor. The Sierra Leone Colony was nominally under the Bishop of London (who, in the person of Bishop Blomfield, supported the CMS), but the appointment of a Bishop of Sierra Leone rested ultimately with the Colonial Government (see Knight, p. 207).

\(^{28}\) CMS, C A1/L7, p. 35, 9 November 1859, Venn to Jones.

\(^{29}\) Crockford's Clerical Directory.

\(^{30}\) CMS, C A1/L7, p. 36, 23 November 1859, Venn to Ehemann. Beckles, therefore, had never been a missionary.
it was notable for what must be considered his single praiseworthy achievement: namely, the establishment of the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate. For, with a sedulousness that belied his other shortcomings, and disarmed CMS anxiety, Beckles quickly got to grips with the nuts and bolts of the Pastorate issue, and succeeded in organising the first Native Pastorate within a year of taking up office.\textsuperscript{31}

It was at this point that Venn made it abundantly clear that the organisation of the Native Pastorate was essentially "an experiment".\textsuperscript{32} The principles on which the concept was based were prescriptive, but only tentatively so, and there was hardly any guarantee of success. The blueprint for the scheme was the 'Articles of Arrangement'; a document whose tenets and provisions were untested and untried. Venn was therefore at pains to point out to Beckles that he should make no attempt to implement the scheme "wholly or at once"; but to take the 'Articles' "as a standard, and to commence the work as an experiment".\textsuperscript{33} He repeatedly argued that it would have a better chance of success if it was introduced gradually; and urged Beckles to "begin with three or four or more congregations and all will be easy".\textsuperscript{34} However, it is instructive that Venn also thought it would increase the risk of failure if the churches were taken up one at a time.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{31} For some inexplicable reason, a full year elapsed between Bishop Beckles appointment and his arrival in the colony, on 11 December 1860 (CMS, C A1/O 3/434, 20 December 1860, Hamilton to Secretaries).

\textsuperscript{32} Cf. CMS, C A1/L7, p. 54, 23 March 1860, Venn to Beckles; C A1/L7, p. 201, 22 January 1862, Venn to Jones; C A1/L7, p. 206, 22 January 1862, Venn to Beckles.

\textsuperscript{33} CMS, C A1/L7, p. 54, 23 March 1860, Venn to Beckles.

\textsuperscript{34} CMS, C A1/L7, p. 127, 23 February 1861, Venn to Beckles; C A1/L7, p. 144, 23 March 1861, Venn to Beckles. He warned that Beckles' predecessors "all failed by attempting to [sic] a general scheme and waiting till they could solve all the possible difficulties".

\textsuperscript{35} CMS, C A1/L7, p. 55, 23 March 1860, Venn to Beckles. He felt that it was "best to begin with at least three such Pastorates", for that would "give the system a better trial". It must be mentioned that this letter was written to Beckles long before he left to take up the Bishopric of Sierra Leone. The fact that the Bishop misplaced it was the main reason for his early confusion about Venn's expectations (cf. C A1/O 25D/3, 19
The suggestion that it was best to commence the Native Pastorate experiment with "a few ripe cases" accorded with Beckles' own views, and was well received in a colony where fears were rife that the scheme was inoperable. According to Venn, the implementation of the scheme required two preliminary steps: first, "the appointment of a Treasurer and Church Committee according to Articles 2 and 3 of 'A Proposed Arrangement'"; and, second, the selection "of the most forward congregations, such as Regent, Bathurst, and Waterloo, etc, in which the experiment shall be tried, and to organise them as parishes of ecclesiastical districts according to Article 5, and appoint native Pastors over them who will be acceptable to the people". But even when reduced to such a simple proposition the organisation of the Native Pastorate was a process fraught with difficulty and opposition; and success required great resourcefulness.

(i) The Finance Equation
Adequate finance was a sine qua non of the Pastorate experiment. The 'Articles of Arrangement' prescribed that along with other "Subscriptions and Donations" the "weekly payments hitherto made to the Society of one half penny from each adult" was to be transferred to the Fund for the Native Church. It further stipulated that "two-thirds" of this Church Fund was to be appropriated to the payment of "the stipends of Native Pastors", and the remaining "one-third" to "the repairing of Churches and Chapels" and "the building of

---

February 1861, Beckles to Venn).

CMS, C A1/L7, p. 126, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles. Compare his first letter to Beckles in which he had urged the formation of a provisional Church Council as "the first step" (ibid.).

ibid.

Cf. Appendix I. The actual amount collected as class pence from each adult was one pence. Each half pence was paid into the Society's funds, while the other half was paid into the school fund.
new Churches and Chapels and Parsonages”. Apart from voluntary subscriptions and the class pence, the only other source of funding for an independent Native Church at the time Beckles took up office, was the Bishop Bowen’s Memorial Fund (in England), which was enough to supply "nearly one stipend". Venn felt that the available funds were enough "to maintain wholly or in part several native Ministers as well as to create partial endowments"; and he explained that "after a few congregations have been organised and the system has been exhibited in a few successful instances... funds may be more easily obtained from the Government, and the system extended over the whole of the Colony". But Beckles discovered that the financial aspect of the experiment was a minefield of insufficiency, increasing need, and conflicting expectations. By January 1861, contributions from the class pence amounted to £250, while subscriptions from the SLACMS provided an extra £130 - a total of £380. This meant that only about £250 (two-thirds of £380) was available for the Pastorate - given that the remaining one-third was to be devoted to the building fund. Beckles' initial proposal for the Pastorate scheme - which was based on the erroneous assumption that the CMS "will withdraw entirely from the colony" - involved the princely sum of £2150; and must be discounted as a false start. Indeed,

39 ibid. Previously, all the money collected from the weekly class pence went into the Central School Fund; and the fact that no provisions were made for an alternative means of funding the Schools when this arrangement ceased, constituted a serious defect in CMS planning.
40 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 126, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles.
41 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 54, 23 March 1860, Venn to Beckles.
42 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 125, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles.
43 CMS, C A1/O 25D/2, 18 January 1861, Beckles to Venn; cp. C A1/O 25D/3, 19 February 1961, Beckles to Venn. The PC later restricted the use of SLACMS contributions to the needs of the Mission, and debarred its usage for Pastorate requirements.
44 See CMS, C A1/O 25D/3, 18 January 1961, Beckles to Venn. This sum was accounted for as follows: 4 European missionaries at £300 each (£1200); 2 Native Pastors at £150 each (£300); 2 Native Pastors at £100 each (£200); and 6 Native Pastors at £75 (£450). Cf. Venn's reply, C A1/L7, pp. 125-127, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles.
the possibility that CMS withdrawal would be entire and immediate was one which many (including Beckles himself) found excessively troubling.\footnote{CMS, C A1/L7, p. 125, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles.} However, Venn rejected the notion and explained that the PC had "no intention of withdrawing their European Missionaries at present, or of casting their salaries upon local resources as long as they remain Missionaries of the Society".\footnote{CMS, C A1/L7, p. 126, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles.} In fact, the PC advised that "European missionaries should remain in Freetown, and from thence pay periodic visits to the country congregations in the 'unsettled districts'".\footnote{CMS, C A1/L7, p. 126, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles.} They explained that they wanted the "the contrast between the settled and unsettled Districts" to be evident; in the hope that the "manifest advantage in the settled District... would create a sufficient inducement to the people of the unsettled District to seek to be organised by raising a fair amount of contributions". This thinking was reminiscent of Bowen's strategy, and somewhat at odds with Beckles' more centralised scheme.\footnote{It had also been advocated by Graf, who suggested that "each station (or at least each District) should stand on its own merits, viz: manage all their money matters locally and receive additions from the PC on a fixed proportion to the amount raised in the given locality" (CMS, C A1/O 3/277).} In any case, circumstances required that both local and central funds be established for the scheme to be workable.

In March 1861, Beckles embarked on a tour of the main districts in the colony, to explain the scheme to the various
church leaders and secure the native congregations' support for his newly introduced weekly payment from each house.\(^4^9\) This was a shrewd tactical move. It seems to indicate that Beckles took the native congregations seriously, and recognized that their acceptance and commitment was vital to the success of the scheme. It was certainly the first systematic attempt (on record) by any Bishop, to engage the native congregations in discussions about the efficacy of the Pastorate scheme and actively solicit their support. Neither Bowen, who had made the call from a congregation the ground for ordaining a Pastor, nor Weeks, who was the most familiar with the congregations, had sought to woo the congregations in this manner. The exercise proved to be singularly instructive for Beckles.\(^5^0\) It enabled him to discover at first hand that the most significant obstacle in the way of the native congregations' contribution to the central Native Church Fund was the heavy building expenses with which almost all the native congregations were lumbered. Ironically, this circumstance helped to call forth the principle of self-support in almost all the native congregations; but meant that whatever resources they were able to muster were largely expended in self-help projects. It created a widespread preoccupation with local needs (arguably a by-product of the self-supporting principle), which, to a large extent, acted against the collective cooperation so integral to the Pastorate concept.\(^5^1\) After this eye-opening experience, addressing the problem of dilapidated buildings and churches became one of Beckles' greatest priorities. The evidence of his visitation, and the industry of the congregations, convinced him that if the CMS were to hand over their churches to the Pastorate "in perfect order", the people were


\(^{50}\) Cf. CMS, C A1/0 25D/4, 20 March 1861, Beckles to Venn.

\(^{51}\) At Wellington, for instance, Beckles discovered that some £300 had already been collected for the building of a new church; and he was told that the congregation would do what he asked for the Pastorate, only if the CMS would build them a church (ibid.)
"really ready to do their proper part". As will become clear, CMS reluctance to make such a weighty concession, left the Native Pastorate with its most enduring and insurmountable problem. But, at least initially, Beckles' promises of help succeeded in winning the heart of the native congregations, and won support for the Pastorate scheme.

In keeping with the principle of gradual progression, the £250 available would have enabled three or four districts to be taken up at once; but Beckles began to contrive various means to increase the outlay. He started a fund "for Donations and Subscriptions" to the Pastorate, which brought in over £41 within a month, and instructed the clergy "to obtain a weekly payment of one pence from each house" in their districts, for the Pastorate. He calculated that "if each clergyman would appoint ten collectors with directions that each was to obtain a dozen subscribers of one pence per week", £390 per annum would be collected. Beckles described this estimate as very conservative. Yet it was one which he experienced a diminishing hope of attaining. He encountered great difficulty in getting either the native or European clergy to commence this additional weekly collection of one pence from each house in their districts.

---

52 ibid.
53 Cp. CMS, C A1/O 164/20a, May 1861, Nicol to Venn.
54 ibid.
56 CMS, C A1/O 25D/3, 19 February 1861, Beckles to Venn. "As he attends all", he explained to Venn, "I think they should all contribute to his support, and not the class people only". He declared that this make some districts "almost if not quite self-supporting"; and that Kissy and Regent (two of the largest district) would bring in over £100. But Venn mistakenly assumed that what Beckles meant was that this collection was to be a substitute for the original half pence a week from the class members (cf. CMS, C A1/L7, p. 144, 23 March 1861, Venn to Beckles).
57 By the time he arrived in the colony, the Society's operations encompassed fifteen districts (Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn).
58 ibid.
European missionaries, who (with no known exception) were completely opposed to the Pastorate scheme, refused to collect even the regular class pence in their districts when it became known that this money was to pass on to the Pastorate. Completely impervious to Beckles' urging, and retaining control of some of the most populous districts in the colony, their intractability deprived the Pastorate of much needed funds. There was little the Society could do to effect a change of attitude among its European agents. Venn was "grieved to hear that the European Missionaries [did] not exert themselves as they ought to do to enlarge the Native Pastorate Fund", but held out little hope that PC would succeed in urging them to greater activity. "From experience in other Missions", he told Beckles, "I fear that you must lay your account for some backwardness in this quarter". European intransigence was one thing; the reluctance of the native clergy to make the added collection was another matter altogether - and one which is difficult to explain. The reason was perhaps not unrelated to the preoccupation with the building repairs and extension in most of the parishes. Maxwell had discovered at Kissy Road that such operations not only made huge demands on the native Pastor's time, but also depended greatly on the Pastor's initiative and fund-raising ability for their success. The native ministers' tacit refusal to implement Beckles' suggestion was probably a reflection of their reluctance to make further demands on their congregations. If such was the case, it was an important signal; but one which Beckles misread. It was also a fact that the payment of the weekly class pence, the burden of supporting their schools, and the

59 CMS, C A1/O 25D/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn. According to Beckles, they excused themselves by arguing that "they were not obliged to collect it as it was quite gratuitous".

60 ibid., p. 158.

61 Beckles discovered to his chagrin that Nicol (in charge of Regent and Bathurst) was wholly occupied with "collecting for a local fund for church repairs", instead of collecting for the Pastorate Fund (CMS, C A1/O 25D/4, 20 March 1861, Beckles to Venn.
costs of on-going building repairs, all imposed as a severe drain on financial capabilities of the native congregations. Some of the larger districts like Kissy or Wellington were capable of greater output under proper stimulation; but the majority of the native congregations were hard-pressed to generate more funds. Nicol was at pains to make this situation clear to Venn; and he wrote,

"When we consider that our people have to support their schools and one, two, or three Relief Companies for their family; it does come hard on some of them... Our parishes, I can assure you, dear Sir, are sufficiently drained. The weekly contributions to CMS impoverish our stations, and there is little chance for self-exertion".  

This state of affairs, Nicol explained, led some to argue that all monies subscribed by the people should remain in the stations for the use of the people, and the benefit of the station. Beckles, however, remained committed to the idea of a central fund. He estimated that at least £1000 was needed for the salaries of the twelve native clergymen: viz., four Pastors ("in the most important districts") receiving £100 each; and the "other eight less important" maintained at £75 each. It must be remembered that under the Society each ordained catechist received £50 per annum (a sum negotiated...

---

62 CMS, C A1/0 164/19, 20 October 1860, Nicol to Venn. Nicol drew a significant comparison between "comparatively well-to-do" congregation at Kissy (were he had previously served), and relatively impoverished circumstances of the Regent congregation, most of whom were old and infirm, and depended on Government allowance for support. The young people who do better, he explained, invariably removed to town.

63 On 24 March 1861, Beckles ordained three native catechists - M Taylor, C Davies, and J H Davies - increasing the total number of native clergymen (including Nicol and Maxwell) to twelve. Cf. CMS, C A1/0 25D/4, 20 March 1861, Beckles to Venn.

64 CMS, C A1/0 25D/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn. Beckles was willing to abandon his original "highest pay" of £150 (cf. C A1/0 25D/2, 1 January 1861, Beckles to Venn); but continued to uphold the argument that a disparity of salaries would have a "beneficial effect": for "if there are advanced positions which they can occupy...their conduct will be influenced by it". Venn, on the other hand, suggested that "it may be sufficient in the first instance to take up the case of the Native Pastors at £75 each" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 125, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles).
under Bishop Weeks); and Beckles tried to use the expected increase in salary to prod the reluctant native clergymen into making collections in their districts. But even that failed to produce the desired effect. Beckles required £1500 in the Native Church Fund, in order for £1000 to be spent on native Pastors' salaries (with one-third set aside for the building fund). The how and where of generating this amount greatly concentrated the mind of the Bishop. He confirmed that £850 could be raised in the colony, in the following manner:

- Weekly class pence subscriptions £230
- Surplice fees and interest on money sent home 40
- Beckles' subscription list in Freetown 100
- Subscriptions to the SLACMS 130
- Bishop Bowen's Memorial Fund 50
- Collections of 1 pence from the districts (provided the clergy complied) 300

Total £850

Based on this assessment, an additional sum of £150 was required. Beckles complained that if only he could get the European and native clergy to do their part, a much larger sum might be collected. But Venn urged him to begin with lower stipends - £80/£90, instead of £100 - "till a sufficient sum is raised for all the purposes required". He argued that clergymen who received the full salary (of £100) would "have no inducement to stir up their country"; whereas "double exertions [would] be used to raise contributions", if Beckles held out the principle that "no full salaries till the Pastorate Fund is complete".

---

65 CMS, C A1/O 25B/7, 5 March 1856, Circular to Missionaries regarding the ordination of Catechists.
66 CMS, C A1/O 25D/4, 20 March 1861, Beckles to Venn. He informed Venn that he was sending them notice "that as soon as they are ready to inform us what amount the district is prepared to provide I shall be ready to place them on the Pastorate, and on the advanced salary".
67 CMS, C A1/O 25D/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn.
68 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 157, 24 June 1861, Venn to Beckles.
(ii) The Church Committee
Up to this point Beckles' exertions with respect to the organisation of a Native Pastorate, were largely unaided and unsupported in the colony. His initial attempts to formulate a *modus operandi* had met with "many discouragements and fears about success" from both the Finance Committee and the Government; and he had, perforce, to struggle against the current of European opinion. Buoyed up by the encouragement from Salisbury Square, he persevered manfully with his intentions; but the absence of support from the local administration and the *de facto* opposition from the European element preyed on his confidence, and occasioned fits of despair. With his usual far-sightedness, Venn had urged the formation of the Church Committee - as his "first step" - partly to forestall such isolated episcopal action. For a while, Beckles' pre-occupation with the thorny problem of inadequate funds made him blind to the efficacy of forming this committee. But, on 12 April 1861, after repeated urging from Venn, he formed what was called "a Church Committee, and provisional Church Council": comprising himself, Chief Justice Carr, Mr Farrah (a prominent business man), E Jones, and J Hamilton, as its members. The formation of this body acted as a catapult in the launching of the Native Pastorate. In conformity with the stipulations of the 'Articles', the "Committee" was responsible "for the collection and disbursement of the Sierra Leone Church Fund";

---

69 CMS, C A1/0 24D/2, 18 January 1861, Beckles to Venn. Within a fortnight after arriving in the colony the bishop "battled over the matter in Committee", and reported that "they were not very sanguine" about the project (CMS, C A1/0 25D/1, 21 December 1860, Beckles to Venn). Venn had warned Beckles to expect some resistance from the European element; but the discovery that the tide of opinion among the ruling parties in the colony was firmly against the scheme, often marred his confidence.

70 Jones reported that Farrah "stood perhaps higher in the estimation of the Public, and was more trusted by the Authorities than any other native (CMS, C A1/0 3/442, 20 July 1861, Jones to Secretaries).

71 CMS, C A1/M 16, pp. 539-540, 12 April 1861, Minutes of the Committee of the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate. Cp. C A1/0 3/439, 20 April 1861, Jones to Secretaries; C A1/0 25D/5, 15 April 1861, Beckles to Venn; C A1/0 3/439, 20 April 1861, Jones to Secretaries. Hamilton was made both Secretary and Treasurer.
though it also acted as a "Church Council" by appointing different parishes and Pastors to the Native Pastorate. At its first meeting, the Committee resolved that three parishes - Kissy, Wellington, and Hastings - "be formed into Parishes or Ecclesiastical Districts, and placed under the Bishop, assisted by the Committee"; commencing on 1 May 1861. The native clergymen appointed to the three parishes ("subject to their own consent") were Jacob Cole (to Kissy), William Quaker (to Hastings), and Moses Taylor (to Wellington) - each of whom was to receive an annual stipend of £75. Unfortunately, this Committee rather lapsed into inactivity; and its next official meeting was held in October (six months later), when they verified the inauguration of the Pastorate. Venn evinced some anxiety about the composition of the Church Committee; and (unaware that the Committee had already been formed) encouraged the Bishop to include Jones, Nicol, and Menzies among its members. His instinct seems to have been that their advanced training and superior ability would be used to full

---

72 The Sierra Leone Native Pastorate Church therefore came into existence on this date; though it is often reckoned to have commenced on 1 November 1861, when the Native Pastorate (comprising nine parishes) was officially "inaugurated". But it is important to note that the Native Pastorate's Financial Year was reckoned from May to June (cf. CMS, C A1/O 45/5, 20 July 1863, Binns to Venn).

73 Venn was very enthusiastic about the Church Committee's decision to begin the scheme with three native Pastors (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 157, 24 June 1861, Venn to Beckles).

74 In July 1861, for example, Venn pressed the Bishop to "perfect the Church system, by bringing the Church Committee into activity" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 160, 4 July 1861, Venn to Beckles). He wrote: "The Committee [i.e., the PC] are continually asking, where are the minutes of the Church Committee? What accounts have you of congregation meetings in the new Native Pastorate? What returns of money collected by the parishes already formed". Cp. C A1/O 25D/18, 18 July 1861, Beckles to Venn.


76 Alfred Menzies was a European missionary from Kingston, Jamaica (of Scottish parentage), who had joined the Sierra Leone Mission in 1858. Like Beckles, he had probably lived all his life in the West Indies; which would help to explain Venn's assertion that he had a natural sympathy with the "African race". However, Venn's failure to mention Maxwell along with this group of able African sympathizers is puzzling.
advantage in such a position; and he argued that "if such men... were upon this Committee they would have a natural sympathy with the African race", for they were "all men of intellectual power, now almost lying dormant". In a letter to Nicol, he expressed his disappointment that he (and his Regent parish) had not been one of the first three Native Pastorates upon the new system; and he entreated him to throw himself into the organisation of the Native Pastorate. However, it was Edward Jones, more than any other individual, to whom both Venn and the PC looked for the most decisive and effective involvement in the implementation of the Pastorate experiment. By 1861, Jones had lived in the Sierra Leone colony for about thirty years; and, having served the CMS for almost twenty years, was its most senior agent. As Principal of the Fourah Bay Institution, and later Secretary of the Mission, he was the most advanced "black" Missionary in Sierra Leone — a position or status which invariably placed him in the vanguard of the perennial racial tension in the Mission, and forced him to confront the prejudices of his European colleagues. It could be argued that Jones' Afro-American background had little in common with the socio-political milieu of nineteenth century "Province of Freedom", and that his experience of racial discrimination in Charleston (South Carolina) were hardly comparable with those of his "black" brethren in the "white" dominated environment

---

77 ibid. He added that "these men meeting frequently with a few native laymen would gradually transfer a vitality into the native Church, as a Church which would surmount all difficulties".

78 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 162, 14 July 1861, Venn to Nicol. He implored Nicol to unite with the three native Pastors "in heart, head and soul... to make the system answer"; and to associate with them (to "consult and pray over the plans for organising the native Church") "as an older brother". "God has given you a clear head, and the pen of a zealous writer, he declared, "and if you concentrate your talents to this great work, He will I am sure help you in it; and open out fresh channels of usefulness day by day".

79 Jones served two main terms as Mission Secretary: 1853-1858 and 1860-1864. However, his latter term was by far the most effective.
of colonial Sierra Leone. However, he was perfectly *au fait* with the subtlety and perniciousness of racial prejudice; and he unequivocally identified with the needs and aspirations of his African brethren (some of whom were under his tutelage at the Fourah Bay Institution). As a member of the Finance Committee, he was often isolated in his support or defence of "native ministers"—especially in the years prior to the establishment of a Bishopric—and frequently antagonised the European members in the process. As Missionary Secretary (1855-1858, 1861-1864) and Principal of the Fourah Bay Institution (1840-1859), Jones was a key player in the Mission and immensely popular in Freetown. In 1860 he wrote,

> From my being so well known, my house is the resort of every Missionary proceeding up or down our coast. I have calls and demands to which no other missionary is subject. And if you would look over the places where the meetings are held, you will find that taking the average of the last ten years, nine out of every ten have been held at my house.

However, it was less for his undeniable popularity than for his intellectual ability (and African haecceity?) that Venn was so anxious to enlist Jones' involvement in the

---

80 What little the writer knows about Jones' life and background in America comes from a paper titled 'From Amherst to Fourah Bay: Principal Edward Jones' written by M. Crowder, and presented at the Bicentenary of Sierra Leone Symposium, Fourah Bay College, is May 1987. It is helpful to note Crowder's remark that Jones may have been "brown" rather than "black" in complexion: a distinction which would not have gone unnoticed among the native population of nineteenth century Freetown.

81 In 1843, Maxwell wrote to Jones, "You have continually sought my good as well as the good of my school fellows" (CMS, C A1/O 129/49, 10 May 1843, Maxwell to Jones). Cf. C A1/O 129/41-100.

82 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 129/1, 30 January 1841, Jones to D Coates; *ibid.*, /4, 26 January 1846, Jones to CMS Secretaries; *ibid.*, /11, 2 June 1851, Jones to Venn; *ibid.*, /24, 19 February 1859, Jones to Venn. During the furore over Nicol's protestations about the exclusion of his wife from the Ladies Visiting Committee, Jones was the only member of the Finance Committee who openly supported his assertions. He stated that he could "fully enter into his [Nicol's] feelings"—CMS, C A1/O 164/66, 2 June 1851, Circular to Missionaries (from Graf), inviting comments on Nicol's letter.

83 CMS, C A1/O 129/27B, 21 July 1860, Jones to Venn. J. Hamilton (a European missionary), who was no friend of Jones, said of him: "The charm he throws around so many, the way in which he fascinates most persons, is remarkable" (CMS, C A1/O 109/20, 20 April 1864, Hamilton to Venn).
organisation of the Native Pastorate. It was remarked that "as a scholar the Colony of Sierra Leone [saw] very few men that were altogether Mr Jones' superiors"; and Venn, who evinced a high regard of Jones, obviously shared this sentiment. He placed great value on Jones' observations and opinion, and described his "powers and knowledge of Africa" as "superior to all his brethren". From the outset he sought to draw Jones out and make him one of the principal organisers of the Pastorate experiment. As early as 1854, he informed him:

To you especially I look for guidance in the arrangements for the settlement of a native ministry. There are a thousand questions which I wish to ask and to which you are best able to give a reply. Let me have your thoughts in respect of what may be done by us at home and by you in the colony for the full establishment of the native Church upon an independent and self-supporting basis.

However, Jones remained curiously, and inexplicably, unresponsive to Venn's rallying call. His letters reveal no direct reference to the Pastorate scheme; and the first mention was made long after it had been formed. There is also no evidence that he made any constructive, meaningful, or deliberate, contribution to the organisation of the Native Pastorate. In fact, what evidence there is seems to indicate a view somewhat opposed to its timeliness and efficacy. In 1857, he wrote to Venn,

It will be many, many years before the African Church can dispense with living examples of European piety, energy and devotedness - and they are neither true nor wise friends to

85 Cf. CMS, C A1/L6, p. 354, 24 January 1859, Venn to Jones. On one occasion, he admitted to Jones, "I often think over our conversations together, from which I received so much information upon the past history of Sierra Leone... and similar great interests; and I long to hear the results of your observations and thoughts now that you have returned to the spot" (CMS, C A1/L4, p. 242, 30 March 1950).
86 CMS, C A1/L5, p. 204, 23 May 1854, Venn to Jones.
87 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 129/36a, 20 September 1862, Jones to Venn. Even this reference was incidental: a mention that "Wilberforce could not for some time be annexed to the Pastorate", as CMS' hold on the people was not very strong.
Africa who would precipitate a state of things that would tend to bring about this result. These are my solemn convictions, and I trust they will have your ready concurrence.88

It would be tenuous to infer an anti-Pastorate stance from this observation; but it does sound a note, which (in the absence of any definitive affirmation of the scheme) could be construed as being out of tune with its objects. It is not unlikely that Jones' lack of interest may have been a by-product of a growing feeling of disaffection with the Society. There is clear indication that by the mid-1850s - certainly by 1860 - Jones had become disenchanted with the CMS, and somewhat embittered by what he perceived to be the Society's lack of support and sympathy towards himself. Through a combination of circumstances, his life in the colony had become clouded by financial worries, impaired health, and other personal problems. The death of his second wife (about 1859), after a "long and expensive illness", left him with six children (two of whom were infants) to care for;89 while the failing fortunes and standards of the Fourah Bay Institution had a demoralising effect on his self-esteem, and left him rather exposed to the whims of the Finance Committee.90 Moreover, after years of robust health in the colony, he had begun to suffer from a failing eyesight (ophthalmia) and attacks of rheumatism.91 His financial

88 CMS, C A 1/0 129/21, 22 July 1857, Jones to Venn.
89 Cf. CMS, C A 1/0 129/17, 23 October 1855, Jones to Venn; C A 1/0 129/25, 21 October 1859, Jones to Venn.
90 Cf. CMS, C A 1/0 129/24, 19 February 1859, Jones to Venn. In 1856, Jones confided in Rev J C Chapman (a close friend; whom he later recommended for the principalship of Fourah Bay College): "I certainly feel that under God my connection with the Institution has not been altogether fruitless; and yet most assuredly my discouragements have not been small. There have been my own shortcomings, great and manifold, and which may the good Lord pardon...; the jealousies and suspicions of brethren of which I have never made mention, and trust that hereafter I may never have cause to mention..." (C A 1/0 129/18, 17 December 1856, Jones to Chapman).
91 Cf. CMS, C A 1/0 129/13, 17 November 1854, Jones to Venn; C A 1/0 129/22, 19 August 1857, Jones to Venn; C A 1/0 129/23, 19 December 1859, Jones to Venn; C A 1/0 129/29, 20 October 1861, Jones to Venn.
vulnerability was probably the main source of his feelings of disaffection towards both Venn and the Society. He found the maintenance of his children a crippling financial responsibility; and in 1859, requested the permission of the Society to take the two youngest to Germany. When the PC demurred, Jones irately denounced what he called their "cruel refusal", and declared that he would prefer to be stationed out of Freetown, "or even out of the Colony". In addition to the economic disadvantages of life in the colony, years of active service, embattled relations with the Society's European missionary body, personal loss, and the debilitating effect of what he repeatedly described as his advancing years, had taken their toll on Jones. His personal letters became increasingly tinged with melancholy and the lugubrious tones of a broken spirit: "My desire", he told Venn, "is to have a station under my charge and be relieved of all other duty. I have been 29 years in the Colony. I have outlived all my friends, and I begin to feel the effects of age". A year later, he repeated his desire to be removed from the colony, intimating that his position as acting Missionary Secretary had added to his expenses. Considering that the organisation of the Native Pastorate was the foremost concern of the Bishop and the PC at the time, his request to be removed from the colony was ill-timed and indicated his detachment from a scheme which held such great importance for the Native Church in Sierra Leone. The PC's response was unequivocal and sharp. They rejoined:

---

92 One of his children was in England; and those in the colony frequently succumbed to illness.
93 CMS, C A1/0 129/25, 21 October 1859, Jones to Venn. He claimed that this move would help him to save £34 p.a, "in the article of houses" (cf. C A1/0 129/27b, 21 July 1860, Jones to Venn).
94 CMS, C A1/0 129/27, 21 July 1860, Jones to Venn.
95 *ibid.* Probably conscious that he was addressing one some ten years his senior, he added, "I consider 52 here equal to 62 in a temperate clime".
96 CMS, C A1/0 129/30, 20 June 1861, Jones to Venn. He complained that unlike his predecessors he had received no allowance to meet the extra expense which devolved on this position.
At such a crisis in the Sierra Leone Mission as the present, when the Native Pastorate is in a course of formation and everything is in a transition state, your talents and experience and sympathy with the African are of the utmost value. No one possesses a tithe of the advantages you possess for giving wise counsels and for taking active measures to help the native Church through its crisis. The idea that at such a juncture you can think of hiding your talents in a napkin is at variance with the good opinion which the Committee ever entertained of you.

Venn was equally forthright in expressing his displeasure at Jones' inert stance on the Pastorate issue; and he castigated him: "In your relations with European brethren, difficulties have arisen; but surely as the representative of the African Church you have a field open to you, in which your peculiar talents will find the most free and complete scope". The heavy censure from the Society threw Jones on the defensive. He reminded the PC of his long unstinted service in the Mission, and blamed his impaired health (since 1859), the demands of his office (as Secretary of Mission), and the debilitating effect of the Sierra Leonean climate, for his lacklustre contribution. He added non-committally: "I am fully alive to the Native Pastorate question and will readily and cheerfully do what I can by the help of God to further its development". However this grudging concession was never translated into a meaningful commitment; and Jones failed to fulfil the pivotal role in the organisation of the Native Church.

---

97 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 169, 23 July 1861, Secretaries to Jones. In any case, the PC would never have removed Jones from Freetown. The Secretaries explained that it was against the Society's practice "to send out their most experienced Missionary into the Out stations", when "their qualifications can be turned to the best advantage at the headquarters of the Mission".

98 ibid. p. 162, 14 July 1861, Venn to Jones.

99 CMS, C A1/O 3/444, 21 August 1861, Jones to Secretaries. This response was hardly different from the despondent, self-absorbed, tone of his personal correspondence over the previous five to six years. By then, Jones had spent almost twenty years in the service of the Society; and he asked the PC to bear in mind that he was already 54 years old, "which is quite equal to 64 in a healthier clime".
The Native Pastorate which Venn had so clearly desired. Venn may have eventually lost faith in him, in this respect; and he later voiced a belief that the "dissension and mutual jealousies of the clergy" originated "with the irritability of our Secretary [i.e., Jones] and the want of sympathy and confidence on his part with the labours of the rest". Ultimately, the native Church in Sierra Leone was denied the active input and contribution of the colony's most gifted and capable "African" clergyman; and that, at a most critical point in its formation. The irony was that in many other respects, especially in his early years in the colony, Jones had proved himself an intrepid champion of native advancement; and it is this consideration which may yet rescue his career in the colony from being relegated to the dustbin of history.

Thus, the formation of a Church Committee notwithstanding, the organisation the Native Pastorate continued to rest largely on Beckles' initiative and resourcefulness. Unfortunately, the scheme had many detractors in the colony, and the Bishop was particularly susceptible to suggestions that native ministers were incapable of carrying on the work started by European missionaries. He confessed to Venn: "I am... more anxious than ever to see how the Native Pastorate gets on, but I certainly fear that we have not the class to whom the whole work can be given over in the country districts; and the feeling is that your former labours will have been lost and rendered void by such a step". He also

---

100 A few months later Beckles complained to Venn about Jones' aloofness and intractability (CMS, C A1/O 25D/20, 21 September 1861, Beckles to Venn).

101 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 178, 23 October 1861, Venn to Beckles. Venn was sufficiently displeased to suggest that if that was the case it could be for the best to grant Jones his desire and send him "to some country station". However, Beckles responded that he did not think Jones was the cause of the troubles (C A1/O 25D/23, 20 November 1861, Beckles to Venn).

102 CMS, C A1/O 25D/7, 19 June 1861, Beckles to Venn. There is more than a suspicion here that Beckles had begun to be influenced by a prevalent European opinion that the organisation of a Native Pastorate constituted a retrogressive step.
argued that the native ministers were "not yet sufficiently respected to be brought out"; and that "we must be able to associate them with their European brethren and raise them, 'ere you can venture to leave them in full charge". Venn was dismayed by the Bishop's diagnosis; but he pointed out that European missionary superintendence would "involve far more formidable difficulties; especially as our present European Missionaries are not the men of experience to exercise such superintendence with advantage". But Beckles' resolve had begun to weaken in the face of prevalent opposition to the experiment. An unyielding financial dilemma, and the paucity of support for the scheme within the Mission, eventually caused him a loss of nerve (and weight). Chronic disharmony between the European and native clergy added considerably to his problems (and made it difficult for the Church Committee to work effectively). He complained that there was "no union" in the Mission; and that "the laity are against the clergy and the clergy against each other". Matters were not helped when, in May 1861, the Manager of Waterloo (a Mr Lord) accused Rev W Quaker (one of the newly appointed native Pastors) of having had adulterous liaisons with six females. Lord's allegations

103 ibid. In an earlier letter he had told Venn that there "was a great desire to look down on the native clergy", and declared that he was "anxious to have a superior class of men for the native Church" (CMS, C A1/O 25D/5, 15 April 1861, Beckles to Venn).

104 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 159, 4 July 1861, Venn to Beckles.

105 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/21, 16 October 1861, Beckles to Venn. The Bishop was "surprised" to discover that he had lost "16 or 17lbs" since leaving England; and attributed this loss to "my fevers and the great anxiety I have felt with regard to the Pastorate and other matters concerned with the Diocese". He added: "When one considers the rather uncertain way in which the annual income of the Pastorate is to be raised, the cause of anxiety is evident". Cp. Yates, (1971), p. 128.

106 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn.

107 ibid., 21 September 1861, Beckles to Venn.

108 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn; C A1/O 25D/18, 18 July 1861, Beckles to Venn; C A1/O 25D/24, 20 December 1861, Beckles to Venn; C A1/M 16, 20 July 1861, pp. 536-538, J Quaker to Venn; cp. C A1/L7, p. 160f., 4 July 1861, Venn to Beckles. The problem started when Quaker refused Lord entry into the Mission House (at Hastings), and accused him
temporarily spiked the Pastorate plans.\textsuperscript{109} It caused such adverse publicity that Beckles decided to defer the ordination of the three newly appointed native Pastors to priestly orders. An Ecclesiastical Council, appointed by the Governor, eventually cleared Quaker of the charges;\textsuperscript{110} but (as was often the case in the colony) prolonged litigation ensued in the secular courts. Unfortunately for Beckles, the incident provided useful fodder for the critics of the Pastorate experiment, and exacerbated the tension between the European and native ministers. Some of the European missionaries were displeased with Beckles' decision to retain Quaker on the Pastorate; and both Hamilton and Menzies tried to get him removed from his station.\textsuperscript{111} The Quaker-Lord scandal was still a talking-point in the Mission when charges of fraud and malfeasance were brought against Mr Farrah, the only "native" on the newly formed Church Committee, necessitating his removal from that body.\textsuperscript{112} These untimely incidents made the Pastorate scheme appear premature, and filled the Bishop with grave doubts about its prospects. However, in a typical manner, his feelings of angst and despair were suddenly (and inexplicably) replaced by renewed enthusiasm and infectious zeal. In contrast to his recurrent of having abused his hospitality on a previous occasion by attempting illicit intercourse with his wife (in his absence). Lord's use of the Mission House had been authorised by Rev J Hamilton (the Superintendent of Hastings), who promptly ordered Quaker to admit Lord. Quaker remained adamant; and Lord (a "well-known infidel" and self-confessed unbeliever) proceeded to bring "unsubstantiated" charges of adultery against him.

\textsuperscript{109} He had a strong ally in Rev J Hamilton, who (despite his position as secretary and treasurer of the Church Committee) had little confidence in native ability and little sympathy with the Pastorate scheme.

\textsuperscript{110} Venn remarked that such cases of a European bringing false accusations against a native clergyman were "lamentable", but "very common"; and cited a similar case in the Indian Mission (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 161, 4 July 1861, Venn to Beckles).

\textsuperscript{111} CMS, C A1/0 25D/24, 20 December 1861, Beckles to Venn.

\textsuperscript{112} CMS, C A1/0 3/442, 20 July 1861, Jones to Secretaries. Farrah, who held the office of an Auctioneer, was "found to be deficient to the amount of £800 and more from goods entrusted to him". Though the charges had not been proved, Jones explained that the Bishop could not retain him as a member of the Church Committee.
fears about native incapability, he applied his energies once more to finding a means of including as many parishes (and native Pastors) as possible on the Native Pastorate, and forwarded a fresh plan.

Beckles recommended that the amount of money appropriated to the building fund should be reduced from one-third to one-fourth; and that the entire amount of the class money "from districts not occupied by Europeans" should be transferred to the Pastorate Fund (instead of only half, as stipulated in the 'Articles'). The other half had previously been paid into the School Fund, for building and repairs, etc.; but Beckles argued that the one-third or one-fourth deduction from the Pastorate Fund could be used to cover this need, while the interest on the £2000 already in the School Fund would be sufficient to supplement schools in the low income districts. The new plan had one outstanding merit, in that unlike the Bishop's previous schemes it was not based on a precarious fund-raising initiative, which would have been resisted by the native congregations. Furthermore, the money involved was readily available, was "apparently gradually increasing", and required "no new and extra effort to collect it". Beckles described the plan as "safe" and simple. "The more I think of it", he enthused, "the greater is my surprise that it never before suggested itself". Of the total sum required under this new scheme, at least £675 was needed for the salaries of the nine native clergymen: 2 at £100 each; 3 at £75; and 4 (deacons) at £62.10. Beckles felt assured that with the help of grants from both the Society and the Government, he would have no difficulty in meeting these requirements. He planned to occupy nine of the fourteen stations in the colony; leaving

---

114 CMS, C A1/0 25D/21, 16 October 1861, Beckles to Venn.
115 ibid.
116 CMS, C A1/0 25D/21, 16 October 1861, Beckles to Venn.
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five - Waterloo, Wilberforce, Pademba Road, Kissy Road, and Benguema - as "unsettled districts" under CMS control.\(^{117}\) The Church Committee endorsed Beckles' proposals, but stipulated that from 1 January 1862 the salary scale was to be revised upwards: the 2 senior Pastors to receive £125, the Priests £75, and the Deacons £62.10.0.\(^{118}\) According to this amendment £750 would be required for the native Pastors salaries; or a total of £1000 (in order to set aside one-fourth for the building fund). By any calculation, the Pastorate's financial requirement would only increase as it progressed. Thus, when the nine native Pastors became Priests (which could not be very far distant) the amount needed for their salaries would be £775 (with £1033.6.8, being the total required);\(^{119}\) and when more stations like Waterloo, Wilberforce, or Benguema were added to the Pastorate, that amount would increase to £1000 for salaries (and a total of £1333.6.8.). Beckles calculated that £884 could be raised in the colony: viz., £500, from class contributions; £284, from subscriptions and donations; £50, from surplice fees and interest payments; and £50 from the Bishop Bowen's Fund.\(^{120}\) But he predicated the success of the whole operation on one consideration: namely, that the Society would hand over its buildings in good repair. He urged Venn that in order "to insure the regular payments from the people with a cheerful heart, their churches must be put in order and the Pastors be made comfortable";\(^{121}\) and he requested a grant of £1500 or £2000 from the Society to meet

\(^{117}\) CMS, C A1/O 25D/21, 16 October 1861, Beckles to Venn. Benguema, the fourteenth station, could not be occupied immediately, because there were "no other men ready for orders". It should be reiterated that the PC had insisted that Pademba Road and Kissy Road were to be "regarded as Mission Churches to be served by European Missionaries with the assist[ance] of unsettled Ministers" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 126, 22 February 1861, Venn to Beckles).

\(^{118}\) CMS, C A1/O 25D/22, 19 November 1861, Beckles to Venn.

\(^{119}\) ibid.

\(^{120}\) ibid. This, of course, fell short of initial requirements by £116.

\(^{121}\) ibid.
The Bishop's assumption that the Society would acquiesce in this request unwittingly endangered the life of the nascent Pastorate, and helped to sow the seeds of a troubled relationship between himself and the Society.

B. Birth of a Church

On 1 November 1861 (a date chosen by Bishop Beckles), nine parishes were formally constituted into the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate: namely, Kissy (Rev J Cole); Hastings (Rev W Quaker); Wellington (Rev M Taylor); Regent (Rev G Nicol); Kent (Rev T Maxwell); York (Rev T Wilson); Bananas (Rev J Davies); Bathurst (Rev C Davies); and Gloucester (Rev J Thomas).123 These nine parishes and their respective native Pastors were effectively removed from CMS authority and control, and placed under the charge and superintendence of the Bishop of Sierra Leone. They ceased to be part of a Mission dependent on foreign support and dominated by foreign agency, and became the constituent elements of a "settled" ecclesiastical system - with a modicum of self-government and a measure of self-support. For all its inherent weaknesses (which became painfully manifest with time), the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate was an embodiment of CMS aspirations; and its inauguration, after a decade of fitful design and frustrated hope, produced the gratification that befitted such a historic development.124 In the colony, where a sensibility of the financial implications of the scheme had often dampened enthusiasm, a mood of optimism largely

122 ibid. "I am sure it does not require words from me", wrote the Bishop, "to induce them [i.e., the PC] under these circumstances to act in a generous way towards us".


displaced morbid misgivings. "A most encouraging feature", reported Jones, "is the great readiness with which the people have entered into all these new arrangements". Indeed, even congregations like Wellington and Waterloo, which had been ill-disposed to co-operate, rallied to the cause. Still, there were those who regarded the severance from CMS control as inopportune and ill-considered. "There is a great variety of opinion with regard to the prudence of the step", wrote Hamilton, "and one very prevalent opinion is that the result will be very unsatisfactory. This is the opinion of some amongst our people". Years later, it was also remarked that "many good men trembled... when the 'Ark of God' was committed to the [native] Pastors". But, on the whole, the establishment of the Native Pastorate engendered excitement and great expectation - corollaries of its novelty and potentiality. The nine native Pastors addressed Venn thus:

This is the day which many of Africa's staunch friends who served her in her day and generation would have rejoiced to see... We would pause and consider the way in which the Lord has led this Mission from infancy to comparative manhood...

The separation, we hope, is merely outward. Inwardly, we shall still be united in the indissoluble bonds of the Gospel...

---

125 This was due in part to Beckles' positive campaigning. In a final effort to persuade the native congregations to espouse the scheme, he had embarked on another extensive visitation of all the districts in the colony, to discuss the Pastorate experiment with the congregations and win their support (cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/22, 19 November 1861, Beckles to Venn; cp. C A1/O 3/447, 21 November 1861, Jones to Secretaries).


127 Wellington and Waterloo were two of the largest congregations in the colony. The former had declined involvement, on account of the pressing responsibility of re-building their church; but were won over after Beckles assured them of a grant. The response of the Waterloo congregation became more positive when Hamilton, their Pastor, became more supportive of the scheme; and they "determined to give up either the whole of their class money, or at least two-thirds of it to the Pastorate" (CMS, C A1/O 25D/22, 19 November 1861, Beckles to Venn).

128 CMS, C A1/M 16, p. 569, 18 November 1861, Hamilton to Venn.

May the Congregations under our pastoral care not take any hurt or hinderance by our negligence; but may they continue to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{130}

In reply, the Secretaries remarked that the establishment of the Native Pastorate was "more than a repayment for all the labours, anxieties, and disappointments through which our Mission has been maintained".\textsuperscript{131} For Venn, the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate was "the great experiment of modern Missions"; which, "if successful, will be hailed as a triumph throughout the whole Mission field".\textsuperscript{132} It was therefore to be guided and tended with jealous and anxious care; not unlike that of a doting parent for a gifted but handicapped child. Nonetheless, the Native Pastorate was, by its very essence, an institutional paradox, which signified both a "coming of age" and a "birth". It admitted of an enduring tension between maturity and nativity - and ultimately between independence and dependence - which defined its existence, and lay at the root of the perplexities and troubles which bedeviled its progress. The rest of this chapter seeks to examine that paradox, to explore the struggles and conflicts which were an inevitable result of what could rightly be termed the "birth of maturity", and to explicate the first faltering indications of a bid (desire, at least) for ecclesiastical independence. In this respect, three aspects require close consideration:

(1) the ingredient of self-support.
(2) ecclesiastical relations.
(3) race controversy and conflict.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{130} CMS, C A1/O 24/11, 21 January 1862, Nine Pastors to Venn.
\textsuperscript{131} CMS, C A1/L7, pp. 209-212, 24 March 1862, Secretaries to Native Pastors.
\textsuperscript{132} CMS, C A1/L7, p. 206, 22 January 1862, Venn to Beckles.
\textsuperscript{133} This last forms the subject of the next chapter, and is only mentioned here for clarity.
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(i) The Ingredient of Self-Support

The self-supporting principle was at the very heart of the Pastorate experiment, and difficulties in this area were prone to jeopardize its survival. Yet, almost from the outset the Native Pastorate was beset with financial problems, which were partly due to the intensely speculative and rather precarious financial propositions under which the scheme was implemented. This pecuniary handicap was greatly exacerbated by the undesirable legacy of dilapidated buildings (churches and parsonages) whose repairs or replacement the newly-born native Church was ill-equipped to shoulder.134 Practically all the buildings inherited by the Pastorate needed costly repairs, enlargement or replacement; and their continued maintenance denoted hidden costs which had not been well anticipated.135 The Pastorate's predicament, in this respect, had no simple solution. The relatively large structures (specifically parsonages and Mission houses) inherited from the CMS were difficult to maintain and expensive to repair - having originally been built in conformity to European tastes.136 Parishes without resident European missionaries (invariably attended by native Catechists) often had no parsonage or Mission House, and the burden of building or renting a house for the native Pastor became the responsibility of the Native Pastorate. There was also the added "liability" of overcrowded churches - a

134 The nine native Pastors informed to Venn that the "chief difficulty" in the way of proper support for the native ministry was "the dilapidated state of all our churches" (CMS, C A1/O 24/11, Nine Pastors to Venn).

135 Buildings in the colony were mainly wooden structures (roofed with shingles, slates, or iron); and were particularly susceptible to the heavy rains, and white ants (cf. CMS, C A1/O 9/4, The Sixth Annual Report of the Sierra Leone Native Church Pastorate Auxiliary for the Year ending 30 April 1868). The building of the Fourah Bay Institution, for instance, frequently required extensive (and expensive) repairs; which in one year amounted to almost £1000 (cf. CMS, C A1/17, p. 24, 23 June 1862, Secretaries to Jones). For more information about building structures in the colony, see A B C Sibthorpe (1970, 4th edition), pp. 53-57.

136 The PC ventured that some of these Mission houses could "be altered as to be suitable native Parsonages or that materials may be employed in constructing such" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 185, 22 November 1861. Secretaries to Jones).
The wishes of the CMS Secretaries - which frequently necessitated expensive re-building schemes. These practicalities constituted the first major test of the Native Pastorate's readiness to dispense with the aegis of the CMS and fall back on its own resources. Together, they threatened to derail the Native Pastorate even before it had gained a settled existence, and raised further doubts about the timeliness of its establishment.

In his sedulous efforts to launch the Native Pastorate, Beckles had been spurred on by a conviction that the Society would (or could be persuaded to) put all the Church buildings into good repair and provide houses for the native Pastors. This was not an unreasonable expectation, considering the Pastorate's newborn status and rather shaky financial prospects; but it was one which the CMS did not share. The PC was only prepared to make a grant to the Pastorate Fund, in the first year or two, "for repairing the churches and parsonage houses: because the Committee think it better that the churches should be repaired in connection with that fund than that the Society should undertake to put them in repair in the first instance". Inadvertently, the issue became obfuscated when the PC instructed the Finance Committee "to procure a schedule of all the churches and parsonages belonging to the Society with probable cost of...

137 The wish was father to the thought; though, in fairness to the Bishop, it must be said that some of the CMS Secretaries' communication on the subject between 1861 and 1863 rather strengthened his misapprehension. Venn stated, for example: "If the Society has not suitable houses for Native Pastors, it will be for the Council to decide on the style and cost of a suitable house for a native Pastor, which I doubt not the Society would build whenever it has the Church" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 56, 23 March 1860, Venn to Beckles). An in a subsequent letter, he assured the Bishop that though the PC had not specified an amount (for the coming year), "they will not fail to give you what may be needed, while you are doing so much on the spot" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 196, 23 December 1861, Venn to Beckles).

138 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 192, 23 November 1861, Venn to Beckles. At the same time Beckles was no doubt encouraged by the Society's "special" grants towards the repair of the Wellington and Regent Churches; cp. C A1/L7, p. 185, 22 November 1861, Venn to Jones; C A1/O 25D/30, 19 June 1863, Beckles to Venn.
putting them into repair". For some time, this directive nourished widespread expectation that the Society intended to hand over the buildings in good repair. The misconception placed on CMS intention did little to help the situation, and simply deferred the problem. "Our great difficulty at present", wrote Rev H C Binns, Secretary of the Native Pastorate (in 1863), "is the dilapidated condition of some of the churches. I feel that when they are put in good repair, the exertion of the people will bring in a sufficient sum to meet almost all expenses". The problem ignited fears (which had never really died down) that separation from the CMS and severance of CMS support was premature and foolhardy. In fact, the prospect of having to shoulder the full burden of building costs and repairs of eight or nine churches and houses effectively dampened the enthusiasm of the native congregations. Instinctive self-preservation prompted each congregation to preserve their local building fund, which detracted from their contribution to the central Fund; and also reduced the capacity of an underfunded Pastorate to meet its financial requirements. Nicol complained: "If our churches had been put in a proper state of repair our people would do more than they are doing now. At present they are busy either in repairing existing churches or building entirely new ones in our different parishes".

139 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 185, 19 November 1861, Secretaries to Jones; cp. C A1/O 3/450, 21 January 1862, Jones to Secretaries. This letter indicated clearly that the Society was "prepared to give some aid towards this object". But the Finance Committee's estimate was rejected on the grounds that it was "far too indefinite and loose to be the groundwork for any grants" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 266, 23 October 1862, Secretaries to Jones). It is also worth noting that in this last letter, the Secretaries mentioned the need for a plan and estimate "for a Native Minister's house [for the time] when it may be desirable to build one".

140 CMS, C A1/O 45/4, 21 April 1863, Binns to Venn. Binns was appointed to the office of Secretary and Treasure of the Native Pastorate (replacing Hamilton) in January 1862.

141 By 1862, the local (building) funds at Wellington and Hastings amounted to over £89 and £84 respectively (cf. ibid).

142 By December 1861, the Building Fund amounted to only about £108 (CMS, C A1/0 9/20, n.d., Account of Native Pastorate Church Building Fund).

143 CMS, C A1/0 164/23, 20 May 1863, Nicol to Colonel Dawes.
of fact, the Pastorate's income was barely enough to provide the salaries of the Pastors; and setting aside the one-fourth percentage for the Building Fund became impracticable.144 Unfortunately, the local building funds of the different congregations were almost invariably deficient (amounting to less than £10 in most parishes), and the Church Committee was overwhelmed with requests for financial assistance.145 In 1862 and 1863, the Society made grants of £300 to the Native Church Fund, specifically to aid building and repairs.146 These were useful, but made little impact on the surfeit of needs;147 and Beckles came under increasing pressure from the native clergy "to do something towards the repairs of the churches and houses".148 A continuing anxiety about the state of the churches, and a misplaced conviction that the Society would provide a sufficient grant, induced the Bishop to order iron roofing for three churches, commence the erection of a Church at Bathurst (estimated at £600 to £700), and (with the connivance of the Finance Committee) commence

144 By January 1863, the Building Fund was being drawn on to pay the Pastors salaries (cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/25, 19 January 1863, Beckles to Venn; cp. CMS, C A1/O 9/22, Statement of Quarterly Account ending 31 March 1863); and in April 1863 Beckles reported that the Church Committee "cannot possibly put by anything as a reserve for building and repairs" (C A1/O 25D/29, 20 April 1863, Beckles to Venn).

145 Only the wealthier churches, like Hastings and Waterloo, were able to undertake their own building and repairs practically unaided. As Jones reported, these parishes had "abundance of excellent farming lands, and the whole population [was] in many respects much better than the people of the other villages" (CMS, C A1/O 3/475, 21 November 1863, Jones to Secretaries). The Hastings Church, for instance, received only £80 in aid towards repairs which amounted to £324 - the rest being defrayed by the Church.

146 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 250, 23 July 1862, Venn to Jones; cp. C A1/O 9/24, General statement of the Pastorate Fund showing the total receipts from all sources and what has been expended on building repairs in Pastorate stations from 1 April 1861 to 30 June 1864; C A1/L7, pp. 483-484, 21 December 1864, Venn to Beckles.


repairs at York and Kent. Matters came to a head when Venn declared categorically that it had never been the intention of the Society to put the buildings into a proper state of repair. He reiterated the PC's opinion that "the churches should be gradually repaired out of the portion reserved for that purpose in the Native Church Fund"; and added that Society would "supplement grants as it [was] in their power". This assertion came as something of a blow to Beckles, and probably marked the turning-point in his hitherto ebullient optimism about the prospects of the Native Pastorate.

The vexed question of buildings and repairs became the bane of the Native Pastorate and a function of its capacity to live up to the self-supporting ideal. It could be shown that the CMS showed indecent haste in its endeavour to expedite the experiment or withdraw from the Mission – a tendency which was more to its benefit than it was in the Pastorate's interest. Irrevocably, the infant native Church became saddled with the obligations of manhood; and the ensuing struggle to overcome (amongst its other handicaps) a precarious financial situation became the first real test of


151 Venn deplored Beckles preoccupation with building concerns; and argued whether the building and repairs of the churches should not "be thrown upon the Church Committee, or even upon separate Committees of friends for each church". He explained to Binns (the Secretary of the Pastorate) that "it has been an understanding for the last twenty years that we have never engaged to keep churches in repair – but only to make occasionally special grants in aid of local efforts" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 3154, 23 June 1863, Venn to Binns).

152 The PC's earlier predisposition to caution – occasioned by a fear of failure – had apparently been erased by the momentum of success and economic expediency. Beckles argued, for example, that the placement of Waterloo District on the Pastorate relieved the Society of more than £300 per annum, while increasing the Pastorate's outlay (at a critical time) by more than a hundred pounds a year (cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn).
its ripeness for ecclesiastical independence. In April 1862, the native Pastors established the Sierra Leone Native Church Pastoral Aid Society expressly to assist the funds of the Pastorate. Its primary objective was to provide lay agency (scripture readers and catechists) for the assistance of native Pastors in the larger districts; but it also contributed to the work of building and repairs in the Pastorate. The Association changed its name to the Sierra Leone Native Church Pastorate Auxiliary in 1866; and played an increasingly significant role in the financial development of the Native Pastorate. Apart from the class pence contributions, it represented the most encouraging indication of the native Christians' resolve to enact the self-supporting principle. However, its contribution to the Native Pastorate Fund in its early years was hardly decisive; and the want of adequate funds remained a source of continuing anxiety to the Bishop and the Church Committee. The addition of the much larger Waterloo District to the Pastorate (in June 1864) - to replace Charlotte - did little

153 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 3/452, 20 March 1862, Jones to Secretaries. It was formed under the patronage of the Governor, the Chief Justice, the Bishop, and the Colonial Secretary.

154 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/10, Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the year ending 30 April 1866; cp. C A1/O 9/4, Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the year ending 30 April 1868. It is worth reiterating that the Native Pastorate's Financial Year was reckoned from 1 May (the date on which the Pastorate commenced), in any given year, to 30 April the following year.

155 Significantly, the change of name was made in order to remove a misconception that the organisation was "a distinct organisation from the Pastorate"; whereas its "efforts were only supplementary to those of the Pastorate, and the funds realized by the special efforts annually made by the committee were placed entirely at the disposal of the Pastorate" (CMS, C A1/0 9/10, Report of the Sierra Leone Native Church Pastorate Auxiliary for the year ending April 30, 1866). This Association shall subsequently be referred to in this thesis as "the Pastorate Auxiliary".

156 Between 1862 and 1864 its contribution amounted to about £102 (CMS, C A1/0 9/25, Financial statement of the Pastorate Funds... from 1 April 1861 to November 1864). But the Pastorate Auxiliary's contribution gradually increased to about £238 in 1867 and about £450 in 1872 (cf. C A1/0 9/2, and C A1/0 9/9, pp. 22-28)
to calm fears;\textsuperscript{157} and the forfeit of the Society's grant of £300 that year only increased the financial distress.\textsuperscript{158} In a bid to contain the situation, the salaries of Deacons connected with the Pastorate were reduced from £62.10.0 to £50,\textsuperscript{159} and only the most urgent repairs were undertaken. It became obvious that unless contributions and support in the colony improved substantially, the Pastorate experiment was doomed to failure (or, at best, liable to suffer from stunted growth).\textsuperscript{160} The bugbear of building and repairs continued to frustrate meaningful progress, and remained potentially disruptive to the whole experiment. Eventually, the problem provoked a confrontation between Beckles and the Society that was as unpleasant as it was instructive. In 1863, the PC reneged on their earlier promise to provide houses for the native Pastors when they discovered that the estimated cost for a native Pastor's house was £300.\textsuperscript{161} When Waterloo was handed over to the Pastorate, the CMS Secretaries declared that the Society would not give up the Mission House at

\textsuperscript{157} Though this arrangement seems to have been made with Beckles' cognisance (cf. CMS, C A1/L7, p. 425, 23 March 1864, Secretaries to Caiger), he later berated the Society for adding this parish to the Pastorate, without the expressed consent of the Church Committee, at a time when it was known that its income fell below its expenditure (cf. C A1/O 25D/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn) Cp. C A1/L7, pp. 438, 23 May 1864, Secretaries to Caiger; pp. 445-447, 23 June 1864, Secretaries to the Leaders and School Council of Waterloo.

\textsuperscript{158} The grant may have been withheld partly due to the Society's own financial difficulties - as estimates from the various Missions exceeded its income by more than £13,000 (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 448, Secretaries to Caiger). Venn informed Beckles that "in the present financial circumstances" the PC were "quite unable to make any grant for churches in any part of the world" (C A1/L7, p. 474, 23 November 1864, Venn to Beckles).

\textsuperscript{159} It is unclear when this was done; cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/40, 18 October 1864, Beckles to Venn.

\textsuperscript{160} The various grants enabled the Pastorate to just about meet its requirement of £1034 (i.e., £775 in salaries, plus one-fourth of the same amount for the Building Fund); and the Church Committee concluded that no further stations could be taken up (cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/39, 19 September 1864, Beckles to Venn).

\textsuperscript{161} Cf. C A1/L7, pp. 285-286, 23 February 1863, Venn to Beckles. He told Beckles that the promise had been made on "the understanding that a native Pastor's house might be erected for £75 or £100" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 454, 23 July 1864, Venn to Beckles).
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Waterloo and insisted that the Pastorate Fund should provide a house for the native Pastor. But Beckles complained that, given the Pastorate's financial predicament, such an undertaking would be an impossibility for some time; but Venn insisted that the Society could give no more than £100 to that object. The Society remained unyielding; and Venn went on to inform Beckles that "in the present circumstances the Committee was quite unable to make any grant for churches in any part of the world". The fact that the Society had withheld its grant of £300 that year made the PC's refusal doubly painful; and their policy of diminishing assistance proved too much for the distraught Bishop Beckles. Frustrated by the Pastorate's incapacity, burdened by a legacy of dilapidated buildings, and overcome with anxiety about the prospects of the Native Church, he became convinced that the whole experiment was precipitate; and was equally persuaded that the scheme was being undermined by the Society's lack of generosity. He remarked acidly:

If I could have imagined that we would have received such illiberal treatment, I must say candidly that I should have acted with the same degree of prudence and caution as my predecessors, and not started the Pastorate, and have left the burden where I found it - on the Society.

Convinced of the injustice of CMS action, he renewed his appeal for the buildings to be put in order, and requested (in accordance with a Church Committee decision) that a loan be granted to complete the repairs at once, to be deducted from the Society's annual grant. The PC was quite taken

---

162 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 438, 23 May 1864, Secretaries to Caiger. The PC was only willing to lay out a grant of £100 (C A1/L7, p. 454, 23 July 1864, Venn to Beckles); though the Finance Committee concluded that a suitable house could not be erected for less than £250 (C A1/O 2/195, Meeting held on 15 August 1864).

163 CMS, C A1/O 25D/34, 26 June 1864, Beckles to Venn.

164 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 454, 23 July 1864, Venn to Beckles. Beckles replied, shortly, that a house could not be erected for £100 (C A1/O 25D/37b, 9 August 1864, Beckles to Venn).

165 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 474, 23 November 1864, Venn to Beckles. The Society's financial difficulty that year has already been referred to.

166 CMS, C A1/O 25D/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn.
aback by the unfriendly tone of the Bishop's communication and the change of attitude which it conveyed. Venn strenuously defended the PC against Beckles' charges of "illiberal" and "ungenerous" treatment towards the Native Church.\textsuperscript{157} He reiterated that the PC thought it "undesirable that the Bishop or the Society should undertake the responsibility of extensive building concerns", which could be "better performed by the local Committee and the different churches, aided by the Native Pastorate Fund".\textsuperscript{158} This response, however, did little to mollify an irate Beckles. He retorted that the Society had given a mere £326 in all (not £500, as Venn claimed) to meet an estimate of £3000 for building and repairs; and observed pointedly that the CMS would have been obliged to meet this full amount "had I not imprudently..., and too prematurely, relieved the Society of at least six stations, if not nine".\textsuperscript{159}

This altercation necessarily raises questions about the timeliness of the Pastorate experiment.\textsuperscript{170} Undoubtedly the capacity of the Native Church to be self-supporting, or to subsist on its own resources, had been somewhat misjudged by both Beckles and the CMS; and the Society's rapid withdrawal left the infant Church painfully exposed and financially vulnerable. Indicative of this misjudgment was the PC's opinion (expressed in 1865) that "Africa has been signally

\textsuperscript{157} CMS, C A1/L7, pp. 498–500, 20 January 1865, Venn to Beckles.

\textsuperscript{158} \textit{ibid.} Venn, unhelpfully, recounted the various grants which had been given towards repairs - amounting to £500. The PC also seems to have overrated the capacity of the different churches to complete repairs (often in excess of £200 to £300) with so little help; and their argument that building and repairs should be undertaken gradually was not very useful. Buildings in the colony deteriorated rapidly when repairs were delayed (increasing the costs); and, as Beckles argued, slow progress meant that the first structures to be repaired would again require attention before all the buildings were completed.

\textsuperscript{159} CMS, C A1/O 25D/48, 24 March 1865, Beckles to Venn.

\textsuperscript{170} Other queries about the fitness of the native Pastors, and their ability to function effectively without European supervision also came to the fore at this time, and had great bearing on the subject; but, in keeping with the thematic structure of our present discourse, these will be discussed in the next section.
successful, during the past four years in its endeavour to relieve the Society, as regards Mission Expenditure; and they feel assured that the present financial pressure will further stimulate the Native Churches, as well as the friends of the Mission cause in the Colony, to still greater liberality."  

This observation, which was no doubt fathered by a preconception of the colony's wealth, rather obscured more salient facts. The point has already been made that despite the relative prosperity of the colony, a significant proportion of its inhabitants - specifically in the villages - were of indifferent means. This fact had significant (economic) implications for the Native Pastorate, whose stations were all in the rural districts; and which was funded mainly by the class payments, and other contributions, from the relatively poorer congregations in these villages. Notwithstanding the fact that some of the villages were reasonably prosperous, the increasing demands of class payments, support for their Schools, local building funds, plus contributions to the Pastorate and CMS Auxiliaries often proved too onerous for the native Christians. In 1864 Nicol asserted: "At present we are crippled in our parishes. If our people subscribe nobly to the Pastorate their schools must suffer; if they support the schools, it will tell on the funds of the Pastorate". Contrary to the sentiment expressed by the native merchant (at the head of this chapter), the nascent Pastorate was largely denied the full financial support of the colony's wealthier class. In 1868, for instance, the Pastorate Auxiliary Report lamented the fact that the inhabitants of the city had "not yet risen to her great duty"; and remarked that "if the large amount of

171 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 23, 10 July 1865, Col. Dawes to Caiger.
172 Cf. Chapter I, pp. 61ff.
173 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 3/475, 21 November 1863, Jones to Secretaries; cp. note 141, above (p. 32). In most instances, the productivity or collective financial output of these congregations was adversely affected by the migration of the young and able members to other parts of the coast, in search for better prospects.
174 CMS, C A1/0 164/27, 20 February 1864, Nicol to R Lang (CMS Secretary).
£500 is received from the poor in our country districts, Freetown ought by some systematic effort to raise an equal sum; for here all the wealth and intelligence are concentrated". In 1865, Binns was astounded to discover that between 1863 and 1865 receipts in class payments had decreased steadily in each of the Pastorate stations, while there had been a steady increase in the stations still retained by the Society. His appeals to the native Pastors for renewed zealouslyness in collecting class payments yielded little result; and by 1866, he had conceded that he could not "expect any improvement in the class receipt in the Pastorate stations". When pressed to account for this discrepancy, the native Pastors explained that their efforts and influence were frequently opposed or undermined by the all too powerful "class leaders" in their various congregations. This explanation cut no ice with the

175 CMS, C A1/0 9/4, The Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the Year ending 30 April 1868. A fervent prayer was expressed that "the Lord [would] incline the hearts of the native merchants to contribute largely towards the permanent endowment of the Native Church". A subsequent report argued that "a dozen native merchants subscribing at the rate of 5 guineas each annually towards the Association would materially augment its funds, and the Committee see nothing to hinder this" (cf. C A1/0 9/6, Eighth Annual Report of Pastorate Auxiliary, 1870).

176 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 45/15b, Statement of Class payments received throughout the Colony for three years ending 30 June 1865; cp. C A1/0 45/15a, Circular to Native Pastors.

177 CMS, C A1/0 45/21, 19 January 1866, Binns to Venn.

178 CMS, C A1/0 45/21, 19 January 1866, Binns to Venn.

179 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 64/36c, 19 January 1866, Caiger to Venn. The appointment of "class leaders", or "church leaders", dated back to the 1820s when the CMS adopted the Methodist practice of dividing their congregations into "classes", to facilitate the spread of the gospel (cf. Fyfe [1962], pp. 202 & 235). According to Fyfe, these "class leaders" instructed the congregation, endeavoured to bring their countrymen to the church, and "enforced Christianity far beyond the missionaries' power". It was these leaders to whom Beckles appealed, in his bid to get the Pastorate scheme accepted by the congregations. Chosen for their position and influence in the district, they were invariably leading members of the Church Relief Companies (formed to counteract the more secular, autochthonous, and non-Christian, Relief Companies) and often exercised more influence in the church, and wider community, than the pastor (cf. C A1/0 64/39, 19 April 1866, Caiger to Venn). Cp. CMS, C A1/0 3/400a, 18 January 1859, Ehemann to Secretaries; C A1/0 3/408, 18 May 1859, Ehemann to Secretaries.
European missionaries, who accused the pastors of lack of discipline and a want of energy.\textsuperscript{180} But Fyfe confirms that "unable to assert the unquestioned authority of their predecessors, the European missionaries, they [the native pastors] were often hampered by class leaders who would answer rebuke by arousing parties against them or seceding to another church".\textsuperscript{181} Indeed, the "class leaders" posed enough threat to the authority and control of the native pastors for the Church Committee to abolish that position in 1867, and replace it with annually appointed "lay helpers".\textsuperscript{182} Another possible explanation for the dwindling financial output of the Native Pastorate congregations was the "falling away of members and removals from the Districts".\textsuperscript{183} CMS stations were not unaffected by this phenomenon, but Binns was forced to admit that "in the villages there is not to the same extent the opportunity to increase the congregations that we have in town".\textsuperscript{184} The point at issue is that the financial capacity of the Native Pastorate could not be properly assessed or projected without reference to these socio-economic variables. The liberality of the native congregations cannot be gainsaid. As one European missionary commented, "very few (if any) places of equal size contribute in the same aggregate for Christian purposes as the colony of

\textsuperscript{180} Cf. CMS, C A1/O 64/36c, 19 January 1866, Caiger to Venn; C A1/O 109/47b, 19 March 1866, Hamilton to Venn. The common view among Europeans was that native Africans were slothful and unreliable. "Alacrity", it was remarked, "is no part of the native's temperament in the tropics" (cf. C A1/O 3/332, 20 October 1853, Graf to CMS Secretaries).

\textsuperscript{181} Fyfe, (1962), p. 352. This was especially the case when the pastor was from one tribe and the majority of his congregation was from another.

\textsuperscript{182} Cf. Fyfe, ibid., p. 352. The considerations which led to this change are discussed at the end of this chapter.

\textsuperscript{183} Cf. CMS, C A1/O 9/10, Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the year ending 30 April 1866; cp. C A1/O 109/47b, 19 March 1866, Hamilton to Venn. John Peterson, Province of Freedom (1969), reports that "by the late 1830's the process of migration from the villages to Freetown was well under way" (pp. 272, 274).

But, given the economic and demographic composition of the Native Pastorate, CMS expectation about its capacity for self-support may have been overly optimistic. An assessment of the wider picture provides an even better perspective. Axiomatically, the material interests of the Pastorate were "bound up with those of the Colony"; and its prospects arguably depended on the colony's commercial progress. This simple truth was forcefully propounded in the "Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary" (after the "ginger riots" of 1866); and it made the following statement:

It is the firm opinion of the Pastors that it is be agricultural and mechanical industry chiefly, that the native Church could be permanently supported. Whatever checks them, or tends to check agricultural industry reacts upon the native Church. Unless the two staple articles, ginger and arrow-root, be encouraged, the native Church will materially suffer.

Nicol, the senior native Pastor, had expressed the same viewpoint, two years before, when he argued "that the temporal prosperity of the native Church now placed on an independent basis is closely connected with a new and improved system of agriculture in this colony". Venn was equally alive to the need for the development of agriculture (and commerce) in the Sierra Leone Colony — specifically,

186 According to Fyfe (1962), the colony villagers began planting ginger on a large scale in the 1860s, to export to England and the United States (p. 354); and exports rose from £3000 worth in 1861 to £24,700 worth in 1866. However, by 1866, fluctuations in the world market caused the colony farmers serious losses, provoking a ginger strike. In an ensuing riot the house of the chief broker at Kissy was burnt down. Cp. Peterson, op. cit., pp. 274-276; CMS, C A1/0 9/4, The Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the Year ending 30 April 1866.
188 CMS, C A1/0 164/26, 21 January 1864, Nicol to Venn.
189 Venn listed the Gospel, agriculture, and commerce, and the three means of improving the social condition of man. He argued that agriculture "secures a due supply of the necessities of life - fosters habits of industry - leads to fixed habitation - creates property...", and "lays the basis and supplies the means" of carrying on commerce. Cf. CMS, C A2/L1, 25 October 1844, pp. 5-6, Extract of letter of instructions to
as a needful foundation for enforcing self-reliance.  

But his strenuous attempts to promote agricultural industry in the colony failed dismally. Traditionally, European observers and missionaries were deeply critical of what they regarded as the native Sierra Leoneans' dislike of manual labour; and even Venn described second generation Christians as "victims of a vicious indolence". In truth, agricultural pursuit was generally eschewed in a colony where the inhabitants showed a predilection for trade; and it would hardly be overstating the case to suggest that the annals of nineteenth century Sierra Leone are littered with the wreckage of agricultural schemes propounded by successive governors, and well-meaning, but misinformed, humanitarian missionaries proceeding to Abeokuta; Warren (1971), pp. 184-5. Cp. Shenk (1983), p. 68. He listed the encouragement of agriculture as one of the chief measures necessary for improving the social and intellectual condition of the Sierra Leone populace (G/AZ1/1, No. 70, n.d., Suggestions for the Improvement of the Social and Intellectual Condition of the Native Africans at Sierra Leone. See also Knight, op cit., pp. 121, 122, 134-136, 537-546.

Venn was probably influenced by the ideas of Fowell Buxton, who had earlier in the century endeavoured to replace the slave-trade with legitimate commerce and argued that the Bible and the plough should go together (cf. T F Buxton, The African Slave Trade and its Remedy, London, 1840).

This was especially true of his scheme(s) to establish the growth of cotton (cf. CMS, C A1/L5, p. p. 34; pp. 38-39; pp. 137-139; pp. 142-145; pp. 152-153; C A1/L6, pp. 179-184; Shenk, p. 71). Both the African Native Agency Committee (in England) and its corollary the African Improvement Committee (in Sierra Leone), which Venn set up in the mid-1840s failed to make any progress in fostering agricultural and commercial development in the colony. Cf. Shenk (1983), pp. 68-71. Note Peterson's observation that "as late as 1869, no one cultivated a holding larger than ten acres [in the rural areas]; and that "the soil in most of the colony was rocky, and did not lend itself even to the simplest forms of nineteenth-century western mechanization", op. cit., p. 273.

Cf. G/AZ1/1, No. 70, *ibid.* Graf also referred to the "race of idle youths of both sexes leaving our schools too proud for agricultural labour, like their parents, and with no formed habits or tastes for industrial pursuits" (cf. C A1/L5, p. 6, Instructions to Missionaries...).

Fyfe (1862) records that "receptive farmers, ready to till the soil if they could make a living by it, were discouraged by what they felt [was] exploitation", and "farming became a despised profession" (p. 259). He also emphasizes that the growing wealth of the inhabitants "originated from trade" (p. 306).
agencies like the CMS.\textsuperscript{194} In 1865, the PC openly condemned what they regarded as the Colonial Government's neglect "to promote Agriculture and to develop the natural resources of Africa"; and stated that "the neglect of agriculture in these colonies [was] the great drawback upon their prosperity.\textsuperscript{195}

This state of affairs had direct bearing on the self-supporting capacity of the Pastorate, which lacked a solid financial base, for the simple reason that the colony itself had (in the words of a contemporary observer) "no commercial resources, no developed latent riches, and no manufactures".\textsuperscript{196} Thus, the Pastorate Auxiliary reported that "voluntary subscriptions are fluctuating and particularly so in the colony where petty trade flourishes, and there are so many manufactures of any kind, [and] no regular system of agriculture".\textsuperscript{197} The same body asserted four years later:

One circumstance which occasions... considerable anxiety as to the future of the Native Church, humanly speaking, is the absence in this settlement of large sources of income by which the contributions of the poor may be rendered more enlarged as well as more regular... If the Native Church is to be self-dependent, as it is hoped it will be in the course of years, if it is to be supported by a liberality proportionate to the magnitude of the scheme, then fresh


\textsuperscript{195} Cf. Warren (1971), pp. 194-196. The Sierra Leone colony's failure to grow its own rice (the staple food) - which had to be imported from surrounding countries, and even England - was offered as incontrovertible proof of this neglect.

\textsuperscript{196} A B C Sibthorpe (1970, 4th edition), p. 88. Sibthorpe's reference to the lack of commercial resources, in a colony which thrived on commerce, is dubious. But it is helpful to note the exasperated remark of T Risely Griffiths (Colonial Secretary and Treasurer in charge of Census), in 1881: "What good I ask can come of a country where one fourth of its people are dependent for their livelihood upon what they sell to the remaining three quarters, or to put it more plainly, where one individual in every four is dependent upon the profits of what he or she disposes of to the other three" (CMS, G3/A1/0/1881, Report on the Census of Sierra Leone and its Dependencies, 1881).

\textsuperscript{197} CMS, C A1/0 9/4, Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the Year ending 30 April 1868. The report insisted that this state of affairs was aggravated by the heavy migration (especially among the young) "to Bonny, Lagos, the Gambia for purposes of trade; and consequently our population in the villages [did] not increase much during the last few years".
departments of industry must be introduced and new appliances of labour sought.\(^{198}\)

The undoubted prosperity of a handful of inhabitants (like James G Wilhelm) was hardly sufficient ground on which to judge the capacity of the Native Church for self-support; and there is some suspicion that Venn, who possessed only second-hand knowledge of the state of affairs in the colony, may have made (or been influenced by) such a judgement. All things considered, it was arguably not so much a question of the timeliness of the experiment as of its timescale. A realistic assessment of the Native Church's financial capacity called for a more gradual transfer of stations from the Society to the Pastorate; which would have allowed for controlled development in keeping with its resources. But once the Native Church had become over-burdened, there was a need to maintain a delicate balance between enforced self-support and judicious aid, in order to safeguard the experiment. Unfortunately, this balance proved impossible to maintain, for the simple reason that the tension between independence and dependence became a breeding ground of conflict and dissatisfaction.

In response to the Pastorate's financial predicament the Society decided to renew its grant (of £300 per annum); and the Government, in response to appeals from the Bishop and Church Council, contracted to provide a grant of £150 per annum.\(^{199}\) The undeniable, but unstated, conclusion was that the Native Pastorate could not possibly survive without substantial external aid. By November 1864, a total of

\(^{198}\) CMS, C A1/0 9/9, Tenth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary, 22 May 1872.

\(^{199}\) Governor Blackhall (Governor, 1862-1865; and first Governor-in-Chief, 1866-1867) seemed sympathetic with the ideals of the Native Church; and was later described by Nicol as "one of the nursing fathers of the Sierra Leone Church" (CMS, C A1/0 164/39, 25 May 1868, Nicol to Venn). In July 1864 Beckles reported that the Governor had "given £50 towards the Wellington Church, and promised grant for the Pastorate Fund" (C A1/0 25D/35, 19 July 1864, Beckles to Venn); cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/25, Financial Statement of the Pastorate Funds... from 1 April 161 to November 1864.
almost £2356 had been collected in class pence, at a rate of £642 per annum. The Pastorate's expenditure during the same period was no less than £3261: accounted for by £55.2.8 on house rent (for two native Pastors), £594 on building and repairs, and £2616 on salaries. Only a significant infusion of grants could ensure its continued existence. This state of affairs underlined the limitations of the experiment; but, more significantly, gave birth to a process of chronic dependence which increasingly compromised the self-hood of the Native Church, and ultimately undermined the Pastorate's capacity for self-determination. One of the earliest indications of this trend occurred in 1865 when a contention over class payments was provoked by the PC's declaration that since half of the weekly collections in CMS Districts were paid into the Pastorate Fund, that Fund (and not the CMS Auxiliary Fund or the Society) should bear the responsibility of repairing those churches. The Native Pastorate Church Council was divided over the issue; but it eventually passed a resolution (proposed by Nicol) that if the Pastorate Fund was to bear such repairs "the whole" of the class payments from the CMS Districts should be paid into that Fund - instead of half. This resolution was rejected outright by the Finance Committee, where the CMS missionaries argued that the half of the class pence retained in the non-Pastorate Districts was "required for local purposes" and could not be relinquished. The dispute awakened latent antagonisms between the two races, and ended in a deadlock.

200 ibid. To this amount could be added the total of £102 from the Pastorate Auxiliary.
201 In the period under consideration, the Pastorate received some £830 in grants: viz., £600 from the CMS (£300 in 1862 and 1863), £150 from the Colonial Government, and £80 from the Bishop Bowen's Memorial Fund.
203 By then Nicol was the Secretary of the Native Pastorate. Cf. CMS, C A1/0 45/23, 17 March 1866, Binns to Dawes; cp. C A1/0 3/508b, 20 March 1866, Caiger to Secretaries; C A1/0 164/31, 19 October 1866, Nicol to Venn.
204 CMS, C A1/0 2/218, 19 March 1866, Minutes of the Finance Committee.
The native Pastors, led by Nicol, were convinced that without the receipt of the full class payment the Pastorate would once again become overburdened and lose the support of the native congregations. But the fact that class contributions in the Pastorate churches were falling off, while that in the CMS stations was increasing, made the European missionaries equally determined not to give up the whole of the class payments. The final decision was left to the PC, who ruled in favour of the missionaries, and stated that it was "very undesirable to make any change" in the arrangements. Both the PC and their missionaries felt that more than enough was already being done for the Pastorate; though the fact that nearly all the Native Pastorate Churches contributed to the CMS Auxiliary Fund was ignored. When Nicol remained opposed to the PC's decision, Venn advised him to let the matter drop. He warned that "if pressed the PC would withdraw from the Pastorate Fund the whole of the coppers" and might even review its grant of £300. "Above all", he admonished, "avoid as you would the venom of a serpent everything which may make a jar between you and the white missionaries". This piece of advice was prescient, and spoke volumes for Venn's perspicacity; but it was one which Nicol was unable to adhere to in the long run.

Between 1865 and 1870, the Native Pastorate's financial situation gradually improved. With the exception of the

---

206 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 85, 23 May 1866, Venn (and Secretaries) to Caider.
207 Binns, for example argued that during the past four years his Pademba Road District had contributed £200 to the Pastorate Fund "and has not drawn a penny from it" (CMS, C A1/O 45/23, 17 March 1866, Binns to Col. Daves).
208 Caider had proffered this argument two years previously (CMS, C A1/O 3/486, 20 June 1864, Caider to Secretaries), but failed to mention it when the loss of the entire class payments in the CMS stations was at stake.
209 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 109–110, 23 September 1866, Venn to Nicol.
1866/67 Financial Year, when the Pastorate's finances suffered a deficit of £200, each year revealed a satisfactory balance between income and expenditure - a feature conspicuously absent in earlier estimates. Buildings and repairs continued to account for a significant proportion of the Pastorate's expenditure; but significant progress was made in that department, and by 1866 the Pastorate Auxiliary intimated that "within a short period hence, all the churches shall have been put in such order as to relieve the Pastorate of the large drain upon its funds for sometime". A fresh appeal was made to Governor Blackhall, for the Government to increase its financial contribution of the Native Pastorate Fund; and by June 1866, Blackhall "placed the sum of £500 as a permanent annual grant" in the Pastorate's estimates. This increased grant enabled the Church Committee to increase the salaries of the native Pastors by £25, and to press forward with its building projects. Fears that the CMS would withdraw its annual grant of £300, when the Colonial Government increased its aid, proved unfounded. The CMS Secretaries gave an assurance that the Society's grant would

---

210 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/26-31, Financial Statements for the years 1865 to 1870. The deficit in the 1866/87 Financial year was probably caused by the unusually high amount (£500) spent on building and repairs (cf. C A1/0 9/4, Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the Year ending 30 April 1868; cp. C A1/0 2/238, 11 November 1867, Minutes of Finance Committee).

211 In the five years between 1863 and 1868, nearly £2000 had been spent on buildings and repairs - an average of £400 a year (cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/4, The Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the Year ending 30 April 1868).


213 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 3/509, 18 April 1866, Caiger to Secretaries; C A1/0 3/511, 18 June 1866, Caiger to Secretaries; cp. Fyfe (1962), p. 352. Fyfe explains that "the grant was officially justified not only on religious grounds, but because in most villages only the pastor, with sometimes a policeman or two, represented outside authority". Cp. The African Interpreter and Advocate, 24 April 1869, vol.3, no.12. Caiger reported that the Governor had also "expressed a willingness to help in the repairs, etc., of the churches and houses".

214 CMS, C A1/0 45/25b, 19 May 1866, Binns to Dawes.
"be continued for the next five years", and would "not afterwards be wholly or suddenly withdrawn, if the help still be needed". Thus the Native Pastorate's finances took on a more stable and favourable aspect: a development which strengthened hope and rekindled expectation. In 1866 Binns reported that "the distinct nature and standing of the Pastorate is becoming better understood by the people, and in consequence is better supported". The following year, two more stations - Benguema and Wilberforce - were added to the Native Pastorate, giving further indication of the Native Pastorate's renewed prospects and progress. All of which help to explain Venn's proclamation, in 1866, that "the greatest advance in native Church organisation has been made in Sierra Leone".

(ii) Ecclesiastical Relations
The organisation of the Native Pastorate necessitated a re-working and re-alignment of (ecclesiastical) relations between the principal actors in both Church and Mission: namely, the Bishop, the European Missionaries, the Native Pastors, and the CMS. Relations between the Bishop and the native Pastors, for example, were largely defined by the 'Articles of Arrangement'; but his relations with those native ministers who remained under European supervision, and the extent of his jurisdiction over the CMS missionaries, were grey areas. Another undefined area was the relation (and degree of association) between European missionaries and native Pastors - which later generated much tension and conflict. Unfortunately, the fashioning of these

216 CMS, C A1/0 45/26, 17 August 1866, Binns to Col. Dawes.
217 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 2/228, 13 February 1867, Minutes of the Finance Committee; C A1/0 3/518, 15 April 1867, Hamilton to Secretaries; C A1/0 3/519, 15 May 1867, Hamilton to Secretaries. This left only four Districts (in the Colony) in the charge of the Society: namely, Kissy Road, Pademba Road, Charlotte, and Bananas.
218 Third Paper (1866).
ecclesiastical relations in Pastorate and Mission often yielded confrontation, conflict, and all manner of discord. Without question, the kingpin in the ecclesiastical machinery of the newly "settled ecclesiastical system", was the Bishop. Whatever the variety of opinion about the timing or prospects of the Native Pastorate, there was a general consensus that its success depended "on the wisdom and sound judgement" of its head.\(^{219}\) It was to him that the Native Church (and to a lesser extent, the Society and its missionaries) looked to for direction and leadership; and it followed that his failings or shortcomings would have a great impact on its fortunes.

The organisation of the Native Pastorate marked the most auspicious of beginnings for Beckles' episcopate; and he became the focus of both CMS gratitude and the continuing expectation of the native Christian population in the colony. Beckles was quite aware of the merits of his achievement, and he promptly declined Governor Hill's invitation to apply for the more prestigious (and salubrious) see of St Helena.\(^{220}\) He told Venn: "I cannot bear the idea of leaving the work at its commencement. Although probably the deeper I enter into it the less I shall wish to leave it; ... it has its trials, yes many and great, yet it is a precious work and I experience great comfort and delight in it".\(^{221}\) By then, Venn's earlier misgivings about Beckles had given way to earnest confidence - engendered in part by the hopeful prospects of the Pastorate. Thus, when the Bishop suffered from a severe attack of fever, he admitted that "I trembled lest you should be ordered home, and all the work you have accomplished should fall into confusion";\(^{222}\) and when he

\(^{219}\) Cf. CMS, C A1/0 64/11, 19 March 1863, Caiger to Venn.

\(^{220}\) CMS, C A1/0 25D/22, 19 November 1861, Beckles to Venn; cp. C A1/0 3/447, 21 November 1861, Jones to Venn. The offer was quite a tempting one; especially since the Bishop had begun to suffer from the "unhealthy" West African climate.

\(^{221}\) ibid.

\(^{222}\) CMS, C A1/L7, p. 206, 22 January 1862, Venn to Beckles.
learnt of the Bishop's plans to visit the other West African missions, he confessed that he grudged "any time taken from your work at Sierra Leone".\textsuperscript{223} In early 1862, when Beckles ran foul of the Colonial Government due to his indiscreet allegations of colonial malpractice, he was sufficiently popular for Nicol to claim that he had "the sympathy of all his clergy and all the friends in Freetown - European and native".\textsuperscript{224} But the Bishop's personal and ecclesiastical relations with both the European missionaries and the CMS quickly deteriorated into chronic misunderstanding and confrontation; while his relations with the native Pastors (which remained on a much better footing) were deficient in vital aspects, and experienced recurrent strain. The root cause of his conflict-ridden ecclesiastical relations was his repeated and prolonged absences from his diocese (often for several months, or even a year, at a time). During his entire episcopate, Beckles spent more time out of his diocese (mainly by his contrivances) than in it.\textsuperscript{225} His absenteeism gradually weakened his influence in the colony, undermined his control over his clergy, and had the most inimical effect

\textsuperscript{223} ibid.

\textsuperscript{224} CMS, C A1/O 164/22, 21 February 1862, Nicol to Venn. The Bishop had alleged that prisoners were being put to death in the Quiah (or Koya) war (cf. C A1/O 25D/27, 19 March 1863, Beckles to Venn); and, according to Fyfe (1862, p. 314), had "unexpectedly" declared the war to be "unchristian". His allegations antagonised Governor Hill and cost him his place in the Legislative Council (on which all the Sierra Leone Bishops, since Vidal, had sat). Beckles described this ignominy as "a marked insult" (cf. C A1/O 25A/5a, 23 September 1853, Vidal to Venn). Cp. C A1/O 25D/31, 20 July 1863, Beckles to Venn; Fyfe, p. 319.

\textsuperscript{225} In the first three years of his episcopate, Beckles spent 19 months outside his diocese; and by the end of his eighth year (December, 1868) he had spent only a total of about 3 years ten months in his diocese - an attendance rate of 47.9%. The archival references are too numerous to quote here in full; but see, for example, C A1/L7, pp. 101, 148; C A1/L8, p. 180; C A1/O 3/450, /452a, /452b, /470, /482a, /494b, /495b, /498b, /515; C A1/O 25D/25. Cp. CO 267/278 99; CO 267/288; and Fyfe (1962), p. 352. Though some of his absences were occasioned by ill-health, Beckles often departed from the colony, or delayed his return, for quite minor reasons (including, in one instance, the need to see his son before departing from England).
on the affairs of the Native Pastorate. 226

The first discordant note in Beckles' relations with his clergy occurred in early 1863. On his return to the colony, after almost a year's absence, he roundly condemned the shortening of morning services on alternative Sundays - a practice which had been sanctioned by his predecessor, Bishop Bowen. 227 The bellicose nature of the Bishop's communication, which charged the clergy with "a breach of [their] solemn ordination vows", triggered incipient fears about the future of the church in Sierra Leone. 228 A few months later, Beckles antagonised the European missionaries further when he rescinded a Finance Committee decision to remove Rev J Davies, a native clergyman, from Prince Alfred's Town (in the Quiah) to Charlotte (which was about to be placed on the Pastorate). 229 He denounced the decision as being the result of a "great prejudice on the part of the

---

226 Most importantly, the native Pastors were deprived of episcopal oversight and leadership (which could not be effectively provided by the European missionaries who acted as the Bishop's Commissaries). Also, the many important, or urgent, concerns which were part and parcel of the Pastorate's existence were often left in abeyance; and on one occasion the Native Church was left without a Church Council for about a year (cf. C A1/O 64/35, 20 December 1865, Caiger to Venn; C A1/O 45/18, 18 September 1865, Binns to Dawes, C A1/O 45/21, 19 January 1866, Binns to Venn.

227 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 3/464, 18 March 1863, Jones to Venn; C A1/L7, 296, 23 April 1863, Venn to Beckles; C A1/O 64/11, 19 March 1863, Caiger to Venn. The Bishop's communication seems to have been directed against the CMS clergy; for according to Jones, he expressed no disapproval about the same practise in the Pastorate Churches (which were under his direct control), or ordered any change in their services.

228 Jones told Venn: "We have all thought it right that you should be made aware of the tendencies that are manifesting themselves. We know not what may be the issue, but... we tremble for the future of the Church" (ibid.). In reference to the same incident, Caiger commented, "My fears are great, my hopes are feeble, for the establishment of the Native Church on a solid basis". (CMS, C A1/O 64/11, 19 March 1863, Caiger to Venn). The reasons for the sudden change in Beckles' attitude towards the European clergy were obscure; but may not have been unrelated to his recent collision with the Colonial Government.

European against the native clergyman;\textsuperscript{230} and inadvertently aggravated the climate of suspicion between European missionaries and the native Clergy.\textsuperscript{231} The Bishop seems to have set himself on a collision course with the majority of the CMS missionaries; and a clash with the Society was inevitable. In 1863, it was reported to Beckles that Rev C A Reichardt, a German missionary, was given to drunken habits;\textsuperscript{232} but after an investigation of the matter, he decided that the reports were false, and cleared Reichardt of the charge. However, the PC proceeded to initiate its own investigation of the case, on the grounds that "a Bishop can only acquit or condemn a missionary on ecclesiastical grounds".\textsuperscript{233} The incident raised the ticklish question of the extent of episcopal jurisdiction over the CMS missionaries. Beckles was offended by what he perceived to be "an apparent want of confidence" in him as Bishop, and went on to assert that the Society had no right to set aside his decision.\textsuperscript{234} Regrettably, the encounter did little to endear the Bishop to the Society.\textsuperscript{235} Ecclesiastical relations between Beckles and his clergy deteriorated even further over a misunderstanding involving Bishop Samuel Adjai Crowther's visit to the colony in 1864 (soon after his

\textsuperscript{230} CMS, C A1/0 25D/30, 19 June 1963, Beckles to Venn.

\textsuperscript{231} Caiger reported that the incident provoked angry feelings among the native Pastors, who spoke strongly against the missionaries at their meeting (CMS, C A1/0 64/13b, 13 June 1863, Caiger to Venn).

\textsuperscript{232} CMS, C A1/0 25D/25, 19 January 1863, Beckles to Venn.

\textsuperscript{233} Cf. C A1/L7, p. 293, 23 April 1863, Venn to Beckles. Venn argued that the case would have been very different if Reichardt had committed an ecclesiastical offence – which the matter under consideration was not. He stipulated that whereas the Bishop was "the ultimate judge" with respect to a missionary's ecclesiastical duties, the PC were bound to satisfy themselves with respect to his character (C A1/L7, pp. 311-313, 23 June 1863, Venn to Beckles).

\textsuperscript{234} CMS, C A1/0 25D/31, 20 July 1863, Beckles to Venn. The Bishop added, tongue-in-cheek, that it was claimed in England that being the Paymaster the PC was in reality the Bishop.

\textsuperscript{235} In the end, the missionaries appointed to look into Reichardt's conduct considered it prudent, in the light of the Bishop's attitude, to drop their investigations (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 317, 23 June 1863, Secretaries to Jones, Caiger, and Binns).
consecration). Rightly or wrongly, Beckles complained (rather bitterly) that he had not been "asked to be present or to preside" at the meeting which had been arranged for all the agents in the colony - European and native - to present an address to the new Bishop.\textsuperscript{236} Caiger (the Mission Secretary), pointed out that Beckles had in fact been present when arrangements were being made for the meeting, and condemned the Bishop's representation of the matter in the strongest terms.\textsuperscript{237} Whatever the merits of the incident, it did further damage to the fragile web of ecclesiastical relations. According to Caiger, it "created a lamentable feeling amongst several of the native Pastors who are surprised that after all professions of attachment expressed by His Lordship towards the natives that he should be so far wanting in friendly feeling towards a Bishop of their own colour".\textsuperscript{238} Meanwhile, Beckles became increasingly frustrated by the limitations of his authority over the European missionaries - even, it seemed to him, in matters ecclesiastical. Shortly after the Crowther incident a spirited altercation ensued between the Bishop and two European missionaries - Caiger (the Mission secretary) and Hamilton - over the ordination and transfer of their native curates to the Pastorate. In August 1864, when Beckles' Examining Chaplain summarily summoned Caiger's curate to

\textsuperscript{236} CMS, C A1/0 25D/37b, 9 August 1864, Beckles to Venn. Beckles thought the "slight was... intentional and exceedingly insulting". He made thinly veiled references to a deliberate conspiracy, on the part of the clergy, to besmirch his reputation in the colony - where he was called "the Black man's Bishop" - by making it appear that his absence "was owing to jealousy or pride". He added, uncharitably, that if Crowther had been made Bishop of Sierra Leone his reception (from the European clergy) would have been very different.

\textsuperscript{237} CMS, C A1/0 64/20, 20 August 1864, Caiger to Venn. He all but accused Beckles of mendacity and war-mongering. Interestingly, he was outspoken about the readiness of the European missionaries to accept Crowther as Bishop (in the event of Beckles departure); stating that "the sound, practical, earnest, missionary address which he gave to the Brethren assembled has led most of us... to feel how very far he is in advance of us".

\textsuperscript{238} Caiger's account was supported by Hamilton, who also mentioned that Beckles' behaviour had "lowered him very much in the eyes of the natives" (CMS, C A1/0 109/24, 19 August 1864, Hamilton to Venn).
undertake preparation for ordination, Caiger protested vigorously. 239 Beckles took exception to Caiger's reaction and replied, astringently, that "having authority over the catechists as well as over the clergy I shall exercise it when I think fit to do so". 240 Caiger accepted the Bishop's censure; but he complained to Venn that if native agents of the Society were to be removed to occupy posts which would disconnect them from the Society, both the Local Committee and the (European) superintendents of the stations should be consulted in the matter. 241 Hamilton, in a more defiant spirit, refused outright to give his curate permission to attend the preparation classes, claiming that the curate was his "right hand in the work in the college". 242 Indeed, under his influence, the curate (Rev D G Williams), also refused ordination (and the promised charge of the Bananas) in order to remain under his supervision. All of which left Beckles effectively thwarted. His bid to remove Williams from the Fourah Bay Institution seems to have been an ill-disposed attempt to injure Hamilton's work; but that did not change the fact that these native Curates were ordained and placed under European missionary supervision specifically to supply the Native Pastorate. 243 He complained that the

239 As Secretary of the Mission, Caiger found it more convenient to live in Freetown; though he was also superintendent of the village of Wilberforce. Beckles had apparently countenanced this arrangement by granting him a "verbal license of non-residence"; but his non-residence meant that the summoning of his curate, Mr Nylander, left the station unmanned. Caiger complained that though he was Secretary of the Mission (and therefore in some way responsible for all the CMS agents) no official notice had been sent to him; and added that the summoning of the native agents was without precedent. Cf. CMS, C A1/0 64/20, 20 August 1864, Caiger to Venn; C A1/0 64/21, 18 August 1864, Beckles to Caiger.

240 *ibid.* He promptly revoked his "verbal licence of non-residence", on the grounds that if the curate was "so much required in the district as to render his absence during the part of two days objectionable it must be far more important that as superintendent [Caiger] should reside in the station".

241 CMS, C A1/0 64/20, 20 August 1864, Caiger to Venn.

242 CMS, C A1/0 64/23, 22 August 1864, Hamilton to Venn.

243 This arrangement had been initiated by the PC; and it was an attempt to provide a resource of men ready to be transferred to the Native Pastorate, as new stations were appropriated. Cf. CMS, C A1/L7, PP. 264-
curates (with the encouragement of the European Missionaries) often preferred to remain under European supervision, and refused to be placed on the Pastorate. In reply, Venn explained that the PC had made the salary of a curate lower than that of a native Pastor in order "to prevent such hesitation"; but emphasised that "it would be at variance with all ecclesiastical and ministerial principles to exert any pressure except a moral pressure upon any one to undertake a pastoral office". This impediment, in an area in which he may have presumed his authority to be supreme, deepened Beckles' chagrin, and possibly coloured his attitude towards native ministers. Whether in an attempt to re-exert his authority, or out of genuine concern, or, indeed, out of feelings of spite, Beckles began to evince increasing dissatisfaction with the ability, training, and calibre of his native ministers and Pastors. His misgivings in this area gradually eroded his confidence in the efficacy of the Native Pastorate experiment; and he declared that he saw "but little hope for the future". It was his bid to effect a modification of its arrangements in the Pastorate which drew him into a most serious conflict with Venn and the Society; and dealt a fatal blow to ecclesiastical relations in the process.

It will be remembered that all of Beckles predecessors (with the possible exception of Weeks) had expressed doubts about the ability of the native clergy, and that Beckles had

244 CMS, C A1/O 25D/37b, 9 August 1864, Beckles to Venn.
245 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 465, 20 September 1864, Venn to Beckles. Venn told Hamilton that the missionary should be ready to let his curate go; but argued that in the event the Bishop refused to ordain fresh men, "a missionary may fairly defer parting with his Curate till he has the prospect of another being ordained" (C A1/L7, p. 468, 21 September 1864, Venn to Hamilton). However, he added, "all must depend ultimately on the Curate himself".
246 CMS, C A1/O 24D/37a, 9 August 1864, Beckles to Venn.
questioned their capability to function effectively without supervision even before the Pastorate was established. By 1863, he had renewed his complaints about the calibre of native clergymen, and remarked that they were "sometimes wanting in judgement". In 1864, he condemned the training provided at Fourah Bay College (which was re-opened that year); and recommended that the young men be sent to the CMS College "to be properly trained". He had become convinced that the native clergy were not sufficiently possessed of social advancement or morality to function effectively without European influence and supervision; and incidents of misconduct among native ministers only served to justify this view. Generally speaking, cases of delinquency among native ministers were not uncommon; and the Finance Committee invariably visited each case with immediate judgement. European missionaries deprecated the minutest moral deviation (in both European and African, it must be said), but considered the African to be especially susceptible to his baser instincts. The establishment of the Native Pastorate had the pernicious effect of focusing

---

247 CMS, C A1/0 25D/33, 20 May 1864, Beckles to Venn. Beckles claimed that his views were supported by Governor Blackhall; and he reported that the good governor thought that European missionaries should be sent to the stations in the first instance, and the native clergy only located when the stations were sufficiently established (cp. C A1/0 64/27, 21 December 1864, Caiger to Venn). Cp. The African Interpreter and Advocate, 20 July 1867, vol.1, no.30.

248 CMS, C A1/0 25D/37, 9 August 1864, Beckles to Venn. He warned Venn that he would not ordain the students if he considered them unfit and unprepared.

249 The Ehemann/Macauley case was a typical example (Chapter 2, pp. 47-48).

250 In 1860, Maxwell’s presence at a "ball" (held at the Custom House in honour of Prince Alfred) was reacted to with vigorous censure by his fellow clergymen (cf. CMS, C A1/0 6/52, November 1860, Ministers to Maxwell; C A1/0 148/13, 21 November 1860, Maxwell to Ministers; cp. C A1/L7, p. 117, 23 January 1861, Venn to Beckles); and Quaker’s intentions towards the maid of Governor Kennedy’s wife became the subject of correspondence (cf. C A1/0 6/48). Charges of financial irregularity (after an unfriendly investigation by Caiger and Hamilton) led to Jones’ downfall and possibly contributed to his demise — though the PC later acquitted him of any misconduct (cf. C A1/O 3/476; C A1/L7, P. 404). Among the European missionaries, card-playing, trading, and drunkenness, were among the moral lapses investigated.
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(European) attention on the moral rectitude of native ministers - both in the Pastorate and Mission - with an increasing tendency to use it as an index of the Pastorate's success. This judgemental proclivity, particularly noticeable among English missionaries, was based on a combination of the European's innate belief in his moral superiority, an intolerance of African frailties, and an imperviousness to the African ethos or worldview. It was not an attitude which Venn (who had a more tolerant and far-sighted perspective) shared; but it was one which the anxiety-prone Beckles was not immune to. In early 1864, the Pastorate was horrified when another charge of adultery was brought against Rev W Quaker of Hastings, which necessitated his removal from Hastings. Another case of misconduct occurred later in the same year when Rev J Thomas of Gloucester began to manifest signs of insanity, and had to be removed from active service altogether. The fact that Thomas' transgression involved a mental rather than moral deficiency was a mitigating factor; and the incident provoked as much sympathy as concern. But the entire Mission (and Pastorate) was again scandalised when it was discovered that Mr Moses T Wellington, a catechist of the Society stationed

251 After the Quaker incident (in 1861), he told Beckles that such difficulties must arise (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 206, 22 January 1862, Venn to Beckles); and on another occasion he argued, optimistically, that "the failure of one Native Pastor... is a comfort in one sense, for it shows that if failures exist they will be brought to light; and therefore we feel confident in the success of all the rest" (C A1/L7, P. 314, 23 June 1863, Venn to Binns).

252 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 45/9, 19 February 1864, Binns to Dawes. The new charge created a suspicion that Quaker might not have been completely guiltless in the previous case involving Mr Lord.

253 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/39, 19 September 1864, Beckles to Venn; C A1/O 164/30, 20 October 1864, Nicol to Venn. According to Jones, Thomas was subject to bouts of "temporary derangement"; and, when in that state, "committed acts of violence towards his mother and others who were near him" (C A1/O 3/472, 21 October 1863, Jones to Secretaries). His removal constituted a difficulty, since the Anglican Church "had no provision for resigning the ministry" (C A1/L7, p. 484, 21 December 1864, Venn to Beckles). But Venn saw "no difficulty in the way of treating such a delinquent as one who has resigned his Christian character, and letting him engage in secular work for his support".
at Krootown, had intercourse with his wife before marriage.\textsuperscript{254} The confirmation of this misdemeanour resulted in Wellington's summary dismissal by the Finance Committee. However, the repeated incidents of misconduct ignited latent European opposition to the Pastorate experiment, and precipitated a chorus of queries about the advisability of leaving native clergy unsupervised.\textsuperscript{255} Venn did not share these qualms,\textsuperscript{256} but then the Bishop was in a more direct line of fire.\textsuperscript{257} Beckles became strongly apprehensive that this contagion of "evil" would spread - "as native agency extends over 50 miles without supervision" - and urged Venn "that... unless a change is made in our present plan, failure must be the result".\textsuperscript{258} Pressure from his European colleagues made him proclaim that "the stations in each of the three districts ought in the opinion of all to have the advantage of European supervision and intercourse". He

\textsuperscript{254} Cf. CMS, C A1/O 2/199, 14 November 1864, Minutes of the Finance Committee; C A1/O 2/200, 21 November 1864, Special Finance Committee; C A1/O 64/26, 21 November 1864, Caiger to Venn. Wellington's misconduct came to light when his wife gave birth five months into their marriage; and his use of prevarication and deception to conceal the fact only added to the offence.

\textsuperscript{255} Both Governor Blackhall and the Colonial Secretary objected to the arrangement whereby the native Pastors were left in sole charge; and seem to have exerted great pressure on Beckles to modify the arrangements (CMS, C A1/O 25D/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn). According to Caiger, the Colonial Secretary "could not see the reason why the churches transferred to the Pastorate should be in every case under the superintendence of natives" (C A1/O 64/26, Caiger to Venn).

\textsuperscript{256} His response was philosophical. "I do not think", he told Beckles, "that the sad cases of Thomas and Wellington should discourage us. Such defections have ever been the mill-stone about the neck of the Gospel" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 484, 21 December 1864, Venn to Beckles). This was his reply to the flurry of pessimistic reports and forecasts from various European missionaries (cf. C A1/L7, pp. 484-485; pp. 486-487; pp. 489-492). Indeed, not only did Venn think that the defections in the Sierra Leone Church compared favourably to other infant churches, he also felt that "days of greater disappointment may be appointed".

\textsuperscript{257} Caiger reported that "the case of Mr Thomas and Wellington have opened the eyes of the Bishop to see that a far more active supervision is needful than has been exercised (CMS, C A1/O 64/26, 21 November 1864, Caiger to Venn).

\textsuperscript{258} CMS, C A1/O 25D/43, 20 December 1864, Beckles to Venn. He submitted that in the three years which had elapsed since the commencement of the Pastorate, four or more cases had come to his attention.
stipulated that European missionaries should be placed in each of these districts, as superintendents of the native Pastors, "if the Church and Ministry are to be, under God's blessing, kept from disgrace and contempt"; and indicated that the Colonial Government was prepared to assist "with a government grant of up to £300", if his proposal was carried into effect.\(^{259}\) It was indicative of Beckles' capriciousness that whereas four months earlier he had bemoaned the refusal of the native curates to leave the succour of European supervision, he now advocated European superintendence of the native Pastors. For good measure, he invoked the 12th article in the 'Articles of Arrangement', which made provision for a review and revision of its provisions (in the second or third year), "after it may have been sufficiently tested".\(^{260}\) The Bishop was on solid (constitutional) ground, but his proposal tended to defeat the purpose of the Pastorate experiment, reject its raison d'être, and betray its principles altogether. Again, the tension between dependence and independence - or, better still, the irreconcilable conflict between judicious subordination and the need for self-determination - seemed unsustainable; and only three years after the establishment of the Pastorate, its prime mover (in the person of the Bishop) was prepared to abandon its grand objective. But the reaction of its chief architect was one of unequivocal repudiation. Venn responded,

> The Committee have... been deeply concerned at the proposal you have made... [They] are not a little startled at the proposal of this retrograde step. The relations between European missionaries and Native Ministers is a difficult and often painful one under any circumstance: but they cannot conceive of the possibility of the European Missionaries resuming the proposed position after the Native Ministers have been for three years under the direct supervision of the Bishop. The Committee are so fully convinced that far greater evils would arise from the course you propose that

\(^{259}\) *ibid.* It was in this same letter that Beckles took Venn to task over the Society's failure to provide sufficient assistance for the Pastorate's building burden.

\(^{260}\) Cf. Appendix I.
they cannot concur in the proposed arrangements.\textsuperscript{261}

He added that the PC "easily understood the need of a restricted supervision" - a significant admission in itself - but recommended a completely different course of action. The PC's suggestion was that

native supervision should be first tried by appointing the most worthy native ministers superintendents of Districts, either as Commissaries or Rural Deans and requiring them to meet you frequently and report upon the work and behaviour of their brethren... Should you find one such superintendent really efficient he might be made an Archdeacon eventually. But this process of training the Native Church to self-government would be frustrated by the re-introduction of European Missionary superintendence.\textsuperscript{262}

The PC's recommendation must be seen as a clear indication of Venn's commitment to gradual and ultimate self-government. He instructed Caiger that the PC's letter to Beckles should be shown to all the European missionaries; for "knowing the determination of the Committee should enable you all to do your utmost, by brotherly influence and advice, to train up the native Pastors and prompt them to a sense of their responsibility".\textsuperscript{263} He emphasised that "such a retrograde step as the Bishop proposes would injure the cause throughout the world, for the eyes of all are now fixed on the Native

\textsuperscript{261} CMS, C A1/L7. p. 499, 20 January 1865, Venn to Beckles.

\textsuperscript{262} ibid. Venn communicated the PC's decision to the Missionary Secretary and other European missionaries, so that there would be no confusion over the issue, in the event Beckles was away from the colony. (cp. C A1/L7, pp. 500-501, 23 January 1865, Venn to C H Brierley; C A1/L7, p. 504, 23 January 1865, Venn to Caiger). He informed Caiger that the PC "feel on this point more strongly than they have thought it right to express to the Bishop".

\textsuperscript{263} CMS, C A1/L7, p. 504, 23 January 1865, Venn to Caiger. He ordered that Bishop Crowther, too, should be shown the letter as soon as he arrived in the colony. The PC was decidedly opposed to a return to European superintendence; and when they learnt, a month later, that a native Deacon had been appointed to Kissy Road Church under Hamilton's superintendence, they ruled that it was "most undesirable that after the Church was so long served by Mr Maxwell and afterwards by Jones it should be now placed under an European Missionary" (C A1/L7, p. 519, 23 February 1865, Secretaries to Caiger). "This step", they added, "would be in the wrong direction".
Church of Sierra Leone". But his most notable remark was that "if an European Bishop cannot properly superintend 12 or 15 native Pastors it is high time to have a native Bishop".

By this time, of course, the European Bishop in question had become disenchanted by the Pastorate's building and financial troubles, and disaffected in his relations with the CMS. His reply to Venn's letter was a catalogue of bitter complaints, and an expose of his disgruntled feelings. He complained that in return for his efforts in establishing the Pastorate he had met with "distrust and opposition"; and that the Finance Committee was given precedence (in Mission matters), and accorded more authority than the Bishop. On the main, Beckles' remarks were captious; though his resentment of the authority and independence enjoyed by the Europeans missionaries may not have been without foundation. The PC's recommendation that he should make a trial of native supervision exasperated the Bishop; and prompted an acrimonious reply:

264 ibid.
265 ibid. The italics are the writer's. This was the first clear indication that Venn may have considered a "native Bishop" a possibility in the Sierra Leone context. It was understandable, of course, that such a suggestion was hardly meat for general consumption at the time.
267 Again, he made the comment (he claimed was frequently made in England) that "the Society was the Bishop as it holds the purse strings".
268 He had discovered, for example, that with regards the management of the Society's schools, the Grammar School, and Fourah Bay college, the missionaries acted independently of him and rejected his authority. Venn's response was that in all matters which lay within the Bishop's "spiritual province" the PC "had never presumed to interfere"; and that "in secular matters... the Committee gave every thought to [his] suggestion as well as those which they receive from other quarters" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 5, 24 April 1865, Venn to Beckles).
You say to appoint trustworthy native Pastors as Commissaries or Rural deans, etc. You must first tell me where I am to find them, at any rate any fit for such offices; and then I must remind you when you speak of these offices, and another as Archdeacon, that these must exercise authority over Europeans also. If you know how such a proposal is received here I am sure the Society would not venture to suggest it.

He denied that he was advocating "the original arbitrary superintendence" by recommending European supervision; and claimed that he only wanted "European example and intercourse" to provide "a check which no native here will ever give to his neighbouring Pastor". However, Beckles' lack of reference to the role or scope of episcopal superintendence in such an arrangement was disingenuous. His failure in this area was undeniably the single most important cause of the problem under consideration; and his tacit disavowal of that fact was rather damning. Caiger reflected that it was "strange that with so small a Colony..., with no Church to serve, the Chief Pastor can never be seen occupying any of the pulpits in the villages or even visiting them excepting on occasions of confirmation or laying the Foundation stone of a Building". He argued elsewhere that "the great marvel... is that with such an entire absence of supervision, as has been the case for the past four years, no more cases of open and flagrant defection have been brought

---

269 The PC had always advocated that the native Pastors should benefit from the influence of, and intercourse with, European missionaries (cf. CMS, C A1/L7, p. 262, 23 October 1862, Venn to Jones; C A1/L7, p. 265, 23 October 1862, Secretaries to Jones); an arrangement which Venn urged on the missionaries (cf. C A1/L7, p. 279, 23 January 1863, Secretaries to Binns; C A1/L7, p. 501, 23 January 1865, Venn to C H Brierley). It is therefore difficult to escape the fact that Beckles, in seeking to go a step further, was in effect invoking the old dominance.

270 It was generally thought that native Pastors (and ministers) were prone to wink at misconduct and misdemeanours both amongst themselves and among their congregations (cf. CMS, C A1/0 64/41b, 19 June 1866, Caiger to Venn; C A1/M 17, p. 115, 25 April 1868, Sass to Venn) In the William Quaker case, for example, Miss Julia E Sass accused the native Pastors of condoning his sin (cf. C A1/M 17, pp. 221-225, 14 July 1868, Sass to Venn).

271 CMS, C A1/0 64/28, 23 March 1865, Caiger to Venn.
to light". Beckles made no further attempt to discuss the PC's proposal; and, indeed, made no further reference to the argument. In the light of his subsequent behaviour, this must be considered as a further indication of his growing apathy and loss of confidence in the Pastorate experiment. His manner towards the Society - if CMS missionary reports are to be believed - became openly hostile; and his relations with the European Missionaries reached a nadir. Hamilton and Caiger became special targets of his hostility, and every trifling misdemeanour - real or imaginary - resulted in a flurry of angry correspondence. Hamilton reported: "Our Bishop is a mystery to us. We do not know how to deal with him, it is as if we were walking upon a mine; and we know not the instant it may explode". Be that as

272 CMS, C A1/0 64/34, 18 November 1865, Caiger to Venn. He also commented that "from the frequency of the Bishop being in England", and (by consequence) the little oversight the native Pastors had received "the state of the Church in the Colony is much better than might have been expected (CMS, C A1/0 64/41b, 19 June 1866, Caiger to Venn).
273 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 64/28, 23 March 1865, Caiger to Venn. Caiger informed Venn that "the Bishop characterised the letter which he received from the Society as 'the most insolent and overbearing he had ever had from anyone', and other things which would grieve you as much to read as myself to write (ibid).
274 According to Caiger, Beckles terminated his subscription to the CMS Auxiliary and openly stated that "he would throw the weight of his influence to induce his friends in the Colony and at home to adopt the same course". Cf. C A1/0 64/31a, 19 May 1865, Caiger to Venn.
275 In April, that same year, when Hamilton accompanied Caiger on a visit to the Bullom and Sherbro stations - which were under Caiger's superintendence - they both came under heavy censure from the Bishop for neglecting their stations (cf. CMS, C A1/0 109/34, 12 April 1865, Hamilton to Venn, which encloses his correspondence with Beckles; C A1/0 64/29, 11 April 1865, Caiger to Venn; C A1/0 64/30, 17 April 1865, Caiger to Venn). The Bishop was also considerably irked by the ignominy of being subjected to the ministrations of a mere catechist at Hamilton's Cline's Town Church (cf. C A1/0 25D/49; C A1/0 64/29); and the fact that his subsequent attempt to have a catechist "licensed" (to preach) - claiming that "they must be under my supervision..., and must therefore require my sanction or licence for acting" - was rejected by the Society, no doubt added to his sense of impotence (cf. C A1/L8, p. 12, 23 May 1865, Secretaries to Beckles; C A1/0 25D/50, 19 July 1865, Beckles to Venn; C A1/L8, pp. 30-31, 23 August 1865, Venn to Beckles).
276 CMS, C A1/0 109/34a, 12 April 1865, Hamilton to Venn. Caiger referred to "our precarious position with the Bishop" (C A1/0 64/29, 11 April 1865, Caiger to Venn); and moaned that "it is no easy thing to preserve the
it may, the European missionary attitude towards the Bishop was by then increasingly one of mute disdain and grudging acquiescence. Venn had cause to warn the missionaries that "the providence of God had placed Dr Beckles in his position, and we must treat him, in all matters, with the deference due to the Bishop and not to the man". Such advice may have come too late. Antagonised, embittered, and alienated, the hapless Beckles gradually lost the respect and confidence "of the people, both European and native"; and, tragically, lost even a vestigial interest in his episcopal office. During his last five years in office (from May 1865 to mid-1870), he spent only about fourteen months in his diocese. The matter of his resigning the see, which had been mooted as early as 1863 (by Beckles himself), became a subject of intense speculation and the fond hope of many, in both the

interests of the Society when meeting with opposition from those so high in office" (C A1/0 64/31a, 19 May 1865, Caiger to Venn).

277 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 10, 24 April 1865, Venn to Caiger; cp. C A1/L7, p. 468, 21 September 1864, Venn to Hamilton. The PC explained that having had to deal with recalcitrant Bishops "at home for the first generation of Church Missionary supporters", Beckles' behaviour was "no mystery" to them (C A1/L8, p. 19, 23 May 1865, Secretaries to Caiger and Hamilton). They exhorted: "The true way of meeting such difficulties is by frank and immediate submission however painful in all points on which the Bishop has official authority; and upon all other points, silence and reserve".

278 CMS, C A1/0 45/12b, 21 April 1865, Binns to Col. Dawes. Binns reported that this was becoming evident to Beckles; and warned that "we may therefore expect serious consequences".

279 Beckles absences from his diocese (from 1865 onwards) became especially protracted; and lasted upward of a year at a time. During those 5 years, the Bishop spent an aggregate of some 3 years ten months (or 76.7% of the time) outside his sphere of labour. Cf. CMS, C A1/0 3/498b, /515, /520, /526; C A1/L8, p. 107; C A1/0 25D/53; C A1/0 164/36; C A1/0 64/54.

280 In 1863, Beckles, who had abruptly departed for England only seven months after returning to the colony (following a year's absence), indicated that he wished to resign on account of ill-health, and asked to be transferred to another diocese (cf. CO 267/279, 18 November 1863, Beckles to Colonial Secretary; CMS, C A1/L7, p. 380, 26 December 1863, Venn to Beckles). He returned to the colony in April 1864, but raised the question again, in August 1864, explaining that the Doctor had given his "candid opinion" that he would not be able to remain in the colony - "he thinks my constitution cannot stand the climate and regrets that I came out" - and had advised him "to obtain an appointment at home" (CMS, C A1/0 25D/37a, 9 August 1864, Beckles to Venn). "If you have any means of helping me", he told Venn, "I shall be helpful.
Venn submitted that there was "not the remotest chance" of Beckles being transferred to another diocese; though he eventually came to the conclusion that the colony was better without him.

The impact of Beckles' episcopal inefficiency - especially in its last five to six years - on the development of the Native Pastorate was inimical, to say the least. Of all his episcopal obligations, none was so critical or far-reaching as the need to nurture and shepherd the nascent Native Church. He was the head who was expected to pilot the ship of the Native Pastorate as it negotiated uncharted territory, faced the challenges of "manhood", and progressed along the road to ecclesiastical independence. This was Venn's great hope; and Beckles' failure to live up to this expectation constituted one of the most lamentable setbacks to the success and wellbeing of the Native Pastorate in the first decade of its existence. For one who was in a position to do so much, Beckles did little; and very nearly became the midwife who strangled the growing infant. His embattled ecclesiastical relations, his failed leadership, and even his want of character, were all detrimental to the interests of

281 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 64/28a, 23 March 1865, Caiger to Venn. In December 1865, Beckles proposed the addition of Madeira to his diocese in order that he made spend each summer in its salubrious climes (cf. CO 267/285; CMS, C A1/L8, p. 62, 23 December 1865, Venn to Caiger). Venn asserted that it could not "legally" be done; and added that both the Bishop of London and Governor Blackhall agreed that "there was far too much work to be done on the coast to allow of five or six months absence every year". He also mentioned that Beckles, who was reportedly suffering from "severe internal haemorrhages", might return to England (from Madeira), and "not improbably be compelled to resign" (cp. C A1/O 64/36a, 19 January 1866, Caiger to Venn).

282 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 10, 243 April 1865, Venn to Caiger.

283 In 1866, when Beckles' leave of absence was extended for two months, he commented: "I cannot say that I am sorry; for I gather from all accounts that things are much quieter in the Colony" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 90, 23 July 1866, Venn to Caiger.

284 "We do feel", commented Caiger, "that everything under God depends on the wisdom and sound judgement of the Bishop appointed over the diocese as to the success of the Native Pastorate" (CMS, C A1/O 64/11, 19 March 1863, Caiger to Venn).
the Native Church; but none so much as his prolonged absences. Nicol expressed this sentiment with deep feeling, when he wrote,

We have now arrived at that stage, that we require all the help, all the advice, the judgement, and discretion a Bishop is capable of, to lead our Church to maturity and consolidation. Questions may, and so often arise, which might require immediate solution, and the presence of an active leading mind on the spot, may contribute much to some satisfactory arrangement.

It was not to be. While the Bishop absented himself for prolonged periods the Pastorate was left without direction or leadership; the native Pastors were bereft of pastoral care; and critical issues relative to the Native Church's progress or welfare had to be addressed by his European Commissary (invariably the Secretary of the Mission). This last arrangement had one significant implication in that it let in European superintendence (by the back-door, as it were) and augmented the Society's propensity for remote control. Native superintendence would no doubt have been vociferously opposed by the European missionaries; but the possibility of two commissaries - one for the Mission and one for the Pastorate - was never contemplated. Certainly, Nicol, who was Secretary of the Pastorate, and enjoyed the respect of both native and European clergy (for some time), would have adequately filled the latter position. But Beckles never considered promoting either Nicol or Maxwell (the two oldest and most experienced native Pastors); and in 1865 he unwittingly sowed the seeds of the greatest crisis of his episcopacy. In July that year, he surprised everyone by expressing a desire to appoint Caiger "Rural Dean". But

---

285 Though it could be argued that the Bishop's absences at some points were of greater benefit than his presence.
286 CMS, C A1/0 164/27a, 20 February 1864, Nicol to Rev R Lang (CMS Secretary).
287 CMS, C A1/0 25D/50, 19 July 1865, Beckles to Venn. The decision was completely at variance with the hostile attitude which the Bishop had maintained for some time. He explained that Caiger "has more of the missionary spirit than most men, and as your Secretary... I feel that he is entitled and it would prevent any dissatisfaction". The Bishop's decision may have signified a change in his attitude to Caiger, as Venn
a cause for even greater astonishment is the fact that the PC, who had asseverated so strongly a few months earlier (in response to Beckles proposal for European supervision) that "even if he should propose to make any one of you rural Deans or Archdeacons the same objection would exist",288 cordially and unquestioningly concurred with the Bishop's intention.289 No one had opposed European superintendence more strenuously than Venn; yet he encouraged Caiger that the office (of Rural Dean) would place him "in the position of an elder brother among all the ministers - native and European"; and ventured that "the native Church will be greatly benefited by your appointment".290 This volte face is difficult to explain.291 Even if the PC had reasoned afresh that European missionary superintendence of the Native Church and Pastors was better than none at all (and therefore the lesser of two evils) their support of what they had earlier described as a "retrograde step" constituted quite a reversal of policy. Yet no other explanation seems feasible. Beckles' incompetence and absenteeism had left the affairs of the Pastorate in a lamentable state;292 and the fact that a cloud

wanted to believe (cf. C A1/L7, p. 504, 23 January 1865, Venn to Caiger); but a less favourable, if cynical, interpretation would be that it was a logical extension of his desire to spend more time outside his diocese. Caiger, at least, was perplexed by the sudden change in Beckles tone of communication, and confessed that the offer caused him "no little anxiety" (C A1/0 64/33a, 19 September 1865, Caiger to Venn).

289 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 30, 23 August 1865, Venn to Beckles; C A1/L8, p. 31, 23 August 1865, Venn to Caiger. When Beckles had raised the same question a year before, Venn had given his opinion that he would be much safer with a commissary; since it was an appointment which he could terminate at any time - unlike that of Dean of Archdeacon. It should also be added that the Diocese of Sierra Leone was much smaller (owing to Bishop Crowther's appointment) than it was in 1853, when Bishop Vidal made Graf an Archdeacon.

290 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 31, 23 August 1865, Venn to Caiger.
291 Indeed, Caiger was surprised as much by Beckles' offer as by the PC's approval of the appointment (C A1/0 64/33b, 19 September 1865, Extract of Caiger's reply to the Bishop - Re: offer of the position of Rural Dean).
292 There was no Church Council - the last one having been dissolved just before the Bishop's departure - and matters of business in the Pastorate had been accumulating for almost a year (cf. CMS, C A1/0 64/36, 19 January
of uncertainty hung over the continuance of his episcopacy only added to the problem. Based on these considerations, expediency was given precedence over policy; and Caiger's appointment may have seemed to Venn a blessing in disguise. He described the appointment as one, which, "when rightly exercised" was "fully adequate to the ordinary needs of the Church: and... having respect to the two races". He expressed his concern that "when the bond of Mission was removed" the native Pastors seemed "to have been left as individuals to themselves; and encouraged Caiger to "go among the Native Pastors as an elder brother", to give them "support and assistance", and "persuade them to meet often together in parties of two or three". When Beckles proved dilatory in confirming the appointment, Venn instructed Caiger to take upon himself "to act as the only person in the Colony who had any delegated power of superintendence from the Bishop"; and to regard himself "as invested by the Society with a general superintendence of its interests, entitled to enquire into the affairs of the Native Pastorate: for the Churches and houses are still the property of the Society". This statement revealed the invincible hold which the CMS held on the Native Pastorate. Venn's concern was unarguably for the welfare of the Native Church; and he

1866, Caiger to Venn).

293 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 53, 23 October 1865, Venn to Caiger. Venn explained that "the law and constitution of our Church recognises the office, but have never defined the inherent powers of the office, as in the case of Archdeacon". All that the office conferred on Caiger was "the right of precedence and of supervision as the Bishop's representative over the rest of the clergy". He cautioned: "You have no power to enforce any directions or regulations as from yourself. Whatever authority or jurisdiction you exercise can only be by the express direction of the Bishop and in his name".

294 ibid.

295 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 62, 23 December 1865, Venn to Caiger. Caiger had complained that the Bishop had taken no step to make the appointment public (CMS, C A1/O 64/35, 20 December 1865, Caiger to Venn). He reported that only the European brethren knew about his appointment to the office; and expressed his "desire that the Bishop himself should show the native Pastors that I had no hand in seeking it" (CMS, C A1/O 64/43, 18 November 1865, Caiger to Venn).
evinced a determination to provide for its ecclesiastical necessities, in the event the unpredictable Beckles failed to go through with the appointment. Nonetheless, his directive favoured a reversal to CMS control; and though the merits of such a proceeding were clear from the Society's standpoint, the long term benefit to the Native Pastorate was extremely doubtful. It is disappointing that he made no attempt to promote Nicol's elevation to a position of greater responsibility - a move which would not only have enhanced self-government but would also have been a natural extension of the high expectation he had expressed about Nicol five years before. It must remain a moot question whether Nicol's elevation (say, to a supervision of his brethren) would have been effective or accepted. Caiger approached the task of visitation and supervision with understandable "fear and great trembling, knowing the extreme difficulties connected with it and the painful sensitiveness of the native Brethren to any such things". He mentioned, significantly, that the native Pastors "have the impression that immediately on their transfer from the Society to the Pastorate... they are removed from all supervision excepting from the Bishop". These considerations weighed on Caiger's mind, and induced him to ask Nicol to work with him in carrying out Venn's instructions. Their visitation of the various districts unearthed an insidious problem, common to almost all the Pastorate stations, which posed an even greater threat to the authority and independent action of the native Pastors than European supervision. The problem was the system of "Church Leaders" (also referred to as class leaders), which had been in existence in CMS stations for over forty years. The number and influence of these church leaders had grown to such an extent that nothing of

296 Cf. note 78, supra.
297 CMS, C A1/0 64/36a, 19 January 1866, Caiger to Venn.
298 CMS, C A1/0 64/37, 16 February 1866, Caiger to Venn. Whether out of a fear (of rebuff from the native Pastors) or from the need for extreme tact, the move showed good judgement.
importance could be done in the church without their consent; and the unwary Pastor who crossed them only met with troubles. Caiger declared that "as helpers to the Pastor the great majority of them utterly fail"; and that "they were generally the instigators of any opposition to any charitable effort made by the Pastor". His well-meaning attempts to find a solution struck a chord with the native Pastors, and it was made the subject of open consultation at the half-yearly conference. Eventually, the system was abolished, by popular consent; and the church leaders were replaced with annually selected "lay helpers", who were installed in office by the Bishop. These "lay helpers" were to "keep class under the direction of the minister", "visit an assigned portion of the district and report to the Pastor regularly", "assist in collecting for an charitable project", and "maintain order in the Church". This was a significant reform; and one which was rendered more so by the collaborative effort (of a European missionary working with the native Pastors) which brought it about. Unfortunately, the rapprochement was shortlived. The dispute over the allocation of class pence, already referred to, fractured the makeshift alliance and revealed the polarisation of (European and native) attitudes. The appointment of a Rural Dean was an expedient necessitated by Beckles' inefficiency and

299 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 64/39, 19 April 1866, Caiger to Venn. Since the position was "for life", the Pastor was unable to remove any "Church Leader"; and tribal allegiance, and other loyalties (which predated his arrival) often constituted a stone-wall of opposition and resistance to his leadership. The fact that the same persons always constituted the managing body of the Church Relief Company only added to his problems; for the interests of the Company were put before the affairs of the Church.

300 Ibid.; cp. C A1/O 64/36, 19 January 1866, Caiger to Venn; C A1/O 64/40, 19 May 1866, Caiger to Venn.

301 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 9/56b, Meeting of Church Committee, 27 February 1867.

302 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 64/51a, 30 March 1867, Caiger to Venn. Venn described the change as "very desirable and judicious" (C A1/L8, p. 86, 23 May 1866, Venn to Caiger); and Caiger attested that "such steps will eventually remove many hindrances and obstacles from the work of the Pastors (cf. C A1/O 64/50, 12 January 1867, Caiger to Venn).

303 CMS, C A1/O 9/56b, Meeting of Church Committee, 27 February 1867.
dereliction of duty. But, whatever the merits of the appointment, it was no substitute for the presence, impartial judgement, and effective leadership of a competent Diocesan. For all his well-disposed intentions towards the Native Church, Caiger was a European (with a European's attitude and prejudices), who instinctively sought to impose European cultural standards; and whose first loyalty was to the CMS. To a very large extent, his appointment (as well as Venn's direct support of his supervision of the native Pastors) could only injure the Native Pastorate in the long run. It was arguably also a betrayal of the principle of self-government, which was a cardinal objective of the Native Pastorate, and one which the native Pastors (notably George Nicol) looked to with undiminished expectation. In that respect, Caiger's appointment may have aggravated an abiding resentment at European domination; and awakened latent desires for self-determination. In the event, the closing years of Beckles' episcopate witnessed an explosion of racial conflict, a dissolution of every semblance of harmonious cooperation across the racial divide, and the first significant - albeit, hesitant - bid for ecclesiastical independence.

304 Caiger argued that "the novelty of such a position... in a diocese of such small extent", and "the needlessness of such an appointment" under ordinary circumstances, would add to the difficulties of such an office (C A1/O 64/33a, 19 September 1865, Caiger to Venn).

305 He argued, for example, that the "winking at heathen and country fashions and customs... such as wakes" was "the great drawback" to the efficiency of the native Pastors, and showed "an absolute want of right discipline amongst members of the Church" (CMS, C A1/O 64/41b, 19 June 1866, Caiger to Venn).
Chapter IV

The Race Controversy and Nationalism: Interlude or Prelude

Race distinctions will probably rise in intensity with the progress of the Mission... They are comparatively weak in the early stages of a mission, because all the superiority is on one side; but as the native race advances in intelligence, as their powers of arguing strengthens, as they excel in writing sensational statements, as they become our rivals in the pulpit and on the platform, long cherished but dormant prejudices, and even passions, will occasionally burst forth...

By 1865 the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate Church had become an established phenomenon within the Sierra Leone Colony: a distinctive and familiar ecclesiastical entity. But its teething troubles were far from over. The end of Beckles' episcopate saw an intensification of racial conflict which was nurtured by a ground swell of nationalistic sentiments in the colony, and escalated into a full-blown race controversy. Racial tension - the palpable strain caused by the challenge which native development posed to European superiority and domination - had been evident in the Sierra Leone Mission since the 1850s (after the advent of native ministers like Nicol and Maxwell, who were intellectual equals of the majority of their European counterparts). But it became increasingly manifest as the education of the native ministers improved and their aspirations increased;

2 Binns claimed it was much better understood by the people, but fails to elaborate (CMS, C A1/0 45/26, 17 August 1866, Binns to Colonel Dawes).
3 Note, for example, the furore which erupted immediately after these two returned to the Mission from England, in 1849.
4 In the months prior to the establishment of the Native Pastorate Beckles complained that there was "by no means the good fellowship that ought to exist between the Native and European clergy" (C A1/0 25D/6, 18 May 1861, Beckles to Venn), and that the clergy were "against each other" (C A1/0 25D/20, 21 September 1861, Beckles to Venn). Even the PC confessed that they were all "too well aware of the difficulties and often mutual jealousies which exist between European missionary and aspiring native Teachers" (C A1/L7, p. 339, 16 October 1863, Instructions of the Committee to Missionaries... returning to Sierra Leone).
inevitably, the establishment of an "independent" Native Church, which fostered those aspirations, provoked a more open climate of hostility. It has to be said, however, that Venn's emphatic rejection of European supervision in the Native Church, and his insistence that a distinction should be maintained between European missionary operation and the ministry of the native Pastors, created a sharp divide - a vacuum even - where none had previously existed, and helped to accentuate a hitherto quiescent racial consciousness. T E Yates argues that this was "the price which Venn paid for a farsighted policy". Even so, Venn under-estimated the potential disruptiveness of ethnocentric strife, and, in the early days, showed a tendency to dismiss racial conflict as an unavoidable by-product of the transition process. He was also pre-disposed to blame native ambition for much of the troubles, while holding on to the mistaken belief that the relative spiritual maturity of the European missionaries would enable them to rise above racial animosity. Moreover, his conviction that the Native Pastorate still needed the

---

5 Yates (1978), agrees that "in order to wean the African from European dependence, and the European from his own dominance in church government and development, he [Venn] was forced into producing a potential division, supposedly overcome in the person of the bishop in the scheme, but open to racial exploitation" (p. 132.).

6 Cf. CMS, C A1/L6, p. 152, 15 October 1856, Venn to Milward; C A1/L8, 21 May 1867, Venn to Beckles. The native ministers' "transition to independence will be marked by many outbreaks", he warned Hamilton; "we must not be extreme to mark what is done amiss" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 195, 28 November 1861, Venn to Hamilton).

7 "A jealousy of races", he warned, "will stir up human nature on both sides, but divine grace should check the evil" (CMS, C A1/L7, p. 17, 23 September 1859, Venn to Wiltshire). Commenting on the issue, the PC told European missionaries returning to Sierra Leone: "The Committee have confidence in you brethren, that you will rise above these things. You have given your lives to Africa, give your hearts to Africa's sons - it is a small sacrifice after the first. Treat them as fellow recipients of divine grace. That will settle every controversy" (C A1/L7, p. 339, 16 October 1863, Instructions of the Committee to Missionaries... returning to Sierra Leone). Even when Venn has realised that European ethnocentrism contributed to the troubles he urged the missionaries to meet native agitation with "the spirit of the Apostle, who had learned to bear all things for the elect's sake" (cf. paper 'On Nationality', 1868 (Knight, op. cit.,pp. 282-289), p. 285).
benefit of European "influence" - as seen, for example, in his endorsement of Caiger's appointment - was intrinsically at odds with the spirit of the experiment and ran counter to the current of an incipient nationalism in the colony. This last factor was a key element in the zeitgeist of the period, and played a crucial role in the ethnocentric controversy which surfaced in 1868 and lasted till 1873.

In 1865, a Select Committee was formed by the British government "to determine whether the West African colonies furthered or obstructed British policy". At the end of its inquiry, the Committee's main resolution was that the object of British policy "should be to encourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible more and more to transfer to them the administration of all the Governments, with a view to our ultimate withdrawal from all, except, probably, Sierra Leone". Although Sierra Leone was exempted, this resolution was greeted by the native intelligentsia in the colony as an important step towards granting self-government in West Africa, and an affirmation of native capability. An early advocate of this point of view was Dr Africanus Horton, a Sierra Leonean physician (whose adopted name denoted his African patriotism). His book, West African Countries and Peoples, British and Native. With the Requirements necessary for Establishing that Self-Government recommended by the Committee of the House of

8 "Anything which brings the native Pastor under European pastoral influence, the better for the Native Church", he contended (cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 58, 23 November 1865, Venn to Binns).
10 ibid. p. 339. Pyfe comments that the Resolution "made little practical change in existing Colonial Office policy, beyond giving sanction to the distaste for further annexations, without obliging the abandonment of any settlement already held and estimated for".
11 James Africanus Beale Horton (1835-1883), was born at Gloucester, of recaptive parents. In 1859, he qualified as a medical doctor in Britain, and served as an officer in the British army in West Africa. For details of his life and writings, see Pyfe, Africanus Horton 1835-1883: West African Scientist and Patriot, 1972; and D Nicol, Africanus Horton: The Dawn of Nationalism in Modern Africa., 1969.
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Commons 1865; and a Vindication of the African Race (published in 1868), included a vindication of African capabilities — in rebuttal of current theories about the inferiority of the negro race — and a cogent advocacy of African nationalism. Horton believed that the Select Committee's resolution had "set on foot... that great principle of establishing independent African nationalities", and argued that Sierra Leone was "the place on the Coast that the British Government... could give up to self-government with hope of success". He declared that "the inhabitants of the Colony have been gradually blending into one race, and a national spirit is being developed"; and also that "there is growing at Sierra Leone an enlightened population", who "under the fostering care of the mother Government... can, within a short time, be left to govern themselves". Horton went on to suggest a host of educational (and economic) reforms, which included a recommendation that "Fourah Bay College should henceforth be made the University of West Africa". His views reflected

12 Fyfe (1972) points out that Horton "realized that if such theories were generally adopted, there would be no hope of carrying out the 1865 resolutions"; for the simple reason that "no one would be interested in the advancement of Africans if they believed that Africans were incapable of advancing" (p. 69).


14 ibid., p. 45f.

15 Nicol, p. 45.

16 ibid., p. 47. To this end, he proposed the election of natives to the Legislative Council and the revival of the Freetown Municipality; and suggested that ultimately the best form of self-government would be a monarchy (Fyfe, 1962, p. 347). He asserted "that with an enlightened monarch, elected by universal suffrage, and an efficient legislature, the African element, so essential to African civilization, will receive a powerful impetus to intelligent progress... (Nicol, p. 47).

17 Nicol, p. 98f.; Fyfe (1972), p. 76f. Like most of the nineteenth century Sierra Leonean elite, who owed their status to the educational enterprise of Missionary Societies, Horton saw education as the key to native advancement; though it must be stressed that he wanted universal education. It is also worth noting that just two years earlier, Venn had lamented "the omission of a proper provision for a superior education for the ministry and for the learned professions, which ought to have been raised as a superstructure upon the excellent foundation of the Grammar School" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 99, 23 August 1866, Venn to Quaker).
an incipient African nationalism which had began to capture the minds of the leading natives in the colony and to influence some members of the native clergy. If the Sierra Leone colony was seen as the perfect model for self-government in West Africa, the Native Pastorate was increasingly regarded as the microcosm of an independent African Church and "a revivication of the early African Churches". It was argued, for example, that the establishment of "a purely Native Church" in the colony was "the glory of Africa", and an indication of her "gradual progress... towards Christian civilization". This concept took root among the native clergy (especially the younger native ministers), and became known as "Ethiopianism": a term which derived its meaning from the scriptural proclamation that "Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God". The foremost advocate of this ecclesiastical brand of African nationalism was Rev James Johnson, the young curate of Christ Church. Ayandele argues that "he was the earliest and most

20 Psalm 68:31. This text was interpreted to be a prediction that Ethiopia (symbolic of Africa) would once again embrace Christianity (cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/3, Sermon preached at Trinity Church, Kissy Road on May 13, 1867, on behalf of the Pastorate Auxiliary by Rev J Johnson). For a thorough definition of the "Ethiopianism", see E A Ayandele, Holy Johnson: Pioneer of African Nationalism, 1836-1917, 1970, pp. 44-47. Ayandele argues, for example, that this West African Ethiopianism was "quite different from the popular one associated with Central, Eastern and Southern Africa" (p. 44).
21 James Johnson (nicknamed 'Holy Johnson') is described in the CMS Register as "a colony-born Christian of the Aku race". He was educated at both the Grammar School and Fourah Bay College, and after his ordination by Bishop Beckles in March 1863 was stationed at Christ Church, Pademba Road, where he remained till the CMS transferred him to the Breadfruit Church (Lagos) in 1874. Though he never joined the Native Pastorate he became one of its most vigorous supporters. His biography by E A Ayandele, Holy Johnson: Pioneer of African Nationalism 1836-1917, 1970, is a detailed and authoritative work, which, however, tends to hyperbolise his importance and emphasize his achievements at the expense of some of his contemporaries. Nonetheless, it does establish that James Johnson (who was consecrated Assistant Bishop of the Niger Delta in 1900) was one of the most dynamic and resourceful native clergymen to emerge in
outspoken advocate of an African Church which would be African in personnel, in liturgy, in hymnology, in rituals, in theology and in forms accommodating to the racial peculiarities and customs of Africans compatible with the verities of the Christian faith".

In a sermon preached on the fifth anniversary of the Pastorate Auxiliary (in 1867), Johnson proclaimed:

The Native Church of this colony is the centre of Christian civilization to all Africa... Africa has been the basest of kingdoms: the judgement of the Lord has rested upon her for her negligence to disseminate Christian truth in the days of her spiritual glory and she stood long deprived of it; but Africa is to rise once more; Ethiopia is to stretch out her hands unto God, her tears are to be wiped off her eyes...; her scores of cathedrals and Bishops are to be restored; her Christian colleges are to be re-established; her native literature is to be revived... The Native Church of this colony is expected to do this work.

In its essence therefore, Ethiopianism was the offspring of a union between African nationalism and Venn's Pastorate experiment; and Ayandele would have us believe that James Johnson was the mid-wife. But Johnson's was not a lone voice in the wilderness. Between 1867 and 1871, Ethiopianism became a recurrent theme in reports of the Pastorate Auxiliary, and its grand vision was often employed to solicit greater liberality toward the Native Pastorate. The older and more experienced Pastors like Nicol were wary of the utopian notions which the concept engendered; and he admonished his brethren that "mere talking... of the progress of Africa, of the rise of the African, of the intelligence and prosperity of our colony will do no good"; for "if Africa is to rise, Africans themselves must be the foremost to put their shoulders to the wheel". But even he pronounced that "now is the day of Africa's regeneration". Thus the

nineteenth century West Africa.

23 CMS, C A1/0 9/3, Sermon preached at Trinity Church, Kissy Road on May 13, 1867, on behalf of the Pastorate Auxiliary by Rev J Johnson.
24 Cf. Reports of the Pastorate Auxiliary.
25 CMS, C A1/0 9/5, Sermon preached by the Rev G Nicol, [July 1869].
conviction grew that not only were Africans capable of handling their own affairs, they were also the best suited to do so. The sixth annual report of the Pastorate Auxiliary, for instance, pointed out that there was "no limit... to the beneficial influence which the Pastors might exert upon the community at large"; and contrasted their "wholesome" impact to the "fluctuating" influence of the European missionary, who "with all his zeal to benefit his congregation often finds to his great regret that an absence of six months in England, for the benefit of his health, is enough to check his influence and retard, if not altogether destroy the progress of well laid plans..." The upsurge of nationalism undoubtedly fuelled the desire for ecclesiastical independence; but, in the early days, there was no thought of rejecting European involvement. The native ministers were prepared to work alongside European missionaries - who, in any case, formed an integral part of the Pastorate administration - as long as the association was one of equality, and as long as ultimate self-government was kept in view. The fact that the European missionaries persisted in their notions of superiority, and evinced little sympathy for native aspirations, made conflict unavoidable. As nationalistic sentiments took root, the collision took on an increasing anti-European tinge, and produced the first definitive call for ecclesiastical independence.

A. Race Conflict

Soon after the Native Pastorate was established, the PC ruled that "the Native pastors should no longer meet in a missionary conference", and that the conference "must be henceforth confined to the missionaries and their missionary

---

26 CMS, C A1/O 9/4, Sixth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary for the year ending 30 April 1868. It argued that the native Pastors who had replaced European missionaries were "in a condition to know more of the people's wants, their fears, their little plans, and schemes for their material benefit".
agents". This ruling was in keeping with Venn's policy of separation, and it effectively brought formal interaction between the native Pastors (as a body) and European missionaries to an end. However, it was reversed in 1863, when Beckles (who had been absent from the colony at the time of the ruling) complained to Venn that such an arrangement was "far from being desirable", since it served to widen the breach which already existed between the two groups. The half yearly meetings were then converted to "clerical meetings", where the entire body of native Pastors and ministers met with the European missionaries. The half yearly conference thus became the centrepiece of racial disharmony and conflict, by virtue of being the sole forum of formal interaction between the two groups - outside the Church Committee and Council.

Before 1868, relations between the native Pastors and their European brethren was characterised by an uneasy, but workable, alliance. This was mainly due to the fact that the recurrent friction between Bishop Beckles and the European missionaries curtailed the latter's domination of Pastorate affairs. As such, even when a Bishop's Commissary (invariably a European missionary) was appointed, the native Pastors were left very much to themselves - a state of affairs which reinforced their sense of independence, and

---

27 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 200, 23 December 1861, Secretaries to Jones. It will be remembered that before the establishment of the Pastorate, the native ministers and European missionaries met at half yearly conferences, which were meant "to foster unity in fellowship and to bring information, experience, and judgment to bear upon the general management of the Mission (Shenk [1983], p. 50).

28 CMS, C A1/O 25D/29, 20 April 1863, Beckles to Venn. He argued that "the advantages which might be obtained from the experience of the Europeans is entirely lost", while "on the other hand, the Europeans knew nothing of what is being done in the other stations..."

29 In a shift from his earlier position, Venn argued that "anything which brings the native Pastors under European pastoral influence, the better for the Native Church"; though he hastened to add that by "influence" he meant "example and counsel"; for "authoritative superintendence can only be exercised by the Bishop" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 58, 23 November 1865, Venn to Binns). A proper missionary conference was held separately.
minimised racial tension.\textsuperscript{30} There was also the fact that, for a while at least, Nicol (the senior Pastor and Secretary of the Pastorate) enjoyed a close and confidential relationship with both Caiger and Hamilton (who were Secretary and Treasurer, respectively, of the Finance Committee).\textsuperscript{31} Nicol collaborated with his European colleagues in the Church Council and Committee, exercised considerable influence in Church government, and acted as a mediator between the missionaries and the Native Pastors.\textsuperscript{32} He even interceded between Beckles and the European missionaries; and could claim that he had succeeded in bringing an understanding between them.\textsuperscript{33} But the climate of mutual distrust which characterised relations between the native Pastors and their European brethren made his mediative role unsustainable. His friendship with the European Brethren was "sufficient to stir up suspicion" about his actions; and his compatriots began to accuse him of "leaning more on the side of the Europeans", and questioned his "fidelity to the native Church".\textsuperscript{34} Even more significantly, the dispute over class payments brought him into open conflict with his European colleagues for the first time, and sowed seeds of doubt on both sides about the survival of

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. CMS, C A1/0 64/36a, 19 January 1866, Caiger to Venn.

\textsuperscript{31} In 1865, Hamilton informed Venn that he and his wife were spending a few days with the Nicols at Regent (CMS, C A1/0 109/33, 24 March 1865, Hamilton to Venn; cp. C A1/0 109/32c).

\textsuperscript{32} His position was thoroughly appreciated by Venn, who regarded it as pivotal to gradual and complete settlement of the Native Church (cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 221, 22 August 1868, Venn to Nicol).

\textsuperscript{33} CMS, C A1/0 164/30, 20 October 1864, Nicol to Venn. In 1866, he asserted that "for four years I have stood firmly by Mr Caiger and my European Brethren in all their struggles with the Bishop" (C A1/0 164/31, 19 October 1866, Nicol to Venn).

\textsuperscript{34} C A1/0 164/31, 19 October 1866, Nicol to Venn. The fact that Nicol often supported European missionary action which his native brethren regarded as oppressive alienated him from some of his native brethren (cf. C A1/M 17, p. 89, 27 April 1868, Nicol to Hamilton). He incurred their chagrin, for instance, by siding with the European missionaries when Rev J Robbin (a native Pastor) was summarily removed from the Waterloo Mission House (in 1864), on the grounds that the Pastorate should provided him with a house.
their friendly association. This dispute also provided an early indication that a lasting alliance across the racial divide, on matters affecting the interests of the Pastorate, was virtually impossible. However, Venn's warning that it would "be an evil day for Sierra Leone" if he was "ever found to be on the antagonistic side", put Nicol under enormous pressure to work at a lasting harmony; and helps to explain why he reacted with strong disapprobation to the first manifestations of ethnocentric conflict.

The first incident occurred in 1866 when an incendiary letter appeared in the Observer (a local newspaper) claiming that upon taking charge of the Wilberforce station, the Rev G J Macauley had - on account of his "colour" - been refused the use of the Mission house and had instead been placed in "a hovel, a little better than a goat-pen". The letter "created a stir in Freetown"; and Caiger (who was Superintendent of Wilberforce) immediately required Macauley to comment on the "scurrilous" allegations. In the flurry of correspondence which ensued between the two, Macauley declined to contradict any of the statements in the 'Probitas' letter; and, when pressed, intemperately denounced Caiger's "disgraceful prejudice" and hatred for his colour, which he claimed Caiger had exhibited in denying him the use

---

35 Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 110, 23 September 1866, Venn to Nicol.
36 He later confessed that he "not only scold[ed] but gave the cold shoulder to some of my native brethren" (CMS, C A1/0 164/39a, 25 May 1868, Nicol to Venn).
37 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 141/9. The letter (dated 16 August 1866) was addressed to the editor, and signed "Probitas". In an unbridled attack on the conduct and attitude of the European missionaries, the writer asserted that "their ignorance and interference combine to make them regard their darker brethren as inferior to them in every respect, humanity not excepted, and they take advantage of every opportunity in the most striking manner, to assert their assumed superiority".
38 CMS, C A1/0 3/513, 18 September 1866, Caiger to Secretaries. He reported that "several of the native merchants who are hostile to our work have made it the occasion of saying the most bitter things".
39 CMS, C A1/0 141/10, 5 September 1866, Caiger to Macauley.
of the Mission house. Caiger was distressed by Macauley's accusation, but took great comfort from the fact that Nicol and the other native Pastors and ministers (with the notable exception of Rev James Johnson) condemned Macauley's behaviour. Nothing came of the "Probitas" affair, for Macauley afterwards retracted his letters and apologised to Caiger for his behaviour. However, the incident exposed an undercurrent of rebellion and antipathy, which had begun to manifest itself in the colony, and foreshadowed things to come. What is significant is that the principal agitators were Afro-West Indians in the colony. Sharing nothing of their Sierra Leonean brethren's ineradicable sense of indebtedness to European philanthropy and missionary enterprise, and evincing a proclivity for political

40 ibid., 10 September 1866, Macauley to Caiger. He also endorsed the sentiments expressed by 'Probitas'.
41 Cf. letters to Venn (CMS, C A1/0 64/44, 20 August 1866 and C A1/0 64/45, 17 September 1866). Caiger expressed his personal grief that Macauley, who had been his curate since his ordination, should display such "bitter ingratitude". He argued that the Finance Committee had simply taken the course laid down by the PC in the case of Waterloo (when they had instructed that the Mission house should be withheld); and explained that two Europeans had previously occupied the house in question.
42 ibid. Some of the native Pastors, as well as Menzies, apparently recommended Macauley's dismissal; but Caiger (in order to avoid the appearance of "personal retaliation") suggested that the PC's action should only "take the form of a censure".
43 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 141/11, 13 & 14 September 1866, Macauley to Caiger; C A1/0 14/2, 21 November 1866, Macauley to Venn. The PC was happy to let the matter rest; but Venn chastised Macauley for having exhibited an "unkind and ungrateful spirit", which was "quite inconsistent with the fraternal bond which unites us all together in a holy work" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 112, 23 October 1866, Venn to G J Macauley).
44 West Indian presence in Sierra Leone dated back to the establishment of a West Indian Regiment in 1819, and the subsequent immigration of other Afro-West Indians (cf. Fyfe, pp. 133, and 135ff). Possessing significant advantages in education and sophistication (compared to the other settlers and the comparatively under-developed Liberated Africans), and better able to withstand the climate than the Europeans (cf. Fyfe, 1962, p. 211), they rose to prominent positions in the colonial administration, and, by the mid-nineteenth century, had become a powerful force in Freetown.
45 Describing mid-nineteenth Freetown, P E H Hair writes: "European missionaries, together with a few colonial officials, formed the ruling group, towards which the attitudes of the populace were in the main the
activism, West Indians frequently led attacks on government policy and openly criticised European missionary actions.46 The fact that most of the newspapers established in the colony between 1855 and 1870 were West Indian owned, speaks volumes for their influence.47 Caiger reported that a number of them were getting among the more intelligent young people, and were "infusing a spirit of dissatisfaction" in them which was "spreading... to the more illiterate".48 He also revealed that 'Probitas' was Rev M Maurice, a young coloured West Indian clergyman, "formerly attached to the Pongas Mission", who was seeking employment in the colony.49 The "spirit of discontent" manifested itself again at the half yearly conference held in April 1867, where papers were presented by the younger native ministers on the subject "The Native Church, its Wants".50 Nicol reported that the paper presented by Macauley "was throughout a vague, spiteful, and most disagreeable production; disrespectful to the Bishop, and injurious to the character, piety and devotedness of the European missionaries, and the interest of the CMS...", and


46 Nicol confirmed: "There is a set of dissatisfied laymen in town who are continually harping against the acts of Government. No act, no law, is right in their eyes. Thus our resolutions in Committee, our decisions in council are taken out and canvassed; and some of our younger clergy are drawn by these men out of the real path of rectitude" (CMS, C A1/O 164/34, 16 April 1867, Nicol to Venn).

47 See Fyfe's article 'The Sierra Leone Press in the Nineteenth Century' in Sierra Leone Studies, (June 1857) 8, 226-236. As a case in point, The Observer was owned by W C Walcott, an Afro-West Indian (cp. Fyfe, 1962, p. 330).

48 CMS, C A1/O 64/50d, 12 January 1867, Caiger to Venn.

49 CMS, C A1/O 3/513, 18 September 1866, Caiger to Secretaries. However, his complaint that Macauley had the "bad fortune to be found in close connection by marriage with Mr Ezzidio, an influential native merchant, who possessed a secret but rooted enmity to our Church" (C A1/O 64/45b, 17 September 1866, Caiger to Venn) seems to be rather wide of the mark (cf. Fyfe's article 'The life and times of John Ezzidio' in Sierra Leone Studies, 4 [1955], 213-223).

calling up again that most unpleasant... affair of Wilberforce House". The paper precipitated such ill-feeling that the meeting was adjourned to the next day. The remaining papers were read without incident; but James Johnson took advantage of the general discussion which followed to re-open what Nicol described as the "old and exploded prejudice of colour". Johnson remarked that it was a natural impossibility for a white man to love a black man, and asserted that lack of harmony among the native clergy, and the want of union between the European and native clergy were among the disabilities of the Native Church. The older ministers was discomfited by the bellicosity of the young native ministers, and most of them disclaimed any knowledge of racial prejudice on the part of their European Brethren. In the absence of any conclusive proof (from either Johnson or Macauley) the conference issued a stern warning that "the bad spirit, if unchecked, will spread among many of the junior clergy". Nicol moaned that "never was a conference held here in which so much ill-feeling manifested itself". He condemned the actions of the native ministers as "most unbecoming"; and, like Caiger, attributed their antagonism to the influence of the West Indian element. Venn seemed to reject this explanation; and

---

51 Hamilton also reported that Macauley "took the occasion in the paper he read to abuse his elder native brethren, the missionaries, the Church Committee and Council, and also the Bishop" (CMS, C A1/0 3/518, 15 April 1867, Hamilton to Secretaries).

52 Bishop Beckles was reportedly so incensed by the presentation that he was only prevented from walking out of the conference by the intervention of the senior native clergy; and Macauley was forced to apologise for his remarks.


54 Ironically, this dichotomy between the older and younger clergy took on historical significance when Macauley and his colleagues became the older clergy by the late 1880s.

55 CMS, C A1/0 164/34, 16 April 1867, Nicol to Venn.

56 ibid.; cp. CMS, C A1/0 9/56, 18 January 1867, Minutes of Church Committee. "The free and perhaps unguarded intercourse of these young men with some worldly young men in the city", he complained, "does them no good at all". He added, however, that the "bad feeling" was confined to
insisted that "the transition from a missionary system to a Native Church is in every country a season of peril, of personal collisions, of outbursts of jealousies, etc..."\(^{57}\) He ventured that "the feelings manifested in a few are a besetting sin of too many native Pastors in other Missions" and "a root of bitterness... which may in time be cast out by prayer, faith, and love in the sounder parts of the Pastorate".\(^{58}\) But the "root of bitterness" was more pervasive than Venn allowed; and beneath the semblance of unity and brotherhood (which some like Nicol were anxious to preserve)\(^{59}\) was a sub-current of mutual distrust and suspicion. In any case, European sensibilities were deeply wounded by the two incidents; and latent feelings of animosity were re-awakened. Exactly a year later, the smothering tension erupted into open hostility over a matter that would have been laughably insignificant but for its unintended consequences.

(i) The Asylum Affair
The details of the circumstances which lead to the closure of the Orphanage Asylum at Kissy (in 1868) are more than a little obscured by the partisan and impassioned manner in which the various sides represented the story. But, in an atmosphere already charged with latent distrust and suppressed antipathies, its main significance lay in its catalytic effect. The Orphanage Asylum had been set up to meet the needs of destitute children in the colony

the two missionary curates, Johnson and Macauley, and that "the chief ground of the dissatisfaction and opposition to the European missionaries" was salaries.

\(^{57}\) CMS, C A1/L8, p. 148, 21 May 1867, Venn to Beckles. He explained that the painful occurrence at the conference could easily be paralleled in India and elsewhere; and that the PC saw "no reason for discouragement".

\(^{58}\) CMS, C A1/L8, p. 155, 23 May 1867, Venn to Nicol.

\(^{59}\) A year later, Nicol wrote, "We are going on nicely in our work. Our younger clergy are doing well, and working harmoniously together" (CMS, C A1/O 164/38, 27 February 1868, Nicol to Venn). As it turned out, this was the calm before the storm.
(especially the victims of war), and was sponsored by the Ladies Committee for Education in the East.\textsuperscript{60} In March 1868, an altercation transpired between the Rev J Wilson (of Hastings) and Mrs Durre (the European lady responsible for the management of the Asylum), during which Wilson apparently asserted that the friends of the children did not want them to be sent out as servants, and that if Durre insisted on doing so they were to be returned to their "friends".\textsuperscript{61} Durre reported the matter to Miss Sass, who, on Hamilton's advice, summarily closed the Asylum and sent a report to the Ladies Committee in London.\textsuperscript{62} This arbitrary decision, ostensibly prompted by the alleged behaviour of a native clergyman, who was given no opportunity to explain his action or respond to the allegation before the matter was reported to London, became the mainspring of the most bitter contention between the native Pastors and European missionaries.\textsuperscript{63} For reasons that are obscure, Nicol, who had

\textsuperscript{60} CMS, C A1/0 209/1, 13 May 1868, Rev M Taylor to Venn; cp. C A1/M 17, pp. 112-118, 25 April 1868, Sass to Venn. This organisation was in England. But it is worth mentioning that the Native Church also made efforts "to aid the funds" of the Asylum.

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. CMS, C A1/M 17, PP. 112-118, 25 April 1868, Sass to Venn; C A1/0 3/527, 25 April 1868, Hamilton to Venn; and C A1/M 17, pp. 82-83, Hamilton to Wilson. This suggestion was contrary to the directions of the Ladies Committee. However, the fact that Mrs Durre "could not make herself understood [in English]", while Wilson's command of the language was not "much better", probably accounted for much of the original misunderstanding (cf. C A1/M 17, p. 253, August 1868, Sass to Beckles; p. 177, 14 July 1868, Alcock to Venn). But Wilson neither denied or confirmed the allegation.

\textsuperscript{62} Miss J E Sass, the zealous but imperious superintendent of the Female Institution, 1849-1869) was the Ladies Committees' representative in the colony. When the furore broke out over her decision, she curtly informed the native Pastors that she had been "invested long since by the Ladies Committee with full power to act for them with regard to the affairs of the Asylum according to my judgement and discretion" (C A1/M 17, p. 84, April 1868, enclosed in letter to Hamilton).

\textsuperscript{63} The fact that Wilson had remained at Durre's house until well into the night - thereby transgressing "against all our English ideas of decency and decorum" (CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 114, 25 April 1868, Sass to Venn) - also meant that Wilson's moral conduct was in question. Thus, the indignation of the native Pastors was heightened by the feeling that the character of a native minister had been impeached without a hearing. Unknown to them Miss Sass had refrained from mentioning Wilson's conduct in her despatch. She commented derisively that Wilson's "ideas of propriety are semi-
hitherto been so emollient, took up the matter with crusading zeal and, at the half yearly conference (held in April a few weeks later), "demanded an investigation of the case before the assembled brethren". Hamilton (who was presiding at the conference, as Bishop's Commissary) promptly ruled against such an investigation on the grounds that the conference had no such authority. This response provoked a violent and dissentient reaction from almost the whole body of native clergy, which subsided only when Hamilton threatened to leave the chair. Hamilton told Venn: "I really cannot describe and you cannot conceive, my dear Venn, what the scene was. Had we been their greatest foes, their sworn and avowed enemies, they could not have behaved with greater violence". The native Pastors held a meeting after the conference and passed a resolution to the effect that the Asylum ought not to have been closed on account of Wilson's representation. However, Hamilton announced on the next day of conference that he was not accountable to the Pastors for what had been done, and would therefore countenance no further proceedings in the matter. Hamilton was furious
that his (and Miss Sass') actions were being questioned by "tribunal" of native ministers, who, he claimed, thus showed their "want of respect both for my character and the office which I have the honour to hold, of Bishop's Commissary and Secretary of the CMS". He immediately dismissed the Rev D G Williams (who was serving under him at Kissy Road Church) for his "disgraceful" involvement with the other native Pastors, resigned his position as Treasurer of the Church Committee, terminated his subscriptions to the Pastorate, and declined to take any part in the proceedings of the Native Pastorate Annual meeting (at which he was scheduled to preach). In a strongly worded letter to Nicol, he accused him of having stirred up "the ill feeling... of the whole body of the native clergy", and declared that he would "attend no more conferences, as they are only made occasions of strife and dissension". He also asserted that after the incident at the previous year's conference, from which the Pastorate had not yet recovered, the present affair could only damage that institution further. Nicol's reply was

which have occurred, to close the Asylum at discretion... [and to] open it again if thought expedient on quite on other footing".

69 ibid. He was convinced that he and the other European missionaries had "truth" on their side (CMS, C A1/O 3/528, 28 April 1868, Hamilton to Venn).

70 It will be remembered that four years earlier, Williams, at Hamilton's instigation, had refused to leave Kissy Road Church for the charge of a Pastorate Church.

71 CMS, C A1/O 3/527, 25 April 1868, Hamilton to Venn; cf. C A1/M 17, p. 87, 24 April 1868, Hamilton to Nicol, and C A1/L8, pp. 211-215, 23 July 1868, Venn to Hamilton. Nicol condemned Hamilton's actions in the strongest terms, and told Venn that they "took the public with surprise and astonishment" (C A1/O 164/39, 25 May 1868, Nicol to Venn). He added sarcastically that "many actions done by our European friends are considered 'venial', whereas the same actions done by a native are considered by them 'mortal'".

72 CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 87, 24 April 1868, Hamilton to Nicol. He expressed surprise that their "long and friendly intimacy with one another" had not been sufficient to "assure" Nicol that he would not do anything which he "believed to be to the injury of the Native Church, or to the damage of any individual native Pastor".

73 CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 90-92, 28 April 1868, Hamilton to Nicol. "The confidence of many must be shaken", he declared, "and the only sufferers will be the pastors themselves". Cp. C A1/O 164/69, 10 September 1868,
recriminatory. He condemned European arrogance and Hamilton's high handedness; and asserted that in the 23 years he had been connected with the Mission he had "never yet witnessed a more arbitrary and independent part acted out by any Secretary of the Society". Hamilton's declaration that he would have nothing further to do with the Pastorate and its pastors moved him to make a significant declaration:

The Pastorate cannot be ruined. It is God's work, not yours or mine...
If you shut the Church door against the pastors, we will go to the cathedral...

We echo your remark. The Pastors must have their own conference with our Bishop. The separation between us must be more and more distinct".

This response denoted an unequivocal call for ecclesiastical independence; but Nicol later denied that this was his intention. As the "prime mover" and standard-bearer of native protest, his earlier friendship with the European missionaries was irrevocably damaged; and he was drawn into an ignominious confrontation with Hamilton. He declared peevishly that he was not "a novice or upstart in the eyes of the PC", and insisted that if they heard Hamilton "they will surely hear an old servant". At the next meeting of the Church Committee (in June 1868) Hamilton questioned Nicol's right to call a meeting without stating the business, while Nicol insisted that Hamilton had no right to be in the chair since he had resigned all connection with the Pastorate. When his protestations were overruled, Nicol offered his

---

74 CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 87-90, 27 April 1868, Nicol to Hamilton.
75 The Native Pastorate Anniversary Service was apparently scheduled to be held at Kissy Road Church (Hamilton's charge); cp. CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 90-92, 28 April 1868, Hamilton to Nicol.
77 "My intimacy with you", he told Hamilton, "will not interfere with me in my duty" (CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 89, 27 April 1868, Nicol to Hamilton).
78 CMS, C A1/O 109/58, 26 June 1868, Hamilton to Venn. Hamilton described Nicol's manner and language as "violent"; and added that he "never supposed such a bitter, hateful, indignant spirit would or could have been manifested towards me by one with whom I have been so intimately acquainted".
resignation, on the ground that he and Hamilton could never sit on the same Committee;\(^79\) and Hamilton responded that unless Nicol apologised for his language or retired from his office as Secretary, he would withdraw from the meeting and refuse as Bishop's Commissary to sanction any proceedings it might take in his absence.\(^80\) In view of this deadlock, the Committee resolved to suspend all business until the Bishop returned to the colony.\(^81\) A palpable climate of hostility engulfed the affairs of the Native Church. With Church government temporarily disabled, and the bishop conspicuous by his absence, both sides (European and native) turned to the CMS - specifically Venn - for arbitration. For the most part, the European missionaries (with the exception of the Rev James Beale)\(^82\) became openly hostile (in action and speech) towards the native clergy.\(^83\) None was more so than Rev Henry J Alcock, the young Principal of Fourah Bay College, who seems to have possessed few commendable

\(^{79}\) *ibid.* The Committee refused his resignation.

\(^{80}\) CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 159-161, Protest of Hamilton to Church Committee.

\(^{81}\) *ibid.* Hamilton accordingly wrote to Beckles to inform him that his return to the colony was imperative (C A1/M 17, p. 161, 26 June 1868, Hamilton to Beckles).

\(^{82}\) Rev James Beale (junior), was the son of the European missionary by the same name who had supervised the building of Pademba Road Church and served there until his death in 1856. He joined the Sierra Leone Mission in November 1867, but within six months had become estranged from the other European missionaries, especially the Rev Alcock, over a difference of opinion about his doctrinal views on baptism (cf. CMS, C A1/O 3/525, 14 March 1868, Caiger to Venn; C A1/L8, pp. 192-194, 23 April 1868, Secretaries to Hamilton; C A1/M 17, pp. 48-51). It is difficult to say whether his support of the native Pastors was genuine, or the product of vindictiveness. But the fact that he had been born in Sierra Leone, and was only in his early twenties, may have made him less paternalistic than his compatriots.

\(^{83}\) Beale confirmed that there was "a dark undercurrent of jealousy between the white and black clergy... [which] appears to have been the growth of time and not the result of a momentary difference" (CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 126, 14 May 1868, Beale to Venn). He also reported that "Menzies, myself, and public opinion all think that Mr Hamilton acted hastily in refusing to preach the sermon, in declining to hold office in connection with the Pastorate, in declining Mr Williams' services at Kissy Road Church, and otherwise attacking him as an individual for the fault of the whole body".
qualities outside a distinguished academic record.\textsuperscript{84} Alcock possessed an irascible, haughty, and imperious disposition, and his letters to the CMS were lengthy, opinionated, and self-vindicating affairs.\textsuperscript{85} He fell foul of Beckles soon after arriving in the colony,\textsuperscript{86} and, within two years, had quarrelled with most of his brother missionaries.\textsuperscript{87} His choleric temperament earned him the sobriquet "firebrand" in Freetown; while his unfamiliar Irish accent created communication difficulties which did little to improve his disposition.\textsuperscript{88} Alcock acted as Hamilton's adviser and instigator at the ill-fated conference;\textsuperscript{89} and described the whole affair as "a conspiracy" deliberately concocted by Nicol, and "a desperate venture on his part for power and importance".\textsuperscript{90} He promptly terminated Williams' connection.

\textsuperscript{84} Rev Henry J Alcock, of Cork, Ireland, graduated from Trinity College (Dublin), in 1864, with first class honours, which he boasted (fallaciously) "were second to none in the world" (CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 316, 9 September 1868, Alcock to Nicol). He served as Curate of St. Thomas' in Lancashire, for two years before his appointment as Principal of Fourah Bay College in October 1866; at the age of 27 (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 74, 23 February 1866, Venn to Caiger). Of the European missionaries only Beale, who joined the following year, was younger — being about 23 (cf. Register of Missionary and Native Clergy, 1809-1904, CMS).

\textsuperscript{85} Nicol complained that Alcock "must have all the say...; will be guided by no-one; [and] listens to no argument". For "every argument is trash; except what he addresses himself" (C A1/O 164/37, 14 December 1867, Nicol to Venn; cp. C A1/O 164/35, 24 July 1867, Nicol to Venn).

\textsuperscript{86} He falsely accused the bishop and his wife of mendacity and of defrauding the Society (cf. CMS, C A1/O 25D/58, 17 January 1867, Beckles to Alcock; C A1/L8, pp. 140-142, 23 March 1867, Venn to Beckles).

\textsuperscript{87} Cf. CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 103-110, 14 May 1868, Quaker to Venn; C A1/O 164/37, 14 December 1867, Nicol to Venn; C A1/L8, pp. 144-145, Venn to Caiger. His animadversions about Caiger's character produce a mild rebuke from Venn (C A1/L8, pp. 145-146, Venn to Alcock).

\textsuperscript{88} Cf. CMS, C A1/ O 64/50d, 12 January 1867, Caiger to Venn; C A1/M 17, p. 103, 14 May 1868, Quaker to Venn. Miss Sass, who was his ally during the Asylum matter, reported however that Alcock's "peculiar eccentricities are now borne with goodwill, or laughed at, or they pass unnoticed" (C A1/M 17, p. 117, 25 April 1868, Sass to Venn).

\textsuperscript{89} M Taylor, a native Pastor, explained that though the native Pastors had always had the greatest respect for Hamilton, a change had come over the latter "since he placed himself under the influence and advice of Mr Alcock" (C A1/O 209/2, 26 August 1868, Taylor to Beckles).

\textsuperscript{90} CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 94, 27 April 1868, Alcock to Secretaries; C A1/M 17, P. 217, 15 July 1868, Alcock to Venn.
(as tutor) at Fourah Bay College;\(^9\) and continued to stoke the fires of European animosity throughout the controversy.\(^9\) Epitomising the scornful arrogance which the native Pastors repeatedly denounced, he declared that he was "sick of hearing... of the dignity and position of the Native Church", and promised never to return to the colony when he left.\(^9\)

Explaining this decision, he told Venn that he was "totally devoid of a true missionary spirit, and [had] a great and constant difficulty in trying to accommodate [himself] to the natives of the colony, in bearing with their absurd pride, their ignorant prejudices, and above all their ingratitude".\(^9\) The same spirit was evinced by Miss Sass, whose actions had been especially condemned by the native Pastors. She waxed vitriolic in her denunciation of the native Pastors (with some of whom, such as Quaker and Nicol, she had previously been on the best of terms), and declined to have anything further to do with them or their children.\(^9\)

She maintained that the Pastors were getting "worse and worse lately every year";\(^9\) and declared that "their character, as Christian ministers, are so far below the scriptural standard and they are such blind leaders of the blind, that their congregations cannot be much enlightened by their teaching or.

---


\(^9\) Cf. CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 100, 24 April 1868, Alcock to Quaker; cp. C A1/O 209/1, 13 May 1868, Rev M Taylor to Venn. Taylor described the "intemperate heat" with which Alcock conducted every discussion, and bemoaned the fact "that a man of his intellectual endowments should manifest so little prudence and still less self-control in his intercourse with his brother clergyman is much to be pitied".


\(^9\) CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 112-118, 25 April 1868, Sass to Venn. She immediately opposed the placement of Nicol's daughters (about to return from England) as monitors at the Female Institution; and, in a blatant abuse of her position, notified the Rev Moses Taylor that his niece would not be accepted at the Institution (cf. CMS, C A1/O 209/1b, 25 April 1868, Sass to M Taylor).

\(^9\) Cf. CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 112-118, 25 April 1868, Sass to Venn; C A1/M 17, pp. 220-226, 14 July 1868, Sass to Venn.
Like the other European missionaries she was infuriated by what she regarded as the native ministers' ingratitude (in return for years of sacrificial labour), but resented the native Pastors' censure even more. In their letters to the PC, the missionaries uniformly declared that it was high time the native Pastors were put in their place and shown their true position - for their own good.

Venn was profoundly dismayed at the outbreak of such a major collision between the European missionaries and native pastors over what he described as a "contemptible quibble". He declared that "after many anxious deliberations, the Committee cannot see their way to pronounce any judgement which could have any practical good effect upon the many complicated questions which have arisen". In the end, the PC decided that neither the matter of the Orphan Asylum nor Hamilton's actions as the Bishop's Commissary belonged to its jurisprudence. They ruled that it was left to Bishop Beckles (who promised to return to the colony immediately) to take "whatever measures of a judicial kind the case may require". However, they instructed the Secretaries to write confidential letters to both Hamilton and Nicol without attempting to "adjudicate between them". The letters were written by Venn, who allowed his profound anxiety about a premature severance from the CMS to mar his assessment of the native Pastors' actions; with the result that his appraisal

97 She opined: "The wholesome influence of a good earnest consistent missionary, and his simple but civilised wife, is gone, and in its stead is a native Pastor, often away from his station and duties, inactive, untidy, and grasping, and his still less civilised wife and children – of course there are two or three exceptions to this..." (CMS, CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 221-222, 14 July 1868, Sass to Venn).


100 ibid., p. 209, 23 July 1868, Venn to Nicol.

101 Cf., CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 209-211, 23 July 1868, Venn to Nicol; pp. 211-215, 23 July 1868, Venn to Hamilton. Though sent in the name of the PC, these letters were most certainly composed by Venn.
was one-sided and tendentious. He described Nicol's letter to Hamilton as "forcible in logical construction but sadly deficient in charitable construction"; and insisted that "instead of taking offense at the supposed personal misconduct of any one European missionary", Nicol should "merge such a fault in the general claims of your gratitude and love of the CMS". Venn was convinced that it was "little more than madness to the Native Pastorate to stir up controversy and disagreement with the European missionaries", for the simple reason that once the European Missionaries were driven from the Pastorate affairs, the Society would withdraw its grant and cut off salaries to catechists and some of the native Pastors. "I, for one", he stated, "tremble to think of the confusion and calamities into which the native Church would be plunged by a premature severance from the CMS". He also expressed a similar concern in his letter to Hamilton, and informed him that the PC "must frankly express their regret" at his withdrawal from the Pastorate. He averred: "This is the point in the whole matter which gives the Committee most concern. It appears like casting away the fruit of 70 years of labour, for the Native Pastorate of Sierra Leone is the crown of the Society's operations. If that is shipwrecked, the West African Mission is proclaimed a failure". However, Venn saw nothing to condemn or criticise in the behaviour of the

102 Moreover, he argued that "the attempt to make out a constructive injustice to the Native Pastorate utterly fails".
103 For good measure, he warned that the "younger members of the PC would precipitate the severance of connexion", and that "it is only a few of the elder who feel towards you as parents to their children".
104 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 211-215, 23 July 1868, Venn to Hamilton. "You are specially the representative of the Society", he told Hamilton, "and when you desert it no other missionary can with equal advantage occupy the post you vacate".
105 He argued that because of "the importance which the Society attached to the working of the Native Pastorate", its missionaries "are therefore bound to pursue that object at whatever price or sacrifice they may be called on to suffer".
European missionaries. He took the view that "no amount of ingratitude or of personal offence should disturb our missionaries"; for "they stand upon a ground from which they may well look down with composure upon such otherwise irritating tumults". He insisted that "the half yearly conference is not properly speaking a part of the Society's Mission"; and condemned the native pastors' attempt to question the European missionaries as "absurd and properly put down". Still, the animosity between the European missionaries and the native Pastors presented a worrying problem; and he confided in Alcock,

This is the calamity which I have most dreaded - the opposition of races: when the native should acquire a position which would enable them to stand up against their European brethren. A few years back the native was not in a position to quarrel with the European, or if he did there was power enough in the missionary body to put him down..."

Once again, the inscrutable tension between dependence and independence presented Venn with the ultimate dilemma. The European missionary was not yet to be withdrawn; but as long as he remained there was nothing to protect him from "the rising native spirit" - which Venn confessed "no influence or injunctions from the distant PC can repress". The absence of effective episcopal oversight no doubt contributed to the problem, but Venn insisted that the solution lay not in episcopal superintendence but in European missionary

106 He entreated Miss Sass not to let the matter trouble her, for her "conduct was quite fair and honourable and you may trust us to do all in our power to protect and vindicate you" (CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 206-207, 23 May 1868, Venn to Sass); and told Hamilton that "the Secretaries of the CMS have deeply sympathised with you under these trials and gladly would they do all in their power to heal your wounded spirits and redress your wrongs".


108 ibid.


110 ibid. Venn had to concede that the native Pastors had "passed the disciplinary age", would "no longer submit to discipline", and, indeed, were "enraged at the attempt". If they were to be controlled then, "it must be done with all the gentleness, love and tact of an Apostle".
forbearance. He was convinced that a working harmony between the races was a requisite for the Pastorate's wellbeing; and he saw "nothing but ruin before the Native Church unless friendly, confidential and cordial relations are maintained between the Europeans and natives until the final settlement of the Native Church be satisfactorily achieved and the aid of the CMS withdrawn". Yet he was forced to admit that the "prejudices and resentments of the native Pastors" were "the inevitable result of a transition state in the Native Church, and an indication that the time of the complete independence of the Native Church is at hand". Venn had no idea how soon this would be; and he implored both European missionaries and native Pastors "to bury in silence all past differences, and to unite in love, candour, and mutual confidence for the solution of this great problem - how soon the CMS may safely withdraw its operations from the colony and leave the Native Church to its own agency and pecuniary resources". But the divisions and antipathies ran too deep to be healed by his counsel; and, to his dismay, his strictures actually aggravated the difficulty.

Nicol was sufficiently chastened by Venn's letter to agree to a reconciliation with Hamilton. However, the reconciliation was fractured almost immediately when Nicol read a copy of Venn's letter to Hamilton (which Hamilton had

111 He wrote: "If the missionary on the spot cannot keep it down, nothing else can. The arrival of the Bishop may do something to allay, but my hope wholly rests upon the grace of God in the hearts of the missionaries" (ibid.). Whether this response was a reflection of his faith in Beckles is uncertain.

112 ibid.

113 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 214, 23 July 1868, Venn to Hamilton.

114 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 217, 23 July 1868, Venn to Quaker.

115 Cf. CMS, C A1/109/59, 12 August 1868, Hamilton to Venn; cp. C A1/O 164/40, 24 August 1868, Nicol to Hamilton. Hamilton, who had expected greater contrition from Nicol described their meeting as "unsatisfactory" and only skin deep.
circulated). He was aggrieved to discover that Venn had charged him "not only of [sic] stirring up strife against my European Brethren, but also of endeavouring to get rid of them". Declaring that it was "hard after a long connection with the Society to labour under such a serious representation without knowing what is alleged against me", he forthwith resigned his position as Secretary to the Pastorate and Conference as well as his seat in the Church Committee and Council. This reaction was extreme; but Nicol was at pains to distance himself and the other native Pastors from the nascent nationalistic movement. He explained to Venn that his remark to Hamilton that "the separation should be more and more distinct" referred "entirely to the conference". This explanation was rather disingenuous, especially since he had also called for a separate bishop; but he went on to declare:

We must repudiate from our inmost souls all idea or wish of such a thing as "severance from CMS"... We see and feel that we are suspected of struggling for independence and self-government; that we are ungrateful. This is what Mr Alcock is throwing at our face daily... Will the Committee, after having brought us thus far - nourished us, raised us - will the Committee receive such a wholesale representation against the Pastors who lean upon them?... I solemnly declare there is not one native Pastor in the colony who has any wish to be deprived of the presence of our European Brethren.

116 He told Venn that this letter led the native Pastors "to think they have been seriously misrepresented in England" (CMS, C A1/0 164/42c, 25 August 1868, Nicol to Venn).
118 ibid. He contended that this would enable him "to avoid, for the future, any possible collision between myself and Europeans in Committee arising from any differences of opinion".
119 The idea that there should be two conferences - one for CMS agents and another for the native Pastors - was also suggested by Alcock, who argued that "the Pastors seem to be able to manage their own affairs... though they may not be able to manage those of their neighbours" (CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 229, 10 August 1868, Alcock to Venn). "Such a state of things", he continued, "would be I conceive a decided step towards a self-supporting and self-regulating condition of the Native Church, which I know to be the final object of the PC".
120 CMS, C A1/0 164/42, 25 August 1868, Nicol to Venn.
It is almost certain that Venn's warning that the Society's aid would cease with the withdrawal of its missionaries had come as a shock to the Pastors, and had dampened the spirit of rebellion. To be sure, none of them would have contemplated severance from the CMS at that stage, but there was an increasing tendency to view the Native Pastorate in nationalistic terms: as a distinctive African Church, free from foreign domination, and even with its own bishop. Quaker attested that "a spirit of self-sufficiency and independence - the former which is dangerous, and the latter altogether premature - had threatened us with a visit, to say the least, and must needs be prevented by a timely warning". However, while the native Pastors smarted under Venn's reprimand, Hamilton (and the other missionaries) felt completely vindicated by his response. Hamilton assured him that he would resume his position on the Pastorate; and that he would henceforth summon only the Agents of the Society to the half yearly conference. Nonetheless, he found Venn's ruling that Williams should take charge of Kissy Road Church most unpalatable, and threatened to leave CMS employ if it went through. The crisis was far from over. Venn's intervention gave little satisfaction; and the racial conflict was intensified by a "right of way" dispute over Nicol's property at Cline Town (adjacent to the Fourah Bay College buildings). The dispute was instigated by Alcock, and was in every sense a spill-over from the contention over the Asylum affair. Briefly, the problem arose (in June 1868) when Nicol blocked up a path running through his property,

121 CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 317, 14 September 1868, Quaker to Venn.
122 CMS C A1/O 109/59a, 12 August 1868, Hamilton to Venn.
123 Cf. C A1/L8, pp. 219-220, 8 August 1868, Venn to Alcock; C A1/O 3/527, 25 April 1868, Hamilton to Venn. He contended that such a move would "at once gratify Williams, and justify him in the eyes of the congregation, and be a complete triumph to all the native Clergy"; effectively putting an end to what little influence he possessed in the colony. Cp. CMS, C A1/O 109/60, 27 August 1868, Hamilton to Venn; C A1/O 109/62, 14 September 1868, Hamilton to Venn.
124 For details of the dispute, see CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 199-241, 312-346; and C A1/O 164/42b, 25 August 1868, Nicol to Venn.
which had for some time been used as an access to the back entrance of Fourah Bay College. This action infuriated the European missionaries, and Alcock threatened to "punish" Nicol with a lawsuit. The matter was represented to the PC in the worst possible light; and Venn, who was still deeply disturbed by the acute racial disharmony in the Sierra Leone Native Church, responded with a harsh denunciation of Nicol's conduct. Nicol was devastated by Venn's severe reprimand, but refused to yield to his adversaries' unlawful claim. As in the Asylum matter, he had the firm support of the other native Pastors, who regarded him as a champion of their cause and wrote him a formal letter to express their sympathy and encouragement. Meanwhile, the CMS Secretaries encouraged their missionaries to "appeal to the law to decide the question" if Nicol insisted on "his supposed right". Their hasty and partial judgement aggravated the contention, and played into the hands of Alcock, who persisted in his

125 Nicol had apparently given Hamilton permission to use the path two years before (CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 202-203, 2 July 1868, Nicol to Reichardt).
126 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 221, 22 August 1868, Venn to Nicol. He accused Nicol of being "led captive by the spirit of prejudice and bitter controversy", and of compromising his role as a "pivot" in the settlement of the Native Church. With his confidence in Nicol obviously shaken, he told Hamilton that unless Nicol recovered his position of mediator and peacemaker "we must select some one of the native Pastors to be our trusted negotiator in the many delicate questions which yet remain to be adjusted between the Society and the native Church" (C A1/L8, p. 222, 22 August 1868, Venn to Hamilton).
127 Cf. C A1/M 17, pp. 316-319, 14 September 1868, Quaker to Venn. Quaker reported that Venn's letter had "almost driven him mad"; and Beckles confirmed that it had "pierced his very soul". Cp. C A1/O 164/42, 25 August 1868, Nicol to Venn.
128 CMS, C A1/0 164/70, 14 September 1868, Letter to G Nicol. This letter was signed by nine native ministers. They lamented the fact that despite his "devotedness to the interests of the European missionaries" and "zealous labours on behalf of the Native Pastorate" he had been branded a "ring leader of a number of conspiracies", "the disturber of the peace and harmony of the Church, and the enemy of the European missionaries". Cp. C A1/O 209/1, 13 May 1868, M Taylor to Venn.
129 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 225, 22 August 1868, Secretaries to Hamilton. Alcock was determined to take the case before the courts, on a fixed date. "Had I done such things", Nicol asked, "what would my European brethren think of me?" (C A1/O 164/42, 25 August 1868, Nicol to Venn).
claims to a "right of way" long after it had become clear that he undeniably in the wrong.130

Bishop Beckles returned to the colony, in October 1868, to find that the racial conflict had reached a great pitch.131 He too had chastised Nicol (in a letter from England) for the "sad tone and spirit" of his correspondence;132 but, unlike Venn, had also condemned Hamilton's action (in closing the Asylum) as "most uncalled for and unjustifiable". After a preliminary enquiry into the "right of way" dispute he ruled that the claim against Nicol was "dishonest" and "unjust", and denounced the European missionaries as "Naboths".133 His castigation of European missionary conduct, and obvious sympathy with the native Pastors, alienated him even further from the missionaries and subverted his role as mediator.134 It is unlikely that the bishop's presence in the colony would

130 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 319-321, 14 September 1868, statement by George Phillipo, Queen's Advocate; pp. 336-337, 19 September 1868, Phillipo to Alcock. It became abundantly clear that Nicol's legal position was "unimpeachable". But Alcock rejected any peaceful settlement, kept up an aggravating correspondence, and insisted on using the path (forcibly removing two fences). Quaker lamented that the "right of way is the only torch... keeping the flame of strife here just now..." (CMS, C A1/M 17, 28 September 1868, Quaker to Venn). He bemoaned the fact that Alcock was determined to pursue the matter in the courts, despite friendly warnings from himself and some of the European missionaries.

131 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 250/54, 15 October 1868, Beckles to Venn.

132 CMS, C A1/O 25D/59, 23 July 1868, Beckles to Nicol. Nonetheless, Beckles readily sided with the native Pastors. He told Nicol, "I can make great allowance (and I have told Hamilton so) for the feelings of the Pastors as the step was most uncalled for and certainly likely to injure the Pastors".

133 CMS, C A1/O 25D/54, 15 October 1868, Beckles to Venn. He insisted that Nicol was "an injured and oppressed man", and told the Society to refrain from "joining the persecutors and from trying to obtain this portion of Nicol's land by oppression".

134 "His Lordship", wrote Caiger, "as though to increase the difficulty has unfortunately taken a stand decidedly against the missionaries which needed great circumspection in carrying out the principle of non-intervention" (CMS, C A1/O 164/54, 23 March 1868, Caiger to Venn). See also, CMS, C A1/O 25D/55, 13 November 1868, Beckles to Venn. The Bishop complained that he was "greatly tried at present with the difficulties here, not only between Europeans and natives, but each class divided..."
have averted the crisis; not only because his own relations with the European missionaries were not harmonious, but also because he had shown little ability to construct a stable environment for the development of the Native Church. To prove the point, he made the commotion even worse, when he ineptly orchestrated a reduction of Nicol's and Maxwell's salaries; thus squandering the opportunity to recover the initiative in directing the affairs of the Native Pastorate. A thoroughly disaffected Nicol immediately resigned from the Pastorate; and informed Venn that "having a family of eight children to support and educate" he would "in consequence of this reduction be necessitated to apply for the vacant chaplaincy on the [Gambia]." Thus the Native Church lost a key player in its struggle for independence.

Beckles himself departed from the colony in March 1869 (five months after his arrival) - ostensibly on account of ill health -

135 For their part, the European missionaries regarded the bishop with contempt. Sass described him as "our weak and supine Bishop" (CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 220-226, 14 July 1868, Sass to Venn), and "unstable as water" (C A1/M 17, p. 368, 13 November 1868, Sass to Venn); and Alcock claimed that the bishop "would do anything so long as he is allowed to stay in England" (C A1/M 17, p. 229, 10 August 1868, Alcock to Venn).

136 The salaries of the native Pastors was a veritable thorn in the flesh in the Pastorate administration. When Beckles called a meeting of the Church Committee in February 1869 (cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/57, Minutes of a Church Committee, 23 February 1869) it was reported that the "four grades of salaries" adopted by a resolution of the Committee in January 1867 (cf. Chapter 5) had caused "much dissatisfaction", both among the Pastors themselves and the general public. After an animated discussion (during which European and native views were locked in opposition), it was resolved that the salaries of Nicol and Maxwell should be reduced from £150 to £125, while the other native Pastors were all to receive £100.

137 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 381, 15 March 1869, Nicol to Venn. The resolution in question was rescinded a month later - after Beckles' departure - but too later to affect Nicol's decision (C A1/0 9/58, Minutes of Church Committee, 13 April 1869; C A1/0 64/55b, 12 April 1869, Caiger to Venn).

138 Nicol was subsequently appointed to the Chaplaincy of the Gambia, after serving the Sierra Leone Native Church for 20 years (cf. CMS, C A1/0 164/44, 16 September 1869, Nicol to Venn).

139 Caiger argued that the bishop's sufferings were "as much mentally as bodily" (CMS, C A1/0 164/54a, 23 March 1869, Caiger to Venn). There is evidence that Beckles' health had indeed declined, but his suffering was no doubt considerably increased by the fact that the Colonial Office had
while the Native Church was still in a critically unsettled state. After waiting over a year for the bishop to return, the Church Committee passed a resolution which declared that "the Bishop be respectfully requested to return to his Diocese or vacate the See, as his presence or that of a successor is indispensably necessary". Bishop Beckles never returned; and, to Venn's chagrin, forestalled the appointment of a successor for over a year by refusing to resign until he was provided with a living in England.

The rift between the European missionaries and native Pastors remained unhealed. Even Caiger - on whose return to the colony the CMS Secretaries had pinned hopes of reconciliation - found the role of peacemaker beyond his reach. Nicol was completely vindicated on the "right of way" dispute, but Alcock's appetite for conflict and stopped his salary, on account of his prolonged absences from his diocese (cf. C A1/O 25D/54, 15 October 1868, Beckles to Venn; Fyfe [1962], p. 352 & 376).

Quaker lamented that "the Bishop left the diocese in [a] confusion caused by himself" (CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 390, n.d. [April 1870], Quaker to Venn).

CMS, C A1/O 9/60b, Minutes of Church Committee, 15 July 1870.

In August 1869, Venn reported that "the Bishop of Sierra Leone has no immediate prospect of any preferment", and "has failed in one attempt to make an exchange". He expressed his disappointment "that the Archbishop does not provide for him at once", and added worriedly that "he still talks of turning to Sierra Leone if necessary!" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 259, 23 August 1869, Venn to Caiger). Cp. C A1/L8, p. 286, 13 July 1870, Venn to Hamilton; and Fyfe (1962), p. 376.


Cf. CMS, C A1/O 164/54, 23 March 1869, Caiger to Venn. He reported that "matters would never have reached such a climax had it not been for Mr Alcock", and warned Venn to prepare himself for "a continuance of this and possibly a repetition of other similar matters until Mr Alcock's turn of service expires" (C A1/O 164/53, 12 December 1868, Caiger to Venn).

The Secretaries reversed their judgement when the facts of the case became clear, and warned Alcock to desist from his claims (CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 238-240, 8 December 1868, E Hutchinson to Alcock; C A1/L8, pp. 250-251, 14 June 1869, Hutchinson to Caiger; cp. C A1/O 164/44, 16 September 1869, Nicol to Venn).
confrontation remained un-assuaged.\textsuperscript{146} Having excluded Williams from Fourah Bay College, he also successfully opposed the appointment of the Rev Henry Johnson (later Archdeacon)\textsuperscript{147} to the College as a teacher of native languages.\textsuperscript{148} Despite Venn's admonition, Hamilton declined to have anything to do with the native Pastors, and refused to sit on the Native Pastorate Church Committee (though his position as Acting Secretary of the Mission made such a relationship desirable).\textsuperscript{149} In a climate that was being gradually infused by nationalistic sentiments, the European missionaries' implicit refusal to accept the native Pastors as equals, and their chagrin at any attempt to question European superiority, precluded any meaningful reconciliation. The native Pastors had insisted that they were not striving for independence; but it was clear that they were no longer willing to submit unquestioningly to European arrogance or ethnocentrism. Venn's unqualified support of the European missionaries increased their

\textsuperscript{146} A bitter row ensued between him and Hamilton over the Secretaryship of the Mission (cf. CMS, C A1/O 109/65, 10 August 1870, Hamilton to Venn). Hamilton also reported that Alcock had had a serious quarrel with the congregation at Kissy Road Church (where he had replaced Hamilton) over the matter of Church discipline.

\textsuperscript{147} Henry Johnson, a native minister (originally from Hastings), served as tutor at the Grammar School for eight years before entering the CM College at Islington, where he excelled in linguistic studies (cf. C A1/L8, p. 254, 23 August 1869, Venn to Quaker). He joined the Sierra Leone Mission in November 1869, and successfully translated a significant portion of the New Testament into Mende. In 1873 he joined the Lagos Pastorate, as Pastor of Breadfruit Church, and was made Archdeacon of the Upper Niger in 1878.

\textsuperscript{148} Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, PP. 252-255, 23 August 1869, Venn to J Quaker. Alcock maintained that there was no room for Johnson at FBC, and that a teacher of native languages was not needed (C A1/M 17, pp. 394-400, September 1869, Alcock to Hon. Clerical Secretary). His opposition was made all the more vociferous, by a suggestion that Johnson might act as Principal during his absence. He declared that "a black clergyman at the head of FBC would be fraught with danger", and that "the place would be filled with his poor relations, who would make the place uninhabitable for a European" (C A1/M 17, P. 400, September 1869, Alcock to Secretaries). In the light of his opposition, the PC "dropped the matter", and appointed Johnson a "Linguistic Missionary" to the Sherbro (C A1/L8, p. 264, 23 November 1869, Venn to Caiger).

\textsuperscript{149} CMS, C A1/M 17, pp. 482-488, 23 July 1870, Quaker to Venn.
frustration but hardened their resolve. But even Venn was forced to recognise that European ethnocentrism was something of a bane, and a factor in the rise of racial conflict. With his usual insight, he addressed the whole issue in a paper, titled 'On Nationality', which was written about the same time as the asylum affair.\footnote{This paper was originally given as instructions of the Committee (cf. Knight, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 282-292); and is generally believed to be written by Venn, and regarded as his Fourth Paper (cf. Shenk, 1983, p. 154; Williams, 1990, pp. 38-41). The paper is dated 30 June 1868, and the controversy which was raging in Sierra Leone at the time possibly influenced some of the arguments.}

The discourse 'On Nationality' was written specifically for the instruction of CMS missionaries, and sought to emphasize "the importance of taking into account national distinctions". Five "practical" considerations were pressed on the attention of the European missionaries, which must be stated here briefly. First, the missionaries were enjoined to "study the national character of the people among whom you labour, and show the utmost respect for national peculiarities".\footnote{The italicized portions (as reproduced in Knight), were obviously meant to highlight the main points.} Venn contended that Englishmen in general found it most difficult to "show respect to national peculiarities which differ from our own";\footnote{He went as far as to stipulate that this was "a national besetting sin" throughout the continent of Europe, "and a national reproach and bye-word against us".} and argued that this study of "the national distinctions" would moderate their "judgment of the Christian attainments of infant native churches". Second, he warned "that these race distinctions will probably rise in intensity with the progress of the Mission"; that as the "native race" advanced in intelligence, "long cherished but dormant prejudices, and even passions, will occasionally burst forth". The truth of this observation had been amply demonstrated by the crisis in the Sierra Leone Mission; and Venn (possibly with such an example in mind) admonished the missionaries that being "ever mindful
of the existence of this root of bitterness", they should be prepared to meet such a crisis "not by charging the natives with presumption and ingratitude..., but in the spirit of the Apostle, who had learned to bear all things for the elect's sake..." The unwillingness, or inability, of European missionaries to emulate this apostolic ideal had implications which Venn did not foresee. Third, he entreated the missionaries to "let a native church be organised as a national institution" as soon as converts were gathered into a Christian congregation, and to "train up the native church to self-dependence and self-government first stage of Christian development". This point was reminiscent of his Second Paper, and simply reiterated the argument that European missionaries were not meant to assume the position of native Pastors. Fourth, he suggested "that as the native church assumes a national character it will ultimately supersede the denominational distinctions which are now introduced by Foreign Missionary Societies". He forwarded the argument that even the Anglican Prayer-book had "laid down the principle that every national church is at liberty to change its ceremonies, and adapt itself to the national taste". It is worth observing, however, that far from striving to make their church ceremonies and Christian ordinances more autochthonous, Sierra Leonean Christians (notably Anglican members) evinced a jealous regard for the strictly English form and patterns they had inherited. Lastly, Venn pointed out that "the proper position of a missionary is one external to the native church, and that the most important duty he has to discharge towards that church is the education and training of native pastors and evangelists".

The paper "On Nationality" clearly endorsed the view that the Native Church should have a national identity; and in that regard was of crucial significance for the growing nationalism in Sierra Leone. But it must be borne in mind that the paper was written for European consumption; and was therefore bound to have a negligible impact in Sierra Leone.
For instance, it urged the missionaries that a lack of respect for national peculiarities "is best counteracted by a determination, from your first arrival in the country, to study and to respect the national habits and conventionalities, till it becomes a habit with you to do so, and a second nature". But at a time when European preconceptions about "native" ability and customs had become entrenched, and European notions about the inferiority of the African were steadfastly held, it is difficult to see how such precepts could have effected any change in European missionary attitudes. European ethnocentrism had flourished (virtually unchallenged) in the CMS West African Missions for over five decades under the paternalistic hegemony of European missionaries; and it was unlikely to be overcome by theoretical instruction. However, it came under increasing attack as the nationalist movement gathered momentum. In the wake of the Asylum controversy native attitudes became more blatantly anti-European, and Bishop Cheetham (Beckles' successor) faced the first clear call for an independent African Church.

B. Race and Nationalism (1871-1874)
(i) Bishop Henry Cheetham (1870-1882)

When Lord Granville, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, was succeeded by Lord Kimberley, the PC lost no time in representing to him "the lamentable state of things" in Sierra Leone due to the want of a bishop. They recommended, through the Archbishop of Canterbury, the name of the Rev Henry Cheetham, Vicar of Quorndon (Derbyshire) as a suitable candidate. Rev. Dr Henry Cheetham from

---

153 Lord Granville had refused to make any appointment to the Sierra Leone Bishopric until Beckles resigned - a circumstance which left the Society stymied. Fyfe helpfully observes that having been "appointed by letters patent" Beckles "could not be dismissed" (Fyfe [1962], p. 352); and reveals that he did not resign "until provided with a Kentish rectory, and the patronage of Berkely Chapel, Mayfair" (p. 376). Cp. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 286, 13 July 1870, Venn to Hamilton.

Bournemouth was a proven scholar, known to possess "considerable powers of organisation", and "a tried and zealous friend" of the Society's cause. Indeed, when Cheetham was introduced to the PC in November 1870, he "expressed the deep interest he had always felt in the Society's work there and his thankfulness for the opportunity which he hoped would be afforded him of aiding in the further development and organisation of the Native Church". His eventual appointment was greeted with great relief at Salisbury Square, not least because the Secretaries looked forward to a more constructive relationship than they had enjoyed with his predecessor.

When Bishop Cheetham arrived in Freetown in January 1871 he had the primary responsibility of putting the affairs of the Native Pastorate in order. But his earnest endeavour to spearhead the Pastorate's recovery was temporarily overclouded by the resurgence of the race conflict on an unprecedented scale. Despite the departure of the main protagonists - Nicol, Hamilton, and Alcock - from the colony, the racial antipathy which had been so forcibly exposed in the Asylum matter continued to simmer beneath the surface of an apparent calm. Deriving added stimulus from a creeping nationalism, it re-emerged, in an even more virulent form than before. But the controversy was given its greatest impetus by the arrival of Professor Edward W Blyden (a

155 Cf. Crockford's Clerical Directory. A scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge, he had acquired a B.A. (in 1856), an M.A. (in 1859), and a D.D. (1870), by the time of his appointment to the office of Bishop of Sierra Leone. He was later awarded an honorary D.C.L (Doctor of Civil Law) degree by the University of Durham, in 1881.
156 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 286, 13 July 1870, Venn to Hamilton.
157 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 278, 5 August 1870, Secretaries to Hamilton.
158 CMS, G/C1, vol. 39, 29 November 1870, Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence. However, three years later, when the troubles in his diocese multiplied, he complained that he had been "dissinclined" to accept the office (having never "looked upon an exchange of an English benefice for a Colonial Diocese as better preferment"), and that he had done so "entirely at the bidding and request of the Society" (cf. C A1/0 25E/52c, 30 June 1983, Cheetham to Wright).
vigorous African nationalist), whose radical views on
cultural nationalism found fertile soil in native clergymen
like James Johnson and G J Macauley, and leading native
laymen like William Grant.

(ii) E W Blyden
Edward Wilmot Blyden's fascinating life story (1832-1912) and
extraordinary achievements have received detailed scholarly
attention from African historians, African Nationalists, and
Pan-Africanists alike - especially during the 1960s and 1970s
(after the dawn of African independence) - and nothing can be
added here.\textsuperscript{159} Nor is this the place to expound on his wide-
ranging views and unparalleled contribution to African
Nationalism. But for obvious reasons, Hollis Lynch's cogent
and incisive study of the early 1870s ethnocentric
controversy in Sierra Leone (both in his book and in an
article entitled 'The Native Pastorate controversy and
cultural ethno-centrism in Sierra Leone 1871-1874')\textsuperscript{160} is of
special relevance. The race controversy makes an interesting
study in itself (especially as a nineteenth century paradigm
of African nationalism), but the main approach here will be
to evaluate its significance within the framework of the
Native Pastorate's development and assess its implications
for ecclesiastical independence.

Blyden was a West Indian Negro of outstanding ability who had
migrated to Liberia, in 1850, and was ordained there as a

\textsuperscript{159} Note particularly H R Lynch, \textit{Edward Wilmot Blyden: Pan-Negro Patriot,}
\textit{1832-1912} (1967); M Y Frenkel, \textit{Edward Blyden and African Nationalism}
(1978); E Holden, \textit{Blyden of Liberia} (1966); P E H Hair, 'Africanism: The
Freetown Contribution' in \textit{The Journal of African Studies}, 5 (1967) 4, 521-
539; and P E H Hair, 'E W Blyden and the CMS Freetown' in \textit{Journal of
Modern African Studies}, 5 (1967) 4, 521-539. Of these, Lynch's work is
the most comprehensive.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Journal of African History}, vol. 3 (1864), 395-413. See also Fyfe's
brief, but pertinent, references to the episode (Fyfe, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 385-
390, and 392-93); and Frenkel (1978), pp. 34-59.
Presbyterian minister eight years later. A gifted scholar,\(^{161}\) he was subsequently appointed Professor of Greek and Latin at Liberia College and Secretary of State in President D B Warner's cabinet in 1863 and 1864, respectively. Lynch extols him as "easily the most learned and articulate champion of Africa and the Negro race in his own time", whose "achievements as litterateur, educator, theologian, politician, statesman, diplomat and explorer, were the most convincing refutation of the oft-repeated white charges of Negro inferiority".\(^{162}\) As this statement suggests, Blyden's interests were wide and varied; but his espousal of the Pan-Negro cause (which supported the emigration of American Negroes to Africa and upheld the distinctiveness of the African personality and spiritual make-up) was the most prominent. Endowed with considerable intellectual ability, and a prolific writer,\(^{163}\) his (often idealistic) views on the Negro race were promulgated with powerful logic and consummate polemic skill; and he became the supreme vindicator of the Negro race in his time. Blyden was a more masterful and accomplished African Nationalist than Horton, who was his contemporary.\(^{164}\) Like Horton, Blyden denied that one race was inherently superior to the other;\(^{165}\) and drew heavily on historical data, as well as contemporary ideas on nationalism, to defend the intrinsic

---

\(^{161}\) Blyden learnt Greek, Latin, Hebrew, French, Spanish, Dutch, German, showed a gift for mathematics, and made a thorough study of history and literature (cf. Frenkel (1978), p. 10; Lynch [1967], pp. 12-15, 33). His extraordinary achievements greatly belied the fact that his formal education had not gone beyond High School (cf. Holden [1967], p. 74).


\(^{163}\) He was the author of 90 publications, including more than ten books (ibid., p. 50). His most popular work was a book entitled Christianity, Islam, and the Negro Race ("a collection of miscellaneous essays") first published in 1887.

\(^{164}\) Horton was most certainly influenced by Blyden's views (cf, Fyfe, 1972, p. 73).

\(^{165}\) Otherwise, their views on race differed greatly (see Fyfe, 1972, p. 73).
value and potential of the Negro. But unlike Horton, his African nationalism made him a vigorous critic of Christianity's impact on Africans and African culture, and an enthusiastic supporter of Islam. Lynch reports, Blyden expounded the controversial thesis that Christianity had stifled and thwarted the development of the Negro, and had disparaged African customs, and disrupted African society. On the other hand, Islam had helped to develop the 'African Personality', had purged African custom of its grosser elements, had kept intact most African customs and institutions and had acted as a unifying factor by transcending tribal divisions.

The fact that Blyden's ideas only reached maturity by the 1870s (according to Lynch) is noteworthy; for it was about this time that he moved to Sierra Leone.

Blyden paid a visit to Sierra Leone in January 1871, and met the recently arrived Bishop Cheetham and several of the native clergy. The native Pastors were greatly impressed by Blyden's extraordinary talents (especially his ability to converse in fluent Arabic with learned Muslims), and began to press him to come to Sierra Leone. When he visited the Grammar School to address the boys, Quaker "prayed fervently [during devotion] that God would open the way" for him to

---

166 See Lynch (1967), Chapter 4. Among his major themes was the fact "that the Negro race did have past achievements of which it should be proud; that it had special inherent attributes which it should strive to project in a distinctive 'African Personality'; that African culture - its customs and institutions - were basically wholesome and should be preserved..." (Lynch, ibid., pp. 54-55).

167 He had begun to criticize missionary operation in Africa from about 1860 "on the grounds that its sectarianism, and, at times, fierce competitiveness, its disrespect of Africans and disregard for their customs and institutions, had produced deleterious results" (Holden [1967], p. 73).


170 Cf. Lynch (1967), pp. 54 and 58.

come to Fourah Bay College.\textsuperscript{172} Blyden mused in his diary: "I think myself that up here the field in which I might labour is more immediate and pressing: and then here I should be surrounded by co-labourers who are interested in the up-building of the race".\textsuperscript{173} Quaker's prayer was dramatically answered a few months later when Blyden was forced to flee the Liberian Republic (in May 1871), on account of his political activities.\textsuperscript{174} After stopping over in Freetown he proceeded to England where he offered his services to the CMS for work in Sierra Leone.\textsuperscript{175} The PC were only too pleased to make use of his linguistic abilities and knowledge of Islam; and appointed him to Sierra Leone "as a Linguist and Translator... with special view to the Arabic language and the Mohammedan controversy".\textsuperscript{176} They proposed that he should "at once commence the study of the Fulah language, give Arabic instruction to the students at Fourah Bay College, and otherwise assist in that [sic] education".\textsuperscript{177} It is most unlikely that the PC were aware of Blyden's more controversial views - on the superiority of Islam, for example - when the appointment was made. However, subsequent claims in the Liberian newspapers that his enforced departure from Liberia had been on account of an adulterous liaison

\[\text{\textsuperscript{172}}\text{Holden (1966), p. 172. Quaker was convinced that God had prepared Blyden to work in Sierra Leone, "to train the young men for work among the Mohammedans", and to train "teachers and ministers [at Fourah Bay College] to go into all parts of Africa".}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{173}}\text{\textit{ibid.} Blyden had visited Sierra Leone on account of his health, and seems to have been determined to resign his Professorship, at least temporarily, to spend time in "some foreign clime" (Holden, p. 174f.).}\]


\[\text{\textsuperscript{175}}\text{Cf. C A1/L8, pp. 328-333, 1 August 1871, Secretaries to Blyden; pp. 334-336, 4 August 1871, Secretaries to Hamilton and Lamb.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{176}}\text{CMS, C A1/L8, p. 328, 24 July 1871, Venn to Cheetham.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{177}}\text{\textit{ibid.;} cp. CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 328-333, 1 August 1871, Secretaries to Blyden. With a salary of £200 a year, Blyden was on a par with the European missionaries. Indeed, the CMS Secretaries admitted: "Your peculiar acquaintance with the Arabic language give you facilities which no member of our Mission in Sierra Leone possesses" for taking advantage of openings in the interior.}\]
with the wife of President Roye overshadowed his appointment; though the news got to England too late for the CMS to reverse its decision.\textsuperscript{178}

Blyden's engagement evoked sharply contrasting reactions in Sierra Leone - predictably along racial lines. The European missionaries were shocked;\textsuperscript{179} and raised up a storm of protest about the pernicious effect, on the Mission, of employing a man who had charges of gross immorality hanging over his head.\textsuperscript{180} The most strenuous objection came from Bishop Cheetham, who observed scathingly: "I dare say the man has talent: I think he has: no doubt he has words and conceit no end: but he did not at all strike me as a spiritually-minded man, on the only occasion when I have seen him; and, alas, alas, it spiritually-minded men we want..."\textsuperscript{181} He went on to declare that "certainly for the present I shall not ask him to my table; and if any Pastor puts him up to preach I shall object". "Bad morals", he concluded, "is far too high a price to pay for good Arabic".\textsuperscript{182} However, the native clergy and other prominent laymen greeted Blyden's appointment with rejoicing and deep satisfaction; and paid scant regard to the charges of moral delinquency which their European brethren gave such credence.\textsuperscript{183} He was also well

\textsuperscript{178} Moreover, the charge was unconfirmed; and Venn took some consolation from the fact that the terms of agreement between the Society and Blyden "provided a dissolution of his connexion by six months notice on either side" (cf. CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 339-340, 5 August 1871, Venn to Cheetham).

\textsuperscript{179} "We hardly know which to be most astounded at", wrote Hamilton and Lamb (the joint-Secretaries), "his appointment at all, without any reference as to character, to Sierra Leone or Liberia, or the salary assigned him" (CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 143, 11 August 1871, Hamilton and Lamb to Secretaries.

\textsuperscript{180} ibid.; cp. CMS, C A1/0 25E/15, 10 August 1871, Cheetham to Venn.

\textsuperscript{181} CMS, C A1/0 25E/15, 10 August 1871, Cheetham to Venn.

\textsuperscript{182} Lynch (1967) surmises that Cheetham's strenuous opposition to Blyden was "partly because the Negro scholar was already known to have been adversely critical of Christian missions, while lauding the influence of Islam..." (p. 88). If that was the case, it is strange that the bishop made no mention of it to the PC.

\textsuperscript{183} Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 173-176, 16 September 1871, Blyden to Venn. He told Venn that "all the native clergymen have called upon me to welcome me of their joy in welcoming me here; so have the leading lay men..." Cp.
received by the Muslims (particularly the more learned among them) who made several deputations to welcome him. His command of Arabic and thorough knowledge of their religion and literature commanded their immediate respect and regard. Blyden was quick to point out that the European missionaries' feelings of contempt for the black Muslims and tendency to class them with the pagan tribes - a predilection which the native Pastors shared - had sabotaged any meaningful intercourse between Christians and Muslims. He criticised not only the European missionaries' ignorance of Islam and aversion for any interaction with the Muslim population in Freetown; but also their disinclination to itinerate into the interior or to study the native languages. In a memorable statement Blyden reflected: "As a general thing, the European missionary, however ardent his zeal in behalf of 'poor benighted Africa' while in Europe, as soon as he comes into actual contact with the Negro, his ardour undergoes a sensible refrigeration, [and] he loses all practical sympathy and all activity." He revealed that the despised Muslims

---

184 CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 156-157, 24 August 1871, Blyden to Venn.
185 ibid. He denounced Rev Knödler's statement that very few of the Muslims in the colony understood Arabic any better than the generality of the Roman Catholics (which was made at a Church Conference) as "erroneous". "Not only do many of the Mohammedans understand Arabic", he argued, "they read, they speak, write and compose in it".
186 ibid.
187 CMS, C A1/M 18, 16 September 1871, Blyden to Venn. Blyden maintained that the only way to counter influence of Islam was "to attack it from the rear - from the interior" (CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 177-179, 28 October 1871, Blyden to Venn). He argued that any attempt to attack it on the coast, were "the inconsistencies of Christians, especially the drunken habits of many white and black present a great barrier", was doomed to fail. What was important, from his point of view, was that "Christians should seek the favour of the Muslims in their endeavour to push the Gospel into the interior", for they were "without doubt the most influential people in
were actively propagating Islam, making converts even "from recaptives in the colony who have professed Christianity", were quietly and rapidly putting up an additional mosque "in the presence of scores of missionaries, European and native, within the sound of numerous Church bells"; and, even more importantly, carried on "all their institutions, educational and religious, independent of foreign aid". But though these insightful observations may have impressed Venn, neither Blyden's Arabic nor his knowledge of Islam cut any ice with the European missionaries in the colony. While he dined with the native clergymen, he was treated like a pariah by most of the European missionaries and shunned by the Finance Committee. The missionaries' moral outrage was a useful fig-leaf for their instinctive hostility; while the Finance Committees' disfavour effectively prevented Blyden from commencing instructions at Fourah Bay College or proceeding with his mission into the interior. However, Blyden's inability to vindicate himself of the charges of adultery (beyond vague references to political chicanery) made his position as an agent of the CMS increasingly untenable. The PC were willing to abide by the principle that he was innocent until proven guilty, but Venn warned him that "if the tide runs so strongly against as... it does in Sierra Leone", the PC "would be compelled to separate from this continent".

188 CMS, C A1/M 18, pp 178-179, 28 October 1871, Blyden to Venn.

189 On 24th October, for instance, all the native clergymen in the colony dined with him in the company of Honourable William Grant. Blyden commented later that "I have never before had the pleasure of entertaining such an unmixed company of pure Africans, so cultivated and apparently so patriotic".

190 The Finance Committee refused to do anything. He was only able to take on a Fulah Interpreter and continue his Fulah studies (cf, CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 169-170, 10 October 1871, Blyden to Venn; pp. 173-176, 16 September 1871, Blyden to Venn). Blyden complained that not one member of the Finance Committee had called upon him to hear what he had to say in vindication of himself.
The situation remained unchanged, and when Quaker returned to the colony two months later (after a visit to England) he remarked on "the unbrotherly feeling which I soon perceived to have existed between the European missionaries and the native clergy - owing mainly to the Blyden scandal". Letters and reports from Liberia confirming Blyden's innocence eventually reached Sierra Leone, and he wasted no time in informing Venn "that the storm raised by the malignity of my enemies... had dispersed". However, his vindication came too late. The PC had already reached a decision that since he had been "engaged by them in ignorance of any moral charge against his character", and without their knowledge of the fact that he "had been suspended by the Presbytery of his Church six weeks before he offered himself to the Society", his position was "virtually annulled". The Sierra Leone Secretaries (Hamilton and Lamb) stated that they were "deeply grateful" for the decision; and Cheetham reiterated that the appointment "had been an error of judgement" in the first place. He also remarked that in future the PC should seek "more testimony than that of a black face". The native clergy were dismayed by Blyden's disengagement, and sent a petition to Venn pleading for his

191 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 345-346, 22 September 1871, Venn to Blyden. He added, however, that he would consider such an eventuality "a great loss", and enquired whether Blyden would be able to secure "any civil appointment under government which would afford [him] spare time to pursue the native languages".

192 CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 183, 15 November 1871, Quaker to Venn.


195 CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 199-200, 15 December 1871, Hamilton and Lamb to CMS Secretaries. They insisted that Blyden had been "a painful problem to us ever since his arrival".

196 CMS, C A1/0 25E/17, 9 November [sic] 1871, Cheetham to Venn.
restoration.\textsuperscript{197} The request was denied;\textsuperscript{198} but there is some evidence to suggest that Venn was equally disappointed with the outcome of Blyden's appointment. He told Cheetham: "Upon Mr Blyden's case we must be content to differ in judgement without mutual recrimination... if we have committed any error it was on the right side of not prejording the case. We fear that you have been too much swayed by reports".\textsuperscript{199} Anxious that Blyden's services should not be lost to Africa, he wrote Governor Kennedy specially to point out that the PC's decision should not "stand in the way of his employment in any civil office, or as an Interpreter or any Mission into the interior".\textsuperscript{200} Blyden had already struck up a friendly acquaintance with Kennedy on his arrival;\textsuperscript{201} and the Governor subsequently appointed him to lead an expedition into the interior.\textsuperscript{202} Thus Blyden was able to maintain his connection with the colony and his association with the native clergy and laymen.

\textsuperscript{197} CMS C A1/0 24/ 21, December 1871, Native Pastors to Venn. Cp. C A1/M 18, pp. 195–196, 11 December 1871, Quaker to Venn. They described the charges against Blyden as "an entire fabrication" and "an unmerited disgrace", and asserted that "his accession to our ranks will very materially advance and strengthen the cause which the Society and ourselves have so much at heart. Quaker explained that "the scandalous report is generally discredited in the colony - [and] consequently the Committee need not apprehend that the cause of religion will thereby be injured".

\textsuperscript{198} Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 399, 15 April 1872, Venn to Quaker.

\textsuperscript{199} CMS, C A1/L8, p. 379, 23 October 1871, Venn to Cheetham.

\textsuperscript{200} Cf. C A1/L8, pp. 366–367, 16 November 1871, Venn to Governor Kennedy. He even intimated that "when the storm has blown over he may be employed as a Bible Translator" (CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 365–366, 16 November 1871, Venn to Rev J B Pinney, New York).

\textsuperscript{201} In September, the Governor had invited Blyden to meet a deputation of Mohammedans in what was for Blyden "a public recognition of his mission (CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 175, 16 September 1871, Blyden to Venn. Governor Kennedy was probably more knowledgeable than others about the political climate in Liberia; and he informed Venn "that in the absence of further proof of Mr Blyden's immorality, I should not hesitate to employ him in any capacity suited for him" (CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 202–203, 4 December 1871, Governor Kennedy to Venn).

\textsuperscript{202} CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 208–209, 27 December 1871, Blyden to Venn. Blyden was to lead two major expeditions into the interior under the auspices of the government - the first to Falaba, and the other to Timbo. For more details, see Lynch (1967), pp. 89–98, and Holden (1966), chap. xiv.
The dissolution of his connexion with the Society did not prevent Blyden from further criticism of European missionary operation on the West Coast. On the contrary, it gave him freedom to propagate his views in a way that would hardly have been possible while in CMS employment. Without the trammels of such an allegiance, his ideas about the inimical impact of Christianity on the integrity and cultural purity of the Negro race came to the fore more readily. Also, the hostile reception he had received from the European missionaries had served to strengthen his alliance with the native clergymen and leading native laymen. By the time the CMS terminated his appointment, he had already entered an arrangement with five native merchants - W Grant, T J Sawyerr, S Boyle, T Bright, and T J Macauley - to establish a weekly newspaper called The Negro, of which he was to be the editor. The title of the paper was a clarion call to cultural patriotism and race consciousness. Blyden

---

203 For instance, after his expedition to Falaba, he renewed his calls for the CMS to press into the interior, and declared that the day had passed for European missionaries to "be confined to routine duty in the settlements" (CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 256-260, 28 March 1872, Blyden to Venn). Though he continued, somewhat contradictorily, that if European missionaries were withdrawn too suddenly it "will paralyse the energies of the Native Church"; for it was "theirs yet to train the people up, by precept and example, to the duty of aggressive work", and to "go before and lead them out".


205 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 196, 11 December 1871, Quaker to Venn; pp. 262-26, 28 March 1872, Blyden to Venn; Lynch, (1967), p. 89. Fyfe in an article entitled 'The Sierra Leone Press in the Nineteenth Century' in Sierra Leone Studies, 8 (June 1957), 226-235, attests that The Negro was brought out by T J Sawyer "to defend the Native Pastorate" (p. 231). Blyden boasted that "not one European has given anything towards establishing the paper" (C A1/M 18, p. 271, 17 April 1872, Blyden to Venn). It was also probably at this time that some of the Native merchants (at the prompting of Governor Kennedy) "formed a Sierra Leone Native Association to represent their interests corporately" (Fyfe [1962], p. 387).

206 The term "negro" had hitherto been used in Sierra Leone as a term of abuse; but, in order to counter the strong objections which its title would invoke, the paper's prospectus forwarded a statement defending its use (cf. Holden [1966], p. 232). "'West African'," it explained, "was
explained that its objective was "to represent and defend the interests of that peculiar type of humanity known as the Negro..., whether on this continent or elsewhere." With the founding of the Negro, the race tension - which focused greatly on the Pastorate - developed into a kind of press war. Two other magazines were founded the same year: one was Home Words for Church Members, a magazine introduced by Bishop Cheetham, "in the hope that the inside matter would furnish our people with sound and sensible reading", but obviously intended to counter nationalistic agitation, and the other was The Ethiopian, a magazine started by Quaker, which attacked European domination and called for independence. But neither had the telling impact of the Negro. The first number of this newspaper was produced in April 1872; and for the next one and a half years its articulate but controversial treatment of the "race" issue and other matters pertaining to native advancement and self-

considered definite enough, but too exclusive for the comprehensive intention entertained by the promoters of the scheme". It proceeded to argue that the term Negro "is at once generic and specific"; and had scientifically legitimacy. "Every Negro", it announced, "is an African, but every African is not a Negro". A year later, the paper could claim that the title "at first somewhat misunderstood" was "now... generally accepted and cordially approved by all thinking members of the race..." (Holden, pp. 239-240).

207 Cf. Holden (1966), p. 232. Blyden claimed that the paper "will be devoted to subjects pertaining to social life, literary matters, missionary intelligence, interior news, etc"; that it "will not meddle with any political questions", and "no disputes or quarrels will be introduced into its columns" (CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 265, 6 April 1872, Blyden to Venn). However, it was later described as the first newspaper in Sierra leone designed to "serve the race purpose" (see Lynch, [1967], p. 93).


209 CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 350, 15 August 1872, Rev T Oldham to Lay Secretary; C A1/O 22/1-37. However, Oldham (who was entrusted with the editing of the Magazine) complained that it was "not enjoying much success", and that circulation was falling off particularly in the villages.

210 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 196, 11 December 1871, Quaker to Venn; pp. 375-376, 20 October 1872, Quaker to Venn. Oldham attested that the Ethiopian was "entirely under native management", and had "the sympathy and active support of the native ministers and agents" (C A1/M 18, p. 351, 15 August 1872, Rev T Oldham to Lay Secretary).

determination placed it firmly on the cutting edge of the race controversy. Its nationalistic thrust targeted European ethnocentrism and gave impetus to the hitherto vague notions of ecclesiastical independence among a few of the native clergy. It also revived fears among the European missionaries that the native ministers were determined to rid the Mission and Native Church of European presence and influence. Rev Thomas Oldham (a CMS missionary) reported that there was "a desire to do without the cooperation of white missionaries not only in the Christian work of all kinds carried on within the colony, but in mission work beyond"; and Quaker attested that "the general feeling here is that all Europeans who do not love the African should go away." Oldham complained to Venn: "I fear the Negro will not be a healthy influence over the minds of Pastors and People; but on the contrary, will increase the dissatisfaction felt at present with the missionary body and with the educational appliances of the Society managed by Europeans". Under Blyden's editorship the paper made stringent calls for the establishment of a West African University "where African teachers from both hemispheres, including Muslims from the interior, would teach students not to copy European models but develop their own originality". Though it echoed Horton's suggestion four years earlier (and Venn's own desire), this scheme was a natural extension of Blyden's conviction that European missionary influence and education had (unlike Islam) undermined the African's selfhood and ... advancement.

212 CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 352, 15 August 1872, Oldham to Lay Secretary.
213 CMS C A1/ M 18, pp. 203-204, 24 December 1871, Quaker to Venn. "Of course", he corrected, "only a few of them are meant".
214 CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 352-353, 15 August 1872, Oldham to Lay Secretary.
216 Cf. Note 17 (p. 214), above.
217 In October 1871, he wrote to Governor Kennedy: "I give it as the result of my experience that the Mohammedan Negro has lost less of the integrity of his race and fewer of the elements of independent manhood in his
Blyden argued that, if in the Government of the Settlements, native agency is to be welcomed and encouraged and not despised and excluded, if the people are ever to become fit to be entrusted with the functions of self-government, if they are ever to become ripe for free and progressive institutions, it must be by a system of education adopted to the exigencies of the country and race...218

He felt that such a University "should be located in Freetown or its neighbourhood", and would be an institution where "Parents here and at other points of the coast might send their children with the assurance that they would receive a training which would fit them for the practical purposes of life".219 European missionary education, he insisted, had failed to develop 'pride of race' in Africans".220 The Negro later claimed that the plan "for the establishment of a West African University has met with the earnest support from all leading Natives on the coast, and from influential friends of Africa in foreign lands".221 This demand for a West African University and other aims of the nationalist movement received unexpected support from Governor Pope-Hennessy, who

contact with his foreign instructor than any other Negro. The difference grows out of the fact that in imparting instruction to him his teacher has not striven to efface his race peculiarities. His idiosyncrasies have been respected. He has been made an African Muslim. He has received the religion as a tropical man. He has been stimulated to elevate and civilize himself; and the result is a sort of independence and self reliance which few other Negroes possess" (cf. Holden [1966], pp. 217-218).

219 CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 272-273, 17 April 1872, Blyden to Venn. He claimed that there was a prevalent feeling among parents "that they would prefer keeping their children at home, if there were opportunities here for liberal culture"; and contended that such training "would be, for many reasons, preferable to what they receive in England"; for "the strain which the mind of the African youth receives when he his sent to England by the sudden transition which it undergoes from African habits and tastes to English modes often unfit him for usefulness when he returns home".

221 ibid. p. 241. Indeed, the scheme received enthusiastic support from Horton, who in a letter to the Editor of the Negro argued that opposition to such an establishment was inconceivable (Nicol, 1969, p. 100).
succeeded Governor Kennedy in February 1872.\textsuperscript{222}

(iii) John Pope-Hennessy

John Pope-Hennessy was an Irish Roman Catholic, who had championed the cause of his oppressed people in the British Parliament, and had in successive governorships earned a reputation for controversy.\textsuperscript{223} However, his penchant for defending "the causes of those of his subjects he deemed oppressed", frequently led him to adopt ill-considered policies. He won instant popularity in Freetown, a few months after his arrival in the colony, when he unhesitatingly abolished the Road, House and Land Taxes (which had been rigorously enforced under Kennedy).\textsuperscript{224} Though some like Quaker initially feared that his influence as "a staunch Roman Catholic" would be injurious to the Native Church, Hennessy exhibited a negrophilism which was unsurpassed by any European. Ayandele describes him as "an unusual governor", and claims that he was "the only man in his position in nineteenth century West Africa who gave paramountcy to what he considered African interest at the expense of British imperial, missionary and commercial interests".\textsuperscript{225} Hennessy became an enthusiastic exponent of the recommendations of the 1865 Select Committee, and zealously promoted Africans to replace Europeans in Government service - though he, somewhat contradictorily, endorsed the view that European missionary education had

\textsuperscript{222} Cf. Fyfe (1962), p. 387. Hennessy was meant to be a temporary replacement.

\textsuperscript{223} Fyfe (1962) speaks of his "partisan enthusiasms", and "his persuasive self-confidence" which "blinded him to the possibility of believing himself mistaken" (pp. 387-388).

\textsuperscript{224} Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 361, 14 September 1872, Quaker to Venn; Fyfe (1962), pp. 388f. A "widely signed" petition was sent to the Secretary of State requesting that his appointment be confirmed (cf. Quaker, \textit{ibid.}). But Cheetham complained to Venn that "a Roman Catholic Governor is a great puzzle to this people: they can't understand Protestant England doing so" (CMS, C A1/O 25E/21, 18 March 1872, Cheetham to Venn).

\textsuperscript{225} Ayandele, 1970, p. 63.
failed. According to one European missionary, Hennessy did "more to create a hostile feeling towards Englishmen in the minds of the Natives than any previous Governor" - in an administration that lasted only a year. He became a vigorous champion of the nationalist cause to an extent that put him on a par with Blyden and James Johnson, and made him a bitter enemy of Bishop Cheetham and the other European missionaries.

(iv) James Johnson and Ethiopianism
The wave of "nationalism", which had infected the leading native laymen in the colony, infused a new spirit of rebellion among the native clergy. They became more united than ever before in their opposition to European domination, and bolder in their calls for the Native Pastorate to be constituted as an independent African Church. Blyden's ardent nationalism certainly acted as a stimulus; but the native Pastors' undisputed champion in the bid for ecclesiastical independence was James Johnson. Johnson remained committed to the ideals of "Ethiopianism"; and persistently believed that the Native Pastorate was "an institution that would achieve several ends for the glory of Africa and of Africans". He struck up a strong alliance with Blyden, and was undoubtedly inspired by that "prince of African Literati". Ayandele takes great pains to argue that

226 Fyfe (1962) explains that he praised William Grant and Samuel Lewis (the young but skilful Sierra Leone Lawyer) "educated at mission schools, and maintained the educated Africans in legislature and government service outshone their European colleagues as the Native Pastors the missionaries" (p. 390). Ayandele states that Hennessy believed that the appointment of Africans to vacant high posts in Church and state "would make the Administration of West Africa and of the Church efficient" (Ayandele, 1970, p. 64).

227 CMS, C A1/M 19, 7 June 1873, Sunter to Hutchinson.

228 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 25E/32c, 1 February 1873, Cheetham to Venn; C A1/M 18, pp. 355-356, 10 September 1872, Lamb to Secretaries.

229 Macauley revealed that he had been corresponding with Blyden before they first met in May 1871 (cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 103, 13 May 1871, Macauley to Venn).

he did not owe his ideas to the influence of Blyden; and insists that they "were more colleagues and collaborators than respectively disciple and master". Whatever the case, James Johnson became a more vigorous advocate for an independent African Church after Blyden's arrival; and the Negro, which he edited in Blyden's absence, provided an excellent medium for the propagation of his views. He told the other native ministers:

> The desire to have an independent church closely follows the knowledge that we are a distinct race, existing under peculiar circumstances and possessing peculiar characteristics, the desire to preserve this distinction uninjured, the conviction that it would materially contribute to give a purely native character and power to our religious profession, and that the arrangement of foreign Churches made to suit their own local circumstances can hardly be expected to suit our own in all their details.

Like Horton and Blyden, Johnson rejected European notions about the inferiority of the negro, and criticised the effect of European missionary enterprise on the African. In a correspondence with Hennessy, he defended the intrinsic value and cultural peculiarities of the African race, and argued that the climate of West Africa was a providential warning that European presence should only be temporary. The "Hennessy-Blyden-Johnson fever" (as it was dubbed by Cheetham) was a contagion which spread nationalistic fervour throughout the colony and excited strong anti-European feelings among the native Pastors. In 1872, the Negro claimed that "the conviction is deepening and extending both among thinking Europeans and intelligent Natives that the

---

231 ibid., pp. 60-63. He allows that Johnson was probably influenced by Blyden's cultural nationalism, but points out that Johnson's Ethiopianism pre-dated his contact with Blyden.

232 It should, however, be stated that Bishop Cheetham felt Johnson was "under the thumb" of Blyden (CMS, C A1/O 25E/32d, 1 February 1873, Cheetham to Venn).


235 Cf Ayandele, 1970, pp. 64-66. The Johnson-Hennessy correspondence was printed in the Negro.
great work of opening Africa to civilization and Christianity must devolve, for the most part upon the African; that the European will have an essential but by no means the greatest or most honourable part in this work...”236 It is of utmost importance to note that the growing tendency to view the Pastorate in nationalistic terms transcended denominational barriers as the leading native laymen in the other denominations embraced the vision of an independent African Church. In its purest form Ethiopianism rejected denominational sectarianism as an alien device, imposed on Africans, and envisaged not only an independent Pastorate but an independent African Church which cut across denominational boundaries.237 In a letter addressed to Hennessy (in 1872) opposing the withdrawal of the Government grant to the Pastorate, a group of non-Anglican churchmen argued that the primary aim of the Pastorate "is to provide at home, from altogether indigenous sources, for the creation and support of the spiritual life of the people, holding in subordination the merely technical or denominational aspect of the question".238 Advocating the Ethiopian ideal, they declared:

We look forward to the time when a religion of fully developed social power will spring up among us, when the religious formulae and system instead of being dull and profitless will be a source of joy and strength; when mere denominational questions introduced from abroad will sink into their proper subordination; when the hope and power that spring from a people's harmony, the reverence for something higher than man, which comes from a people's finding out and

237 The following extract from an article 'The Sierra Leone Native Pastorate Institution', which appeared in The Weekly News, (18 May 1889) is an interesting expose of the "native" point of view: "As the Englishman cannot realize or understand how it is that there is so much of tribal distinctions and tribal jealousies among us when we all appear to them as one people, so the natives in the interior cannot understand, and in consequence rightly question the divine message of Christianity, when they observe men of the same race and people contending for differences in a religion from the same Founder. We therefore regard it as nothing less than ignorance, at least, when we observe one native attacking another for a difference which is only exotic and does not belong to either".
238 CMS, C A1/0 9/90b, "Correspondence on the Native Pastorate Question": Letter (4 December 1872) by Churchmen from different denominations to Hennessy.
following their own will and instincts, will have their proper influence. To hasten such a time, and in bringing about such results, is the aim and purpose of the Native Pastorate.

These aspirations invoked considerable disquiet among the European missionaries. Rev J A Lamb (the Secretary of the Mission) informed the CMS that "matters are in a very unsatisfactory state on this coast, just now"; and declared that "the Blydenized natives, and some others, evidently want to get rid of Europeans". But while the European missionaries were subdued by the nationalist offensive, the movement encountered an aggressive opponent in the newly arrived Bishop Cheetham.

C. Bishop Cheetham and the Native Pastors
When Cheetham returned to the colony in January 1873 (after an absence of six months, on furlough, in England), he was considerably alarmed to discover a new militancy among the native clergy. He informed Venn that he had returned to "find the influence of Mr Hennessy's administration and the presence of Mr Blyden to have produced most important and unfortunate results in the minds of the native Pastors and some of the other upper natives"; and that "a most strong and virulent anti-white feeling has arisen". Cheetham felt that Blyden was the main source of all the troubles; and asserted that "the Society could never make amends to me personally, nor to my European fellow helpers here, for sending that man". However, the bishop was even more critical of James Johnson, whose editorship of the Negro

---

239 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 35, 3 February 1873, Lamb to Secretaries. He intimated that he would be seeking a "more suitable" sphere of labour.

240 CMS, C A1/O 25E/32a, 1 February 1873, Cheetham to Venn. He complained that "the general effect of Mr Hennessy's administration has been to set the blacks against the yellows; the blacks and yellows against the whites; and the whites against each other". "But the great source of evil", he charged, "is Mr Blyden"; who "has so dwelt upon this race feeling that everything is embittered".

241 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 76, 7 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright. He stated that the PC "has reaped as it sowed, in sending Mr Blyden here".
(while still in CMS employ) he deplored, and whose declarations in that newspaper aroused his deep anger. He drew special attention to two of Johnson's recent statements. The first had been made in a letter to Hennessy, in which Johnson had declared that "the use of our own liturgy and canons is a mere question of time"; and the second in another letter to a church member, in which he stated: "We are not anxious to accuse any part of the opposition with antagonism to the Church of England, because that Church is not ours in the true sense of the term". The bishop regarded the first statement, taken on its own, as innocuous - for he allowed "that it would not be imperatively necessary to cut oneself off from communion with the Church of England to have a somewhat altered liturgy and canon, which in some sense we might call our own, as distinct from those used in England" - but he insisted that its meaning had to be judged in the light of the second statement. He considered it highly improper that James Johnson had made such statements while still "in the employ of a Church of England Society and under oath to a Bishop of the Church of England"; and expressed great concern at the possibility that his pronouncements were representative of the feelings of the whole body of native clergy. He reasoned: "If Mr Johnson is speaking just his own sentiments then it is a small matter; but I really fear Mr Johnson represents the native Pastors. He is the chosen champion and his words are representative words". The thought that his native clergy could elect to repudiate their allegiance to the Anglican communion was one which Cheetham found totally unacceptable. He dismissed James Johnson's

---

242 Cheetham quoted the two statements in his letter (ibid.); and underlined the words which are italicised here. The first statement was taken from the issue of the Negro dated 18 December 1872, and the second from the issue of 15 January 1873.
243 ibid.
244 ibid. He scoffed that "though eating the bread of the Church of England, and ministering in her service, he says this Church 'is not ours'".
245 ibid.
idea of an "African Church" - "a conglomerate Church of Roman Catholics and Protestants", in which denominational sectarianism would be dissolved - as visionary and impracticable.\textsuperscript{246} In fact, Cheetham was dogmatically opposed to ecclesiastical independence in any shape or form, and regarded separation from the Church of England as anathema.\textsuperscript{247} He confirmed that the native Pastors "evidently wanted [him] to be the Bishop of two churches: the Europeans being one church and they another church"; but declared emphatically that "it is an utter impossibility for one man to be Bishop of two churches in their sense". Nonetheless, he could hardly escape the fact that the Pastors' demand for an independent Native Church (with its own bishop) was in keeping with the objectives of the Native Pastorate experiment; and he complained that part of the problem was traceable to the title 'Native Pastorate': a description which, he claimed, was "convenient" but "not without objection".\textsuperscript{248} Amongst other things, Cheetham evinced a very low opinion of the native clergy;\textsuperscript{249} and obviously felt that

\textsuperscript{246} ibid.; cp. C A1/M 19, 7 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright. He prognosticated that it would take another 1000 years for such a scheme to have any likelihood of fulfilment.

\textsuperscript{247} "I yield to the Native in desire to plant an unsectarian catholic Church in this land, which shall become national by being set in the hearts of the people...; on the other hand I should regret any exigency that might require us to secede so far from our root and mother, the Church of England" (CMS, C A1/0 25E/52d, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright). Earlier, he had stated that "while I am in trust of my present office I should think to be disloyal to the Church of England would be to be disloyal to my Lord" (C A1/0 25E/32c, 1 February 1873, Cheetham to Venn).

\textsuperscript{248} Not least because the Native Church was far from self-supporting; and, as if to underscore this point, he questioned whether the considerable sum of money he had collected in England - money given for "planting and consolidating the Church of England here" - should be spent "for the benefit of men who publicly avow that the "Church of England is not theirs"; and asked Venn whether he "ought not at once to return all the money" (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{249} Somewhat ironically, James Johnson was a notable exception (though it could be argued that he was not a native Pastor). The bishop observed with some magnanimity that he was "one of the best of fellows"; and that he was "a little dazed just now by Government House [namely, Hennessy's] influence, and under the thumb of the merely political Mr Blyden, but a fine fellow" (ibid.).
the native Pastors, whom he described as "the lowest of the people", 250 had neither the status nor calibre to operate effectively outside European control. Indeed, he observed (in connection with the need for an ordained man at Sherbro) that though an Englishman might be as 100 a native would be as 3. 251 With such little faith in native ability, he treated native aspirations with some disdain and invariably opposed native advancement. As a case in point, he wrote most disparagingly about Henry Johnson's Mende translations, and vigorously opposed his appointment to the vacant Colonial Chaplaincy (as proposed by Hennessy). 252 It goes without saying that Cheetham had little sympathy with the nationalistic notions which had taken root among his clergy, and was determined that they should bear no fruit. He was confident that if both he and his successors were to "pursue a quiet course..., and so win the confidence of Christians generally, as orderly evangelical trustworthy men" a good deal of dissent would pass away. 253 He told the CMS: "it is our duty to try to hand down to our immediate posterity a safe and good thing...; and if we do not want anything to be uncertain and unsettled, it is our duty to be faithful to, and to plant and to leave for some generations (God willing) yet to come, the Church of England". 254

Venn's reaction to the agitation for ecclesiastical independence will never be known. The "father of the West
African Church" died on 13 January 1873, after suffering a stroke three days before. It must remain a moot point, therefore, whether he would have endorsed the call for an independent (non-denominational) African Church - which rather transcended his own scheme. Venn was aware of the ground swell of nationalism in the colony, for he subscribed to and received copies of the *Negro*; but there is no record of his reaction to nationalistic claims. However, on the strength of his response to the racial conflict which had surfaced in the Sierra Leone Mission at the close of Beckles' episcopacy, it is probably safe to assume that he would have sympathized with the growing feelings of nationalism, which the paper 'On Nationalism' had anticipated. But it is almost certain that he would have discountenanced the native Pastors' agitation for an independent Native Church as both premature and unsafe; not least because the Native Pastorate was still so heavily dependent on the Society's largesse. For this reason, it is most unlikely that his attitude would have differed from Cheetham's; and suggestions that his death affected the outcome of the incipient clamouring for an independent African Church must therefore be treated with caution.

Cheetham concluded that the most effective way of forestalling the contemplated bid for independence was to ensure that the Society withheld its property in the colony (which included all the buildings and land being used by the Pastorate), and to threaten a withdrawal of the Society's aid. One of his first actions was to admonish the CMS to secure its property in the colony, and not to part with it.

---

255 Cf. Knight, pp.401-411; Shenk (1983), p. 103. Venn had already resigned his office as CMS Secretary a few months earlier, due to the infirmities of age.

256 In May 1872, he told Blyden that he had read two numbers of the *Negro* "with much interest and sincerely wished it prosperity". He also promised to try and procure other subscribers, though his movements were limited by the "infirmities of age" (CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 400-401, 17 May 1872, Venn to Blyden).
"without full satisfaction". He sought the PC's assurance that "during my life and occupancy of this see, no transfer of this property can very well take place without my consent; and that after I shall have ceased to occupy the see, I am willing to rely that the Society will be faithful to its own principles and not transfer these Parsonage Houses to any Trust of any Church which is not by its constitution in communion with the Reformed Church of England and desirous of recognition by and of maintaining so far as may be allowed and secured friendly relations with the see of Canterbury". He also urged the PC to establish the loyalty of the native Pastors (to the Church of England) by warning them "that the £300 would not continue if they were not, in good faith, members of that Church". The suggestion was unashamedly manipulative; but the bishop had become estranged from the Pastors, and was infuriated by the native Pastors' approval of the blatantly anti-white diatribes of Hennessy and Blyden. Hennessy's repeated assertions about the injurious impact of

257 CMS, C A1/O 25E/32d, 1 February 1873, Cheetham to Venn.
258 CMS, C A1/O 25E/52d, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
259 CMS, C A1/M 19, pp. 77-78, 7 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
260 ibid. He confided that even though he might be required to go down on his knees afterwards to "supplicate... for its continuance", the threat would do much good; for "there is no power here like the power of money".
261 He excused himself from attending the Pastorate Auxiliary meeting, which had met to pass a resolution after learning of Venn's death, "on the grounds of my great disgust that men, who had so recently applauded all that Mr Hennessy and Mr Blyden had written in their attacks upon Protestant missions and missionaries, which seems specially in this place to apply to Mr Venn, should meet together to pass a laudatory resolution" (CMS, C A1/O 25E/39, 13 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright).
262 See, for example, CMS, C A1/O 9/80, 21 February 1873, Native ministers to Governor Hennessy (on his imminent departure). "May the great interest you have shown in everything that tends to the elevation of our race", declared the native ministers, "remain unabated either by distance or time".
European missionary enterprise on the Negro race provoked vigorous, apologetics style, protestations from the bishop. But the idea that the native Pastors - who were so greatly indebted to the CMS - endorsed their vigorous denunciation of European missionary endeavour made Cheetham even angrier. Hennessy's correspondence with James Johnson was a the most conspicuous example. The Governor wrote: "I take the opportunity of again expressing my satisfaction at finding that you and the Native Pastors are fully sensible of the grave evils that have fallen upon the negroes along the Coast from the mistaken benevolence of those who have endeavoured to Europeanize the African". Cheetham wrote an official letter to the native Pastors demanding to know whether Hennessy was right in asserting that they agreed with him in his charge about the "grave evils, etc", and whether they agreed "in any measure" with the sentiments which James Johnson had publicly expressed in the Negro. To add gravity to his enquiry, the bishop stated: "I can hardly overrate the importance of the answers to these questions. They will in all probability either establish the Native Pastorate in the confidence of its friends and supporters, or sadly diminish their interest in it: and I believe the answer will be regarded with no less interest by its supporters here, and by its friends in England, than myself". To Cheetham's chagrin, his letter was published in the Negro, and its over-bearing style aroused the ire of the nationalists, who attacked the bishop for trying to change the title of the Native Pastorate to "the Church of England

263 CMS, C A1/M 19, 7 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright. Conscious of Hennessy's popularity, Cheetham refrained from censuring the Governor publicly; and contented himself with heated protestations to the Society. However, he pressed the PC to send "a strong remonstrance" to the Colonial Office, about Hennessy's attacks on missionary enterprise; and, when the Governor's administration ended in March 1873, urged the Society to use all the means in its power to prevent his return.

264 Quoted by Cheetham in CMS, C A1/M 19, 7 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright. The bishop had no doubt in his mind that Hennessy was alluding to European missionary operations.

in Sierra Leone". However, the thinly veiled threat in the letter was enough to invoked a conciliatory response from the native Pastors', who acknowledged Hennessy's friendship towards them, but denied being privy to his views, and disclaimed any responsibility for opinions expressed in the "Negro newspaper". Though the bishop's letter was intimidatory, it presented the Pastors with a clear opportunity to indicate their desire for the Pastorate to be an independent African Church, and to affirm James Johnson's Ethiopianism. However, they equivocated on the matter of James Johnson's statements; and insisted that "the bishop and the Finance Committee have power to call Mr Johnson to order if they think that he has erred in his zeal to defend the Pastorate". Far from endorsing the call for an independent Church, the Pastors were anxious to ratify their connection with the Church of England affirm their allegiance to its bishop. They wrote:

We are the legitimate offspring of that Church, and will ever remember with gratitude the good done us through her. No mere denigration can influence us to forget the greatness and sacredness of the work to which through the tender mercy of our God we have been called....

In conclusion, we deeply regret that anything has transpired to cause such great grief to His Lordship as to lead him to the painful conclusion that on our reply would depend his future interest in the Native Church... In complying with His Lordship's request, we submit our own feelings and views of propriety to his authority as our Bishop; and we hope that the apparent breach now made will soon be healed, and that the banner of peace and mutual confidence will still wave over the Bishop and his clergy.

The response was equivocal; and precludes any firm conclusions about the native Pastors' desire for ecclesiastical independence. However, their response satisfied Cheetham that his "little vigour in this matter has

266 CMS, C A1/O 25E/40, 24 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright. The bishop implicated James and Henry Johnson in the attack on him (which took the form of a letter to the editor), and claimed that the publicity given to his letter "will clear the air..., and cause the best of the laity to rally round me more and more".

267 CMS, C A1/M 19, pp. 156-159, 3 April 1873, Pastors to Quaker (as Secretary of the Pastorate); cp. C A1/O 25E/42.
done and is doing a deal of good... has checked the Hennessy fever, arrested attention and encouraged some to speak out". The Pastors' ambivalent response is partly accounted for by the fact that there was incipient resistance to the "Hennessy-Blyden-Johnson fever" within their ranks. This resistance was initiated by James Quaker, the Secretary of the Pastorate, who had replaced Nicol as spokesman of the native Pastors. Quaker was a moderate, who was convinced that nationalist claims were not necessarily in the interest of the Pastorate. He maintained that "extreme views in these matters tend much to retard our progress to that position of national social independence, which is the great object aimed at by England, by prejudicing the minds of those Europeans around us, and elsewhere, who might aid us in the speedy attainment of the very same object".

As opposed to Blyden et al, he argued that "Africa still stands in need of all the aid she can get from British philanthropists and British Christians, in order to rise to her proper standard in the scale of humanity". Quaker was not against ecclesiastical independence; but he was more aware than most of the Pastorate's financial vulnerability, and shared Venn's fears that premature independence may well prove fatal. He therefore rejected the anti-European views of the


269 As Principal of the Grammar School, and the most senior Pastor, Quaker had considerable influence in and without the Church. Both Cheetham's letter to the Pastors and the Pastors' reply had gone through him (C A1/M 19, p. 142, 15 April 1873, Quaker to Secretary).

270 Cheetham was convinced that he was timid; and in a different context declared that there were "certain softnesses about him" (cf. CMS, C A1/O 25E/8, 8 May 1871, Cheetham to Venn).

271 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 19, pp. 140-143, 15 April 1873, Quaker to Secretaries. He repeatedly countered the nationalist claim that Protestant Missions on the Coast had been a bane (cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 375-376, 28 October 1872, Quaker to Venn; C A1/O 9/79, 20 February 1873, Quaker to Governor J Pope Hennessy); and probably due to the rivalry between his own magazine and the Negro, argued that the latter "will never succeed", for "our people can never be one with a Liberian or a West Indian in spirit".
nationalists, and fell out with Blyden, whom he told curtly that "Israel is not to be delivered by killing the Egyptians; otherwise we shall have to wait a good while in the Land of Midian". Any doubts about the merits of Quaker's arguments were rudely dispelled by a strongly worded letter from the "Missionary Leaves Association", an organisation (in England) "especially formed to aid Native Pastorates". The Secretaries of the Association denounced "the suicidal policy" of separation from the Church of England; and reminded the Pastors of the sacrifices of "that noble army of martyrs", on whose blood the Native Church was founded. The letter paternalistic and blatantly intimidatory - in a manner not dissimilar to the arm-twisting tactic which Cheetham had employed. They warned:

> If any have been led astray by misguided men, and by plausible, but deceptive representation, we most earnestly entreat you to retrace your steps without delay.
> Till we know that our own correspondents, and those whom we are striving to help, are clear in this matter and are true and faithful to the Church and Society which have so befriended them, we must hold our hand against further aid.

This naked threat successfully subdued the native Pastors. In their reply, which was drafted by Quaker, they denied any association with the Negro newspaper, and declared that they "cannot endorse any of its sentiments". They openly disavowed James Johnson's pronouncements, and stated that "although they believe his intentions were good, they cannot agree with all the statements contained in that letter, as they do regard... the infant Native Church here established by the zealous and untiring efforts of the CMS... as a legitimate offspring of the Church of England". The idea of separation from the Church of England was categorically

---

272 *ibid.* He informed Wright that "the 'Negro-race' question and the general spirit of the Negro newspaper have separated Mr Blyden and myself".

273 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 9/81a, 4 April 1873, Address from the 'Missionary Leaves Association' to the Native Church and Pastorate.

274 CMS, C A1/O 9/82, 7 May 1873, Quaker (on behalf of the Native Ministers and Pastors) to the Managers and Secretaries of the Missionary Leaves Association.
repudiated. The Pastors declared that,

In contemplating the future growth of this infant Church under the fostering care of Christian England, into a well organised national Church, they might fondly express hope that it should never be under any restraint in respect to external observances - differing perhaps a little from the English Church in discipline - and exercising its own authority "to ordain, change and abolish ordained by man's authority"; but they could not for a moment anticipate a time - such an event they most cordially deprecate - when there would be a breach of communion between it and the Church of England - when orthodox doctrines and the evangelical teachings of the mother Church so absolutely essential to its permanent stability and vitality would be abandoned as a "worn out vestment".

It is noteworthy that the native Pastors maintained the vision of a "national" Church; but their reply constituted an absolute rejection of both the nationalist agenda and the ideals of Ethiopianism. The desire for self-determination was unreservedly sacrificed on the altar of self-preservation; though Cheetham remained "very far from being convinced that some of the native Pastors were not ready to endorse" James Johnson's words, or "that they did not largely sympathize with" the nationalist movement.

D. The CMS Reaction
The CMS Secretaries' reaction to the growing feeling on race and nationality in Sierra Leone was at once concerned and cautious. They insisted that while "they would not wish to check that growth of a natural spirit of independence" they could not but deprecate some of the sentiments which had found expression in the Negro, and concluded that the current of feeling was assuming a direction which required "some intervention" on the part of the PC. At the same time they made it clear that they wanted to "abstain from any act

275 Indeed, Quaker reproached the Secretaries for not making "proper enquiries 'ere an unmerited threat is held over, and a sentence of condemnation, as it were, passed upon them as a body from an ex parte statement".

276 CMS, C A1/O 25E/52d, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright.

which in the present state of feeling might be regarded as arbitrary". Though Cheetham and the European missionaries had called on them to denounce James Johnson's statements; their only course of action was to invite James Johnson to England "to confer with them upon the state of things in Sierra Leone and upon the feeling expressed as to the need of a higher education". CMS response to the build up of nationalism in the Native Church was tempered, and even indulgent - in significant contrast to Cheetham's feisty denunciations. Henry Wright (who had succeeded Venn as Honourary Clerical Secretary) told Cheetham that "the idea of a 'National Church of Africa' is very great and would meet with much sympathy here at home"; He subscribed to the view that Hennessy and Blyden were exercising an evil influence in the colony "in making such evil use of the race feeling", but submitted that:

"We should, I think, agree that the feeling in itself is not only natural, but a hopeful sign. It is one doubtless that may readily be turned to bad account and employed by [ill]-disposed and self interested persons to evil ends; but at the same time I cannot resist the conviction that it is one which kindly met and properly guided, and above all sanctified by the Holy Spirit, may have good results in stimulating the Christian negroes to raise earnest efforts on behalf of their unenlightened countrymen."

---

278 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 38, 24 January 1873, Minutes of the Finance Committee; p. 77, 7 March 1973, Cheetham to Wright.

279 ibid.; cp. C A1/L8, pp. 459-460, 11 March 1973, Hutchinson to Johnson. The PC felt sure that James Johnson had "misapprehended the real sentiments of those who are interested in Africa". With regard to his editorship of the Negro, they "affectionately" requested him "to remember his position as a missionary of the Society and for the work's sake to avoid that which must necessarily give pain to his missionary brethren".

280 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 469, 10 March 1873, H Wright to Cheetham. At the same time, he convinced that "for some time to come... it will be little more than an idea". With regards James Johnson's statements in the Negro he commented that "I would not myself be disposed to attach much importance to such words as you have quoted".

281 It could hardly be gainsaid that this response was far more judicious and accommodating than either Bishop Cheetham's or the other European missionaries'. Yet it bore the first indication that the Society regarded the nationalistic clamouring in Sierra Leone as a convenient platform on which to build its policy of systematic withdrawal.
Cheetham could not disagree more. He responded tersely: "National feeling and so forth is not finding expression in the Negro; but the Negro is spreading it on thick before the people are ready... Patriotism and national feeling, etc, are plants that grow with a nation's growth; and here there is not a nation yet; only a collection of persons from different tribes who heartily hate and distrust one another". The bishop's argument was valid; but, for a while at least, the shared aims of nationalism put a veneer on the fissiparous tribalism in the colony. On the matter of a West African University, Cheetham reminded the Society that when he had written on the subject two years previously the idea had only received "a small modicum of encouragement". He, however, found much in the African nationalists' proposal to deprecate: notably their savage criticism of the past educational efforts of European missionaries, and their intention to create "a Godless University" (both Christian and Mohammedan being accepted on equal footing). He urged the Society to "so open Foutah Bay and announce it open, as to cut to the ground the plea of necessity for another college"; and to "give serious thought how to secure what you have won". He argued that the

282 CMS, C A1/0 25E/44, 9 April 1873, Cheetham to Wright. He contended that a week's stay in the colony "would dissipate all serious thoughts and hope about the blessing" of race sentiment; and warned that "in the present condition of the society, to write about race sentiment is understood to mean by the common folk - be good haters; hate well, everybody else but yourself".

283 It was one which he had propounded in his Primary Charge some two years previously, when he had denounced "tribal distinctions" as a hindrance to "growth in national strength, and to the spread of the Kingdom of God in the regions beyond" (cf. CMS, C A1/0 25E/136, Primary charge of the Bishop of Sierra Leone to all the Clergy, October 1871).


286 The bishop's fears were unfounded. Despite the publicity given to the proposed West African University in the Negro, Blyden's proposal had little prospect of coming to fruition. Lord Kimberley (the Secretary of State), to whom Blyden propounded the scheme, concluded that "there is much in it which is impractical and somewhat visionary"; and remarked that "just now... the attention of the British Public is rather turned towards
Society should keep the higher education of the Coast in its own hands "for a long time to come", spend money freely to supply teachers, "offer an attractive syllabus, with Christianity the pervading element...", and save us from the blight of infidelity. Cheetham's views coincided with CMS thinking. The PC had already decided (in the light of the nationalist agitation) to recommend that Fourah Bay College should be made "more of a University, so that higher and wider education should be given in its, and its door thrown open to any well-recommended Christian African who may enter it and are willing to pay". Much more willing to accommodate the demands of the nationalists than Cheetham, they suggested that "native Professors - of whom Mr Johnson might be a chief one" - should be appointed to the institution. Wright affirmed that "this arrangement would be likely to satisfy all that is legitimate in the cry for a university; and prevent the liability of such an institution being established in godless hands". Cheetham concurred with the PC's proposals, but queried the notion of "native Professors". "Are the natives to be called Professors? - could it not be avoided? - need anyone be so called?", he enquired in carping tones. However, he agreed that "it would be desirable to have native teachers" - though "the Principal must be God-given" - and argued that the Institution should be open not only to Africans but also to "well recommended

287 CMS, C A1/0 25E/38b, 13 March 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
288 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 470-471, 10 March 1873, Wright to Cheetham. They affirmed that this should be done as soon as "good university man" could be found to act as Principal (and under him a vice Principal).
289 The reference here was to Henry Johnson, who, but for Alcock's opposition, would have taken up position at Fourah Bay College three years earlier. The PC suggested that James Johnson should take charge of Christ Church. Cp. CMS, C A1/0 25E/44, 9 April 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
290 ibid. It is significant that the PC had arrived at this decision even before James Johnson got to England. Endorsing Cheetham's own opinion, the PC also felt that they "should keep for the present in our own hands the higher training, both for the ministry and for office[s] of trust".
291 Cf. CMS C A1/0 25E/44, 9 April 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
Christian youths... whether European or West Indian". The CMS proposal was considered sufficient to meet the outcry for a West African University, and Governor Berkely (Hennessy's successor) declared a year later:

I consider that the Fourah Bay College, especially since it had been thrown open to laymen, possesses all the essentials requisite to promote that higher class of education in furtherance of which the establishment of a Government University is by certain parties advocated.  

The PC's request that James Johnson should visit England created a great stir in Freetown, and fuelled widespread speculation about what he might achieve. According to Ayandele, "African members of the Legislative Council, the press and clergymen, put all the burden of their grievances on him", and "Churchmen hoped he would work towards the formation of an African Church". Rumours were rife that he was going to plead with the Society not only on behalf of the West African University, but also for a black governor to be sent, and a black bishop in a little while. Cheetham considered the PC's invitation "a wise step"; and pondered whether Johnson "will manfully repeat all his rubbish here, and gravely tell you how seriously you have injured him and his race..., or whether his better nature will burst through and he will apostrophize England, as he is well able to

---

292 ibid. He also suggested that the expanded College could be affiliated to the London University "so that the students if they merit it get their degree".

293 Cf. Holden (1966), p. 260, Berkely to Colonial Secretary, 8 May 1874. In June 1873, Rev Metcalfe Sunter (the new Principal of Fourah Bay College) reported that Blyden "has just placarded Freetown stating that 'as the people do not wish to have a University at present' he will henceforth no longer advert to it in the pages of his paper" (CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 197, 7 June 1873, Sunter to Hutchinson). Cp. C A1/L9, pp. 15-17, Further Report of Sub-Committee upon matters at Sierra Leone, 1874.


295 CMS C A1/0 25E/46, 21 April 1873, Cheetham to Wright. The prayers of the people were also asked on behalf of Johnson's "important mission", and it was recommended that the Pastorate Anniversary meeting be postponed to await his return.
do". He dismissed the rumours as "so much rubbish", but warned the CMS to deal cautiously with James Johnson. Quaker too informed Wright that "Mr Johnson is the great man of the Race isolation question"; and expressed the hope that Wright "will succeed in talking him to something like mediocrity". The conflicting expectations only highlighted the importance attached to Johnson's visit; but the paramount mood when he departed for England (in April 1873) - along with Henry Johnson - was one of optimism.

James Johnson had hardly left the colony when the ethnocentric controversy was rekindled by Hennessy's statements in a paper presented to the Society of Arts, on 2 May 1873. The paper was typical Hennessy fare: combining a vituperative condemnation of the impact of Protestant Christianity and European missionary presence on Africa with a laudatory exposition on the merits of Islam, and extolling the cognitive attributes and cultural depth of the Negro. But views which he had propounded with impunity in the relative obscurity of Sierra Leone immediately provoked an animated response from European missionaries when presented in a wider forum. A lengthy dialectic article (entitled 'The Negro') appeared in the C M Intelligencier, which forwarded a vigorous rebuttal of Hennessy's views and opposed other nationalist ideas which had been propounded in the pages of the Negro newspaper (including the scheme of a West African...

296 CMS, C A1/O 25E/44b, 9 April 1873, Cheetham to Wright. "I guess something of this latter will be the case", he concluded.
297 *ibid.* He offered Wright advice on how to counter nationalist claims about "injuries done to the race"; and stated anxiously that "I cannot help but wish you had yourselves a little practical experience in dealing with men who have not reached our own level of civilization".
298 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 141, 15 April 1873, Quaker to Secretary.
299 Henry Johnson had also been invited by the PC to discuss his Mende translations.
University). The following extract from the article provides sufficient indication of its thrust:

We have thus come to the conclusion, not only that Africa has no past, but that the present internal condition of the country is, generally speaking, most deplorable. And yet its resources are great, and under favourable circumstances would be capable of almost indefinite extension...

And as the material resources of the country are great, so do we also believe that the natural capacity of the negro is great. If there had not been in him very considerable force of character, he would long since have been brutalized under the multitude of oppression and wrongs which he has endured. But so far from this being the case, he comes forward in Europe and in America, and displays a power of acquiring knowledge and exercising influence, furnishing significant evidence that God has not withheld from him the powers with which He had gifted the Asiatic and the European.

The article denounced the nationalists' scheme of a West African University as absurd, prohibitive, and visionary; and condemned both Islam and Roman Catholicism. It admitted to glaring imperfections in African Christianity, but upheld "the freedom and enlightenment of Protestant Christianity", which having created public opinion, upheld chastity, and dispelled ignorance in Europe would do the same in Africa. This Eurocentric perception, notwithstanding, the writer paid homage to the ideal of an independent, self-governing, Native Church, and affirmed "that Africa should be for the Africans"; though he urged "the more intelligent community in Sierra Leone... to refuse to give ear to idle loafers and professional agitators". In Freetown the article aroused some ill-feeling against the CMS, but brought immense relief to the European missionaries in the colony, who had been smarting under the onslaught of criticism from the

---

301 Cf. CMI, vol. ix, NS (August 1973), pp. 225-250. Quaker described it as "the severest article to my knowledge that has been penned by our Society in reference to the negro race"; and added, significantly, that "had my Brethren taken my advice they would certainly have saved themselves such an exposé".

302 ibid., pp. 233-234.

303 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 330, 5 December 1873, Quaker to Lay Secretary.
African nationalists. In a letter to Wright, he roundly denounced the nationalist cause and accused Blyden, Johnson, and Hennessy of "endeavouring to lead the Sierra Leone public by the nose..., with a view to their own interest." He stated that though "very many perhaps may be inclined to wish for the 'good time coming' when Europeans shall vacate their posts and Native Clergy under the superintendence of a Native Bishop shall rule alone", many "judge that it is not wise to quarrel with the milk that feeds them, and discreetly remain silent". From Sunter's point of view, the Africans were entirely to blame for the controversy which had engulfed the Mission. He insisted that whereas the Europeans had "carefully avoided... anything that might give offence or prejudice in the eyes of the Natives... some measure of the family characteristic of the African, a little love of power, no dislike of money, and probably a little race feeling have sufficed to bring about the present... state of things".

The CMS Secretaries, however, played down the significance of Hennessy's remarks, and exhorted the European missionaries to endeavour to

---

304 Menzies asserted that the flame of controversy "was in a great measure quenched by that most excellent article 'The Negro' which appeared in the *Intelligencer for August*" (CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 312, 28 October 1873, Menzies to Lay Secretary). Though CMS policy prohibited its missionaries from penning articles in newspapers, the Native Pastors were bound by no such restriction; and many articles and letters in the *Negro* which lambasted individual European missionaries (and were usually signed by a "well-wisher" or with a pseudonym) were actually been written by members of the native clergy.

305 Sunter, an Englishman from Yorkshire, was appointed Principal of Fourah Bay College in December 1870. It was indicated that he had "a defective utterance" (cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 292, 15 December 1870, Fenn to Cheetham).

306 CMS, C A1/M 19. pp. 192-204, 7 June 1873, Sunter to Hutchinson. He characterised William Grant as Blyden's "catspaw".

307 A large portion of his letter was devoted to castigating the nationalists and disparaging their views.

308 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 207, 26 June 1873, Sunter to Lay Secretary.
preserve the spirit of brotherhood.\textsuperscript{309} C Peter Williams argues that they were "primarily concerned with stopping, or at any rate controlling, the damage done by the negative reactions of the missionaries to understandable, and even commendable, movements within West Africa".\textsuperscript{310} In the Annual Letter for 1873, C C Fenn (one of the CMS Secretaries) discussed the ethnocentric controversy, and while maintaining that there was fault on both sides was particularly critical of the English missionaries.\textsuperscript{311} When the European missionaries protested, Fenn reiterated (in words which echoed Venn's Paper 'On Nationality') that "a somewhat haughty... treatment of foreigners seems to be one of the faults of the English character", and that there "is a coldness in our manner towards them, and an unconscious assumption of superiority which [is] so often disagreeable to them".\textsuperscript{312} It was evident that the CMS Secretaries considered ethnocentric arrogance on the part of their missionaries to be a prime factor in the troubles at Sierra Leone, and that they were greatly sympathetic (possibly as a result of their interaction with James Johnson) with native grievances and aspirations.

To the surprise of the European missionaries, the PC were greatly impressed with James Johnson, and reported themselves "much pleased to find a very different spirit on his part

\textsuperscript{309} Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 486, 2 June 1873, Hutchinson to Menzies; pp. 504-505, September 1873, Wright to Cheetham; and C A1/L9, pp. 7-10, 24 November 1873, Fenn to Menzies. Hutchinson enquired whether there was "any interchange of hospitality among brethren of both races", and whether the white missionaries returned the call of his negro brother.

\textsuperscript{310} Williams, 1990, p. 55.

\textsuperscript{311} \textit{ibid.} This response angered the missionaries, who also resented the fact that a copy of the letter was sent to the native clergy. Menzies felt the CMS statement savoured too much of a rebuke, and argued that it gave the native ministers "a handle against us which some of them will not be backward in using" (cf. C A1/M 19, pp. 311-312, 28 October 1873, Menzies to Lay Secretary).

\textsuperscript{312} CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 7-10, 24 November 1873, Fenn to Menzies. He emphasised the need for mutual esteem and friendship, and encouraged the missionaries to "not only welcome the more educated native Christians to their own homes, but also to make them visits".
from what we had anticipated.\(^{113}\) "I like what I have seen of him", wrote Hutchinson, "and do most earnestly trust he may return with wiser and more practical views of the future that lies before them."\(^{314}\) James Johnson pressed two main proposals on the PC: namely, the conversion of Fourah Bay College to a West African University, and the granting of ecclesiastical independence to the Native Church.\(^{315}\) The former had already been sanctioned before his arrival, and only the details remained to be worked out. The request for ecclesiastical independence received some support from Wright, who favoured "the idea of letting the Native Church take of and work a Mission of its own".\(^{316}\) But Hutchinson objected on two counts: first, that it will "be giving a false notion of things for a Church [which] really cannot support its own ordinances to appear as a Mission Church"; and second, that the Native Church lacked the men.\(^{317}\) In the end, the PC deemed ecclesiastical independence premature; and James Johnson's most significant demand was denied.\(^{318}\) His return to the colony was an anti-climax. He had no dramatic concession to announce, and the position of the Native Church remained unchanged.\(^{319}\) However, in two letters to Rev G J Macauley, which were printed in the Negro (of 20 May 1874),

\(^{113}\) CMS, C A1/L8, p. 480, 2 June 1873, Secretaries to Lamb. This was not because James Johnson had tempered his views; for Hutchinson attested that "we have done as much as possible to keep Mr Johnson straight" (ibid., p. 495, 16 June 1873, Hutchinson to Cheetham).

\(^{314}\) CMS, C A1/L8, p. 495, 16 June 1873, Hutchinson to Cheetham.


\(^{316}\) CMS, C A1/L8, p. 495, 16 June 1873, Hutchinson to Cheetham.

\(^{317}\) *ibid.* He admitted that he did "not find Johnson extravagant"; but argued that "the native will prefer being in our books to being the agent of a pure Native Church".

\(^{318}\) Lynch (1967) explains that his demands to the Colonial Office - which included the founding of a teacher's training college, elementary schools, and a secondary school, and the setting up of a system of municipal governments (to improve native self reliance) - were equally unsuccessful (pp. 101f.). Cp. Ayandele, 1970, p. 79.

\(^{319}\) CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 371, 18 March 1874, J Johnson to Lay Secretary. He however claimed he could "look back with much pleasure and thankfulness to... the patience, carefulness, and prayerfulness, with which the matters relating to the Sierra Leone Church [and] other things were considered".
he declared in emphatic terms that the PC's sympathy and support was wholly with the native Pastors in their long drawn struggle with the European Missionaries. His allegations, and their publication, enraged the Europeans in the Mission, and gave rise to one last spasm of discord. Johnson told the native Pastors that the PC had

... manifested strong sympathy with us in all our difficulties; [and] are anxious to see much friendly feeling, Christian love, and mutual forbearance between ourselves and their own missionaries...

They would be glad if we should first, for the sake of Christ, and then, for their own, bear with the failings, infirmities and shortcomings of their missionaries. Difficulties may crop up and differences may arise; and it is natural for them to do so in the present state of things, but efforts, prayerful efforts, should be at once and as often made to subdue the one and compose the other... It would delight them if we and their missionaries exercise confidence in each other's motives, and if in times of differences, which are to be prayed against, we should look from their agents to themselves.

The native Pastors obviously considered James Johnson's representation of the PC's opinion to be sufficient vindication of their stance in the ethnocentric controversy and a tacit rebuke of European missionary attitudes. This interpretation was not lost on the European missionaries; and Judge Huggins, the President of the Sierra Leone Church Missionary Auxiliary Association, sent a lengthy, irate, protestation to the PC, upbraiding the Society and denouncing the statements in the letter. He described Johnson's allegations as "not only injurious but mischievous in their tendencies, and - as touching the European missionaries - as far from the truth as darkness is from daylight". He inveighed against the PC for their encouragement of the "Johnson-Hennessy" correspondence and for "pampering up to

See CMS, C A1/0 23/68, for newspaper clips of two letters (both dated 4 May 1874) written by James Johnson to Macauley (and through his to all the native Pastors); C A1/0 23/69, 26 May 1874, H Huggins to Wright.

CMS, C A1/0 23/69, 26 May 1874, H Huggins to Wright.

He was particularly incensed by the reference to "the failings, infirmities, and shortcomings" of European missionaries, and their want of "friendly feeling, Christian love, and forbearance"; which contrasted pointedly with the PC's "strong sympathy" with the native Pastors.
the full, the well known overweening vanity and conceit of
the African, whose advancement in the world as a nation is
unfortunately retarded by the puffs, praises, and flatteries
of Europeans who have never come in contact with the African,
[and] by a continuance of time among them, to form a correct
opinion". His tirade, against both the CMS and the native
Pastors, was ample testimony to the frustration and unchanged
attitude of European missionaries, who he claimed were
"pained and humiliated that their own Society should consider
and openly declare their inferiority in character... to
Native Pastors and Ministers".\(^323\) He issued a warning that
since the CMS had discredited their own missionaries, the
Europeans in the colony, from whom the Society received the
bulk of its larger subscriptions, "assuredly will withhold
their annual subscriptions given in its support". Finally,
he called on the PC "to publicly condemn the letter and the
writer..., and to remove a stigma so publicly cast by a
native Pastor, most undeservedly, upon a highly esteemed body
of European missionaries". Cheetham was equally offended by
the Society's message to the native Pastors; and, like
Huggins, came down firmly on the side of the missionaries.
He praised European missionary forbearance in the face of
newspaper attacks, and remarked that he "had hoped to read in
the Annual Report of the Society some few words of thankful
acknowledgement [for] the admirable patience... exhibited by
your own missionaries under circumstances of peculiar
difficulty".\(^324\) He also queried the Society's silence on the
Native Pastors' fraternisation with Hennessy (a man who had
denounced the Society's labour on the Coast), and asserted

\(^{323}\) He also argued that the bishop's authority and influence was undermined
and discarded by the PC's suggestion that the native Pastors "should look
from their agents to themselves". Cp. CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 408, 17 June
1874, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.

\(^{324}\) CMS, C A1/0 25E/62, 1 June 1874, Cheetham to Wright. He argued that
over the last 18 months, "during all that period of the Hennessy-Blyden-
Johnson fever", the European missionaries had displayed admirable
restraint by not breaking bounds and putting pen to paper in any of the
newspapers in the colony or at home. But, instead of receiving "the
unqualified approbation of the Society", he continued, "they and only they
are rebuked and openly rebuked".
that the Society's message would surely provoke "another year of travail", for which the fault rest, not with Johnson or the native Pastors, but "at Salisbury Square". The PC appeared unmoved by the remonstrances from the two self-appointed advocates of the European missionaries. In reply to Huggins letter, Wright agreed that it had been an error to publish letters which conveyed counsel that had been given orally, and insisted that the sentiments "would have been expressed differently if the Committee had spoken for themselves". He, however, denied that Johnson's representation was as one-sided as Huggins in his "friendly zeal" for the missionaries had suggested; and side-stepped the demand for a public condemnation by asserting that the PC "form far too high an estimate of the Bishop on the one hand and of our missionaries on the other to think that the authority of one and the reputation of the other will suffer from the somewhat unguarded expression of Mr Johnson". Wright's refusal to accept European missionary inculpability, or to lay all the blame on the native Pastors, represented a striking departure from Venn's predisposition to console one and censure the other. Unlike Venn, he did not depend mainly on missionary reports to form his judgement; for as he informed Huggins, the vast majority of the PC "have spent the best part of their lives in closest contact with native races", and were therefore not without experience.

E. Aftermath
The ethnocentric controversy, fuelled by the upsurge of nationalism, over-shadowed the affairs of the Native Pastorate for about seven years. But by mid-1873 it had lost much of its force; and despite the storm of protest raised by Hennessy's statements, "the Hennessy-Blyden-Johnson fever"

325 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 43-45, 3 July 1874, Wright to Huggins.
326 Indeed, Fenn had been able to censure European missionary attitudes with authority precisely because he could claim that he had fallen into the same pitfalls as a missionary in Ceylon (CMS, C A1/L9, p. 8, 24 November 1873, Fenn to Menzies).
had entered a cooling period from which it never revived. Hennessy's departure (in March 1873) not only removed the controversy's most mercurial protagonist but also weakened Blyden's position and influence in the colony. Blyden subsequently applied for the vacant post of Director of Public Instruction; but Bishop Cheetham, who prayed that "the Lord guide us in this matter and avert Mr Blyden getting it", used his not inconsiderable earthly influence to prevent the appointment.327 Defeated at the last by the man who had become his arch-enemy, Blyden returned to Liberia (in June 1873) on grounds of ill-health, and resigned his position as Agent to the Interior.328 His departure dealt a severe blow to a movement which owed much of its impact to his leadership and genius. But by then even the Negro newspaper appeared to be losing ground; and Quaker reported, in June 1873, that its "sentiments... are now being generally considered, to say the least, wrong and improper".329 For a while, the somewhat unrealistic expectations surrounding James Johnson's visit to England enlivened awareness; but his eventual return (in December 1874), with nothing but CMS good wishes to deliver, deprived the nationalist cause of a last-minute deliverance.330 The final blow came when the PC decided to transfer Johnson to the Breadfruit Church, in Lagos.331 The native Pastors (joined by five native laymen) petitioned the PC against Johnson's transfer, which they insisted "would be

329 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 229, 17 June 1873, Quaker to Lay Secretary. He added that in consequence "a new paper is being got up called The Independent".
330 Quaker had feared that James Johnson's return would result in a revival of the controversy (CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 229, 17 June 1873, Quaker to Lay Secretary); but Cheetham noted, spitefully, that when Johnson gave a lecture "on the greatness of England", after his return, "hardly a single native, except the Female Institution children went to hear him" (CMS, C A1/O 25E/62, 1 June 1874, Cheetham to Wright).
331 The PC's decision was taken in February 1874 (cf. CMS, C A1/L9, p. 23, 12 February 1874, Wright to Cheetham).
a serious loss to Sierra Leone".332 The PC demurred;333 and James Johnson's departure from the colony, in June 1874, effectively brought all nationalistic agitation in the Native Church to an end.

The ethnocentric controversy signified little more than a growing pain in the life of the Native Pastorate: a stepping-stone to maturity. But it was not without a certain beneficial impact. The native Pastors' struggle against European domination and racial prejudice had received the backing of leading native laymen; and, for a while, a certain alliance was forged between the two. Also, native aspirations were brought to the fore, for the first time, as both native clergy and laity sought to articulate their own vision of an independent Native Church - which became epitomised in James Johnson's Ethiopianism. The fact that the vision was inchoate and impracticable is immaterial, for its main value lay in the fact that it was a product of native insight and instincts rather than a foreign conception. It was a bitter irony that Venn who was chiefly responsible for evoking such a vision in the first place showed such little sympathy for the native Pastors' cause, and seemed to endorse European authoritarianism. Significantly, it was only after his death that the PC evinced a willingness to entertain the native Pastors' point of view, and to openly query the attitude and actions of the European missionaries - some of whom like Alcock had a contemptuous disregard of all that the Pastorate stood for. The Native Pastorate remained the main focus of the race controversy even after the controversy itself had been transformed by the contagion of nationalistic fervour. However, the agitation for an independent African Church was never a full-blooded affair; mainly because the native

332 CMS, C A1/O 23/22, 7 April 1874, Petition (signed by native Pastors, and five native laymen) to PC.
333 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 46-49, 24 July 1874, Secretaries to the Ministers and Members of the Native Church, Sierra Leone; cp. C A1/O 25E/62, 1 June 1874, Cheetham to Wright.
Pastors (as a body) were loath to be deprived of CMS support, and for the most part remained on the fence. As Oldham observed, while there were "many indications of a desire to be rid of foreign supervision of every kind", there was no "well sustained effort to do without, as soon as possible, foreign support". Lack of self-support was a fatal impediment, and sufficient reason to argue that the movement was doomed to fail even before it began. The grand vision of Ethiopianism and the rousing rhetoric of Blyden produced longings in the native mind which were not matched by a corresponding liberality, and contributions to the Native Pastorate remained precariously low throughout the period. The halting bid for ecclesiastical independence was defeated not so much by European missionary opposition or by Cheetham's intransigence, but by the Native Pastorate's lack of self-support - a deficiency surprisingly ignored by both James Johnson and Blyden, but adeptly exploited by Cheetham. And once the clamour of nationalism and the furore of ethnocentric conflict had died down, attention returned once more to this fundamental requirement. The experience, to be sure, had not done the Native Pastorate any harm; but neither could it be said to have assisted its progress. It had been an interlude, not a prelude.

334 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 351, 15 August 1872, Oldham to Lay Secretary.
335 In 1872, for example, the Committee of the Pastorate Auxiliary lamented "the absence in the Settlement of large sources of income by which the contributions of the poor may be rendered more enlarged as well as more regular" (CMS, C A1/0 9/9, Tenth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary, 22 May 1872, p. 20). However, it is worth mentioning that in the period before this (between 1871 and 1872), contributions to the Pastorate Auxiliary showed a sharp increase mainly because the anti-white feeling induced many to transfer their contributions from the CM Auxiliary to the Pastorate (cf. C A1/M 18, p. 226, 12 February 1872, Quaker to Venn).
Meanwhile, gentle but gradual withdrawal should be affected if the Native Church is to walk alone and upright. The number of European missionaries should be as far as possible diminished, and the number of Native Pastors be increased: resources should be looked to from within, and not from without. Moreover, utmost care should be taken that the burden eventually to be imposed upon Native congregations should not be made heavier than is absolutely necessary.

When Bishop Cheetham arrived in the colony on 6 January 1871, he inherited a Native Pastorate that was in an embattled and enfeebled state. Apart from controversy and conflict, the Pastorate was plagued by a number of insidious problems. Beckles' prolonged absence (and eventual resignation), followed almost immediately by Nicol's and Maxwell's departure from the colony, created a leadership vacuum and a 20% reduction in the number of competent native Pastors. The situation worsened further when Caiger, who was Bishop's Commissary, died at the Gambia in May 1870. Even more worrying than these manpower problems was the Pastorate's financial predicament. The depreciation of the African ginger in the English markets in 1870 created widespread...

---

1 Quoted from article entitled 'The Relations of the Missionary Societies to Native Churches' in CMI, vol. 1, NS (March 1876), 129-134, p. 132.

2 Like Nicol, Maxwell had been offered the Acting Chaplaincy of the Gold Coast (by Governor Kennedy), which he accepted without hesitation (CMS, C A1/0 148, 5 May 1870, Maxwell to Venn). The loss of the Native Church's two senior Pastors was deeply felt; but their appointments tended to authenticate the popular view that the Native Pastorate represented the nucleus of a new African Christianity. The Committee of the Pastorate Auxiliary described it as "a new era in the history of the Church of West Africa" (C A1/0 9/6, Eighth Anniversary of the Pastorate Auxiliary, July 1870); cp. C A1/0 164/45d, 4 May 1870, Nicol to Venn.

3 Of all the European missionaries who had been connected with the Pastorate since its establishment, Caiger was undoubtedly the most supportive of its ideals and the most beloved of the native Pastors. Nicol wrote: "I have lost one with whom I worked for may years building up the Native Church in Sierra Leone. His interest in establishment and consolidation of the Native Church never flagged... He freely over taxed himself" (CMS, C A1/0 164/45a, 4 May 1870, Nicol to Venn); cp. C A1/0 9/6, Eighth Anniversary of the Pastorate Auxiliary, July 1870.
hardship in the colony (specifically in the villages), and caused an alarming drop in contributions to the Native pastorate.4 "'What are we to do before we eat, pay school and class, and the Government tax', is in the mouth of almost every villager", reported Macauley, in 1871.5 Quaker confirmed that the Pastorate Fund was "in a very backward and unsatisfactory state - assets being insufficient to meet ordinary liabilities - while large repairs are necessary".6 The expectation that building repairs would be largely completed by the end of the first decade proved entirely mistaken, and the Church Committee (whose function, in the absence of episcopal leadership, was more or less vestigial) was inundated with applications from the various Churches for financial aid.7 The distinctive air of despondency which inexorably overshadowed the affairs of the Native Pastorate was poignantly expressed in the Pastorate Auxiliary Committee's report of July 1870:

The dark clouds which hanged over the firmament of the Pastorate ... have been in a manner dispersed, and others not less portentous, and of which your Committee never dreamt, are staring them in the face. The true position of the Native Church could only be adequately described in the words of the Apostle, 'without were fightings, within were fears'...

Cheetham's appointment and subsequent arrival in the colony therefore became the focus of every expectation about the Pastorate's revival. The CMS Secretaries expressed the hope that his presence would bring "deliverance from the many

---

4 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 30, 12 December 1870, Quaker to Venn. The Pastorate Auxiliary Committee reported that "the fall in the price of ginger, arrow-root, etc, in England already begins to tell on the class coppers in Pastorate stations"; and they "urge[d] on their friends the necessity of enlarged contributions" (C A1/O 9/6, Eighth Anniversary of the Pastorate Auxiliary, July 1870).

5 CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 102, 13 May 1871, Macauley to Venn.

6 CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 419, 12 April 1870, Quaker to Venn.


8 CMS, C A1/O 9/6, June 1870, Eighth Anniversary of the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate Auxiliary.
perplexities and difficulties which have so long surrounded the work; while the beleaguered native Pastors prayed fervently that "the things that are wanting in the Native Church may 'ere long be set in order". They told the new bishop: "Long have we laboured in weakness, but with faith persevering. May your presence this day amongst us contribute much to quicken our zeal, and clear our hearts for a more earnest and persevering effort, for the spiritual edification of the flock, over which the Holy Spirit have made us overseers".

Cheetham lived up to reports of his administrative ability and wasted no time in getting to grips with the problems facing the Native Church. Naturally energetic, he visited every parish in the colony within three months after his arrival, and held confirmations in nearly all of them. He activated lay interest in the affairs of the Pastorate by pronouncing that "every Church member in the colony who likes will have a voice in the election" of the Church Committee, and also re-organised the Church Council (which was increased from five to seven members, to correspond with the increased number of native clergy). By May 1871 he was able to reassure Venn that "the constitution you put into my hands is

9 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 296, 23 December 1870, Secretaries to Hamilton and Lamb.
10 CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 38-40, 10 January 1871, Address from the Clergy of Sierra Leone to the Rt Rev Henry Cheetham, Bishop of Sierra Leone on his arrival in the colony.
11 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 25E/4, 17 April 1871, Cheetham to Venn; C A1/M 18, p. 396, 24 November 1871, Lamb to Secretaries. He confirmed 997 candidates, and remarked that despite "the sectarianism of the place and the general love of isms, the rite of confirmation is valued".
12 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 66-67, 14 March 1871, Cheetham to Venn. This approach was a significant departure from the restricted, almost cryptic procedures, previously adopted in the election of members to this governing body.
13 This increase had first been contemplated under Beckles, and was provided for by the 'Articles of Arrangement' (cf. C A1/O 25E/1, 11 January 1871, Cheetham to Venn; C A1/L8, pp. 306-308, 11 February 1871, Venn to Cheetham).
being worked, in all its main features". But, as he became more settled in his new position, the bishop found much to deplore in the Native Church. He described the native pastors as the "lowest of the people"; and vigorously criticised the exclusive use of Fourah Bay College for ministerial preparation, which, he claimed, tended "to impoverish the ministry and hinder its getting the respect of the people to the extent it might". Anticipating the demand of the African nationalists, he called for the establishment of "a school superior to Grammar School", which "might become the University of West Africa"; and argued that expanding the College to include secular education supported by fee-paying students "would be helpful to the raising up of a higher order of ministry". He also advocated (like Beckles before him) that the catechists who were still in CMS employ should be licensed by the bishop as a regulatory precaution. However, it was the Native Pastorate's financial predicament which presented Cheetham with his most formidable problem. He discovered that the Native Church barely raised half of its financial requirements, and remarked tersely to Venn that "the Editor of the CMS Periodicals should not write of the Church being self-supporting!". A closer scrutiny of the Pastorate Fund revealed that its income had "exhibited a tendency to decline" over the past three years (between 1867 and 1870), and that it needed "an increase of several hundreds a year".

---

14 CMS, C A1/0 25E/8, 15 May 1871, Cheetham to Venn.
15 CMS, C A1/25E/7, 6 May 1871, Cheetham to Venn.
16 Venn told him that "the question of the future for Fourah Bay is a very anxious and perplexing one" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 309, 5 April 1871, Venn to Cheetham).
17 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 124-128, 4 July 1871, Cheetham to Venn; C A1/L8, p. 343, 5 September 1871, Venn to Cheetham. Venn replied that in the past the PC had "declined presenting their catechists for license in any Mission", and suggested that they were unlikely to "depart from the precedents in the case of Sierra Leone".
18 CMS, C A1/0 25E/6, 8 May 1871, Cheetham to Venn. He added that even what was obtained required so much effort "that ways and means for small schools and for repairs of Churches and school houses are a great perplexity".
just to service the "continual" repairs of buildings. Cheetham emphasized that "the dimensions of the Pastorate at the present moment are confined by necessity imposed upon us through its financial position", and warned that "the fund at the disposal of the Church Committee is entirely inadequate for sustaining the work at its present dimensions". He called for "an earnest support and an enlarged liberality"; and advocated a tithing scheme - "the dedication of a fixed portion of or income" - which he calculated would raise some £3000 a year and "place the Native Pastorate in an easy and comfortable position". Sadly, this proposal was overly ambitious, and even though it was taken up by the Pastorate Auxiliary Committee, the scheme died a natural death. In any case, Cheetham may have rather defeated his own purposes when he suggested in his Primary Charge that Class Meetings (at which the bulk of contributions were made) were "not especially arranged for and provided by the Church", and that attendance at them was "entirely voluntary".

A. The Articles of Arrangement

Both Venn and the PC regarded the successful creation of a Church Council and Church Committee as sufficient indication that the Articles of Arrangement (or Church Constitution), drawn up in 1853, were quite adequate for the purposes of the Pastorate experiment. By 1867, therefore, the PC had begun

---

19 CMS, C A1/0 25E/136, October 1871, Primary Charge of the Bishop of Sierra Leone (to all the Clergy); cf. pp. 33-36. The income of the Native Pastorate Fund had dropped from about £1,664, in 1868, to £1,622, in 1869, and £1,607 in 1870. Class payments and the Native Pastorate Auxiliary contribution also showed a similar decline.

20 ibid.

21 Cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/7c, Ninth Annual Report of the Pastorate Auxiliary, 1871.

22 Venn informed Nicol that the PC "are aware that in the working of it many points will arise which have not been provided for, and they will give their assistance in the settlement of such matters as they arise" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 154, 23 May 1867, Venn to Nicol). It was further testimony to the value of the Articles that even after the Colonial Church Regulations were drawn up the Society's legal advisers saw no reason to
to call for a more comprehensive implementation of the 'Articles', in order "to strengthen and settle the Native Church". Venn informed Beckles that it was time "a form of lease be prepared by which the native Pastors are to be put into possession of the Churches and houses" (as stipulated by Article 9), and that the patronage of the Society’s Churches (provided for by Article 8) should be taken up by the Sierra Leone Finance Committee. These two Articles were specially designed to consolidate the Pastorate experiment as well as to give impetus to its progress. Article 8 stipulated that "the Patronage of the Society's Churches and Chapels shall rest for the present with the Society, to be exercised in Sierra Leone by the parties upon the spot, whom they may appoint, who shall select and present Native Pastors in full Orders to the Bishop, for his approval and license". The requirements of Article 9 (which was titled the "nature of the tenure by which Native Pastors shall hold Churches belonging to the Society") were far more complicated. Among other things, it declared that the Society would not dispossess any native Pastor of his House or Church "so long as he continues to hold the Bishop's license"; but that they would "dispossess every such Pastor as soon as legally and conveniently may be after the withdrawal of such license". In order to give effect to this stipulation, the Article went on to declare that "the Society shall give to each Native Pastor presented by them to a District, and license by the Bishop, a lease of the parsonage, glebe, and church, attached to such District, during his incumbency, but to terminate

make alterations to its stipulations (cf. C A1/L8, p. 147, 21 May 1867, Venn to Beckles).

23 Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 156, 23 May 1867, Secretaries to Hamilton.
24 CMS, C A1/0 9/56, 18 January 1867, Minutes of the Church Committee; cp. C A1/L8, pp. 147-151, 21 May 1867, Venn to Beckles.
25 Cf. Appendix I.
26 ibid.
upon the withdrawal of the Bishop's licence". The significance of Articles 8 & 9 cannot be overemphasized. The form of lease and the Patronage of the Churches (which included the appointment of any Pastor to a particular Church) represented the only formal connection between the Society and the Pastorate - apart from the educational establishments - and it is important to note that they denoted the Society's firm if residual control of the Native Pastorate's development. For this reason, the two Articles later became the focal point of the whole question of ecclesiastical independence. The PC declared that they intended to retain the Patronage of the churches until "the Native Church is mature enough to form its own judgement". Venn revealed that since the Anglican Church offered no precedent or guidance on the matter, the question of patronage was being "agitated in twenty different colonial churches", and "very different schemes are adopted". "One half of our [i.e., English] Churches", he told Hamilton, "are in private patronage, one-sixth in the patronage of Bishops, and the same proportion in the gift of Colleges and Chapters". He argued that though "the CMS would gladly divest itself of the Patronage at once... it owes a solemn obligation to the Native Church not to leave it open to the designs of ambitious and unreflecting men by whose instrumentality the great enemy of the Church would soon introduce confusion and ruin". In order to "prevent a

---

27 Incidentally, the form of lease, which was prepared by the Society's Lawyers, was only provided after considerable delay. It had still not been completed three and a half years later when Cheetham took up office (cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 293, 23 December 1870, Venn to Cheetham).

28 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 169-171, 9 September 1867, Venn to Quaker. They stated that "the PC will be ready to make any other arrangement which may appear desirable when the Native Church has sufficiently advanced for the settlement of this question of patronage on a permanent basis" (C A1/L8, pp. 156-157, 23 May 1867, Secretaries to Hamilton). Cp. C A1/L8, pp. 147-151, 21 May 1867, Venn to Beckles; pp. 176-180, 23 October 1867, secretaries to Hamilton.

29 Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 170, 9 September 1867, Venn to Quaker; pp. 176-180, 23 October 1867, Secretaries to Hamilton.

30 C A1/L8, p. 169-171, 9 September 1867, Venn to Quaker.
premature settlement of a complex question" therefore, the Secretaries ruled that the Society's right of patronage should "be exercised by the Bishop and Church Committee on the clear understanding that it is under the general control and sanction of the CMS". In the event, Beckles' absenteeism, and the upsurge of racial ferment, made it virtually impossible to implement these provisions. But Cheetham's appointment presented a fresh opportunity, which the PC were quick to grasp; and they urged the new bishop to give immediate attention to establishing the Society's patronage and granting leases to the native Pastors. The form of lease was not ready in time for the bishop's departure, but he was instructed to form a Board of Patronage (comprising himself, Hamilton and Menzies) immediately on arrival.

The introduction of lease arrangements turned out to be a process beset with pitfalls. Once Cheetham was settled in his diocese, he discovered that almost all the Parsonages were in a dilapidated condition; and he told the PC that the buildings had to be made "habitable and acceptable" before "we can expect a Pastor to accept the lease and enjoy his freehold and keep it in repairs". Venn agreed "that a great amount of preparatory work is required" before the leases could be introduced, and accepted "that before we can force the Pastors to take leases we must provide them with

---

31 CMS, C A1/L8, 23 October 1867, secretaries to Hamilton. The unsettled state of affairs in the Native Church at the time, and the subsequent outbreak of racial conflict, strengthened the Society's resolve to retain this patronage.
33 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 293, 23 December 1870, Venn to Bishop Cheetham. The form of lease was however prepared by April 1871 (cf. C A1/L8, p. 309, 5 April 1871, Venn to Cheetham).
34 CMS, C A1/O 25E/3, 14 March 1871, Cheetham to Venn. "The present residences", he wrote, "are in every condition of circumstance, requiring in one or two instances almost re-building, and in every case more or less of repair" (C A1/M 18, p. 105, 24 May 1871, Cheetham to Venn).
substantial and valuable residences". This response convinced Cheetham and an anxious Church Committee that the Society was prepared to assist in the repairs of the buildings. The Church Committee expressed their readiness to cooperate with the Society in seeing that the leases were put into operation as soon as possible, and immediately reduced repairs of the Parsonage houses - the scourge of the Pastorate Fund - to the barest minimum, "in anticipation of a thorough and general repair". They enquired to what extent the PC were "thinking of aiding in accomplishing the same"; and even argued that there was "nothing in the regulations requiring the Church Committee to assist in the repairs of Parsonages". It was also resolved that "instead of going on as formerly, patching and patching from time to time, and thereby exhaust the small balance in hand, without being able... to render the house sufficiently comfortable to the resident Pastor", it would be better "to put at once in thorough repairs about one or two parsonages as the funds will allow, and then hand over the same to their respective Pastors on lease". Cheetham calculated that the whole of the repairs would involve an outlay of £3000 to £4000 - an

---

35 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 309, 5 April 1871, Venn to Cheetham. He added that "this can only be done year by year with the funds in hand"; and stated that "we have longed to hear of any one Parsonage that it is a fair model - and what the cost of such a model is".

36 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 104-106, 24 May 1871, Cheetham to Venn. Cheetham ventured that the PC "must feel so deeply interested in everything connected with the taking root of the Church in this Coast, that... their proposals on this head will be marked by much generosity".


38 Ibid. Nonetheless, they conceived of themselves as the medium through which the PC would act in the matter. Indeed, Cheetham suggested that the PC should leave the labour to the Church Committee and make a money contribution "in proportion to the outlay" (CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 106, 24 May 1871, Cheetham to Venn).

39 Cf. C A1/M 18, pp. 226-227, 12 February 1872, Quaker to Venn. An account of the repairs of buildings revealed that from January 1862 to June 1872 over £878 had been expended on the repairs of Parsonages, and just over £1541 on the repairs of churches and erection of chapels in the villages (C A1/M 19, pp. 361-362).

amount that was completely beyond the reach of the overstretched Pastorate Fund. This huge estimate was accounted for by the enormous sizes of the Parsonages. Cheetham complained that they were "much larger than we should think of building for a Pastor, who is hereafter to keep his Parsonage in repairs"; and Quaker observed that "our missionaries here should be advised to take care how they enlarge their dwelling houses, as they are likely to prove burdensome to their successors, the native Pastors". But the primary focus remained on putting the buildings into good repair. Quaker argued that "when once the buildings are put into thorough good repairs" there would be "no objection to the leases being adopted". Indeed, he submitted that the "legal binding will make men of us, and call forth increased exertion, and higher sense of responsibility". But in a manner reminiscent of the confusion which plagued Beckles' early efforts, the expectation that financial assistance from the Society was forthcoming turned out to be based on a misapprehension. For almost a year, the Church Committee could get no response from the Society; and eager anticipation slowly gave way to frustration. The PC's response, when it came, summarily dismissed all expectation about CMS assistance. The Secretaries announced that

42 CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 359-360, 14 September 1872, Quaker to Venn. He claimed that the house at Hastings, for example, was "as large as this Regent Square, if not larger".
43 ibid.
44 In November 1871, Quaker reminded Venn of Cheetham's letter (CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 190-191, 22 November 1871, Quaker to Venn); and in February 1872, wrote to say that he had been requested by the Bishop and Church Committee "respectfully to ask Venn for a reply to their letters" (C A1/M 18, pp. 226-227, 12 February 1872, Quaker to Venn). Venn later explained that the delay was occasioned by the uncertainty in England about the regulation of Colonial Churches (C A1/M 18, pp. 398-399, 15 April 1872, Venn to Quaker).
45 "I cannot hide it from you", Cheetham told Venn later, "how very much I have felt the delay in answering my letter of 27 May 1871...; and I believe the laymen on the Committee feel for me deeply - in fact it has puzzled them completely" (CMS, C A1/O 25E/23, 26 April 1872, Cheetham to Venn)
"however deep may be the interest which the Committee take in the welfare of the Native Church, they do not consider that the question of repairs is one at all devolving upon them". They stated brusquely that "when the Society handed over to the Church Fund the weekly payments which it previously received", and continued to subsidize that fund with an annual grant, "further money responsibility was at an end". Cheetham's membership of the Board of Patronage also came under scrutiny; and Hutchinson declared that his inclusion had been a mistake, for the bishop could not represent the Society in an arrangement which placed them on opposite sides. The Society's response threw everything into confusion; and when Cheetham visited England the PC decided to form a "sub-Committee to confer with the Bishop of Sierra Leone", on the various perplexities surrounding the Articles of Arrangement. Discussions with Cheetham induced the "Sierra Leone Sub-Committee" to adopt a more accommodating stance on the matter of the leases. They passed a resolution to the effect that "while the Committee consider the responsibility of the repairs as not resting upon themselves, they are willing to consider to what extent they can assist the Native Church Council in this matter"; and that "they will be glad to receive proposals from the Native Church Council on the subject". Countering Hutchinson's objection, they also recommended "that Bishop Cheetham be appointed a

46 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 388-389, 5 April 1872, Secretaries to Cheetham.
47 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 405, 5 June 1872, Hutchinson to Lamb. According to Hutchinson, it "was never intended that the Bishop should represent the Society", for the Article of Arrangement "placed the Bishop on one side and the Society on the other, and the Societies representatives as lay patrons present to the Bishop"; and it was unacceptable that the Bishop should present to himself. Cp. CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 407, 13 March 1872, Resolution of the Committee of Correspondence.
48 Cf. CMS, G/Cl, vol. 40, 14 October 1872, Minutes of the Committee of Correspondence. The remit of the Sierra Leone Sub-Committee was to deliberate on matters pertaining to the welfare or development of the Sierra Leone Church in conjunction with the bishop, and report to the PC.
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member of the Committee of Patronage". The PC's resolutions, based on the report of the Sierra Leone Sub-Committee, and the newly prepared form of lease arrived in the colony in January 1873. The two years delay in commencing the necessary repairs had been costly, since buildings deteriorated rapidly in the Sierra Leonean climate; and the Church Committee was anxious to commence work immediately (before the rainy season began in May). In order to avoid further delays, which correspondence over the details of an agreement would entail, they proposed "that whatever financial arrangement is finally concluded between the CMS, the Church Committee, and the native Pastors on the subject of the repairs of ministers' Houses, it may be allowed to be retrospective in its action". Confident that the Society would be amenable to the suggestion, the Church Committee opened a special "Ministers' Houses Repairs Fund" (with the sum of £200), and commenced work on the Parsonages.

Cheetham was most displeased with the way in which the Society had handled the matter of the leases. Apart from the prolonged silence which preceded his visit to England, he took exception to the PC's declaration that no responsibility

---

49 CMS, G/Cl, Vol. 40, 9 December 1872, Report of the Sierra Leone Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee's resolutions were subsequently adopted by the PC.

50 CMS, C A1/O 9/62, Minutes of Church Committee, 28 January 1873.

51 CMS, C A1/O 9/62, 28 January 1873, Minutes of the Sierra Leone Church Committee; C A1/M 18, pp. 27-28, 3 February 1873, Cheetham to Wright. They also requested that the services of J H Ashcroft, a CMS Missionary, should be made available. Cheetham explained that since the work was considerable and involved such a large outlay, it was "desirable to have the assistance of an European in determining what to do" (C A1/O 25E/27, 30 January 1873, Cheetham to Venn). Ashcroft was "to have charge of the work; to buy materials, etc; and to employ... native master men and their hands".

52 CMS, C A1/O 9/62, 6 February 1873, Minutes of the Sierra Leone Church Committee. The PC later acceded to the request (cf. C A1/L8, p. 467, 10 March 1873, Wright to Cheetham).
devolved upon them to repair the Parsonages.\textsuperscript{53} He pointed out that since the leases had not yet been granted, the native Pastors' occupation of the Parsonages was "outside the Regulation", and therefore a matter between them and the Society.\textsuperscript{54} He argued that neither he, as bishop, nor the Church Committee had a definite obligation to do anything about the matter until the leases had been signed - though he certainly had a pastoral interest in the well-being of his clergy, who were "suffering through the condition of their houses". From Cheetham's point of view, the fact that the Church Committee had been willing "from day one... to join with the Society in putting the property into good tenantable repair", and had expended £1000 on the Parsonages in the last eleven years, was sufficient reason for the Society to give unrestrained assistance to the repairs of the Parsonages. He reiterated that the Pastors "could only be compelled under the leases to undertake future repairs if they were given houses in good condition"; and he pointed out the discrepancy between Venn's earlier response and Hutchinson's reply to enquiries about the repairs. Even more than Beckles (who had not been of CMS mould) Cheetham felt betrayed by the Society's lack of support. Like Beckles he had enthusiastically pursued a course advocated by the Society, with every assurance of their backing, only to discover when faced with difficulties (invariably of a financial nature) that the Society hastily retreated behind a wall of silence and summary denial. He reminded the PC that "there were special circumstances in my acceptance of the office, entitling me to... a special consideration, a special sympathy, a special strengthening"; and he insisted that "circumstances which have taken placed since my acceptance of

\textsuperscript{53} CMS, C A1/0 25E/53, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright. This lengthy missive covered every aspect of the Native Pastorate.

\textsuperscript{54} The term "Regulation" referred to the 'Articles of Arrangement'. In a previous letter, Cheetham had complained that the Society had no proof of ownership for much of its property in the colony, and that the native Pastors treated the churches, residences and schools as their own (CMS, C A1/0 25E/45, 9 April 1873, Cheetham to Wright).
office... have increased my claims to such consideration".  

The bishop went on to propose that if the Society was willing to provide one-third of the estimated £3000 needed for the repairs, and the Church Committee did the same, he would contribute the remaining £1000; on condition that if the total exceeded £3000, the Church Committee would undertake the extra costs, and the Society would continue to provide, and pay for, the services of an agent.  

This proposal was made after much reflection; for the outburst of nationalism (which placed him at loggerheads with the native Pastors) was still evident in the colony.  

Even so, the proposal was a significant indication of Cheetham's commitment to the development of the Native Pastorate. He stated:  

I am in no haste to make haste; and usually in matters of this kind we cannot proceed much faster than national growth admits of; yet it might be recognised all round, that it is incidental to a man of my position, and with my heart desires to wish to accomplish as much during his own lifetime as may be granted to him by the One who holds the stars".  

The bishop's proposal was accepted by both the Church Committee and the Society; and as repairs got under way attention became more focused on the details of the lease.  

55 CMS, C A1/0 25E/52c, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright. The "circumstances" in question obviously included the ethnocentric controversy. Cheetham also mentioned the "silent contract", which he felt existed between the Society and himself.  


57 He confessed that he had "pondered much as to whether under these present circumstances I should devote money entrusted to me for work in connection with the Church of England towards this object"; but expressed the hope that "the state of feeling referred to... had abated" (ibid.).  

58 ibid.  

59 Cf. CMS, G/C1, Vol. 40, pp. 703-704, 10 November 1873, Report of the Sierra Leone Sub Committee, respecting subsidy to the Native Pastorate; C A1/M 19, pp. 241-242, 8 July 1873, Quaker to Fenn; C A1/L8, pp. 507-508, 23 September, Wright to Cheetham; C A1/L9, p. 4-5, 11 November 1873, Hutchinson to Nicholson (Secretary of the Sierra Leone Mission, 1874-1879).  

60 As far as the writer has been able to determine, there are no extant copies of this form of lease.
When the subject was discussed at a Clerical Conference in June 1872, it was suggested that the indenture ought to be between the Society and the Church Committee, and not between the Society and the individual Pastors.\(^{61}\) There was a consensus of opinion in the colony that the leases would never be signed if the Pastors were required to undertake the whole of the repairs for the Parsonages, churches and schools, as stipulated in the form of lease.\(^{62}\) The Church Committee suggested that it would be much better to distinguish between repairs "commonly known as landlord's repairs" and those known as "tenant's repairs", and recommended that only the latter should be covenanted for by the Pastor accepting the lease, leaving the "landlord's repairs" to be undertaken by the Church Committee".\(^ {63}\) They also passed a resolution indicating their readiness "to become a third party to the Lease", if this suggestion was acceptable. Cheetham gave his backing to the resolution, and proposed that those Pastors who consented to tenant's repairs should be allowed to retain their surplice fees.\(^ {64}\) However, he argued that the Church Committee could not enter into a contract "since they are not a corporate body" (but a changing body subject to annual appointment), and suggested that "an understanding" should be established between Pastors and Church Committee until the difficulty was overcome.\(^ {65}\)

---

\(^{61}\) CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 320-323, 27 June 1872, Quaker to Venn. Quaker explained that drawing up the lease as a contract between the Society and the Church Committee would leave matters as they had been since the establishment of the Pastorate; the sole difference being that the Church Committee would "now transmit by a formal legal agreement what in years past it had been doing without one".

\(^{62}\) Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 320-323, 24 June 1872, Quaker to Venn; C A1/O 25E/52e, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright.

\(^{63}\) CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 242, 8 July 1873, Quaker to Fenn.

\(^{64}\) CMS, C A1/O 25E/52e, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright. He added that landlord's and tenant's repairs should be well defined; and suggested that the former should include foundations, main parts of the framework, roofs, etc, while the latter should comprise work not affecting the structure - painting, cleaning, doors, locks, carpentry, etc.

\(^{65}\) Quaker had expressed a similar concern (cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 320-323, 24 June 1872, Quaker to Venn). Cheetham observed that the bishop was "the only fixed quantity"; but commented elsewhere that the bishop had "no
The consummate administrator, Cheetham proceeded to discuss and question minute details of the lease, and suggested amongst other things that the Society's representatives should "be instructed as to the quantity of land to lease with the Parsonage". The PC accepted the Church Committee's suggestion that the Pastors should only be covenanted to undertake tenant's repairs; but proposed that since the Church Committee could not be parties to the leases, "the Pastors must on the face of the lease be responsible to the Society's representatives for the whole repairs", with the understanding that the Church Committee was responsible for landlord's repairs. Even then, the process suffered from interminable delays, and the leases were not signed until January 1876. Hutchinson later commented that "the Lease arrangements seem satisfactory, let us hope that all will now go smoothly".

B. Expansion of the Native Pastorate

By 1874, the Native Pastorate comprised 10 ecclesiastical districts: namely, Waterloo, Hastings, Wellington, Kissy, Regent, Gloucester, York, Kent, Bathurst, and Wilberforce.

duties under the lease as it is", and neither did the Church Council and Committee (CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 260, 8 July 1873, Cheetham to Hutchinson).

---

65 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 260, 8 July 1873, Cheetham to Hutchinson.
68 CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 141, 8 January 1876, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
69 CMS, C A1/L9, p. 155, 17 March 1876, Hutchinson to Nicholson; cp. pp. 120-121, 7 January 1876, Secretaries to Nicholson.
70 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 9/90, Ecclesiastical Returns. It will be remembered that two stations - Benguema and Wilberforce - were added to the original nine stations in 1867 (cf. Chapter 3, p. 45). However, due to insufficient funds and manpower, Benguema was never taken up as a separate Pastorate District, and it remained under the charge of the Pastor at Waterloo (cf. C A1/O 3/527, 25 April 1868, Hamilton to Venn). The records indicate that it was constituted into an Ecclesiastical District in May 1872 (cf. C A1/O 9/92); but the Church Committee was unable to make it
The CMS retained four districts in the colony (Kissy Road, Pademba Road, Charlotte, and Bananas) as well as mission stations in Bullom, Sherbro, Quiah, and Port Loko, and maintained two educational establishments. The Pastorate was anything but self-supporting. Between 1868 and 1874, class payments and contributions to the Pastorate Auxiliary averaged just over £513 and £362, respectively, per annum; giving a combined average of about £876. These receipts accounted for only half of the Pastorate's income, and were insufficient even to pay the salaries of the Pastors - which amounted to over £1000 per annum. Substantial grants-in-aid from the CMS and the Government, totalling £800 per annum, formed a veritable life-support system for the Institution. Ideally, increased contributions would have formed the basis of reductions in either subsidy; but the progress of the experiment was also affected by its precarious economic environment. In financial terms, the Pastorate was insecure, vulnerable, and utterly incapable of self-sustenance. Yet there was no guarantee about a continuance of either the Government or CMS grants. The Government grant (of £500) - which accounted for one-third of the Pastorate's income - was particularly shaky; and the Pastorate was constantly plagued by fears that it would be withdrawn at any time. Rumours filtered through the
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colony, with disturbing regularity - and often coinciding with the arrival of a new Governor - that the grant was going to be withdrawn. So much so that in 1869, the principal native merchants held a meeting "to consider the advisability of a Native Pastorate Church". They unanimously accepted "the great need of such a Church"; but, according to Caiger, "serious fears were entertained as to how they would be able to maintain their present ground" without the Government grant. Wesleyan opposition to the subsidy posed a constant threat to its continuance. Between 1868 and 1874, Rev Benjamin Tregaskis, the Superintendent of the Wesleyan Methodist Church (1864-1875), whose antagonistic sectarianism disrupted the inter-denominational cooperation hitherto existing in the colony, launched repeated assaults on the Pastorate grant, with what Wright described as a "dog in a manger" attitude. However, he was repeatedly foiled by the residue of the inter-denominational alliance (reinforced by the ideals of Ethiopianism) and by the pro-Pastorate policies of Governors Kennedy and Hennessy. The Anglicans in the colony (as well as the CMS) defended the Government grant by arguing that the Government was only repaying its debt to the

75 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 17, p. 109, 14 May 1868, Quaker to Venn; C A1/O 3/543a, 12 July 1869, Caiger to Secretaries; C A1/L8, pp. 210-211, 23 July 1868, Venn to Nicol.
76 CMS, C A1/O 3/543a, 12 July 1869, Caiger to Secretaries.
77 For more about Tregaskis, see Fyfe, 1962, pp. 350-353, 374f., 386f., & 398; L Sanneh, West African Christianity: The Religious Impact, 1983, p. 65. Hamilton described Tregaskis as "one of the most bigoted sectarians I have known" (CMS, C A1/O 3/558, 26 September 1970, Hamilton to Secretaries).
78 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 428, 22 December 1872, Wright to Cheetham. In 1870, for instance, his Wesleyan Committee memorialised the Legislative Council "regarding the unpolicy and injustice involved in the recent extension of Church Grants upon the Colonial Estimates" (See extract from the Warden (the Wesleyan Methodist magazine) in CMS, C A1/O 3/558, 26 September 1870, Hamilton to Secretaries).
79 It is worth reiterating that when the agitation against the Pastorate grant reached a height in 1872, a group of churchmen from different (non-Anglican) denominations wrote a letter to Hennessy defending its needfulness. CMS, C A1/O 9/91, Correspondence on the Native Pastorate Question: Letter, 4 December 1872, by churchmen from different denominations to J Pope-Hennessy.
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CMS for decades of self-sacrificing endeavour at considerable expense (particularly in the areas of education and church building). Quaker declared that "as no other Missionary Society in this settlement can in fairness be ranked on an equality with the CMS in the extent of its outlay of money for the benefit of the natives... none can have a right to dispute the claims of its offspring for any pecuniary aid from the government". But the fact remained that the Government regarded the grant as a consideration and not an obligation; and its continuance or otherwise remained open to the discretion of any particular administration. However, it is interesting to note that at the time when the PC was urging a continuance of the Government subsidy, the Society was already contemplating a gradual withdrawal of its own grant to the Pastorate. In 1866, Venn had given an assurance that the Society's grant "will be continued for the next five years, and... will not afterwards be wholly or suddenly withdrawn, if the help still be needed". But two years later, the furore over the closure of the Orphan Asylum induced the Secretaries to reassert the Society's intention to "withdraw its men and its pecuniary aid from the Pastorate" and confine its work to "the two educational Establishments..., and one church in Freetown". Anxious to justify this step, the Secretaries made the curious (and unfounded) declaration that "the Native Church is strong enough even at present to provide for the whole of that Pastorate, though some extra provision must be made for the Quiah and Sherbro". They directed Caiger to "consider

80 Wright urged Cheetham to remind the Government that it was to the CMS that the colony "in a great measure owes its existence" (CMS, C A1/L8, p. 420, 22 December 1872, Wright to Cheetham).
81 CMS, C A1/M 19, pp. 8-11, Paper on the Pastorate of Sierra Leone, December 1872. He contended that even a grant of £1000 "could not reasonably be considered too much", in consideration CMS outlays on behalf of the Government. Cp. C A1/L8, p. 428, 22 December 1872, Wright to Cheetham.
82 CMS, S A1/L8, p. 84, 23 May 1866, Venn (and Secretaries) to Caiger; cp. Chapter 3, p. 44f.
83 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 235-236, 23 October 1868, Secretaries to Caiger.
whether by some changes in the Districts the people may be more equally distributed under the existing number of native Pastors", and to report on the desirability "of having a Native Pastorate formed in the towns of Sierra Leone". Caiger supported the idea of a CMS withdrawal mainly because most of the European missionaries were determined to leave the colony (after Asylum controversy). He suggested that the Society should give up the Pademba Road Church to the Pastorate on condition that it also take up the remaining stations in the villages: namely, Charlotte, Bananas, and Aberdeen. Venn felt this suggestion had much to commend it - even though a year earlier he had berated the native Pastors for putting continued CMS support at risk - and he requested Caiger "to feel the pulse of laymen as to your proposal for the Pademba Road Church and its equivalents". Quaker responded immediately that such a movement would be premature, but, possibly due to Caiger's sudden demise, the matter was not taken any further.

The CMS policy of deliberate and systematic withdrawal from the Sierra Leone colony became manifest in 1873. In principle, the enlargement of the Pastorate and the reduction of aid (in order to call forth increased self-support) was consistent with the objectives of the Pastorate experiment, and certainly vital to the preparation for self-government. It is therefore helpful to note that the need for expansion was acknowledged within the Pastorate itself, even before the CMS policy became known; for the records show that in April 1872 the Church Committee recommended "the establishment of three additional Pastorates, as soon as... the state of the

84 CMS, C A1/O 3/543a, 12 July 1869, Caiger to Secretaries. The Society would then be left with Kissy Road Church (and its Chapel of ease at Cline's Town) and the two educational establishments.
85 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 258-259, 23 August 1869, Venn to Caiger.
86 CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 409, 4 December 1869, Quaker to Venn.
87 Hamilton, Caiger's immediate successor, refused to have anything to do with the Pastorate (cf. CMS C A1/M 17, pp. 482-483, 23 July 1870, Quaker to Venn).
fund will admit". However, it is going to be argued here that the CMS withdrawal was largely a reaction to the race controversy and nationalistic fervour which raged in the colony between 1868 and 1873, and also that the programme of expansion relentlessly pursued by the Society had less to do with the Pastorate's progress than with CMS interest. For a start, the PC gave little consideration to the shifting economic forces which exercised so great an influence on the Pastorate's financial well-being; and which, in the decade of the 1870s, weakened its financial base.

In 1873, when the race controversy in the colony was at a great height, the Sierra Leone Sub-Committee was again called into activity to deliberate on the issues affecting the Sierra Leone Mission and review the Society's relationship with the Pastorate. Along with the decision to invite James Johnson to England, the Sub-Committee made a tentative recommendation "that the Church Council be asked to add Pademba Road to the Native Pastorate, as we cannot help thinking that the addition of so important a charge to the Native Church would be good". Cheetham replied that the Pastorate did not have the funds to justify the transfer, and added that its income was unlikely to increase, since the prevalent anti-European feelings had quenched European interest. However, this prevalent anti-European feeling in the colony became a factor in CMS determination to commence a gradual withdrawal from the colony. The proposal was withdrawn; but in October 1873, the Sierra Leone Sub-

---


89 Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 469-471, 10 March 1873, Wright to Cheetham. He indicated, however, that if the Church Council "felt indisposed to take it" the Society would retain it and put James Johnson in charge.

90 CMS, C A1/0 25E/44, 9 April 1873, Cheetham to Wright.

91 By 1867, the Society's annual expenditure on its Sierra Leone Mission was well over £5000 a year (cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 89, 9 July 1966, Dawes to Caiger)
Committee made two other important recommendations, on which they requested Cheetham to give his views, before a definite resolution was passed.  Both recommendations reflected CMS desire "to use the best means for promoting among Sierra Leone Christians a missionary spirit; and at the same time gradually to withdraw the grant-in-aid". The first was for the transfer of CMS Auxiliary funds (hitherto paid to the Society) to the Native Church, to enable it to undertake "the care and superintendence of the [CMS] Missions outside the colony now supported by half of those funds"; and the second was that the Society's grant to the Pastorate should be reduced by £50 per annum, with the provision that the Society would "meet with an equal sum" all money expended on the missionary work. It will be noted that the recommendations were geared towards encouraging greater self-support within the Pastorate, and some degree of self-extension. Cheetham, who was in conflict with the native clergy at the time, immediately warned the PC about "the grave responsibility involved" in leaving the Native Church "to prosecute its own missionary work"; and he listed a host of defects in the native character which he argued would jeopardize such a venture. There was more than a trace of the cultural ethnocentrism, which his clergy had repeatedly condemned, in the bishop's reaction; but with an air of philosophical forbearance he went on to argue that native foibles, however objectionable, were not "sufficiently great to discourage the contemplated change", and that they "must be faced and endured someday". Even then he objected to what he thought might be a desire to establish an all African mission in Sierra Leone, "in which no element shall enter but the black". He stated categorically that however great the interest that might surround such a venture, it would be

92 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 512-513, 16 October 1873, Wright to Cheetham.
93 CMS, C A1/0 25E/58, 4 December 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
94 ibid. Among these were tribal hostility and favouritism, "the unwillingness of black man to be under black man", the African's propensity for dissimulation, and the natives' fear of water.
wrong in principle and the Society would have to initiate and work it without his help. Only its successful operation, he insisted, could win his confidence. Alternatively, he proposed that the Society could withdraw from certain missions, whose management would devolve upon him entirely. He suggested that the Society could retire from its missions on the Bullom Shore and in British Quiah – which he claimed "would not exceed our powers and would be in localities admitting of extension" – and recommended formation of a Board of Missions and a Board of Management, "constituted very similarly to our Church Council and our Church Committee", to supervise the operation. Cheetham was confident that provided there was no unnecessary delay on the part of the Society he would be able to set up the operation by January 1875. He also stated that he had no objection to a gradual reduction of the Society's grant. "It is time it began to diminish", he admitted, "and I rather suspect this will be the way in which the Government grant will disappear". This response must have surprised even the PC. Cheetham had made no reference to the Pastorate's financial constraints (as he had done six months earlier) though he himself described the venture as "a great and important change". He gives the impression of one who had decided to succumb to the inevitable. But a note of caution would hardly have been out of place. The overriding impression is that the bishop was rather taken with the notion of superintending an independent missionary operation, whose management would "in every measure devolve upon me" – notwithstanding the fact that he was willing "to keep in view, the importance of shifting on to others, even at great trouble to myself, all that they can possibly undertake".55 His statement that the two missions would not overtax the Native Church was probably true (considering the amount of native contribution to the CMS Auxiliary), but his supine acceptance of the gradual reduction of the CMS subsidy is difficult to explain.

55 CMS, C A1/0 25E/58, 4 December 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
The Sub-Committee's report, incorporating Cheetham's suggestions was submitted to the PC in 1874. It stated that the time had come for "an enquiry whether an annual reduction in the subsidy might be safely made, the Society consenting to an equivalent reduction in the subsidy sum handed over by the CMS Auxiliary"; and also to determine "whether ultimately the CMS Auxiliary might not be so constituted as to become a Missionary Society with a Committee containing a sufficient European element". The Sub-Committee recommended that the Bishop and Church Council, and the Mission Conference, "be consulted on the subject and as to the possibility of the Native Church undertaking direct missionary work". The feasibility of the proposal hinged greatly on the strength of contributions (in the colony) to the CMS Auxiliary. By 1872, Auxiliary contributions (which came from Angliucs and non-Anglicans alike) averaged over £400 a year; and after a sharp drop between 1871 and 1873 (possibly due to the anti-European feeling in the colony), they rose to just over £500 in 1874, and reached an all time high of £605 in 1875. However, only about one-fifth of the overall contributions came from the Pastorate stations. This fact was significant, for the simple reason that the contributions originated on the main from a desire to support CMS labours directly. Nicholson (the Mission Secretary) argued that "many of the native Christians would prefer to remain as an Auxiliary to the CMS, rather than that the Church here should have its own independent Society". Even Cheetham, who

96 Cf. CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 15-16, Further Report of Sub-Committee upon matters at Sierra Leone - 1874.
97 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 18, pp. 225-226, 12 February 1872, Quaker to Venn; p. 270, 17 April 1872, Quaker to Venn. Quaker was Secretary of the Auxiliary.
98 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 381, 10 April 1874, Quaker to Lay Secretary.
99 CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 28, 22 March 1875, Quaker to Lay Secretary.
100 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 9, 10 December 1874, Quaker to Lay Secretary.
101 CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 19, 13 March 1875, Nicholson to Lay Secretary. He stated that "there is much confidence in the CMS more than in the Native Church".
favoured the transfer, had argued that there would be greater confidence in the scheme if money was raised in the Society's name; "for the great bulk of the people will give and like to give to the CMS in England whereas it would be quite another thing to raise the money for a black man's CMS". Quaker, the Secretary of the CMS Auxiliary, suggested that the Native Church should only take up one of the three Mission Stations in the first instance, and add on the others gradually as its funds improved. But the PC brushed aside all misgivings and passed a resolution that the CMS Auxiliary should be constituted into a Sierra Leone Missionary Society which would take charge of the Society's missions in the Quiah and Bullom countries. The Church Council deliberated on the CMS proposal in two consecutive meetings in April 1875. Nicholson reported that the matter was discussed with full cognisance of its magnitude. In the end, the Council conceded the transfer of the Bullom and Quiah missions (along with CMS Auxiliary contributions) to the Native Church, and endorsed the need to form an organisation, separated from the missionary work of the CMS, "whereby the Church in Sierra Leone will for the future have its own missionary work, administered by its own offices, [and] maintained at its own charges". But instead of an independent "Church Missionary Society in connection with the Native Church" (as the PC had suggested), they proposed the institution of a "Board of Administration", which would "accept the charge of the

102 CMS, C A1/0 25E/28, 4 December 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
103 CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 9, 10 December 1874, Quaker to Lay Secretary.
104 CMS, C A1/L9, p. 86, 19 February 1875, Wright to Cheetham; p. 81, 19 February 1875, Secretaries to Nicholson. They, however, requested Nicholson to keep in view "the desirableness of permitting any who may be so disposed to continue their contributions to the general work of the CMS".
105 CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 44-48, 11 May 1875, Nicholson to Secretaries. A full discussion of the CMS proposals was delayed by Cheetham's absence from the colony, from July to December 1874, on furlough.
106 CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 49-53, 13 April 1875, Questions and Answers at Church Council, respecting transfer of the Bullom and Quiah countries.
107 Cf. CMS, C A1/L9, p. 95, 18 June 1875, Secretaries to Nicholson.
Church's missions and provide for their management". This Board was to comprise the Bishop as President, and not less than 14 other members (of whom at least 7 were to be communicant lay members of the Church), who were to be nominated triennially by the Church Council and Church Committee at a combined meeting. The Council's recommendations were then laid before a body known as "the Large Executive Committee of the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate Auxiliary", for a final decision. In what appears to have been a momentous proceeding, the Large Executive Committee accepted the recommendations, and gave "the sanction and authority of the Church" to the operation. The decision to establish a Missionary society and take over two of the Society's missions marked a significant milestone in the history of the Native Pastorate: an exciting step taken with suitable gravity and prayerfulness. Although it was a step somewhat foisted upon the Native Church rather than voluntarily assumed, it was one which Venn had longed to see; and it signalled the Native Church's readiness to become more self-supporting, and self-propagating. The PC were thankful for "the solemn and prayerful spirit" in which the responsibility was assumed, and expressed the hope "that a missionary spirit may be abundantly poured out upon the whole Church, leading its members to prosecute with vigour the work of evangelising those of their countrymen who are yet in darkness [a]round

108 The need (especially stressed by the CMS) for the management body to contain a sufficient European element was duly noted.
109 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 53-55, 22 April 1875, Meeting of Church Council.
110 CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 55-57, 27 April 1875, Minute of the Large Executive Committee of the Pastorate Auxiliary.
111 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 44-48, 11 May 1875, Nicholson to Secretaries. The previously sceptical Nicholson commented: "So earnestly and intelligently was the subject in hand discussed... I felt good to be there... the Holy Ghost was with us".
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It was the nature of things that while the transfer of the Quiah and Bullom missions to the Native Church was accompanied by much debate and publicity, a less conspicuous but equally significant step was made almost unnoticed. In March 1874, the Church Committee took over Banana Islands, entirely on its own initiative. The move was facilitated by the adoption of a "Supplementary Regulation of Ministers' Stipends", which enabled the Pastorate Fund to absorb the additional Pastorate with a minimal increase in outlay. Nonetheless, it was a bold step, for the Pastorate Fund (even subsidized by the CMS and Government grants) could still barely meet expenditure. This circumstance made the proposed reduction of the CMS grant a cause for genuine concern. While Cheetham seemed resigned to the eventuality, Nicholson urged the Society to commence the reduction of its grant without delay, on the grounds that "the native Christians must be led on more urgently to support the Pastorate, and they will do this with more zeal than they do, when the Society's and the Government's grants are gone". But, within the Pastorate, many felt that such a step would have disastrous consequences, not least because the Government would be prompted to do the same. Macauley implored the Society to consider the underdeveloped and impoverished economy of the colony; and argued that the falling price of ginger, "the only harvest of importance" in the colony, meant that the villagers (who made up the Pastorate) lacked the

113 CMS, C A1/L9, p. 95, 18 June 1875, Secretaries to Nicholson. They, however, mentioned that they preferred the term "Committee" to "Board".
116 CMS, C A1/M 19, pp. 423-424, 21 August 1874, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
117 CMS, C A1/M 19, pp. 451-452, 26 November 1874, Macauley to Lay Secretary.
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economic capability to support the Native Church.\textsuperscript{118} He declared emphatically that "it will be some time 'ere the Church could become so efficiently maintained to enable her to dispense with foreign helps"; and pleaded with the PC to "continue to lend her a helping hand until such a time that a better state of things presents itself".\textsuperscript{119} However, the proposal to commence a reduction of the CMS grant was shelved, as PC became more concerned about the transfer of remaining stations in the colony to the Native Pastorate.

In 1874, a sudden shortage of CMS missionaries in Freetown (in the aftermath of the race controversy) necessitated the closure of Fourah Bay College and left Pademba Road Church (locally referred to as Christ Church) without superintendence.\textsuperscript{120} By June that year, Nicholson (in charge of Holy Trinity Church, Kissy Road) was the only missionary left in the colony; and he expressed fears that the work would suffer.\textsuperscript{121} To his astonishment, Rev Moses Taylor (of Waterloo), whom he described as "one of our best native Pastors", turned down the appointment to Christ Church; and he was obliged to offer the position to the relatively inexperienced Rev Moses Pearce, who was his curate at the

\textsuperscript{118} He declared that though the colony abounded "in mineral and vegetable productions and all other sources of untold wealth", the absence of capitalist enterprise meant that the inhabitants were "literally famishing in the midst of plenty"; for "money is in the hands of only a few, and these have neither the patience nor the knowledge to undertake schemes involving risks and uncertainties".

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{ibid.} For good measure, he promised that "we shall never fail to urge the people of our charge to greater diligence and activity in this matter".

\textsuperscript{120} Cf. CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 376-378, 10 April 1874, Nicholson to Secretaries; p. 409, 17 June 1874, Nicholson to Secretaries. The decrease in the number of European missionaries was probably linked to the increased anti-European feeling in the colony; though Sunter had departed on account of ill-health (C A1/M 19, p. 379, Minutes of Finance Committee, 31 March 1874). Quaker later reported that when Lamb was the Local Secretary he had remarked that he preferred Lagos any day to Sierra Leone; and that he had only come to the colony because he was appointed by the PC (C A1/M 20, p. 127, 13 December 1875, Quaker to Lay Secretary).

\textsuperscript{121} CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 377, 10 April 1874, Nicholson to Secretaries.
The PC immediately renewed their call for the transfer of Christ Church, whose congregation, they pointed out, was already making a substantial contribution to the Pastorate. They proposed that in the event the Church Council undertook "the entire charge of Pademba Road Church and District, the Committee will continue the subsidy to the Pastorate Fund for another year, after which time the subject of the reduction will be further reconsidered". The Church Committee eventually conceded to the transfer when the Committee of the newly formed Henry Venn Memorial Fund (H V Fund) promised an additional grant of £100 for the support of the Church. It was suggested that James Johnson would accept the charge of Pademba Road Church if it was offered to him; but Johnson promptly declined the offer, and in September 1874, Christ Church officially joined the Native Pastorate, with Rev Moses Pearce as Pastor. Anxious to press the issue, the Secretaries informed Nicholson that the Committee of the Henry Venn Fund was prepared to provide a

---

122 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 377, 10 April 1874, Nicholson to Secretaries; p. 390, 27 May 1874, Nicholson to Lay Secretary. Located in Freetown, and possessing a large and wealthy congregation, Christ Church rated as one of the prime stations in the colony. Moses Taylor's refusal to leave Waterloo was almost certainly tied to the fact that Waterloo was his birthplace; not to mention the added consideration that after seven years at that station he had become firmly dug in (see also Chapter 6, pp. 423-424). Rev Moses Pearce, who was subsequently appointed, had been in CMS employ (cf. C A1/M 19, p. 393, Minutes of Finance Committee, 5 May 1874); and Nicholson remarked that though he "had not the experience", he was a "good preacher" and "able to look after the people".

123 Cf. CMS, C A1/L9, p. 40, 3 July 1874, Secretaries to Nicholson.


125 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 9/70, Financial Statements of the Church Committee, April 1877; C A1/M 21, pp. 98-99, 5 December 1877, quaker to Lay Secretary. This grant was increased to £110 the following year (C A1/L9, p. 213, 30 March 1877, Hutchinson to Nicholson); though Hutchinson warned that "the increase... is not to be taken as implying a continuance but rather a diminution of the amount hitherto received".

126 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 82, 31 July 1875, Nicholson to Secretaries; p. 103, 16 October 1875, Nicholson to Secretaries.

127 CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 91-95, 24 September 1875, James Johnson to Secretary.

grant to enable the Pastorate to take over the remaining two stations of Bananas and Charlotte.129 Wright reported that "it was felt that Charlotte and the Bananas ought to be included in the Pastorate and that no more fitting object for the first grant from the H V Fund could be found than such a completion of the Pastorate".130 The Church Committee declined. But two years later, when Sunter (acting as Mission Secretary) again pressed for Charlotte to incorporated with the Pastorate station of Bathurst,131 Cheetham conceded that there was no "reasonable hindrance" to taking the parish of Charlotte into the Pastorate; and that station came under the Pastorate on 1 October 1876.132 Again, considering the Pastorate's financial instability, there was something about its expansion which seemed to tempt fate and invite economic crisis.

(i) The Government grant
By the early 1870s, commercial depression in Europe had begun to affect trade in the colony, and the Colonial treasury, which had been undermined by Hennessy's fiscal policies (notably the abolition of taxes), suffered a deficit in 1873 - the first in 25 years.133 In 1876, the exchequer was reported "literally empty."134 With trade crippled, and revenue at an all time low, the colony was over-taken by a

129 CMS, C A1/L9, p. 81, 19 February 1875, Secretaries to Nicholson. The reference of Bananas was a mistake. By 1875, only Charlotte (besides the two CMS churches in Freetown) remained outside the Pastorate.
130 CMS, C A1/L9, p. 86, 19 February 1875, Wright to Bishop Cheetham. He revealed that the H V Fund had offered a grant of £100 to the Church Committee to facilitate the transfer of the two stations.
131 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 249-250, 7 July 1876, Sunter to Lay Secretary.
132 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 379, 19 July 1876, Cheetham to Sunter (Mission Secretary); p. 405, 27 September 1876, Sunter to Secretaries.
severe economic crisis. The Government was forced to make cutbacks in expenditure; and in March 1876, exactly ten years after it was first awarded, the Government grant of £500 was abruptly withdrawn. Considering the Pastorate's recent expansion, the withdrawal of the grant could not have come at a worse time. The fact that the Pastorate Fund had already begun to suffer from the depressed trade, from which the majority of its contributors derived their income, made the impact doubly devastating. Hutchinson suggested, rather mistakenly, that the Legislative Council's decision was probably influenced by the Pastorate's enlargement, which conveyed the impression that the Native Church was capable of supporting its own Pastors. Not to put too fine a point on it, the withdrawal of such an essential source of aid translated into a severe test of the Native Pastorate's readiness to become more self-supporting. In fact, the initial CMS reaction was that it would engender a "more healthy state of things"; for "thus thrown upon their own resources the Church will be more vigorous than ever". For emphasis, Hutchinson warned Quaker that the Pastorate would have to face the withdrawal of the CMS subsidy also, and that it was best advised to put its house in order. Nicholson immediately expressed doubts about whether the Native Church would be able to carry on the work so recently

135 Fyfe reports that expenditure exceeded revenue by £9,000 in 1875, the colony was overdrawn £18,000 at the Crown Agents, and only the British Treasury could avert bankruptcy (Fyfe, 1962, p. 404).

136 CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 185, 10 March 1876, Nicholson to Secretaries; p. 194, 20 March 1976, Sunter to Wright.

137 The Sierra Leone Missionary Society had taken over the Bullom and Quiah missions only three months previously (CMS, C A1/M 20, 12 January 1876, Quaker to Lay Secretary. Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 81e-82, 31 July 1875, Nicholson to Secretaries; pp. 85-86, 17 August 1875, Quaker to Lay Secretary).

138 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 158, 27 March 1878, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.


140 C A1/L 9, p. 172, 7 July 1876, Hutchinson to Quaker.
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taken up in Bullom and Quiah;\textsuperscript{141} and Quaker complained that the Pastors evinced an attitude of indifference to the withdrawal of the grant, as a result of their dissatisfaction with the appointment of Moses Pearce (a junior minister) to the prestigious Pademba Road Church.\textsuperscript{142} He, however, made the ill-judged remark that the Native Church could get on without the Government grant. The fact of the matter was that the funds of the Native Pastorate were severely damaged.\textsuperscript{143} A petition, organised and signed by 1105 church members - mainly from the villages - was sent to the Secretary of State entreating a restoration of the grant.\textsuperscript{144} The ad hoc Church Members Committee sent a copy of the petition to the CMS, partly to explain that the sending of the petition was not an indication of "any unwillingness on our part to support our own Church".\textsuperscript{145} They pointed out that "the manner in which the grant was erased" had thrown the Church into pecuniary difficulties, and that "the depressed state of business" prohibited "that enlarged liberal support of the ministry as could be wished". The over-burdened Pastorate Fund, they insisted, needed all the aid it could get. Belatedly alerted to the Pastorate's predicament, the PC passed the following resolution (in

\textsuperscript{141} Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 185, 10 March 1876, Nicholson to Secretaries. \\
\textsuperscript{142} CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 360, 3 July 1876, Quaker to Lay Secretary. It should be mentioned that Quaker had become somewhat estranged from his native brethren, who (he claimed) had accused him of showing more interest in CMS affairs than "in their business". In 1875, the Pastors had elected G J Macauley as Secretary of the Native Pastorate - dropping Quaker who had held the office for six consecutive years (cf. C A1/M 20, p. 81, 30 June 1875, Quaker to Lay Secretary; C A1/O 25E/67, 7 May 1875, Cheetham to Wright). Cheetham described his rejection as "a little hard and unhandsome... considering how much service he has rendered". \\
\textsuperscript{143} Sunter reported that Cheetham was "making prodigious efforts" to restore the depleted finances, and added that there was little chance of recovering the entire sum lost to the Pastorate (CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 250, 7 July 1876, Sunter to Lay Secretary). \\
\textsuperscript{144} CMS, C A1/O 24/23/1 (C A1/M 20, pp. 384-387), Petition of a Religious Body in connection with the Native Pastorate Church established by CMS in Sierra Leone to the Rt Hon. Earl of Carnarvon, Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, August 1876. \\
\textsuperscript{145} CMS, C A1/M 20, pp. 382-383, 5 August 1876, Church Members Committee to Wright.
October 1877): "That while the Committee have felt that the time was approaching when the Sierra Leone Native Church should be independent of government, they consider that... the recent large expenditure of the Churches and houses may be properly urged as reasons for asking a reconsideration of the action of the Government and the substitution of a gradual for the present sudden and entire withdrawal of the grant". However, the Government grant was never reinstated; and by March 1877, Hutchinson informed Nicholson that "the financial condition of the Colony is so bad that no prospect seems to be held out for continued assistance". Extra efforts were made to offset the loss of the Government grant, and contributions to the Pastorate Auxiliary (which had never exceeded £400 per annum) showed an increase of £256 in 1877, and exceeded £520 in 1878 and 1879. But the increased contributions hardly made up for the deficiency, and the Pastorate faced its worst financial crisis.

(ii) Class pence
Rather inopportune, a brief controversy developed around class payments, which accounted for over 60% of contributions to the Pastorate Fund. The seeds of the controversy were laid by Cheetham's declaration (in his Primary Charge, of 1871) that class attendance, which was previously regarded as a condition for Church membership, was not recognised by the Church and was therefore "entirely voluntary". Rev Moses

---

146 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 186-187, Extracts from Minutes of the Corresponding Committee, 17 October 1873. On the basis of the resolution, a letter was also sent to the Secretary of State (cf. C A1/L9, p. 214, 30 March 1877, Hutchinson to Nicholson).

147 C A1/L9, p. 214, 30 March 1877, Hutchinson to Nicholson.


149 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 95, 5 December 1877, Nicholson to Lay Secretary; C A1/O 9/71, Financial Statement of the Church Committee, April 1879.

150 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25E/136, Primary Charge of the Bishop of Sierra Leone, October 1871, p. 40. The system of Class meetings, for instruction and Bible teaching, etc, had been developed by CMS missionaries (with the sanction of the CMS), and pre-dated the Pastorate. Attendance at these
Pearce, the young and relatively inexperienced Pastor of the newly formed Pastorate of Christ Church, protested that as a result of this statement "classes begin to be thinly attended..., and class payments must suffer". The truth of the matter was that Pearce, whose appointment to Pademba Road had been unpopular even with his brother clergymen, was experiencing considerable problems with his congregation; and invidious comparisons were often instituted between him and his illustrious predecessor (James Johnson). However, Cheetham was disinclined to enforce class attendance by making it a condition of Church membership; and he was supported by Nicholson, who remarked that "the CMS as a bond of English Churchmen could not lay down a law by which people were regarded as members of Church other than the recognised one of baptism". Be that as it may, the Pastorate was faced with financial difficulties which made it was necessary to devise ways and means of ensuring, or indeed, enhancing class contributions. Nicholson suggested that it was competent for the bishop in Council or in Synod to pass a canon to the effect that if Church members "neglect to pay their Church dues for the support of the ministry", or wilfully withheld them, "they have no claims to the ministration of the Pastor in the Baptism of their children, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, and in the burial meetings, at which class dues were normally paid, became a prerequisite of Church membership - along with baptism (the only recognised condition in the Anglican Church). For details of the argument, see C A1/O 25E/129, 7 January 1878, M Pearce to Cheetham; /130, 19 January 1878, Cheetham to Nicholson;/131, 25 January 1878, Nicholson to Cheetham; C A1/L9, pp. 272-274, 9 May 1878, Wright to Cheetham.

151 CMS, C A1/O 25E/129, 7 January 1878, M Pearce to Cheetham. It is unclear whether the other Pastors were faced with the same problem; and equally puzzling that it took over six years before the issue was raised.

152 For greater detail, see article 'The Pastor of Christ Church and His Flock' in The West African Reporter (29 August 1877), no. 34, vol. 4; (15 August 1877), no. 32, vol. 4; CMS, C A1/M 21, 26 November 1877, Cheetham to Wright; cp. G3/A1/0, no. 43, 18 July 1881, Cheetham to Wigram. See pp. 367f. below.

153 Though he admitted that class attendance as a token of membership had been sanctioned by the CMS.
of their dead". But the PC was reluctant to endorse such a proceeding, on the grounds that "the introduction of an element of compulsion is liable to weaken moral and spiritual motives". They confirmed that the custom of regarding class attendance as a token of membership had received the "full approval of the Society at home"; but agreed that it could not be laid down positively as a rule. Their final opinion was that "every effort should be made to encourage" class attendance and class payments "not so much by any authoritarian measures" but by making class meetings as interesting and helpful as possible, and by "seeking to foster a healthy public opinion on the subject so that a member of the Church would find himself by very shame if not by higher motive compelled to take some part if not his full share in supporting the ministry". This suggestion sounds rather wishful. And there is no evidence to support the general premise that the removal of the element of compulsion caused class contributions to decline. All too often, a marked decline within a given congregation was simply an indication of their disapproval or rejection of a particular Pastor - as appears to have been the case with the unfortunate Pearce. And, in the wider context, contributions were prone to be affected less by the strength of Christian devotion than by economic forces.

(iii) The case for expansion

The enlargement of the Native Pastorate in the space of three years - by the transfer of 3 districts and two missions to its control - saved the Society "£350 a year in the salaries of agents alone". A modicum of expansion was certainly

---

154 He explained that by Church dues he meant "a regular offering such as is given in our classes together with a monthly or quarterly or yearly donation: according to the ability of the each member".

155 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 272-274, 9 May 1878, Wright to Cheetham.

156 Class payments show a steady increase throughout Cheetham's episcopate (cf. CMS, C A1/O 9, for Financial Statements).

157 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 379, 19 July 1876, Cheetham to Sunter.
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desirable, to enable the Pastorate to overcome its stunted growth; but the rate of expansion leaves room for criticism - especially when it is considered that the same period saw the preparation of leases and a programme of extensive building repairs. The fact that each additional district brought an increase in class payments meant that the initial burden was not as severe as it would otherwise have been; but the Pastorate's financial status was more endangered than enhanced. There is a case for arguing that the CMS determination to transfer remaining districts to the Pastorate was occasioned by the race controversy and the clamour for self-determination which erupted in the colony between 1868 and 1874. Certainly Venn had feared that the escalation of racial conflict would provoke a CMS withdrawal; and those fears were realized when the bitter controversy over the closure of the Orphanage Asylum induced the CMS Secretaries to announce the need "to complete [the] organisation of the Native Church so that the Society may withdraw its pecuniary aid from the pastorate within the old limits of the colony". To be sure, nothing came of that intention; and the granting of leases later took precedence. But it is noteworthy that the Sierra Leone Sub-Committee first expressed a determination to promote a "missionary spirit" among Sierra Leone Christians and "gradually to withdraw the grant-in-aid" after they had had "a long intercourse with Mr and Mrs Lamb" (two missionaries from Sierra Leone who returned to England in 1873). Rev J A Lamb had been Mission Secretary during the height of the controversy (from 1870 to 1873). He was convinced that the natives wanted "to get rid of Europeans"; and had made it quite clear, prior to his departure from the colony, that he

158 Class payments increased from £545.4.1 in 1874 (before the additions were made) just over £586 in 1875, and £645.7.5 in 1876 (cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/69-70, Financial Statements of the Church Committee).
159 CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 234-237, 23 October 1878, Secretaries to Caiger.
160 Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, pp. 512-513, 16 October 1873, Wright to Cheetham.
161 CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 35, 3 February 1873, Lamb to Secretaries.
Problems of Growth - 334

had no desire to return.162 When Huggins, in what appeared to be a jibe at Ethiopianism, declared that he was prepared to contribute £25 annually from his salary "the moment the first Native puts his hand to the plough and goes forth hopefully to his labours", Lamb sent a copy of Huggins’ letter to the PC and published it in Cheetham’s Home Words.163 The message was clear: when all was said and done, more was said than done. And the reminder that native Christians were notoriously backward in engaging in missionary enterprise effectively turned the argument that European missionary endeavour had failed on its head. The advantage of encouraging the Native Church to undertake its own missionary enterprise was one which Lamb no doubt pressed on the Sub-Committee. Whether it needed such pressing is doubtful, for Wright had already confirmed that the CMS was not opposed to the idea of a National Church, simply because it was felt that nationalism "may have good results in stimulating the Christian negroes to raise earnest efforts on behalf of their unenlightened countrymen".164 The nationalist movement, therefore, played right into CMS hands; and the resolve to replace European missionary endeavour with native agency provided the perfect justification for the policy of withdrawal. The subsequent shortage of European missionaries in the colony reinforced this line of thinking, and precipitated the decision to transfer CMS missions to the Native Church. Even Cheetham, it must be said, was taken by surprise when he was informed of the PC’s proposal. He responded: "I have not thought much weight was intended to attach to any words of the Society which seemed to read favourable [sic] towards the Church here undertaking its own missionary work. I have rather looked upon them as words which the Society has thought good to use occasionally by way

162 ibid.
163 CMS, C A1/0 22/8, Home Words, no. 1, (January 1873) 2, p. 4; cp. C A1/M 19, pp. 11-12, 9 January 1873, Lamb to Secretaries.
164 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 469, 10 March 1873, Wright to Cheetham; see Chapter 4, p. 55.
of keeping the subject in view..."\textsuperscript{165} The growing nationalist agitation also prompted the PC to propose the transfer of Pademba Road Church to the Pastorate; on the grounds that "the addition of so important a charge to the Native Church would be good".\textsuperscript{166} Their readiness to relinquish control of a district of such strategic importance denoted a significant concession to nationalist claims about African capability. No native clergyman had ever been given full charge of either of the two CMS Churches in the colony,\textsuperscript{167} and the PC's insistence that whether the Church Council accepted the charge or not James Johnson "will be the man for it", puts the proposal into better perspective.\textsuperscript{168}

The expansion of the Pastorate therefore had its genesis in the race controversy, which awakened the Society to the detriment of entrenched European missionary control and triggered a policy of systematic withdrawal. In one sense, expansion prodded the Native Pastorate into greater maturity, not only in terms of increased responsibility but with regards to the attendant struggle for greater self-support. But, considering the economic context, the CMS programme of withdrawal was ill-timed, if not ill-conceived, and as Cheetham was later to suggest, "fraught with much peril to the Native Church".

As the Society began to face financial difficulties of its

\textsuperscript{165} CMS, C A1/0 25E/58a, 4 December 1873, Cheetham to Wright.
\textsuperscript{166} Cf. CMS, C A1/L8, p. 470, 10 March 1873, Wright to Cheetham.
\textsuperscript{167} In 1868, Hamilton had vigorously opposed the proposal that D G Williams should take charge of Kissy Road Church (CMS, C A1/0 3/527, 25 April 1868, Hamilton to Venn; see Chapter 4, p. 23).
\textsuperscript{168} Ayandele's claims that Johnson had "full control" of that Church is misleading (cf. Ayandele, 1970, p. 29). As native Curate, James Johnson exercised considerable influence at Pademba Road Church, which was under the charge of Rev A Menzies. In 1869, Menzies (on departing on furlough) recommended that Johnson should take charge of the Church (cf. CMS, C A1/0 2/253, Minutes of Finance Committee, 29 December 1869; C A1/0 3/549, 10 May 1870, Hamilton to Secretaries), but this recommendation was never endorsed by the PC (cf. C A1/L8, p. 278, 5 August 1870, Secretaries to Hamilton). In fact, Menzies resumed charge of Pademba Road when he returned to the colony in 1870 (cf. C A1/L8, p. 297, 23 December 1870, Secretaries to Hamilton and Lamb).
own in the late 1870s, the PC became even more determined to reduce expenditure at all costs (in its various Missions). 169 The policy of withdrawal from Sierra Leone was revived with greater urgency and little regard for the Pastorate's capacity to sustain further expansion. Wright informed Cheetham that the time had come for Kissy Road Church (locally called Holy Trinity Church) to be added to the Pastorate, and also for the Sherbro mission to be included in the missionary operations of the Sierra Leone Missionary Society. 170 The proposed transfer of Kissy Road Church surprised both Cheetham and the Finance Committee, since the Society had indicated that it intended to retain that Church for some time. 171 However, it signified CMS intention to withdraw completely from pastoral labours in the colony. Cheetham replied that the completion of the Pastorate had already been pushed on "to the verge of a reasonable faith" during his episcopate, and "that whilst there will be no reluctance on our part still to move on towards completion, we must consider whether, with all that we have now upon us, it will be prudent for us to accept at present further financial responsibility". 172 All the same, he held out some hope that Kissy Road Church could be taken up, provided the financial arrangements were satisfactory. Holy Trinity Church was the second largest Church in the colony; 173 and its transfer constituted a major undertaking. But Nicholson commented that "the time has come for the Sierra Leone Church to gird on her armour, and face manfully the difficulty of getting on without the white man". 174 and he ventured that

169 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 220-221, 28 July 1877, Wright to Cheetham.
170 ibid.; pp. 221-222, 27 July 1877, Wright to Nicholson.
171 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 21, 20 November 1877, Minutes of the Finance Committee.
172 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 68, 3 August 1877, Cheetham to Wright. He later reported that the Society was willing to retain the Church at Cline's Town (hitherto under the Kissy Road Church) as a chapel attached to Fourah Bay College (C A1/L9, pp. 225-226, 22 October 1877, Wright to Cheetham).
173 Only St George's Cathedral was larger (cf. CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 75, 1 October 1877, Nicholson to Lay Secretary).
174 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 73, 14 September 1877, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
the Native Pastorate would have no difficulty supporting Kissy Road Church, because its congregation "can easily raise the funds to pay their own minister and a curate". But the fact remained that the depleted Pastorate Fund could not easily assume the additional burden. The Fund faced a deficit of £200 at the end of the 1876/77 financial year, and it was feared that the money in hand would be insufficient to pay the salaries of the Pastors. Cheetham reported that the Pastorate's "(failing) income" was completely engaged, and had "not a single penny to dispense of in further grants for repairs and new buildings". He added that this situation would remain unchanged as long as the economic depression in the colony continued. After much deliberation, the Church Committee passed a resolution to the effect that unless the Society accompanied the request "with an offer of an annual grant of £100 from the H V Memorial Fund as was made in the Pademba Road Church", they afforded "no hope of being able at present to acceded to the request of the Society" (for the transfer of Holy Trinity Church), on account of the inadequate funds. The PC readily conceded to this requirement, and in consideration of the difficulties the Native Church faced in raising the needful funds, the Committee of the H V Fund also increased their previous grant (of £110) to £120. On 1 May 1878, Kissy Road Church was transferred to the Pastorate.

The PC's other request for the Sherbro Mission to taken up by

175 CMS, C A1/M 21, 5 December 1877, Nicholson to Lay Secretary; C A1/M 21, p. 89, 22 November 1877, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
176 CMS, C A1/M 21, 8 December 1877, Cheetham to Wright. He explained that two applications for help toward extensive repairs of Kissy and Hastings Churches, amounting to nearly £500 and £600 respectively, had been declined by the Church Committee.
177 CMS, C A1/M 21 pp. 98-99, 5 December 1877, Quaker to Lay Secretary.
179 ibid., p. 238, 1 February 1878, Wright to Cheetham.
180 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 172-173, 20 April 1878, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
the Native Church was a matter for the Missions Committee to consider. Cheetham admitted to having strong personal doubts about the possibility of such an undertaking; and Nicholson expressed "grave fears" about the Native Church's capability to take up the Sherbro Mission, which had a running cost of about £800. Like the rest of the Native Pastorate, the newly formed Sierra Leone Missionary Society was in financial difficulty. As many had feared, contributions fell off drastically after the Pastorate took over the management of the two missions; and the loss of the Government grant made things considerably worse. However, to facilitate the transfer of the Sherbro Mission to the Native Church, the PC promised an annual grant of £300; though they readily admitted that it would be insufficient "to enable the Native Church to carry on the Sherbro Mission on its present scale". Wright suggested that, provided the whole £300 was spent on the Mission, the Native Church was "free to carry it on whatever scale may seem to them to be practicable". But unanimous opinion in the colony was that even with the CMS grant the Native Church was incapable of taking up the work. Nicholson reported that "it is a very critical time here with the Native Church"; and added that "the Bishop is very much exercised to know where the funds for the work in the Colony and the Mission will come

181 ibid.; pp. 70-71, 14 September 1877, Nicholson to Wright.
182 Again, Quaker's declaration, in October 1876, that "our Church Missions at the Bullom Shore and in British Quiah are progressing favourably" was most premature (CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 423, 10 October 1876, Quaker to Lay Secretary).
183 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 122-123, 4 February 1878, Quaker to Wright. In February 1878, general receipts came to £490, compared to £605.5.6 in March 1875 (cp. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 28, 22 March 1875, Quaker to Lay Secretary. Though Quaker argued that a deviation from the old way of raising funds was partly to blame.
184 An annual grant of £20 from the H V Fund was useful but hardly sufficient to repair the deficiency.
185 CMS, C A1/L9, p. 239, 1 February 1878, Wright to Cheetham.
186 ibid.
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from". He explained that though "there was a general disposition to fall in with the Society's proposal, for CMS is much loved in Sierra Leone", it was felt that "in the present difficult state of finances of the Native Church" such an undertaking was completely beyond reach. The Missions Committee, headed by Cheetham, declined the proposal; and informed the PC that "as our whole income is already engaged in the prosecution of our own Missions, to undertake another Mission is (financially) impossible". But in a manner that bears ample testimony to the Society's underlying tendency to safeguard its own interests at the expense of the Pastorate's financial stability, the PC determinedly pressed the issue. In the end, their attempt to foist the costly Sherbro Mission on the over-burdened Native Church was a major factor in Cheetham's decision to resign the episcopate.

(iv) The case for Structural Adjustment
The difficulties into which the Pastorate was plunged by the withdrawal of the Government grant led to queries about its structure and composition; specifically with regard to the number of native clergy, whose salaries accounted for over 70% of its expenditure. Under Beckles, uncontrolled salary increases had been a major contributing factor to the financial troubles of the Pastorate. But in 1873 Cheetham had introduced a Regulation of Stipends, which provided specific guidance for the allocation of stipends within a

187 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 158, 27 March 1878, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
188 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 158, 27 March 1878, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
189 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 102, 14 December 1877, Cheetham to Wright.
190 Before 1877, the salaries of the native Pastors accounted for over 60% of the annual expenditure; but that percentage rose to over 70%, when catechists were employed in the Pastorate in 1877. See Financial Statements of the Pastorate.
precise framework - a move which had facilitated the addition of Banana Islands to the Pastorate in 1874. For reasons that are unclear, Venn had observed in 1871 that there were "too many Pastors for the population"; and it is difficult to say whether his observation applied to the extended Pastorate. In 1876, the PC began to call for a reduction of native clergy in Sierra Leone, ostensibly because it would help to relieve the Pastorate's financial difficulty but covertly to acquire native Pastors for other parts of the West Coast - particularly Lagos, where an experienced Pastor was needed "to succeed James Johnson". Hutchinson told Quaker: "I have often thought that you are over-crowded in the colony and that if some of your Pastors would start off for some other fields so the Pastorates might be re-arranged and catechists put where Pastors now are, it would be a good thing for the colony and the men themselves". The PC were convinced that some of the Pastorate districts could be combined, thereby "setting free both men and means for other purposes"; and Wright informed Cheetham that "they would be prepared to facilitate the matter by the employment of any native Pastor whom you could recommend for work connected with the Society - if you did not see your way to employ them". Cheetham was unresponsive; but the Pastorate's inability to support Holy Trinity Church without the aid of a grant prompted the PC to renew the argument about "the desirability of a re-arrangement of the Pastorate in the colony with a view to an

193 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 317, 5 June 1871, Venn to Cheetham.
194 CMS, C A1/L9, p.173, 7 July 1876, Hutchinson to Quaker. James Johnson's transfer to Abeokuta was being contemplated at the time (cf. C A1/O 25E/72, 2 March 1876, Cheetham to Wright).
195 ibid.
196 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 182-183, 14 November 1876, Wright to Cheetham.
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economy of men and a reduction of expense". Such a re-
arrangement, they felt, would "enable the Native Church not
only to take over Kissy Road but also to form Pastorates in
the places where they may be required". By 1877, the Native
Pastorate comprised 13 districts, 15 native clergy, 16
principal churches, and "about a score other places where
divine service and preaching of the word and administration
of the Sacraments regularly obtain". Nicholson, a strong
advocate for a leaner Pastorate, also asserted that "if the
present number of Pastorate stations are kept up, there would
have to be a diminution in the salaries of the Pastors", for
"as at present constituted it cannot be supported". Some
outstations, he argued were located in sparsely populated
areas, had feeble congregations (under catechist
schoolmasters), and were maintained at considerable expense
and not without struggle - due to the competition from one or
more denominations. These, he declared, "might be very
conveniently dropped", and "left to the Wesleyans and other
bodies who were there before us". In a radical vein, he also
pointed a finger at the Pastorate district of Wilberforce,
which had four places of worship and four schools, but only
a population of 800. At CMS behest (but without Cheetham's
knowledge), Nicholson recommended G J Macauley for transfer
to Lagos, as a suitable replacement for James Johnson; and
intimated that Macauley would be willing to go provided the
salary was acceptable. The fact that Cheetham learnt
about Nicholson's recommendation at the same time as the PC's
suggestion for a re-arrangement of the Pastorate came to his
notice arguably made him less disposed to entertain such a
scheme. The bishop was deeply offended that, despite his

198 ibid.; cp. C A1/0 9/53, Statistical Returns of the Sierra Leone Native
Pastorate Church for 1878.
199 CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 75-76, 1 October 1877, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
200 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 28, 15 March 1877, Nicholson to Lay Secretary.
Macauley later declined the appointment "principally on the ground of the
strong feeling in Lagos against importations from Sierra Leone" (cf. C
A1/M 21, p. 152, 18 March 1878, Cheetham to Wright).
"weight of responsibility touching the Pastorate", the Society had not made the request for the transfer of a suitable native Pastor to Lagos directly to him. He objected strongly to the removal of Macauley - whom he described him as "one of the rudest men I have ever met" - on the grounds that he was most unsuitable. Moreover, he declared emphatically that "we have not a Pastor to spare from Sierra Leone" and that "we shall be at our own wits ends how to fill up appointments". On the matter of re-arranging the Pastorate, the bishop argued that since the PC had not indicated "a single instance where re-arrangement might be successfully adopted", their suggestion was hypothetical. He confessed that the subject had frequently occupied his attention, but declared that "all other things being equal I do not think it desirable to disturb the present arrangements, except to establish a Pastorate of Benguema so soon as we may be able". The bishop went on to argue that even though poverty "may compel a re-arrangement, a catechist must take the place of a Pastor, and money be saved only to that extent"; whereas it would be better to have "a Pastor on a lower stipend". The only re-arrangement he was prepared to contemplate was to unite York and Bananas - but the absence of a bridge between the two made that impractical. Cheetham was convinced that a contraction of the Pastorate, for economic reasons, would "subvert the Pastorate", undo his work of past years, and "leave it in confusion"; and, on this basis, he asseverated,

The Pastorate may be a mistake, and to lock up so many men in pastoral work an error...; but the thing is done and I must be excused from pulling down with my hands what God has enabled me to build up and permits me to see working as smoothly and in as good order as usually consists with human affairs.

201 CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 136-138, 2 March 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
202 ibid.; cp. pp. 151-153, 18 March 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
203 CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 169-172, 17 April 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
C. Bishop Cheetham and the Native Pastorate

The proprietary tone in the above quotation was indicative of a shift in Cheetham's attitude to the Native Pastorate, which had become evident by the mid-1870s. In the early years of his episcopacy, Cheetham's attitude to the Pastorate was noticeably ambivalent. His staunch Anglicanism made him critical of the Pastorate experiment, which he felt engendered a notion of two Churches and fostered the desire to secede from the mother Church; and his appreciation of the concept was somewhat beclouded by an adversarial relationship with his native clergy - the roots of which lay in the spirit of independence inspired by the race controversy. In December 1873, for example, he objected strenuously to the inclusion of a statement in the CMS Auxiliary Report that the Pastorate's "influence for good on the natives of West Africa" was "being more and more realized every year", and stepped down from the chairmanship of the Auxiliary meeting, in protest. But even then, the bishop evinced a commitment to the development of the Pastorate which transcended his reservations. He proclaimed in 1873: "My purpose [is] completely set, so far as my small influence can be exerted to develop and expand the Church here, so as for it to be self-acting and self-governing; and to possess the elements of continuance and propagation". With his organisational ability and gift for administrative leadership, he became the driving force behind the Native Pastorate's development, and a key player in its expansion and consolidation. Nicholson acclaimed him as "a wonderful organizer", and "a man so wonderfully fitted to plan and guide"; and as early as 1872, the Pastorate Auxiliary

---

204 CMS, C A1/M 19, pp. 348-351, 6 January 1874, Nicholson to Lay Secretary. He denied the truth of the statement even when the native Pastors defended the sentence (cf. C A1/M 19, pp. 351-352, 30 December 1873, Cheetham to Quaker). Nicholson complained that "the relations between the bishop and his native clergy is not so cordial as it should be, and this will not tend to heal the breach."

205 CMS, C A1/O 25E/52d, 30 June 1873, Cheetham to Wright.

206 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 71, 14 September 1876, Nicholson to Wright.
Committee testified to "the devotion and energy of the Right Rev Dr Cheetham, whose interest in the Native Church is unbounded".\(^7\) Quaker, with whom he was often in disagreement, remarked (after the withdrawal of the Government grant) that "Bishop Cheetham continues his indefatigable labours in behalf of the Native Church; his zeal and earnestness have never been surpassed".\(^8\) Cheetham fell in unreservedly with CMS plans to implement the Articles of Arrangement more fully and to expand the Pastorate. The introduction of the leases, the extensive repairs of the Parsonages, the establishment of a Sierra Leone Missionary Society and the expansion of the Pastorate were all accomplished by virtue of his energetic episcopal leadership. But whereas all of these had their origin in CMS policy, Cheetham personally took steps to consolidate important aspects of the experiment. The first of these was his scheme for the "Regulation of Minister's Stipends", introduced in 1873, which addressed a major deficiency in the Pastorate's financial structure and eliminated a source of chronic dissatisfaction. Two "Supplementary Regulations" were produced between 1873 and 1876; and in 1878 the three Regulations were "codified" and reduced to a single "Regulation of Minister's Stipends", which embodied "such alterations, amendments, and improvements, as time and experience have shown to be desirable".\(^9\) Of even greater significance was the "incorporation" of the Church Committee, in 1876; a legal device which enabled it to buy, sell and hold property up to a value of £10,000.\(^10\) Cheetham


\(^8\) CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 361, 3 July 1876, Quaker to Lay Secretary. He told Venn that Cheetham was "very active and laborious" (CMS, C A1/M 18, p. 225, 12 February 1872, Quaker to Venn). The bishop was particularly active in collecting funds for the Pastorate, and gave liberally from his own pocket (CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 365, 3 March 1874, Quaker to Lay Secretary).

\(^9\) CMS, G3/A1/0/43, Regulation of Ministers Stipends, 1878.

\(^10\) CMS, C A1/O 9/94, A copy of "An Ordinance to Incorporate the Sierra Leone Church Committee; cp. T S Johnson, 1953, p. 64."
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instigated this measure because he felt that it was necessary to equip the Church body for such a time when the CMS would feel it necessary to transfer the Churches, Parsonages and school houses to them. The move immediately enabled the Church Committee to become trustees of CMS property being used by the Native Pastorate; and Cheetham later argued that "by the passing of the Local ordinance incorporating the Church Committee", the Queen and the Governor and Council of the Colony had in effect given recognition to the Articles of Arrangement. Unfortunately, the passing of the ordinance created an uproar in Freetown among the other religious bodies, led by the Wesleyans; and a meeting of the members of all the "Dissenting Churches" denounced the move as an attempt by "the Sierra Leone Church... to make itself head over all the Churches" in the colony. It was widely rumoured that "on the ordinance being passed the CMS would buy all the Government lands and property in the settlement" and impose a tax on all the people. The matter aroused such strong feeling that in some villages the people threatened to take the life of the Pastor or pull down the Pastorate, should taxes be imposed. However, the commotion subsided when the actual object of the ordinance became known. Cheetham also fostered the interest and involvement of the laity in the management of the Native Church. When he convened the first ever Church Conference (of clergy and

211 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 22, p. 248, 19 October 1878, Quaker to Lay Secretary. Note Fyfe's argument that "far from strengthening the connection between Church and state the Ordinance weakened it, by making the Pastorate a separate body on the same footing as other churches" (Fyfe, 1962, p. 408).
213 CMS, C A1/0 25E/79, 24 March 1877, Cheetham to the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Body; C A1/M 21, pp. 2-3, 15 December 1876, Nicholson to Secretary; pp. 22-23, 20 February 1877, Quaker to Secretary. Having failed to stop the ordinance being passed, they organised a petition (signed by Christians from other denominations) which was sent to the Secretary of State.
214 Cf. article 'The Incorporation of the Sierra Leone Church' in The West African Reporter (12 December 1876), no. 55, vol. 3.
laity) in the colony, in 1871, he declared that the purpose was to

give all the feeling that the Bishop was not the Church, that the clergy were not the Church, that the laity were not the Church, but that as regards its manifestation on earth, the Church consisted equally of Bishop, Clergy and laity, a three-fold chord.\textsuperscript{218}

A year later, the Pastorate Auxiliary Committee reported that the bishop "has placed an amount of responsibility on the laity which indeed is their legitimate portion to bear", and remarked on "the hearty co-operation of the clergy and laity in furthering the interests of the Pastorate".\textsuperscript{217} On an administrative level, the bishop insisted that lay representatives should be sent from each parish in the colony to assist in the election of the Church Committee;\textsuperscript{218} and in 1875 he suggested that two lay representatives should be added to the Patronage Committee.\textsuperscript{219} In the words of the Pastorate Auxiliary Committee, he succeeded in giving the Native Pastorate "a vigorous push forward".

But if Cheetham's attitude and involvement with the Pastorate improved as his episcopate wore on, the opposite was true of his relationship with the CMS - with whom he became increasingly disenchanted. The PC's inconsistency over the arrangement of the leases served as an eye-opener for the bishop, while their support of the native clergy during the race controversy may have irreparably damaged his confidence in Society. The attempt to woo Macauley from Sierra Leone

\textsuperscript{218} CMS, C A1/O 25E/136, Primary Charge of the Bishop of Sierra Leone, October 1871, p. 61. Cheetham in fact declared that he "like[d] the Native laymen, the upper sort, far better than the Pastors" (CMS, C A1/O 25E/15, 10 August 1871, Cheetham to Venn). See also article entitled 'Church Conference' in \textit{The West African Reporter} (17 November 1880), no. 142, vol.6. The second Church conference was convened in 1880.


\textsuperscript{218} \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{219} Cf. C A1/L9, p. 86, 19 February 1875, Wright to Cheetham. Though it should be noted that Venn had made the same recommendation four year earlier (see C A1/L8, p. 327, 24 July 1871, Venn to Cheetham; cp. C A1/O 25E/15, 10 August 1871, Cheetham to Venn).
(literally behind his back) did little to restore that confidence. In 1878, when the PC requested that he remove his headquarters to Lagos, he responded: "I have now an experience of Church Missionary treatment and Church Missionary management which has made far too deep an impression on me, for me to accept much further responsibility". Explaining that he still had a lot to do in Sierra Leone, he went on to state that "I do feel I have not been allowed to help the CMS to the extent I might; nor to have the impress of my hand where I might beneficially have done". This feeling that he had not done enough was perhaps induced by a conviction that he was "the last Crown Bishop" in the colony - due to cutbacks in colonial expenditure. He admonished the PC that they should endeavour to retain him as long as possible, and ensure that he resigned gradually "whilst the work should be delegated to a suffragan Bishop of Freetown". This reference was to a European bishop; but Cheetham also suggested that a native bishop could be set over the Sherbro, who would do "what Crowther has done in the Niger". These recommendations were well-intentioned, but intensely speculative; for a Native Church that was struggling to pay its clergy was hardly in a position to support a native Bishop. In any case, they were based on the incorrect assumption that the Colonial Government would no longer provide for the salary of a bishop. Meanwhile, the bishop's position in relation to

---

220 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 179, 10 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright. He also added that Lagos contributed nothing to his salary - which was provided entirely by the Government in the Sierra Leone Colony.

221 ibid.

222 ibid. By this time, it was anticipated that an independent bishop (or, failing that, a Missionary bishop) might be instituted at Lagos.

223 ibid. According to Cheetham, there were "some dozen rivers from 25 to 150 miles in length all flowing into the Sherbro River". "What a suitable diocese for a native", he enthused, "and for him a 'Henry Venn, No.2' would be provided". [Note: 'Henry Venn' was the name of the steamer provided for Bishop Crowther by the CMS.].

224 The subject of a native episcopate is given detailed attention in the next chapter.
both the Society and the Native Pastorate was subjected to an acid test when the Articles of Arrangement - the bedrock of the Native Pastorate experiment - was put on trial in 1878.

(i) The J C Taylor Case
John Christopher Taylor, "a colony-born Christian of the Eboe tribe", was among the first native ministers to be ordained in the colony, under Bishop Weeks, in 1856. Educated at Charlotte School and Fourah Bay College, he was described by Bishop Vidal as "one of our most intelligent catechists"; and he later translated portions of the New Testament, and the Liturgy, into the Igbo language. Taylor accompanied the Third Niger Expedition, of 1857, and joined the Niger Mission the following year. He returned to the Sierra Leone Colony in 1870 (apparently to recover his health), and was appointed by the Finance Committee to take temporary charge of the parish of Wilberforce, during Maxwell's absence. According to Cheetham, he sought, craftily, to manoeuvre himself into a permanent position at Wilberforce by turning the congregation against Maxwell; but was thwarted by the bishop, who resisted requests for Maxwell's removal. Nonetheless, the Church Committee commented on "the very able, efficient, and praiseworthy manner" in which Taylor had worked (for six months) at Wilberforce, and Cheetham

---

225 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25B/4, 17 September 1856, Weeks to Venn. There were two native ministers with the name John Christopher Taylor in the colony. Both were ordained Deacons at the same time, and they were usually referred to as J C Taylor I and II. The one in question is J C Taylor II, who was the younger (see Fyfe, 1962, p. 289).

226 CMS, C A1/O 25a/4, 9 June 1853, Vidal to Venn.

227 Cf. CMS Register, p. 304f. However, Vidal was "a little disappointed" when he saw Taylor's first efforts in 1853. For having been born in the colony, Taylor's knowledge of his mother-tongue was less than adequate.

228 Cf. CMS, C A1/o 2/256, 2 May 1870, Minutes of the Finance Committee; C A1/M 17, pp. 460-463, 31 May 1870, Minutes of the Finance Committee; C A1/O 25E/2, 23 [January] 1871, Cheetham to Venn.


remarked that he was "rather clever, has energy, and is busy". Taylor's return to the Niger mission was prevented when it was discovered that his name had been struck off the estimates of that Mission. He was eventually recruited into the Sierra Leone Mission, and was sent to work in South Quiah, though some doubts persisted about his character. Apart from his deviousness, it was believed that he had a fondness for drink, and Bishop Crowther reported that Taylor had an uncontrolable temper. The doubts remained, but in 1873 Taylor was appointed to the Pastorate of Kent, partly because he was the most senior native minister (outside the Pastorate) and partly because he was believed to have maintained a clean sheet while at the Quiah Mission.

In 1878, it was reported that Taylor was guilty of drunkenness, and was using the children he brought out of slavery on the Niger as wives. When the details emerged, an irate Cheetham complained that Taylor's foibles were kept from him (for over five years), by the native Pastors, who should have informed him before Taylor was appointed to Kent. After consulting with the Chief Justice, Cheetham decided to "risk a trial", based on the procedures laid down

231 CMS, C A1/O 25E/2, 23 [January] 1871, Cheetham to Venn. Though he added that his behaviour at Wilberforce "far from pleases me".
232 ibid.
237 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 118, 24 January 1878, Cheetham to Wright. Cheetham explained that though Taylor received £20 a year from English Christians for the children, he "let them go adrift, not giving them their clothes, and flogged them if they would not agree".
238 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 236, 16 September 1878, Cheetham to Wright. He suggested that Bishop Crowther had also known about Taylor's drunkenness, and had "veiled" the true reason for Taylor's dismissal from Niger.
in the Articles of Arrangement;\textsuperscript{239} which, in his own words, involved "treating the Church as a Voluntary Association, outside the Church of England", and putting aside "any powers I derive through the Crown".\textsuperscript{240} This step was unprecedented; and the bishop confessed that it was an anxious time for him and the Church. "I wonder if we shall get most thanks or kicks", he mused; but declared that "it will be wonderful if we make no slip and are able to carry it through".\textsuperscript{241} To safeguard the chances, he retained the legal services of Samuel Lewis, who was arguably the best Litigator in the colony.\textsuperscript{242} The charges of drunkenness, immorality, and general unfitness for ministry were duly brought against Taylor, and he was summoned before the Church Council, in accordance with the Articles of Arrangement, "under which he was a licensed minister and Pastor of Kent".\textsuperscript{243} In an unexpected move, Taylor retained legal counsel, in the person of W W Streeten, the Queen's Advocate - who Cheetham claimed had not attended Church since he came to the colony in 1875.\textsuperscript{244} When he appeared before the Council, in May 1878, Taylor presented a written protest in which he questioned the proceedings and challenged the authority of the Church Council. He declared that since the Articles under which he had been summoned "were only proposed", and had never been ratified, he was in effect appearing before "a tribunal which has no legal existence and therefore can exercise no jurisdiction".\textsuperscript{245} Acting on the advice of his Counsel, he declined "to appear further before His Lordship and the Council sitting under the proposed Articles of Arrangement", and recorded his "protest against any step which may already

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{239} See Article 7 of the Articles of Arrangement.
\item \textsuperscript{240} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{241} CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 181, 10 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
\item \textsuperscript{242} CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 183, 16 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright; cp. Fyfe, 1962, p. 434.
\item \textsuperscript{243} For documentation of the Taylor Case, see also CMS, C A1/0 25E/133.
\item \textsuperscript{244} ibid.; pp. 182-185, 16 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
\item \textsuperscript{245} CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 185-186, 14 May 1878, Taylor to Cheetham.
\end{itemize}
have been taken or which His Lordship and his Council may hereafter assume to take thereunder". In reply, Cheetham stated that the Articles had been in operation for 16 years, and "that Mr Taylor had accepted them by drawing income under them and by accepting a lease of his house, etc". The bishop suggested to Wright that Taylor's repudiation of the Articles was tantamount to a repudiation of the Pastorate; and he enquired whether the Society was "prepared to stand by the Articles of Arrangement" and "take all needful steps to defend them, if necessary in England". The situation had implications which were not lost on the bishop. He argued that if it were shown that the Articles "will not hold water", it would mean "an end of the Pastorate" (in which case he advised the PC to resume quickly "and arrange something that will hold water"); whereas if it appeared that the Articles were enforceable, "the Pastorate will be very much more established and stronger for these proceedings". The PC were surprised that Taylor had chosen to repudiate the Articles of Arrangement, which they claimed "may well be regarded as a sort of 'Magna Charta' of the Native Pastors". They insisted that if Taylor had signed the lease he had "ipso facto placed himself under the Articles of Arrangement"; and therefore his tenancy would cease if his license was withdrawn. However, they argued that as far as legal proceedings were concerned everything depended on the lease itself; and that even if by accident Taylor had not signed the lease, he was only a tenant who could be ejected by those charged with exercising the Society's patronage. This argument was tantamount to an admission that the Articles of Arrangement in themselves had no legal force; as opposed to the lease arrangement, which had enforceable conditions. The PC were of the opinion that the Society's

246 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 183, 16 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
247 *ibid.* He was certain that the Council would advise him to withdraw Taylor's licence - in accordance with Articles 7 & 9 - but expected some resistance from Taylor.
248 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 274-276, 7 June 1878, Wright to Cheetham.
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involvement was not required at that stage; but assured Cheetham that he could "depend on the Committee for standing faithfully by the Articles of Arrangement, and for seeing, as far as they are concerned, that they are carried out".

After the initial inquiry, the Church Council met (without the bishop) to consider the evidence against Taylor, and to deliberate on the case. They came to the conclusion that the charge of adultery and fornication against Taylor "has not been legally proved against him" - although they had "no doubt that he has been morally guilty of it". But they ruled that Taylor was guilty of drunkenness - the evidence "being overwhelming" - and that "his general conduct as appears from the evidence proves him to be unfit for the discharge and functions of his ministerial office". Cheetham, who protested about his exclusion from the meeting of the Council, was somewhat displeased with the Council's conclusions. He noted that the Council had neither "expressed regret at the conduct of Mr Taylor in repudiating the Articles" nor advised that his licence be withdrawn; and a flurry of correspondence ensued between him and Quaker about the meaning of the expression "morally guilty" in the Council's communication. But he was assured by Samuel Lewis that the Articles would stand, and was advised to make his charges against Taylor "a little more definite" than he

---

249 CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 189-190, The Sierra Leone Church Council's Opinion: re Rev J C Taylor of Kent - presented to Bishop Cheetham on 22 May 1878 - with respect to the charges brought against the Rev J C Taylor.

250 CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 190-192, 28 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright. He contended that the spirit of the Articles would suggest that the matter ought to be decided by "the Bishop in Council".

251 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 192-193. Quaker explained, after consulting with other members of the Council, that the term "is to be taken in its usually acceptation - being expressive of the inevitable sequence of a fact short only of legal proof" (23 May 1878, Quaker to Cheetham). When Cheetham requested clarification of the phrase "the inevitable sequence of a fact", Quaker responded that it was "the implied certainty of its moral proof"; upon which an exasperated Cheetham commented; "Thank God I am not a Negro, and have been taught to answer 'Yes' and 'No'" (ibid.).
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had done in the first instance.252 The Council wanted the bishop to adjudicate the case without a further hearing, but Cheetham decided to write to Taylor, making "explicit charges", and giving him 14 days to reply.253 Taylor acknowledged receipt of the bishop's letter, and "quietly submitted to be interdicted from officiating", but requested an extension of time to two months, on account of his Counsel's absence from the colony.254 Cheetham declined this request, and at the expiration of the 14 days proceeded to take action against Taylor.255 The "Taylor Inquiry" resumed on 27 June; but Taylor refused to attend.256 Samuel Lewis presented the main evidence against Taylor, and the Council repeated their opinion; this time adding their advice "that it is not possible to do any other than withdraw the license of the aforesaid J C Taylor". Lewis advised the bishop to write and deliver a judgement, "in order strictly to fulfil the spirit of English law";257 and at a meeting of the Church Council, on 11 July, Cheetham read his decision in which he "withdrew Mr Taylor's license and inhibited him from taking any duty in the Diocese".258 Nicholson (also acting under Lewis' advice) immediately sent off a month's notice to Taylor to quit the house; and the Church Council gave him notice of the termination of his salary. Cheetham urged the PC that since he had complied with all that the Articles of Arrangement required of him, they should inform Nicholson

252 CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 190-192, 28 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
253 ibid.; pp. 206-207, 18 June 1878, Cheetham to Wright. Article 7 of the Articles of Arrangement stipulated 10 days notice.
254 ibid.
255 Cheetham felt that Taylor was either thinking of appealing to the Archbishop of Canterbury or planning to revert to the civil courts (ibid.).
256 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 219, 5 July 1878, Cheetham to Wright; pp. 212-213, 15 July 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
257 Article 7 required that "all proceedings before the Bishop and Council against any Native Pastor be conducted in a formal manner, and as far as possible according to the spirit and laws of the United Church of England and Ireland".
258 CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 212-213, 15 July 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
that under no circumstances was Taylor to continue to enjoy possession of the Society's property.\footnote{ibid. The bishop anticipated that Taylor would try to delay his ejection by appealing to the civil courts; and insisted that the Society should make it clear that whatever the outcome of an appeal he would not continue to use their "private property".} Hutchinson accordingly informed Nicholson that Taylor's tenancy of the Parsonage House should cease with the withdrawal of his license, regardless of the result of any appeal.\footnote{CMS, C A1/M 21, pp. 245-247, 10 October 1878, Nicholson to Wright; cp. pp. 235-238, 16 September 1878, Cheetham to Wright; pp. 238-241, 18 September 1878, Cheetham to Wright. However, in April 1879, Governor Rowe made an attempt to re-open the case; and requested Cheetham to explain his authority to withdraw Taylor's license (cf. C A1/O 25E/108, 25 April 1879, Cheetham to Governor-in-Chief; C A1/M 22, pp.26-27, 1 May 1879, Cheetham to Wright). Nothing came of the matter.} However, he was uncertain about whether Nicholson should commence ejectment proceedings, in the event Taylor refused to move; for "there may be disadvantages in going to law which would suggest caution". The PC's misgivings on this point were to have great significance later; but fears that Taylor would resist ejectment proved unwarranted. At the end of the one month's notice, Taylor quietly gave up possession of the Parsonage at Kent, and the matter came to an end.\footnote{CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 288-289, 14 August 1878, Hutchinson to Nicholson.}^1

The most significant outcome of the Taylor Case was that it gave validity to the Articles of Arrangement, and by so doing authenticated the Pastorate experiment. Both Cheetham and the Society therefore looked back on the incident with some satisfaction. However, as a test case, it also revealed a serious defect in the arrangements, which Cheetham was quick to highlight: namely, that whereas the bishop bound himself to the Articles, by his own consent, the native Pastors (singly or collectively) were under no such constraint. The Taylor Case exposed the tendency for a Pastor to accept the Articles only up to the point where he was put on trial under its stipulations. Cheetham described his position, under the Articles, as "anomalous"; and complained that while he had entered into an arrangement whereby his "rights, authority
and power under the Crown" were "limited and fettered for the sole advantage and security of the Pastors", the same Pastor "for whose security it was arranged, repudiates it and refuses to attend and submit to its ruling." He pointed out that in the absence of the Articles he would have "had to treat Mr Taylor as a Stipendiary Curate officiating in an unconsecrated building"; and on "being satisfied of his misconduct have withdrawn his licence". "A stroke of the pen would have done it", he added. He conceded that the primary purpose of the scheme was to prevent just such a summary method of proceeding, and to tone down the bishop's "arbitrary powers"; but argued that "if the Bishop voluntarily consents to this restraint of his natural authority... the Pastor should also be bound to adhere to the arrangement". He observed that the other Pastors had "not moved a single step to give any public expression of their disappointment of Mr Taylor's conduct", and had addressed no letter or any other communication to him on the subject. Cheetham maintained that he did not wish to withdraw from the arrangements, but gave the Society twelve months "to propose such a remedy as shall be most likely to hinder such a catastrophe in the future". He explained that if he did not receive any answer from the Society within three months, he would then give nine months notice of his intention "to retire from any agreement with the Society as expressed in the Articles of Arrangement". The PC accepted Cheetham's argument about the weak point in the scheme, but submitted "that it is a weakness that is inherent in all human courts of judicators, and is rather apparent than real". Wright argued that "the value and power of the court does not depend upon the views of its jurisdiction as held by the person brought before it, but in the fact as to whether it can

262 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 239, 18 September 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
263 ibid.
264 ibid. However, he submitted that "I do no for one moment think any one of them approves of Mr Taylor's proceedings".
265 CMS, C A1/L9, pp.295-299, 1 November 1878, Wright to Cheetham.
enforce its judgements - whether he repudiates it or not". He pointed out that the arrangement had great advantage not only in guarding against arbitrary action on the part of the bishop but also in giving greater moral value to his decisions than if they issued from himself alone. Moreover, the Articles provided "a power whereby the sentences of the Bishop acting with the Council may at once be enforced, which might otherwise entail the putting into motion of a cumbersome, expensive and uncertain machinery". From the Society's point of view, the Articles of Arrangement were workable as long as CMS and the bishop were faithful to their respective parts of the arrangement; and the PC acknowledged that the success which had so far attended its working owed a great deal to Cheetham's diligence. But, in view of the Taylor Case, they recommended, for Cheetham's consideration, the advisability of preparing a form of agreement, "to which the Articles of Agreement might be scheduled; which each Pastor on his admission to a Pastorate might be required to sign". They also suggested that when the Articles came under revision a clause might be added "throwing the expense of measures taken against a Pastor upon himself if he is condemned and upon the Church Fund if he is acquitted".

It must, however, be stressed that apart from the concern which he expressed about the weakness in the scheme, Cheetham approved entirely of the Articles of Arrangement, and stated that "it has been a great pleasure to me to work out a scheme upon which Mr Venn bestowed so much thought and attention". He probably accepted the PC's arguments in response to his query; and later argued that Taylor had

266 This was never done.

267 *ibid.* This procedure was meant to "act as a motive against any action whereby expense would be unnecessarily incurred". The expenses of the Taylor Case amounted to £62.4.1 (including Samuel Lewis' bill of £39.9.4). The PC strongly opposed Cheetham's offer pay the entire cost, on the grounds that it would "establish a bad precedent for the future"; and insisted that it was better for the Church Fund to bear the entire expenses.

268 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 239, 18 September 1878, Cheetham to Wright.
assented to the Articles "by becoming a Native Pastor, by receiving his salary quarterly from the Church Committee, by taking part in the election of the Church Committee and Church Council... before which and the Bishop he was cited to appear". To clarify the issues, he published a "Memorandum on the Authority of the Bishop in disciplinary matters", in which he put down his thoughts "in regard to Articles 7 & 9 of the Articles of Arrangement of March 1853". With regards the "accused Party", he asserted that the Articles were "drawn in his interest, for his protection and advantage", and that "he himself assists in forming the Council who assist and advise the Bishop". He was at pains to point out that the Articles "in no wise invite the Bishop to attempt to exercise powers in excess of his lawful authority, but rather tend to give direction to and moderate the exercise of his power within his lawful authority". At the same time, he made it clear that the Articles did not detract from the bishop's authority; for "he is not bound to act upon the advice given him by the Council; if he thinks it would break any plain legal enactment, or if he feels it would burden his conscience". In reply to Governor Rowe's enquiring about his authority to withdraw Taylor's licence, he explained that though the Articles may seem, at first sight, "to derogate from the Bishop's inherent and derived prerogative of judge", a careful reading of Article 9 would show that that clearly was not the case. However, the Articles of Arrangement came under increasing attack as the Pastorate matured and other inherent limitations in its application were later exposed.

270 CMS, C A1/O 25E/132, Memorandum on the Authority of the Bishop in disciplinary matters, 1878. He discussed the Articles of Arrangement under three headings: (1) "Their general scope and object", (2) "As regards the accused party", and (3) "As touching my own authority as Bishop".
D. The Limits of Expansion

The Taylor Case distracted attention momentarily from the financial ills of the Pastorate and the programme of expansion which the Society was determined to pursue to the hilt. In July 1878, Quaker complained about the unfavourable financial condition of the Native Church, and announced in a rather dramatic manner that "evils are looming at no great distance in regard to the Funds for the maintenance of the Native Church, the Native Church Missions, and the quietness and peace of the various parishes in the settlement".\(^{272}\) The Church Mission Fund was in such a critical state that the Missions Committee lacked sufficient money to pay the salaries of the agents, and it was forced make retrenchments in expenditure.\(^{273}\) Quaker criticised Cheetham for spending "all that we raise and multiplying Pastors in the settlement"; and he projected that "in a couple of years hence, if not before, we shall be obliged to reduce the Pastors stipends".\(^{274}\) Nicholson also informed C C Fenn that "the Native Church is now passing through a great trial".\(^{275}\) He reported that finances of the Church were falling off, and that the "missionary income for the present year is only about £350 to meet an expenditure of £500".\(^{276}\) Despite these dismal reports, the PC again urged the Native Church to take up the Sherbro Mission, and in addition to the assistance of grants from the Society and the H V Fund, they offered to pay

---

\(^{272}\) CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 220, 5 July 1878, Quaker to Lay Secretary.

\(^{273}\) ibid., p. 221, 16 July 1878, Quaker to Lay Secretary. A special appeal was made in a bid to recover the deficit.

\(^{274}\) ibid., p. 249, 19 October 1878, Quaker to Lay Secretary. It is worth mentioning that the bishop and Quaker were often at loggerheads; and in this same letter, Quaker mentions his intention to forward some correspondence between himself and the bishop about the bishop's behaviour towards him in Committee meetings.

\(^{275}\) CMS, C A1/M 22, p. 22, 7 April 1879 Nicholson to Fenn.

\(^{276}\) By mid 1879, however, the Pastorate Fund had somewhat recovered (cf C A1/M 22, p. 29, 10 May 1879, Lamb to Wright); but the further retrenchment was being contemplated with regard to the Church Missions (cf. C A1/M 22, p. 27, 5 May 1879, Quaker to Lay Secretary).
the salary of the native missionary agent for one year.\textsuperscript{277} Hutchinson informed Lamb (who had returned the colony as Acting Secretary) that the PC had decided to "withdraw entirely from the Sherbro Mission"; and that "after next year they will think it right to commence the reduction of the annual grant of £300 to the Native Church by £100 per annum".\textsuperscript{278} Due to some confusion in communication, the PC assumed (incorrectly) that Sherbro had been taken up after their letter of 24 January; but Lamb later informed Hutchinson that the Sherbro Mission was still being carried on at the expense of the Society.\textsuperscript{279} The Church Committee passed a resolution to the effect that the Mission should not be taken up in the absence of Cheetham (who was in England at the time)\textsuperscript{280}, and requested the Society to carry on the Sherbro Mission until the bishop returned.\textsuperscript{281} In view of the fact that the Church Committee had not been informed of their intention to withdraw, the PC agreed to carry on the work until the end of the year.\textsuperscript{282} Meanwhile, Lamb praised the Church Committee as "a thoroughly sensible and practical set of men", who had "a deep sense of the PC's liberality and kindness"; and testified "to their sincere wish to meet your proposals in a complying an co-operative spirit".\textsuperscript{283} It was suggested that if the work at Sherbro was to be carried on "at the lowest figure possible" - as the PC had suggested - the Native Church might be able to take the responsibility. But Cheetham, who was still in England, was infuriated by the Society's decision to withdraw from the Sherbro Mission; and

\textsuperscript{277}CMS, C A1/L9, p. 306, 24 January 1879, Hutchinson to Nicholson. They insisted that "the Society must now withdraw from the Sherbro Mission in conformity with their previous resolution".

\textsuperscript{278}CMS, C A1/L9, p. 325, 25 July 1879, Hutchinson to Lamb.

\textsuperscript{279}CMS, C A1/M 22, p. 64, 18 August 1879, Lamb to Lay Secretary.

\textsuperscript{280}The bishop had taken ill in May 1879 and left for England after a visit to the Coast (cf. CMS, C A1/M 22, p. 27, 1 May 1879, Cheetham to Wright; p. 40, 29 May 1879, Quaker to Wright).

\textsuperscript{281}CMS, C A1/M 22, p. 64, 18 August 1879, Lamb to Lay Secretary.

\textsuperscript{282}CMS, C A1/9, p. 330, 1 August 1879, Hutchinson to Lamb.

\textsuperscript{283}ibid.
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he condemned their apparent readiness "to let all past Christian work die out and the Church expire, in the event the Native Church [did] not relieve them of it". He also denounced the resolution as bearing "a spirit of coercion" either towards "the infant Native Church" or "the friendly bishop". Such a proceeding, he argued, infringed the mutual agreement between the Society and bishops; and added that if proper consultation had been pursued a solution to the difficulties would have appeared. Cheetham found the PC's propensity for unilateral decisions most displeasing; and with relations between him and the Society already admitting of great strain, the attempt to force the Sherbro Mission on the Native Church turned out to be the final straw. Declaring that he had no desire "to enter upon a course of strife", he informed the PC that he proposed to ask the Secretary of State for a three months extension of his leave and give notice of his intention to resign his present office at the end of that period. Insisting that the decision was taken with much sorrow and regret, he wrote,

It troubles me much to lay down the work. But I do not feel called upon to follow the Society in a course which I fear will be fraught with much peril to the Native Church; and I would rather retire while I can look back with satisfaction and thankfulness, that up to this point the Church has been developed and expanded with safety.

What transpired after this is unclear; but it seems safe to assume that the PC initiated some consultation with Cheetham,

---

284 CMS, C A1/M 22, pp. 66-70, 3 September 1879, Cheetham to Wright.
285 According to Cheetham, the agreement was that the bishops ordained and licensed, while the CMS keeps up the Mission once established. Based on this "compact", the PC should never determine to withdraw from a Mission without previous consultation with the bishop, "if he be a friendly bishop". This agreement, he pointed out, was set out in the Society's paper entitled "Remarks on the constitution and practice of the CMS with reference to its ecclesiastical relations".
286 He complained that the PC had already made up their minds before his visit to England, "and thought themselves to be at liberty to do so without taking any further notice of me, than sending to me an intimation of such a resolution". He observed that "this is not the only instance in which our relations... have not been respected.
287 ibid.
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with a view to convincing the bishop about the expediency of their policy.288 By the time Cheetham left England in October 1879, he was prepared to submit a plan to the Native Church for taking over the Sherbro Mission at the beginning of 1880.289 Lamb (who was superintending Sherbro) reported that the general opinion in the colony was that Sherbro "should be put on a purely self-supporting system".290 Misreading the situation, he asserted that too much was being made of the difficulty of Sherbro Mission; because "English people seem to think Africans must forever remain in swathing bands!".291 When Cheetham arrived in the colony in November, he submitted a plan to the Church Committee for the Island of Sherbro to be taken up as a Pastorate district.292 The proposal was accepted, and in December the "Regulation constituting the Ecclesiastical District of the Island of Sherbro and adjacent places" came into effect.293 It appears that Cheetham yielded to CMS pressure solely because of the threat to abandon the Mission, for he remained unconvinced about the timeliness of the transfer. In a letter to Wright, he commented: "You may say the Committee's policy of coercion has been successful; but there are victories that are more disastrous that defeats".294

The addition of Sherbro Island to the Pastorate marked the

288 In August, Hutchinson had told Lamb that "we are communicating fully with the bishop on the subject", and intimated that the postponement of the withdrawal from the Sherbro Mission was due to the bishop's objection (cf. CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 330 & 334, 1 August 1879, Hutchinson to Lamb.
290 CMS, C A1/M 22, p. 75, 1 November 1879, Lamb to Lay Secretary.
291 ibid., p. 77, 7 November 1879, Lamb to Wright.
292 CMS, C A1/M 22, pp. 93-94, Cheetham to Wright. He reported that the Committee of Missions resolutely declined to accept Sherbro.
293 ibid.; p. 87, 20 December 1879, Lamb to Wright. The Committee of the H V Fund made a grant of £100 towards the working of Sherbro, and sanctioned the transfer of another £100, granted a year previously for the use of Kissy Road Church, to Sherbro (cf. CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 356-358, 2 April 1880, Wright to Sunter).
294 ibid.
The end of the momentum of expansion. The CMS withdrawal was complete. The Society only retained an incipient and struggling mission among the Muslim population at Cline's Town, its Port Loko Mission, and the educational establishments. There was a movement, in 1880, to take St George's Cathedral (the Colonial Church) into the Pastorate, when the Governor proposed to abolish the Colonial Chaplaincy. However, the scheme was promptly shelved, when it became apparent that the Colonial Government was indisposed to put the building into proper repair. Still, the addition of the Cathedral would have been a fitting apogee to Cheetham's episcopate, during which the Pastorate progressed from a state of arrested development to full fledged maturity. The West Reporter proclaimed: "He found a Church but in its infancy which he has tended and nurtured carefully into a strong and thriving Church, that promises to do much in the great work of evangelising and civilising

295 For a while, Cline's Town Chapel remained connected to Fourah Bay College, and outside the Pastorate proper; but in early 1884, it was made a part of the ecclesiastical district of Kissy Road (cf. G3/A1/0/20, 4 February 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary). Cp. C A1/L9, p. 358, 2 April 1880, Wright to Sunter.


297 In April 1880, the PC authorized Sunter (the Mission Secretary) to dispose of their properties at Wilberforce Street, Fort Street, and Kissy (CMS, C A1/L9, 9 April 1880, pp. 363-364, Hutchinson to Sunter. With no CMS Church in the colony, the Principal of Fourah Bay College was automatically the Secretary of Mission.

298 CMS, C A1/M 22, pp. 99-101, Cheetham to Wright. The readiness to add the Cathedral to an already over-taxed Pastorate Fund was prompted by the long entertained hope of having a Pastorate in the centre of Freetown. There was a consensus of opinion that the Cathedral would not be a "burdensome Pastorate"; and Cheetham declared that from "a spiritual point of view, I would make the change at any cost". But fears were expressed that the move would alienate "the large section of dissenters who... willingly contribute to its funds" (see editorial, 'The Transfer of the Cathedral', in The West African Reporter (31 March 1880), no. 108, vol. 6.).

299 ibid., pp. 134-135, 10 June 1880, Cheetham to Wright.
It is worthy of note that despite a crisis-ridden tenure, and repeated confrontation with his clergy, his energetic labours endeared the bishop to his church members; and his departure was deemed to "create a void... that will be difficult to fill". A petition signed by four native Pastors and four native Laymen petitioned the CMS for the continuance of his supervision, expressing their conviction that it "would under God result in further strength to the Infant Institution". However, Cheetham resigned his office in 1881 and departed from the colony in June that year. His episcopate marked a watershed in history of the Pastorate; and his achievements were unparalleled by any other bishop in the nineteenth century. But in what can only be described as a sombre historical irony, his legacy of growth was transformed into the Pastorate's greatest trial (during our period of study).

E. The Roots of a Crisis

In the face of things, the new stage of the Pastorate experiment - the completion of expansion and CMS withdrawal - was pregnant with possibilities and opportunities for greater ecclesiastical independence. But enlarged beyond its means and trapped in a precarious economic environment, the Pastorate was confronted with the possibility of perennial financial tribulation. Sunter, for instance, complained in 1882: "I fear the Pastorate increases too fast for the means of the small colony... In fact, in my opinion, the Pastorate have undertaken - or had imposed on them - far more than,

---

from the circumstances of the place they are able to bear. The foundations are by no means so securely laid... The state of trade here materially affects... the income of the Church". However, the financial struggle was an expected cost of expansion; and it could be argued that it was also an unavoidable phase in the Pastorate's chequered progress towards complete self-support. But, tragically (and quite unexpectedly), the expansion of the Pastorate produced internecine strife and controversy. This particular development was triggered by the transfer of Christ Church and Holy Trinity Church, with their wealth of intelligent, successful and prosperous laymen to the Native Pastorate. In the village stations the majority of the congregations were poorly educated - certainly, few were as educated as the Pastor - and though conflicts between Pastor and congregation were not unknown (often traceable to tribal antagonism), the Pastor had a certain authoritative edge. At any rate, the village congregations had long become accustomed to the pastoral leadership of native (as opposed to European) clergymen. The experience and situation of the two city churches was entirely different. Their location and prolonged connection with the Society had given them a prestigious image and a membership roll which was illuminated with the names of the cream of the colony's burgeoning intelligentsia and successful merchant class. This class was more inclined to challenge the authority and competence of a native Pastor, and was significantly less disposed to give unquestioning (financial) support to an Institution in whose affairs they had little say. In 1876 therefore, after the transfer of Holy Trinity Church to the Pastorate was announced, The West African Reporter, whose proprietor (the Hon. William Grant) was a reputable member of that Church, immediately printed a leading article which queried the "preponderance of clerical influence" in the affairs of the Pastorate, and called for a revision of the Articles of Arrangement which would give "a sufficient amount of lay

---

303 CMS, G3/A1/0/34, 17 April 1882, Sunter to Lang.
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influence as shall be equivalent to that of the clergy" in the Church Council. 304 The paper asserted that "the lofty spirit of reserve manifested by the pastors towards their flock" had occasioned "violent discords between ministers and congregations of every Church in the Settlement"; and it proceeded to argue that "deprived absolutely of the fostering care of its great nursing parent", the future success of the Pastorate "laid deep in the hearts of the people who will be responsible for that success, and upon whose shoulders the burden is now to be laid". The article resonated with the deep anxiety which the CMS withdrawal had generated among the native Anglican population; and it sparked off a controversy which was carried on, not within the Pastorate proper but in the press. 305 The controversy was characterised by recrimination, partisan loyalty and sectarian interest, and, on the main, generated more heat than light; but it provides valuable insight into the way the Pastorate was viewed at ground level. Two opposing factions, or schools of thought, became easily distinguishable; not least because they rallied round two main newspapers (though correspondents often attacked each other's point of view within the columns of any given newspaper). The West African Reporter, championed the cause of those laymen who advocated a revision of the Articles of Arrangement (to give the laity greater powers and representation), condemned clerical

304 Article 'Withdrawal of the CMS from Sierra Leone', The West African Reporter (12 September 1877), no. 36, vol. 4. The paper was edited by William Grant's son (cf. Fyfe, 1962, p. 408).

305 The Sierra Leone press had been dominated by West Indians during the 1860s, but the 1870s saw an upsurge of Sierra Leonean founded newspapers like The Negro (1872-1873), The Independent (1873-1878), The Watchman and West African Record (1875-1886), and The West African Reporter (1875-1884). For greater detail, see Fyfe's most helpful article 'The Sierra Leone Press in the Nineteenth Century' in Sierra Leone Studies, 8 (June 1957), 226-236. As could be seen from the figures in parenthesis, few of the papers were in existence for more than ten years, and only the last two lasted into the 1880s. Fyfe rightly observes that "the newspapers founded in the 1870s and 1880s set a higher standard"; and that "the contributors style improved, reflecting the general increase of cultivation and fluency in a community were no longer content to be shopkeepers like their fathers but were entering the learned professions" (p. 232). Cp. Fyfe, 1962, pp. 408-409, 464-465.
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authoritarianism, and pressed for "Ministerial Removals". The counter-view was upheld by *The Watchman and West African Record*, owned and edited by M H Davies, an Aku from Hastings, who had two brothers who were pastors. The *Watchman* defended the native pastors, upheld the 'Articles', and expatiated on the merits of the parochial system. It was the classic case of the radical against the traditional. As one correspondent put it, "the main subject of the argument is whether the constitution of the Sierra Leone Church is calculated to promote the welfare, and develop the permanent growth, of the Church under an entire native agency; whether as it at present stands it does not require revision, and what reasons can be brought to oppose the demand for and introduction of sufficient lay influence into the Sierra Leone Church Council proportionate to that of the clergy therein".

It is hard to ignore the underlying, but patent, distrust of the native clergy (as a body) which formed the mainspring of the controversy. *The Reporter*’s reference to the recurrence of "violent discords between ministers and congregations of every Church in the Settlement" was true, if somewhat exaggerated. The statement elicited a spate of letters from various Churchmen, who warmly proclaimed its veracity and used the opportunity to vent their spleen against obdurate native Pastors. "Everyone in Sierra Leone who knows anything of the matter", claimed one correspondent, "must be perfectly aware... that differences of more or less magnitude exist in many places between pastors and people". Reference was made to "those 'grumblings, low and deep' which are often

---

306 Fyfe describes M H Davies as "the veteran of the Freetown press" (Fyfe, 1962, p. 375). A staunch Anglican, Davies had been sent to London by the CMS, to learn printing, and had already published and edited three different newspapers before starting *The Watchman* (cf. Fyfe, 1962, pp. 280, 315, 356, and 375).


308 See issues of *The Reporter*, for September to October 1877. It is worth mentioning that letters to the editor were almost invariably signed with a pseudonym - a practice which was not peculiar to Sierra Leone.
wafted to this part [i.e., Freetown] in low murmurs from Waterloo, Hastings, Wellington, and which have broken the quiet harmony of Christ's Church. Moreover, the "violent discords" were uniformly attributed to what was described as "the overbearing and intolerant conduct" of some of the Pastors. Irate churchmen complained that since the Pastors commanded a majority in the Church Council (the highest governing body), it was useless to report their conduct. The Pastors, they observed, also boasted that the discord which their actions provoked was "not cognizable by the Ecclesiastical laws of England which regulates the constitution of the Sierra Leone Church Council": a remark which the churchmen took to mean that native clergymen could continue "ad infinitum to lord it over God's heritage and to 'hector and torture' their flock without fear of reprimand". Clashes between the Pastors and congregations of the two city churches provided useful fodder for the critics of the Church constitution; and their chorus of protest found ample scope for expression in newspaper columns. There is a suspicion (tantamount to certainty) that the same individuals who led the opposing factions in the various churches (for in no instant was the entire congregation opposed to the Pastor) and gave the Pastors much grief in the church committees, were the ones who penned acrimonious letters in the press. The two city Pastors - Moses Pearce (Christ Church) and D G Williams (Holy Trinity Church) - were pilloried mercilessly in The Reporter. Williams' plans to build a Chapel at Clines's Town was vigorously opposed by a powerful cabal within his church, and the merits or otherwise of the scheme were debated hotly in the newspapers. However, Pearce's problems with his

309 *ibid.*, 26 September 1877, no. 38, vol. 4 (Letter to Editor).
310 Misunderstandings, it was agreed, were bound to arise, but it was asserted that "in the majority of instances they originate with those pastors who are most troublesome".
311 This probably helps to explain why Cheetham made no reference to what was obviously a seething problem.
312 *ibid.*
congregation, which dated back to the late 1870s, were of far greater magnitude. In May 1881, the Church warden and five members of his congregation (the five belonged to one family) called on Cheetham to demand Pearce's resignation, and forwarded charges of gross immorality against him.  

However, when an enquiry was set up, the Church warden (who was represented by Samuel Lewis) refused to attend. To Cheetham's chagrin, Lewis who had drawn up the Libel in exactly the same words as he had done in the Taylor case, also advised his client that the bishop could not compel witnesses to attend under the Articles of Arrangement. The Church council subsequently dismissed the case. A troubled Cheetham demanded that before another bishop was sent out it should be determined whether he "was at liberty to follow out the Articles of Arrangements without any reference to the charter"; whether "the Articles... can be worked in subjection to the charter"; and whether "the charter being provided, the Articles... are incompatible with them and must fall to the ground". The bishop was particularly distressed that the laity appeared to have rejected the authority of the Articles in almost the same manner that a Pastor had done three years before. However, there was a subtle difference. In the Taylor case, it was the authority of the bishop which had been under threat, whereas in the Pearce affair it was the Pastor's control which was being opposed. One churchman observed: "The pastors may be well assured that the public eye is on them, that the days have long since gone by when they used to consider themselves the oracles of learning and can do whatever they list; that whenever they pursue a wrong principle, adopt a wrong policy or make a wrong move, a voice will surely be heard from the crowd, if only there is opportunity, calling them to order.\r

313 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/P1, no. 19a, 9 May 1881, Quaker to Lay Secretary; G3/A1/0, no. 43, 18 July 1881, Cheetham to Lay Secretary. The Church warden, a Mr Georgestone, promised to provide proof.
314 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 43, 18 July 1881, Cheetham to Wigram.
and pointing them to the right direction.\textsuperscript{315} For their part, the native Pastors - notably Macauley, their self-appointed spokesman - were rigidly opposed to any form of change. Macauley took the editor of \textit{The Reporter} to task for making "sweeping statements" about clashes between Pastors and congregations, and for taking every opportunity to print disparaging remarks about the native Pastors.\textsuperscript{316} But another correspondent (who claimed to be a member of his Church at Wellington) replied, indignantly, that there were "numerous instances and abundant evidence" within Macauley's own parish of such discord, resulting from "his pastoral tyranny".\textsuperscript{317} The rather pugnacious Macauley became embroiled in a brief, but rancorous, exchange with the anonymous churchmen in the columns of \textit{The Reporter}.\textsuperscript{318} He chided the editor for always representing "the native Pastors and their parishioners as two snarling dogs chained together, and pulling in opposite directions"; but rather defeated his argument by asserting that the Pastors were determined to maintain the position which the Church of England has given her clergy in her constitution "though all helps were withdrawn".\textsuperscript{319} As a parting comment, he declared that "pulling down those whom we should uphold" was no way to prepare the Native Church for self-government; and that "if, through petty jealousies, bickerings, tribal feelings, sectarian bigotry, etc, the work reared up in the Settlement by the CMS at vast expenditure of life and means be allowed to fall through, posterity will load with infamy the memories of those who shall in any way contribute to the bringing about of so great a catastrophe".\textsuperscript{320}

\textsuperscript{315} \textit{The Reporter} 17 October 1877), no. 41, vol. 4, letter to editor.
\textsuperscript{316} \textit{The Reporter}, 19 September 1877, no. 37, vol. 4.
\textsuperscript{317} \textit{ibid.}, 26 September 1877, no. 38, vol. 4.
\textsuperscript{318} One of whom accused him of having a "proclivity to appear" before the public in print.
\textsuperscript{319} \textit{The Reporter} (10 October 1877), no. 40, vol. 4, Macauley to editor; cp. 19 September 1877, no. 37, vol. 4, Macauley to editor.
\textsuperscript{320} \textit{ibid.}
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After a brief hiatus, the case for radical reform was resumed with fresh vigour in a leading article which appeared in The Reporter on 11 August 1880. The article was entitled 'Support of the Native Pastorate', and was later reputed to have been written by Samuel Lewis. It was premised on the familiar argument that since the Pastorate's support devolved mainly on the laity, the strong feeling of dissatisfaction (with the working of the Institution) from that quarter posed an undeniable threat to its survival. The writer asserted that though ".called upon to contribute liberally and cheerfully of their substance, and expected to give the weight of their liberal support to the Institution, the interest of lay members is not cultivated by an invitation to partake in an intelligent arrangement of the plans of the Institution". "What is worse", he added, "they are sometimes enraged by an assumption of priestly arrogance which seems in some cases to regard them as a mere coining machine to supply the pecuniary calls of the pastor". The writer insisted that the Articles of Arrangement were "formed too closely after the model of the English Church, without even the doubtful security of the tedious Ecclesiastical Law of the prototype", and left the congregations "too much in the power of the pastor, who regarded his parish "according to the English fiction, as a virtual freehold, which it is his right to enjoy for life". "The circumstances in which the English Church was established", he pointed out, "differed widely from those of the establishment of any of the voluntary Evangelical Societies operating in the Settlement". The Pastorate was financially dependent not on an endowment from the state or on private property, but on contributions and donations from its congregations and other sympathizers; and it was necessary that "a right of representation in some

321 The Reporter, 11 August 1880, no. 137, vol. 6. Rev O Moore (who succeeded Quaker as Principal of the Grammar School), drew attention to this article several years later, and stated that it was believed to have been written by Samuel Lewis (cf. CMS, G3/A1/0/91, 26 March 1888, Moore to Wigram, p. 4). Lewis' close association with The Reporter (he was the paper's legal adviser) underlined suspicions that the paper had Methodist leanings.
effective form" be conferred on its laity. He drew a comparison with the Methodist Society, in which (he claimed) the lay members had a voice in all questions affecting the interest of their Churches, and could exercise their right to "control the expenditure of their local contributions". The comparison with the Methodist Society did not end there, for the fulcrum of the problem and the chief cause of discontent, as the writer saw it, was "the apparent helplessness of the parishioners to be rid of a pastor whose ministration is not acceptable or profitable to his congregation". As a rule, critics of the parochial system generally argued that no matter how despotic and unbearable a Pastor was, there was no means available of removing him as long as he had not violated some moral law, and he "had the power of harassing his parishioners all his life time". For them, the Methodist system of a periodic removal of their ministers had a compelling attraction.\textsuperscript{322} The writer of the article under consideration called for a change in the regulations which would introduce "a periodical change of parishes of every pastor... every three to four years". He argued that such a system "would offer an easy way of settling without harshness and without reference to the personal considerations of merit or demerit, the already vexed question of continuing indefinitely a pastor among a flock notwithstanding their universal dissent and with palpable injury to the interests of the Church".

\textit{The Watchman}, which had hitherto been silent on the matters related to the Pastorate, responded with an editorial which denounced \textit{The Reporter}'s coverage as "tending to jeopardize the interests and prosperity of the infant Church".\textsuperscript{323} The

\textsuperscript{322} There had already been calls in \textit{The Reporter} for the introduction of "the periodical removal of ministers", as practised by the Wesleyans, to counteract the evil of "constant dissensions... and dissatisfaction with the pastor". See Article 'Recognition of Pastoral Services' in \textit{The Reporter}, 28 July 1880, no. 135, vol. 6.

\textsuperscript{323} See editorial, 'The Sierra Leone Church Pastorate', \textit{The Watchman} (31 August 1880), vol. vi, no. 16.
editorial specifically addressed the issue of ministerial removals, which had become the main talking point among Anglicans in the colony. Presenting the opposite side of the argument, the editor argued that "the pernicious system of frequent removals" practised in the Methodist Church, tended, "in a considerable degree, to neutralize or paralyse" the efforts of its ministers. He added that even the Wesleyans themselves deprecated the system, and would "be willing, within certain limitations", to adopt the constitution of the Native Church. In any case, he continued, the ecclesiastical status of the native Pastors differed greatly from that of the "non-conforming" ministers - the former being "Incumbents of settled Parishes", while the latter were itinerating "Preachers of the gospel travelling from Circuit to Circuit" - and the system adopted by one could hardly be a suitable model for the other. The editor described the Reporter's statements about problems within the Pastorate as "exaggerated and misleading". But he probably revealed the main cause of the Pastors' resistance when he asserted that the churchmen were endeavouring "to raise an outcry for reforms which, if introduced in the way they recommend, will [not] only place the Pastors under their entire and vindictive control, but will eventually prove detrimental to the interests of religion, of peace, of Africa". As was usual in the colony, the article evoked anonymous letters from correspondents sympathetic to the pastors and supportive of the Church constitution; and who also criticised The Reporter's apparent hostility towards the Pastorate. In subsequent issues The Watchman continued its denunciation of the periodic removal of ministers, as inimical to the work of a Pastor. It maintained that when set in good working order, the parochial system was "admirably adopted to achieve such results as cannot fail to elicit the good opinion of the public, and enhance the influence, moral as well as spiritual, of the pastor over the flock"; and that the pastor's "prolonged residence" in a parish was absolutely
necessary for the system to be effective. But eventually, even *The Watchman* was forced to admit that "the present state of things in this Settlement is such that a general reform is now of imperative necessity". It confirmed that "in the Church there is a want of stability and confidence between the clergy and laity, and a dissatisfaction is now and then expressed on either side as to the general working of the affairs of the Church".

The advocates of reform included some of the staunchest Anglicans and the most powerful laymen in the colony; notably the Honorable William Grant. Grant presented their views at the second Church Conference (of Cheetham's episcopate), held in November 1880, in a paper entitled 'The layman's Position in the Church according to Usage and the Constitution of the Pastorate Institution'. While recycling the same arguments about increased lay representation being a necessary function of lay financial support, Grant presented an incisive and cogent critique of the Pastorate's organisational structure from the layman's point of view. He took great pains to emphasize that lay representation in both the Church Council and Church Committee was mere window-dressing. Noting that lay members in the Council were outnumbered 3 to 4, he pointed out that not one single lay member was appointed by the laity; for all

---

324 Article 'The Sierra Leone Native Church', *The Watchman* (30 September 1880), vol. vi, no. 18. Possibly in response to this article, an editorial entitled 'Ministerial Removals' appeared in the recently established *The Methodist Herald and West African Educational Times* (27 October 1882), vol.1, no. 2, which outlined the benefits and advantages of the Methodist practice.


326 Grant a self-made merchant with little formal education, was one of the most influential natives in the colony, and the second to be appointed to the Legislative Council (in 1869) - see Fyfe, 1962, p. 365. An imposing figure, at 6ft 2in, Venn is reported to have described him as his "beau ideal of an African".

the lay representatives were appointed by the CMS, the Bishop and the Pastors, who were in fact under no obligation to chose lay members of the Pastorate.\(^{328}\) The Church Committee had a more equitable composition of five laity and five clergy; and Grant admitted that the "balance of power" in that body was a security for the laity ("who chiefly contribute the money for the support of the Institution") against "unauthorised... expenditure, by those [i.e, the Pastors] on whom the burden of contribution falls, if at all, very lightly". However, he argued that the equality of representation in the Church Committee amounted to little since that body was "strictly confined to the collection of funds of the Institution" and appeared to have no further powers in the management of the Pastorate "besides providing supplies". Even the Council "which comprised three-fourths of lay element seem to have authority only to take up and recognize ecclesiastical districts, and to sit and vote in a forum convened for determining ecclesiastical offenses". In a word, the Articles of Arrangement "imposed duty rather than conferred power" on the laity. But the Articles also provided for the church members of each new ecclesiastical district to "elect officers to exercise, as far as practicable, the usual functions of Churchwardens in England; and to collect the contributions of that congregation towards the Church Fund".\(^{329}\) This regulation had led to the formation of Parochial or church committees in the various parishes, which were meant to assist the Pastor in the oversight of temporal matters in the church. In practice, however, the majority of church members paid their contributions directly to the Pastor; and the absolute control which the Pastors exercised over the use of funds became a perennial bone of contention between Pastors and

\(^{328}\) Indeed, he observed that "in previous years, the greater proportion of the lay members in the Church Council did not belong to" the Pastorate. However, he defeated the argument somewhat by pointing out that at the Council "the Bishop has virtually 2 votes, the CMS 2, the Native Pastors 3, and the Church members none".

\(^{329}\) See Article 5.
Grant complained that "in more than one case, pastors have been known to collect and retain for a considerable time large sums of money for the use of the Institution, the amount of which there has been no means of ascertaining, and ... have personally disbursed these sums or portions of them without warrant". Cheetham had stated in his "Second Pastoral Charge" (from which Grant quotes) that the principal duty of the Parochial Committee was "to be a Board of Advice to the Pastor and the churchwardens on all matters not directly of a spiritual or of a disciplinary character affecting the Church". But the bishop had also made it clear that he was not in a position to enforce a duty on the Pastors, and could only give advice on the functions and appointment of the Parochial Committees. For Grant, this meant that the Parochial Committee held its position "only by sufferance", since "a Pastor is not bound to listen to its advice". As such, of the three organs of government in the Pastorate structure - the Church Council, Church Committee, and Parochial Committee - the lay voice was only entitled to be heard in the Church Committee; "and even then", Grant argued, "he has chiefly the privilege of giving and afterwards of regulating to a small extent how his contribution shall be applied". Grant insisted on a reconstruction of the constitution to give the laity more effective powers in the government of the Pastorate. He sought to justify this demand by making an innovative, but rather shaky, parallel between the CMS and the laity of the Pastorate as the undisputed paymasters and providers of the financial support. He contended that "the same reasons which prevail for placing the missionaries under the superintendence and government of the CMS", must weigh in

330 A good many of the "violent discords" between Pastors and their congregations could be traced to this source. The writer of the article entitled 'Support of the Pastorate' (The Reporter, 11 August 1880) called for the introduction of some fixed rule by which the pastor "should have the aid of an effective committee to relieve him as much as possible from the more temporal matters of the Church".

331 The writer has not been able to find a copy.
favour of extending to the Church Committee, or some other body representing the lay men, "the power of direction of and control over, the pastors". He drew ammunition from Venn's paper entitled "Remarks on the Constitution and Practice of the Church Missionary Society, with reference to its Ecclesiastical Relations", which stated inter alia that the Society "stands towards its Missionaries in the relation of Trustees of the fund out of which their salaries are paid". Grant argued that the CMS had continued "to interfere in the management of the Pastorate" (through its representatives in the Church Council and Church Committee) precisely because of their financial provision; and he concluded thus:

It scarcely requires a distinct statement of the fact, that the laity here occupies - in virtue of its respectable annual contributions, out of which not only are the salaries of the pastors paid, but the parsonages and churches are repaired - a position so analogous to that of the Parent Society, that it should have especially now, in the increase of lay intelligence, ample and express representation in the government of the Institution.

However, the thought of CMS control being replaced in any measure by that of powerful native laymen, who would determine their salaries and remove them at will, was one which was calculated to elicit the strongest possible opposition from the most supine of native Pastors. The Reporter records that "the discussion which ensued on Mr Grant's paper, was of a most animated character... showing a clear antagonism between the clergy and laity", and proving "beyond a doubt, and in the Bishop's own presence...,

---

332 He reasoned that the complete withdrawal of the CMS grant of £300 "would furnish even stronger reasons for the Church Committee or some similar body, having a due sprinkling of lay power, being appointed to assume a position analogous to, if not quite identical with, that in which the CMS has stood for many years in relation to the pastorate".

333 See Warren, 1971, pp. 152-158. Reference has already been made to this paper (which was first printed in the Society's 39th Report) in chapter 2 (p. 25).

334 He also drew attention to the Mission Committee in India which was "the continual paymaster of the Missionary after he is duly licensed", and also "proposed removals and changes of stations to the Bishop".
existence of an unhappy and deep-rooted discord between pastor and flock, which may undermine the fabric of the rising Institution".\textsuperscript{335} The newspaper re-emphasized the need for a revision of constitution, along the lines of Grant's suggestions; and declared ominously that "it remains for those in authority in the Church to watch the signs of the times, and avert the impending calamity of disorganisation if not entire dissolution". With the benefit of hindsight, it could be argued that the 1880 Church Conference (by bringing together informed lay representatives and the native clergy in an atmosphere of dialogue) was a missed opportunity for compromise and effective episcopal intervention, in a matter which aroused such deep feeling on both sides. With Cheetham's subsequent departure, attitudes became even more polarised, and there was an ever diminishing likelihood of reconciliation. In the end, the laity-inspired attack on the Articles of Arrangement generated bitter controversy, divided the Native Church, and centred on the issue of 'ministerial removal', which became the \textit{leitmotif} in the clamour for a constitutional change.

It is interesting to speculate whether the laymen's agitation for greater control in the temporal affairs of the Native Pastorate was the kind of eventuality Venn had in mind when he declared over a decade earlier that the Society "owes a solemn obligation to the Native Church not to leave it open to the designs of ambitious and unreflecting men by whose instrumentality the great enemy of the Church would soon introduce confusion and ruin".\textsuperscript{336} But not even Venn could have foreseen such an unexpected twist in the bid for ecclesiastical independence. Cheetham's reaction is equally obscure. Though he had done much to increase lay involvement in the Church, the bishop failed to give a meaningful

\begin{footnotes}
\item[335] Article 'The Laity of the Native Pastorate' in \textit{The Reporter} (24 November 1880).
\item[336] CMS, C A1/L8, p. 170, 9 September 1867, Venn to Quaker. See page 6, above.
\end{footnotes}
response to the churchmen's demand for a revision of the Articles, the agitation for ministerial removal, or the recurrent discord between Pastors and congregations. He later confirmed that he had indeed hoped to sketch out a suitable revision during his term in office; but that "the profound sense of the weakness of Salisbury Square, which I recognised during my first visit home in 1872, that convinced me there was neither statesmanship, nor time, nor sufficient interest in West Africa to secure adequate attention to any suggestion I might submit". In the light of subsequent developments, it must be considered one of the tragedies of the Pastorate experiment that an accomplished administrator and seasoned leader, such as Cheetham, had declined to undertake such a vital step. Misreading his reluctance to act, The Reporter asserted (after the 1880 Church Conference) that "His Lordship the Bishop himself seemed from some of his remarks... to misapprehend the true position of the laity in the governing body of the Institution". Although his deep disgruntlement with the CMS was unarguably the main reason, it is not unlikely that with his episcopate drawing to a close, Cheetham may have lacked the incentive to pursue what would surely have been a major undertaking: namely, to initiate a forum for discussion with a view towards a reconstruction of the Articles of Arrangements. The prospect of having to conciliate an intransigent and antagonistic clergy would have appeared daunting even if he had had time in his favour. Another problem was that the seeds of strife and controversy had been sown in the nooks and crannies of

337 Indeed, restrictions were placed on the attendance of the laity at the Church Conference (cf. The Reporter, 17 November 1880, no. 142, vol. 6).

338 Though with regard to this last it is helpful to bear in mind the observation made by a churchman that "the Bishop can hardly be blamed for not alluding to what he knew nothing about, for the simple reason that the people have not always seen the propriety of making the necessary representations to him". The Reporter (3 October 1877), no. 39, vol. 4, letter to editor.


340 Article 'The Laity of the Native Pastorate' in The Reporter (24 November 1880).
parish life, where they were watered daily by petty squabbles and conflicting interests - beyond the cognisance of episcopal surveillance. The result was a veritable time-bomb. And, in the most unforeseen manner, the Pastorate experiment was ambushed by forces (known and unknown) which propelled it inexorably towards its greatest crisis.
Years of careful training and tender nursing have been bestowed upon us in the planting of this Church amongst us by the CMS. It is now Sierra Leone's turn to demonstrate to the world at large... that we have in us the germs of self-independence and that we fully appreciate the sacrifices which have been made for us. We are a people emerging from a state of tutelage to one of self-support; we are just budding forth from an embryonic condition, and we do not expect that in our own circumstances there should be some supernatural interposition of special direction from the natural course of things.

In the early years of the Sierra Leone Episcopate the high mortality of the European bishops produced calls for a native African (specifically Samuel Crowther) to be appointed bishop. But Venn was strongly opposed to such a step, on the grounds that Sierra Leone was "too much of an English colony". Williams argues that he was disinclined to push for a native bishop "in a context where there were European settlers and where the issue of authority in... the church would be dictated by them". This attitude reflected the official CMS position; for the CMI also maintained that a European episcopate was best "in fields of mixed elements as to population, where as in our colonies and dependencies, there is an admixture of natives and settlers, such, for instance, as... Sierra Leone". The fact that Venn's

1 Article 'Withdrawal of the CMS from Sierra Leone' in The Reporter (12 September 1877), no. 36, vol. 4.
2 See Yates, 1978, p. 152. An editorial in the Church Missionary Record, enquired after Bishop Vidal's death (in 1855): "If we have a native ministry, why should there not be a native Bishop to superintend it".
3 *ibid.*; cp. Williams, 1990, p. 12. There were other reasons, including Crowther's unwillingness, and Venn's conviction that the Niger provided a much better opening for Crowther's gifts. Yates observes: "In Sierra Leone he could have considered some kind of suffragan or assistant bishop, which would have completed his ideal of the church; but it is probably true to say that in Venn the neat ecclesiastical system, however desirable, must be secondary to the needs of the Mission".
4 Williams, p. 13.
5 *CMI*, (August 1858), vol. ix, p. 171.
resistance to a native episcopate continued after the establishment of the Native Pastorate (with its ideal of self-government) may seem inconsistent. But Venn insisted, from the outset, that a native episcopate was to be the crown and not the foundation of the experiment; and he also linked "the ultimate settlement of the Native Church, upon the ecclesiastical basis of an indigenous episcopate" to an "independence of foreign aid and support". He had, to be sure, ignored this principle in the case of Bishop Crowther; but then the experiment in Sierra Leone was of a completely different nature. By any reckoning, the appointment of a native bishop in Sierra Leone in the first 20 years of the Pastorate would have been foolhardy; especially when it is borne in mind that even European bishops like Beckles were deeply antagonised by both the intransigence of European missionaries and the Society's remote control. The realist in Venn made him resist early calls for a native bishop of Sierra Leone; and the fact that he made hardly any reference to the subject would seem to suggest that he did not consider it an imminent possibility. His most direct reference to the issue occurred when he declared exasperatedly (in response to Beckles' expressed desire to restore European supervision over the Pastorate) that "if an European Bishop cannot properly superintend 12 or 15 native Pastors, it is high time to have a native Bishop". He therefore clearly expected a native episcopate to be the crowning step of the Pastorate experiment in Sierra Leone; and his response to the Asylum controversy of 1868 was that it was "the inevitable result of the transition state in the Native Church, and indicates that

---

6 He maintained his objection even when he felt (wrongly), in 1864, that Bishop Beckles was going to resign (cf. Yates, 1978, pp. 153f). Cp. CMI (June 1862), vol. xiii, p. 127.
8 CMS, C A1/L7, p. 504, 23 January 1865, Venn to Caiger. This was a private correspondence.
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the time of the complete independence of the Native Church is at hand". Yates, therefore, seems to stretch the point when he suggests that Venn "expected the see of Sierra Leone to remain in European hands".\(^{10}\) Venn's great worry was that a premature CMS withdrawal would shipwreck the experiment. This issue, as observed elsewhere in this thesis, presented him with an unresolvable dilemma, since continued European involvement often acted as a roadblock to the Pastorate's progress towards ecclesiastical independence. However, Venn departed from the scene when the Pastorate was only 11 years old and still dependent on the Society. A completely different scenario existed in 1880.

A. The Question of A Native Episcopate

At the end of Cheetham's episcopate, the question of a native bishop began to be mooted within and without the colony.\(^{11}\) The subject had weighty implications, but one main consideration made it an inevitable talking-point: namely, the fact that the Native Pastorate had become an entirely "native" affair, and (episcopal superintendence excepted) the hitherto ubiquitous European missionary was conspicuously absent from its daily functions. Native Pastors had assumed full charge of the parishes; the administrative machinery of the Institution worked mainly through native channels; and, despite CMS ownership of property, the congregations were wont to look on the churches as their own.\(^{12}\) In a word, the euthanasia of the Mission - the primary objective of the

\(^{10}\) Yates, 1978, p. 136.


\(^{12}\) As Cheetham remarked before the Anniversary Meeting of the CMS in May 1882, every single one of the 100 Anglican services held every Sunday in the colony was "conducted by a black man" - two-thirds of whom were laymen (cf. The Methodist Herald and West African Educational Times, 24 November 1882, vol. 1, no. 4, 'Extract of an address delivered in Exeter Hall, London... at the Anniversary Public Meeting of the CMS by the Right Rev Dr Cheetham, late Bishop of Sierra Leone, who presided at the evening meeting, May 1882').
Native Pastorate experiment - had been accomplished. Furthermore, the outbreak of "violent discords" between Pastors and parishioners raised the question whether a native bishop, with greater appreciation of native instincts and a better affinity with the Native Church under his care, was not best fitted to handle the peculiar problems facing the Native Church. The growing agitation for a revision of the Articles of Arrangement was yet another compelling reason; for laymen like Grant argued that it was "a mistake to suppose that in all points the Pastorate should be made to conform to the English Church". Who better, it could be argued, than a native bishop to supervise the necessary constitutional reform, which would reflect the local circumstances of the much developed Native Pastorate and introduce autochthonous requirements?

The possibility of a second native bishop in West Africa (in addition to Bishop Crowther) came under consideration in the mid-1870s (after Venn's death), in connection with the large Yorubaland. In 1876, when James Johnson's transfer from Lagos to Abeokuta was being contemplated, it was suggested that he should be made a native Bishop, "exercising jurisdiction in Abeokuta and the Yoruba country". The PC, who were keen to promote this step, stated that though they "are not insensible to the weaknesses of James Johnson's character... his good points are unmistakable". However, they applied to Cheetham (whose episcopal jurisdiction extended to the district under consideration) for his judgement, making it clear that the move was subject to his

13 Ayandele, 1970, makes a strong case for such a step (pp. 138f.); cp. Williams, p. 125. The PC was of the decided opinion that "increased episcopal supervision for the Yoruba country would be of great advantage to the work both of the Mission and of the Native Church" (CMS, G3/A1/L11, p. 39, 19 July 1887, Extracts from Minutes of Committee of Correspondence.

14 Cf. CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 126-129, 28 January 1876, Wright to Cheetham. Two independent bishoprics were being considered: one at Lagos and the other at Abeokuta.

15 ibid.
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Both Crowther and Cheetham were of the opinion that Johnson was "not yet sufficiently proved". Cheetham reminded the PC of Johnson's leading role in the attack on the Society and its European missionaries (in Sierra Leone) less than three years previously, and insisted that "a season of further trial, during which it may be hoped his convictions and passions may temper, as becoming a man ordained to the order of Bishop, is very much to be desired". His negative response notwithstanding, Cheetham rated Johnson highly (possibly more than he did any other African clergyman), and he confessed that he "must be a Bishop some day". Two years later, the CMS again recommended the appointment of a separate Bishop of Lagos, whose diocese would cover "the Yoruba and adjacent countries". Cheetham was amenable to the suggestion, but stipulated that he would have to "acquiesce in the individual chosen". He also suggested that his office "should be delegated to a suffragan Bishop of Freetown" - presumably under the Bishop of Lagos - and that "a Native Bishop might be set to do in the Sherbro" what Crowther had done in the

---

16 Ibid. They also wrote to Bishop Crowther to obtain his views. Cf., Williams, pp. 90-91.
17 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25E/72, 2 March 1876, Cheetham to Wright. According to Ayandele, Crowther praised Johnson's ministry and character, but judged that he required a further experience of two years (Ayandele, 1970, p. 113).
18 Cf. CMS, C A1/O 25E/72, 2 March 1876, Cheetham to Wright. He also pointed out that Johnson's "incapacity to preach in Yoruba is more or less an objection", and expressed a fear that Johnson would sanction polygamy.
19 He described Johnson as "full of work and not at all sparing of himself"; and added that "I am afraid there would soon exist far more sympathy between himself and me, than I should feel towards any other man" (cf. CMS, C A1/O 25E/72, 2 March 1876, Cheetham to Wright).
20 Cp. Williams, p. 91f.
21 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 260-261, 22 March 1878, Wright to Cheetham. The PC argued that a separate bishop, consecrated under the Jerusalem Act, would be more easily obtainable than a suffragan bishop; and that difficulties would be avoided in the event the Bishop of Sierra Leone changed.
22 CMS, C A1/M 21, p. 180, 10 May 1878, Cheetham to Wright. However, nothing came of the proposal.
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Niger. Again, neither proposal came to fruition. The point at issue, however, is that by the end of Cheetham's episcopate the establishment of a native episcopate in Sierra Leone had come under active consideration. What remained in doubt was whether the means and the man could be found.

Between 1881 and 1883 financial contributions to the Native Pastorate averaged £2244. The CMS and the H V Fund contributed grants of about £300 each; which meant that some £1644 (of receipts) - or 73% - came from contributions. In addition, over £1000 (in half penny weekly payments) was contributed to the maintenance of schools. However, class payments, which were the most definitive indication of the Pastorate's financial capacity, had risen to only about £885, in 1883 - a mere 43% of total receipts that year - when salaries alone amounted to £1449. The rest of the receipts were accounted for by voluntary subscriptions to the Pastorate Auxiliary (which came from both Anglican and non-Anglican subscribers). The Native Pastorate, therefore, was far from self-supporting. Still, the fact that 73% of its financial support was derived from the colony (with the odd contribution from the Gambia or Cape Coast) was of great significance; and raises questions about the expediency of the general assumption that absolute self-reliance - i.e.,

23 ibid.
25 In 1883 the actual amount was £1283 (The Reporter, 26 May 1883). The support of its 37 Primary Schools was an enormous burden on the Pastorate; and the restoration of government aid, in 1882 (with the establishment of a Board of Education), only eased that burden fractionally. See Fyfe, 1962, p. 436; The Watchman (20 June 1882), vol. viii, no. 2. Cp. The Watchman (31 May 1881), vol. vii, no. 10.
27 D J Williams stated in the Pastorate Auxiliary Report for 1882, that "most of the contributions to its fund were foreign helps" - see The Watchman (20 June 1882), vol. viii, no. 2.
the ability to meet all financial requirements without outside help - was a prerequisite for self-government. C Peter Williams explains that self-support "assumed enormous importance in relation to self-government" because Victorian financial rectitude dictated that "there must be answerability for the way money was used"; and he seems to suggest that this was a major weakness in Venn's thinking. It is quite plausible to argue, in the Sierra Leone context, that the appointment of a native bishop at a time when all European supervision had ceased and the bulk of the financial burden rested on native Christians, would serve greatly to draw out the energies of the Church in striving for complete self-support - thereby hastening the consummation of the experiment. It is not inconceivable that this reasoning would have appealed to Venn, who had upheld the need for operational flexibility, but it is doubtful whether the Pastorate had acquired that financial foundation which would enable it to support a native bishop, even partially. Its financial condition, to be sure, admitted of some improvement, but the Institution was still struggling to cope with the pecuniary burden of its recent enlargement. Moreover, the fortunes of the Native Church were inextricably tied to the fragile and largely unstable economy of the West African region; which meant, on a long term basis, that the appointment of a native successor to Cheetham would be fraught with great risk. These, and other considerations, were tackled in an article entitled 'The Bishopric of Sierra Leone', which appeared in The Freetown Express and Christian Observer of 17 November 1882. The writer admitted "the great desirableness of having a Bishop of our own race, one who can understand our instincts and peculiarities, respect our feelings and reciprocate our sympathies". But he declared that "after a calm survey of the 'signs of the times' and the exigency of the case, we are forced, regretfully and with a

28 Williams, p. 24. Venn, it will be remembered, insisted that "whilst the [Native Church] Fund receives grants from the Society, the Parent Committee must direct its mode of management" (Second paper) - cf. Shenk, 1983, p. 122.
sigh to declare, 'Not now a native Bishop of Sierra Leone; not just yet'. Asserting that "full and ample" self-support was a prerequisite for self-government, he argued that "the support of a Bishopric would prove too heavy for the rising Church, should it be called to bear it", and that undertaken prematurely, it would "only end in disaster and disgrace". In his opinion, the best course "should be first to raise the funds for the maintenance of the dignitary we aspire to, then we can call aloud for a bishop of our own and can never call in vain".

A subsidiary concern was whether a suitable native candidate, for the episcopacy could be found. By 1880, Rev James Quaker was the most senior native clergyman in the Native Church. Quaker's chief claim to prominence was as the first native Principal of the Grammar School (a position he held for 22 years); but, at the same time, his wealth of contribution to the Pastorate - invariably in a position of leadership - was unsurpassed by any other native clergyman. "As I am situated at present", he declared in 1881, "no man... can have more work put upon him than I have on. The government, the public, the Mission, the Native Church, all look to me for help in one thing or another; not to say any[thing] of the school and its hourly calls".

---

29 He explained that many of those who advocated for a native bishop expect "people in England and elsewhere to continue to find the means to support the dignity and requirements of the Bishopric". This, the writer insisted, was "childish", for "we have no more reason to expect this than the Liberians or the people of Gambia to expect Sierra Leone to furnish funds for the support of a bishopric of their own founding".

30 Educated at Fourah Bay College and the CMS College at Islington, he was among the first eight native ministers to be ordained in the colony in 1856. He was ordained at the same time as the Rev John Campbell, who became the first native Colonial Chaplain in the colony (see Fyfe, 1962, p. 618).

31 Between 1862 and 1882, he served as Secretary of the CMS Auxiliary, Secretary of the Pastorate, Garrison Chaplain, and Secretary of the newly formed Sierra Leone Church Missions.

32 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 59, 27 September 1881, Quaker to J B Whiting (Acting Secretary, CMS).
unequalled; but his sudden death, on 24 May 1882 (at the age of 54) makes any argument about his suitability for a higher ecclesiastical position purely academic. However, Macauley's declaration after his death is noteworthy: "The Native Church is now deprived of its head. For nearly all who are now connected with the Pastorate have been under Mr Quaker. He was our recognized head, and as such his advice was always sought in all cases of importance". No other native clergyman in the colony was a clear candidate for the native episcopate. Indeed, the writer of the newspaper article (who was writing months after Quaker's demise) questioned whether the ministers of the Church were "prepared to submit to one of their number as 'their Father in God'... whose claim to their deference rests for the most part on the dignity of his lofty station, and on no other perceptible or admitted superiority". A native bishop therefore seemed unrealistic; and there was growing feeling that the first step should be to have a native Archdeacon, followed by a suffragan bishop, and then a native bishop. Sunter was one of the first to argue that a native Archdeacon should be created at Sierra Leone; and that James Johnson should be appointed to the position. He explained that "someone - a Native - whom the Pastors and Laity could look up [to] with respect and confidence, as a Native, is most wanted", and that it would be "a great step" in the direction of

33 Rev Obadiah Moore, his ex-pupil and successor, wrote (after Quaker's death): "Go wherever you can on the West Coast in any department you like; there you will find his pupils, doing their duty and doing it well. If greatness consists in doing right for one's country, in being useful, in preparing men for time and for eternity, there can be no question the greatest man among us departed when Mr Quaker sank to the grave" (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 62, 5 June 1882, Moore to Lang).

34 ibid., no. 64, 30 May 1882, Macauley to Lay Secretary.

35 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 34, 6 March 1882, Sunter to Lang; cp. C A1/M 20, p. 374, 19 July 1876, Sunter to Wright. Quaker was still alive at the time; but Sunter had little love for the Principal of the Grammar School, with whom (in his capacity as Principal of Fourah Bay College) he was often in conflict (cf. CMS, C A1/M 20, p. 182, 13 March 1876, Sunter to Wright; p. 362, 3 July 1876, Quaker to Lay Secretary; p. 418-419, 10 October 1876, Quaker to Lay Secretary; and G3/A1/O, no. 14, 24 January 1882, Cheetham to Lang).
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independence. A similar argument was proffered by Macauley, who argued that someone like Quaker (and Nicol before him) was needed "to stand between the Bishop and the Pastors on the one hand, and between the Pastors and the Committee on the other". He reported that the general opinion (both lay and clerical) was that James Johnson would be the most fitting successor to Quaker, both as the head of the native clergy and at the Grammar School. However, James Johnson was integral to CMS plans for the Yoruba Mission, and calls for his transfer to Sierra Leone were studiously ignored. But while there seems to have been a growing inclination to settle for the lesser office of an Archdeacon, the desire for a native bishop persisted; and soon after Bishop Ingham, the European successor to Cheetham, arrived in the colony, The Reporter expressed the hope that "the present Bishop..., will after staying here sufficiently long to know the state of the Native Church, find that it will be to the interest of the Church to recommend the creation of a Native Co-adjutor in the Diocese".

Regrettably, Bishop Ingham, whom Williams describes as a man of "decided convictions on doctrinal truth and Church order", found the idea of a native episcopate - and specifically James Johnson's appointment to that position - most unacceptable, and used his considerable influence at Salisbury Square to forestall such a step. Interestingly, the most definitive call for a native episcopate to be established both in Sierra Leone and the Yoruba Mission came

36 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 68, 22 June 1882, Macauley to Wigram.
37 ibid. "No one among the present staff of our native ministers", he explained, "commands that respect among the people generally as Mr James Johnson". This commentary on the calibre of native clergymen who remained in the Sierra Leone Pastorate was significant.
40 Williams, 1990, p. 127.
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from James Johnson himself. In 1887, when the PC invited him to England, he set forth his views on self-government in the Native Church in a powerful memorandum titled "A Memorandum on the West African Native Churches and Missions and Native Episcopacy". Observing that the idea of a native suffragan for Sierra Leone had been under consideration for many years, Johnson argued that the length of time the CMS had been in that colony "more than warrants the existence of native supervision long before this time". He declared that "there evidently had been retrogression instead of an advance forward in the matter of Native Episcopal Supervision", and dismissed the oft repeated argument that European supervision was indispensable (because of native shortcomings and low morality) on the grounds that no English diocese was without fault. The real hindrance, Johnson argued, was the lack of commitment on the part of both the missionaries and the Anglican Church to the principles of self-support and self-government - principles which, he was quick to point out, are upheld by the New Testament. The memorandum ended with a specific call for the appointment of a native suffragan in Sierra Leone, and the creation of Yoruba diocese headed by an African bishop. Johnson's pronouncements made a great impression on the PC, who informed Ingham that they would be willing to assist the Yoruba Native Church in the maintenance of "an African" bishop, appointed "either as a Missionary Bishop in the Interior Yoruba country with delegated jurisdiction in Lagos, or as a suffragan to the Bishop of Sierra Leone". The question of a native bishop for the Yoruba Mission does not concern us here; but it is worthy of note that Ingham, on whose views the CMS placed great importance, sought to discredit Johnson's fitness for

41 ibid., p. 126. Excellent details of this memorandum are provided by Ayandele (1970, pp. 142-149) and Williams (1990, pp. 126-129). Williams describes it as "an impassioned and coherent argument for a native bishop".


43 CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 39, Extract from Minutes of Committee of Correspondence, 19 July 1887.
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the episcopacy in a most bizarre manner and marshalled native opinion against the move.44 He insisted that "a European Bishop would be best [for the Yoruba Mission], to get things on a good footing at starting", and argued that the idea of a native episcopate would be "shelved for years" if the CMS were to inform the West African Churches that it "will respond to their appeal for a Bishop of their own colour as soon as the new Bishop can report the episcopal fund in a satisfactory condition".45 Ingham gave no response to the suggestion of a native suffragan for Sierra Leone, but he urged the PC to send a lay deputation to Sierra Leone and Lagos to assess local feeling in the diocese, as the situation was "one of crisis".46

Ingham's request for a deputation was unprecedented. No CMS deputation had been sent to the colony since Rev E Bickersteth was sent out "to examine the actual state of the Mission", in 1816.47 However, the PC conceded to the request without hesitation,48 and, after a futile search for a suitable layman, secured the services of Rev W Allan (the Vicar of St. James, Bermondsey). Lang presented Allan as "somewhat impetuous in manner", but a "constant attendant on Committee", who knew "thoroughly the Society's work and

44 With what Williams describes as "the Heads-you-lose-tails-I-win attitude", Ingham questioned whether the most talented and spiritual man should necessarily be a Bishop. For greater details, see Ayandele, 1970, pp. 150-158; Williams, 1990, pp. 127-132. Cp. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 84, 85 & 140, Ingham to Lang; G3/A1/P2, 7 September 1887, Ingham to Lang. Ayandele, it must be said, interprets the Ingham's opposition (as well as that of the other CMS missionaries) in racial terms.
45 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 140, 7 September 1887, Ingham to Lang.
46 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 140, 7 September 1887, Ingham to Lang. Ayandele misinterprets the evidence to mean that Cheetham made this suggestion (1970, p. 158). Ingham insisted that a lay man would "easily gain the confidence of the missionaries and pastors, and... command the most attention and confidence all along the Coast". He suggested E Stock's (cf. Williams, 1990, p. 132).
47 Cf. Stock, i, 159-161.
48 Cf. Resolution of 1 November 1887 (G3/A1/P2).
principles". Allan's visitation in Sierra Leone included a three day Church Conference, at which the issue of a native episcopate for Sierra Leone was discussed. The opportunity was a unique one, but the timing was inauspicious. The Native Pastorate was in the grip of a severe financial crisis, and assailed by bitter divisions (between laity and clergy, and between the bishop and a few of his clergy). Opinion was decidedly against the appointment of a native bishop. Rev S Spain, a young native clergyman, who presented a paper entitled "A few thoughts on Native Episcopacy in West Africa", argued that there was "no special need" for a native bishop, since the Crown appointed a bishop "whose services are gratuitously at the disposal of the Sierra Leone Church". But the foremost objection to such a step was the financial one. At a time when the Church was plagued by financial difficulty - which had necessitated retrenchment and salary cuts - the thought of increasing the pecuniary burden carried no appeal. Even the idea of a native suffragan, whose salary would be initially paid by the Society (and gradually withdrawn), was rejected outright: first, because it was argued that it would ultimately land the Church "in complete bankruptcy", and second, because self-support was considered to be a sine qua non for self-government. It should be stated that the climate of opinion in West Africa was strongly against a dependence on the Society for the support of a native bishop, who like Crowther

49 CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 70, 9 December 1887, Lang to Ingham; p. 74, 14 December 1887, Lang to Nevill. He added that he was "a true and loyal friend of the Society", and "a very able and thoughtful man". See also G3/A1/L 11, pp. 78ff. 20 December 1887, Secretaries to Allen. Williams surmises that though it was "unlikely that Allan was identified with a strongly anti-African stance", he was "certainly not a noted Afrophile" (1990, p. 133).

50 The Allan visitation is given greater attention further on in this chapter.

51 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 80, Paper by S Spain, "A few thoughts on Native Episcopacy in west Africa".

52 Spain argued convincingly that the gradual withdrawal of financial support (which was the main cause of the Pastorate's predicament) was far more damaging that a sudden cut (pp 11-13).
would be "the puppet so to speak of a foreign Society - and therefore rather a humiliation than a glory to their race". Whatever the merits of this argument it placed a native episcopate completely beyond reach; especially since the Sierra Leone Christians were indisposed "to incur the least expense to secure a native Bishop". The Pastorate Fund was in such a critical state that an estimated increase "of between £800 and £1000 a year" was needed to meet the required £300 for a bishop's stipend. In fact, the favoured method of providing a bishop's salary was by raising a capital of £10,000 for a Bishopric fund, which would yield an interest of £300 to £400 a year for the bishop's salary. By this reckoning, the prospect of a native bishop was virtually non-existent. Allan remarked that "in the present state of the Church, to attempt a Native Episcopate would be disastrous", and that such a step would be unwelcome "at least for a generation to come". Perhaps the most telling indication of the prevalent attitude towards a native episcopate was Spain's emphatic declaration that "the subject of a native episcopate has never seriously engaged our attention". Allan reported that "it was very difficult to get the meeting to see that it was a subject which would have any bearing upon Sierra Leone", and that "no strong feeling was entertained upon the subject". The Sierra Leone Christians' refusal even to contemplate the appointment of a native bishop in a situation where the Native Church was utterly incapable of providing the means was consistent with the principles of the Pastorate experiment. The irony was that it happened at a time when the Society was ostensibly

---

55 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 72, 29 May 1888.
disposed (after years of resistance) to promote such a scheme. But in order to fully understand the conclusions of the 1888 Church Conference it is necessary to examine the deep-rooted divisions and climate of conflict which characterise Ingham's episcopate, and left the ideal of self-government in tatters.

B. Bishop Ernest G Ingham

Despite his recommendation for a native bishop to be appointed to Sherbro, Cheetham was of the decided opinion that the Bishop of Sierra Leone should "for a little while longer be a whiteman". However, the CMS experienced considerably difficulty in finding such a "whiteman". Their first choice, a Rev W Walsh (of London), was disqualified on medical grounds, as was the Rev J B Whiting, a member of the PC. In desperation the PC considered sending out Rev James Hamilton (who had left Sierra Leone ten years previously under the most inauspicious circumstances) to act as Commissary; but Cheetham vetoed the suggestion, on the grounds that Hamilton "would carry no

---

58 The Methodist Herald and West African Educational Times (24 November 1882), vol. 1, no. 4, 'Extract of an address delivered in Exeter Hall, London... at the Anniversary Public Meeting of the CMS by the Right Rev Dr Cheetham, late Bishop of Sierra Leone, who presided at the evening meeting, May 1882. On another occasion, he insisted that it was "very undesirable for Sierra Leone to be left without a white man of some standing" (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 15, 3 February 1882, Cheetham to Lang).

59 On Henry Wright's death (by drowning), in September 1880, he was replaced as Honourary Lay Secretary by F E Wigram (his brother-in-law); but the Secretary "in whose charge the African Missions [were] specially placed" was the Rev R Lang. Cf. CMS, C A1/O 9/65; C A1/L9, p. 399, 28 October 1881, Wigram to Sunter; p. 410, 10 February 1882, Wigram to Sunter.

60 CMS, C A1/L9, pp. 408-410, 10 February 1882, Wigram to Sunter; p. 474, 17 November 1882, Lang to Reichardt. See also Stock, iii, p. 376.

61 Cf. The Watchman 14 April 1883), vol. viii, no. 7. Williams, who attests to Whiting's belief in "African episcopal capacity", observes that "one of the tragedies in the development of the West African Church must be that Whiting's health did not allow him to accept the nomination to the episcopate" (1990, pp. 101 & 127).
weight among the natives". Eventually, the name of Rev Ernest Ingham (Vicar of St Matthews, Leeds) was forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Colonial Secretary; and Ingham was duly appointed, and consecrated Bishop of Sierra Leone on 24 February 1883.

Ernest G Ingham was a zealous Evangelical clergyman of true CMS stamp. Lang introduced him as "a man of deep piety, considerable ability and a staunch friend of Missions and of the CMS in particular". The son of the Speaker of the House of Assembly at Bermuda (a circumstance which it was hoped had inured him to hot climates), he had served as Association Secretary of the CMS in Yorkshire for five years prior to his appointment. Described as being "of middle stature", he was also, at the age of 33, quite young for a bishop. Ingham arrived in the Sierra Leone Colony on 17 March 1883, and was installed ten days later at the St George's Cathedral. He had probably been warned about the strong undercurrents of discord which threatened the stability of the Native Pastorate, for he (presciently) chose "Unity" as the subject of his very first sermon in the

---

62 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 15, 3 February 1882, Cheetham to Lang. It appears that Cheetham was consulted on all matters of importance attaching to the West African Mission (particularly Sierra Leone). He boldly suggested that Lang should go himself, and so help "to remove the impression that no member of Committee will approach nearer than Madiera".


64 ibid., p. 498, 12 January 1883, Lang to Reichardt; p. 515, 27 February 1883, Lang to Moore; Stock, iii, p. 376.

65 Cf. The Watchman (14 April 1883), vol. viii, no. 7.


67 ibid.; Crockford's Clerical Directory; Stock, iii, p. 376. Ingham's Bermuda background is relevant. It meant that he had belonged to one of the slave-owning families, and had grown up in a Society deeply divided by race; which had implications for his attitude to the natives under him, and more specifically to the native Pastors.

68 Cf. The Methodist Herald (22 March 1883), vol. 1, no. 12.
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And, by all accounts, impressed a packed Cathedral with his eloquence and diction. It was ironic, therefore, that he became embroiled, shortly after, in a controversy sparked off by his refusal to allow the Rev T Truscott of the United Methodist Free Churches to preach at Holy Trinity Church. While insisting that he had no ill feeling against the "Dissenting bodies", Ingham asserted that "he would not tolerate a Dissenting minister in any pulpit, nor would he allow any of his clergy to ascend any Dissenting pulpit". The sharing of pulpits, he remarked, was an irregularity which "could not be allowed in England", and would not be permitted "as long as he was Bishop of the Evangelical Church of England". When a deputation of five lay gentlemen informed him "that whatever might be the respective attitudes of the Church and Dissenters in England, a different policy was adopted in the Colonies", the bishop replied that he saw no difference between England and the Colonies. This response contrasted sharply with the bishop's later antagonism towards those native clergymen who claimed the protection of the English ecclesiastical system. Oblivious to local feeling, Ingham also asserted his resolve "to prevent the introduction of Ritualism into his Diocese".

70 ibid. His text was John 17:21 and Ephesians 4:3.

71 In a colony were first impressions were taken very seriously, Anglicans and non-Anglicans alike thronged to St George's to assess both the theological leanings and oratorical proficiency of the new bishop. They were not disappointed. The Watchman (14 April 1883) commented on his "fine voice, good delivery and persuasive manner"; while The Reporter claimed that he unfolded the subject matter of the text "in a most eloquent, energetic and practical language" which "kept the whole congregation spell bound". Clearly, the laity were satisfied with their new bishop.

72 The right and wrong of the bishop's action was hotly debated in the columns of the newspapers. See The Reporter (7 April 1883, 21 April 1883 & 5 May 1883), The Watchman (30 April 1883), The Methodist Herald (13 April 1883 & 27 April 1883). The Methodist Herald was scathing in its condemnation of the bishop's action; but the two other newspapers (owned by Anglican members) rallied to Ingham's defence, and offered copious arguments to show that it was, as Ingham himself argued, a matter of principle.

73 Cf. The Reporter (7 April 1883), no. 267, vol. ix. - "By Ritualism", he claimed, "the Church had lost many great men".
and announced that he was "strongly fond of Church discipline and order". These early proclamations portrayed an attitudinal rigidity which was to contribute in no small measure to the dissension and conflict which plagued the bishop's 13 year episcopate.

Ingham was unimpressed with the Native Pastorate, and six years into his episcopate denounced the experiment as a big mistake. He professed a certain thankfulness that the Church organisation and schools were "outwardly flourishing", and that "there is no bankruptcy"; but he repeatedly condemned the lack of "spirituality". He also evinced a low opinion of the native clergy, and told Lang that "I could not find five men today that I could recommend to you for any part of the African Mission field". After four months in the colony, he insisted that "a few more white men" were needed as examples to the clergy and others; for "an Englishman is so much more methodical and thorough". He admitted (grudgingly) that "it would never do to put English men in the parishes", but maintained that to "have an entire English staff at Fourah Bay College... [along] with the Chaplain would be strength indeed". The bishop's call for an infusion of European agents was an early indication not only of his low opinion of native capability but, more significantly, of his poor appreciation of the objectives of the Pastorate experiment. He was convinced that "the CMS must keep its hand firmly on Sierra Leone for some time yet", for "as a Church it will be in danger of forgetting the very

75 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 142, 27 July 1889, Ingham to Wigram.
76 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 109, 5 July 1883, Ingham to Lang. He commented: "We grievously want more spirituality, and we must have it". What the bishop meant by this is unclear; but he added cryptically that "there are many unhealthy signs". He also stated that "I feel like preaching a mission in every Church of the colony, but I must be very careful".
77 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 139, 3 October 1883, Ingham to Lang.
78 Ibid.
79 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 139, 3 October 1883, Ingham to Lang.
object of its existence if left alone".\textsuperscript{80} Ironically, the
dearth of European missionaries meant that he became the
first bishop to appoint a native clergyman as his Commissary
during his absence from the colony. The clergyman of his
choice was the Rev James Robbin (Pastor of Regent), who he
claimed "has more ballast, so to speak, than many".\textsuperscript{81} To
Ingham's credit, he also started thinking of appointing "an
African Archdeacon of Sierra Leone" - in order "to avoid and
checkmate any possible jealousy should a European Archdeacon
go to Lagos" - but he was both anxious to "avoid a false
step", and doubtful about finding the right man.\textsuperscript{82}
Significantly, Ingham complained that his greatest difficulty
was "really getting to know" the Pastors, who were "outwardly
loyal and true", but whose "sincerity" he doubted.\textsuperscript{83} This
inability to relate to his clergy was a conspicuous
deficiency of Ingham's episcopate. Ordained in 1874, he had
had less ministerial experience (allowing for cultural and
contextual differences) than the majority of the native
Pastors, and was considerably younger than most.\textsuperscript{84} His
relative youth and inexperience sat uncomfortably with his
station and episcopal responsibilities; and he displayed
little of the tact, self-assurance, and objectivity which
were so badly needed in the climate of discord and clerical
rebellion which blighted his episcopate.

\textsuperscript{80} CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 139, 3 October 1883, Ingham to Lang.
\textsuperscript{81} ibid. A comparison between Ingham's and Cheetham's opinion of the
native clergy reveals some striking contradictions. Cheetham, for
instance had described Robbin as "slow and dull"; and he rated Williams,
whom Ingham referred to as susceptible and lacking "force of character",
the "next best" to Henry and James Johnson, "though at a distance behind
them" (CMS, C A1/M 22, p. 4, 6 January 1879, Cheetham to Wright).
\textsuperscript{82} CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 77, 19 June 1884, Ingham to Lang. "I make as much
of my Pastors as I possibly can", he claimed, "but I constantly find I
dare not bring them forward too much".
\textsuperscript{83} ibid. He was at pains to convince Lang that it was very difficult "to
judge and govern a Church when you have men to deal with who were wanting
in openness and common honesty".
\textsuperscript{84} Robbin, the most senior Pastor, was ordained in 1859; Macauley and
Williams in 1863; and Pearce in 1866. At 45 years of age (in 1883),
Macauley was 12 years the bishop's senior (cf. Fyfe, 1962, pp. 375 & 618).
Unlike Cheetham, Ingham inherited a Pastorate that was in a reasonably stable condition, and his first year in office coincided, auspiciously, with the 21st anniversary of the Pastorate Auxiliary. Much was made of the fact that the Auxiliary (whose founding was often confused with that of the Native Pastorate) had attained its "majority"; and the Honourable T Risely Griffiths (the Colonial Secretary), suggested that an Endowment Fund should be established, as a way of commemorating the Auxiliary's coming of age. This proposal was reportedly welcomed by churchmen who felt that it was high time the Native Church "whose progress has been so successful should, whilst gratefully accepting voluntary subscriptions, be placed in an independent position as regards funds". The scheme was subsequently launched on Sunday 1 June 1883. There were other encouraging signs that the Pastorate was well on its way to complete self-support. In November 1883, Honourable T J Sawyerr, who had been a member of the Church Council and Committee for years, and was one of the first native laymen appointed to the

---

85 The Pastorate Fund was in a healthy state, but showed no sign of improvement. Ingham reported that there was a balance of £136 for the year (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 91, 25 May 1883, Ingham to Lang).

86 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 91, 25 May 1883, Ingham to Lang; no. 92, 25 May 1883, Williams to Lang. Ingham held his first confirmation (of 215 candidates) in May 1883, and his first ordination four months later (cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 83, 5 May 1883, Williams to Lang; cp. The Reporter (5 May 1883), no. 271, vol. ix; G3/A1/0, no. 109, 5 July 1883, Ingham to Lang; no. 138, 29 September 1883, Williams to Secretaries).

87 Cf. The Reporter (9 June 1883), no. 275, vol. ix. Ingham reported that Risely Griffiths "took unusual interest" in the Pastorate (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 91, 25 May 1883, Ingham to Lang). His idea was that each member of the Anglican Church within the colony should subscribe "one dollar" towards the proposed fund each year, "until a sufficient fund was raised to give the Church a permanent endowment".

88 ibid.

89 ibid.; see also, 7 July 1883, no. 279, vol. ix.

90 It will be remembered that Sawyerr, a wealthy bookseller, had been the publisher of The Negro. He became a member of the Legislative Council in July 1883 (cf. The Reporter, 7 July 1883; Fyfe, 1962, p. 457).
Patronage Committee,\textsuperscript{91} gave the sum of £1000 to the Pastorate.\textsuperscript{92} Another unspecified amount was bequeathed to the Native Church by Africanus Horton, who died in October 1883.\textsuperscript{93} Such instances of native generosity, coupled with the establishment of the Endowment Fund, prompted the PC and the Committee of the H V Fund to reconsider their grants to the Pastorate. The Committee of the H V Fund informed Williams "that in the increasingly prosperous condition of the Pastorate Fund" they did not recognize the need for the continuance of" the grant of £100 for Holy Trinity Church.\textsuperscript{94} The PC also declared that the establishment of the Endowment Fund was "an indication that the time has arrived when the withdrawal of their grant-in-aid may reasonably begin";\textsuperscript{95} and they stipulated that the grant of £300 "should now be reduced yearly by £50". Recent happenings in the Lagos Pastorate,\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{91} Sawyerr was appointed to the Church committee as early as 1867 (cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/56, Extracts of Minutes of Church Committee, 27 February 1867); and to the Patronage Committee in 1875 (cf. C A1/L9, p. 86, 19 February 1875, Wright to Cheetham; Chapter 5, p. 42).

\textsuperscript{92} Cf. CMS, G3/A1/L 10, P. 150, 17 January 1884, Lang to Sawyerr; pp. 151-2, 18 January 1884, Chapman (CMS Secretary) to Sawyerr; G3/A1/O, no. 29, 13 February 1884, Sawyerr to Lay secretary; no. 35, 16 March 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary. Sawyerr offered the sum for investment with the Society for the benefit of the Pastorate, the Sierra Leone Church of England School Society, and the Sierra Leone Church Mission; and Fyfe rightly observes that it was "the first example of real munificence in Freetown" (Fyfe, 1962, p. 463). Unfortunately, Sawyerr was forced to resign from the Church Council and Finance Committee, four years later, for defending polygamy (cf. CMS, G3/A1/O/1888, no. 76; G3/A1/L 11, pp. 212-3; G3/A1/P2, p. 33, 6 November 1888, Resolution of Correspondence Committee).

\textsuperscript{93} Cf. Fyfe, 1972, pp. 135 & 148. Horton's legacy consisted in shares in his various investments, particularly his mining and railway interests in the Gold Coast; and his bequest to the Native Church must have been substantial, for Williams referred to "the late Dr Horton's liberality" (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 10, 4 February 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary). However, his will was contested, and the lawsuit dragged on for over thirty years. By the time it was settled, his estate was worth very little, and the Pastorate got nothing (cf. Fyfe, 1972, pp. 150-152).

\textsuperscript{94} CMS, G3/A1/L 10, pp. 185-187, 7 April 1884, Secretaries to Williams; cp. pp. 129-130 Lang to Ingham; p. 157-158, 7 February 1884, Secretaries to Williams.

\textsuperscript{95} CMS, G3/A1/L 10, pp. 186-187, 7 April 1884, Secretaries to Williams; p. 192, 10 April 1884, Lang to Ingham.

\textsuperscript{96} The Lagos Pastorate was founded in 1875, on the Sierra Leone model.
where the enterprising James Johnson was making persistent demands for the transfer of all CMS property to the Pastorate, made the CMS particularly anxious that similar demands would be made in Sierra Leone, as it became more self-supporting. While insisting that the transfer of CMS property (to the Sierra Leone Pastorate) would be deferred as long as the CMS grant continued, the PC declared that the Society would "not necessarily transfer the patronage with the buildings". Lang stated that "it might be desirable that we should for a time at least retain that voice and influence after the material fabric had passed out of our control". It is arguable that this expressed desire to retain a voice in the affairs of the Native Church denoted a departure from Venn's agenda and had the potential to compromise the integrity and objectives of the experiment. However, the Sierra Leone Church Committee assured Ingham that they had no desire to press for the transfer of CMS property (as Johnson had done). With the cognisance of the Church Committee, Ingham accepted the CMS decision to commence a gradual withdrawal of their grant; though he declared that "it will be a mistake to suppose that there is very much wealth here", for "the people who have money are very few".


98 Cheetham observed, significantly, that it was only be retaining its property that the Society "can efficiently act with the Bishop and give him the support in carrying out the Articles of Arrangement" (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 62, June 1885, Cheetham to Lang).

99 CMS, G3/A1/L 10, pp. 165-166, 5 March 1884, Langham to Ingham. Even then, he continued, the whole question would need careful consideration, "as a hasty and premature step might issue in much inconvenience ad embarrassment to either or both parties".

100 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 65, 12 May 1884, Ingham to Lang. They were certain, they stated, that the property would "be the Church's own in good time".

101 ibid.; cp. no. 65, 14 May 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary. He explained that the endowment fund was "not an indication of wealth", but rather a means by which "those who feel the necessity of looking to the future are giving something over and above their normal subscriptions
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and the Church Committee's request for a continuation of the grant from the H V Fund (which had been reduced from £300 to £200), on the grounds that the endowment scheme was liable to affect regular contributions, was denied. Subsequent events were to prove that the CMS decision to commence a gradual withdrawal of their grant was overly hasty, ill-judged, and very opportunistic; though Ingham and the Church Committee were as much to blame for countenancing a step that was to have such an inimical impact on the fortunes of the Pastorate.

The widespread appeal for contributions to an Endowment Fund provided a useful pretext for the pro-reform element within the Church to renew their call for greater lay representation in the government of the Pastorate and for a revision of the Articles of Arrangement. The recrudescence of this movement was spearheaded by The Reporter, whose editor reprinted Grant's paper on 'The Layman's Position in the Church', presented at the 1880 Church Conference. It was argued that until the laymen's position in the affairs of the Church was addressed (with a view to giving them "the controlling voice and influence") there was "abundant cause for fear that this Endowment scheme, important as it is, will on meet with the success it deserves". The paper expressed the hope that Ingham would, after sufficient acquaintance with the requirements of the Native Church, "address himself to its reformation in such a way as to have a better representation annually for the good purpose". It will be "uphill work" for a long time, he concluded.

102 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 65, 14 May 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary.

103 See issues 25 August 1883, and 1 September 1883. The fact that the hugely popular Grant had died just over a year before (on 28 January 1882) gave the renewed call for a step which he had advocated so passionately, a certain poignancy.

104 Cf. The Reporter (8 September 1883), no. 288, vol. ix, letter to editor. See also article 'The Sierra Leone Endowment Fund' ibid., (15 September 1883), no. 289, vol. ix. It also asserted that "the most numerous and influential portion of the Church" was against the endowment scheme on principle.
of the Laity, which will enable the latter to give a more adequate support to the Church than they had hitherto done". However, the allegation that the laity were waiting for a revision of the constitution before supporting the Endowment Fund was refuted by another writer, who insisted that the scheme had met with enthusiastic support and would "be a complete success". The same writer mounted a spirited defence on behalf the Pastors' behalf, and complained that in many instances "the most pressing need of a Church is shelved from year to year by the determined opposition of a clique led by one or two influential members of a Parochial Committee". The battle lines had again been drawn; but the voice of the laity was gaining in strength, and their claims would appear to have been endorsed by the CMS. In a pamphlet entitled "Native Church Organisation" (1884), the Society declared:

The laity should be fairly represented in the Church Councils; and experience has led to the belief that this cannot be affected unless they have a numerical preponderance. It should be laid down that no salaries paid from the Native Church Fund can be increased except by the consent of the majority of independent lay delegates present at the time when the increase is proposed...

This policy statement may help to explain Ingham's predisposition to side with the laity; but there is little evidence to support the claim that the majority of the Church members were opposed to making extra contributions for the Endowment Fund. Also, the oft repeated threat that lay support would be withheld unless the laity were given greater control had no real potency, since the pro-reformists constituted a small minority of disgruntled (though wealthy) Churchmen. In the end, the financial argument (as a basis

105 ibid.; cp. (22 September 1883, no. 290, vol. ix, Lewis to editor.
106 ibid, letter to editor (signed "A True African").
107 Native Church Organisation, CMS, 1884.
108 Rev Williams reported that "though some are suspicious" of the endowment fund "others regard it with hope and confidence" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 35, 16 March 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary). He added that "the late Dr Horton did all he could to promote the scheme among all classes of the community".
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for reform) failed to call forth any significant following because it was elitist, both in origin and intention. However, the controversial issue of ministerial removal, which the much expanded Pastorate was forced to address, eventually provided sufficient leverage for a more effective assault on the Articles of Arrangement. This was because the issue, which aroused strong feeling in the majority of church members (rich and poor alike), affected the Native Church both at the parochial and governmental level.

C. Removal and Revision

It was inevitable that the issue of ministerial removal would become a source of bitter contention within the Pastorate. The removal of native Pastors from one parish to another had been practised in the Pastorate from its establishment; but never on a compulsory basis. Chronic discord between Pastors and parishioners aside, the Pastorate had become extensive - comprising 15 ecclesiastical districts, and including the far-flung Sherbro and Quiah districts. Financial constraints necessitated re-arrangements and adjustments which could not be accomplished without the removal of Pastors, nolens volens. Also, a shortage of ordained ministers (due partly to problems at Fourah Bay College),\(^{109}\) meant that deaths among the native Pastors created vacancies which could not be supplied without moving ministers from other parishes.\(^{110}\) It was therefore no coincidence that Quaker's death, in 1882, set a process in motion which led to the greatest crisis in the Pastorate. Quaker's successor at the Grammar School was Rev Obadiah

---

\(^{109}\) When Sunter's successor, the Rev Frank Nevill, took over as Principal of Fourah Bay College in 1885 (three years after Sunter's resignation), he reported "the universal complaint" about "the lack of men at present prepared to enter our Church or Mission work" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 7, 24 January 1885, Nevill to Lang). It was stated that if all the native Pastors and Mission agents were suddenly removed, "there would be not a single man found ready to fill their places".

\(^{110}\) Rev D Felix (Pastor of Benguema) died a year after Quaker (cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 83, 5 May 1883, Williams to Lang).
Moore, who had previously been in charge of the Sherbro Pastorate; and his appointment to the Principalship of Grammar School meant that a replacement had to be found for the Sherbro Pastorate. When Ingham requested Rev J B Bowen (a Tutor at Fourah Bay College, and therefore in CMS employ), to take over the charge of the Sherbro Pastorate, Bowen replied that he would only assent to the request if it was endorsed by the CMS. The PC stated that Bowen's transfer to Sherbro "would be very suitable and desirable", but insisted that the decision must rest with him. Given the choice, Bowen refused the appointment outright; and Ingham was forced to appoint Rev G G Nicol (son of Rev George Nicol), a young curate, to what was the largest Pastorate station. The matter became a subject of spirited debate; and The Reporter publicized the fact that the Sherbro Pastorate had been offered to three different clergymen, each of whom had offered a variety of excuses for refusing the appointment. The paper declared that the only solution

111 Cheetham recommended Moore to the PC "as the most fitting of those from whom you have to chose" (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 63, 19 June 1882, Cheetham to Lang).

112 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 10, 9 January 1884, Bowen to Lay Secretary. Bowen, a Mende (the predominant tribal group in the Sherbro region), had been in charge of the Sherbro until it was transferred to the Pastorate in 1880. The appointment of O Moore (also of Mende parentage) to that station after it became a Pastorate, left him embittered and convinced that his clerical brethren wanted to get rid of him. Cheetham explained that Bowen was "generally disliked", and added that "being a Mende, he stands alone" (G3/A1/O, no. 14, 24 January 1882, Cheetham to Lang). Cp. Fyfe, 1962, p. 405.

113 CMS, G3/A1/L 10, pp. 159-160, 7 February 1884, Secretaries to Bowen; pp. 154-155, 7 February 1884, Lang to Ingham; p. 157, 7 February 1884, Secretaries to Williams.

114 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 41, 28 February 1884, Bowen to Lay Secretary. He stated that the CMS response had confirmed to him that he was in the right place, and claimed PC that Ingham was "disappointed, but not offended" by his refusal.

115 ibid., no. 39, 10 March 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary.

116 Article 'The Sherbro Pastorate' in The Reporter (24 May 1884), no. 314, vol x. The article argued, tongue-in-cheek, that if each station was responsible for the stipend of its Pastor, and Sherbro could provide £300 a year, "not only would there be no mention of family circumstances but possibly not even failure of health or chronic disorders". Cp. CMS,
was the introduction of "the system of Ministerial Removals", and called for "the calm discussion of a crying evil" at Ingham's first Church Conference. However, the issue was momentarily sidelined by an outbreak of typhus and yellow fever in the colony, which caused a scared Ingham to flee the colony, with his wife.\textsuperscript{117}

The Sherbro vacancy became the focus of a full-blown controversy, which centred on the issue of ministerial removal. The Church Committee lamented the fact that they were unable to find a Pastor willing to accept the Sherbro Pastorate "at the very time that one Pastor and another was applying for permission to accept temporary Chaplaincies on the Gold Coast and the Gambia during the absence on leave of the regular Chaplains".\textsuperscript{118} The issue agitated the minds of the laity (and some clergy) to such an extent that it threatened the stability of the Native Church;\textsuperscript{119} and there was a renewed outcry for a revision of the Articles of Arrangement.\textsuperscript{120} In February 1885, the Church Committee resolved that the bishop should summon a Conference, comprising members of the Church Council, Church Committee and Patronage Committee, to discuss the "several urgent matters in connection with the Church in the Colony" which needed "immediate consideration and settlement".\textsuperscript{121} The agenda for the proposed joint Conference included:

\textsuperscript{117} Cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 83, 2 July 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary; no. 96, 31 July 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary; Fyfe, 1962, p. 445. The epidemic caused many deaths among the native and European population. But the bishop's hasty departure, while other Europeans like Governor Havelock (with his wife) remained at their posts, was interpreted in some quarters as a singular lack of faith and a poor example to his flock (see The Watchman, 22 July 1884, vol. ix, no. 9).

\textsuperscript{118} CMS, G3/A1/0/1888, no. 120, Notes on the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement, and the Memorandum thereon.

\textsuperscript{119} CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 34, 14 March 1885, Moore to Wigram.

\textsuperscript{120} CMS, G3/A1/0/1888, no. 120, Notes on the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement, and the Memorandum thereon.

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{ibid.}
Ministerial Removals; Relation between Pastors and their Parochial Committees; Church Finance (custodianship, monthly payment by parishes, monthly payment to Pastors - stipend claims, class pence, etc); Endowment; and Re-arrangement of Parishes. Ingham appointed 13 members (8 clergymen and 5 laymen) for the Conference, which he described as "the general representative voice of the Church for the time being". The Conference met in March 1885, and forwarded three important resolutions: viz,
- that "the time has come for some revision of the Articles of Arrangement to be made and that the said Articles be revised accordingly"
- that "removals under certain circumstances are absolutely necessary from time to time"
- that "whenever it shall be considered by the Bishop and Council that any removal is necessary, they should have the power to effect such removal"

Moore reported that "the whole of the laity", and the "vast majority of the clergy" were in favour of ministerial removal and a revision of the Articles. However, four Pastors - G J Macauley (Kissy), M Pearce (Christ Church), M Taylor (Waterloo) and S G Hazeley (Wellington) - denounced the joint Conference as an unconstitutional body (not provided for by the Articles of Arrangement), and repudiated its resolutions. Ingham solicited the PC's "aid and counsel",

122 ibid.
123 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 54, 6 May 1885, Ingham to Lang.
124 ibid.; G3/A1/0, no. 34, 14 March 1885, Moore to Wigram. Cp. CMS, G3/A1/L 10, p. 286, 10 April 1885, Lang to Ingham. Among the clergymen who took part in the Conference were J Robbin, W Quaker, M Taylor, M Pearce, D G Williams, and O Moore.
125 CMS, G3/A1/0/1888, no. 120, Notes on the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement, and the Memorandum thereon.
126 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 34, 14 March 1885, Moore to Wigram.
127 Macauley was transferred to Kissy in 1880, after 13 years at Wellington, where he was replaced by Hazeley (who had previously been in missionary curate in CMS employ).
128 Moore remarked that the four Pastors were "loud and seemed determined" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 34, 14 March 1885, Moore to Wigram). But it is worth noting that two of the Pastors - Taylor and Pearce - had taken part in the Conference. The four voiced their dissent in a memorial to Ingham, and sent a copy of their communication (at Ingham's behest) to the CMS. This memorial is missing. Cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 54, 6 May 1885, Ingham to
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which he claimed they had to give "by virtue of holding our Church property", and warned "that theirs and our joint action in this matter will certainly be used as a precedent in all their growing Churches throughout the world and that therefore the greatest caution is needed". However, it was indicative of his weak leadership that Ingham placed such a heavy premium on CMS backing. Taylor later claimed that he had not "informed himself on the question [of revision]" nor acquired sufficient experience of men and things among us to undertake the duty.

The removals question, and its ecclesiastical implications, caused much perplexity at Salisbury Square; and both Cheetham and the Ecclesiastical Sub-Committee were consulted. Cheetham confirmed that the question of ministerial removal had begun to be agitated during the last years of his episcopate, and that the periodical removal of all the Pastors (a "go round") - as practised in the Wesleyan Church - had been requested. He noted, however, that the recommendation of Ingham's joint Conference was for the specific removal of a Pastor, "against whom some objection is deemed to lie", from one district to another, and in such a manner that "his removal would imply a measure of fault and


CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 54, 6 May 1885, Ingham to Lang.

Cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 24, 13 January 1888, Taylor to Archbishop of Canterbury.

Cf. CMS, G3/A1/L 10, p. 286, 10 April 1885, Lang to Ingham; pp. 293-294, 1 May 1885, Lang to Ingham; p. 304, 29 May 1885, Lang to Ingham. The African Sub-Committee (otherwise known as Group 3), which had replaced the Sierra Leone Sub-Committee, reported that the matter was "too large and important" for them (cf. C A1/L9, p. 399, 28 October 1881, Wigram to Sunter).

CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 62, June 1885, Cheetham to Lang. Cheetham was then Vicar of St Mary W Cowe, on the Isle of Wright. He argued that though the procedure was not Anglican, it had one advantage in that it did not target a particular Pastor, and all had to remove "whether they were praiseworthy or unworthy".
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would be attended with a sense of disgrace". He declared that it "would be a violation of the Articles to remove in a compulsory manner any one who had become a pastor under the Articles, except for reasons assigned in the Articles themselves", and argued that the needs of the case would be met if "a common understanding" was established "between the Bishop, the CMS, and the Pastors and members of the Church that they will in future be acted upon in a wider sense than they have hitherto been". Cheetham also expressed the view that it was never intended that the Articles should reproduce "the evils attendant upon our English usages" - notably perpetual curacies - in Sierra Leone, and ventured that Venn had tried to guard against this by insertion of the words "general unfitness". But even if a Pastor was removed under the Articles without being disgraced, the great difficulty would be to find another cure for him. Such a difficulty, Cheetham admitted, would be minimal in a country where there were 1200 parishes; but, "in a peninsular of only 15 Pastorates", he observed pointedly, "where is the man to take refuge[?]". Cheetham made two other important observations: first, that if Ingham felt the need to revise the Articles and give the Church a proper Constitution, the revision should not be undertaken "only with reference to one point that may at the present time be stirring in men's minds, but rather with the desire to give the Church a workable and lasting Constitution"; second, that though "Patronage was a great anxiety", he would personally have had no difficulty in filling up Sherbro.

133 He observed disapprovingly that the desire was "to order a pastor from district to district, there being no presumable fault; but only that he be preferred by the Patronage Board".

134 "It is notorious among ourselves", he observed, "that the ministerial usefulness of many has entirely ceased in the parishes in which they have location and that they are practically immovable to the serious detriment of the flock over which they are placed".

135 This last observation supports the view that Ingham lacked that strength of character and leadership which were so badly needed in the current crisis, and which had been the forte of his predecessor. Cheetham, in fact, added that he had made a suggestion to Ingham when they met in England "which would have given to Sherbro the best Pastor
The CMS response to the question of ministerial removal and the desirability of revising the Articles of Arrangement was embodied in a lengthy resolution (of 7 July 1885). The resolution, which endorsed ministerial removal and advocated revision, was predicated on the erroneous assertion that the status and position of the Pastors in the Sierra Leone Church "are not the same as that of an English Incumbent who possesses the freehold of his Incumbency and can only be deprived thereof by legal process". This pronouncement provides a strong indication that CMS policy had begun to move away from the spirit and requirements of Venn's scheme - for among other things, Venn had made it clear that Article 1 gave the native Pastors "the status of perpetual Curates or Incumbents at home" and the abandonment of such a cardinal tenet of the Articles of Arrangement became the source of much grief and confusion. The resolution went on to declare that "it is desirable that the power of such removal should be possessed by the Sierra Leone Church", and that "no wrong would be inflicted on Pastors holding their cures on the terms current in Sierra Leone by the adoption of a carefully framed system whereby pastors may be removed from one cure to another for causes which to competent authority appear to make such removal desirable in the general interests of the Church". The PC thought that Article 7 had "too penal an aspect to meet all the cases of removal contemplated", but warned that if the Articles were modified "great care should be taken in framing rules for giving effect to a scheme whereby such removals might be accomplished to guard the Pastor against vexatious removal and against any stigma being necessarily attached to him in consequence of such removal". They urged the Native Church to consider "whether the time has not come for a general possible". "Those who cannot spin", he observed enigmatically, "cannot turn".

136 CMS, G/C1, Vol. 50, pp. 381-383, 7 July 1885.
137 He underlined this fact when addressing Bishop Beckles' enquiry about removing an errant W Quaker (in 1866) - CMS, C A1/L7, p. 127, 24 December 1866, Venn to Beckles.
revision of the Constitution of the Church", and pointed out that as holders of the Church property the Society had "a right to assist in such a revision and would wish to be represented on the Committee of Revision by an adequate number of members appointed by them".\(^{138}\) At the same time, Wigram (quoting from Cheetham's letter) stressed the importance of undertaking the revision "with a view to give the Church a working and lasting Constitution", and not in reference to one point only.\(^{139}\)

The four dissentient Pastors were dismayed by the CMS response and promptly opposed the PC's proposals.\(^{140}\) Their resoluteness owed a lot to the fact that Macauley, who was generally assumed to be their leader, possessed an combative disposition and displayed the sort of fiery independence which grated on European missionaries and bishops alike.\(^{141}\) Nicholson described him thus: "He is very much the stamp of James Johnson. He is a good preacher..., liked by the Church people at Wellington. So far as I know he is a pious man... somewhat rough and outspoken in his manner and he has a spirit of independence".\(^{142}\) Macauley's influence was such that the PC considered inviting him to England - aware, no doubt, that such a move had yielded satisfying results, 13

---

138 In addition, they insisted that the revised Articles should be submitted to the CMS (as were the original Articles) through the Bishop of Sierra Leone, and, if approved by them, to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London.


140 This letter, a memorial to Ingham, is also missing. But see CMS, G3/A1/L 10, pp. 399-402, 8 January 1886, Wigram to Macauley and Pearce; G3/A1/0, no. 86, 17 July 1886, Macauley to Lang. Wigram responded that "in any change it is always possible... that some individual interests may have to be sacrificed for the general good" (cf. G3/A1/L 10, pp. 399-402, 8 January 1886, Wigram to Macauley and Pearce).

141 Fyfe reports that he was born at Hastings, in 1838, and was "like Johnson... a forthright controversialist with a lucid pen". (Fyfe, 1962, p. 375.

142 CMS, C A1/M 21, 9 March 1878, Nicholson to Wright.
years previously, in the case of James Johnson.\textsuperscript{143} Lang told Ingham: "We consider Mr Macauley the most potent factor in the Sierra Leone Church community; but at present, he does not see eye to eye with our policy, and it is possible that contact with our friends in England may help to modify his views and bring him into happier concord with us and others to make him a greater strength and help to the Church and yourself". However, he made it clear that the decision was subject to the bishop's approval, for "it may be that his being invited by the CMS at this juncture, when he had placed himself in opposition to your proposals, may be misunderstood, and in your opinion inconvenient and undesirable". Ingham objected strenuously to the proposal, and spitefully disparaged Macauley's character and ministry.\textsuperscript{144} He reminded the PC that Macauley had been as much trouble to Cheetham as he was to himself, and declared that far from exercising the sort of influence which the PC believed, Macauley's "pride and temper are gradually isolating him from the other clergy".\textsuperscript{145} He was convinced that there was "no good cause to be served by Macauley being taken to England to learn wisdom", and equally fearful that Macauley "would come back more difficult to manage than before". His adverse opinion caused the PC to discard the notion without further comment.\textsuperscript{146}

Bishop Ingham, it must be said, possessed neither the statesmanship nor sufficient disinterestedness to effectively address the fissiparous tension which was slowly eroding the

\textsuperscript{143} CMS, G3/A1/L 10, pp. 403-404, 18 January 1886, Lang to Ingham. James Johnson had already been invited to England that same year. Wrote Lang: "We should from time to time invite to England leading African clergy, for the purpose of creating additional interest in missionary work as well as for their spiritual refreshment" (ibid., p. 398, 15 January 1886, Lang to Ingham).

\textsuperscript{144} CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 20, 26 February 1886, Ingham to Lang.

\textsuperscript{145} He also suggested that Macauley had "lost influence with the laity", and was "at present ... cherishing such ill feelings against some of his Church officers as must injure his own soul".

\textsuperscript{146} CMS, G3/A1/L 10, p. 449, 14 May 1886, Lang to Ingham.
fabric of the Pastorate. Given to strong opinions and prone to resentment, he regarded the dissent of the four Pastors as less a function of the disunity and discord which he inherited, than a personal affront. Unlike Cheetham, who had resisted the efforts of the laity to overthrow clerical dominance, he did little to protect his Pastors from bellicose churchmen who were, as often as not, motivated by self-interest; \(^7\) and he became "the layman's bishop".\(^8\)

His alliance with the leading laymen showed poor insight and poor judgement, and aggravated the deep-rooted antagonism between Pastors and Laity. In 1885, for instance, he issued rules for Parochial Committees which stipulated, among other things, that the treasurership of parish funds should rest wherever possible with the lay members and not the Pastor.\(^9\)

The ruling, which was resisted by some Pastors, exacerbated existing tensions considerably.\(^10\) Macauley complained: "I am sorry to say that under the present episcopate we have found our work more and more difficult. The recognition by the Bishop of Parochial Committees, which led some of them to regard themselves as dictators instead of advisers, has proved extremely trying to some of us."\(^11\) D G Williams, at Holy Trinity Church, became an early casualty of the growing crisis. Dogged by recurrent clashes with a powerful clique within his congregation (some of whom were members of his

---

\(^7\) He remarked rather lamely that "it would be vastly to the interest of the Church, if Pastors would unitedly set themselves to discover the true cause of this most ominous distrust on the part of many of the laity" (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 54, 6 May 1885, Ingham to Lang).


\(^9\) Cf. CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 80, Paper on Native Pastorate Finance, by T J Sawyerr, p. 12; cp. Fyfe, 1962, p. 508. Cheetham, it will be remembered, had declined to legislate for the Parochial Committees (see Chapter 5, p. 67).

\(^10\) At Holy Trinity Church, however, church members refused to give their money to anyone but the Pastor (cf. G3/A1/O, no. 143, 31 May 1888, Macauley to Lang).

Parochial Committee), he eventually resigned his charge to take up the post of Colonial Chaplain in the Gold Coast (in 1886). On his departure, Macauley declared angrily that "a man of sterling worth in the Pastorate" had been forced to resign and go to Accra "under great pecuniary disadvantages" on account of his Parochial Committee. Macauley was of the opinion that the crisis would have been largely averted if the Pastors had a leader who would represent them before the bishop and the CMS. But it is doubtful whether the presence of such a leader - James Johnson was the only choice - would have prevented the crisis. Indeed, the evidence points the other way; for the puritanical and autocratic James Johnson would have been even more vociferously opposed to a move which was geared so ostensibly to giving the laity greater control and increasing episcopal prerogative.

(i) The Four Pastors

The removal and revision question produced a state of ferment in the Pastorate. At the centre of the storm were the four Pastors, who were nicknamed the "Obstructionists".

---

152 In December 1884, he enquired despairingly what he was supposed to do with the four members of his congregation who differ from him and the other members (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 136, 7 December 1884, Williams to lay Secretary). Cp. no. 98, 9 August 1884, Bowen to lay Secretary.

153 ibid., no. 96, 31 July 1884, William to Lay Secretary. Cp. Sierra Leone Weekly News (22 May 1886).

154 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 86, 17 July 1886, Macauley to Lang. Macauley stated that Williams' departure had not only divided Holy Trinity Church but had also had "the most injurious effect on the members, whose feelings have already risen to fever heat". Some of the members had apparently threatened to leave the Church on Williams' departure. Cp. Weekly News (7 October 1886).

155 Moreover, if Ayandele is to be believed, Ingham feared Johnson more than any other native clergyman in his diocese. Cf. Ayandele, 1970, pp. 149-153.

156 Moore reported that "everybody, Churchmen and dissenters, all think that they have a right to discuss and pass opinion on the work and claims of the Church" (CMS, G3/A1/0 no. 135, 3 September 1887, Moore to Lang).

157 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 86, 17 July 1886, Macauley to Lang. As the crisis deepened, it became obvious that some of the other Pastors shared the convictions of the four, to varying degrees (cf. G3/A1/0, no. 143, 13
The four had three things in common: all belonged to the Egba group;\(^{158}\) all were in charge of the largest parishes (Holy Trinity excepted) in the Pastorate;\(^{159}\) and all were senior Pastors.\(^{160}\) In the absence of any firm evidence to the contrary, it has to be assumed that the tribal affinity which the four men shared was a mere coincidence; though it probably helped to foster and preserve a strong cohesive bond among them. Of prime significance, however, is the fact that they were in charge of the larger parishes in the Pastorate. These parishes were the main centres of discord between clergy and laity, as they invariably contained an affluent and powerful body of laymen, with whom the Pastors were inexorably drawn into a power struggle (in an effort to preserve their leadership). The four Pastors were genuinely concerned that a revision of the Articles would give the whip handle to their detractors. They asserted that the removals and revision question was being agitated only by "a few of the wealthy laymen of Freetown", who had "organised themselves into a clique to coerce the clergy".\(^{161}\) To be sure, the joint Conference had made no mention as to how the

---

\(^{158}\) Cf. CMS Register. The Egba were a branch of the Yoruba tribe, whose capital was Abeokuta. See Ayandele, *The Missionary impact on Modern Nigeria, 1842-1914: A Political and Social Analysis*, 1966, pp. 6-7; 1970, pp. 114-115, 120f. According to Ayandele, Christianity had an impact among the Egba "of a kind and on a scale that could not be found anywhere else in the interior of Africa in the pre-colonial era" (1970, p. 120).

\(^{159}\) According to the 1884 statistical returns, the six largest parishes in the colony were: Holy Trinity (1545), Waterloo (870), Kissy (830), Hastings (800), Christ Church (720), Wellington (710). Cf. G3/A1/0, no. 30, Statistical Returns for the year 1884). These were probably attendance figures. The 1879 statistical returns were: Holy Trinity (5,000), Kissy (1,358), Christ Church (1,280), Waterloo (1,190), Wellington (900). Cf. CMS, C A1/0 9/54. It is worth reiterating that Williams, the Pastor of Holy Trinity, had chosen to leave the colony.

\(^{160}\) Hazeley (ordained in 1868) was only marginally so; but Taylor, Macauley and Pearce were ordained in 1861, 1863 and 1866 (cf. CMS Register). *Contra*, Johnson, *Story of a Mission* (1952), who gets the dates wrong for Taylor and Hazeley (see p. 144).

\(^{161}\) CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 24, 13 January 1888, Taylor to Whiting. Macauley also complained that all that was being contemplated in the revised Articles was "power over the Clergy and nothing more" (*ibid.*).
position of the laity was going to be affected by the revision, and it is noteworthy that the original clamour for greater lay representation in the affairs of the Pastorate was replaced by a call for ministerial removals. Still, lay control remained the objective. The four Pastors stated repeatedly that their objection was not to "the principle of removals but to the mode";¹⁶² and they (at least Pearce and Taylor) went as far as to admit that they would probably "see eye to eye" with the bishop if he made it clear that they would be "absolutely guarded from all intrigue, etc, of ill-disposed persons".¹⁶³ Whether this assurance was given or not, they remained convinced that the revision being contemplated would subvert their authority and leave them at the mercy of antagonistic parishioners. In a lengthy letter to Lang, Macauley asserted that "once it became a rule that Pastors are removable at will... there would be an end to all faithful discharge of one's duty as a minister of the Gospel".¹⁶⁴ Insisting that Article 1 gave native Pastors "a status assimilated to that of Perpetual Curates or Incumbents at Home",¹⁶⁵ he declared that "if removals are to take place at all... it should be periodically; for that was "the only way in which they could be affected without jeopardising the spiritual state of the Church, or otherwise have a stigma on a Pastor's character". There is a case for arguing that the four Pastors were more susceptible to a fear of being "technically" demoted to a smaller or less prestigious station. The parishes under their charge had distinct advantages, which made vexations within the Church itself

¹⁶² CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 20, 26 February 1886, Ingham to Lang.
¹⁶³ ibid.
¹⁶⁴ CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 86, 17 July 1886, Macauley to Lang. To illustrate the point, he commented that influential members of the congregation who indulge in sinful practices would immediately seek to effect the removal of a Pastor who rebuked them.
¹⁶⁵ It was a striking irony that Macauley who had vociferously opposed foreign domination in his youthful days, and had called for an independent African Church, should (admittedly under different circumstances) defend the Articles of Arrangement and stake a claim to sharing the status of an English clergyman.
bearable. At least three were so located that the Pastor could perform chaplaincy duties for the Government, for which they received extra pay. Pearce (at Christ Church) acted as Military Chaplain; Macauley (at Kissy) was Chaplain to the Kissy Hospital; and Taylor (at Waterloo) acted as Chaplain to the Waterloo Prison. As The Reporter observed, the vacancy at the Sherbro Pastorate would probably have been supplied with little difficulty if that station had more to offer an incumbent in terms of material reward.

The seniority of the four Pastors was also significant. The younger clergy, for whom the Articles had no special resonance, were strongly in favour of revision, on the grounds that they were over 30 years old, and framed on a foreign prototype. Obadiah Moore, who emerged as the leader of the younger clergy, was a most outspoken pro-reformist. He defended the revision at every opportunity, and brazenly denounced the rebellion of the four senior Pastors. Tension had developed between the older and younger clergy as the latter used their numerical strength to

168 At the Pastorate Auxiliary anniversary meeting in 1886, Ingham was considerably distressed by an outburst from Alfred Sawyerr (the son of T J Sawyerr), ridiculing the Pastorate's claim to being a branch of the Church of England and declaring that Venn had intended the formation of "a National African Church" along inter-denominational lines. "The worse part of it", reported a distraught Ingham, "was he had a lot of young men applauding him" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 60, 21 May 1886, Ingham to Stock).
169 Born at York in 1848, Rev O Moore had married William Quaker's daughter. Something of a high-flyer, Moore was ordained in 1877, and was better educated and arguably the most gifted of his colleagues. He had attended the Grammar School, Fourah Bay College, and Islington College; and was described by The Freetown Express as "one of our most talented native Pastors" - cf. article 'The Principal of the CMS Grammar School' in The Freetown Express (17 November 1882), no. 7, vol. 1.
170 In 1887, he complained that being a younger clergyman his utterances fell "with much offensiveness on the ears of my elder brethren, and brings me much obloquy" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 151, 23 September 1887, Moore to Lang); cp. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 34, 14 March 1885, Moore to Wigram.
sideline their more senior brethren, and colluded with other young laymen to outvote them on important issues.\textsuperscript{171} The senior Pastors therefore saw the call for ministerial removal as an additional means of depriving them of their last vestige of real power; and Macauley declared warmly: "We feel it a duty incumbent upon us to resent all assumption of power over us by such men, who besides are so young in years".\textsuperscript{172} It is also significant that the younger clergy had a much better relationship with Ingham, who found them easier to control and exploited the tension between the younger and older clergy by cultivating the allegiance of the former.\textsuperscript{173} Both Taylor and Macauley accused the bishop of excluding from his favour "those of his clergy whose views differ from his own";\textsuperscript{174} while Taylor complained that "the Bishop's policy is pitting class against class, and encouraging sycophancy and slander".\textsuperscript{175} It is interesting to note that though Ingham had appointed the first native Archdeacon in the person of James Robbin, the incident passed virtually unnoticed and made no impact whatsoever on the affairs of the Pastorate.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{171} Macauley complained that "the younger pastors are pressing themselves forward, and as their number is increasing [they] can always have a preponderance of votes over the senior... [and] can always manage to send in such of their companions as they list" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 86, 17 July 1886, Macauley to Lang). It is certainly interesting to note that Moore was a member of all the Committees in the Church by 1882, and was appointed Secretary of the Pastorate in 1886 (cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 91, 26 March 1888, Moore to Wigram; cp. no. 30, 12 February 1887, Moore to Lang).\textsuperscript{172} CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 143, 31 May 1888, Macauley to Lang.

\textsuperscript{173} Macauley complained that when he and his colleagues "first entered the ministry two and twenty years ago, we could only know the Bishop's mind through the senior pastors; but now the reverse is the case, as they are regarded and spoken of as being 'more easily managed'" (ibid.). In fairness to Ingham, it should be said that the more self-assured Cheetham also found his younger clergy easier to work with (cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, 12 July 1881, Quaker to Hutchinson).\textsuperscript{174} ibid., no. 24, 13 January 1888, Taylor to Whiting; no. 143, 31 May 1888, Macauley to Lang.

\textsuperscript{175} ibid., no. 24, 13 January 1888, Taylor to Whiting. Most of the younger clergy", he added, "have been carried away".\textsuperscript{176} Robbin was appointed to the office of Archdeacon on 31 July 1887 (cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 139, 3 August 1887, Robbin to Lang).
As far as could be determined, Robbin was merely a puppet figure in the administration of a weak and insecure bishop, who feared the more aggressive assertiveness of men like Taylor and Macauley. He confessed to Lang that the "painful absence of full and hearty confidence" in him, was due to the conviction among leading natives that "full episcopal authority on the Coast ought long since to have been in their hands". Whether the crisis would have been averted under a native Bishop must remain a moot point. What is clear is that Ingham's leadership frailties added to its inevitability. Amongst other things, he failed to grasp the fact that the four Pastors's rebellion was, at least initially, less against his episcopal authority than against lay control (which was indisputably the motivating force behind the clamour for removals and revision); and he wrongly assumed that the revision of the Articles "will be the means of removing causes of discord and will also provide security against financial difficulties in the future". Unable to provide a dispassionate and authoritative leadership, susceptible to pressure from a clamorous laity, and prone to lean on the doubtful support of the CMS, the bishop was inexorably drawn into a prolonged and bitter confrontation with the four Pastors.

(ii) A Problem of Finance
By 1887, the Committee (and Sub-Committee) of Revision, which included representatives from the Society, had come into

---

177 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 5, 31 December 1886, Ingham to Lang.
178 ibid., no. 18, 5 February 1887, Ingham to Lang. It was hoped that the new Constitution would, among other things, "provide for some fixed contribution from the people, irrespective of voluntary offerings" (cf. G3/A1/0, no. 31, Resolution of Church Committee) – what Ingham called "a minimum Church rate from every Church member".
179 CMS, G3/A1/L 10, pp. 185-486, 18 August 1886, Secretaries to Nevill; /L 11, pp. 4-5, 21 April 1887, Lang to Nevill. The PC was careful to include native Sierra Leoneans (on the recommendation of the Finance Committee) among their nominees, in order that the views of a wide section of the community would be heard; but due to a fear that native views may not coincide with that of the Society, they insisted that only the
activity. But the unsettled state of the Pastorate was compounded by growing financial troubles. By 1886, the entire grant of £300 from the H V Fund (for the transfer of Christ Church, Holy Trinity Church, and the Sherbro Mission) had been withdrawn, while the additional CMS grant (of £300) was "in the process of withdrawal". The withdrawal of the grants, combined with a depressed trade, wrought severe damage on the financial capacity of the Native Church. By the end of the 1886/87 financial year, the Pastorate Fund had suffered a deficit of about £200, and the beleaguered Church Committee were unable to pay the salaries of several Pastors. Moore explained that the Pastorate's predicament arose not from a decrease in receipts "but from the single circumstance that its responsibilities have increased much beyond its means and inspite of the exercise of the most careful economy". Ingham confessed that he had been "too sanguine" about the Pastorate's financial position, but expressed uncertainty about whether the financial troubles were due to bad trade (a useful scapegoat) or the friction which had long existed between Pastors and some of the leading laymen (or, indeed, to both). Macauley, however,
attributed the financial difficulty to mismanagement, and vigorously criticized Ingham and the Church Committee for being pre-occupied with a revision of the Articles at the expense of more needful reforms.\textsuperscript{186} The Pastors, who invariably bore the brunt of the Pastorate's financial difficulty, attributed the problem to the ill-advised increase in the number of native ministers, and forwarded several recommendations for a re-arrangement of the Pastorate, with a view to reducing the number of Pastors.\textsuperscript{187}

But the main source of the Pastorate's financial predicament was its inability to make up for the loss of the CMS grant of £300, and the Church Committee eventually passed a resolution requesting the Society "to postpone the process of withdrawal for three years" and "to allow them the sum already withdrawn".\textsuperscript{188} The PC replied that the Society's funds "are not rightly applicable in providing pastoral ministration for settled Native Christian congregations such as those in Sierra Leone", and that its assistance can only be "properly rendered by supplying European or other agency for directly evangelical and educational works".\textsuperscript{189} They also argued that it would have a very adverse effect in the interests of self-support and healthy independence, if on the first alarm of pecuniary distress [the] congregations felt that they could fall back on the funds of the foreign parent, rather than

\textsuperscript{186} ibid., no. 86, 17 July 1886, Macauley to Lang. He asserted that "if in addition to the frequent meetings for the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement, which have so engrossed the Bishop's attention, he had set himself to confer and devise ways and means for providing money for the payment of Pastors, the Church might not have fallen into that disrepute, into which I am grieved to say it has fallen" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 153, 21 September 1887, Macauley to Lang).

\textsuperscript{187} CMS, G3/A1/O/1889, 19 January 1887, Pastors to Ingham and Patronage Committee.

\textsuperscript{188} CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 31, Resolution of Church Committee, February 1887; cp. no. 32, 12 February 1887, Moore to Lang.

\textsuperscript{189} CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 11, Resolution of Committee of Correspondence, 5 April 1887. They reminded the Church Committee that the proposal for a gradual withdrawal of the grant had been approved by Cheetham and the Church Committee (in 1884).
that they should rouse themselves to a more prayerful, vigorous and self-denying effort to meet their own necessities.\textsuperscript{190} Faced with such a rebuff, the Church Committee was forced to make reductions in the salaries of all the Pastors, and to pension off much older ministers like William Quaker.\textsuperscript{191} Even then, the outlook remained dismal, as the yearly reduction of the CMS grant deprived the Pastorate of badly needed funds; and the financial crisis eventually precipitated a showdown between the four Pastors and the bishop.

The reduction of their salaries affected the clergy greatly;\textsuperscript{192} and men like Macauley were particularly irritated by the fact that all the lay members of the Church Committee had voted in favour of the salary reduction when the motion was passed by that Committee.\textsuperscript{193} "You may imagine", he told an unsympathetic Ingham, "how grating and humiliating it must be to us, when such men must now sit down and quietly cut down our pay without the least compunction".\textsuperscript{194} Apart from the salary reduction, the financial difficulty led to a decision to reduce the number of Parishes, which in turn made

\textsuperscript{190} *ibid.*, 29 April 1887, p. 12, Lang to Moore. Lang argued that in so far as the Pastorate's financial crisis may have arisen partly due to disaffected Church members withholding their contributions, it would "tend to strengthen them in their opposition if they found that it forced the hands of the PC" (p. 7, 21 April 1887, Lang to Ingham).

\textsuperscript{191} CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 89, 6 June 1887, Moore to Lang; no. 115, 29 July 1887, Nevill to Lang.

\textsuperscript{192} They complained that unable to pay their house rent and other bills, they had "become debtors to their Parishioners and feel themselves placed under most humiliating obligations" (CMS, G3/A1/0/1889, 19 January 1887, Pastors to Ingham and Patronage Committee). "Our independence, honour and security are all but gone", moaned Macauley, in a letter to Ingham requesting the bishop to summon a meeting of the clergy in order to encourage them (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 143, 5 September 1887, Macauley to Ingham [enclosed in 13 September 1887, to Lang]).

\textsuperscript{193} All the clergymen voted against, and Ingham who had the casting vote came down on the side of the laity (*ibid.*).

\textsuperscript{194} *ibid.* He claimed that the lay members were not "sufficiently spiritually-minded to know their duty to the Church", and that very few of them "were anything in the community when most of us entered the service".
removals unavoidable. In an attempt to smoothe the process, the Council arranged for a special Committee of lay men to be elected (two by the Pastors themselves) "before whom a Pastor, when nominated by the Patronage Committee might appear in person, or send his reason against removing, and with whom the decision regarding the validity of the reasons submitted would rest". The four Pastors promptly declined to have any part in appointing members to a body which was "neither provided for nor recognized by the Articles of Arrangement, which until legally superseded, are the rules by which the Church is governed". In response, an exasperated Ingham retorted that he would discuss the question no further, and that (since the Pastors had alienated themselves from all claims to consideration) no further memorial that might be sent would receive attention. The smouldering controversy over Ministerial Removal was therefore brought to a flash point when Moses Taylor, one of the dissenting Pastors, refused to remove from his parish of Waterloo as directed by the bishop and the Patronage Committee.

(iii) The Moses Taylor Case

Rev Moses Taylor was one of the first native ministers to be transferred to the Native Pastorate (in 1861) - the year he was ordained - and he was consequently the most senior native

---

196 ibid.
197 This memorial is also missing. Cf. CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 122, 13 July 1887, Ingham to Macauley. They also deprecated the fact that they had not been invited to express their views before the Revision Committee.
198 ibid.
199 It is necessary to state that a good deal of the material related to this case, and on the general subject of "Removals", are missing from the CMS Archives, and great reliance had to be placed on the Precis Books (G3/A1/P), which contain a summary of all correspondence from the Mission.
"Pastor" in the Native Church. Born at Waterloo, and educated at the Grammar School, Nicholson had acclaimed him as "a man of some experience... a faithful Pastor", and one of the best clergymen in the Pastorate. After six years at Wellington, Taylor was transferred to the extensive and notoriously difficult parish of Waterloo (his place of birth) in 1867. He had therefore presided over that parish for 20 years, by the time of his disputed removal in 1887. As part of the policy of retrenchment, a union of the Pastorate districts of Waterloo and Benguema was proposed, and the Patronage Committee appointed Taylor to the Pastorate of Kent and York. The explanation given for Taylor's removal — namely that he could not possibly manage both — is somewhat specious when it is considered that Benguema had for long been administered under the Waterloo district. Claiming that he was being removed to satisfy a few grog-sellers in his parish, Taylor rejected the appointment of the Patronage Committee; and an irate Ingham immediately summoned

200 The first three parishes to be constituted into the Native Pastorate (on 1 May 1861) were Kissy, Hastings and Wellington, which were respectively pastored by Revds. Jacob Cole, William Quaker and Moses Taylor. Cf. Chapter 3, p. 16.

201 Cf. CMS, C A1/M 19, p. 377, 10 April 1874, Nicholson to Secretaries; p. 390, 27 May 1874, Nicholson to Lay Secretary. The fact that Taylor was the only one of the four dissentient Pastors who had not been to Fourah Bay College makes Nicholson's assessment even more significant.

202 The Waterloo parish was a constant source of anxiety (CMS, C A1/0 64/50a, 12 January 1867, Caiger to Venn). The large number of tribes living in that district (whose numbers had been swelled by the annexation of Quiah), made it a breeding ground of tribal antagonism and disunity; and Caiger emphasized that "Waterloo needs a man of peculiar tact, sound judgement, missionary spirit, and free from all partiality in administering discipline".


204 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 138, 24 September 1887, Ingham to Lang; G3/A1/P2, no. 142.

205 ibid.

206 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 24, 13 January 1888, Taylor to Whiting; cp. no. 143, 31 May 1888, Macauley to Lang.
him to appear before the Church Council. Taylor agreed, but stated that he did so under protest (as he did not recognize the legislative rights of that body). The legal services of Samuel Lewis. The "trial" before the Church Council (on 10 September 1887) was highly irregular. Ingham, who acted as "both judge and prosecutor", had no charges to press against Taylor (a prerequisite for the summons), and refused to allowed Taylor either to be represented by Counsel or to present a personal statement. The proceedings came to an abrupt end when Taylor declined to answer the bishop's questions; and, in a manner which suggested that the "trial" had been a mere formality, his license was summarily withdrawn.

Ingham's proceedings were arbitrary, to say the least. Tormented by the dissent of the four Pastors, and infuriated by Taylor's defiance, he embarked on a course of action which deepened the crisis in the Pastorate and destroyed any chance of a meaningful reconciliation. In as much as he had withdrawn Taylor's license specifically for his refusal to remove (the consent of the Church Council notwithstanding) he had violated the terms of the Articles of Arrangement; since Taylor was not guilty of any of the misdemeanours anticipated by Article 7, nor had he been "charged with any offence cognizable by the Ecclesiastical Law of England". This, it has to be said, was just the sort of episcopal tyranny which Venn, who had insisted that the Pastors did have "the

207 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 142.
208 It is worth reiterating that as well as being the colony's most able lawyer, Lewis was an ardent Methodist (cf. J D Hargreaves, A Life of Sir Samuel Lewis, London, 1958).
209 For better details, see letter to editor titled 'The Pastor of Waterloo before the Church council' in The Weekly News (24 September 1887).
210 ibid., no. 138, 24 September 1887, Ingham to Lang.
211 A useful comparison can be made with the J C Taylor case, of 1878, in which Cheetham had painstakingly conformed to the Articles of Arrangement, and had withdrawn J C Taylor's license on the grounds of "moral misconduct" and "general unfitness" (see Chapter Five, pages 45-49). Moses Taylor, on the other hand, had not even been charged.
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status of perpetual Curates and Incumbents at home”, had intended the Articles to protect them from. In 1866, he explained to Beckles that the matter of the removal of Pastors had been "fully discussed when those Articles were adopted, and the decision was that they should not be removed at the will of the Society, or by the Bishop, without a judicial proceeding". The form of judicial proceeding was prescribed in Article 7; and Venn had emphasised that "the enquiry must be conducted in a formal manner, and as far as possible according to the spirit of the laws of the United Church of England and Ireland - such, for instance, that the charge should be formally stated". Cheetham, who himself had taken great pains to adhere to the requirements of the Articles, condemned Taylor's "trial" as "an arbitrary proceeding in which the Articles of Arrangement had not been strictly adhered to". He asserted that since "the Bishop has for years acted upon the Articles of Arrangement", he was "therefore bound by them", and was "not at liberty to repudiate them any more than any of his Pastors". But Ingham's actions were indicative not only of his own repudiation of the ideals of the Pastorate experiment but also of the almost imperceptible shift from Venn's policies which had begun to take place at Salisbury Square. Nevill (the Secretary of the Mission) therefore argued later that "the Bishop's proceedings are based on the Minute of the Society of early last year"; while Ingham himself insisted that he and the Church Committee would not have acted without

213 ibid.
215 ibid.
216 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 149, 26 September 1887, Nevill to Lang. The reference was almost certainly to the CMS resolution of 5 July 1885, which had declared that the status of the native Pastors was "not the same as that of an English Incumbent who possesses the freehold of his incumbency and can only be deprived thereof by legal means". He added that "though the action may appear sudden and severe, it is not so, for the difficulty had long been foreseen".
the Society's Minute. Lacking the resourcefulness and sure-footedness of his predecessor, and unaware that CMS pronouncements were not an assurance of CMS backing, Ingham was bent on arrogating powers to himself that were denied to an English bishop: namely, the authority to remove his clergy, nolens volens. Though his actions amounted to an abrogation of the Articles of Arrangement, he immediately called on the Society to dispossess Taylor of his Church and parsonage (as stipulated by the same Articles), stating brashly that "the claims of Native Pastors to be quasi-English rectors will no longer be heard of when this case has been fairly disposed of!".

On the advice of Samuel Lewis (his Counsel), Taylor appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, under the Charter of 1852 (by which the Diocese of Sierra Leone was established). The following is an extract of his letter to the Archbishop, in which he outlined his appeal:

Your Grace will have perceived that as a canonically ordained Clergyman, I am amenable to the Ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England of which the Church at Sierra Leone is at present a genuine branch; and that the Royal Charter by which the Colony of Sierra Leone was erected into a Bishop's See provides for an appeal to your Grace against any course which the Bishop of Sierra Leone might pursue against any of his Clergy for alleged contravention of the Ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England...

Though ours is not an endowed Church, the original framers of the Articles of Arrangement, regarding it as a genuine branch of the Church of England, endeavoured to secure for her clergy a stated in Article I a status assimilated to that of Perpetual Curates or English Incumbents thereby placing them above the frowns and smiles of their respective congregations in the dispensing of the word and sacraments...

This arrangement the present Bishop is now labouring to supersede and the result of his action if permitted, will completely destroy the parochial character of our Church, reduce the Pastor almost to the position of an itinerant missionary, and foster in our people a love of change for its own sake.

217 ibid., no. 9, 6 January 1888, Ingham to Lang.
Taylor seems to have had the sympathy, if not the active support, of the Rev J B Whiting (a member of the PC), whom Williams describes as "one of the great Afrophiles within CMS circles". He appears to have communicated regularly with the Whiting, and sent him a copy of his letter to the Archbishop. The support of such a highly placed CMS member was undoubtedly a great boost to Taylor's confidence. He condemned Ingham's action (in withdrawing his license) as "despotic", arbitrary and illegal; and not only continued to minister at the Waterloo Church but also retained class contributions for his stipend (though he refrained from celebrating the sacraments). When Ingham came to Waterloo (accompanied by Nevill) to demand the keys of the Church and parsonage, Taylor refused to admit the bishop; and the Finance Committee was left with no option but to pursue legal action, in order to effect his ejectment under the terms of the lease. Nevill sought the legal services of Mr Nash Williams (who was the only other lawyer in the colony, apart from S Lewis), and enquired of the PC whether he could

---

220 Williams, 1990, p. 99 - note 326. According to Williams, Whiting "acted as secretary for the Society on a number of occasions, was on most of its influential committees and was a commissary for Bishops Crowther and Johnson".

221 ibid., 13 January 1888, Taylor to Whiting. He mentioned that he had read Whiting's letters to Macauley, and expressed his (and Macauley's) thankfulness "for the genuine interest" which Whiting had "always manifested in the affairs of our infant Church and in all that concerns the cause of our dear Master in West Africa generally". It is noteworthy that Ingham expressed a suspicion that Taylor "has received private letters from a member of the Committee", and added that he was "left in doubt as to whether he is thus feeling encouraged in opposition or not" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 9, 6 January 1888, Ingham to Lang).

222 ibid.

223 ibid., 13 January 1888, Taylor to Whiting.

224 ibid. See also G3/A1/0, no. 149, 26 September 1887, Nevill to Lay Secretary; no. 151, 23 September 1887 Moore to Lang. Taylor reported that Ingham attempted to disperse his congregation "by telling as many of the people as the could get together in the Government House... not to go to the Church or class".

225 ibid.; cp. no. 150, Minutes of the Finance Committee, 15 September 1887.

226 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 149, 26 September 1887, Nevill to Lay Secretary.
"take steps for the recovery of their property". However, he was advised by Nash Williams that it would "best to let the matter lie until the decision of the Archbishop is obtained", for if the Archbishop confirmed the withdrawal of Taylor's licence his ejectment will then become a question of Common law. There was no thought at the time that Taylor's appeal would be upheld; but the Taylor case caused a major commotion in the colony, and deepened the crisis within the Native Church. His defiance of the bishop's authority was unprecedented, as was his appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury; but in both he had the unqualified support of his three brethren. Unified in their resistance, the four Pastors remained isolated from the rest of the native clergy. Indeed, the other Pastors and clergymen of the Pastorate sent a memorial to Ingham specifically to assure him of their "loyalty and prayers" as the Church passed through "a most anxious and painful crisis". They deplored the "present very unsatisfactory condition of affairs" as a "circumstance likely to retard that consolidation and progress of the Pastorate Institution", but reckoned that the turn of events only served to highlight the importance and necessity of the revision of the Constitution of the Church, which was already in progress. Partly because the incident had ended in a deadlock, the outcome was deemed to hinge on CMS reaction; for without their mandate the obdurate Taylor could not be moved. The PC's decision was therefore awaited with bated breath.

227 ibid.
228 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 164, 7 October 1887, Nevill to Lay Secretary. He also suggested that Nevill should procure a power of attorney from the CMS, as his position as Secretary of the Mission did not in itself entitle him to eject Taylor from the premises.
229 ibid., no. 151, 23 September 1887, Moore to Lang.
230 Nevill claimed that Taylor would probably have given up the keys of his Church had he not been "backed up" in his action by Macauley and Pearce (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 149, 26 September 1887, Nevill to Lay Secretary).
231 This memorial, dated September 1887, is enclosed in G3/A1/0, no. 158, 12 October 1887, Ingham to Lang; cp. G3/A1/0/1888, no. 120.
But no definitive response was forthcoming from Salisbury Square. Taylor's appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his obvious readiness to "seek the decision of the courts", gave the PC pause; and, fearful of taking any precipitate action which would embarrass the Society, they resorted to the time honoured tactic of equivocation and dilatoriness. Reluctant to give Nevill the necessary authority to proceed with ejectment action, they passed the matter on to the Ecclesiastical Sub-Committee, who, in turn, felt the need to hold back any decision until "they were satisfied by their legal advisers that they might and should forthwith proceed". In the end - to Ingham's chagrin - the Society declined to take any action against Taylor, "until after the result of the appeal has been known". The PC informed the bishop "that it would be highly prejudicial to the Society to incur even the appearance of acting prematurely in a matter upon which his action has been called in question and on which an appeal has been sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury". Taylor's appeal, to be sure, stymied the Society; but questions were also raised about the legality of Ingham's proceeding. The PC were anxious to satisfy themselves that the bishop's action was so clearly within the terms of the Articles of Arrangement (the compact between the bishop and the Society) "that there would be no probability of their finding themselves, by prematurely dispossessing one of those Pastors whose appeal might be successful, liable to the appearance of having taken (so to speak) a side in the

232 CMS, G3/A1/L 11, pp. 57-58, 28 October 1887, Lang to Nevill.
233 ibid., p. 59, 11 November 1887, Lang to Nevill.
234 CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 66, 25 November 1887, Lang to Ingham. Lang stated that though they were "legally and sympathetically desiring to uphold the hands of the Bishop they [also] had a responsibility towards the pastors whom they regard so to speak as their children and who would naturally look to the Society for such protection and sympathy as they felt they needed".
235 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 138, Resolution of General Committee, 22 November 1887.
236 Lang remarked that Taylor's appeal will probably test the point (ibid.).
contest against those who would naturally look for their support". This response increased Ingham's agitation considerably. He described the state of affairs in the Church as deplorable, and asserted that "if every time discipline is exercised in these native Churches there is to be an appeal to the Archbishop, and delay proportionate to know whether the appeal is entertained, no bishop will venture to attempt to exercise discipline!". Conscious of the fact that the delay tended to strengthen Taylor's opposition, as much as it undermined his authority, he countered that the PC ought to authorize Taylor's ejectment, unless they were certain that his appeal was being entertained. He denounced Taylor's appeal as "obstructive and irregular", and declared that the arrangement whereby the ejectment of a Pastor (on the withdrawal of his license) was dependent on the sanction of the distant PC was "paralysing to local control". At his instigation, the Church Council passed a resolution requesting the PC "to delegate their control of the property to some responsible local body (say, the Church Council) with full power to act in all cases". The request was ignored. Significantly, Ingham insisted that "the great majority here", as well as the Church Council considered his actions to be in consonance with the "spirit and intent" of the Articles, which the Society's own Minute (of 5 July 1885) on "Removals" had endorsed. "Without that 'Minute'", he declared, "we should not have acted". Like every Bishop (of Sierra Leone) before him, Ingham had to learn the painful lesson that CMS support could not be taken

---

237 ibid.
238 ibid.
239 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 9, 6 January 1888, Ingham to Lang.
240 ibid. All CMS property had been transferred to a Church Missionary Trust Association in the colony (ibid.; cp. G3/A1/0, no. 169, 27 July 1888, H M Price, Acting Principal of Fourah Bay College, to Lang. It is not impossible, considering the PC's wary response to the calls for Taylor's ejectment, that there were those at Salisbury Square who felt that the Society's control of its property could also act as a last line of defence against arbitrary episcopal action.
241 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 9, 6 January 1888, Ingham to Lang.
for granted; especially in times of controversy and crisis. But, much more than any of his predecessors, Ingham was conditioned, by long-standing acquaintance and involvement with the Society, to turn to them for succour. Just before the furore over the Taylor case broke out, therefore, he had already urged the Society to send a deputation to Sierra Leone and Lagos, in view of the crisis in his diocese.

(iv) The Allan Deputation (1888)
The Allan deputation (of 1888) has already been discussed, in connection with the question of a native episcopate. Apart from that vital issue, the PC were anxious to have a impartial and in-depth report on the state of affairs in the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate, which was in the grip of an economic and ecclesiastical crisis. Allan arrived in Freetown on 11 January 1888 and stayed in the colony for three weeks. During that time, he inspected all the Pastorate stations (with the exception of York and Kent), conversed with all the Pastors and a good number of the laity, and attend a Church Conference convened for the purpose of eliciting general opinion on several subjects of great importance related to the affairs of the Pastorate. The three-day Conference, which brought together some 80 representatives of the Native Church, was the high point of the visit. The subjects discussed at the Conference had been specifically chosen by the Society: viz. (a) the Claims of the Heathen and Mohammedan world in and around Sierra

242 The bishop confessed that had he guessed that the PC would have had hesitation in acting, he would have corresponded with them before hand.
243 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 140, 7 September 1887, Ingham to Lang.
245 The Sierra Leone Weekly News, reported that it was "the first Conference of the kind which has ever been held in the Settlement" (4 February 1888, in G3/A1/O/1888, no. 48).
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Leone; (b) Sierra Leone Church Finances; (c) Revision of the Articles of Arrangement; (d) Special Mission to Sierra Leone; (e) Female Education; (f) Polygamy; (g) Native Episcopate.246 The discussion of each subject was preceded by a paper; and it is noteworthy that most of the papers were presented by the younger members of the Church.247 Two of the subjects discussed are of special relevance to our discussion at this point: namely, Native Pastorate Finances, and the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement. By 1888, the Native Pastorate was in the grip of its worst ever financial crisis. The salaries of three or four Pastors were in arrears for the previous quarter; and the Church was virtually bankrupt, "needing an additional £200 or £300 per annum to enable it to pay its way even on the most economical system".248 The paper on Pastorate finances, presented by T J Sawyerr (the Treasurer), provided a powerful diagnosis of the Church's financial condition, and boldly identified the main causes (which he classified under "external" and "internal" categories).249 The sudden withdrawal of the Government grant (in 1876) was highlighted as the initial "external" cause, but the greatest damage was considered to have been inflicted by "the hasty withdrawal of the CMS from several stations in the colony", the subsequent discontinuance of the promised grants from the H V Fund for those stations, and the gradual reduction of the CMS grant.250 In striking contrast

246 ibid.; cp. G3/A1/P2, no. 72, 29 May 1888.
247 The Weekly News commented that "every one of the youthful readers of papers was born after the consecration of the first Bishop of Sierra Leone" (ibid.).
248 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 72, 29 May 1888.
249 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 80, Paper by Hon. T J Sawyerr, on "Native Pastorate Finance".
250 Sawyerr made special mention of the Sherbro Pastorate, which (in his words) "has proved, and still is a great burden on the Pastorate Fund", and required "more than half of the whole annual receipts of the Pastorate to do anything like an appreciable work there" (pp. 8-9). "One thing to us was however apparent", reported The Weekly News, "that the main cause why the Pastorate fund could not meet its liabilities has been in a great measure due to the hasty withdrawal by the CMS, either in whole or in part, of its grants amounting to something between £400 and £600" (The
to the heated debates which accompanied every other subject discussed at the Conference, there was a unanimity of opinion "that the CMS had been far too premature in withdrawing from Sierra Leone, and in handing over the missionary work to the Native Church". But the Society's withdrawal was only part of the problem; and, in a periphrastic reference to the thorny question of ministerial removal, Sawyerr highlighted the "want of self-denial on the part of some Pastors" as a significant internal cause. The choice of words was significant. He argued that opposition to removals was related to the material or financial benefits which some Pastors derived from their particular stations, and emphasized that this "want of self-denial" had an adverse effect on the "hearty and liberal support" of Church members. Allan reported that the issue of Church finance "bought out into strong relief the hostile feelings entertained by the laity (or a large portion of them) toward the clergy". Shifting through the recrimination and fault-finding, however, he concluded that the main factors which had brought the Pastorate to the verge of bankruptcy were the withdrawal of the CMS and Government grants, the internal dissension and distrust, and the stagnation of

Church Conference', 28 January 1888).

251 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 25, 25 January 1888, Allan to Lang. Allan reported that even the "Africa for the Africans" group expressed this feeling; and The Weekly News asserted that "the prevailing opinion seems to be that the CMS should resume the pecuniary burdens of outside stations in un-evangelised districts, leaving the youthful Native Church in the Settlement to strengthen itself for future work" (cp. G3/A1/L11, pp. 215-216, 15 November 1888, Lang to Ingham).

252 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 151, 23 September 1887. The people, he reported, argued "well, if Pastors cannot exercise any self-denial and are unwilling to undergo any inconvenience for the good of the Church, it is hard for us poor lay men to be called upon to undergo any special self-denial on our part for the same purpose". In another context, Moore had also asserted that the Pastors' attitude "has had a very depressing effect on the generosity of the Church at large".

253 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 25, 25 January 1888, Allan to Lang. Indignant lay representatives charged the Pastors "with trading, with getting the Church Funds into their hands and then lending them at interest, with self-seeking and a mercenary spirit, with slandering, [and] with injustice in the exercise of discipline" (ibid.; cp. Sawyerr's paper).
trade. He added: "Things are almost certain to get worse before they can improve; the purification of the Church must lead to still further lowering of the exchequer". The paper on the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement, which was presented by Rev Moore, also focused mainly on the question of ministerial removal. Moore asserted that the practice was "coeval with the establishment of the missions in Sierra Leone", and that no stigma had ever been attached to removals, nor were there "disputes or opposition from Pastors against the decision of the Bishop and Council". He condemned the chronic disunity in the Church, and denounced the conduct of the four pastors as being "very extraordinary and very damaging to the Church". Deprecating the Native Church's allegiance to the laws of the Church of England, and rejecting the notion that native pastors had the status of English clergymen, he waxed eloquent on the need for constitutional reform:

We must suit our laws to the condition of our Church, and we are the best judge of such a condition... We do not wish to imitate the Church in England on those very points which have given so much trouble to the mother Church... What we want in this matter is a definite and clear set of rules and regulations for the easy government of our little Church; power on the spot within the Church to act upon an emergency without having to wait powerlessly for the slow result of a distressing appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury".

The Church Conference provided a rigorous analysis of the Pastorate's teeming problems, and was as much an exercise in

---

254 ibid.
255 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 72, 29 May 1888.
256 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 74, Paper by O Moore on "Articles of Arrangement".
257 ibid., p. 9. He proceeded to give examples of such removals.
258 He defended the need for removal on several grounds: including the "incapacity to manage a large station, arising from age or natural disposition, disturbance and confusion in a Parish..., or a natural call to enter a large and more arduous sphere of labour" (ibid., p. 11). However, his foremost reason was that "the grand principle that what is regarded as absolutely necessary should not be left to the freewill and supposed good sense of individuals".
259 ibid., p. 12. "If you do not agree with them", he stated bitterly, "you incur their ill-will immediately" (p. 17).
collation as in self-flagellation. It produced no meaningful solutions; and, apart from the emphatic rejection of a native episcopate, it yielded no plan of action. Allan's report, therefore, merely confirmed that the Pastorate experiment was facing its greatest crisis. However, the controversy over Ministerial Removal had dominated the Conference, and his visitation provided a unique opportunity for an independent assessment of the Moses Taylor case and its impact on the Native Church. After receiving a deputation from Taylor's Church, made up of 10 members of his Parochial Committee and two school masters (all of whom were regarded as "loyalists"), he surmised that "their supposed loyalty to the Bishop and the Church was in reality loyalty to their own pockets and trade". However, he informed Lang that no matter which side won (Taylor or the Bishop) "a heavy blow would be inflicted on the Church in Sierra Leone". He explained that Taylor's defiance of the bishop's authority was injurious to the Church, and that his victory would have two adverse consequences: first, that "ecclesiastical authority will be regarded as a nullity", and second, that "the laity will be so indignant at the irremovability of Pastor's that they will not continue to support the Church". At the same time, he observed that "it will be the beginning of endless trouble and evil for the Church", if the bishop succeeded and Taylor was removed. "The laity", he insisted, "will regard the clergy merely as their servants, to be dismissed almost at their pleasure; incessant cabals against them will be raised, faithful ministers will be gagged, and that vigorous denunciation of crying sins, and steady exercise of strict discipline in warning off flagrant transgressors from the Lord's table, which are so urgently needed at the present, time will be rendered impossible and

260 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 25, 25 January 1888, Allan to Lang. He reported that the Secretary and Treasurer, who were the most outspoken among the delegation, were both wealthy "grog sellers". This information would seem to endorse the point of view that the rich and powerful often sought the removal of a Pastor who reproved them of sin.

261 ibid.
the Church, corrupt as it is at the present, will wax worse and worse". Allan argued that it was "a case for settlement by compromise"; and he suggested that, to limit the potential damage, Ingham should be prevailed on to restore Taylor's license, and Taylor in turn be persuaded to go to the post assigned to him by the Patronage Committee. But his call for a compromise came too late. The Vicar-General had already advised the CMS that Ingham "should, as a matter of favour, restore his license to Mr Taylor", and that if the bishop "finds that he cannot restore Mr Taylor as a matter of grace, the appeal must go on". Lang immediately requested Ingham to return Taylor's licence as "a concession", on the understanding that Taylor would remove to York as directed. Thus, the bishop, who had previously asserted that it would be "impossible to yield and remain Bishop", was forced into a humiliating climb-down. He promptly restored Taylor's licence, on the recommendation of the Church council, "as an act of grace and favour". But in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, he questioned the opinion of the Vicar-General, which he claimed was "formed on insufficient and apparently incorrect information", and

---

262 *ibid.*

263 He also argued that "if the CMS had taken prompt action, by addressing a letter of remonstrance to Mr Taylor, the matter would have been settled long ago"; for "the CMS possess a moral influence independent of all question of legal rights over property" (CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 72, 29 May 1888, Report on the state of Church in Sierra Leone).

264 CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 130, 25 February 1888, M Fowler (Archbishop's Chaplain) to Lang. This was a clear indication that the withdrawal of Taylor's license had been irregular.

265 *ibid.*, pp. 124-126, 2 March 1888, Lang to Ingham. He also wrote to Allan entreating him to look into the matter and undertake negotiations between Taylor and the bishop without delay (G3/A1/L 11, pp. 132-134, 2 March 1888, Lang to Allan; cp. p. 131, 2 March 1888, Lang to Taylor). See also G3/A1/L 11, pp. 137-138, 16 March 1888, Secretaries to Nevill.


267 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 68, 21 March 1888, Ingham to Lang. According to the bishop the recommendation was made with "extreme regret and reluctance". "Never before", reported Moore, "has any in authority as high as the Bishop, or even the head of a Department, been placed in such a humiliating condition" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 91, 26 March 1888, Moore to Wigram).
asserted that removals from one Pastorate to another had always prevailed in the Native Church. 268 "We may now expect any Pastor in this Diocese", Ingham told Lang, "to act on his right of appeal to Canterbury, no matter how just he knows a decision to be, to the extreme irritation of the laity, the loss therefore of pecuniary support, the damaging of episcopal authority and most grievous delay". 269 Taylor's refusal to remove to Kent, after the restoration of his license, deepened Ingham's embarrassment. 270 Macauley reported that no less than "636 souls" attended a Thanksgiving service held at Waterloo to celebrate the restoration of Taylor's license - confirming that the majority of church members remained firmly behind their Pastor. 271 However, the celebration by the simple folk of Waterloo was in sharp contrast to the deep distress which the wealthy laymen in Freetown felt at receiving news of the Archbishop's ruling and the restoration of Taylor's license. The development was viewed as "a most complete triumph of Mr Taylor and his three brother Pastors over the Bishop and Council and all hitherto recognized authority in the Church". 272 Pro-reformists like Moore were filled with profound dismay, and even envisaged the Pastorate's imminent collapse. Moore wrote:

268 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 89, 16 April 1888, Ingham to Archbishop of Canterbury.
269 ibid. "You will see that I am much disturbed and tried at this time", he confessed to Lang, "especially as I am well aware that I am liable to a thousand misconstructions".
270 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 68, 21 March 1888, Ingham to Lang; cp. 20 March 1888, Ingham to Taylor (enclosed). The bishop wrote another letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury stating that "it would be a strength to him, and agreeable to a majority of Church people, and perhaps prevent disorder, if the Archbishop having heard the defence, etc., would express a wish that Mr Taylor should remove to Kent" (G3/A1/P2, no. 90, 26 March 1888, Ingham to Archbishop of Canterbury).
272 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 91, 26 March 1888, Moore to Wigram. He claimed that "the four Pastors were seen about Freetown parading and proclaiming their victory".
Matters connected with the Native Church have suddenly assumed such a serious aspect that it is no exaggeration to say that our Church organisation is on the verge of dissolution. It is threatened with a swift and complete collapse. A paralysis has fallen upon the whole Church machinery in every particular. "The Native Pastorate is gone - it has gone done", is the expression heard everywhere now from Churchmen and Dissenters alike. The situation is grave.273

He insisted that, the Archbishop's advise notwithstanding, the question of whether the right to remove Pastors ought or ought not to be available in the Native Church was one which had to be addressed; for "the settlement one way or the other will settle or ruin the Pastorate", and "a mistake may here precipitate dismemberment and accelerate collapse". Moore's statements were greatly exaggerated and sensationalist; but Taylor's victory undoubtedly left a significant proportion of Church members perplexed and disturbed. The reason for this revolved around the much discussed correlation between self-support and self-government. Moore argued that it was quite anomalous that the church members' expressed desire for ministerial removals should be blocked by "a distant power", who had no local experience or "the least share in their pecuniary burden".274 He reasoned that if the Church was self-supporting it ought to be self-governing, and that those who hold the power of governing should accept the responsibility of supporting.275 Taylor's "victory" therefore caused widespread disgruntlement among the wealthier lay men in Freetown, and many of these withheld further support and contributions to the Pastorate. Moore

273 ibid.

274 ibid. Ingham informed the Archbishop that "the Sierra Leone Church is maintained by the people themselves; and the information that all local control is now destroyed, is received with general dismay and discontent" (CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 90, 26 March 1888, Ingham to Archbishop of Canterbury).

275 "Are we", bemoaned Moore, "to have the burden and responsibility of supporting the Church whilst the Church itself is governed by a Charter made by those who know but little, if anything, of our local circumstances; a charter which does not contribute one penny to that support of the Church?" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 91, 26 March 1888, Moore to Wigram).
warned that "a very appreciable portion of those in the villages are certain to assume the same sullen attitude of concern, because they say the Church is not Native and they have no voice". In a bid to counter this argument, Macauley presented facts and figures to show that not only had Waterloo contributed its highest amount to the Pastorate Auxiliary that year (1888) but also that the total receipts of the Auxiliary was one of the largest ever realized.  

It has already been argued that the bulk of the Native Church's support came not from the handful of wealthy and extremely vocal laymen who kept up the clamour for lay control or ministerial removal, but from the rank and file in the villages. But even this voiceless majority were not immune to the spirit of dissatisfaction which had begun to pervade the length and breadth of the Pastorate.

The Taylor affair caused opinion within the Native Church to become even more polarised. While Macauley warned the PC against sanctioning inimical changes to the Church Constitution, "out of fear that the Native Pastorate would collapse when the laity withhold their support", Moore declared that "the Pastorate had to be re-organised anew", and that "if time be lost and the present bewilderment and derangement continue much longer, the re-organisation may come too late..." The latter view was more prevalent, as the climate of confusion and uncertainty prompted many to regard the new Constitution as an urgent and desperate necessity. By upholding the 1852 Charter, the Archbishop of Canterbury's ruling (for that is what his advise came to be

---

276 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 143, 31 May 1888, Macauley to Lang. "This certainly does not show that the Church as a Church is dissatisfied with existing arrangements", he observed.

277 In the words of Macauley, it was not so much "the guineas of the rich" but the "mites of the poor" - accounting for over three-fourths of contributions - which brought total contributions to some £1,350 annually (ibid.). The sum included the weekly half pence for schools.


279 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 91, 26 March 1888, Moore to Wigram.
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regarded as) raised serious doubts about the efficacy and validity of the Articles of Arrangement, which, in theory at least, were meant to supersede the requirements of the Charter and provide for the specific ecclesiastical needs of the embryonic Native Church. The verdict, therefore, had a paralysing effect on the proceedings of the Native Pastorate.281 Ingham visited England, in June 1888 (to attend the Lambeth Conference), determined to press on the CMS and the Archbishop "some new but necessary conditions on which alone I can at all see my way to continuing to superintend this Diocese".282 Both the PC and the Archbishop were anxious to accommodate the concerns of the troubled bishop, and to give him their assurance and support. In a letter to Ingham, the Archbishop stated that he was "desirous... that it should be understood that the Charter, while it prescribes methods of hearing, and requires certain notices, is not calculated to interfere with the proper authority of the Bishop over his clergy or with the due control of the CMS over its missionaries"; and he assured the bishop that "if the provisions of the Charter are accurately attended to, there will be found to be no lack of authority in your hands for the exercise of affected discipline".282 In what was obviously an attempt to check the overriding assumption that the Charter offered native Pastors a protection against removals, the primate asserted that in no case was the Charter "intended to interfere with established rights and methods of patronage which have obtained in Sierra Leone from the beginning of the Mission to the present time".

280 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 96, 10 April 1888, Nevill to Lang. "What is the meaning of the Articles of Arrangement, old or revised, as long as the Charter is in full force?", queried Moore; and what room, he continued, did the Charter leave for independent action? (cp. no. 91, 26 March 1888, Moore to Wigram).

281 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 68, 21 March 1888, Ingham to Lang; cp. G3/A1/P2, nos. 122 & 123, 21 June 1888, Ingham to Lang. It can only be inferred that one of "the new but necessary conditions" which the bishop had in mind was the compulsory removal of native Pastors.

The tendentiousness of this statement only added to the confusion which the Taylor case had provoked; for while Ingham and the CMS interpreted it to meant that removals recommended by the Patronage Committee (according to Article 8) were not subject to appeals to Canterbury, the dissentient native Pastors took a completely different view. The hub of the problem was that the Archbishop's letter failed completely to address the relationship between the Charter and the Articles of Arrangement. Cheetham, who, it must be said, showed better insight into the existing situation than either the Archbishop or the CMS, explained that though the Charter gave the bishop "unlimited and unrestrained authority", the Bishop of Sierra Leone consents to limit his action by the Articles of Arrangement - in the same manner that "English Bishops are restrained by the country's laws" - so that he is not "the autocrat that other colonial Bishops are". But the death knell of the Articles of Arrangement had already been sounded, as Taylor's triumph imbued the pro-reformists with fresh determination to enforce a Revised Constitution.

D. The Revision of the Articles of Arrangement
From the moment the decision to revise the Articles of Arrangement was made, the Native Pastorate was poised on the threshold of its most significant move towards ecclesiastical independence. Apart from the controversial question of removals, there was little doubt or disagreement that a revision of the Articles of Arrangement was long overdue and of vital importance to the well-being of the Native Church. Both Beckles and Cheetham had contemplated such a revision, though for different reasons. However, it was a step which, by its very nature, was bound to be plagued with difficulty and contention. It therefore called for far-

283 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 215, 19 November 1888, Cheetham to Lang.
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sighted leadership and skilful arbitration - none of which Ingham possessed in any noticeable degree. Also, for the revision to be even moderately successful, it needed the concerted effort, mutual respect and cooperation, and intellectual partnership of the leading laity and clergy; and since the native clergy were bound to be the most affected by any constitutional change, it was particularly desirable that their concerns should be given due consideration. Cheetham was the first to observe that it was of vital importance that "the assent of all the pastors (present and future)" be obtained, as well as "the assent of all members of Church Council and Church Committee".285 His was a lone voice; for the painful reality was that inordinate lay influence, the excessive pre-occupation with the issue of ministerial removals, and the bishop's patent desire for greater powers over his clergy marred the process of revision from the very start and provoked repeated opposition from the ranks of the Pastors.

The work of revision, which had been proceeding apace during the Moses Taylor affair, was completed by April 1888;286 and a General Meeting of the Revision Committee was called "to consider and pass" the revised Articles presented by the Revision Sub-Committee.287 The meeting, which was chaired by Archdeacon Robbin, comprised all the native clergy, lay members of the different Pastorate Committees, and "delegates from the rural districts".288 On the first day, the four dissentient Pastors tabled a memorandum which explained their refusal to take part in the discussions, and left the meeting. Their withdrawal affected the balance of opinion at the meeting greatly; for six of the nine native clergy who remained had actually been members of the Revision Sub-

288 ibid.
Committee which was presenting the draft Constitution. More importantly, the native clergy were greatly outnumbered by the laity; and the Pastors were accordingly "outranked in every instance by the majority of the clergy and laity that were marshalled against them". It soon became evident that, in sharp contrast to the laity (whose interests the contemplated changes purportedly favoured), most, if not all, of the native Pastors were dissatisfied with the revisions. Four of the clergy were sufficiently disgruntled with their numerical disadvantage to absent themselves from the second day of meeting, during which most of the revised Articles were passed. They later explained that not only were the Pastors, who were chiefly concerned, "not sufficiently represented", but also that "the spirit of the laity during the proceedings... and their determination - under the influence of some of the leading men in Freetown - to carry out their notions of what a Church should be, made it evident that a fair discussion of the Articles was not to be expected". A writer to the editor of the Weekly News alleged that the meeting "ended in a ridiculous fiasco". He commented: "One is pained and bemused to note how tenderly the framers have dealt with the laity of the Church; for while they took care to 'bind' the pastors 'hand and foot', they left the laity entirely at large". Nevill admitted

290 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 164, Memorandum relative to the New Constitution of the Sierra Leone Church, in which it is stated that "only a handful" of Pastors were present "against a large body of laity and CMS agents".
291 ibid. It is worth noting that not all the clergy were Pastors; since some like Moore were in CMS employ.
292 ibid.; CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 164, Memorandum relating to the New Constitution of the Sierra Leone Church (16 July 1888). Of the 5 native clergy who remained, two (O Moore and S Spain) were agents of the CMS, and J E Taylor was the Assistant Colonial Chaplain. The other two (W Quaker and J T Asgill) could hardly have represented the Pastors effectively since the former had retired, whilst the latter was only a curate at Holy Trinity Church.
293 ibid.
that "some of the Pastors were vexed at some points being carried against their votes"; but he also argued "that probably all the Pastors (except the 'four') would accept heartily the Revised Constitution if some room were left for a final appeal on certain matters to the decision of the Archbishop". The memorandum presented by Macauley, et al, at the General Meeting created a stir, and a Sub-Committee was appointed to reply to it. It was argued that since the Pastors had accepted office under an arrangement, which contemplated revision, they "ought not reasonably to be surprised or reasonably to complain if the revision should take place and if it should involve an alteration of a 'proposed status' whatever it be, as one of those provisions which experience has shown to be tenable". Nevill rebutted the four Pastors' claim that the revision had been throughout the work of the bishop, and maintained that "whatever the Bishop has done in the matter has been done with the object of forwarding the expressed wish of the Native Church".

Still, it was significant that none of the native "Pastors" approved of the Revised Constitution; and that even those native Pastors who had initially favoured the step were thoroughly dissatisfied with the proposed revisions. Six clergymen rejected the revised Articles, on the grounds that they were "far more unsatisfactory than the old Articles of Arrangement which they are intended to supersede", and that they were passed solely "by a large body of laymen and some

295 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 101, 1 May 1888, Nevill to Lang. The appeal in question obviously had to do with the matter of ministerial removals. Nevill goes on to add that if such an appeal was to be made to the Archbishop whenever removal is insisted on, and the whole course of English ecclesiastical procedure resorted to, then "it will be better to cut the Church off altogether from any appeal to the Archbishop".

296 ibid. The Memorandum is missing. In a subsequent letter, Nevill reported that "the Sub-Committee appointed to answer the memorandum of the four Pastors have declined to act" (G3/A1/0, no. 106, 8 May 1888, Nevill to Lang). But some response appears to have been given in a printed pamphlet titled "Notes on the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement, and the Memorandum theron" (G3/A1/0/1888, no. 120, n.d.).

297 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 101, 1 May 1888, Nevill to Lang. He insisted that Ingham had been present at only 5 of the 20 sittings of the Revision Sub-Committee.
clergymen in connection with the CMS... whose interests are not directly concerned". Among the changes which the clergymen found most objectionable were: the compulsory removal of Pastors; the fact of being called upon to accept "the doctrines and general forms of worship" of the Church of England, "but not her discipline; and having to accept the decision of the bishop in Council as final, without right of appeal, "contrary to the Charter constituting Sierra Leone a Bishopric". Unfortunately, this memorial was discredited when it emerged that one of the Pastors had forged the signature of another, and no reply was given. But in the face of such discontent, the Revised Constitution was taken back to the drawing board.

(i) The CMS Involvement
CMS calls for a revision of the Articles of Arrangement became more urgent after the Taylor affair. The incident raised disconcerting questions about the Society's capacity to enforce the requirements of the lease arrangements, and to exercise patronage and proper control over its property in the colony (under the Articles of Arrangements). In the eyes of many native Christians, CMS unresponsiveness to calls for Taylor's dispossession was the main cause of his eventual triumph; and many looked to the Society for redress.

298 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 164, Memorandum relative to the New Constitution of the Sierra Leone Church, signed by six native clergymen (S Mousa, J B Bowen, N J Cole, J C Nylander, H P Thompson and N H Boston). It is noteworthy that all six had signed the letter (of September 1887) to Ingham assuring the bishop of "their loyalty and prayers", and stressing "the importance and necessity" of the revision of the Articles (G3/A1/0, no. 158, 12 October 1887, Ingham to Lang).


300 As far as could be determined, the PC had still not received the revision by November 1888 (cf. G3/A1/L 11, pp. 214-215, 15 November 1888, Lang to Ingham).

301 Moore wrote: "We naturally and confidently turn to the Parent from whom we sprung for direction under the very trying circumstances in which we now find ourselves, for speedy and effectual interposition before our
Nevill reminded the PC that it had never been the intention that "each Pastor should have the life tenure of any district", and he urged the Society to "establish its claim to be the owner of the property". Inevitably, therefore, the CMS postmortem of the Taylor affair focused not so much on the illegality of Ingham's actions but on the great difficulty of dispossessing a defiant Pastor. The PC confirmed that Taylor's appeal had "disclosed possible difficulties in the working of the existing Articles of Arrangement, especially with respects to patronage"; and they declared that "if any step is to be taken towards the settlement of a Constitution for the Church of Sierra Leone, that Church must possess in itself sufficient authority to regulate its own internal affairs, including the patronage of the churches, which authority safely guarded against arbitrary exercise, will rest with the Bishop". Several Minutes were produced in October and November 1888, which were eventually embodied in an important Resolution of 12 November 1888. The Native Church was notified "that the Church property in that Colony is the absolute property of the CMS, and that (subject to existing leases) the Committee will, at present and till a satisfactory Constitution is agreed upon, retain the property under their own control".

---

302 CMS, G3/A1/0, no, 96, 10 April 1888, Nevill to Lang.
303 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/P2, p. 31, Minutes of Committee of Correspondence of 16 October 1888, amended by Committee of Correspondence of 6 November 1888, and confirmed in General Committee, 12 November. The Minutes and resolution were later printed in The weekly News (16 March 1889) - cf. G3/A1/0/1889, no. 66.
304 ibid.
305 CMS, G3/A1/P2, p. 31, Resolution of the General Committee, 12 November 1888.
306 Interestingly, Cheetham (who previewed the Resolution) informed the PC that during his episcopate it was the Native Church and his "own grants" which took care of all repairs; and that "in such a country as Sierra Leone where repairs have for a long term of years been done by others than the owner, the building that now is had scarcely been paid for by the owner" (CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 215, 19 November 1888, Cheetham to Lang). He argued that "it would hardly be incorrect to say that many of the
At the same time, the Resolution stated that "a reconsideration of the terms under which the tenure of their property is granted to the Sierra Leone Church is an immediate necessity". In order to expunge any doubts about their readiness to dispossess native Pastors, the PC declared "that in the case of existing leases defining conditions of tenure, the Committee will act strictly upon those conditions"; and that "it must not be assumed from what has recently taken place that in any subsequent case of the withdrawal of a Pastor's license by the Bishop there will be any hesitation or delay on the part of the Committee in acting upon the terms of the lease". They also authorized the formation of a new CMS Patronage Board in Sierra Leone (to replace the existing Patronage Committee), which was to consist of "the CMS Secretary..., the Archdeacon of Sierra Leone, two Native Pastors, and two African laymen being communicant members of the Church". The exclusion of the bishop from the Patronage Board signified a shift in CMS policy, which could also be construed as a tacit acknowledgement that Ingham had exerted an illegal or undue influence in the removal of ministers. The PC ruled that "the property shall be occupied by such persons as the Patronage Board, with the consent of the Bishop, from time to time appoint; the Board with the like consent, retaining in their hands the power of altering the appointments". By setting up a new Patronage scheme, the PC signalled their determination to settle the vexed question of ministerial

buildings that now are, have been paid for by the CMS, Native Church and Bishop Cheetham".

307 This declaration amounted to little more than a show of strength - meant as much to caution the Pastors as to reassure the bishop. Cheetham's suggestion that the phrase "provided that the Bishop's action be itself constitutional" should be added was ignored (cf. ibid.).


309 It will be remembered that there had been some confusion, when the Patronage Committee was first organised at the start of Cheetham's episcopate, about whether the bishop should, in fact, be a member of the Committee, since he would in effect be presenting ministers to himself. Cf. Chapter Five, pages 305 & 306f.
removals. However, the scheme had a fundamental flaw in that the Article of Arrangements (which were still in force) made no provision for a "Patronage Board"; and in the climate of dissent which prevailed in the Native Church, its creation merely added to the confusion.

Ingham returned to the colony, in December 1888 (after an absence of six months), armed with the CMS Resolution and the Archbishop of Canterbury's letter - both of which he circulated among the native clergymen and ministers - and made it known that he had acquired sufficient powers to effect removals.\(^3^{10}\) A month later, seven native Pastors addressed a lengthy memorial to the bishop, detailing their response to the Archbishop's observations and the issues raised by the CMS Resolution.\(^3^{11}\) There was nothing remarkable about the seven memorialists. Their names included that of the four dissentient Pastors and three others (S Mousa, T C Nylander and N J Cole), who had already indicated their disgruntlement with the revision process in the 1888 memorandum to Archdeacon Robbin (which was discredited). Together, they represented more than half the native Pastors; and their alliance was a powerful indication of the rather prevalent anxiety among that group that the revision of the Articles was inimical to their interests. In response to the Archbishop's letter, the seven Pastors noted with some satisfaction that, contrary to Ingham's and CMS opinion, the Archbishop had admitted that the Charter applied to them, and gave them protection from "any informal trial and summary dismissal". Regarding the Archbishop's reference to patronage, they reminded the Society that there was "a broad line of demarcation" between the period of the Sierra Leone Mission, when all CMS agents had to go wherever

\(^3^{10}\) Cf. CMS, G3/A1/0/1889, no. 66, Enclosed copy of the Weekly News, (16 March 1889); G3/A1/P2, no. 93, 24 May 1889, Ingham to Wigram.

\(^3^{11}\) CMS, G3/A1/0/1889, no. 21, 18 January 1889, Memorial to Bishop Ingham, signed by M Taylor (Waterloo), G J Macauley (Kissy), S Mousa (Charlotte), T C Nylander (Wilberforce), M Pearce (Christ Church), S G Hazeley (Wellington), N J Cole (Regent).
appointed, and the period of the Native Pastorate, under which Pastors were selected and given the option to accept or decline. They forwarded cogent arguments to show that "compulsory Ministerial Removals" (with the use of "threats" and "coercion") were not sanctioned by the Articles of Arrangements, and that for over 25 years a Pastors removal was "purely voluntary - a matter of accepting or declining on the occurrence of a vacancy".\footnote{A copy of the letter addressed to M Taylor from the first Church Committee (dated 15 April 1861) was produced, and Ingham's attention was drawn to the fact that Taylor's removal from the Society's employ to the first Pastorate had been contingent on whether it was (in the words of Hamilton, the then Secretary) "agreeable with your wishes".} Insisting that the coercive removal of a Pastor had been unheard of during the episcopates of Beckles and Cheetham, they called on Ingham to abstain from his "present determination, which if carried out will... result in so much scandal and the disintegration of" the Pastorate. The Pastors discountenanced the revision of the Articles of Arrangement on the grounds that the proceedings of the joint Conference of 1885 (which took the decision) "were ultra vires, as the Articles of Arrangement which assigned the Sierra Leone Church Council, Church Committee, and Patronage Committee their duties, nowhere empowered them as [a] joint Conference under your Lordship's presidency to pass any resolution on us". They observed that the revision which had since taken place had "met with the protest of the majority" of Pastors "who not only deprecate the particular form which the Draft Constitution has taken but revision altogether, under the present state of things". Reacting to the CMS Resolution, they remarked, with some disdain, that they saw no need "to be told that the Church property in the Colony is the absolute property of the CMS". In the light of subsequent developments, however, it is noteworthy that they recorded their full approval of the newly constituted CMS Patronage Board - albeit from a conviction that it would save the Church "from what was purely an anomaly till but recently, when the Bishop as President of the Committee selected and presented to himself
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for his own approval and license a Pastor to a living when vacant, or to a district when formed into a parish". The Pastors condemned the "exaggerated importance" which had been given to the subjects of Ministerial Removals and the Revision of the Articles of Arrangement "to the utter neglect of more important matters" – notably, the "great pecuniary difficulties, caused, for the most part by the withdrawal of the CMS grants" – and deplored the fact that Ingham had returned to the colony not with funds to assist the ailing Church but with the pronouncement that he had brought power from England "for our coercion". They requested the bishop to send copies of their memorial to both the PC and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

It is perhaps a measure of their determination to pursue the matter of Revision and Removal that both Ingham and the PC dismissed the memorial as unworthy of a response. After six years in the colony, Ingham, who was memorialised more often than any previous Bishop of Sierra Leone, had developed a low regard for memorials and memorialists.313 Experience had taught him that the safest response was one of dignified silence, and he merely acknowledged the memorial.314 However, in a letter to Lang, he claimed that the Pastors had misinterpreted the Archbishop's letter and had "wilfully misunderstood" the joint Conference of 1885.315 Lang agreed that the "mis-interpretation of the Archbishop's words regarding patronage is very evident", and stated that "the whole memorial indicates an unreadiness on the part of these Pastors to respond to the desire and suggestion of the Committee that the Church as a whole should earnestly and

313 He told the PC that "memorials are quite often got up in a very discreditable manner, and are quite worthless" (G3/A1/P2, no. 52, 11 March 1889, Ingham to Lang); cp. G3/A1/0, no 20, 21 January 1889, Ingham to Lang.
315 CMS, G3/A1/0, no 20, 21 January 1889, Ingham to Lang. He also described their reference to the Society's property as being "in bad taste".
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resolutely lend their best energies to the revision of the Constitution of the Church".316 "We cannot but believe", he continued, "that better counsels will prevail; and that whatever may be the private views and desire of the individual pastors, they will recognize that the welfare of the Church demands an honest effort to face the question..."317 P V Smith, the Society's legal adviser, to whom the memorial was forwarded, gave it as his opinion that "the less notice which the Committee takes of the Memorial..., the better".318

(ii) The Patronage Board

Macauley surprised both the Finance Committee and the PC by agreeing to serve on the new Patronage Board, along with W Quaker (the second clergyman who was elected).319 The rapprochement, however, was shortlived, precisely because the relationship between the Patronage Board and the Articles of Arrangement was not clarified.320 The Finance Committee were persuaded that by setting up a new Patronage Board, the CMS had in effect empowered Nevill (their Secretary, and Chairman of the Patronage Board) to take legal proceedings if such was necessary in carrying out the appointments of the Board, and thereby the vexatious delays which instructions from England involved.321 However, the ever cautious PC insisted that "any legal question which may arise out of the new Patronage Scheme... should be referred to them before action is taken

317 ibid.
319 CMS, G3/A1/P2, p. 37, no. 37, Resolution of Finance Committee, 8 January 1889; G3/A1/L 11, p. 233, 18 January 1889, Secretaries to Nevill. The two laymen appointed were D Carroll and E W Edwin.
321 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 28, 11 February 1889, Nevill to Lang. Some like Moore, who was a member of the Finance Committee, were convinced that the Board's appointments were certain to be opposed.
in the matter". Even then, the Board's authority and powers of action remained ill-defined. But when it held its first meeting on 1 March 1889, Nevill (the Chairman) asserted, in response to Macauley's queries, that the Board's authority rested with the PC, and that the Articles of Arrangement had been set aside with respect to "the method of Patronage, which now rested absolutely with the present Board". This assertion was incorrect; and it later provided Macauley with a useful excuse for challenging the authority of the Board when it suited his purpose. The Board's first activity was to fill the vacancies in the Pastorate stations of Sherbro and Kent. They appointed Macauley to Sherbro, J S Asgill (the young curate at Trinity Church) to Kent, M Taylor to Kissy (to fill Macauley's position), J B Bowen to Waterloo, H P Thompson to Hastings, and N Bull to Benguema. Nevill subsequently wrote to each appointee to enquire whether he had "any private or family reasons" why he should not remove as appointed by the Board. Macauley, whose appointment to Sherbro had been made despite his own strong protestations, replied that he would defer his acceptance or non-acceptance of the appointment until a reply had been received from the PC to the "Memorial" (of 18 January) addressed to Ingham from the seven Pastors. However, pressure from the other board members forced him not only to withdraw his letter, but also

322 CMS, G3/A1/F2, p. 42, Resolution of Committee of Correspondence (2 April 1889).
323 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 57 (i), Minutes of Patronage Board, 1 March 1889. Though he had received no such information from the PC, Nevill informed the Pastors that whatever rights they had under the old Article of Arrangements had been "abolished by the action of the Society in appointing a new Patronage Board" which had "authority to act absolutely for the Society in all matters relating to the patronage of the Churches, etc" (G3/A1/0, no. 56, 21 March 1889, Nevill to Lang).
324 ibid.
325 ibid. It is important to note that Taylor's appointment was actually proposed by Macauley himself.
326 ibid., no. 56, 21 March 1889, Nevill to Lang.
327 This letter was printed in The Weekly News (16 March 1889).
to accept the appointment to Sherbro (though he made it clear that he did so "under protest"). His name was subsequently forwarded to the bishop, who promptly gave his consent. The speed of events unsettled Macauley, and, on being informed that the bishop had sanctioned the appointment, he abruptly rejected the Board's decision (on the grounds that it had no power to act within the Articles of Arrangement) and tendered his resignation. He also argued that the removals suggested by the Board would exacerbate the financial problems of the Native Pastorate (which was "head and ears in debt"), and told Lang that the removals "were totally unnecessary." The Board accepted Macauley's resignation but declined to recommend that the bishop withdraw his consent to the appointment. However, as suddenly as he had declined, Macauley withdrew his objections to the Board's appointment and consented to go to Sherbro. Forewarned about the possibility of opposition, and still convinced of their authority to enforce removal, the Board requested the PC to "cancel all existing leases, and have fresh ones drawn up by the Trust Association in which the withdrawal of the Bishop's license shall not be made a necessary condition for the removal of any Pastor".

328 CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 57 (iii), Minutes of Patronage Board, 12 March 1889.
329 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 57 (III), Minutes of Patronage Board, 12 March 1889. See also no. 57 (IV & V).
330 ibid., no. 57 (VI), 21 March 1889, Macauley to Nevill. He claimed that the Board's decision was an attempt to drive him out of his present charge; and complained that he was expected to move at short notice (with a family of eight children) in obedience to "the marching orders of the Society, through its Patronage Board, when I am no agent of theirs and no party to the resolution by which I am to be ordered away". Cp. G3/A1/O, no. 59, 27 March 1889, Macauley to Lang.
331 ibid. He calculated that the removals would entail an expenditure of £50 to £80 (G3/A1/O, no. 59, 27 March 1889, Macauley to Lang).
332 ibid. Nevill countered that the appointments were being made specifically to save some £130 to £150 to the funds of the Pastorate (G3/A1/O, no. 57 (vii), 21 March 1889, Nevill to Ingham).
333 ibid., 21 March 1889, Nevill to Macauley.
334 ibid., no. 57 (xii), 23 March 1889, Macauley Nevill.
335 ibid., no. 57 (ix), 21 March 1889, Minutes of Patronage Board.
They declared that if the PC rejected this proposal, and the bishop subsequently refused to withdraw any Pastor's license for refusing the appointment of the Board, "it would be impossible for the Board to act any longer, and they would be compelled to give in their resignation". By then, Ingham, who was anxious to avoid another scandal in his diocese, had made it clear that if a Pastor resisted the appointment of the Board he would withhold his decision (to withdraw his license) "until I knew exactly and definitely what the CMS Committee will do".336 "To do otherwise", he opined, "would be to bring my episcopacy into contempt and make it impossible for me to remain". At the same time he enquired about the possibility of withdrawing a Pastor's "local license" to minister in a CMS Church at a particular place (within the terms of the lease) without touching his license to minister as one of his clergy elsewhere.337

With the exception of Moses Taylor, all the other clergymen who were appointed to new stations by the Patronage Board, accepted its decision without comment.338 Taylor informed Nevill that it was an inauspicious time for him to leave his charge, as his "immediate removal will undoubtedly cast a stigma on me and my work".339 He made it clear that he had no "desire to resist or withstand constituted authority", but argued that he should remain where his "services are not altogether unappreciated" rather than be transferred to a new and much larger parish.340 However, the Board deemed his

336 *ibid.*, no. 64, 30 March 1889, Ingham to Lang. There was "no power to enforce", he observed, "while the Society does not give us power to eject".

337 *ibid.*

338 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 57 (iii), 12 March 1889, Minutes of the Patronage Board. These were Asgill, Thompson and Bowen.

339 *ibid.*, no. 87 (V), 27 March 1889, Taylor to Nevill; cp. no. 56, 21 March 1889, Nevill to Lang. His Parochial Committee had also memorialised Nevill against his removal.

340 "In my present sphere", he wrote, there is a large body of Church members and others who show no depreciation of my work; may I not be permitted to continue my labours among them even for some time to come[?]
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reasons to be insufficient; and Nevill wrote to the Bishop requesting his consent to the appointment. Ingham was manifestly unhappy with having yet again to deal with Taylor in the matter of removals; but he duly gave his consent. Nervous about Taylor's reaction, he insisted that Nevill should send Taylor an ultimatum requesting a final answer from him, on or before 3 May 1889, stating his acceptance of the appointment. Taylor interpreted the ultimatum as "coercive", and promptly challenged the authority of the Board (under the provisions of Article 8) "to exercise any coercive jurisdiction over a Pastor" or to judge whether or not the reasons assigned by a Pastor for declining an appointment were sufficient or not. He pointed out that the CMS Resolution (of 12 November 1888), by which the Board had come into existence, stated clearly that "in the case of existing leases defining conditions of tenure the Committee will act strictly upon those conditions"; and he demanded to know what coercive authority the Board possessed over "those Pastors who have long held leases, so that they can be turned out of their lease holds without their consent". Nevill denied that any power of compulsion was implied in his letter, though he argued that the Society had a certain jurisdiction over Pastors by retaining the right to remove

- ibid.

341 ibid., no. 87 (vii), 12 April 1889, Minutes of Patronage Board. His reasons were particularly condemned by the semi-retired W Quaker, who recalled that Taylor had refused to remove first to Regent (as too cold) and then to Kent (as a retrograde step). He asserted that Taylor's attitude was "nothing less than downright contumacy" and a "trifling with lawful authority", and "should be visited with such a censure which such a conduct deserves" (ibid., no. 87 (vi), 9 April 1889, Quaker to Nevill).

342 ibid. no. 87 (viii), 13 April 1889, Nevill to Ingham.

343 ibid., no. 87 (xi & xii). The Board had set the date of Macauley's removal from Kissy as 15 June (three months from the date he was notified of the bishop's consent), and it was determined that Taylor's removal to that parish should take effect the same day. (ibid., no. 87 (vii), 12 April 1889, Minutes of Patronage Board).

344 ibid., no. 87 (xiii), 30 April 1889, Taylor to Nevill.

345 The enquiry was rhetorical. "Seeking now to exercise coercive jurisdiction over me and compel me to remove is certainly not a condition of the tenure by which I hold my present tenure", he declared.
them from its property (if their license was withdrawn by the bishop).\(^{346}\) Still labouring under a conviction that the Board indeed had the authority which Taylor had questioned, Nevill sent a further ultimatum to Taylor requesting a distinct statement of his acceptance of his appointment to Kissy, on or before 15 May, beyond which date "immediate action will be taken by the Board in reference to your conduct".\(^{347}\) Meanwhile, he informed that PC that if they intended to render the authority of the Board effective, it was imperative that they "send authority to enable the Board to act promptly and without delay, if Mr Taylor should refuse to move at the time fixed".\(^{348}\)

CMS response to the fresh difficulties which had emerged in connection with the activity of its newly established Patronage Board was unequivocal.\(^{349}\) The Secretaries explained that "holders of leases" had to be "dealt with under the Articles of Arrangement", and "should the Pastors who hold actual leases resist the instructions of the Patronage Committee, each case would have to be considered on its own merits... and dealt with as may prove feasible under the provision of the Articles of Arrangement". Stating that the Society could not "arbitrarily cancel" the Articles of Arrangement, even if it desire to, they declared that the Patronage Board had exceeded the "function strictly belonging to it, in ordering the removal of those who have... leases under the existing Articles of Arrangement", while the bishop was "manifestly right in declining to withdraw his license simply on account of refusal on the part of any of those pastors to obey the direction of the Board". The only effective solution to the problem, from the CMS point of

\(^{346}\) ibid., no. 87 (xiv), 3 May 1889, Nevill to Taylor.

\(^{347}\) ibid., no. 87 (xvi), 11 May 1889, Nevill to Taylor.

\(^{348}\) CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 86, 17 May 1889, Nevill to Lang.

\(^{349}\) CMS, G3/A1/L 11, pp. 265-269, 26 April 1889, Secretaries to Nevill. They admitted that the situation in question was "in transition... consequently there must be inconsistencies and anomalies which cannot be met perhaps legally or technically".
view, was a Revised Constitution, under which new leases (with new conditions) would be granted to the Pastors. In response to Ingham's enquiry, Lang stated that withdrawing the "local licence" of a Pastor could not be a satisfactory solution since that was not the license referred to in the Articles of Arrangement. It is difficult to say whether this response signified yet another CMS back-down in the face of controversy, or whether it meant that the PC's strongly worded Resolution (of 12 November 1888) had amounted to little more than mere posturing - a muscle flexing exercise convincing enough to deceive its own agents. Whatever the case, the response left both Ingham and Nevill bitterly disappointed and aggrieved. They had been convinced that the PC effectively cancelled Article 8 when they set up the new Patronage scheme and that the scheme was meant to secure all necessary control in the matter of appointments (removing pastors if necessary), until the revision was complete. Ingham described the Secretaries' letter as "an unexpected blow" and lamented the fact that "his having given his consent to appointments which will not now be carried out is another blow to his authority". Embarrassed yet again by the Society's apparent and inexplicable failure to back their own resolution, and frustrated by his own sense of helplessness, the bishop asseverated: "Perhaps... the facts show that the CMS of 25 years ago would have done well to have kept all the native Pastors of the first quarter of a century at least, in the position of stipendiary curates in England, with a truly spiritual Vicar or Rector (who should be English) over a group here and there".

This outburst not only provides a further indication of Ingham's

---


351 ibid.

352 Cf. G3/A1/P2, no. 93, 24 May 1889, Ingham to Wigram; no. 94, 23 May 1889, Nevill to Lang.

353 He complained bitterly that this was the second time he had been "unfortunately misled in this business" (G3/A1/O, no. 92, 24 May 1889, Ingham to Wigram).

354 ibid.
dissatisfaction with the Pastorate experiment (specifically with regards to its provision for self-government), but also raises questions about his motives in advocating the revision of the Articles - a move ostensibly geared towards providing the Native Church with greater autonomy. In the meantime, the CMS reply forced yet another mortifying climb-down (on the removal question) by the bishop, the Secretary of the Mission, and the Patronage Board. At Ingham’s direction, Nevill sent a circular to all the native pastors informing them that

the Bishop had decided that until further notice no pastor lately appointed to a new Pastorate by the Board shall be licensed therunto unless he is willing to proceed as appointed of his own free will; that this is a last effort of the Bishop to remove the feeling of opposition, which the ideal of coercion seems to have produced; that he trusts that the Bishops invitation to co-operate in revising the Articles forthwith will be now responded to; and that they, in the interests of the Church, will proceed as appointed to their new sphere.333

The circular validated Taylor’s resistance and represented another resounding victory for the four dissentient Pastors. The disenchanted members of the Patronage Board declined to make any further appointments,356 and subsequently resigned.357 For a brief while, Nevill applied his mind to concocting various schemes by which removals could be effected within the existing leases. His main suggestion involved "giving a succession of notices to all the Pastors to cease to officiate, and renewing such notices every six months".358 But the idea was rejected by P V Smith as being neither "technically possible" nor "morally speaking... tenable".359 Interestingly, P V Smith, who believed that

333 Cf. G3/A1/P2, no. 94.
357 ibid., no. 126, 23 July 1889, Members of Patronage Board to Lang. "Our further continuance as members of the said Board will in no way contribute to the advancement of the Native Church in its present condition", they wrote.
358 Cf. ibid., no. 99, 4 June 1889, Nevill to Lang; cp. no. 116, 19 July 1889, Nevill to Lang.
359 ibid., no. 117, 20 July 1889, P V Smith to Lang.
"the Articles have never become legally binding on the Society", held the view that CMS "could resume possession on the withdrawal of the Bishop's license, without regard to whether it was rightfully withdrawn or not; and that the remedy of the Pastor, if the license were wrongfully withdrawn, would be against the Bishop and not against us". However, the dubious morality of this approach was unacceptable to the PC; and the Secretaries affirmed that though the Articles had no legal validity "the Committee have all along felt that, whatever might be possible... they were not morally justified in proceeding in the case of existing incumbents otherwise than in accordance with the terms of those Articles". The unavoidable conclusion was that the position adopted by the four Pastors on the removal question was unassailable as long as the Articles of Arrangement remained in force. Their revision, therefore, became the centrepiece in the final struggle for reform.

E. The Sierra Leone Church Constitution

The validation of their position on the removals question arguably strengthened the four Pastors' opposition to revision. When an appeal was made to them (at a Conference of the clergy, held in April 1889) to end their dissent and unite with their brethren in revising the Articles, they maintained an eloquent silence; and Pearce, who vouchsafed a reply, merely stated that he was incompetent to offer an opinion. As the work of revision approached completion, fears were expressed that the four Pastors' dissent was bound to jeopardise the implementation of the revised Articles.

360 ibid., no. 123, 8 August 1889, P V Smith to Lang.
361 ibid., no. 117, 20 July 1889, P V Smith to Lang.
363 Indeed, the PC made the significant admission that "those holding the leases actually executed can if they please appeal to the courts in support of the validity of their leases" (CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 285, 12 July 1889, Secretaries to Nevill).
364 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 93, 24 May 1889, Ingham to Wigram.
Ingham was convinced that they would never get "common consent" while hope of resistance remained; and he implored the PC to make it clear at once that the revised Articles, when adopted, would affect all.\textsuperscript{365} The PC had already intimated that they intended to grant new leases to all the clergy "on the condition of the Revised Articles", and that the four Pastors "would be fairly expected to accept a new lease in lieu of that which they now hold".\textsuperscript{366} But a somewhat damaged confidence in CMS pronouncements induced the Revision Sub-Committee to address a letter to the PC enquire specifically "whether the fact that four Pastors still refuse to join in this revision, while the rest concur, and the general body of the laity are unanimously in its favour, will, after all our effort, be allowed to prevent the consummation we so anxiously desire, viz, your concurrence and imprimatur".\textsuperscript{367} They insisted that unless the PC were prepared to cancel all the old leases and give a definite assurance that new leases would be issued to all the Pastors under the Revised Constitution it would be useless to proceed further. They added: "It is felt by many that any failure on the part of yourselves and this Committee to agree to satisfactory terms will be a signal for disruption, and will wreck the long established influence of the CMS in this Colony, the lack of which the mere loan of their property will not suffice to supply". The four Pastors gave four main reasons for opposing the revision: (1) that they were satisfied with the existing Articles; (2) that no necessity had been proved for revision (which would deprive the Pastors of their status); (3) that there was no desire for revision; and (4) that they did not wish to have their connection with the See of Canterbury cut off.\textsuperscript{368} Nevill described the

\textsuperscript{365} ibid.
\textsuperscript{366} CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 271, 3 May 1889, Lang to Ingham.
\textsuperscript{367} CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 143, 15 July 1889, Revision Sub-Committee to Wigram. The letter was drafted by Ingham (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 142, 27 July 1889, Ingham to Wigram).
\textsuperscript{368} CMS, G3/A1/P 2, no. 136, 14 August 1889, Four pastors to Nevill.
reasons as inadequate, and sought to reassure the Pastors that the new Constitution would neither subject them "to vexatious removals" nor "deprive them of their right of appeal to the See of Canterbury". But fears that the Pastors' rebellion would be disruptive were allayed when the PC gave the much desired undertaking that when the revised Articles came into force "all the clergy will immediately come under them", and that "all will receive new leases and be expected to accept them". Indeed, they emphasised that the contemplated revision (which was provided for by the Articles themselves) would, in CMS opinion, cancel old conditions; and that they would therefore "be acting equitably in ejecting on the withdrawal of the Bishop's licence, and should not hesitate to do so".

Events moved swiftly to a final and open confrontation between the Bishop (and Church Committee) and the four Pastors. The latter prepared themselves for the inevitable by forming "The Sierra Leone Church of England, Clerical and Church Defence Association", which called "for united action on the part of the Pastors"; and, in August 1889, Macauley abruptly declined the appointment to Sherbro. Nevill complained that the four pastors were "sedulously at work trying to disaffect the minds of the other Pastors, and...

---

[^369]: CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 137, 15 August 1889, Nevill to Taylor, Macauley, Pearce and Hazeley.
[^370]: CMS, G3/A1/L 11, pp. 306-312, 13 September 1889, Secretaries (Wigram and Fenn) to Ingham. The PC, they asserted, could "not consent to allow the refusal of any four Pastors to take part in or consent to Revision to, prevent the desired consummation".
[^372]: ibid., 31 August 1889, Macauley to Ingham. "From what I have seen of the place and the nature of the work", he told the bishop, "I regret that I cannot, at this time of my life, on the other side of 50, and in my 31st year of active service, accept the offer of that district, and must at once beg to decline it". Cp. G3/A1/0, no. 146, 30 August 1889, Nevill to Lang; no. 156, 23 September 1889, Ingham to Lang; no. 157, 18 June 1889 Macauley to Ingham. By then, Sherbro had been vacant for over a year.
that in some cases they have been successful”. This campaigning may account for the fact that the four were subsequently joined by Rev H P Thompson, the Pastor of Hastings.

The work of revision was eventually completed in October 1889 (after four years of debate and controversy). The Revised Constitution was unanimously accepted by the General Revision Committee, and approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. After a final approval by the PC, it was returned to the General Revision Committee, in Sierra Leone, with little amendment. The latter endorsed the PC's amendments, and on 4 March 1890, "The Constitution of the Sierra Leone Church" came into effect. It is interesting to note that a significant proportion of the modifications incorporated into the new Constitution reflected the recent crisis. For a start, it embodied the much desired self-regulation and outlawed all appeals to Canterbury by stating that though the Native Church was "a genuine branch of the Church of England so far as it holds its orders doctrines and

373 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 172, 12 October 1889, Nevill to Lang; cp., no. 175, 21 October 1889, Ingham to Lang.

374 H P Thompson was appointed to Hastings by the shortlived Patronage Board. He had appended his signature to the Revised Constitution, but later addressed a memorandum to Ingham objecting to several of the aspects of the new Constitution, including "periodical removals" and the enforced retirement of clergymen (ibid., no. 204, 2 November 1889, Memorandum relative to the "Constitution of the Sierra Leone Church"; cp. no 203, 11 November 1889, Ingham to Lang).

375 Cf. ibid., no. 173, 17 October 1889, Ingham to Lang; no. 175, 21 October 1889, Ingham to Lang; no. 176, 17 October 1889, General Revision Committee to PC. The four Pastors declined to take part in the General meeting.


377 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 30, Resolution of the General Committee of Revision, 4 March 1890; no. 29, 5 March 1890, Ingham to Wigram. Cf. Appendix II.
general forms of worship", it "shall be governed and maintained" in "all matters of discipline and order" in accordance with the revised Articles. The guiding spirit of the new Constitution was centralisation, not self-government.378 Among other things, the revised Articles provided for a more equitable composition (of laity and clergy) in the Church Council and Committee, sanctioned ministerial removals, extended the grounds of complaint against a Pastor to include "any course of action prejudicial to the well-being of the whole Church", and made the ejectment of a Pastor dependent not on the withdrawal of his license but on the "terms of the judgement" in any judicial proceeding.379 The PC abolished the old forms of lease forthwith, and replaced them with new leases under the Revised Constitution.380 They also passed an important resolution, which authorised the CMS Trust Association "to demise the property heretofore leased to individual Pastors to the... Church Committee";381 thus transferring power to eject all who would not sign the new leases to the Native Church.382 This development placed the Church Committee on a collision course with the four Pastors, who repudiated the new Constitution and refused to sign the new leases.383 They informed Ingham that they were "unable to place themselves under the guidance of the Rules of a Constitution, the legality of which is still and open question, and to which we

378 An example was the formation of a School Board (see Article ix of the New Constitution) which many feared would destroy the authority and control of local managers (cf, CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 191, 25 October 1889, letter from members of Parochial Committee and School Managers of Christ Church district to the Bishop; no. 204, Memorandum relative to the "Constitution of Sierra Leone").

379 See Appendix II.

380 CMS, G3/A1/L 11, p. 388, 9 April 1890, Torch to Leversuch; p. 401, 13 August 1890, Lang to Ingham.

381 CMS, G3/A1/L 11, pp. 403-404, Resolutions of General Committee (12 August 1890); p. 401, 13 August 1890, Lang to Ingham.

382 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/P2, no 84., 23 July 1891, Ingham to Lang.

383 Cp. CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 4, 10 December 1890, Moore to Lang; no. 58, 1 May 1891, W J Humphrey (Secretary of Mission) to Lang; no. 59, 1 May 1891, Ingham to Lang.
have never at anytime either expressly or by implication assented". The four Pastors, joined by H P Thompson, hired the legal services of Samuel Lewis to contest the right of the CMS or the Church Committee to eject them from the property (under the terms of a lease they had not signed). The fact that the new leases were "so worded by the PC that the pastors must either accept the new Constitution or vacate the property" made legal action unavoidable. Fearful of the disruptive impact of taking action against their own Pastors, Ingham and the Church Committee requested the Society, as the stronger body, to take the necessary legal action against the Pastors, and so avert the risk of dividing the Church. The PC immediately responded that the responsibility and costs of taking the necessary legal steps to eject the recalcitrant Pastors must rest the Church Committee. But, being owners of the property, the Society was drawn into the prolonged and painful litigation against the five Pastors, which ended in a victory for the latter but inflicted immeasurable damage on the Native Church.

(i) A Fading Vision

The "Five Pastors' Case" was the shattering climax to an era of unrelenting internal strife (dating back to the late 1870s). It marked the nadir in the working of an experiment which had, for three decades, embodied the hope and aspirations of the vast majority of native Christians on the

---

38^4 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 62, 23 April 1891, Taylor, Macauley, Pearce and Hazeley to Ingham.
38^6 CMS, G3/A1/P2, no. 84, 23 July 1891, Ingham to Lang.
38^8 The details of the "Five Pastors' Case" are outside the purview of this work; but it should be mentioned that the congregations involved became bitterly divided (for and against the Pastors), with the result that some of the Pastors were forcibly ejected, while large numbers left the Pastorate to join other denominations (for more details, see CMS, G3/A1/P2, pp. 78b-155b (1890-1896); Johnson, 1953, pp. 65-69; Fyfe, 1962, p. 510--511).
West African coast. The irremediable feuding between "Pastors, Prelate and People" signalled that the Pastorate experiment had lost its way and liable to self-destruct. Admittedly, there was, by the end of Cheetham's episcopate, a need for Venn's scheme to be re-examined, in the light of the Pastorate's rapid and tendentious expansion. Venn had predicted that a hasty CMS withdrawal would lead to "confusion and calamities"; but even he would have been surprised by the violent conflicts between clergy and laity which that withdrawal unleashed. The belligerent and persistent demands of the leading laymen for greater control could not be ignored; and practical common sense dictated that the Articles of Arrangement, which anticipated but failed to provide for the euthanasia of a Mission, should be reviewed and revised. It was the greatest misfortune that such a crucial and vital undertaking should fall to the headship of a prelate who deprecated all that the Pastorate stood for. Imbued with notions of episcopal supremacy (probably garnered from his experiences in Bermuda), and convinced of the moral and spiritual superiority of his race, Ingham had little sympathy for an experiment which fostered native self-determination. He denounced the

389 The Rev J B Bowen observed, in 1895, that "endless wranglings and fruitless litigations" had made the Native Church "the laughing-stock of all the other churches, and of the Mohammedans and Heathen in the colony" (Sermon preached on 7 May 1895, on the 33rd Anniversary of the Pastorate Auxiliary).

390 Macauley wrote: "I am inclined to think that the Bishop's early association and re-collections of the Negro in the land of his servitude, have so influenced his mind and biased his judgement as to disqualify him to form a true estimate of the race, even when he finds him in a totally altered condition" (CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 143, 31 May 1888, Macauley to Lang). Cp. G3/A1/O, no. 142, 27 July 1889, Ingham to Wigram. 

391 Cf. CMS, G3/A1/O, no. 142, 27 July 1889, Ingham to Wigram. "These men", he complained, "have so completely identified themselves with the independence of English clergy that they do not even consult me when they make important changes". As a case in point, he discovered, to his chagrin, that choral services proliferated in the Pastorate churches, despite his expressed disapproval of the practice (ibid.; cp. 3/A1/O, no. 39, 10 March 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary; no. 69, 9 June 1884, Williams to Lay Secretary). Ayandele affirms that the bishop saw himself as no more than a chaplain (1970, p. 152).
Native Pastorate as ill-conceived, and declared that "as I look back on what CMS did I am bound to say that I think the then Committee sacrificed practical common sense to a theory and I look to them now, in the light of experiences in Sierra Leone, Abeokuta and on the Niger, to discover a sounder principle of action". The bishop was therefore motivated not by the need to give the experiment a new impetus but by a determination to disable it and reinforce his own authority. He was, by his own admission, the wrong bishop, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. By investigating the Native Church's readiness for a native episcopate, the CMS evinced a continuing commitment to Venn's theory; yet its uncritical support of a bishop who was opposed to that concept would seem to suggest otherwise. The overwhelming impression is that the spirit of Venn lingered, rather than dictated attitudes, at Salisbury Square; and that institutional self-interest took precedence to theoretical formulations. The four (or five) Pastors' resistance - their motives must remain a moot point - stemmed from a conviction that the current of change would "operate disastrously against the welfare of the Native Church". But their loyalty was to a fading vision; and without the mandate of those whom they claimed to defend their stance was ill-fated. In a nutshell, the Pastorate experiment came to grief at the very point at which its energies for self-support and self-government were released; or, in a scriptural paraphrase, it had come to the point of birth, but there was no strength to

392 CMS, G3/A1/0, no. 142, 27 July 1889, Ingham to Wigram. He criticized the CMS for establishing a scheme which created a native ministry on the lines of English incumbencies, and, somewhat contradictorily, argued that the ministry would have been much better if English clergy had been left here and there. He also pointed to racial conflict in the Niger Mission, and unrest in other parts of his diocese as proof that the scheme was a big mistake.

393 "Had I known all that I know now", he commented, "the extreme peculiarities of Sierra Leone, the race feeling, tribal feeling, hypocrisy, and worldliness, and sensuality of the Sierra Leone Church, and the feebleness of its Pastorate, I should not have dared, at my age, to have faced such a problem... (ibid.)."
deliver.\textsuperscript{394}

\textsuperscript{394} Cf. 2 Kings 19:3.
The concept of a Native Pastorate was based on the theory that "the settlement of a native Church, under native pastors, upon a self-supporting system", was the ultimate object of a mission. Its guiding principles were self-support, self-government and self-propagation, and its obvious strategic benefits (to the parent Missionary Society) inspired speedy implementation. Sierra Leone, the oldest and most successful mission field of the CMS, was the ideal laboratory. With teeming congregations, a burgeoning native ministry, self-supporting primary schools, a theological training establishment, and the well-established practice of weekly class payments, the Mission seemingly portrayed a true capacity for independence and self-support. The Sierra Leone Native Pastorate became "the great experiment of modern Missions"; with the CMS as administrator, Venn (the chief architect of the Pastorate concept) as the strategist, and the Articles of Arrangement as the blueprint. The native Pastors and native congregations were the subjects, and the European missionaries on the ground were cast as facilitators. The scheme was founded on farsighted theoretical formulations, but it had no timetable. Indeed, none could be given; for there was no prototype and the operational dynamics had to be worked out within the Sierra Leone situation. There was, at the time, over 45 years of missionary enterprise in Sierra Leone to draw from; yet the context had certain peculiarities which were not well judged, or taken into consideration. The transformation of a Mission into an independent, self-governing Native Church was a laudable undertaking, but the operation faced immense obstacles and perpetual difficulty. Some of these were inherent in the scheme, others were the result of precipitate or ill-judged action, and still others were generated by a combination of historical circumstance and unpredictable human behaviour.

It cannot be emphasised too strongly that the paramount
difficulty was the financial one. Lack of adequate financial resources was the bane of the Pastorate experiment and the rock on which it foundered. CMS, and more precisely Venn's, misjudgment of the financial capacity of the nascent Native Church put the experiment at great risk, even before it begun. The initial caution which prompted repeated warnings that it was best to commence with only a few hand picked churches, was discarded in the wake of Bishop Beckles' sedulous but ill-judged efforts, and the Pastorate was inaugurated with no less than nine parishes. Composed exclusively of rural congregations, and burdened with a legacy of expensive and dilapidated structures, the newly formed Native Pastorate faced certain collapse. Socio-economic factors - notably, migration from the villages - and the vicious constraints of a precarious economic environment, which lacked any established industry (agricultural or mechanical), militated strongly against the realization of self-support. At that stage, the wealthy native merchants of Freetown - whose activity had inspired Venn's vision of a self-reliant Native Church in Sierra Leone - were wholly excluded from the equation by virtue of their concentration in the churches retained by the CMS. Lacking the pull of self-interest, they remained impervious to the repeated calls from the hard-pressed Church Committee and Pastorate Auxiliary, for enlarged contributions to the Pastorate; and a good many were persuaded that they had fulfilled their Christian duty by paying the same class pence as the much poorer villagers. The Pastorate owed its survival to a large infusion of grants-in-aid from both the CMS and the government. This circumstance was of dubious necessity; for the integrity of the experiment would probably have been preserved by reducing the number of Pastorate stations to a more manageable nucleus. But there was little chance of such a reversal of policy as long as reducing CMS expenses (by the transfer of churches to the Native Church Fund) remained a prime motive behind the scheme. The substantial external aid created a dependence on the Parent Society which ran counter to the genius of the experiment, subverted the growth of
self-determination, and gave hostages to the future.

The Native Pastorate experiment encountered a major roadblock in European missionary opposition. Venn’s under-estimation of this particular difficulty (at least in the early stages) represented a significant blind spot in his thinking. Imbued with a spirit of paternalism (engendered by decades of foreign domination), influenced by deep-seated territorial feelings, and habituated to the subordination of native ministers, European missionaries found the Pastorate concept hard to swallow. To most, if not all, the transfer of churches and stations (founded and developed by European missionary sweat and sacrifice) from European control to native clergymen – who had been their converts not so long before – was retrogressive and foolhardy in the extreme. To be sure, some of the native Christians shared that view. But while these came to embrace a scheme which fostered native advancement, the European missionaries in the colony remained steadfastly opposed to the experiment. The moral failings and shortcomings of native clergymen and ministers, of which there were many instances, were seized on with self-righteous disdain and held up as compelling evidence of the inadvisability of placing natives in positions of unsupervised leadership. Venn reacted sharply to calls – specifically from Bishop Beckles (1860-1870) – for the re-introduction of European missionary superintendence, and underlined his commitment to the ideals of the experiment by declaring that such a move would frustrate the training of the Native Church to self-government. That he should, shortly after, sanction the appointment of a European missionary as Rural Dean – effectively letting in European superintendence by the back door – was inconsistent and inauspicious. Whatever the risks, it would have been far more in keeping with the ideals of the experiment, and a useful means of training the Native Church in the principles of self-government, that an experienced and much respected native Pastor like G Nicol should have been brought forward and given a supervisory role over the other native ministers.
Venn's reticence in that regard is disquieting, and rather underlines the fact that despite his revolutionary thinking, he was very much a man of his time, who (in the words of Peter Williams) "could sometimes appear to be irritatingly conservative and cautious".¹ It is possible that the weight of European opinion had convinced him that the native clergymen were indeed as yet incapable of holding positions of responsibility, but it is more likely that he balked at alienating an antagonistic European missionary element and jeopardising the vital CMS support by insisting on native superintendence.

The principles and ideals of the Pastorate challenged the European missionary attitude of paternalism and innate superiority; while the rise of an ordained native ministry, free from European missionary supervision, shattered the myth of European indispensability. Furthermore, the notion of an independent Native Church and the ideal of self-government ignited native aspirations and helped greatly to awakened a certain "nationalistic" fervour. The creeping racial tension (which pre-dated the Pastorate) eventually exploded into a full-scale controversy, in the early 1870s. The race controversy engendered strong anti-European feelings among the native clergy and leading native laymen and produced concerted attacks on the cultural ethnocentrism of European missionary enterprise in the West African region. Most significantly, it gave rise to "Ethiopianism" and the first definitive calls from native Christians themselves for an independent, non-denominational, African Church, free from all foreign element in its government and offices. This movement provided the first instance in which the Pastorate concept was ambushed by elements within its host environment, re-interpreted (in a bid to endow it with a more meaningful resonance), and given a completely new thrust. Its chief significance lay in the fact that it was the product of native self-perception - an attempt to make the experiment

¹ Williams, 1990, p. 12.
their own - and not a concept imposed from outside. However, the Native Church's financial incapacity (epitomised by its dependence on CMS aid) was a fatal flaw in the bid for ecclesiastical independence; and the agitation quickly subsided when it became clear that foreign support would be instantly withdrawn with the removal of foreign agents. From another point of view, the movement was decidedly premature; not least because it is debatable whether it had any appeal beyond the cluster of native intelligentsia, who gave it its rhetoric and impetus. It certainly failed to convince all the native clergy; and there is a suspicion that in a society built on philanthropy and conditioned by decades of dependency, a good many paid lip service to the ideal of ecclesiastical independence with no intention of bearing its costs. Even so, the lack of self-support arguably vitiated the Native Pastorate's natural development; and for the next decade its progress was determined less by local factors than by a foreign agenda. The abbreviated rise of "Ethiopianism" had failed to give birth to a purely African or "national" Church, but in a somewhat convoluted manner it hastened the *euthanasia of a Mission* - when the European element was almost entirely removed.

By the 1870s, the CMS had already become restive about the seemingly stunted growth of the Native Pastorate; and though the experiment still suffered from a severe financial handicap, its growth and consolidation was pursued with great vigour under Bishop Cheetham (1871-1880). The sudden reduction in the number of European missionaries which the race controversy induced, provided a perfect pretext for a CMS policy of systematic withdrawal. Within the space of five years (1875-1880), all the remaining CMS stations and missions in the colony, were transferred to the ill-equipped and impoverished Native Pastorate. It was certainly consistent with the objectives of the experiment that the Society should gradually withdraw from remaining stations as the Native Church grew stronger and became more self-supporting; and, on the face of things, the CMS action
appeared to be inspired by a commitment to Venn's theory. But institutional self-interest rather than the development and well-being of the Pastorate was at the heart of the CMS policy. Beset by economic depression in the colony, and financially crippled by the sudden withdrawal of the government grant (in 1876), the Pastorate was greatly imperilled by the precipitate CMS withdrawal and its improvident enlargement. The experiment, to be sure, survived the immediate crisis (by virtue of Bishop Cheetham's enterprising leadership), but the artificially induced growth (or expansion) violated its basic principles, thus sowing the seeds of a major disruption. From then on, the experiment began to lose its way; and, waylaid by forces unleashed by its enlargement, it was drawn inexorably into its deepest crisis.

Possibly the most profound (and inherent) weakness in the Native Pastorate scheme was the fact that the transition process from Mission to independent Native Church tended to create power vacuums. In the early stages, the European missionary, whose dominant and authoritarian leadership had been the mainspring of the Mission, was replaced by the native Pastor, who had neither his intrinsic authority or venerated status. The native Pastors were faced with the difficulty task of asserting their authority over the native congregation, and, having only the example of the European missionary to follow, they strove to re-invent the European missionary's domineering presence. The chronic friction between many Pastors and their parishioners which ensued (only partly addressed by the abolishment of Class Leaders - see p. 216f.) turned out to be a veritable time-bomb. It was effectively triggered by the CMS' complete withdrawal, which created yet another power vacuum, by virtue of the fact that the Society's financial support had given it a dominant voice

2 In 1888, the Honourable T J Sawyerr asserted that the manner in which some Pastors exercised church discipline was one of the causes of the Pastorate' declining finances (CMS, G3/A1/0/1888, no. 80, Paper on "Native Pastorate Finance", by T J Sawyerr).
in affairs of the Pastorate. Deeply resentful of the authoritarian mien of the native Pastors, the wealthy laymen, who were concentrated in the newly transferred town churches, argued that the laity (who provided the financial support for the Pastorate) were the natural successors to Society, and demanded a controlling voice in the affairs of the Pastorate. The resulting power struggle and internal strife heightened considerably with the advent of a weak and immature prelate (in Bishop Ingham, 1883-1896), who rejected the principles of the experiment and sided with the laity out of a desire to exercise greater control over his clergy. Expanded beyond its means, bankrupted by the withdrawal of the CMS grants, and torn by internal dissension (which climaxed in the "Five Pastors Case"), the Native Pastorate ended up a caricature of the self-supporting, self-propagating, self-governing entity it was meant to embody. The hotly disputed constitutional reform of 1890 effected important structural adjustments, but did little to re-activate the fading vision.

The most scathing criticism of the Sierra Leone Native Pastorate experiment has come from Stephen Neill, who describes it as a "premature and ill-considered" attempt to create an independent Church,\(^3\) and who claims that "the complete withdrawal of the missionaries from participating in the affairs of the Pastorate inflicted on the Church a paralysis from which a whole century did not avail to deliver it".\(^4\) Yates counters Neill's criticism,\(^5\) and argues, among other things that "if the implementation of the policy of self-support and self-propagation and self-government was premature, there was little to demonstrate it in the first thirty-five years of the Native Pastorate Church's life at least in relation to self-support and attempted self-propagation". Neill's criticism is based on a strong

---

disapproval of the separation between Church and Mission; but though his contention that CMS support was too rapidly withdrawn could be sustained, he shows a poor understanding of Venn's concept. His allegation that the Pastorate experiment was premature has no sound basis, and he seems unaware of the overwhelming problems which continued European missionary involvement created within the Native Pastorate. But to suggest, as Yates does, that the elements of self-support and self-propagation were amply demonstrated in the first 35 years of the Pastorate rather over-stretches the evidence. The Pastorate made significant strides towards self-support, to be sure, but its financial inadequacies as an institution were palpably evident. What is open to debate is whether the scheme failed to unlock the "potential" for self-support - considering the fact that a single native entrepreneur (the Honourable T J Sawyerr) donated £1000 to the Church in 1883. In this regard, it is interesting to note that the wealthy churchmen, who could conceivably have rescued the operation, only began to show an active interest when the Pastorate became entirely "native" and their churches became part of the experiment. This circumstance leads naturally to the conjecture that Venn and the Society may have chosen the wrong starting-point. But, at the same time, the fact that these same churchmen (inspired by CMS' relations with both its missionaries and the Native Church) insisted on lay control as a prerequisite for their badly needed financial support leads one to query whether Venn interpreted the native merchant's declaration correctly, and whether the experiment would not have benefited enormously from some preliminary consultation with the target group.

6 Cf. J L C Horstead (Bishop of Sierra Leone, 1936-61), 'Towards an Indigenous Church in Sierra Leone' in The East and West Review. An Anglican Missionary Quarterly Magazine, (April 1946), 41-46. Horstead, for instance, laments the fact that at a time (80 years after the establishment of the Native Pastorate) "when other denominations were drawing heavily upon Britain and America for support in their missionary endeavours" the Native Church faced her task "largely unaided... as far as the pastoral and evangelistic work is concerned..."
Self-extension was probably the most defective component in the Native Pastorate scheme; and Venn, who was possibly misled by the fact that Sierra Leone Christians had made such a significant missionary impact in other parts of West Africa, is hardly to blame for this. But the deficiency could be described as a CMS legacy. As early as 1866, Venn recognised that "a prominent defect" of CMS missionary enterprise in Sierra Leone was "the feebleness of our attempts to cultivate the languages around Sierra Leone, and to provide versions of God's blessed volume, and send forth native evangelists to speak the great things of God in the vernacular languages". Indeed, the majority of the Society's missionaries, who clustered around Freetown, not only failed to learn the native languages or Arabic, but also (as Blyden observed in 1871) showed a disinclination to itinerate into the interior. Fourah Bay College was equally ineffectual in this regard; for while its curriculum imbued its students with the classics, the native languages were in the main neglected.

It is hardly surprising therefore that the Native Church was manifestly tardy in the area of self-propagation. Steeped in an English-style Christianity, which served first and foremost as a status symbol, the native Christians simply ignored the growing Muslim and non-Christian population in their midst (beyond a certain alarm that their domain of Christian respectability and western

7 CMS, C A1/L8, p. 99, 23 August 1866, Venn to Quaker. "I am filled with self-reproach for my share of responsibility in this neglect", he continued lugubriously, "and more so because God gave us such linguists as Schön, Schlenker and Koelle: and we failed to make full use of their labours or to raise up native linguists to carry out and to multiply their work".

8 This needs clarification. The work of early linguists like Koelle was not continued, while the appointment of the very gifted Henry Johnson to Fourah Bay College was strenuously opposed by Alcock (cf. CMS, C A1/L8, 23 August 1866, Venn to Quaker; p. 254, 23 August 1669, Venn to Quaker; C A1/M 17, pp. 399-400, September 1869, Alcock to Secretaries). Johnson was subsequently transferred to the Yoruba Mission. It will also be remembered that the attempt to utilise E Blyden's linguistic skills (particularly his knowledge of Arabic) failed. See, however, P E H Hair's article 'Colonial Freetown and the study of African languages' in Africa 57 (1987) 4, 560-565.
cultural values was being invaded). Venn's expectation that the Pastorate would "act as a nursery for Missions into the interior" was never fulfilled (within our period of study); for even when the Bullom and Quiah missions were added to the Native Church (in 1876) its missionary efforts were ineffective, due ostensibly to shortage of men and means. A penetrating commentary on the native congregation's failure in the area of self-propagation is provided by Rev S Spain, a native clergymen:

Here we are surrounded... with a wide expanse of heathenism which may reward the earnest worker; but from our unfortunate training we are out of sympathy with the surrounding heathen: we are by our language and dress and habits almost as much foreigners to them as Europeans are. They call us Englishmen, and the difficulty of our assimilating with them is great. Hence a great Church proceeding from Sierra Leone and extending to the interior is, under present circumstances, hardly feasible.

It is beyond dispute that the Native Pastorate became self-governing to a significant extent, as native clergymen and laymen gradually took control of its affairs. But the ideal, and crowning glory of the experiment, was undoubtedly a native episcopate. Beyerhaus observes that as an Anglican, when Venn "conceived the idea of independent churches, he was thinking not only of local congregations, but of a whole


10 Cf. CMS, C A1/L5, p. 195, 29 March 1854, Venn to Vidal.

11 In 1895, Archdeacon Robbin wrote: "It is to be regretted that the scheme for the pecuniary support of the Native Church is such that the greater part of the money raised cannot be given for missionary operations. The question of means and men for work among the Heathen and Mohammedans in the neighbourhood, must sooner or later be faced by the Church if she means to 'lengthen her cords'" - article 'The Sierra Leone Mission' in CMG, xiv (May 1895), p. 67.

diocese under a native bishop". As long as the Native Church remained under a European bishop and the CMS maintained its policy of remote control (by virtue of its ownership of property), the Church was under foreign domination and neither self-governing nor completely independent. The connection between self-support and self-government has been questioned, but it is worth reiterating that the native Christians themselves felt strongly that without self-support the Church would not be truly self-governing. This frame of mind may have been the result of CMS propaganda; but the argument that there was no need for a native bishop as long as the Church continued to benefit (at no cost to itself) from the services of a European bishop provided by the colonial government, was a particularly strong one; even if it was symptomatic of the dependency which the Pastorate concept was meant to eradicate. Again, it is not out of the question that where one native layman had provided £1000, ten or even twenty could provide £10,000. But history does not always provide simple answers; and in the end, the bitter divisions in the Church effectively spiked the progress towards self-determination, and left the Pastorate with unfulfilled hopes.
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ARTICLES of a PROPOSED ARRANGEMENT between the Bishop of Sierra Leone (Dr Vidal) and the CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, in respect of the regulation of the Native Church in the Colony of Sierra Leone, (March 1853).

N.B. This arrangement was submitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London (Dr. Bloomfield), and received their approval: but it was not carried into effect, owing to the early death of Bishop Vidal.

ARTICLE 1 - General principle of the proposed arrangement.

That the charge and superintendence of the Native Pastors and Christian Congregations which have been, or may hereafter be raised up through the instrumentality of the Society’s Mission in Sierra Leone, be placed under the Bishop of Sierra Leone, assisted by a Council, and by a Church Committee. And that arrangements be proposed for providing the Native Pastors with a suitable income from local resources, and also for giving them a status assimilated to that of Perpetual Curates or Incumbents at Home.

ARTICLE 2 - The Church Fund.

That a fund be instituted in Sierra Leone, to be called "The Church Fund", to receive subscriptions and Donations, and to which the weekly payments hitherto made to the Society of one halfpenny from each adult shall be transferred. From this Fund shall be paid:

(1) The Stipends of Native Pastors.
(2) The repairing of Churches and Chapels.
(3) The building of new Churches and Chapels and Parsonages.

That, for the present, two-thirds of the Church Fund be appropriated to the first head, and one-third to the two last.

ARTICLE 3 - The Church Committee.

That a Church Committee be annually appointed for the collection and disbursement of the Sierra Leone Church Fund, to be called "The Sierra Leone Church Committee."

That this Committee be appointed in the first instance by the Bishop and the Society conjointly, one-half being clerical and one-half lay, and hereafter in such way as may best secure the full confidence and co-operation of the Native population. The Bishop or his Commissary to be ex officio President of such committee.

---

1 For a copy of the Articles of Arrangement, see Papers on Africa, Mauritius, China, New Zealand, pp. 43-49, located at Partnership House Library (incorporating CMS Library), 157 Waterloo Road, London.
ARTICLE 4 - The Church Council.

That a Church Council be elected triennially, the members of the same being re-eligible: to consist at first of five members, of whom three shall constitute a quorum; but eventually, when the number of licensed Ministers shall be increased, it shall consist of seven members, of whom five shall constitute a quorum. The Bishop and the Society shall each nominate one clerical and one lay member, and all licensed Ministers in full Orders, or the major part of them, shall elect at first one clerical member, and eventually two clerical and one lay member.

In the proposed appointment of a Church Council, should it so happen that one and the same person should be nominated by different parties, so that a fresh nomination may be required to make up the full number, such fresh nomination shall take place in the following way and order of precedence. The Bishop shall have the option of a second nomination, if one or both members of his first nomination have been chosen by other parties: and after the Bishop, the Society shall have a second nomination, if such be required to make up the requisite number. Also, if a member of the Council shall die, resign, or cease to reside in the Colony, the party which had nominated such member, shall appoint a new member in his room.

ARTICLE 5 - Formation of Parishes, or Ecclesiastical Districts.

That when a District attached to a Church or Chapel belonging to the Society shall be recognised as an Ecclesiastical District by the Bishop and major part of the Council constituted as above, a Native Pastor, in full orders, shall be duly licensed to the same: and the Church members of such Districts shall elect officers to exercise, as far as practicable, the usual contributions of that Congregation towards the Church Fund (Article 2), the same to be transmitted immediately to the Treasurer of that Fund.

ARTICLE 6 - Stipends of Native Pastors.

That the Church Committee shall settle and engage with the Bishop for the payment of annual stipends to Native Pastors, duly licensed to such Churches, subject to such conditions and limitations as hereafter prescribed.

ARTICLE 7 - Judicial proceedings against Native Pastors.

That a complaint may be brought before the Bishop and Council, against a Native Pastor, either by the Bishop himself, as by any member of the Council, or by direction of the Church Missionary Society: and that moral misconduct, wilful neglect of ministerial duty, or general unfitness, as well as all offence cognizable by the Ecclesiastical Law of England, be sufficient grounds of such complaint.

That all proceedings before the Bishop and Council against any Native Pastor be conducted in a formal manner, and as far as possible according to the spirit and laws of the United Church of England and Ireland. And that the Bishop or his Commissary shall, ten days at least before the
holding of any such inquiry, cause notice to be given to each member of
the Council in the colony of the time and subject of such inquiry.

ARTICLE 8 - Patronage of Churches belonging to the Society.

That the Church Missionary Society shall for the present continue to hold
the Churches and Mission Houses which already belong to it; and shall also
receive and hold any buildings or endowments which may hereafter be
assigned to it. And that the Patronage of the Society's Churches and
Chapels shall rest for the present with the Society, to be exercised in
Sierra Leone by parties upon the spot, whom they may appoint, who shall
select and present Native Pastors in full Orders to the Bishop, for his
approval and licence. But should they fail to make such presentation
within six months after a vacancy by the death or resignation of the
Pastor, or the presentation for that turn shall lapse to the Bishop, as
in the case of incumbencies at home.

ARTICLE 9 - Nature of the tenure by which Native Pastors shall hold
Churches belonging to the Society.

That the Society agrees not to dispossess of his House or Church any
Native Pastor so nominated by them, or in case of their default by the
Bishop, so long as he continues to hold the Bishop's licence; and to
dispossess every such Pastor as soon as legally and conveniently may be
after the withdrawal of such licence. Provided, in the first case, that
the licence shall not have been continued by the Bishop contrary to a
request of the major part of the Council to be constituted as aforesaid,
that the same should be withdrawn; and in the second case, that the
licence shall not have been withdrawn by the Bishop without the assent of
the major part of the said Council, after the case had been heard by the
Bishop or his Commissary and his Council. Provided also, that if a case
shall occur in which the Bishop shall deem himself to be bound by law or
conscience to act against the judgment of his Council, such case shall be
regarded as exceptional, and be made the subject of special arrangement
between the Society and the Bishop: or the Society shall be at liberty in
such case to terminate this agreement altogether.

That in order to give effect to the provisions of the foregoing Articles,
so far as the same are capable of being practically carried out under the
circumstances, the Society shall give to each native Pastor presented by
them to a District, and licensed by the Bishop, a lease of the parsonage,
glebe, and church, attached to such District, during his incumbency, but
to terminate upon the withdrawal of the Bishop's licence. A counterpart
of every such lease shall be executed by the lessee, and delivered to and
kept by the authorised agent of the Society in the Colony.

And in order to provide for a case in which it may be proper in the
judgment of the Bishop, with the assent of the major part of the Council,
to interdict a Native Pastor from officiating, whom may be formally
charged with any offence cognizable by the Ecclesiastical Law of England,
or with any such misconduct, neglect, or unfitness, as is specified in
Article 7, until the course of proceeding directed in that Article shall
have been brought to a conclusion, every such lease shall contain a
provision, that the Native Pastor shall, upon receiving a notice to that
effect, signed by the Bishop, cease to officiate in the said Church, and
allow any person named by the Bishop, peaceably to occupy, hold possession
of, and officiate in the said Church, until such charge shall be dismissed or adjudicated upon in the manner provided for in Article 7. Provided, however, that unless steps shall be taken and prosecuted with effect to obtain a decision by the Bishop and Council as aforesaid, upon the matters complained of, within six months from the time of such notice being given by the Bishop, the right of the person so named by the Bishop, at last aforesaid, to the possession of the said Church, shall cease and be determined.

That every such lease shall contain all proper and usual clauses, regard being paid to the circumstances of the case, including a covenant to repair, subject, however, to a provision for the surveying from time to time of the parsonage house and premises, in order to ascertain that the same are kept in proper repair. And if it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the Bishop or his Commissary that any such home or premises are not in proper repair, then the Bishop or his Commissary shall specify what proportion of the annual stipend attached by Article 6 to the District should be apportioned to such repairs. And a provision shall be introduced into every such agreement as the Church Committee shall make with the Bishop (as mentioned in Article 6) for the allowance of stipends to Native Ministers, authorizing the withholding of a proportion of the stipend, under an order to that effect from the Bishop or his Commissary, such proportion of the stipend to be applied to the necessary repair of the parsonage house and premises belonging thereto.

ARTICLE 10 - Ordination of Assistant Ministers.

That as Native Pastors presented to the Ecclesiastical Districts, referred to in Article 5, are to be in full Orders, it is expedient that Native Deacons should be ordained and licensed, either as Assistant Missionaries of the Society, or to act as Native Pastors under the superintendence of the Missionaries; until Churches shall be vacant or newly formed, to which they may be licensed.

ARTICLE 11 - Arrangement not to affect Missionaries.

That the foregoing Regulations shall not affect the Missionaries of the Society, strictly so called, whether Native or Europeans, who shall be wholly supported by the funds of the Society, and employed in carrying on its Mission, either within or without the Colony.

ARTICLE 12 - Revision of Arrangement.

Adverting to be the peculiarity of the present arrangement, and the uncertainty which must attend its future execution, until it shall have been fully tried, the Society anticipate a review of its provisions, after it may have been sufficiently tested; and they conceive that such revision may be suitably made before the second or third triennial appointment of the Church Council.
ARTICLE 13 - Nature of this Arrangement.

The Committee are also fully aware that they cannot legally bind the Society, nor can the Bishop bind himself or his successors; but they enter into this arrangement with the bond fide purpose of preparing the Native population in Sierra Leone, as far as it is in their power, for the establishing in that Colony of a genuine branch of the United Church of England and Ireland; and also in the confidence that an arrangement, which sanctioned by the highest Ecclesiastical authorities, will be maintained both by the Society and by the Bishop of Sierra Leone and his successors, in a spirit of mutual confidence and good faith, unless their arise some manifest necessity for setting it aside.
APPENDIX II

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SIERRA LEONE CHURCH [1889]

Article i - Of General Principles.

The Church planted in the Colony of Sierra Leone mainly through the instrumentality of the Church Missionary Society is a genuine branch of the Church of England as far as it holds its orders, doctrines and general forms of worship, but in all matters of discipline and order shall be governed and maintained in accordance with the Articles following, or that nothing be done repugnant to the terms of the existing Charter.

ARTICLE ii - Of Superintendence.

That the superintendence of this Church be committed to the Bishop of Sierra Leone, aided in various departments by a Church Council, a Church Committee, a Church School Board, and a Patronage Board of all of which, except where otherwise provided for, he on his Commissary shall be chairman.

ARTICLE iii - Of the Church Fund.

That the Church Fund receive all annual subscriptions, donations and legacies; two-thirds of the weekly payments from Church members; one-half of the annual sum received by Pew-rents from every Parish in District; and sums raised by special authority of the Church Committees. From this fund shall be paid:

(1) The stipends and pensions of all Pastors, Curates and Catechists.

(2) The expenses connected with the repairing and building of Churches, Chapels and Parsonages; and removal, travelling and other charges.

And the amount to be appropriated to each of the above shall be determined from year to year by the Church Committees.

ARTICLE iv - Of the Church Committee.

That the Church Committee be annually appointed for the management of the Church Fund. This Committee shall consist of eleven members with power to fill up vacancies from names standing next highest on the list the day of election of the nominees of the clerical or by representatives as

---

2 CMS, G3/A1/0/1889, no. 177. This was the New Constitution proposed by the General Committee of Revision (in its unamended form). The PC made minimal amendments (see Chapter 6, p. 463, note 376), after it had received the seal of approval from both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London.
the case may be. Of these the Bishop shall nominate one clerical and one lay member; the Church Missionary Society one clerical and one lay member; Pastors and Curates in full orders and other licensed Clergy of the Diocese resident in Sierra Leone shall elect three Clerical members; and the lay representatives of the various Districts shall elect three lay members. The Bishop's Commissary shall be an ex-officio member. A quorum shall consist five members, of whom two at least shall be laymen.

ARTICLE v - Of the Church Council.

That the Church Council be elected initially, to consist of nine members of whom six shall constitute a quorum. The Bishop and the Church Missionary Society shall each nominate one Clerical and one Lay member; Pastors and Curates in full orders shall elect two Church members; and the lay representatives of the various Districts shall elect two lay members. The Bishop's Commissary shall be an ex officio member. And the Council shall have power to fill up vacancies from names standing next highest on the list on the day of election of the nominees of clerical or lay representatives as the case may be. The Church Council shall assist the Bishop deciding all matters arising out of the government of the Church in connexion with these Articles: and in all judicial proceedings under Article xi the Church Council shall sit with him as assessors.

ARTICLE vi - Of the Patronage Board.

That the Patronage Board be elected initially to consist of seven members of whom four shall form a quorum: the Bishop shall nominate one Clerical and one Lay member. Pastors and Curates in full orders shall elect two Clerical members: the Lay representatives of the various Districts shall elect two Lay members: and the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society shall be an ex officio member. The Board shall elect its own Chairman. The Board shall select and present to the Bishop Clerks in Holy Orders or candidates for Ordination for appointments to Churches or Chapels. All appointments shall be for periods of not less than five years. And no Pastor shall be removed from his station before the close of the five years unless in the opinion of the Bishop-in-Council any emergency affecting the interests of the Church shall as requires. And the Patronage Board shall not burden the funds of the Church Committee without its consent.

ARTICLE vii - Of Church Property.

That all property of the Church Missionary Society and of the Sierra Leone Church be held by lease in the case of all Pastors and Curates whose appointments have been made in accordance with the terms of Article vi. But if any judgment shall have been pronounced under the terms of Article xi against any Pastor or Curate, he shall, if so required by the terms of the judgment, forfeit his lease and shall cease forthwith to officiate in his District; and within six weeks of the date of such judgment shall cease to occupy any property for which he held the lease. And no such Pastor or Curate shall have any claim on the Church Committee for compensation, pension or stipend. And no Pastor or Curate shall
appropriate to his own use or maintenance, without the authority of the Church Committee, any monies raised in the District to which he may be appointed.

ARTICLE viii - Of the Retirement of Pastors and Curates.

That the Patronage Board on the recommendation of the Bishop in a Council have power to decide upon the retirement of any Pastor or Curate. Any Pastor or Curate whose retirement shall be decided upon by the Board shall receive from the Church Fund a sum recommended by the Bishop-in-Council and approved of by the Church Committee of not more than Fifty Pounds per annum. Retired Pastors and Curates shall have the right to vote on Church matters in common with acting Pastors and may undertake any light duty appointed for them by the Bishop. The Church Council shall have power to withdraw the pension of any retired Pastor or Curate who shall refine or neglect to abstain from any business in which he may be engaged or with which he may be connected and which in their opinion shall appear improper.

ARTICLE ix - Of the Church School Board.

That Church School Board be elected initially to consist of fifteen members of whom seven shall from a quorum. The Bishop shall nominate three members of whom one shall be his commissary: The Pastors and licensed Clergy as referred to in Article 9 shall together elect six Clerical members: and the Lay representatives of the various Districts six Lay members. The Board shall receive and disburse Subscriptions and Donations, Government School Funds, the interest annually obtained from Funds invested in the hands of the Church Missionary Society, and all other sums raised by special authority of the Board. The Board shall have the right to supervise all schools. No teacher shall be appointed to any school who has not received a Certificate from the Board. And no such certified teacher shall be disconnected from any school without the consent of the Board whose decision shall be final. the Board shall undertake the annual inspection of schools in religious and secular knowledge by means of a Diocesan Inspector who shall be appointed by the Bishop. Every local body of school managers shall present Quarterly Returns to the Board.

ARTICLE x - Of Parochial Committees.

That a Parochial Committee be elected initially in Easter-week by the adult male Communicants of each Districts. It shall also be a Committee of school managers. It shall consist of not less than six not more than twelve members, and shall elect its own Treasurer and Secretary who shall be two district persons. Church Wardens shall be ex-officio members. Vacancies shall be filled up in the manner provided in Article iv. The Pastor or Curate, when present, shall be Chairman. It shall be lawful for the Committee to make bye-laws not inconsistent with the constitution of the church. Its functions shall be to aid the Pastor in all matters not directly of a spiritual or of a disciplinary character affecting the Church. It shall determine any changes in the building enlargement or repairs of the District Church. Chapel or school alterations in the pews
or fittings of the Church, but which shall not be undertaken without the approval of the Church Committee or the Church School Board. It shall cooperate with the Pastor in the collection of subscriptions, class queries and other dues and shall have the custody of all monies raised in the District for various purposes; except that all Alms at the time of Holy Communion and all special collections shall be at the disposal of the Pastor and wardens. The Bishop-in-Council shall receive and settle appeals from the Pastor and Parochial Committee.

ARTICLE xi - Of Judicial Proceedings.

That an enquiry may be made by the Bishop and Church Council respecting any Pastor or Curate; and if any complaint be made against any Pastor or Curate it shall be laid in writing before the Bishop: and that moral misconduct, wilful neglect of ministerial duty or the due conduct either of public services or class meetings; general unfitness; any course of action prejudicial to the well-being of the District or of the whole church; or any infringement or violation of the Articles of this Constitution be sufficient ground for such enquiry or complaint. The Pastor or Curate shall have the right of representation by a Counsel or Solicitor, and the Bishop shall summon all who can give evidence in the case or either side, and shall ten days at least before the holding of any such enquiry cause notices to be given to each member of the Council in the Colony as well as to the Pastor or Curate concerned of the sum and substance of such enquiry. Any Church member who shall without sufficient reason refuse to obey the summons shall be suspended from Church membership during the pleasure of the Bishop-in-Council. Any Pastor against whom after due enquiry made any of the offence emanated above shall have been sufficiently proved in the opinion of the majority of the whole Council shall according to the nature of offence either be admonished or be suspended from officiating during the pleasure of the Bishop-in-Council (and during which time he shall not be entitled to any stipend or pension from the Church Fund) or forfeit his lease in the manner provided for in Article vii. In the absence of the Bishop Judicial Proceedings shall be conducted by the Bishop's Commissary or the Archdeacon with the Church Council in each case, if they shall have authority granted to them or to do by the Bishop himself.

ARTICLE xii - Of Ecclesiastical Districts.

That the Bishop-in-Council have power to form new Ecclesiastical Districts and to amalgamate and rearrange old Districts.

ARTICLE xiii - Of Church Wardens.

That in every Ecclesiastical District there be two Church wardens to each separate congregation. Church wardens shall be communicant members, to be elected in Easter week one by the Pastor and the other by the adult male communicants of the congregation. Their names shall be forthwith submitted by the Pastor to the Archdeacon or the Bishop's Commissary, and they shall subscribe their monies in the Archdeacon's register on the day of the General Election. It shall be the duty of the Church wardens to have an oversight and inspection of the Church and School fabric and other
Church buildings, and the Pastor or Agent-in-Charge shall afford them all facilities for inspection. They shall report all cases of repairs to the Pastor and the Parochial Committee. They shall, under the direction of the Parochial committee, appropriate pews and collect the pew-rents. They shall observe and report in writing to the Archdeacon or the Bishop's Commissary any irregularity or negligence in the order of public worship; and shall assist the Pastor in the administration of all special collections and of Alms received at the time of Holy Communion. No person who has been convicted of felony shall be eligible to hold the office of Church warden or any other office in the Church. Church wardens can be removed or suspended from office at any time only by the Archdeacon, or the Bishop's Commissary, for moral misconduct, neglect of duty, or insubordination. The Bishop-in-Council shall receive and settle appeals from Church wardens.

ARTICLE xiv - Of Church Elections.

That each District choose from the number of its adult male Communicants in Easter week in each year two delegates who shall, with the Pastor and Wardens, attend at Easter Season an Election Service at the Cathedral at the invitation of the Bishop, the Archdeacon, or the Bishop's Commissary, and subsequently elect members for the various Committees and Councils for the year, and shall present a financial statement for the closing year from each Parochial Committee. Licensed Clergy of the Diocese in full orders and resident in Sierra Leone shall be entitled to attend and vote as provided for in previous Articles. And if any doubt shall arise as to the qualification of any person for election it shall be decided by the Bishop-in-Council. No Layman shall be considered qualified to vote on any Church question who is not a Communicant and who has failed to pay his class pence or its pecuniary equivalent for six months: and any Lay Communicant shall be considered eligible for election on Parochial Committees and to the office of Church warden who has paid his class pence or its pecuniary equivalent during the past year; and on the Church Committee, the Church Council, Church School Board and Patronage Board, who in addition to his class pence or its pecuniary equivalent has paid an annual subscription to the Church Fund of not less than one guinea. The Bishop shall have power to declare eligible any person who may be bona fide unable to qualify according to the terms of this Articles.

ARTICLE xv - Of extra Appointments.

That any Pastor or Curate may accept and hold any dignity, post or office in addition to his pastoral work subject to the permission of the Bishop-in-Council, and to such terms as the Bishop-in-Council shall arrange.

ARTICLE xvi - Of Special Legislation.

That any Bishop and a Combined meeting of the members of the Church Council, Patronage Board and Church Committee have power to frame laws and bye-laws when circumstances not provided for in these Articles may arise. And all such laws and bye-laws shall be binding provided that they are passed by the majority of those present. A quorum shall consist of ten members and notices specifying the proposed laws and bye-laws shall
be given to the members at least fourteen days previous to the day of meeting.

ARTICLE xvii - Of the Nature of this Constitution.

That this Constitution is based on the Articles of Arrangement drawn up in 1853 between the Church Missionary Society and the Bishop of Sierra Leone. And this Constitution of the Sierra Leone Church shall supersede and take the place of the old Articles of Arrangement. And it is hereby provided that any or all of these Articles may be repealed or amended provided that in each case any repeal or amendment be made with the united consent of the Church Missionary Society's Committee, the Bishop, and the majority of a combined meeting of the Church's Council, Patronage Board and Church Committee.