

Early Victorian Periodicals and the Colonial Church of England

Joseph Hardwick

The growth in both the number and circulation of missionary journals is one of the most startling aspects of the general expansion of the religious press in nineteenth-century Britain.¹ While perhaps not the most exciting body of literature ever produced, missionary periodicals have recently started to attract attention from historians, not least because such periodicals were amongst the most popular forms of literature of the Victorian period.² In addition to playing a key role in shaping public understanding of the geography and ethnography of the empire, periodicals have been seen as creating a sense of “imagined community” among colonial and metropolitan readers, which, it has been claimed, was important for the formation of evangelical and middle-class identities.³

One can argue, however, that the study of missionary periodicals has, like the study of religion and empire as a whole, tended to concentrate disproportionate attention on the theme of conversion and the publications of voluntary missionary societies given the broad title “evangelical.”⁴ Focusing on these areas, however, may give us a partial understanding of imperial religion, and may misrepresent the range of groups and agendas involved in overseas missions, which were after all not just about conversion. Hilary Carey’s work reminds us that all the nineteenth-century Christian denominations shared a sense of responsibility toward maintaining Christianity among those other objects of missionary concern: British settlers.⁵ Crucially, concentrating on the work of voluntary missionary organizations has meant that the imperial activities of established and institutional churches has been left in the shadows.

Carey is among those who have sought to redress this imbalance by bringing the established and institutional churches back into the story of imperial mission, and her work, along with that of Rowan Strong and others, has turned the spotlight on the Church of England's engagement with empire.⁶ This Anglican mission ebbed and flowed. One moment of particularly vigorous activity came in the 1830s and 1840s, decades which saw all Church parties – high-church, low-church, and broad-church – respond to increased emigration. Work by Carey and Rowan Strong has shown that key to this period of revived imperial mission were institutions – colonial missionary societies – and, importantly for our purposes, texts – particularly periodicals. While work by Carey and others draws attention to the importance of periodicals in disseminating information and communicating particular understandings of mission, questions remain about their content, their function, the differences between high- and low-church journals, and what such sources tell us about the metropolitan support for the colonial church.

Here we extend Carey's work by examining the role played by periodicals in the Church of England's engagement with empire. Periodicals are crucial for the scholar of imperial religion because they tell us what was distinctive about the missions of different denominations and church groups. Here the focus is on the imperial activities of one group within the Church – the high-church party – and a key high-church periodical, the *Colonial Church Chronicle*. Established in 1847 and sold in both the colonies and Britain, this monthly never enjoyed wide circulation (its monthly circulation of 2,000 put it behind the *Railway Record*),⁷ but it is significant because it was a key vehicle for a distinct strand in Anglican Church expansion that was to be a key influence on the development of institutional religion in the British Empire.⁸ Although often castigated as “high-and-dry,” high-churchmen's brand of imperial mission was distinctive and important as it had a crucial influence on the development of institutional religion in the empire. It considered episcopacy essential to Church extension and a civilized and “English” empire, it emphasized the importance of institu-

tions in the export of English identity, and it was marked by a drive for more centralized ecclesiastical authority, doctrinal unity, and hierarchical church structures. It was also highly élitist, both in terms of its membership and its imperial vision.

This high-church engagement with empire has started to attract attention from historians, and this paper's discussion of the "discourse" of empire articulated in the *Chronicle* builds on this previous research.⁹ This paper differs from previous research in that it argues that periodicals give us a clearer sense of the shortcomings of the high-church imperial project – particularly those relating to problems of funding and Church unity. While the *Chronicle*'s chief function was to disseminate information on empire and raise funds, its pages reveal that high-churchmen harbored anxieties that their support base was too narrow. The *Chronicle* also reveals high-church anxieties about the unity and future of the Church, a pressing issue at mid-century, given the signs that the "Anglican Communion" (a phrase first used around 1850 in the *Chronicle* and elsewhere)¹⁰ might fragment as a result of the introduction in the early 1850s of new forms of Church government that threatened to turn colonial dioceses into self-governing voluntary organizations. The *Chronicle* frequently commented on the need for a more unified and singular "colonial church" because the future of the church depended on it and because some high-churchmen harbored very ambitious (and perhaps wildly misplaced) hopes that the Anglican Church would be the "national" church of the British Empire. While some have claimed a role for print in creating a sense of unity or "imagined community" among imperial churchgoers, this paper is more sceptical.¹¹ Here we argue that periodicals' significance lies in what they tell us about the tensions and divisions that high-churchmen recognized existed in the church at mid-century.¹² We begin by situating the *Chronicle* in the wider context of church expansion in the 1840s, and then move on to analyze the extent to which periodicals realized their aims of raising funds and seeking to create a sense of "imagined community" among Anglicans.



The 1830s and '40s were a moment when the issue of empire attracted increasing comment in the metropolitan British press. Periodicals appeared whose coverage of imperial issues ranged from emigration, free trade, anti-slavery, and the question of imperial political reform and self-government. The dramatic expansion of the Church of England, symbolized in the establishment of ten colonial bishoprics between 1835 and 1842, was also drawing the attention of various groups in Britain. The expansion of the church was significant for different groups for different reasons. Non-Anglican journals such as the nonconformist *British Banner* (1848) and the Roman Catholic *British Catholic Colonial Quarterly Intelligencer* (1833-37) saw the expansion of the episcopate as bringing unwanted "church and state principles" to the colonies. Secular liberal journals similarly commented on the colonial church when they thought it was being privileged.¹³ But favourable comment could come from both a conservative journal like the *Quarterly Review* and the reformist *Simmonds's Colonial Magazine*. While the former believed the expansion of the Church would bring a more moral and more English empire, the latter's interest stemmed from its attraction to institutions that promoted colonial loyalty but did not comprise the self-government that it, and the Colonial Reform Society that it spoke for, wanted to see for all the colonies of European settlement.¹⁴

Colonial Church expansion also received fuller comment in established Anglican periodicals. Such coverage was indeed something new. While the issue of conversion and mission to "the heathen" had been a staple of the evangelical missionary press since the 1790s, settler religion had only periodically attracted interest, and this largely because of the occasional appeals for funding made by returning colonial churchmen.¹⁵ In the 1830s and onwards, publications such as the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* and the *English Review* gave extensive coverage to the activities of the Anglican missionary societies such as the Society of the Propagation of the Gospel (established 1701), which recruited clergy, and the Colonial Bishops' Fund (1841), which raised funds for colonial bishops. Space that established periodicals gave to the Church overseas aided a process

by which the church's colonial mission became as familiar to metropolitan readers as domestic church extension. To borrow the language of a recent edited collection on imperial Britain, the colonial church became "normalized" and "everyday."¹⁶ This increasing coverage stemmed from anxieties about increased emigration, fears of Roman Catholicism, changes in the state's imperial policy, and debates over the selling off of the Canadian clergy reserves. Interest was also linked to the symbolic importance that colonial church expansion had for churchmen back in Britain who were dealing with party conflict and an intrusive state that had reduced the number of bishoprics in Ireland and was threatening to do so in England. Whatever the reason, the 1830s and 1840s was a period when churchmen in Britain were showing far more interest in the various branches of the church, both in the colonies and, significantly, in Scotland and America.¹⁷

In addition to comment in established journals, this period saw the appearance of new titles specifically focused on colonial Anglicanism. This was a diverse literature, with all the various church "parties" producing periodicals publicizing their missionary society's work. This diversity partly stemmed from the period of voluntarism, which was opened up by the Whig government's decision in the early 1830s to withdraw state support for church extension. Consequently, there was space for churchmen of all parties to establish institutions and imperial networks that linked clergymen on the frontier of empire with metropolitan subscribers. Evangelical Anglicans established the Upper Canada Clergy Society and the Colonial Church Society with the latter's work being broadcast by the *Colonial Church Record*, and high churchmen followed their example. Indeed, one of the striking developments of the 1830s was the formation of a high-church network that despite the current interest in humanitarian and evangelical networks has remained hidden from view. The nodes of this high-church network were prominent individuals – notable names include Ernest Hawkins, secretary of the SPG; Edward Coleridge, an Eton headmaster; and W.E. Gladstone, who needs no introduction – and institutions, notably the SPG and the Colo-

nial Bishoprics' Fund (although both presented themselves as above party, both were associated with the high-church wing of the church). High-churchmen generated their own promotional literature: the 1840s saw the publication of colonial bishops' visitation journals in the *Church in the Colonies* series, the first histories of the colonial church, the first church atlases, and from 1847 the annual Ramsden sermons preached at Oxford and Cambridge on church extension.¹⁸ This literature complemented the SPG's *Journal* (1701-1870), which published missionary letters, the annual sermon, and details on subscription communities. To this list we should also add *The Mission Field*, first published in 1856 and which for the remainder of the century was the key vehicle by which the SPG broadcast its mission activities among settlers and non-Christians.¹⁹

This was "official" church literature insofar as it was published by the SPG, a body that was an adjunct of the Church and, in lieu of its 1701 parliamentary charter, part of the British state (at least until the 1830s, when parliament reduced its grant). The status of the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, the first high-church periodical specifically focused on the colonial church, was more ambiguous. This was an independent publication, "established," as it put it in its second volume, "by a few individuals." The available evidence does not tell us who these individuals were, but we know that its first editor was Francis Fulford (who became first bishop of Montreal in 1850). Rather than being part of the SPG – though its editors and readers were connected to the society – the *Chronicle* was more closely associated with the Bishoprics' Fund, an organization established in 1841 to provide the funds for new bishoprics that would no longer come from the state. The *Chronicle*'s first number announced that any profits would go toward the CBF.²⁰ The status of the CBF, like the *Chronicle*, is difficult to define. Unlike the SPG, it had no charter, and so cannot be said to have been part of the church. Although the CBF tried to present itself as a church endeavour – it emphasized that it received the backing of the archbishops and tried to cast itself as above party and faction – it was in essence a voluntary organization, and despite its claims to inclusivity and the support it re-

ceived from some evangelicals, it was dominated by the high churchmen who read the *Chronicle*.

Despite its rather ambiguous status, the fact that the *Chronicle* was – apart from the SPG's *Journal* – the only high-church periodical specifically interested in colonial religion, means that it and the other high-church periodicals that covered colonial Church expansion²¹ are key sources for understanding this high-church engagement with empire. In some senses there was nothing distinct about the *Chronicle* since like other missionary periodicals it sought to inculcate among the middle-class public who usually supported missionary activity a sense of responsibility toward British settlers. It used techniques common to all mission periodicals, such as letters from missionaries, highlights of mission work, and the careers of missionary celebrities.²² But the *Chronicle* was also distinctive. It, and the high-church agenda and network it supported, was an overwhelmingly élite enterprise. Indeed, work on high-churchmen and empire by Carey, Strong, and others tends to overlook this élitism.²³ Both the membership of this network as well as the imperial vision it communicated in its literature were élitist. As we shall see, the *Chronicle* promoted a reformed colonization that would create new Englands overseas with all its hierarchies and class structures.

This distinctiveness comes across more clearly once we take a closer look at the contents of the early numbers of the *Chronicle*. The first articles – "Rise and progress of the Colonial Episcopate" and "Four new bishoprics in the Colonies" – emphasize the *Chronicle*'s links with the CBF and points to the centrality of bishoprics in this model of Church extension. This concern with episcopacy certainly marks it out from Evangelical periodicals like the Colonial Church Society's *Colonial Church Record*, which paid little attention to the work of bishops, dwelling instead on the activities of clergy and the need for an evangelical mission to combat the depravity of colonial society.²⁴ The *Chronicle*, by contrast, gave more room to the letters, reports, and appeals of colonial bishops rather than clergy on the ground.

Why was there this emphasis on episcopacy? Why was the CBF, the key institution in extending the colonial episcopate, established at this point? Various reasons were given at CBF meetings as to why bishops were needed: bishops would recruit more clergy and a higher caliber of clergy; they were a more effective way of spreading Christianity abroad; and they would prevent the export of the less desirable aspects of the “Anglo-Saxon race.”²⁵ But a clue as to why high-churchmen placed so much emphasis on the need for a colonial episcopate is suggested by an early number of the *Chronicle* which recorded the bishop of London – Charles Blomfield – as stating at the consecration of four colonial bishops in 1847 that with the creation of colonial bishops,

There is now a centre of union and exertion. The Church assumes a definite form, and instead of isolated and desultory and ill-directed efforts, it acts under the impulse of one mind, and aims at the attainment of the same objects, by combined and uniform exertions. The unity of the Church is practically exhibited, and felt to be a reality [...].²⁶

A *Chronicle* correspondent similarly commented that the “establishment of new Bishoprics” served to “provide against all the evils of want of system, and to remedy relaxed discipline.” Looking back from the 1860s, Ernest Hawkins called the CBF “the great movement for the full organization of the colonial Church.”²⁷ While the formation of the CBF was clearly a practical measure to raise the funds which would have once been provided by the state, the above comments show that the CBF was also an attempt to establish a more cohesive, hierarchical and unified colonial church with clear lines of authority. As Carey has explained, and as the quotations above suggest, the CBF was an attempt to place the Church overseas on a more permanent and territorial footing, replacing the somewhat tenuous and uncertain church that had been planted in previous decades by chaplains, missionary societies, and fluctuating state aid.²⁸ A coordinated and unified church was one governed by bishops and one sharing a common central authority, Canterbury. This notion of

mission under properly delegated authority was far removed from the model of missionary work pursued by the evangelical Colonial Church Society; for high churchmen, their work resulted in fragmented congregations and independent clergymen beyond the supervision of higher authority. Indeed, one of these evangelical missionary societies – the Upper Canada Clergy Society – was absorbed into the SPG in 1840. That this was all part of a common agenda is suggested by the fact that those involved in the union were also prominent CBF members, with Gladstone, CBF treasurer, drafting a memorandum on the subject.²⁹

But we still need to understand why Church unity was such a concern. The answer here lies in fears of Roman Catholicism and anxieties over colonial autonomy. By mid-century Roman Catholicism seems to have replaced dissent as the chief source of anxiety, with the spread of the Roman Catholic hierarchy highlighting the need for a more organized, institutionalized and Episcopal Anglican presence overseas.³¹ “We must have speedily an increase of the number of Bishops or we perish,” was how bishop Broughton of Australia put it in early 1845.³² In addition to challenging Catholicism, a unified Church with firmer territorial roots would prevent the development of autonomous colonies and independent church congregations, such as those that had developed in Britain’s eighteenth-century North American empire. The assumption was that autonomy in religion led inevitably to demands for political autonomy, and so nineteenth-century churchmen commonly argued that a national church was necessary to keep British settlers “British” and to tie the empire together.³³ Despite the “established” status of the Church of Scotland in India and elsewhere, this imperial church would be the national, English, church.

In addition to episcopacy, the other key theme was emigration, or rather the problem of emigration. The early article “Emigration” called for the Church to play a role in a reformed emigration which, rather than exporting “pauper hordes” and “companions in misfortune,” resulted in the creation of “another England at the Antipodes.” In the short term this meant clergy at embarkation ports and Bibles for emigrants.³⁴ But this

was a case of the church *responding* to, rather than *initiating*, emigration. Indeed, the church, unlike Scottish Presbyterians, can be criticized for not getting involved in organizing the emigration of congregations with their clergy, what is sometimes called “communal emigration” (though there is some evidence of this happening in Church of Ireland congregations in the 1840s).³⁵ Interestingly, the *Chronicle* did carry suggestions on how the church could follow the Presbyterian example. Letters and articles in the second volume called for the creation of church associations or “Emigrant Clubs” that would send out “a United Society, composed of neighbours and friends supporting one another, and acting together systematically for the common end.” The letter “Parish Emigration” told of forty parishioners who had left for the Cape Colony with an Oxford graduate as schoolmaster and catechist.³⁶ Of course other high-church periodicals took up the subject of church-directed emigration, but the *Chronicle* remained a key forum for discussion about a respectable, religious and moral form of “parochial emigration.”³⁷

While the key theme was emigration, mission to non-Christians was not ignored. Early articles included “Missionary Proceedings in India” and “On the Methods Employed for the Religious Instruction of Heathens.” The *Chronicle*’s key point was that mission to settlers and mission to the ‘heathen’ were not antagonistic ideologies.³⁸ Rather, colonization was intimately connected, and indeed proceeded hand-in-hand with, the conversion of the “heathen”; conversion that was, of course, conducted correctly and moderately through instruction, education, and example (the *Chronicle* carried plenty of advice on the proper mode of conversion). The early article “Systematic Colonization” noted that conversion would be “incalculably easier” with reformed emigration. Once “our noble England” had “spread her roots, and multipl[ied] her branches, till she shall have covered all the isles of the East,” the article claimed, “their savage inhabitants shall repose under the shelter of her laws, and be nourished with the fruits of her religion.” The idea that reformed emigration would have widespread benefits for both colonized, colonizer, and Britain’s domestic population, reveals that the

Chronicle was aligned with those liberal conservatives known as Peelites, and the high- and broad-churchmen who supported various schemes for a reformed emigration that emerged in the late 1830s and 1840s.³⁹

Articles like "Systematic Colonization" show that the *Chronicle* and other church publicity communicated a particular vision of empire and the ideal colony. While on the one hand it was to create a more Christianized empire, it was also to be a more anglicized one, too; an empire composed of colonies that were miniature Englands, with the customary institutions, social structures, and values of a particular rural England. From the outset the *Chronicle* made the point that the colonization of the future should be founded on the principle of establishing miniature versions of the mother country overseas: this meant – and this point really needs emphasizing – transplanting the *institutions* of the mother country, of which the key one was the established Church. An early number argued that colonies should have "a nobility, a gentry, an established church, [and] endowed colleges and schools." These were "those specific provisions for moral refinement which are the distinguishing characteristics of the *British* portion of the Anglo Saxon race." The disorganized nature of British expansion up to that time had failed to lead to such "moral refinement": the result was scattered populations beyond the pale of "civilizing influences." Such communities spread un-English democratic sentiments. "Our Colonies, British in name," the article worried, "are American in character."⁴⁰ This vision of a more anglicized empire based on key institutions is captured in J.P. Gell's description of the Anglican college in Van Diemen's Land (published in the February 1849 number). After noting the English games played at the college and the English landscape which surrounded it, Gell concluded that this community was "to be moulded as nearly as may be to the English forms of sound and Christian education."⁴¹

This linking of colonization, Christianization, conversion, and the spread of a particular English civilization was one articulated in other high-Anglican literature at this time,⁴² but the early numbers of the

Chronicle also reveal the methods which would make this “English empire” a reality. One was establishing institutions such as Gell’s college. “The foundations of English society,” the journal noted, were to be laid by a “system of municipal institutions” such as colleges, chapters, guilds, and charities.⁴³ English identity therefore appears to have rested on establishing English institutions, which meant the Church had a huge task on its hands, making good previous neglect and establishing the complete Church hierarchy of bishops, better-trained clergy, parishes, and congregations to those colonies that had developed without such things. Perhaps surprisingly, the publication of statistics on Church attendance, letters from colonial clergy and colonial bishops in the “Colonial, Foreign and Home News” section breathe a confidence and optimism which was mirrored in the colonies by bishops who were sure of their ability to make up lost ground and transform multi-ethnic and multi-denominational colonies into English spaces with dominant Anglican Churches. Broughton in New South Wales, for instance, confidently asserted that his aim was “to make the Colonies so like England, that they may form together [in] one body.”⁴⁴

Another method was creating completely new “English” colonies formed around an established Anglican Church: utopian proposals that compare with the kind of plans radicals made for new communities in the American West.⁴⁵ The Anglican colony at Canterbury in New Zealand received extensive coverage in the *Chronicle*’s early numbers.⁴⁶ The concept of “Christian colonization” was, as Carey has shown, widely held, with all denominations taking up the idea of a religious colonization that would relieve social problems back home and work toward the conversion of the heathen overseas.⁴⁷ Articles on church colonization in the *Chronicle* and the *Christian Remembrancer* drew a distinction between the character of emigration up to that point and a new model of “Christian colonization” for the future. Where the former was marked by the removal of the worst elements in British society, the latter would be an organized, systematic, and religious process which would, as the *Remembrancer* put it, ‘reproduce in other regions the entire framework of

the society of the fatherland.⁴⁸ The result would be, as one *Chronicle* correspondent put it, colonies "in unison with the parent state, in religion and feeling [...] monarchical and free." The *Chronicle's* support for Canterbury was qualified: its opposition to the involvement of the New Zealand Company was reminiscent of evangelical criticism of the East India Company.⁴⁹

What this all amounted to was the argument that the Church of England had the task of moralizing the British Empire. The Church stood as a "national" institution with a remit to reform the nation overseas. This emphasis on the special role of the Church of England as the national church of the British Empire and a "Greater Britain," marked the *Chronicle* out from the other mission periodicals. Evangelical publications like the *Colonial Church Record* emphasized the importance of evangelization rather than institutions. Non-Anglican journals like *British Missions*, which in the 1850s publicized the settler missions of nonconformist organizations such as the Congregational Colonial Missionary Society, rejected the claim that the Church of England should be the national church of the empire, asserting instead that colonies should be spaces of full religious liberty and equality – for Christians at least. Still, a Nonconformist periodical like the *British Banner* could develop similar themes to the *Chronicle*. It wanted to see "Emigration of godly families and individuals."⁵⁰ It assumed that British settlers should be united by a common religion and a common culture, and it held to the view that without spiritual provision colonial communities would sink into corruption. But for nonconformists the requisite colonial religion was not narrow Anglicanism but a broad Protestantism, and their ideal colony was not one modeled on the hierarchies of English society, as was the case in the high-Anglican vision.⁵¹

High-churchmen therefore saw the expansion of the church as part of the creation of a "Greater Britain" (though seemingly really meaning a "Greater England"). But ideas were one thing, finding funds and clergy another. Existing scholarship has paid less attention to how churchmen went about making these bold plans a reality. Generally the

hope was that colonial churches – like the colonies themselves – would become self-supporting, but it was clear that for the foreseeable future funds would come from voluntary sources at home. The *Chronicle* was part of this fund-raising mission. Although it appears to have targeted the middle-class public who traditionally supported missions, it is worth noting that its price of 6 pence put it within reach of people of small means, and was the same price as the noted Catholic mission periodical, *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*.⁵² In 1850 the *Chronicle* paid two instalments of £25 to the CBF: not a particularly staggering sum, though we might speculate that the journal's contribution went beyond this, as it probably encouraged donations to congregational collections.⁵³

At face value, church organizations such as the CBF were successful fund-raisers. The CBF raised some £165,127 by 1850, while the SPG's income increased from £74,136 in 1839 to £96,007 (admittedly with a slight reduction in 1843 and 1846).⁵⁴ Though these figures far outstripped the funds raised by the other settler missionary societies, they do mask key shortcomings in the church's fund-raising abilities. These problems are addressed in the *Chronicle* and tell us something about which groups supported overseas church extension, but also about how the vision of colonization described above could never be fully realized.

The problem was that the bulk of support came from a narrow constituency of wealthy and prominent lay persons and clergy. The CBF did not follow the example of the SPG and actively solicit funds; the task was instead left to pastoral letters from bishops and congregational collections. The bulk of the money consequently came from wealthy individuals such as the heiress Angela Burdett-Coutts and a group of around 160 subscribers.⁵⁵ The Fund's subscription lists reveal that the vast majority of donors were professionals and clergy, with very few small contributions. The almost complete lack of Church of Ireland contributors speaks of the Anglo-centric basis of the CBF's imperial vision. The *Chronicle* itself can be seen as part of the problem: despite its price, it

seems to have been a very middle-class publication, and there is little evidence to suggest it reached the kind of diverse readership who Anna Johnston claims consumed the texts produced by nonconformist missionary societies.⁵⁶

A chief concern was that those down the social scale showed little interest, whether this was because of fears of Tractarianism, the élitism of the high-church ideology, the greater appeal of missionary work, or economic hardship on their doorstep. Such concerns were long-standing. Those involved in the 1839 SPG fund-raising tour bemoaned the apathy they faced when they tried to raise funds for the colonial Church. Significantly, fund-raisers pointed out that while the lower classes gave little to the high-church mission, they were enthusiastic supporters of the Church Missionary Society and missions to non-Christians.⁵⁷

The 1840s did, however, see attempts to tackle this problem, with the *Chronicle* providing a forum for the discussion of solutions. Noting that the important question was "how are we to win over the middle and poorer classes to take an interest" in the "great work" of settler religion, the correspondent "G.M." proposed in 1850 the publication of books written in a "simple and popular style" to give information on colonies so that "people may become alive to the fact [...], that the inhabitants of those Colonies are our fellow-Christians and fellow-subjects, and consequently have a claim upon us." "E.P.E." claimed that the problem was "the *strangeness* of the whole subject to people's minds," and therefore recommended maps to teach the "geography of missions" to children, as he claimed that schools provided the "opportunity of laying the foundation of a Missionary spirit throughout the country."⁵⁸ Widening appeal and raising funds was an ongoing problem: in the 1860s churchmen still worried that sermons on missions were not filling the SPG's coffers. Efforts were made to combat these problems and encourage public donations, with individual dioceses introducing half-yearly collections, where congregations subscribed to domestic church objects in Spring and missions in the Autumn: a clear demonstration of how overseas and domestic mission, colony and metropole, were interconnected.⁵⁹

These funding problems had major repercussions for the colonial church. First, it struggled to raise the requisite funds to achieve its aims of a comprehensive colonial coverage. As we have seen, high-Anglicans argued that even if the Church of England could not enjoy constitutional privileges, it should still remain as the national church of the colonies. CBF publications still talked in terms of the “national” status of the Church of England, and colonial bishops were finding new ways of emphasizing that they were the church of the English by attaching themselves to cultural associations, notably St. George’s Societies in British North America.⁶⁰ National status brought with it responsibilities, namely that the church would have a special duty to provide pastoral care and spiritual instruction to the whole colonial population. This required clergy and bishops ministering to small geographical areas, and enough church sittings for the colonial population. Funding problems scuppered such plans. In New South Wales, for example, despite an impressive increase in the number of churches and clergymen in the colony, the church could only accommodate around 21,260 in 1855 out of a total population of 187,243 (1851 census).⁶¹

The funding issue therefore compromised the colonial church’s claim to be a national institution. The narrow support base for high church extension was manna from heaven for colonists – often low-church evangelicals – who believed that unsuitable bishops were being forced on increasingly “democratic” colonies. Sydney’s *The Atlas* – a low-church weekly – claimed that the CBF was part of an “aristocratic movement – the middle class of England, the ruling body, has no share in it. [...] It is an attempt to engraft upon the colonies, the religion of the bishops and the nobles, not the religion of the people.”⁶² Hostility to the arrival of alien bishops and clergy who had not been selected by colonial congregations, coupled with fears that the CBF was an agent of international “Puseyism” (a derogatory term for Anglo-Catholicism), explain why the early 1850s saw the secession of congregations from the church and, most dramatically, plans for a “Free Church of England” in New South Wales.⁶³

The fund-raising achievements of the high church network were therefore mixed. Perhaps the *Chronicle* was more successful with its

second, albeit unstated aim: inculcating a sense of unity among Anglicans, what in modern parlance might be called a kind of Anglican "diaspora consciousness." Given its title, we might speculate that one of the *Colonial Church Chronicle's* functions was to bring imperial churchgoers closer together by giving them the sense they were members of a singular "colonial Church": a task that, as we have seen, was key to high church extension. Indeed, contributors to the *Chronicle* frequently referred to the need for closer links to be built between what one correspondent called "the Anglican Communion."⁶⁴ These calls for closer links mirrored those which Anglican churchmen in the colonies and in America were making for what Henry Caswall termed an "Anglo-Saxon Synod,"⁶⁵ links which would unite a disparate Anglican Church, and, presumably, a vague population of English and British across the British World and – given the interest in the Episcopal Church of the United States – America as well.

Achieving such coordination and unity was a pressing concern at mid-century, as accompanying moves toward colonial self-government were signs that colonial dioceses were emerging as autonomous and voluntary institutions, once again raising the bugbear of colonial autonomy. Overseas bishops were training clergy, colonial Churches were increasingly reliant on local funds, and the first self-governing colonial synods appeared in the 1850s. Fears that the Church of England would fragment like the Scottish Kirk were compounded by the secession of congregations (in the Cape Colony),⁶⁶ proposals for free churches, and doctrinal disputes over "baptismal regeneration" comparable to those convulsing the Church back home during the infamous Gorham episode. Hopes for a more unified Anglican overseas community were also a response to the growing global threat of Catholicism, represented by the return of a Catholic hierarchy to mainland Britain (the "Papal Aggression") in 1850. Arguments were made that Catholic Aggression at home was the outcome of the toleration of Catholicism in the Empire, reinforcing fears that Catholicism was organized globally and the church had to follow suit.⁶⁷

The *Chronicle* was a key forum for discussion about plans for a closer union between imperial Anglicans, proposals that were comparable to plans put forward at mid-century for a closer alliance between Britain and newly-self-governing colonies.⁶⁸ Unity had to begin at home, with correspondents arguing that all Anglican missionary societies should be unified under a church which would become “the great Missionary body of England.”⁶⁹ In terms of the church overseas, the correspondent “F.H.D.,” in a number of letters in the early 1850s (and reprinted in the *Sydney Morning Herald*), considered the question of how the church would be held together given that in the future the “Anglican Communion” would “probably comprise not two, but many kingdoms and republics.” Key was finding a body, such as a pan-imperial synod, which could judge issues about discipline and doctrine that would be binding on the Communion. While the correspondent acknowledged that “we cannot stereotype Anglicanism,” and that diversity (such as seen with the Episcopal branches in the US and Scotland) should not be stifled, he nevertheless recommended a “great council of the whole Anglican Communion,” taking his inspiration from the congress of colonial bishops which met in London in 1853 to debate the future of colonial Church government.⁷⁰ Similarly, “H.C.” in 1851 drew a comparison with the Great Exhibition and called for a “General Church Union” that embraced all the branches of the Anglican Church.⁷¹

There were signs at mid-century that these calls for Anglican unity were bearing fruit, at least in terms of bringing élite Anglicans together. Colonial, Irish, American, and Scottish churchmen attended the SPG’s 1851 jubilee in London; a delegation of the American church toured England the same year; English churchmen reciprocated by sending a delegation to America in 1853; and six colonial bishops met in London in January 1853.⁷² That debates about doctrinal controversies such as baptismal regeneration surfaced in the colonies in the late 1840s – the same time as they were convulsing the church at home – suggests that mid-century was a moment when Anglicans could imagine themselves part of a wider community, one engaged in debates which had an impe-

rial reach. Print – both metropolitan journals and the growing colonial religious press – was clearly crucial in disseminating news and information about Church affairs at home and overseas, but what role periodicals played in bringing Anglicans together and inculcating a sense of unity or “imagined community” is debatable. The Papal Aggression – which was of colonial as well as domestic import – was as likely to play the role of unifier as print. Certainly there is anecdotal evidence that the *Chronicle* might have aided this process: it printed a letter from a Cape Colony Anglican who claimed that until he read the journal, he was “by no means aware that so much was doing in several of them [colonies], as to the advancement of our Church.”⁷³ The *Chronicle* was also a key source for news and information on debates about new forms of church government in the North American and Australian colonies in the early 1850s; debates that, like Papal Aggression, strengthened a sense of community among Anglicans.⁷⁴ The correspondence of William Woolls, a lay activist against synods in Parramatta, New South Wales, reveals an individual well-informed about Church affairs in India, New Zealand, and the other Australian colonies.⁷⁵ Keeping in touch with developments in other dioceses did not mean colonists wished to replicate models established elsewhere. A hostile speaker at a Cape Colony meeting in 1856 noted that he did “not wish to go beyond England, for a reference to the general practice in matters ecclesiastical or civil,” adding that he “never expected to be referred to Australia” for new models of church government.⁷⁶ Such statements indicate that Anglican attachments were primarily to the mother church rather than a wider colonial Anglican community. Nevertheless, the correspondence of lay Anglicans shows that at mid-century colonists were aware of church developments in other colonies, and one can reasonably speculate that print and periodicals aided this process.

Overall, however, the ability of the *Chronicle* or any periodical to inculcate a sense of community among Anglicans can be overstated. While the *Chronicle* undoubtedly helped to bring the imperial church closer to home, the Anglicans who were being brought together at mid-

century were largely the élite. Evidence of networking, communication, and the formation of group consciousness between colonial Anglicans on the periphery remains anecdotal: individual clergy moving from colony to colony, laymen establishing branches of colonial missionary organizations in multiple colonies, and contemporaneous petitioning campaigns over events such as the Papal Aggression. Indeed, whatever work periodicals such as the *Chronicle* did in bringing Anglicans together was building upon the firm attachments which Anglicans routinely demonstrated to the church, empire and crown. These attachments come across particularly forcefully during the debates over the introduction of synodical forms of government in the early 1850s. A key theme running through these debates was the colonial Anglican fear that synods would snap their church's ties with Canterbury and replace this figurehead with the authority of a despotic colonial bishop. Despite threats to form a "Free Church of England," most colonial Anglicans wished to remain within a church centered on Canterbury.

The limited role played by print in the formation of a sense of "Anglican Communion" at mid-century can be demonstrated more forcefully once we recall that high-church publicity of mid-century had more specific aims than inculcating a general sense of community among Anglicans. More precisely, they wished to encourage colonial churchgoers to feel part of a church with a particular identity. If they were asked what this identity was, high churchmen would have answered that its essential ingredients would be episcopacy and an emphasis on the sacraments and the pre-Reformation "Catholic" elements of Anglican worship. In the 1840s this particular Anglican identity was carried overseas by bishops, clergy, institutions such as colonial theological colleges, periodicals such as the *Chronicle*, schemes such as the Canterbury colony, and individual settlers. This was a program which was oftentimes pursued aggressively. In the Cape Colony in the late 1840s, the high-church archdeacon N.J. Merriman offended low-churchmen in Grahamstown when he altered the decor of their church, notably removing high pews and introducing stained glass.⁷⁷

The hostility which Merriman faced in low-church Grahamstown (recounted in his *Cape Journals*) reveals the difficulties that faced any group when they tried to create a sense of community among imperial Anglicans. Anglicanism is fundamentally a contested identity. Despite the claims about Anglican unity articulated about the time of the SPG's 1851 jubilee, the colonial church of mid-century, like its counterpart back home, was composed of groups with varying views on what Anglican identity was. The broad line of tension was between high and low churchmen, between those who emphasized the Bible and those who attached greater importance to tradition and the sacraments. These differences surfaced at particular moments of tension, such as mid-century, a moment when the arrival of new high-church colonial bishops were stirring up doctrinal disputes over "baptismal regeneration." These disagreements frequently had an ethnic edge, with English bishops squaring off against Irish clergy and laity.

The churchmen we have looked at here entertained hopes that by establishing colonial bishops and absorbing missionary societies under the umbrella of the SPG a more uncontested Anglicanism and colonial church could be created. But building a singular "colonial church" was highly problematic. Reviews of the first history of the overseas church (Anderson's *The History of the Church of England in the Colonies and Foreign Dependencies of the British Empire*, published in three volumes from 1845) picked up this point, noting the problem of pulling all the diverse elements together and writing a history of a "colonial Church."⁷⁸ All we can say is that while the *Chronicle* was unlikely to serve as a unifying force for communities of low-church and Irish Anglicans, it could encourage feelings of community among a much narrower constituency of like-minded high-church groups across the empire.



This essay has used the *Colonial Church Chronicle* to take a snapshot of the colonial Church at mid-century, a moment of critical importance for the Church of England in the British Empire. In one sense the decades after 1830 were ones of adjustment for a church searching for an

alternative to the old church-state model. But it was also a period of Anglican expansion and confidence, an optimism that was captured in the work in the CBF. Though it exacerbated tensions between colonial Anglicans, as a voluntary organization it was remarkably successful. This confidence and ambition comes through strongly in the *Chronicle's* articles and correspondence. More than the other high-church periodicals, the *Chronicle* served as a forum for churchmen to outline their ambitious hopes for the church overseas: the church would provide, if not monopolize, spiritual provision to a "Greater Britain"; it would take an active role in emigration and peopling this nation overseas; and it would become the premier missionary institution to non-Europeans. The interest it showed in the American Episcopal Church also suggests that churchmen included America in a "Greater Britain," and that the church could be an agent in bringing the scattered "Anglo-Saxon" race closer together.

But this paper has also shown that the *Chronicle* can shine a light on the anxieties of churchmen at mid-century. Correspondents were aware that the support base for the extension of the church was narrow. Too little money came from the "penny subscribers" who supported evangelical missionary efforts. There were nagging doubts that the CBF would have been much less successful without the support of wealthy patrons, and indeed the organization's records reveal these financial worries. There were also concerns that the "Anglican Communion" would fragment into a series of voluntary organizations, each free to change Anglican doctrine. Finally, funding worries raised troubling questions about the church's ability to realize its aim of providing a national and imperial coverage. Hanging over all this was the fear that imperial history might repeat itself, that the lessons of the American Revolution had not been learned.

Here we have drawn attention to an under-examined body of Victorian periodical literature, and to offer some – albeit rather brief – suggestions on how it compared and contrasted to evangelical periodicals. A study of the *Chronicle* is a reminder of how the Church of England overseas was marked by considerable diversity, with various groups of high-

church, Irish and evangelical Anglicans seeking to impose their understanding of Anglican identity on the "colonial church." Any history of the church in the colonies has to pay attention to the contested quality of colonial Anglicanism.⁷⁹ Conflicts between church parties meant that hopes for a unified church or Anglican community were doomed from the start.

This essay raises as many questions as it has tried to answer. The focus here has been on mid-century and the problems facing those wanting a "national" imperial church. Questions remain about Anglican missionary literature later in the nineteenth century, notably whether it continued to embrace the notion of mission to a Greater Britain; whether later periodicals used the same techniques, such as the celebrity bishop, as those earlier in the century; whether there was a similar preoccupation with problems of funding and church unity described here; and finally, whether Anglican publicity diversified, with periodicals emerging which targeted those groups who mid-century churchmen worried were not engaged in extending the church to their "brethren" overseas.

Northumbria University

Notes

¹ Louis Billington, "The religious periodical and newspaper press, 1770-1870," ed. M. Harris and A. Lee, *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries* (Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1986), 113-32.

² Terry Ballinger, "What Mrs Jellyby might have read. Missionary periodicals: a neglected source," *Victorian Periodicals Review* 37:4 (2004), 46-74; Anna Johnston, "British Missionary Publishing, Missionary Celebrity, and Empire," *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, 32:2 (2005), 20-47.

³ Facilitating this interest has been the Missionary Periodicals Database, <http://research.yale.edu:8084/missionperiodicals/index.jsp>. On missionary contribution to middle-class and evangelical identities, see Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England* (Stanford UP, 1999).

⁴ For instance, London Missionary Society publications form the basis of Johnston's study, "British Missionary Publishing."

⁵ Hilary Carey, *God's Empire: religion and colonialism in the British World, c.1801-1908* (Cambridge UP, 2011). Also see Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c. 1700-1850* (Oxford UP, 2007); and Pamela Welch, *Church and Settler in Colonial Zimbabwe: A Study in the History of the Anglican Diocese of Mashonaland/Southern Rhodesia, 1890-1925* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

⁶ Carey, *God's Empire*, ch. 3; Howard Le Couteur, "Anglican high churchmen and the expansion of empire," *Journal of Religious History*, 32:2 (2008), 193-215; Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c. 1700-1850* (Oxford UP, 2007).

⁷ "Return of London newspapers," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 September 1854, 6-7.

⁸ This literature is beginning to attract scholarly interest. See Rowan Strong, "The Church of England and the British Imperial State: Anglican Metropolitan Sermons of the 1850s," in H.M. Carey and J. Gascoigne, eds., *Church and State in Old and New Worlds* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

⁹ Le Couteur, "Anglican High Churchmen."

¹⁰ The term's origin is touched on in A.M.G. Stephenson, *The First Lambeth Conference: 1867* (London: SPCK, 1967), ch. 3.

¹¹ This paper's emphasis on the limited ability of print media to bind together imperial communities develops points made by Simon Potter in his work, particularly "Webs, networks and systems: Globalization and the mass media in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century British Empire," *Journal of British Studies* 46 (2007), 621-46.

¹² These shortcomings have tended to be overlooked in literature on Anglican engagement with empire: for example Le Couteur, "Anglican high churchmen," and Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire*. The problems confronting missionary efforts are given more attention in Carey's *God's Empire*.

¹³ For the increasing metropolitan comment on empire in this period, see "Uses of a Colonial Journal," *The Colonial Gazette*, 7 August

1839; *British Banner* (16 May 1849), 313; "The Church of England in the Colonies," *Examiner* (March 1854), 162-63.

¹⁴ "Ecclesiastical State of the Colonies," *Quarterly Review*, 75:149 (December 1844); "The Church in the Colonies," *Simmonds's Colonial Magazine* 13 (February 1848), 182-85.

¹⁵ For example, the appeals which Charles James Stewart, the future second bishop of Quebec made in the mid-1820s. See T.R. Millman, *The Life of the Right Reverend, the Honourable Charles James Stewart* (London, Ontario: Huron College: 1953), 46.

¹⁶ Catherine Hall and Sonya Rose, eds., *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge UP, 2006).

¹⁷ For this interest, see Henry Caswall, *America and the American Church* (London: Rivington, 1839); Samuel Wilberforce, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America* (London: J. Burns, 1844); "The American Church," *Christian Remembrancer* 7:39 (March 1844); Caswall, *Scotland and the Scottish Church* (Oxford: Parker, 1853).

¹⁸ *Church in the Colonies* (London: SPG, 1844-57); J.S.M. Anderson, *The History of the Church of England in the Colonies and Foreign Dependencies of the British Empire*, 3 vols. (London: Rivington, 1845-56); *The Colonial Church Atlas* (London: SPG, 1842); For the Ramsden sermons, see Strong, "The Church of England."

¹⁹ For this literature, see Carey, *God's Empire*, ch. 2.

²⁰ CCC 1 (July 1847), 2.

²¹ "The Church in Upper Canada," *The Church of England Quarterly Review* 4 (1838); "The Church in the Colonies: Canada," *CR* 8:44 (August 1844); "Colonization," *CR* 19:68 (April 1850); "The Church in the West Indies," *British Critic*, 29:58 (April 1841). Coverage was not always positive. The *Remembrancer* criticized the appointment of evangelical colonial bishops: "The Recent Consecration of Colonial Bishops," *CR* 14:58 (October 1847).

²² Johnston, "British Missionary Publishing."

²³ Thanks to Dr John Powell for emphasizing this point to me.

²⁴ For example, see "New South Wales," *Colonial Church Record*,

vol. 1, no. 4 (1838), 49-64. Carey, *God's Empire*, 161.

²⁵ See the speeches in *Proceedings at a Meeting of the Clergy and Laity, specially called by His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and held at Willis's Rooms, on Wednesday, April 20, 1853, for the further extension of the Episcopate in the Colonies and Dependencies of the British Crown* (London: Rivington, 1853). The Bishopricks' Fund establishment is covered by Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire*, ch. 4.

²⁶ CCC 1 (August 1847), 55.

²⁷ CCC 4 (January 1851), "State of the Colonial Church," by "F.H.D.," 254; Hawkins quoted in Strong, "The Church of England," 202.

²⁸ Carey, *God's Empire*, 28.

²⁹ On Gladstone's activities in the union, see the entries for 7 March, 25 March, 24 April, 6 June, and 16 June 1840, in Matthew and Foot, eds., *The Gladstone Diaries. Vol. III: 1840-47* (Oxford UP, 1974). For high-church opposition to the CCS, see Carey, *God's Empire*, 162-65.

³¹ The anti-Roman Catholic agenda of the Bishopricks' Fund is brought out in a draft declaration dated February 1842, in Overseas Bishopricks Fund Records, Church of England Record Centre, OBF/REPORTS, 1841-91, f. 4.

³² Bishop Broughton to Judge Coleridge, 27 January 1845, OBF/CORR/DIO/11, f. 1.

³³ For an early statement of this view, see Claudius Buchanan's manifesto for a national Church overseas, *Colonial Ecclesiastical Establishment* (London: Cadell & Davies, 1813). Also see Le Couteur, "Anglican high churchmen" for the importance of memories of American Independence.

³⁴ "Emigration," CCC 1 (May 1848), 401.

³⁵ An Upper Canada clergyman noted in the early 1830s that "Many of the Irish Protestant clergy are coming out in the spring, with large quotas of their flocks": George Mortimer, *The Life and Letters of the Rev George Mortimer, M.A., rector of Thornhill, in the diocese of Toronto* (London: Aylott and Jones, 1847), 191. On "communal emigration," see

Joseph Hardwick, "Early Victorian Periodicals and the Colonial Church of England"

Eric Richards, *Britannia's Children: Emigration from England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland since 1600* (London: Hambledon, 2004), 104; Carey, *God's Empire*, 208.

³⁶ "Emigration Clubs," CCC 2 (April 1848), 389; "Church Emigration" by "C.W.S." (December 1848), 229-31; "Parish emigration" by Anthony C. Lefroy (May 1849), 426-28.

³⁷ "Colonization," CR 19:68 (April 1850).

³⁸ Strong, "The Church of England," 204.

³⁹ "Systematic Colonization," CCC 2 (July 1848), 6. The links which contemporaries drew between colonization and conversion is a key theme of Carey, *God's Empire*, but for Anglican support for new colonization and emigration schemes, see ch. 11.

⁴⁰ "Projected New Colony," CCC 1 (April 1848), 369-70.

⁴¹ "Van Diemen's Land and its College," CCC 2 (February 1849), 297-302.

⁴² "The Newfoundland Mission," CR 20:70 (October 1850); "Colonization," CR 19:68 (April 1850).

⁴³ "Endowment of Colonial Colleges," CCC 2 (April 1849), 364.

⁴⁴ Bishop Broughton to Joshua Watson, 9 November 1837, Moore Theological College Library, Sydney, Broughton Papers Misc.

⁴⁵ For radical utopias, see Gregory Claeys' eight-volume *Modern British Utopias, 1700-1850* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1997).

⁴⁶ For example, "Prospects of the Association for Founding the Canterbury Colony," CCC 2 (October 1848), 123-30.

⁴⁷ Carey, *God's Empire*, chs. 11-12.

⁴⁸ "Colonization," CR, 450.

⁴⁹ "Letter of 'A Layman,'" CCC 3 (March 1849), 335; "Prospects of the Association for Founding the Canterbury Colony," *ibid.*, 2 (October 1848), 123-30.

⁵⁰ "Christianity and Colonization," *British Banner* (7 February 1849), 89.

⁵¹ Carey, *God's Empire*, 193-201.

⁵² Carey, *God's Empire*, 128-132.

⁵³ OBF/FIN/OTH/1, General Account, 1841-63.

⁵⁴ OBF/REPORTS, 1841-91, "Abstract of receipts and payments, 1841 to 1850," f. 12; Carey, *God's Empire*, 112-13.

⁵⁵ OBF/REPORTS, 1841-91, "To the most reverend the Archbishops, and the right reverend Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland," 14 May 1849, f. 8.

⁵⁶ Johnston, "British missionary publishing," 28.

⁵⁷ Edward Bather to A.M. Campbell, 1 October 1838, USPG Archives, Rhodes House Library, Oxford, X-Series, X-1340. Samuel Wilberforce noted that the CMS dominated the West Country and that the "lower orders" showed little interest in the SPG: Wilberforce to Hawkins, 15 July 1839, X-1340.

⁵⁸ "Diffusion of Missionary Information," by "G.M.," CCC 4 (September 1850), 111-13; "Missionary Geography" by "E.P.E." (April 1851), 392-95.

⁵⁹ "Finances of the SPG," *ibid.*, 14 (December 1861), 469-71; "The Bishop of Rochester on Collections for Missions" (November 1861), 411-16.

⁶⁰ See the draft memorandum dated 16 February 1842, in OBF/REPORTS 1841-91, f. 4; Carey, *God's Empire*, 28. Anglican links to cultural associations can be seen in the sermons churchmen gave at St. George's Society meetings, for instance G.J. Mountain, *Responsibilities of the Englishmen in the Colonies of the British Empire* (Quebec: J.C. Fisher, 1847).

⁶¹ *Census of the Colony of New South Wales, taken on the 1st of March, 1851* (Sydney, 1851), 1. Figures on church accommodation are approximate: records do not always record sittings in remote chapels.

⁶² *The Atlas*, 24 January 1846, 37.

⁶³ A relative of a New South Wales clergyman told Hawkins that some clergy in the colony were prepared to establish a Free Church of England: P. Friell to Hawkins, 27 October 1847, USPG Archives, C/AUS/SYD/1, f. 19.

⁶⁴ CCC 4 (March 1851), "State of the Colonial Church," 339.

⁶⁵ Quoted in Stephenson, *The First Lambeth Conference*, 45.

⁶⁶ Opposition to Tractarian innovations led a Port Elizabeth congregation to secede from the Church in 1854. They later contacted the CCS to send them a clergyman: Colonial Church Society Records, London Metropolitan Archives, General Committee Minute Book, 1850-55, MS 15674, 16 May 1854, ff. 683-84.

⁶⁷ For accusations about the connections between Catholic toleration overseas and "Aggression" at home, see Dudley Perceval, *The Queen's Ministers Responsible for the Pope's New Hierarchy* (London: Rivington, 1851).

⁶⁸ Such as Arthur Davies, *Proposals for uniting the British colonies with their mother-country* (London: Trelawney Saunders, 1851).

⁶⁹ "Missionary Societies" by "M," CCC 2 (July 1848), 27-28.

⁷⁰ "How are the colonial Churches to be connected with the Church of this country?" by "F.H.D.," CCC 7 (September 1853), 94-97; reprinted in the *SMH*, 14 December 1853, 5.

⁷¹ "The Church of the Future," by "H.C.," CCC 4 (April 1851), 386.

⁷² Stephenson, *The First Lambeth Conference*, chs. 3 and 4. The *Chronicle* provided extensive coverage of proposals for greater Church unity: "Proposal for an Assemblage of the whole Anglican Episcopate," CCC 6 (August 1852).

⁷³ "Extract from a Letter from the Cape of Good Hope," CCC 1 (April 1848), 380.

⁷⁴ The *Chronicle's* articles on the subject were later published in colonial newspapers, for example in the *New Zealander* (29 November 1851) and the *SMH* (8 May 1852).

[75] William Woolls to Mr Statham, 19 March 1852, Sydney Diocesan Archives, Parramatta North, All Saints – Correspondence, Churchwarden's Treasurer, 1848-1851 [1930/3/59].

⁷⁶ F.R. Surtees, *Correspondence between the Lord Bishop of Cape-town and F.R. Surtees, Esq.* (Cape Town: A.S. Robertson, 1857), 65.

⁷⁷ D.H. Varney and H.M. Matthew, eds., *The Cape Journals of Archdeacon N.J. Merriman 1848-1855* (Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Soci-

ety, 1957), 21.

⁷⁸ *The Critic* (21 June 1845), 156.

⁷⁹ While Strong's work downplays the contested nature of colonial Anglicanism, more attention is paid to the tensions between high- and low-churchmen in Vaudry, *Anglicans and the Atlantic World*. The contested nature of Anglicanism is a key theme of the forthcoming *Oxford History of Anglicanism* series.

