

MOORE COLLEGE: BROUGHTON LETTERS

Broughton to Coleridge, 9|3|1844

My dear Coleridge: I have safely received your very kind note of Michaelmas day and box of excellent books, by the 'Caledonia'. The unpacking and inspection of them gave me the same sort of satisfaction as must I suppose attend the successive unfolding of each roll of a Herculaneum MS, only, I believe, the most part, at least, of what you have sent is more interesting and 'useful reading. If you can convey my best acknowledgements to the donors, especially Archdeacon Manning (the son I find of Mr Manning whom I have in former days met at Mr Hunter's at Beach Hill) you will confer an additional favour. You mention two boxes with books and prints. If you mean two in addition to that which I am now acknowledging, then one is missing: for me we have received but one: viz by Dr Cowper, with the Bp of N.Z.'s portrait etc: my thanks for which have been long ago conveyed to you.

My last Letters to you were written in December. One forwarded by lady Franklin per 'Rajah', sailed 12th January 44 from Port Phillip: the other from Sydney per 'Constant' sailed 21st December. Most probably you will have received the last first. Herein I hope and believe I acknowledged the safe arrival of all your Letters: but last there shld have been any omission I will, even at the risk of repetition, do so in a more business like way.

*check →*  
*check →*  
You may feel secure than of my having had your long Letter of April 25th: but not yet the copy of 'Aids to Reflection' therein mentioned: I have also your short Letters of 25 June, 3rd August, 2nd September, enclosing communications from Dr Pusey, Palmer, Perceval and others on the Protest. It is often in my thoughts that, owing to my wandering mode of life and almost continual absence from home between the beginning of June 43 and the middle of January last, I have not written so fully as I ought in reply to many of your communications and remarks contained in this series. But let me

MOORE COLLEGE: BROUGHTON LETTERS

Broughton to Coleridge, 9|3|1844 (cont 2)

assure you most affectionately that if so it has not arisen from my failure to read all that you write over and over again and always with fresh gratification; but you must attribute it entirely to the cause above spoken of.

The Letters from other well-known correspondents - well-known I mean by reputation for personally all are strangers to me - were highly satisfactory. So far as they extend they appear to confirm the correctness of my views in the matter of the Protest. I wish indeed that they had gone a little more deeply into the question. This however can hardly be expected so long as the conflict of jurisdiction is confined to the Diocese of Australia: but the case will be otherwise when the same pretension is set up (as it will be in due time) in the Dioceses of Canterbury and London, cum caeteri. I cannot meet with anything in books that helps me much. Mr Perceval's Letter is a little unintelligible to me. he says the natural inference wld be, from the form of protest, with entire silence as to any charge of schism or heterodoxy against the Church of Rome, that I recognize that communion as orthodox and catholic. My reply is that this had nothing to do with the question. The point was whether any other bishop (and I do not dispute but that Dr Polding is one) had canonically a right to exercise his functions within this Diocese, against my will. I deny that right: and if he or his church were, in other respects, as perfectly orthodox and catholic as heart cld wish, I shld not have been a bit more exempt from the duty and necessity of protesting against his acting episcopally here without the consent of the Abp of Canty and myself. Mr P. is also in error when he says 'it would have been better to have waited for the arrival of the titular Abp'. In fact I did wait not only until he arrived but till he had

MOORE COLLEGE: BROUGHTON LETTERS

Broughton to Coleridge, 9|3|1844 (cont 3)

been also (on the Sunday previously) installed and proclaimed with great pomp; and had set forth a plenary indulgence from the pope 'in perp, rei memm': What more have been done than I did is not apparent. Surely Mr P. wld not have advised that I shld excommunicate Dr P with his associates: and yet that seems to be the next and only further process. Your friend Allies sees the matter in the true point of view. The Church of Rome does deny that we belong to the Catholic communion; and therefore acts very consistently in assuming that we have no bishops. This was exactly what I felt, that the intrusion of Dr Polding involved an absolute denial of my character: and you will see all this clearly enough, when that which is now a mere experimm in corp. vili comes to be tried (as I once more say it will be) upon Canty.

The other day I laid my hands upon a document which shows how long this has been my view. It is a paper which I drew up in 1829 (at the time of the passing of the dreadful Act) and which was shown to Lord Ashley by Briscall at that time. My suggestion was that instead of continuing as a test the Declaration against transubstantiation, every R C previously to admission to office shld solemnly recognize the Church of England as 'an independent Church; so as not to be of right subject to any ecclesiastical jurisdiction but such as is now provided and allowed by the laws of this realm'. What I thought I had proved was, that we were justified in demanding this for our own security, and that any R C who wld not admit this was evidently not entitled to the privileges of the Constitution. The Church of Rome wld of course have thundered its denunciations against so heretical an admission: but I think the laity wld have felt the proposal to be so reasonable that they wld have accepted admission to office on such terms: and so it is not impossible, some disunion might have arisen between the lay and ecclesiastical orders. I mean to preserve my paper as a proof that we do not take up our

Broughton to Coleridge, 9|3|1844 (cont 4)

opinions merely for the occasion. Lord Ashley's answer, sent verbally by Briscall, was also rather peculiar. He said he thought highly of my proposal: and it might have been worthy of consideration but that the Bill had now gone so far that no alteration could be made. But, he added, though he had given his own assent to it, yet he would lay down his head upon the block rather than do so, if he thought it possible that the R C (s) in parliament (sic) or elsewhere would ever abuse the privileges granted them to the injury of the Established Church! No doubt he spoke very honestly, but where was his foresight? It does appear to me very like a judicial retribution that the D of W and Sir R P should be now in office to work out the consequences of their own measure: and should find civil war (or something near to it) the actual effect of that, which they justified their own assent to under the plea of necessity to avoid that crisis. However, this has driven me far away from Mr Allies (sic) letter: with whom I fully concur upon another point: namely the episcopal titles.

We are wrong, and the R C(s) are right. In 1835 I told the B of London that mine should be Bishop of Sydney: to which his reply was 'oh! nobody knows where Sydney is'. I was wrong not to press the point. In writing also upon the suggested establishment of the Bishoprick of N Z I proposed to the Abp. that 'Auckland' would be a fine old and appropriate name for the See. Perhaps it is not of much moment: and yet I regret it. So many customs not really catholic are pleaded for, that we should be more tender of surrendering one which is undeniably primitive: that of denominating Bishops from the cities in which their seats were fixed. I recollect only one instance to the contrary: where Ignatius (ad Roman) calls himself 'ton episkopon Syrias' (Gk). But even this does not suffice: for there can be no doubt that his proper title was 'Bishop of Antioch'.

MOORE COLLEGE: BROUGHTON LETTERS

Broughton to Coleridge, 9|3|1844 (cont 5)

Dismissing however such matters I must interpose a word or two on more personal and domestic matters. My wife, is thanks be to God, in such a restored state of health that she no longer occasions me the great uneasiness which I felt and expressed to you, I believe, after my return from Port Phillip in December. Still she cannot bear a hot climate so well as the rest of us. My dear child Phoebe's marriage still lingers. The times are so unprosperous here for settlers that I do not clearly see how her proposed husband can be secure of gaining a livelihood from his farm: and I now, for the first time in my life, begin to regret the want of wealth sufficient to make them independent in some degree at least. On the other hand, he is a good young man: quite unencumbered; and eight years have now gone by since their first meeting on board the Ship Camden, and the commencement of their mutual regard. May it not therefore be unreasonable on my part to object? It seems as if I was not philosopher enough to be content that my child shld go into poverty and obscurity; nor yet christian enough to trust that God will provide better for them. A few weeks must decide what is to be done.

← wife  
Case ??

I am now stationary till the first week in May, when it is my purpose to hold my Visitation here: and then to go over the Southern Districts. In my Charge I wish I may have ability to trace with distinctness the true line of the Church of England amidst the many deviations from it in either direction to which we of this age seem prone. My own clergy in general (I speak of those who understand the subject) are inclined enough to go steadily onward: but they need watching and advice.

Mr Sconce, by an exchange, has removed to Sydney. To this I very willingly gave my sanction; as he is a clever zealous man (for whom I am indebted to

Broughton to Coleridge, 9|3|1844 (cont 6)

you) and quite equal to a large parish if he have discretion. He has printed a small pamphlet on Church obedience, some portions of which plainly show that he starts from some false premises, and is therefore to that extent liable to adopt false conclusions. But I hope we shall go on well.

Pray thank Dr Pusey for the presentation copy of his Sermon. I still think there is nothing wrong in it: though the style and cast of some parts are liable to lead the less informed into a misconception of his opinion: and therefore had been better avoided. We wait with much anxiety the issue of events. Late accounts speak of Dr Wynter as designated Bishop of Lichfield: but I think, after what has happened, this wld be a little too strong and therefore believe Sir Robert will not do it. I have had a visit from the Bishop of Tasmania. We missed each other at Port Phillip: and he very kindly came up by the Fly, Captain Blackwood, and stayed a month with me. We had oceans of talk, for he is full to overflowing; and though discussing all topics with the greatest openness and candour I am sure there was no one point of importance on which we widely differed. We wanted only the presence of our dear third brother to render our satisfaction as complete as this world can often supply. With the latter (N.Z.) my correspondence has been much interrupted by his absence and my absence: but I have a letter ready to send flying across the sea, and hope it will reach its aim just as he arrives at Waimate about the 25th inst. I hope Dr Keate will forgive me; I really mean to write to him. We all rejoice thankfully to hear how well he is, and I send my love to Mrs Keate and Mrs Coleridge accordingly. Ever yours most affectionately, W.G. Australia.