

Typescript (no no. in Letters
with no 77)

MOORE COLLEGE: BROUGHTON LETTERS

Broughton to Coleridge, (22/5/1846)- date on envelope)

~~NO BEGINNING OR FIRST PAGES~~

REV JAS
WALKER

~~pro Irish system~~

What you tell me of Mr Walker is rather singular. He may, it is possible, write amusingly and well: but how he is to give my Lords of H.M. Treasury through their Secretary any correct account of things and persons here must puzzle anyone to think who knows that he has never been 20 miles from Parramatta since he came to the Colony. All he says can be but from hearsay: and be sure he will never say anything, however true, that can displease Lord Stanley or C.E. Trevelyan, to whom he avowedly looks to find appointments for his family of boys. On this account, because the General or Irish system of education was the offspring of Lord S. he wd not stand up heartily against it with me, on the side of the Church of England schools. You say he must be a Whig. I am not sure but he is also a prig; as you shall hear. On the day of our late Diocesan Meeting he was at luncheon with some of the clergy, talking oracularly as he usually does: when he fell foul of the poor Eton Latin Grammar, which he said was a shocking production filled with nothing but faults. For example, said he, there is the Rule 'quum duo substantiva etc....posterius in genitivo ponitur.' Whereas in all good writers the genitive always stands first not last in order. My observation when I heard of the remark was "Then I wonder Juvenal shld not have written, Nummi crescit amor instead of Crescit amor nummi, if the genitive should always stand first." However, as he might object to metrical examples, a better answer was made by Allwood (an Etonian) who was present; and taking down Caesar's Commentaries produced 12 instances in succession of the genitive standing last in order: whereat the critic was considerably dumbfounded. But pray excuse my asking, does not posterius mean the word which stands last of the two in English? This is the sense in which I always understood it.

ALLWOOD

~~AGNEW & SELWYN~~ Agnew and his wife are living quietly in the lodging he had when they were here 12 months ago. He is reading steadily: and next week I begin to give him an examination one day in seven. The B. of N.Z. merely sent me copies of Letters from yourself Dr Pusey and C. Marriott without any but a cold neutral remark, which perplexed me very much. It is evident that he and A. somehow or other did not quite get on together. Of course I never enter upon the subject with Agnew: but should be sorry, after all that you have done, to turn him adrift. I have ~~me~~ an Ordination on the 8th of March, but do not mean to admit him then. I shall keep him three months more on trial and probe him well: and really, so far as I can judge, he may fulfill (sic) all that Dr Pusey promises for him. But the Bishop's evident dissatisfaction disquiets me very much. We have had, strange to say, no news for a month from N.Z. and are beginning to be

P. T. O.

excessively anxious as to what must have occurred there before this time. God bless you my dear Coleridge. Do not over work yourself. I am, Yours most affectionately, W.G. Australia.

Broughton to Coleridge, (22/5/1846) - date on envelope

NO BEGINNING OR FIRST PAGES

What you tell me of Mr Walker is rather singular. He says, it is possible, write earnestly and well: but how he is to give my lords of R.M. Treasury through their Secretary any correct account of things and persons here must puzzle anyone to think who knows that he has never been 20 miles from Farnham since he came to the Colony. All he says can be put from hearsay: and be sure he will never say anything, however true, that can displease Lord Stanley or G.B. Trevelyan, to whom he avowedly looks to find appointments for his family of boys. On this account, because the General or Irish system of education was against it with me, on the side of the Church of England schools. You say he must be a Whig. I am not sure but he is also a Whig: as you shall hear. On the day of our late Diocesan meeting he was at luncheon with some of the clergy, talking oracularly as he usually does: when he fell foul of the poor Rector Latin Grammar, which he said was a shocking production filled with nothing but faults. For example, said he, there is the Rule 'dum duo substantivae etc....' posturing in genitive positur. Whereas in all good writers the genitive always stands first not last in order. My observation when I heard of the remark was "then I wonder Juvenal should not have written, Nummi crescit amor iustas or Crestit amor nummi, if the genitive should always stand first." However, as he might object to metrical examples, a better answer was made by Allwood (an Etolian) who was present; and taking down Caesar's Commentaries produced 12 instances in succession of the genitive standing last in order: whereas the critic was considerably dumfounded. But pray excuse my asking, does not posturing mean the word which stands last of the two in English? This is the sense in which I always understood it.

AGNEW & SELWYN Agnew and his wife are living quietly in the lodging he had when they were here 12 months ago. He is reading steadily; and next week I begin to give him an examination one day in seven. The B. of N.S. merely sent me copies of letters from yourself. Dr Pusey and G. Martineau without any but a cold neutral remark, which perplexed me very much. It is evident that he and A. somehow or other did not quite get on together. Of course I never enter upon the subject with Agnew but should be sorry after all that you have done, to turn him aside. I have an Ordination on the 8th of March, but do not mean to admit him then. I shall keep him three months more on trial and probe him well: and really, so far as I can judge, he may trick (sic) all that Dr Pusey promises for him. But the Bishop's evident dissatisfaction displeases me very much. We have had, strange to say, no news for a month from N.S. and are beginning to be