

THE BAGGAGE OF WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON.

THE FIRST BISHOP OF AUSTRALIA AS HANOVERIAN HIGH CHURCHMAN*

Bruce N Kaye

Abstract: This article examines the intellectual and ecclesiastical baggage which WG Broughton brought with him when he came to New South Wales as Archdeacon in 1829. After identifying Broughton's circle of friends in the Church of England, this article traces his early life and education, his early ministry and scholarly writings. Finally the travel diary which Broughton kept on his journey to New South Wales is examined for his estimate of the books he read on his journey to New South Wales. Broughton emerges from this study as a person of considerable scholarly talent, and a member of the old High Church group by both theological, and political conviction as well as personal friendships.

Late in the afternoon on 26 May 1829 the recently appointed archdeacon of New South Wales could have been seen deftly stepping aboard the convict ship *John*, with his wife and two daughters, and their assorted household luggage. The baggage that he carried in his head, and which would direct the way in which he tried to arrange the affairs of the Church of England and its mission in the colony, is also reasonably identifiable. Here we have a high churchman of the Hanoverian church/state mould. He was entirely committed to the Church of England as the fruit of the Protestant Reformation with its basis in the authority of scripture. The

* This article arises from initial work in 1991/1992 when I was a Fellow Commoner at Churchill College Cambridge. I should like to express my appreciation to the Master and Fellows of Churchill College for their warm and friendly hospitality for the academic year 1991/92. I would also like to acknowledge the help of Dr David Thompson and Dr Mark Goldie as well as the friendly and efficient library staff at Cambridge, Lambeth, the British Library and Moore Theological College in Sydney. Dr Ken Cable and Professor Geoffrey Bolton have been valued conversationalists on Australian church history generally and on Broughton in particular.

Duke of Wellington, great though he was, had made a terrible mistake with Roman Catholic emancipation, for Romanism was not just politically subversive it was a system of error from which the Reformation had delivered the Church of England.

Broughton warrants more attention than he has been given so far in terms of Australian history and religion.¹ However, he also deserves some consideration in terms of the English framework within which he spent the first forty-one years of his life, and that in two respects. First, with what convictions, habits of thought and educational qualities did he venture to Australia to deal with this new and threatening situation for the Church of England in New South Wales. Secondly, does an examination of his background shed any light on our understanding of church and theological movements in the early part of the nineteenth century in England itself, especially the position of the old high church group?² It may, therefore, prove of interest from both an English point of view, and also from an Australian point of view, to look a little more carefully at the baggage which Broughton took with him to Australia.

Such an examination, I suggest, places Broughton in the category of the "old High Church" group. There is a certain difficulty of definition involved in this statement,

¹ That Broughton has been somewhat neglected is clear from the biographical publications on him. G.P. Shaw, *Patriarch and Patriot. William Grant Broughton 1788-1853 Colonial Statesman and Ecclesiastic* (Melbourne, 1978), hereafter referred to as Shaw. Shaw's biography is the only modern critical biography on Broughton and all who work on this subject are indebted to him for his pioneering and excellent work. There is an earlier biography, F.T. Whittington, *William Grant Broughton, Bishop of Australia* (Sydney, 1936) (This work was completed with extensive assistance from Dr P. Micklem). There is also an extensive memoir by Archdeacon Benjamin Harrison in the collection of Broughton's sermons which the Archdeacon edited, *Sermons on the Church of England, Its Constitution, Mission and Trials* (London, 1857). Shaw thinks that the Revd George Gilbert wrote the memoir of Broughton in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (vol.39, 1853) 431-436. There is also a memoir in the *Annual Register*, (1853) 214-217 and in E. Churton, *Memoir of Joshua Watson* (Oxford/London, 1861) the whole of chapter 23 is devoted to Broughton.

² See in particular Peter Nockles, *Continuity and Change in Anglican High Churchmanship 1792-1850*, D.Phil. thesis (Oxford, 1982) and also his essay, *The Oxford Movement: Historical Background 1780-1833*, in G. Rowell (Ed) *Tradition Renewed* (London, 1986) 24-50. In relation to patronage and the Hackney Phalanx see Clive Dewey, *The Passing of Barchester* (London, 1991).

since it is a matter of discussion as to how exactly that High Church group should be characterised, a characterisation which may well vary according to the point in time in which one was interested. The term in an ecclesiastical sense goes back to the last decade of the seventeenth century when 'High Churchmen' tried to respond to a flood of anti-clerical publicity.³ The term comes to have a variety of connotations in the nineteenth century, in no small measure as a result of the division which developed between Tractarianism and the High Church group in the late 1830s.⁴ We are concerned here, however, with the period up to 1829, when Broughton departed for New South Wales. In this period that division had not occurred. It is very easy to project the post Tractarian categories back on to the earlier period, just as, more generally it has proved to be a temptation for historians to read back later Victorian categories into the interpretation of the eighteenth century. The temptation in both cases is to be resisted.

William Grant Broughton was born on 22 May 1788 at Bridge Street, Westminster. When he was six years old the family moved to Barnet in Hertfordshire, and the young Broughton went to Barnet Grammar school. In January 1797 he entered the King's College Canterbury, and at the end of that year he was granted a King's scholarship. He left school in December 1804, having won an exhibition to Pembroke college, Cambridge, but he was not able to take up his position for lack of funds. For the next two years he appears to have lived at home and then, in April 1807, obtained a position at the East India Company in London. Six years later he inherited £1000 from his uncle and this enabled him to take up his position at Pembroke in October 1814. He graduated BA (sixth wrangler in mathematics) in 1818, and then was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Salisbury, married his long time sweetheart Sarah Francis and became the curate of Hartley Wespall in Hampshire, where he stayed for nine years. In 1827 he went to be Assistant at Farnham in Kent and was also appointed Chaplain to the Tower of London in 1828. He was offered the position of Archdeacon of NSW in October 1828, for which colony he set sail on 26 May 1829, four days after his forty-first birthday.

³See G. Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London 1956) xiii. However Peter Nockles *Continuity*, xLiv, refers the origin of the term to its use by Richard Baxter in relation to Richard Hooker.

Such, in brief outline, is the course for the formation of the Archdeacon. That formation and its results can be identified in more detail by concentrating on three stages in his life, each of which contributed something to the final outcome; his early life, time at Cambridge and his ministerial period. Before turning to these details it will help to focus the developing picture if we pause briefly to note the sorts of issues which Broughton would have to face in New South Wales first as Archdeacon and then later as the first Bishop of Australia. The English background can be focussed as well by identifying Broughton's circle of friends and acquaintances, for they securely locate him in the High Church tradition.

New South Wales was founded as a convict colony and this fact dominated the first twenty-five years of its existence. The Governor was supreme and the Archdeacon was an important person in the hierarchy of the colony. Although he came later in the life of the colony, Broughton still had to contend with some of the convict problems. The role of the church in relation to marriage, divorce and social mores certainly were a concern to him. The problems of the developing colony in matters such as immigration, the cessation of transportation, the settlement of land and the basis of its tenure, and the supply of labour in the colony all occupied his attention as an advisor to the government. For a number of years he was the chairman of the immigration committee of the Legislative Council. He was continually occupied with the problems of the role of the church in education, particularly with the rise anti ecclesiastical sentiment in this area. In his episcopal role he was faced with questions of church government and the relation of the church to the colonial government. As we shall see these challenges pick up elements in his background and development. The "baggage" he took with him was useable in the colony, but it had to be significantly re-arranged.

An interesting circle of Broughton's acquaintances within the ecclesiastical life of the Church of England can be identified. At Cambridge the Greek Professor, James Henry Monk, turns up again as the Bishop of Gloucester at Broughton's consecration. He was the leading light on Greek textual criticism at Cambridge, and he was also a staunch high churchman. Broughton would also have met or known of, George D'Oyly who was the Christian Advocate at Cambridge in Broughton's first two years as a student. D'Oyly was well known in his day as a theologian, was the Treasurer of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) and a member of the committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG); the

⁴For a detailed analysis of the relations between High Churchmen and Tractarians, see Peter Nockles, *Continuity*, Chapter 6.

two societies which Broughton supported, the latter being the object of his first published sermon at Reading in 1822. D'Oyly's successor as Christian Advocate during Broughton's time at Cambridge was Thomas Rennell, who was also the editor of the *British Critic* from 1811.

Rennell was a close friend of the Revd Handley H. Norris, whom we know from Broughton's correspondence was an old friend of Broughton as well. An indication of Broughton's friendship with Norris and his identification with the "church principles" of Norris, and thus the Hackney Phalanx group, can be seen in their correspondence. Norris had written to Broughton about his appointment to NSW and in his reply of February 9, 1829, Broughton said ;

you are quite right in saying that there is no ground for congratulation on my appointment...you have taken what appears to me to be the truest view of the relation in which the maintenance of the Church of England stands to the present and future happiness of mankind; and it is truly in the hope of recommending such views that I am going to what I know and feel to be a banishment.⁵

Norris was an extremely close friend of Joshua Watson, who not only knew Broughton well but also was one of his greatest and warmest supporters in the colonial church. Years later, when Watson's daughter Mary died, Broughton wrote to Watson to console and encourage his friend with recollections of the work which he had done for the church. "Your mind should preserve its activity and interest in those plans which were cherished by you and others within the bosom of the church at a time when the world at large , though retaining the word church in the creed, yet seemed to have forgotten that it had any proper meaning. You have lived to see the revival of a better feeling."⁶

Then , of course, we have Dr. Keate, with whom Broughton was on close and familial terms from the time at Hartley Westpall when he was Broughton's non-resident rector. Keate maintained his connections with Eton , which institution, through the person of the Revd Edward Coleridge was to play such a vital part in Broughton's work later as a bishop. Last but not least we note Bishop Pretymantomline, to whom Broughton dedicated his first significant publication which was

⁵Churton, *Memoir*, 113.

⁶Quoted from Churton, *Memoir*, 125.

an answer to *Palaeoromaica*. Tomline wrote to Broughton with approval for his work⁷, and in relation to Broughton's publication on the politically more sensitive issue of the *Eikon Basilike* he told Broughton that he strongly inclined to his side of the matter. Tomline was also on personal terms with Broughton's father in law, the Rev J. Francis.⁸

We see here a circle of friends and acquaintances of not inferior influence in the institutions of Church, State and University in the persons of Marsh, Tomline, French and also Wellington, through whose patronage Broughton was appointed to the chaplaincy of the Tower of London, and then the Archdeaconary of New South Wales. Tomline, together with Monk, D'Oyly, Rennel, Norris and Watson indicate Broughton moving in the orbit of the Hackney Phalanx. Certainly this grouping sits well with Broughton's opinions and convictions. We might even say that Broughton was the sort of person who could be covered by Lyall's phrase "...men who had no other claim except that of merit ...persons whose fathers were in very humble stations in life ..."⁹

Edward Churton wrote to S. Copeland on 29 October 1855 saying that some good might come from "quietly rebuking the upstart self-satisfied spirit of some whom I have heard preaching up their noble selves as if they had been the people and the knowledge might die with them." Peter Nockles relates this intention with Churton's composition of his Memoir of Joshua Watson, which was thus an attempt to set the later Tractarians in their proper place and to re-assert the position of the Hackney Phalanx High Churchmen. Thus in the second volume of the memoir¹⁰ Churton says, "The picture of the calm practical and retired wisdom of Joshua Watson was, to all who witnessed it, the most instructive contrast and preservative of those who came within the glare and dazzle of the rival and eccentric scintillations. What were the fruits to be attained in a school equally distinct from that of Newman and of Arnold." It is in the circumstance of this intention and purpose in the Memoir, that he devotes an entire chapter to a very sympathetic account of Broughton. In 1855

⁷Tomline to Broughton 1 March 1824 "I have read your work with much pleasure. I really think that it does you very great credit. It possesses merits of various kinds. You have displayed no small share of learning and knowledge, which you have applied with very forcible reasoning..."

⁸Tomline to WGB, 14 March 1826

⁹W R Lyall, *The Nature and Value of Church Property Examined* (London, 1831) 20f., quoted from C. Dewey, *The Passing of Barchester* (London, 1991) 15

¹⁰Churton Memoir, Vol. II, 157

Churton clearly thought Broughton to be in Watson's group and not in that of the later Tractarians.

With these future problems and this circle of acquaintances in mind we can now turn to the development of the young William Grant Broughton and the formation of his "baggage".

BROUGHTON'S EARLY LIFE

Broughton's family circumstances were relatively modest . Nonetheless there are some indications of aristocratic connections.¹¹ He is reported to have obtained his position at the East India Company on the patronage of the Marquess of Salisbury. In June 1852 the grandson of the Marquess, Lord Robert Cecil, stayed with Broughton in Sydney, and, in correspondence with his mother at that time, Broughton was able to relate the event with nostalgic recollections. "I could not help thinking how strange is the course of events which brings one of that family to my house: and I think that my having the honour of being able to receive and entertain him on terms of equality, may lawfully gratify you, and make some little return for the exertions and sacrifices which you and my dear father made to give me education , and to prepare me for the situation in which I am" .¹²

It was that education at the King's College Canterbury which contributed so much to Broughton's future development ; a solid grounding in the classics, particularly Latin, a habit of discipline, personal and mental, and an enduring emotional commitment to the symbols of the established position and character of the Church of England, so richly supplied by living in close proximity to Canterbury Cathedral. He also found there his Housemaster's daughter, whom he later married. His later correspondence makes it abundantly clear that this time at the King's College was profoundly formative, and he remembered it with great affection.

¹¹The obituary for Broughton in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (vol 39, April, 1853) 431 identifies the God-parents as Broughton's grandparents and the Countess of Strathmore, the baptism taking place in June 1788. The 9th. Earl of Strathmore married Mary Eleanor in 1767, but then died in 1776. His widow re-married in January 1777, but this marriage was dissolved by divorce in 1789. The tenth Earl was born in 1769 and did not marry until 1820. The reference to the Countess of Strathmore in connection with Broughton's baptism must be a reference to this Mary Eleanor.

¹²Broughton to his mother, June 1852, quoted from Whittington, 19

The ten years that followed school were not so well remembered, but they nonetheless exposed him to questions which, in the colony of NSW, would prove to be extremely valuable. Undoubtedly this was a frustrating time in terms of advancement, but it was a period of practical activity and developing romance with Sarah Francis. Broughton worked in the Treasury section of the East India Company from 1807 to 1814, that is to say, when he grew from a nineteen year old youth to a twenty-six year old young man.

East India House has received a bad press from Charles Lamb's references to the dark and dingy corridors which impressed themselves on him when he worked there at this time. However, for an intelligent and energetic young man like Broughton there was a good deal to observe and to learn. It was a period of significant change for the company in terms of its organisation, the extent of its power and success and also the range of its religious responsibilities in India.¹³ In 1809 there was a major re-organisation of the company's administrative arrangements at India House, and although the Charter was renewed in 1813 some changes were made in the way directors were elected. One of the debates which would have been of interest to the young Broughton, was that concerned with the responsibility of the company for missionary activity in India. In the period 1806-1812 India House was literally a house divided against itself on this issue. Charles Grant and Edward Parry, together with their Clapham Sect associates, were striving for a change in the policy of non-interference to one of the universal dissemination of Christianity in India.¹⁴

What we learn, then, from this early life of Broughton is that he came from modest family circumstances, with peripheral but significant aristocratic contacts. Clearly a

¹³ During the period 1784-1834 the company was losing power in India. The renewal of the charter was sometimes a doubtful matter, and certainly a question of concern in the company. The company also faced financial pressure because of the European blockade, and this created severe trade and cash-flow problems. The Indian debt, for example, during the period 1806-1812 grew from £10 mil. to £26 mil.. Operations were disrupted by a Sepoy revolt at Vellore in 1806, and there were more severe disturbances with rebellion and mutiny in 1809. The increasingly severe financial problems which afflicted the company from 1811 would have had an impact on the Treasury of the company, and those who worked in that section. For the general background of the East India Company in this period I am indebted to, C.H. Philips *The East India Company 1784-1834* (Manchester, 1940).

¹⁴ See Philips op.cit. 159-166. The same Charles Grant as Lord Glenelg was later the Colonial Secretary with whom Broughton had to deal when he became Bishop of Australia.

boy of intelligence and promise, he imbibed the classical learning and ecclesiastical traditions of King's College Canterbury. We also observe that he spent the very formative years of his youth in the capital working in an environment which exposed him to the issues of the day, commercial, colonial, political and ecclesiastical.

BROUGHTON AT CAMBRIDGE 1814-1818

Broughton was admitted to Pembroke College on 7 May 1814,¹⁵ and he graduated sixth wrangler, that is to say, the top group of candidates, out of a list of twenty eight.¹⁶ In the terms of the day must be reckoned to be a very considerable achievement. Broughton was also the top candidate of his year in Pembroke.¹⁷ The Tripos examination was, of course, mathematical and required a high level of technical skill as well as ability to present and argue before the Moderators.¹⁸ He would have been prepared for this examination by his tutor in Pembroke, William French, in interactive small group and individual exercises.

French would have been the key influence on Broughton. He taught him mathematics and was Bursar of the College 1816-1817, and Dean 1814-1815. He was also one of the two College Tutors throughout the whole of Broughton's time. French had migrated from Caius where he had graduated as second Wrangler and Smith's prizeman. He was appointed Master of Jesus College in 1820 at the age of thirty-four and in 1830 published a new translation of the Psalms. Only two years older than Broughton he offered him the sharp training of mathematical precision and linguistic skills. This influence came in the environment of a small and stable

¹⁵The Pembroke College Admissions Book, 1797-1891 records Broughton's admission on 17th May 1814, ad mensam secundum sub Tutoribus Mags Wood et French. Despite the increased enrolments following the end of the war, Pembroke was a small community.

¹⁶There were also 30 Senior Optimes, and 11 Junior Optimes.

¹⁷There were two other Pembroke Wranglers; Attwood (seventh) and Hutchins (ninth).

¹⁸The Moderators for 1818 were William French (Pembroke) and Fearon Fallows (Johns). Broughton was not examined by Isaac Milner, *pace* Shaw, 7. In fact Milner was an old man during Broughton's time as an undergraduate and he almost certainly had no contact with him as a teacher or an examiner. Milner was Lucasian Professor of Mathematics 1798-1820, but he delivered no lectures. He was Vice-Chancellor in 1792 and again in 1809/10. He engaged in a public dispute with Herbert March in 1813 about the Bible Society, but towards

college community, which was Tory in politics and strongly supported the church establishment.

The University and the town were both affected by the immediate post-war problems of depression and financial stress, which led to farm workers' riots in Ely in 1816. In 1815 students founded the Union and this became a forum for debates on political and other matters.¹⁹ However the forces of conservatism were very strong in what was still a very clerical society. Isaac Milner's objections in 1811 to student desires to establish an auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society were more those of conservatism than religion. "He was convinced that if undergraduates were permitted to organise themselves for the purpose of diffusing a knowledge of the Bible, it would not be long before they were banding together to spread subversive political ideas; and that therefore it was of the utmost importance to impress upon them that they had not come to the university to teach their elders and betters."²⁰

Of the theological professors the most effective presence was that of Herbert Marsh.²¹ The points of contact between Marsh and Broughton are extensive, and while there are a number of aspects to Marsh's outlook with which Broughton would not have agreed, there are many areas of agreement. Herbert Marsh grew up in Farnham, Kent, where his father was the incumbent and where Broughton was later curate. Marsh went to the King's College Canterbury as a Kings scholar in 1771, as Broughton also did sixteen years later. Marsh went straight on to Cambridge, and spent the last decade of the century in Germany studying and translating the work of Michaelis on the New Testament. When he returned to Cambridge he became Lady Margaret Professor in Divinity and began lecturing in 1809. He initiated the practice of lecturing in English, and gave his lectures in Great St Mary's Church in order to accommodate the larger audience, and also to enable townspeople to attend. His lectures were printed but were never set as a text in the university. He lectured on a three year cycle and Broughton would have heard them delivered in 1816. He would also have had available to him the lectures Marsh gave on New Testament textual criticism for the first time in 1810.

the end of his life (he died in 1820) he described himself as an invalid and rarely left the Lodge.

¹⁹See M.J.Murphy, *Cambridge Newspapers and Opinion 1780-1850* (Cambridge, 1977) 15 .

²⁰D.A.Winstanley, *Early Victorian Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1955).

Before he went to Germany Marsh had been influenced by Paley and the case for Christianity which deployed arguments from "evidences" and from prophecy. This theological approach was sharpened by his stay in Germany where the theological issues were differently drawn. Marsh came to emphasise the case for Christianity based upon a defence of the New Testament as historically reliable, rather than the arguments based on the fulfilment of prophecy from the Old Testament. However, in the process the New Testament becomes not a divinely authoritative book in its own right, but rather historically reliable evidence for early Christianity. In England the intellectual challenge from Deism was met by a development of what was essentially a Lockean epistemology which enabled the defence of Christianity to be brought into more positive relationship with Enlightenment impulses. Cambridge played a particular role in this respect, in some contrast to Oxford which was less hospitable to the Enlightenment.²² It is interesting to note that a contemporary of Marsh at Cambridge, Richard Malthus, also developed Paley's line of argument and sought to deal with the question of theodicy raised by the Enlightenment in relation to social evil.²³

In Germany the reaction in theological circles to the Enlightenment was to develop an aggressive, critical attitude to the interpretation of scripture which eventually, in the hands of people like Semler, Reimarus and most notably Lessing, separated in a quite radical way the defence of Christianity from the defence of the Bible. The former could be enterprised on what came increasingly to look like romantic grounds, while the latter was left aside as either unreliable or irrelevant.²⁴

In England, and Herbert Marsh exemplified this, the Bible remained in large measure secure at the end of the eighteenth century, but a more open historical approach had to be developed in relation to the regularities of the Lockean

²¹In what follows I am particularly indebted to R.K. Braine, *The Life and Writings of Herbert Marsh* (unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge, 1988).

²²J. Gascoigne *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1989) 21.

²³See A.M.C. Waterman, *Revolution, Economics and Religion. Christian Political Economy, 1798-1833* (Cambridge, 1991), especially 58ff., 114-123. Malthus was ordained deacon in 1789, and priest in 1791, serving as curate in Oakwood, then holding the living of Walesby in Lincolnshire before becoming, in 1805, Professor at the East India College, where he remained.

epistemology. Thus, from Michaelis Marsh developed a view of history which opened up more possibilities for the defence of a conservative social and ecclesiastical position than appeared to be possible in Germany. " The Christian religion was as true within the first ten years after the death of Christ , as it is at present; but at that time the New Testament was not written, consequently the truth of Christianity could not depend on the authenticity of the New Testament".²⁵ The christian apologetic did not fall apart if the Bible was shown to be unreliable, as it did for Reimarus, nor was that apologetic restricted to what one believed in one's heart , as it did for Lessing. The apologetic was conducted on a broader base and with a more confident critical historical outlook. R.K.Braine characterises Marsh in the following way.

Marsh was thus in many ways a representative churchman of his day even if he was more learned than most of his ecclesiastical colleagues. He belonged to a self-confident latitudinarian -Orthodox apologetic tradition and was not, as some commentators have supposed , a High Churchman. He rejected the authority of the Fathers, of Councils and Tradition. He never seriously considered the doctrine of apostolic succession. Nor did he dwell on the spiritual authority of the church or her priesthood. Instead he gave articulate voice to the two typical themes of latitudinarians - the authority of reason and the Bible. At the Reformation, he believed, papist claims to infallibility , fallacious appeals to the authority of tradition, and the whole superstition of the middle ages , had been swept aside by the Reformers. The scriptures had been subjected to reason, their grammatical sense restored, and a new era of learning inaugurated.²⁶

Not all of this would have been congenial to Broughton. In later life he did appeal to the early church and its councils, and he would more correctly fit into the category of the late eighteenth century "orthodox". He was not a latitudinarian, though he certainly shared Marsh's strident anti-Roman sentiments. He also came to share Marsh's views about the importance of education and the role of the Church of

²⁴See B.N.Kaye, Lightfoot and Baur on Early Christianity, *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984) 193-224 and D.F. Strauss and the European Theological Tradition: "Der Ischariotismus unsere Tag" ? *The Journal of Religious History*, 17(1992) 172-193.

²⁵From Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament, vol 1, p.378f., quoted from Braine, op. cit. 53.

England in it. "Broughton made Marsh's arguments his own."²⁷ Shaw has argued that Broughton took up Marsh's emphasis that the clergy should be a learned profession and that the history of Israel had something to teach all nations, "Marsh had scarcely a more devoted pupil".²⁸ However, Broughton had taken on more than this from Marsh, and in some respects it was more profound and important ; namely, a critical and open historical approach to the past. This attitude is revealed in Broughton's early publications, particularly in his defence of Gauden's authorship of the *Eikon Basilike*, a position which ran against the grain of Broughton's social and royalist sentiments. For the moment we should note that this historical attitude has its antecedents in Marsh and the historical methods and attitudes which he contributed to Cambridge from his study and reflections in Germany.

When Broughton graduated from Cambridge he wanted to marry Sarah Francis and was firmly committed to ordination and a clerical career. His achievements at Cambridge would have opened up the prospect of a Fellowship at his college, but he could not hold a Fellowship and at the same time be married. He left such thoughts of a College Fellowship behind him in order to plunge into his ministerial work.

MINISTERIAL WORK

Broughton wasted no time in getting on with things.²⁹ He had clearly made prior arrangements for his ordination in February by the Bishop of Salisbury on letters

²⁶Braine op.cit. 10f..

²⁷Shaw, 7

²⁸ibid

²⁹The impression given by Shaw (p.7f.) that Broughton's ordination and move to Hartley Wespall were somehow a second best to seeking a fellowship at Cambridge is, I think, not correct. Broughton's final examinations began on 20 January 1818 and would have extended for at least two weeks. Even on the minimum scale this would only leave less than two weeks for him to get ordained and licenced. Such things were not then arranged at such short notice and it is impossible to think that there were not prior arrangements made. It is an interesting question as to how Broughton was able to come by such a comfortable house and position at Hartley without some connections or patronage. Shaw thinks Broughton's income at Farnham was £1,000. Peter Virgin has investigated the incomes of clergy in some detail and such an income in 1830 would have put Broughton in the top six percent of incomes for

dimissory from the Bishop of Winchester. He was licenced immediately to Hartley Wespall, where the non-resident rector was the Hon and Revd Alfred Harris, to be replaced soon after by the Head Master of Eton, Dr Keate. In July he was married to Sarah Francis in Canterbury Cathedral where her father, his former housemaster, was one of the Six Preachers of the Cathedral, and later in the same year he was made priest. Broughton came to love this little village just off the road between London and Winchester, and sitting near to the social and architectural bulk of Stratfield Saye, the seat of the Duke of Wellington given to him by a grateful nation.

Broughton occupied a large vicarage in which he conducted a school, reflecting his educational commitments. He became acquainted with the Duke, and more particularly the Duchess who assisted him in seeking to obtain a librarian's position in London. He and his family entered into an intimate and affectionate relationship with his rector Dr. Keate, and Broughton quickly established a reputation as a staunch high churchman. It was not long before he was offered a curacy in Margate.³⁰ His first publication was of a sermon preached at a deanery conference to support the SPG and it was dedicated to the Bishop of Salisbury, John Fisher, who coincidentally had been previously the resident incumbent of Broughton's parish. We also have a sermon which Broughton preached on the resurrection at Farnham in 1829.³¹ However, in the intervening years years Broughton published two significant works, each with a follow-up publication, and these call for some more detailed consideration in order to identify a little more clearly Broughton's intellectual skills and outlook.

PALAEOROMAICA

In 1823 Broughton published a 320 page reply to *Palaeoromaica*, an anonymous work on the linguistic background to the text of the New Testament, and then later in 1825 he published a further contribution.³² This densely argued debate reveals something

beneficed clergy. See P. Virgin, *The Church in an Age of Negligence. Ecclesiastical Structure and Problems of Church Reform* (Cambridge,1989) Table VI, 277.

³⁰See Shaw 8, though I am not sure that Broughton felt as isolated as Shaw suggests.

³¹*The Resurrection of the Dead and Life Everlasting* (Farnham, 1829).

about Broughton's general social and ecclesiastical attitudes as well as showing something of his skills. The timetable of the debate was as follows;

1822 *Palaeoromaica*, published anonymously by someone identifying themselves as a "humble protestant".

1823 five published reactions to this book; Thomas Burgess (Bishop of St David's), the Revd J.J. Conybeare (Prebend of York), the British Critic, the Revd W.G.Broughton and Dr Falconer. In 1824 the anonymous writer published a Supplement to *Palaeoromaica* which included a response to Burgess, Connybeare and the British Critic and appended three postscripts dealing with German debates of the original language of the New Testament, Broughton and Dr. Falconer.

1825 Broughton published an 84 page Reply to the Second Postscript.

The original publication consisted of six disquisitions which effectively set the terms of the debate:

I. Was Greek as widely known in the time of the Apostles as is commonly thought?
No

II. The apostolic autographs are considered and some general principles about translations made. Indications of translation are then identified in St Mark's gospel according to the Elzevir text. A thesis is developed that the Elzevir text has behind it a Latin original.

III. The style of the Greek NT examined, and the difficulty of designating this style. The "barbarism" of Paul's style had been noted by the early church fathers, and these stylistic marks betray a Latin original.

IV. A long list of words and phrases are considered which point to a "a servile version from the latin".

V. The history of the formation of the canon on the NT is reviewed in a way that suggests preference would be given to a Greek text. In the history of NT text editions up to Wetstein greater respect had been given to Latin texts.

VI The hypothesis of a Latin original is applied to Griesbach's theory of recensions, and the advantages of the hypothesis are noted.

Palaeoromaica, in general terms, argues the thesis that behind the Elzevir Greek text of the NT, which had been published in 1624, there is a Latin original. This whole exercise and the hypothesis itself has, of course, been taken over by later events in

³²*An Examination of the Hypothesis, Advanced in a Recent Publication, Entitled 'Palaeoromaica'* (London, 1823) and *A Reply to the Second Postscript in the Supplement to Palaeoromaica*, (London, 1825).

the textual criticism of the NT; the discovery of many more manuscripts, the development of scientific methods of dating ancient documents, the vastly superior knowledge of first century Greek provided by the discoveries of papyri, the increased knowledge of the Graeco-Roman social and linguistic environment arising from archeological discoveries. The dispute is really a *cul de sac* from a modern perspective, and indeed even in 1823 it really should not have raised much of a ripple. That Broughton engaged so substantially in the debate is in itself interesting and sheds some light on his own more general attitudes.

In Broughton's reply he deals at some length with the details of the argument in *Palaeoromica*. He has no difficulty in showing that Greek was in fact quite widely known in the first century. He then goes through the questions of style, especially Paul's, and of the examples claimed as indicators of translation, particularly those from the gospel of Mark. He summarises the testimony of the early church fathers and relates the hypothesis to that of Hardouin. Broughton's reply to the second postscript simply answers the further questions and then concludes with some general remarks on the nature of reasoning that is appropriate in such debates.

The exact terms of this debate do not concern us here. We are interested in what is revealed of Broughton's skills, learning and attitudes, and in all these respects we learn something. We also have the opportunity of observing to which writers and authorities he appeals. All in all Broughton shows up very well from these publications. He discusses a wide range of particular cases of supposed latinisms of translation, and in the process demonstrates a very high level of skill in Latin and Greek, as well as a reasonable competence in Hebrew. At one point he discusses Hebrew morphology with a degree of facility.³³ He is clearly aware of text critical methods in relation to the NT and to classical writers, an aspect of classical studies which had a strong tradition at Cambridge. He is aware of scholarly discussion of these issues, and he sees the significance and limitations of applying the criterion of "sense" to text critical questions. He clearly sees the strength of having a wide range of textual variations and is able to compare NT and classical texts in this respect. He also readily recognises that the best that can be hoped for is what is most likely, in the light of the available evidence, and that absolute certainty in such cases is not possible. He points out that the tendency to Latinise referred to by Wetstein referred to Codex Bezae and not generally.

³³Broughton, *An Examination*, 146.

Broughton's historical skills and learning are also of a very high standard. His summary of the evidence for the extent of Greek in the apostolic age is neat, crisp and to the point. He identifies the relevant evidence from the NT, particularly the Acts of the Apostles, from Josephus and relevant information about Roman language policy in imperial administration. His approach to the characterisation of style is appropriate in terms of historical method; comparisons should begin from a known exemplar and it is therefore necessary to identify precisely Paul's style before seeking to discriminate particular passages within the Pauline corpus. So he examines the evidence for Paul's biographical details, and the likely linguistic implications from such a background. He draws in a consideration of Paul's social station, and the known regional differences in the Roman world. He agrees that Paul quotes from the Roman poets, but does not think he read them extensively.

Broughton is aware of scholarly debate on the issues he discusses; the main hypothesis of a Latin ur-text, the non-classical character of NT Greek, and the latinisms in the NT. One of the quite remarkable features of this book is the range of knowledge it shows of the early christian fathers, particularly those of the second and third century. He is able to discuss with some familiarity Gregory of Nyssa, Jerome, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and he has also worked his way through Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History. He is familiar with the early sources which point to Mark having written his gospel in Rome, and is willing to take an independent line on the synoptic relations of the gospels. In taking the view that Mark wrote after Matthew and to a certain extent copied his words, he says, " I am aware that I am opposing very great authorities".³⁴

Broughton's reading is also disclosed in the sources and authorities which he quotes or uses. He seems to have access to a reasonable range of editions of the classical and patristic texts which he quotes from, and it is interesting to note that he quotes from a wide range of scholars including Paley, Warburton, Leland, Bellamin, D'Oyly and Mant, Michaelis and Marsh. We might note that he quotes Michaelis with warm approval in support of the view that a number of Greek words and phrases in the NT come from the Septuagint; the point cannot be put "more sensibly or more correctly than has been done by Michaelis".³⁵ However, even though he quotes Michaelis on a number of occasions, he does not always agree with him. On the other hand when he refers to Marsh, as he does on a number of occasions it is always in agreement. The range and character of references shows that Broughton is

³⁴W.G. Broughton, *An Examination*, 219

³⁵ op.cit. 122

not only widely read in the primary sources, but that he is well read in the theological literature of his day in connection with this subject. He shows a distinctive awareness of German literature on the subject.

In this work Broughton also reveals some of his own attitudes, most obviously in regard to the NT and the early church, but also in relation to more contemporary matters. He reveals a very optimistic estimation of the unanimity of the testimony of the early church fathers and the value of this unanimity in moving back to the time of the apostles; "the testimonies of Clemens of Alexandrinus, of Tertullian, of Gregory, of Jerome, and of Augustine are, I repeat, valuable as evidence of a widely diffused, uniform and unbroken persuasion, existing among Christians from the beginning; they assure us of their own sentiments, and lead us, by a kind of induction, to those of a much earlier period."³⁶ The unanimity of the testimony of the early church was important for anyone who wished to vest the period of the first four councils with special authority, as did many churchmen of Broughton's day and before. Not only so, but this appeal also saw that early church period as continuous with the apostolic witness. In the hands of Protestants, the appeal to the early church was an extension of their appeal to the New Testament and had a distinct anti-Roman Catholic role. On the other hand he avers that Paul intended 1Corinthians not just for its immediate addressees in Corinth "but of the whole Christian world in that and every succeeding age. St Paul himself knew this; and his disciples knew it as well as we know it now; the perusal of the fifteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians was alone sufficient to convince them; and, as far as they were able, though their ability might be trifling compared with ours, they would seek to extend the knowledge of these universally interesting truths."³⁷

This does not lead him into any kind of absolute certainty about the contemporary authority of scripture since that would imply a form of certainty which is not appropriate in religion. Thus he rejects the demand of *Palaeoromaica* that there should be absolute certainty in establishing any text which is to claim to be the word inspired by the Holy Spirit. Such certainty could only be achieved by a constant divine superintendence at every point in the transmission of the text, that is, it would demand,

a series of miracles, and a perpetual infraction of the laws of nature, which no reasonable person can expect to witness. In a less instructed age the exertion of such a superintendence was inferred, because it was thought that, without

³⁶ op.cit. 296

³⁷op.cit. 275

it the integrity of the Sacred Writings could not be preserved. But a fuller enquiry has shewn that it was not exerted (otherwise there had been no various readings) and a juster comprehension of the subject teaches us to believe that neither was it necessary. "Should we grant the assertion," says the author of *Palaeoromaica* " that every word of the Greek Testament was originally inspired by the Holy Spirit, yet amidst a hundred and fifty thousand various readings, *which is the word used by the Holy Spirit.*" (p.469) And again "I would exclaim with Erasmus, let me be shewn the word dictated by the Holy Spirit and I will embrace it with the utmost reverence." We know who they were who cried "shew us a sign from heaven;" give us demonstrative assurance and then " we will believe;" but God rejected their unreasonable demand because a *moral* and not a *demonstrative* assurance was all the evidence which he saw could reasonably be required.³⁸

Shortly afterwards Broughton reverted to the same allusion to Erasmus as presented by *Palaeoromaica*, where the point at issue was whether or not it was possible historically , and necessary for religion, to be able to produce with absolute certainty the original text of the NT.

But "let me be shewn the word dictated by the Holy Spirit" is the cry; out of many readings which is genuine ? That, we reply, in favour of which reason and judgement , exercised according to certain approved rules , shall pronounce the balance of evidence to incline.Because reason and judgement are not infallible, the criterion here proposed , I am ready to admit, is not infallible; but this is a question of evidence ; and the assurance which is thus obtained , after impartially weighing what may be said on either side, is as satisfactory as that upon which men do not hesitate to act in the most important affairs of life: and in the case before us the balance of evidence is sufficient to beget a moral conviction, which, in matters of religion is faith.³⁹

The attitudes that are expressed in these sentiments about the text of the NT are quite important in determining Broughton's attitude to authority in Christianity. They also reflect the attitude with which he opened his book. There he explained to the reader that he was going to treat the matter as an historical question without any prejudice as to the character of the authority of the NT; " I am anxious to explain to him that the reasonings which they contain are founded on no such assumption , as that the writings of the Apostles are above scrutiny, and that every opinion which

³⁸op.cit. 244-246

³⁹op.cit. 251f.

appears to intrench upon their authority must therefore *a priori* be necessarily false."⁴⁰

It is in this context that Broughton declares that the same kind of critical examination may with the utmost propriety be applied to any scriptures taken to be divinely inspired as might be applied to any other texts. In making this claim that the Bible can properly be examined in an historical critical way just like any other texts Broughton is moving significantly ahead of many of his conservative contemporaries, but not, of course, of Herbert Marsh. That view was to attract a good deal of hostility when it was expressed in more elaborate and extended form by Benjamin Jowett in *Essays and Reviews* in 1861.

Broughton's real objection to *Palaeoromaica*, apart from the historical weaknesses in its case, is the spirit of scepticism which the book represents.⁴¹ It does not seek to argue for the strength of its own point of view as to cast doubt and uncertainty, "to produce *doubt* rather than *conviction*; not to fix, but to unsettle opinions, by insinuating that the most general and the longest established persuasions of men may be false, rather than by shewing that their own are true."⁴² It is for this reason that Broughton says he writes for the unlearned,⁴³ since they may not be in a position to see the inadequacies of the arguments put forward by *Palaeoromaica*. The learned will be well able to see the inadequacies and errors in the book but Broughton judges that it is his place to write for a wider audience, and thus he gives expression to Herbert Marsh's ideal of the role of a learned clergy.

⁴⁰op.cit. ix

⁴¹Compare the same complaint made three years earlier by Thomas Rennell, who had been Christian Advocate at Cambridge when Broughton was there; "There is a fashion of scepticism, which readily adapts itself to the reigning humours and caprices of mankind. Yet the shapes which it assumes, and subjects to which it is applied, vary with the peculiar character of the day." ... "At another it shelters itself under the garb of candid discussion and free enquiry. Sometimes the Scriptures of the New, but oftener those of the Old Testament, are the object of derision." *Remarks on Scepticism* (London, 1819) 1f.

⁴²op.cit. 13.

⁴³With which we might compare the review in the *British Critic* (19, 1823) 347, "We have reason to complain of the manner in which this is done; a manner remote from that of modesty and candour with which the author professes to conduct his enquiries, and savouring more of universal scepticism and a thorough contempt for sacred literature. The *Palaeoromaica* is calculated to unsettle all the historical notions of the young student of theology."

EIKON BASILIKE

Broughton's second excursion into public controversy did not involve any thought about the defence of the Bible, or the protection of the unlearned from the evils of sceptical thought. Rather, it had to do with what he regarded as one of the most important periods of English history, namely the seventeenth century, and in particular the reign and fate of Charles I. It had to do with history and it also had to do with Tory politics.

Within a few days of the execution of Charles I on 30 January 1649 a document was published which appeared to have been written by the king as an apologia, the so called EIKON BASILIKE.⁴⁴ It was presumed to be by the king and in time it came to be a symbol of Tory loyalty to the royal cause. In 1690 this assumption was brought into question with the publication of the Anglesey Memorandum and its claim by Bishop Gauden that he had been the author of the EIKON. The matter seemed to have reached something of a conclusion with the publication in 1717 by Wagstaffe of his third and very full edition of his vindication of the King's authorship. However, in 1821 H J Todd, who had been working as Librarian at Lambeth, published the memoirs of Bishop Waller. Included in these were four letters from Gauden and one from Mrs Gauden, the originals of which were at the Lambeth Library. *The Edinburgh Review* seized upon this new information, which appeared to make Gauden's claim decisive, and made the most of what it called "yet another Tory attempt to falsify history".⁴⁵ This stung some Tory sympathisers in their familial discussions in the Lakes District⁴⁶ and a public debate ensued.⁴⁷

⁴⁴For a summary of the debate and the issues involved see F.F.Madan, *A New Bibliography of the EIKON BASILIKE of King Charles the First with a note on the authorship* (London, 1950).

⁴⁵Quoted in Madan op.cit. 147

⁴⁶Robert Southey to George Ticknor, 30 December 1824, "Wordsworth was with me lately, in good health, and talked of you. His brother, the Master of Trinity, has just published a volume concerning the Eikon Basilike, a question of no trifling importance both to our political and literary history. ...I am the more gratified that this full and satisfactory investigation has been made, because it grew out of a conversation between the two Wordsworth's and myself at Rydal, a year of two ago." C.C.Southey, *The Life and Correspondence of the Late Robert Southey*, vol v, London, 1850, p 197.

⁴⁷ The publications in this debate were as follows:

1824 C.Wordsworth, *Who Wrote EIKΩN ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ?* (413 pages)

The dispute was finally settled in Gauden's favour , much along the lines argued by Broughton, with the publication in 1839 of the autobiography of Symon Patrick, who had died in 1707, and whose diary refers to the writing of the EIKON by Gauden and its revision by the King.

It is not necessary to rehearse the arguments put forward by Broughton , but his two publications reveal a detailed knowledge of the period and the events involved. He deploys the same kinds of skills as were found in the *Palaeoromaica*. Though there is not the same variety of linguistic usage, there is nonetheless a question of style in the documents under dispute. Broughton , however, places the weight of his argument on the historical circumstances and the possibilities that these yield. His classical learning is again apparent.

The reasons for Broughton's involvement in this debate are quite different from those in the previous excursion. He believed strongly that the period was one of great importance.⁴⁸He says tht he had studied it over a period of time. In the *Additional Reasons*, he acknowledged that he had made a mistake in the name of an author to whom he referred . "In sober sadness , then, I am compelled to

1825 C. Wordsworth, Documentary Supplement to "Who wrote EIKΩN
 ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ?" (56 pages for the King)

1825 H.J. Todd, A letter Concerning the Authorship of EIKΩN
 ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ.

1825 Robert Southey, Review of Wordsworth's two volumes in The
 Quarterly Review, vol 32, pp.467-505.(for the King)

1826 W.G.Broughton, A Letter toWho was the Author
 (92 pages for Gauden)

1826 Sir James Mackintosh, in the Edinburgh Review, vol 41 pp 1-47,
 514 - 515(for Gauden)

1828 C. Wordsworth, reply to the above (256 pages for the King)

1829 W.G.Broughton, reply to Wordsworth (76 pages for Gauden)

1829 H.J.Todd, reply to Wordsworth (72 pages for Gauden)

⁴⁸See the entry in his Travel Diary for the journey to NSW for 5 June 1829, in his reflections upon reading Harris' history of Charles I , "Of all periods whereof the history has been written I consider this as the most deeply interesting and it is one concerning which all Englishmen ought to have their minds well made up." The Diary is held in the Library of Moore Theological College, Sydney.

acknowledge I had not books whatever . The truth is, that having read, or rather devoured everything relating to this subject , as it fell from time to time in my way, I thought myself able , from recollection only, to shew the fallacy of your conclusion..." Broughton also probably had some contact with Henry Todd whose publication in 1821 had sparked the debate. Todd was one of the Six Preachers at Canterbury Cathedral at the time of Broughton's marriage there, and would consequently have been known to Broughton's father in law. He had used Todd's work in the *Palaeoromaica* debate.

Broughton's sentiments and political attitudes were decidedly on the side of the King, so that there was no desire on his part to make a political point out of proving Gauden the author. Almost his last word on the subject concerns the King's reputation, " my first anxiety was as to how it might affect the king's character for probity; and my principal gratification at the present moment arises from the conviction which I feel that it does not at all injuriously affect him."⁴⁹ In the first contribution he had , however, found Gauden to be at fault because he had sought to defend the church and episcopacy in the name of the dead king. Good causes do not need and should not use such dishonest supports.⁵⁰ Tory in politics he may be, committed to the established church order as a High Churchman he may be⁵¹, but he was also the student of Henry Marsh in the matter of historical method and of historical honesty.⁵²

BROUGHTON'S TRAVEL DIARY

⁴⁹W.G.Broughton, *Additional Reasons in confirmation of the opinion that Dr Gauden and NOT King Charles the First was the author of EIKΩN ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ* in a letter to the Revd Christopher Wordsworth D.D. , Master of Trinity College Cambridge (London, 1829) 70

⁵⁰*Letter to a Friend Touching the Question, Who was the author of EIKΩN ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ* (London, 1829) 88ff.

⁵¹Peter Nockles, *Continuity* x, makes the connection between High Churchmen and the monarchy on the basis of "the divine origin of all political power and authority in the family as well as in the state, and on the sacral notion of monarchy".

⁵²Shaw has suggested that both Broughton's controversial excursions were examples of the well known device of public display in order to attract patronage, and that this was particularly so in the case of the Eikon Basilike. I have already suggested that Broughton was

Broughton set sail for NSW on 26 May 1829 and sixteen weeks later arrived in Sydney harbour on 13 September. It was a fairly tedious journey on a convict ship with the usual difficulties and inconveniences. Broughton kept a diary on this journey and, although it is somewhat intermittent, at several points it relates his reflections on the books that he has been reading. The comments only occur in the first half of the journey, but during that time he records his thoughts on six books; Harris' History of Charles I, Hey's lectures in Divinity, Thomas Balguys' sermons and charges, Heber's journal, John Balguys' collection of tracts and Elisha Cole's book on God's sovereignty and righteousness.⁵³ He is clearly still occupied with the seventeenth century and his recent controversy over the Eikon Basilike in reading Harris. He comments on the critical role of errors of judgement by the chief players, and the weakness of the leaders, indeed the "wickedness of chief actors", and "the King's insincerity". Of the archbishop he says, "Excepting for his magnanimity at the hour of death, I have indeed little to say for Laud. His views might be honest. To a great extent I believe they were; though mixed with too great an anxiety for the exclusive interests of his order".⁵⁴ The reference here to King Charles' insincerity marks a critical note as compared with what he had said in the Eikon Basilike dispute. While the King may be cleared of any charge against his probity, he is nonetheless not entirely sincere in his dealings.

The basic attitudes displayed in the diary are quite consistent with what we have seen so far in Broughton's writings. He is politically conservative, yet historically critical, even of the cherished aspects of the Tory tradition. He nonetheless thinks that civil freedom is in fact dependent on some having privileges above others. He is

not as isolated as Shaw suggests. It is also the case that Broughton's first effort on *Palaeoromaica* had gained the sympathetic attention of his bishop, Pretyman-Tomline.

⁵³ Broughton's reference to the titles of these books is not full but they can be identified with reasonable confidence as follows: W.Harris, *An Historical Critical Account of the Life of Charles I King of Great Britain after the manner of Mr Bayle. Drawn from original writers and State papers*, London, 1758. J. Hey, *Lectures on Divinity delivered in the University of Cambridge*, 4th. Edition, Cambridge, 1822 (the first edition was published in 1785). T.Balguys, *Discourses on Various Subjects. Charges delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester*, Winchester, 1785. R.Heber, *Narrative of a Journey through the Upper Province of India, from Calcutta to Bombay, 1824-1825, and An Account of a journey to Madras and the Southern Provinces 1826*, London, 1828. J.Balguys, *A Collection of Tracts Moral and Theological*, London, 1734. The book by Elisha Cole does not appear in the British Library catalogue and I have not been able to trace a copy of it.

⁵⁴Broughton, Travel Diary, 5 June .

totally committed to the rightness of the subscription required of Anglican clergy. He finds Thomas Balguys to be weak on this point and to be "sadly Hoadleyan" in his principles. He worries that Hey has perhaps left room for the kind of scepticism of mind that makes for refinements that amount to dishonesty. "Surely a Christian and above all a minister of the gospel in practicing his assent to the doctrines of his church may speak the truth from his heart without all those refinements, reservations and subtle distinctions which are so many helps to prevarication and seem meant to enable men to swear that black is white with a safe conscience."⁵⁵ He is similarly concerned with John Balguys, that he may have left the sceptics' objections to Christian faith still in place. As in the *Palaeoromaica* debate he is exercised by the threat of a sceptical frame of mind. He also reveals that it is not so much the learning that students acquire at University that is finally important, but rather the habits of mind which their teachers instil in them. In this context he is concerned about Hey's lectures. Even though Elisha Cole is a Calvinist and his book argues for limited atonement, Broughton enjoys the scriptural quality of the argument. He makes the opposite complaint about Hey's lectures.

AU REVOIR

This analysis of Broughton's development up to 1829 shows that he was highly intelligent, well read and linguistically very competent. He had clearly demonstrated his historical acuteness and learning in public disputes and he was aware of German historical scholarship. He was concerned with education and religious commitment and held to the ideal of a clergy who were not only learned but who had the right habits of mind and dispositions. He was able to submit his political commitments to the higher demands of historical honesty. In this, it is fair to say that he was a churchman and a scholar before he was a Tory. He was also a man of practical experience of administration in the East India Company and had been exposed there to the issues of trading, finance and missionary policy. He was also clearly a man of strong and independent personality.

This picture of Broughton and his intellectual baggage is relevant to the recent interest in the old high church group during the 1830s and their relationship to the Tractarians. As we see him stepping aboard the *John* in 1829 to go to New South Wales he is clearly a High Churchman. This is apparent from his social and religious connections with the leaders of the Hackney Phalanx group. Not only did he see

⁵⁵Travel Diary, 5 June.

himself as belonging to this group, their leaders saw him as one of them. His “church principles” and intellectual habits belonged in this tradition.

In 1829 Broughton is a very good example of this high church tradition, just at the time when the Tractarians’ star began to rise. This picture of his intellectual baggage helps to mark out more accurately the lineaments of that high church tradition at the beginning of the 1830s.

During the next twenty years the High Churchmen faced major changes in those matters which were closest to their identity as a group; church state relations, the authority of social institutions, indeed the very character of authority in social institutions and as a consequence the nature of authority in religion. Many of these questions were directly related to their commitment to the Royal Supremacy in Church and State.⁵⁶

What his English colleagues faced gradually over a period of forty years, Broughton was forced to confront and come to terms with in less than twenty. In England that confrontation took place in a complex and developed institutional environment. In New South Wales Broughton stood virtually alone. When he responded to these social challenges he did so from the standpoint of a High Churchman.⁵⁷ In the raw institutional environment on New South Wales that provided him with an intellectual base of some considerable flexibility and sophistication.⁵⁸ He did not lack the intellectual strength to re-arrange his “baggage” in the new environment. What he sometimes lacked was the emotional and personal disposition to act upon the conclusions to which his very considerable intellectual endeavours led him. His intellectual and religious instincts enabled him to map out the basis for a response to the death of pluralism in Australia, even if he was not able to act out those conclusions.

⁵⁶ See B N Kaye, *A Church without Walls. Being Anglican in Australia* (Collins Dove, North Blackburn, 1995) especially 96ff.

⁵⁷ See B N Kaye, Broughton and the Demise of the Royal Supremacy, *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* (vol 81, 1995) 39-51

⁵⁸ A contrast between Broughton and his successor, Frederic Barker, can be made in this respect by comparing the way in which they understood and used tradition, see B N Kaye, The Role of Tradition in Church State Relations in Mid-Nineteenth Century NSW: The Cases of Bishops Broughton and Barker, in *Prudentia, Supplementary Number, 1994, Tradition and Traditions*, Eds. D Dockrill and RG Tanner (Auckland, 1994) 224-242

One of the critical challenges facing the High Churchmen in the 1830s was the clarification of their relationship with the Tractarians as both groups sought to respond to social changes. Perhaps because he was separated from the power of the enthusiasm coming from Oxford, Broughton saw more sharply than some of his English colleagues the tendency of the Tracts and the threat which it constituted to their brand of Anglicanism. Despite some loose and misconceived contemporary characterisations in Australia, Broughton was not a Tractarian. True he supported the reforming zeal of Newman and his Oxford colleagues in the early 1830s, but that waned towards the end of the decade. Broughton's enunciation of his conception of apostolic succession over against that of the Tractarians in his Charge to the clergy of New South Wales in 1841 made the difference between Newman's very singular and highly focussed religious impulse and his own absolutely clear. Broughton's was a more open religion, with a more diffused sense of authority, a more open conception of history and of theodicy.

From the point of view of the re-assessment of English religion in the 1830s Broughton constitutes a valuable study of the continuing High Church tradition. In Australia the colonially given form of christendom was the Anglican Royal Supremacy. The death of that christendom and the emergence of politically recognised religious pluralism came quickly and sharply. Broughton is the key to understanding the Anglican response to those changes. It is a key that can only be turned by a better appreciation of the intellectual baggage with which he came.