Chapter 6

Women’s Business:

Domesticity and Upholding the Faith

Oh, I wish I was married and had a comfortable home and mama could live with me in peace and rest where I could repay her back all her kindness. This is my great wish in life, this is what I pray for night and morning, and patiently I try and wait God’s time in fulfilling my prayer.

From Blanche Mitchell’s Diary; Friday 21 September 1866.

. . . I know that my horror at the idea of bringing a human creature into the world is morbid and unnatural but not the less can I overcome it. I do indeed lose all fear of gallows and handcuffs &c when the baby is once born. I cannot look into the innocent little face and connect it with such a future, but the sense of a dreadful responsibility remains [a] feeling of having invested heavily [in] something from which it is beyond your power to sell out, turn out how it will. You have brought a life into an uncertain world of wrecks and disease and dynamite explosions. Your heart’s love is irrevocably invested in that life.

Nora Murray Prior to Rosa Praed, 15 June 1884.
Much has been written about women’s lives in both nineteenth century England and in colonial Australia, and though the concept of separate spheres for describing the lives of men and women in the period has come under criticism, it still has useful explanatory power. The centrality of the study by Davidoff and Hall of middle-class families of evangelical/nonconformist background in the debate about separate spheres reflects its size and detail, but not its scope: it is a detailed study of a fragment of English society, hedged in by class and religious belief.¹ As Amanda Vickery has pointed out, the arguments made by Davidoff and Hall are not easily transmissible to other locations, classes or religious systems.² Vickery’s criticism may be true if the notion of ‘separate spheres’ for men and women are treated as rigid categories, and we see no role for women in the public sphere in which men were seen to operate, and no role for men in the domestic sphere apportioned to women. Even a cursory examination of the autobiographical writings of nineteenth century men and women, and of recent writing about them, demonstrates that the boundaries between the public lives of men and the domestic lives of women were not rigid. The involvement of men like T.L. Murray Prior and W.L.G. Drew in the domestic affairs of their households, or that of Eliza O’Connell and Anne Drew in public philanthropy, are examples of a wider reality.

The record of the lives of women in mid-nineteenth century Brisbane is quite different from the kinds of records on which men’s biographies can be constructed. There is much material about men’s lives in the public sphere, such as records concerning their employment, businesses and recreations, in archives related to those activities. Much of
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the material in newspapers concerns men’s activities. There is little, however, that gives us any insight to their personal lives: diaries and sequences of letters are not common, and even then men are less likely than women to write about how they thought or felt about the events of their lives. Robert Hogg, who has been doing a comparative study of writing by men in colonial Queensland and colonial Canada, has made the point that men are mostly concerned to describe their businesses or their adventures in their writing.

Whereas there was often little in newspapers or in official records to record the substance of women’s lives, there is a rich source in the writings of women in the form of diaries and letters. These two kinds of sources are quite different. Diaries are personal, and not necessarily meant to be shared with others. Blanche Mitchell, the twenty-three year old daughter of Sir Thomas Mitchell, surveyor and explorer, records that she was reluctant to read from her diary to Lizzie Rogers, because what was recorded was personal and not meant for other’s eyes or ears. Her diary for the year 1866, in which she visited Brisbane, is fascinating. She gives an outsider’s view of life in the very new colonial capital, and comments on the town itself, and on its social life. These comments are embedded in the rhetoric of her class, and are often quite barbed. Blanche was also a rather introspective woman and she frequently reflected on the events of her own life. These reflections are invaluable in trying to recreate some idea of her religious belief. For example, in the two months she stayed in Brisbane, she was in a household that experienced two deaths in as many weeks and in her diary she has recorded extended

---

3 Pers. com; Robert Hogg is a postgraduate student at the University of Queensland.
5 In the end, Blanche did read some of what she had written to her friend Lizzie Rogers.
meditations on these events. Letters, however, perform a different function. Writers in the 1860s and 1870s were generally immigrants writing to friends and family ‘at home’. The letters were often handed around the family for others to read. Nora Murray Prior records in her letters that she has sent her stepdaughter’s letters to other family members to read. Rose Paterson’s letters to Nora also provide evidence for this practice.

The content of letters is substantially different. The salutations and farewells often give some clues to the worldview of the writers and the receivers of the letters. There may be responses to queries and comments about people, events or ideas. Rachel Henning wrote to her sister Etta of the countryside, of town and country life, of houses, the weather, livestock and crops, about people and their doings, and gossip about mutual acquaintances. The content is dependent also on the receiver of the letter; the English working-class immigrant Julia Cross, in writing to her mother in Cambridgeshire, reveals a shared religious faith. When Julia wrote that she expected to eventually join her mother in heaven, the implication was that it was her mother’s expectation, too. Among the letters from Katie Hume to her family, there is one by her husband Walter to his sisters-in-law, suggesting a shared interested in the Tractarian Movement. The collections of letters used here have these kinds of elements, and all, in their different ways, give considerable insight into the lives and thoughts of the women who wrote them.

---


7 Her correspondent was Rosa Praed.

8 All these matters arise in the letters of Rachel Henning. A good example of this diversity is her letter of Christmas Day, 1864, Adams, p. 186ff.

9 Julia Cross lived at Goodna, near Ipswich. Her letters to her mother are preserved by Pam McClymont, *The Cross Family Book*, Brisbane, privately published, 1992. There is a copy in the Oxley Library in Brisbane and a photocopy is held by the author; my thanks to Val Hillier of Chinghee Creek, who brought the Cross family history to my attention.

What, then, constituted the woman’s domain? It was negatively defined by an English male trade unionist in 1877:

[men] had the future of their country and children to consider, and it was their duty as men and husbands to use their utmost efforts to bring about a condition of things where their wives should be in their proper sphere at home, seeing after their house and family, instead of being dragged into the competition for livelihood against the great and strong men of the world.¹¹

This English vision of a woman’s proper sphere was part of a public discourse about women’s life and work that extended to Australia. Katrina Alford quoted from Women's Work in Australia, by Susan Nugent Wood, to open her discussion of colonial women’s work:

Women do not, must not, live for themselves. It is their mission to combat against the worldly spirit which men too often cherish at home and abroad; it is theirs to soften the hard selfish feelings of the business life, to refine, exalt, purify and strengthen – and all this may be done without giving up the seat by the fireside, without one curtain lecture, without declamation of women’s rights . . . ‘Women’s Work’ must begin at home, and very often she need never move from the common round of the uneventful life to fulfil her noiseless part.¹²

Alford questioned the reality of this prescriptive view of the women’s place in colonial society where nearly one in three women between 15 and 64 were in the paid workforce.

Embedded in the historiography concerning separate spheres is a strong class component which locates the nineteenth century discourse about the separate spheres in the middle class.¹³ This raises questions about the ruling class elite at the one end of the social spectrum, and the working class at the other. Were there no separate spheres of activity for men and women there? There is probably little separating the ideology and

¹² S.N. Wood, Women’s Work in Australia, Melbourne, Samuel Mullin, 1862, p. 1
¹³ In American scholarship it has been tied to the rise of the middle class and its evolving self-identity; Vickery, pp. 384, 385.
reality of the lives of women from ruling/governing class backgrounds in the colonial context, from those living in more typical bourgeois/petit bourgeois contexts. The distinctions to be made relate more to household income and consumption and the extent of domestic service available, rather than a distinctly different set of guiding values, as Colin Bannerman has pointed out.\textsuperscript{14} The quoted trade unionist suggests that gendered spheres of activity for women were advocated by at least one working class man.\textsuperscript{15} It raises questions about working class ideology and working class reality. In colonial Australia, were working class women restricted in their opportunities for paid work? Katie Spearritt, in a study of women’s labour in colonial Queensland, suggests so.\textsuperscript{16} In our period, in 1871, 23\% of the paid female workforce worked in factories, 58\% were in service, and 7\% were professionals.\textsuperscript{17} It is worth exploring those figures. Women in service worked in a domestic environment. Women working in ‘factories’ were dressmakers, tailors, milliners and the like, who were capitalising on domestically acquired skills that many middle class and elite women also had. The 7\% who were professionals were presumably mostly teachers and governesses, and here again women have taken skills from the domestic sphere into the marketplace. Even those who were shopgirls were often working in an extension of the domestic sphere whether they were living in or not.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} Alford, p. 143.
\textsuperscript{17} Spearritt, pp. 142-143.
However, the portrayal of separate spheres by Wood is the more striking. The images of the ‘seat by the fireside’; an ‘uneventful life’; and woman’s ‘noiseless part’ represent a highly romanticised and idealised view of domestic life. They also draw attention to the paradox at the heart of Victorian domestic ideology: a sheltered passivity veiling the necessary creativity and activity of managing a home and family. Men’s domain is portrayed almost antithetically as worldly. By overdrawing the nature of the separate spheres, Wood focuses attention on the moral and spiritual dimensions of the woman’s domain and, excluding men from it, banishing them to the ‘world’.

Patricia Grimshaw noted the view of Bishop Moorhouse of Melbourne on the complementary nature of men’s and women’s domains:

Man the fighter and toiler occupies, as he must, the more prominent, though by no means the more important position. Woman, on the other hand, the nurse, the comforter, the sanctifier, can only do her work if she keeps out of the din of battle and the glare of publicity.  

Grimshaw explores some of the implications of this view of the separate spheres, especially in the way the church tried to keep women’s work out of the public sphere. The martial imagery used by Moorhouse – men as fighters, the din of battle – emphasises the difference and the distinctiveness of the separate spheres, and the bishop is just as guilty as Mrs. Wood of overdrawing the distinctions for polemical purposes. Nevertheless, the views had value in the promotion of an ideal, even though daily life may have fallen well short of it.

The role of women in nurturing faith and inculcating moral values in their children within the domestic circle was important to both Wood and Moorhouse. Neither gave men

---

19 Church of England Messenger, 6 October, 1881, p. 22.
any responsibility in these areas. In this chapter we will explore the lives of some
Anglican women, drawing largely on autobiographical writings. In the next chapter we
will turn to the public lives of Anglican men, to discover the how these prescriptive
definitions of the separate spheres have value in understanding the contributions of
Anglican men and women to the church and colonial society in Queensland.

**Stories of Anglican Women**

*Gaining Material Independence: The Letters of Julia Cross*

The letters of Julia Cross to her mother have been compiled by the late Pam McClymont,
and published in the family history.\(^{21}\) The sequence comprises twenty-five letters written
between October 1855 and April 1872. The early ones, especially those written on board
ship, are quite long and their grammar and spelling demonstrate that Julia was quite
literate, and she only stumbles over long words or words that she uses to try to convey
complex ideas. For example, she uses the word confirmed instead of confined when she
writes of women, including herself, giving birth, and rumatic for rheumatic.\(^{22}\) There are
many other similar cases of phonetic spelling. The letters are lively chronicles of daily life
in early Queensland.

Julia and her husband and family were quite conscious of their class location – as
unskilled labourers. Soon after their arrival in Brisbane from England in 1855, their
fifteen-year old son had found a job at Ipswich with a butcher, delivering meat. Twelve-
year old Emma was offered work as a nursemaid at 3/- weekly, and Julia hoped that
Emma and Walter (a ten-year old) could go into service at 4/- a week plus rations. Her
husband George soon found work with a brickmaker at £50 a year, with house and rations,

\(^{21}\) See note 5. Reference will be made to the letters, using the abbreviation *JCL*.

\(^{22}\) For use of the word confirmed; *JCL*, letter of [late] 1857; for rumatic, *JCL*, May 22 1856.
Walter working with him. Where they lived depended on where George could find work; this in itself was a significant defining factor in the family’s Australian life, which began near Goodna, about thirteen kilometres east of Ipswich, near the Brisbane River (Map 4, Appendix 1).

Julia was, first and foremost, a wife and mother. On arrival in Queensland, her children were 15, 12, 10, 7, 4, and 2 years old. Another child, Mary Ann, was born the following year. Her husband provided the second defining element of Julia’s life. George was an alcoholic, and used all the money he earned on rum; it is surprising that he remained in employment. Julia was dependent on the rations George received to feed her family. That the three eldest were in work was an important factor in the domestic economy. Julia had to find the means to clothe and feed the younger members of her family. Being a country woman, she envisaged having a cow, poultry, fruit-trees and vegetable garden, the care of which would be shared with the children. She showed young Georgy how to make fish traps to catch eels in the nearby creek, so that he could be encouraged to provide something for the table. Eventually her daughters Emma, Ellen and Lizzie all went into domestic service.

Over the years she managed to get together the money to buy land and build a house for the family in Goodna and on several occasions she assured her mother that she

23 JCL, 22 May1856.
26 c.f. Bannerman, p. 11.
27 JCL, undated letter, but about 1859; the letters are in chronological sequence. For the involvement of children in the family economy, see Rose, p. 87.
felt independent of her husband, George.  Nevertheless it must have been a great struggle for her. In a letter of 1868 she wrote that:

He cannot sell me out now, he cannot tell me now as he used to do tis his property, no indeed tis my property. I worked for the money, brought and paid for it in my name and if I die he will only have it as long as he lives, at his death it is Mary Ann’s . . . the one object of my life in this country to be independent of the man.

In this same letter, Julia mentions that she and Mary Ann (now 11 years old) had been picking cotton, and in the next letter she wrote of going out to do washing and sewing, and assisting women at their confinement. Thus Julia and her daughters did ‘women’s work’ – in their own home or someone else’s. Even in these straitened circumstances she managed to save a little money to remit to her mother in England. Her claim to be ‘independent’ of her husband is striking. Independence was a characteristic of manliness, especially in the construction of respectability. It also had legal connotations; a married woman was considered to be socially and economically dependent on her husband.

Julia’s claim to independence was a claim to respectability for herself which effectively ‘unmanned’ her husband, George, on the basis of his inability as a breadwinner.
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28 JCL, 9 August 1861; 16 March 1862; 18 January 1867.
29 JCL, 3 October 1868. This pre-dates the Married Women’s Property Act in Queensland. There is some evidence in the letters to suggest that she may have received an inheritance from her family in England that was used to secure her independence; it would have been treated under law as a marriage settlement, that is, for her use.
30 The local minister helped her find some of this work; JCL, 23 February 1869(?). Sonya Rose discusses similar kinds of work English working class women did to make ends meet; Rose, pp. 77-79.
32 JCL, 4 August 1869.
33 Rose, p. 15.
34 Writing in 1853, it was the Chartist William Lovett’s view that ‘A man must have indeed lost all self-respect to allow himself and his offspring to be dependent on a wife’s labour’. By this standard, he would have judged George Cross to be a failure; quoted in Rose, p.148. Rosa Praed, from quite a different socio-economic class, placed a similar importance on economic independence from her businessman husband, Campbell Praed, made possible by her literary pursuits. See Patricia Clarke, Rosa! Rosa! A Life of Rosa Praed, Novelist and Spiritualist, Melbourne, MUP, 1999, pp.1, 62, 71, 124.
Julia was keen that her youngest children would learn to read and write, and the ‘mistress’ of the household in which Emma was working took this in hand for her. Later, the youngest, Mary Ann, went to school and the last of the letters in the sequence were written by her when she was in her mid-teens. Julia was quite satisfied when Emma married a wheelwright/carpenter:

I know that she for one of my children will be respectably situated in life, far better than she would have been at home. What a comfort. Oh, my Mother ’twas for my childrens welfare that I left the shore of old England. I could foresee that they would be better off here than in England.  

The class location of the Cross family is also confirmed by the way they related to others, especially the Campbells, who at one time or another employed George, Croxford, Walter, Ellen, Emma, and Emma’s husband, Henry Bache. There was material help, too, as Julia could get what she needed from the Campbell’s stores when George worked for them. The Campbells were undoubtedly aware of Julia’s domestic situation and Mrs. Campbell and her daughter would visit their cottage. Certainly, from Julia’s point of view, Mr. Campbell was a ‘gentleman’, and there is an element of deference in the way she writes of the Campbells. Nevertheless they were generous, and in 1867 she wrote that the ‘Campbells never close their share on me’.
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35 The school was probably the National School at Goodna; *JCL*, 15 December, possibly 1858.
36 *JCL*, 14 July 1860.
37 *JCL*, 14 May 1866; 18 January 1867.
38 *JCL*, 14 July, 1860. When the girls went into service there, they ‘married from there’ – that is they were married out of the Campbell household.
39 At this time, John ‘Tinker’ Campbell was in partnership with Captain Robert Towns in a coalmine and also ran cattle at Redbank. He may also have been involved in the timber industry there. His wife’s name was Temperance, and the daughter, Rebecca. The family seems to have been at least nominally Anglican; Rebecca married a Charles Alfred Owen, and their child’s baptism is recorded at the Anglican Church in Ipswich. Thomas Welsby, ‘John Campbell – A Squatter of ’41’, *Journal of the Royal Historical Society of Queensland*, 3(1), 1937, pp.27-36.
Julia’s consciousness of her class position came from her religious belief; she believed her class location was due to the providence of God. Answering a letter from her niece, who was caring for elderly parents, Julia wrote:

God in his all-wise providence has ordained your position in life to be as it is. As you wisely remark if you had married you could not do for your parents as you now do. I was so glad to hear that your father has not forgotten you, he may think it an honour conferred upon him having such a daughter.

Ideas about God’s providence and filial duty are inseparably intertwined. Julia implies not only adaughterly duty to care for her elderly parents, but specifically draws attention to a gendered relationship in a close father-daughter bond. The expectation that a single daughter would care for her parents was normative. In Julia’s worldview, divine providence and human duty spiritualise the trap of gender and class. She is writing as much about her own situation in relation to her husband as that of her niece to her father. The response was an acceptance of a social reality – there were few, if any, choices.

In a society of immigrants, few people had kith or kin nearby at all, and the activities surrounding church or chapel gave them a sense of identity and belonging. Julia Cross did have members of her husband’s family nearby – children of his first marriage – but none of her own family. For quite some years she implored members of her immediate family to migrate, especially her brothers Tom and Ted, but none did. As her children grew up, married and had families, the ache was less acute. However, her sense of

---

40 This structured view of society was spelled out in an article in the *Church of England Magazine* in 1838, when Julia would have been nineteen years old: ‘the various gradations of society are of God’s appointment; and if so, then the duties that spring from those relations rest upon divine sanction. The whole world may be compared to a great army, of which God is the supreme commander; he has appointed to each his rank, in keeping which is safety, honour, and reward. Eminence does not consist in rising out of any one of those stations that may be looked on as inferior into one of the higher, but in so discharging the duties of the relation wherein each finds himself, that there is no omission chargeable against him.’ There is much more in the same vein; *Church of England Magazine*, vol. 5, no. 114, 21 July 1838, p33.

41 *JCL*, 4 August 1869.

42 It is important to bear in mind that there were no welfare services for the elderly to fall back upon.
separation from her family was always present in her letters, and she asked after a great many of them by name.43 One gets the impression that by bringing them to mind she was trying to recreate her lost family community. Even more poignantly she sometimes concluded her letter on an eschatological note:

   My Dear Mother, I often wonder is I shall ever see you again in this world, O My Mother let us endeavour to live so that we may both meet on the right hand of Christ. God bless you and my poor aff[il]icted sister for ever and ever. Amen.44

Realistically, Julia had no chance of seeing her family again. The exchange of letters and photographs was an integral part of keeping memories alive and of coming to terms with separation. The hope of meeting again in the next world was a not uncommon theme of immigrants’ letters.45

   There was pragmatic element to Julia’s faith. Writing to her mother about the difficulty of having an alcoholic husband, she was philosophical about it, quoting a text from the Old Testament prophet, Jeremiah: ‘Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard change its spots?’46 In truth there was little she could do. She had considered having him committed to the asylum, but if she did she would have lost the all-important rations to which he was entitled from his employer.47 Instead she developed strategies to protect herself and her children when he was frequently drunk.48

   In the absence of comparable sources, it is difficult to estimate how representative Julia’s life is of working-class women. She lived out of town where her work options were few, but there was scope to supplement her husband’s due in rations from her backyard.
and to find paid work to support herself and her children, and eventually to house the family. On one hand her life was defined by her husband’s addiction and on the other by her class and gender. George’s drinking put her and the children at risk of his violence, which she countered with caution and wisdom. Her class and gender limited her opportunities for the paid work she needed to survive, but her resourcefulness and courage enabled her to maintain herself and family. George did not cross into the domestic sphere, nor did he seem to actively interfere with Julia’s role as mother and household manager, though he had no qualms about taking any money he could find to support his drinking habit. He lived in a limited man’s world, with a wife to service his needs.

Her story is one in which a woman’s life could not altogether be restricted by a narrow understanding of a separate sphere for women. Her role in the family was clearly subordinate and circumscribed by her husband’s perceived role as breadwinner – one in which he failed miserably – but necessity enabled her to be an actual provider for her family. Even her paid work was within the domestic sphere apportioned to women – except for cotton-picking. But even there, cotton-picking was considered as ‘appropriate’ for women and children. Through all this was an undercurrent of faith. By undertaking her tasks as mother and provider for her children under divine providence, she would be rewarded by reunification with her family in the life to come.

Anglican Congregationalism: The Evangelical Mission of Mary Nicholson

Mary Nicholson’s letters are only available as extracts that specifically deal with her religious activities whilst living at Grovely, outside Brisbane, and span the period from
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49 She developed strategies to keep the children away from George when he was roaring drunk. Two of her younger children were members of the children’s temperance movement, the Band of Hope, which met at Goodna. JCL, 18 January 1867; 3 October 1868.
50 Obituary, Mrs Yarrow, QT, 10 July, 1915; for women’s work as an extension of the private sphere, see Strachan, p. 14.
1865 to 1869. Photocopies of the handwritten extracts and typed transcriptions of them are held in the John Oxley Library in Brisbane; other letters are in the possession of the Nicholson descendants. The extracts are from letters written by Mary to her mother and sisters who lived at Barford St Martin, outside Salisbury in England. Mary’s writing style is quite different from Julia’s, and reveals a very high educational standard. The Nicholsons farmed at Grovely, where they bought a vineyard from Daniel Skyring. The photo of them (Plate 6.1) projects the image of a farming couple. They also ran cattle on the property and at Samford. Early in their Grovely life they employed at least one nearby settler (Tom Marshall), and the family history identifies others who worked for them. In a risky attempt to improve their financial position, the Nicholsons lost their capital, including their farm, by investing in a sugar-milling venture at Caboolture. In the wake of this disaster, John Nicholson found a job as a clerk of petty sessions. According to the criteria discussed in chapter five, they were petty bourgeoisie, initially receiving income from the property they owned and then from John’s employment as a clerk. Their network of social relationships confirms this class position. Mary Nicholson claimed the Rev. James Matthews as a friend, also identifying him as the minister responsible for the district in which they lived. He was ‘an excellent young man and we were very much pleased with his manner and his matter’. Relationships with neighbours throw further light on their own perception of their class. Tom Marshall was a farmer who supplemented his income by working for the Nicholsons. Marshall and another farmer by the name of McDowell were consulted when the Nicholsons were proposing to build a church at
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51 See maps, Appendix 1.
54 I. Nicholson, pp. 31, 42.
55 MNL, p. 2.
Grovely. The way Mary Nicholson wrote about them suggests that they were regarded as social equals. They were ‘Mr. Marshall’ and ‘Mr. McDowell’. Working class people are never named and always written about in a collective sense.56

Nearby, there were both German and Irish labourers. The Germans were engaged to make bricks for the church.57 John Nicholson used to visit them on Sunday mornings and read the scriptures with them, taking with him his Bible and a dictionary.58 Also on Sunday morning he would send down books to the Irish labourers and then go down in the afternoon and talk with them for an hour. It comes across as a very middle class mission to the working class. No doubt the Nicholsons were sincere in evangelising their neighbours, but it is clearly constructed around class differences. They could be condescending:

Sometimes we reach as far as the huts, where I have always been gratefully welcomed. We have been planning for some time to get a few together on a Sunday or to have a little school. We want to see somebody caring for the souls of these poor emigrants – finding them out – fanning the tiny spark of life where any exists & leading them to Jesus. The last time I went down I found a tidy young looking couple – they came from Manchester two years ago, with two children & have buried one – we entered into conversation, the wife showing me several Bibles given them by friends before sailing & bye and bye the husband went to a drawer and took out a sheet of notepaper, very clean, which proved to be a “certificate of conversion to God” signed by elders of a primitive Methodist connexion & also stating him to be a Sunday school teacher & helper in other good works.59

Likewise when writing of a German family, she wrote:

In the afternoon my husband took his Bibles and went down to the poor Germans. They were very grateful, especially the wife, she regrets the absence of all the means of grace both for themselves and the children.60

---

56 MNL, pp. 1, 2, 4, 19.
57 MNL, p.10
58 MNL, pp. 7, 12
59 MNL, pp. 4, 5
60 MNL, p.7
The emphasis in both cases is the material and spiritual poverty of the recipients of Nicholson kindness. Both families are portrayed as being grateful and deferential. Mrs Nicholson also reveals her class location when she referred to the ‘tidy looking couple’ from Manchester, and commented that the Marshall family, with seven children, was all ‘clean and healthy-looking’. Perhaps cleanliness really was the next thing to godliness.

Where no clergyman was available, laymen would ‘read the prayers’ from the Book of Common Prayer, and often a sermon of a well-known preacher, such as Spurgeon. Rachel Henning records that, at Port Denison, the Police Magistrate read ‘the service’ each Sunday in the courthouse and at Figtree, near Wollongong, it was taken by the schoolmaster.61 Over time the Nicholsons gathered together a group that would worship at their Grovely home. John Nicholson assumed public leadership, taking worship in the absence of a clergyman, and as director of the Sunday school. 62 He was also the driving force in building the church, liaising with the bishop, the clergy, the architect, builders, and even the Governor, who laid the foundation stone. His assumption of local leadership hints of noblesse oblige, but it is probably true to say that without his drive and initiative, nothing would have happened. In this case the evangelical commitment to spreading the Gospel is bound up with a strong sense of Christian duty.

Class location is as much determined in relation to superior as to inferior classes. We get an inkling of this from Mary’s description of the laying of the foundation stone for the church by the Governor. There were several Aborigines present among the men and women who attended, but the give-away was the sentence: ‘There were several ladies also present.’ The context suggests that the ladies were from a higher station in life than the

---

61 Adams, pp. 151, 219.
62 MNL, pp. 11-14.
Nicholsons. One was Lady Bowen, who Mary described as a Greek princess, according her a higher rank than she possessed as the daughter of the president of the Senate of the Ionian Islands.\textsuperscript{63} Perhaps it was Mary’s way of emphasising the significance of the occasion. This impression is strengthened in a fuller account of the occasion in the family history, which also details Mary’s activity behind the scenes where she organised the refreshments for 300 people with the help of neighbours and friends.\textsuperscript{64} The formalities clearly indicate that the Nicholsons were not part of the colonial ruling class.

At the heart of Mary Nicholson’s faith was the conviction that ‘future success and prosperity of the Church of England depends mainly . . . on the persevering efforts of her private members each in his own sphere of duty’.\textsuperscript{65} This comment was made in the context of the logistical difficulty the church faced in adequately ministering to its scattered adherents and served to legitimise the Nicholson’s proactive role in local church affairs. The clergy had their work cut out for them in their routine ministry without being involved in active evangelism – this was something the Nicholsons could do. Mary Nicholson was well-equipped for the task. She was well-educated, befitting a woman believed to come from the landed gentry in England.\textsuperscript{66} The family historian described Mary as:

a gifted Biblical and Hebrew scholar. She spoke German and French fluently and was an accomplished pianist and an expert on church music.

\textsuperscript{63} Lady Bowen’s father was Count Candiano di Roma. Bowen had been rector of the Ionian University at Corfu, joining the colonial service as political secretary to the government of the Ionian Islands. \textit{ADB}, vol. 3, p. 203.

\textsuperscript{64} Nicholson, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{65} First letter in the sequence, 1865; that such spheres of duty were gendered is not explicit.

\textsuperscript{66} I. Nicholson, p. vii. I have been unable to verify this claim.
Another source made similar claims and further that she could converse in Norwegian and Italian. 67 There was something of the omnicompetent wife of the Book of Proverbs, as Mary was also a good horsewoman and housewife. 68

Mary’s vision for the church connected the idea of ‘lay agency’ which we have already noted, to a more institutional one centred in Sunday worship in a church building. 69 The Nicholsons thought it was unreasonable to expect anyone, but especially women and children, to walk six miles to church at Fortitude Valley and then six miles home again, especially in the heat of the day. Their vision was to provide a place of worship accessible to these local people. Much of the content of Mary’s letters is concerned with how they garnered support for their project, and how it was achieved.

Underlying this activity was the desire that the worship they could offer be ‘in a seemly and good order’ as the Book of Common Prayer exhorts, quoting St Paul. 70 Ideally, they wanted their own resident clergyman, but till then a monthly visit from a Brisbane incumbent would serve. In a letter dated Advent Sunday, 1865, Mary expressed the view that in their Sunday worship the ‘saints on earth’ and ‘those above’ were bound in ‘one sweet holy communion’. It was a powerful view of the communion of saints that also connected the colonial and English saints by the binding power of prayer. The connectedness to things English extended beyond personal relationships. The model for liturgy was English and liturgical music provided one of the means to evoke memories of Sunday worship ‘at home’. When the little congregation was worshipping in their home, Mary wrote:

67 Church Chronicle, 1 June 1952.
69 ‘Lay agency’ was the contemporary expression for the activities of lay people within a congregation. It covered everything from parish visiting and church music to church cleaning and lay readers.
70 Book of Common Prayer; ‘of ceremonies’ in the Preface.
Christmas Day has come to us once more with all its bright and happy memories but they do not make me very bright this morning. To remind ourselves of olden times we sang “The song of the Angels” before the service and then chanted “I Will Arise” but broke down in the middle. Sometimes a word or sentence carries us back and forcibly reminds us of past days. What would I have given to be a worshipper in God’s house. You cannot understand how intensely we long for that at times. Altho’ we are happy in our Sunday duties and service and firmly believe that the Lord’s blessing will and does rest on our efforts in His name, yet nothing can quite make up to us for this great lack.\textsuperscript{71}

Here the vision accorded with the High Churchmen’s vision of colonisation – to create ‘little Englands’ in the colonies. The yearning for the forms of worship familiar in England was in stark contrast to the experience of worship under shady trees in the Nicholson’s yard in the heat of summer that she wrote of the following month. It wasn’t just the form of worship they wished to recreate, but the familiar appurtenances to worship like bell, a harmonium, and appropriately traditional furniture for their little church.\textsuperscript{72}

Mary was a deeply committed Anglican woman who placed high value on the liturgy and evangelical tradition. In her visiting she met a young couple who had emigrated from Manchester. The husband had been active in the primitive Methodist tradition. He showed her a ‘certificate of conversion to God’:

> When I said “that must be very precious to you” – “No” (he said) it is not – it speaks of what I was, not what I am. I can never be that again. Two years in the bush don’t do your soul any good, it is all gone now.” We talked on for some time, for my heart seemed strongly drawn to him & his young wife. He was mild and gentle in his manner, & softened as we chatted – when I was leaving he said, “I tell you what did me more good than anything since we left England. When we left the bush and came to Brisbane, I went the other Sunday to the Church of England & the first words the minister read were – “I will arise and go to my Father”, & then came that heavenly confession which I had never heard, & it melted my hard heart till I sobbed like a child.” I thought I had not heard a more beautiful and striking testimony to the value of our prayer book than this. It is with such as these that earnest devoted men of God are needed. Open air preaching should be encouraged in these out-skirts. The people generally will not exert themselves to walk six

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{MNL}, Christmas Day 1865.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{MNL}, pp. 28, 29, 36, 37, 19, 39-41 of the manuscript letters.
miles in the scorching sun after a hard week’s work to go to any place of worship.73

These vignettes are testimony to the widely-held view of the converting value of the Anglican liturgy; and of the necessity of providing places of worship that were accessible to the poorest of people to enable them to experience it. When the church was finally unofficially open for worship, she wrote:

We shall, I trust, often meet with God’s blessing within this little sanctuary, humble tho’ it be. I cannot tell how the refreshment it seemed to sit once more in God’s House & hear His word and join in our beautiful service – really it is almost too good to be true!74

Mary Nicholson’s letters convey two interesting themes. One is the memory of the experience of worship ‘at home’ and the way it formed worship in the colonial context. It was to be as close as possible to the English tradition, based on the Book of Common Prayer. It had to be in a church building of a style to somehow reproduce that experience of worship. House-based worship or even worship outdoors was acceptable, but it was a duty to provide the best possible context for worship – a church building.

The second theme is Mary’s role in this project as a woman. She is an example of the home visitor, the middle-class woman who visited the homes of the poor to take to them the gospel of salvation.75 She and her husband co-operated in drawing together a worshipping community and Sunday school of which they were the de facto leaders.

---

73 The service of Morning Prayer in the Book of Common Prayer can begin with the words from Luke’s Gospel (15:18, 19) recalling the prodigal son’s decision to repent and return to his father’s house. This is followed by an invitation to confession, and the confession to which the young man referred and begins ‘We have erred and strayed like lost sheep . . .’. MNL, first letter in the sequence, 1865.
74 MNL, 9 February 1869 (p. 38).
75 Davidoff and Hall, pp. 141. Bradley quotes the evangelical writer, Hannah More’s Strictures on Female Education: ‘It would be a noble employment, and well becoming the tenderness of their sex, if ladies were to consider the superintendence of the poor as their immediate office . . .’ (my emphasis). Ian Bradley, The Call to Seriousness; the Evangelical Impact on the Victorians, London, Jonathon Cape, 1976, p. 124.
Plate 6.1 John and Mary Nicholson, of Grovely. Mary’s letters to her family in England tell the story of the gathering of a worshipping congregation at Grovely and of the building of their church.

Plate 6.2 A very youthful Katie Hume of Drayton with her daughter Ethel.
John Oxley Library, acc. no. 80-7-4.
Plate 6.3 Walter Cunningham Hume, on the right Katie’s husband with Katie outside the survey Office in Stanthorpe. Hume was a government surveyor and later, senior civil servant. Source of picture not recorded.

Plate 6.4 The buildings of Maroon Station, from the rear; Mt Maroon in the background. This was the home of Nora Murray Prior. It was a very isolated spot when she first lived there, being a good couple of days from Ipswich by buggy. Picture from Rosa Campbell Praed, My Australian Girlhood. The photographer, Dr Lightoller is mentioned in Nora’s letters to Rosa.
Though a kind of Anglican congregationalism, the Nicholsons assured its legitimation by the institutional church by networking with the Anglican clergy such as James Matthews, Thomas Jones, Edward Tanner and John Sutton. All were supportive, conducting services in the Nicholson home or in the church. Nevertheless, there was a clear line of demarcation of activities between husband and wife; John Nicholson was the public face of the church, while Mary’s role was behind the scenes.

*Darling Downs Domesticity: Katie Hume’s Letters Home*

Katie Fowler came to Australia in 1866 to marry Walter Hume, whom she had known in England and who had established himself as a surveyor on the Darling Downs. 76 Katie’s letters to her mother and sisters in England illuminate life on the Darling Downs in the 1860s and 1870s. They reveal a shared worldview with her family, and like Rachel Henning, she writes about those things that would be of interest to them - her new friends and acquaintances, her house, the climate, her social activities, and her family.

Katie was gregarious and enjoyed an active social life, and clearly saw herself among the social elite; as in a letter to her sister Emma, writing of the Toowoomba races:

> We the upper ten thousand (that is, Ramsays, Taylors, Beits, Staceys and a few others) made a party each bringing a share. There was chicken, pattys, cake, beer, wine and plenty of good things, the Taylors and Ramsays being well-supplied.77

The named parties were all long-established Anglican squatting and professional families who lived on their runs or in Toowoomba in the manner of English landed gentry. Katie noted that even in Toowoomba and Drayton:

---

76 Walter Cunningham Hume received his surveyor’s licence in February 1864. He began work in the Surveyor-General’s department in June that year. In September 1872 he was promoted to the position of Crown Lands Commissioner, was Under-Secretary for Lands from 1885, and was promoted to the Land Court in 1898. He retired in 1901. Katie Hume’s letters date from the period prior to his appointment as Commissioner for Crown Lands. See Nancy Bonnin, p. 9. For their courtship and marriage, see Bertram Hume, *A Victorian Engagement*, St Lucia, UQP, 1975; and Bonnin, pp. 1-9.

77 Bonnin, p. 69.
People dress here quite as much as in England – much more than they do at Wycombe for instance, tho’ they all complain of the badness of the times\textsuperscript{78} – it seems to make no difference – they come out as swell as ever, and give as many dances, etc. Numbers of people must live beyond their means.\textsuperscript{79}

Katie is here referring to the extravagant lives of the ruling class. George Harris of Brisbane and Ipswich is reputed to have spent up to £20,000 in a year.\textsuperscript{80} In the early days of her marriage, she and Walter did something akin to a ‘royal progress’ around the Warwick district, meeting the squatting families:

You must know this is the realization of my idea of perfect happiness – riding with my husband on our own horses, from one delightful station to another – a series of ‘Totts’\textsuperscript{81} – as much refinement & more luxury – receiving a kind welcome from owners, all friends of Walter’s & very nice people. I think there are few places at home where you could find more pleasant & worthy people in one locality! It is very convenient having the cart and men here, as they convey the luggage while we ride, & thus we are very independent.\textsuperscript{82}

Katie visited and was visited by the Gores of ‘Lyndhurst’, the Lesters at ‘Rosenthal’, the Wildashes at ‘Canning Downs’, the Deuchars at ‘Glengallen’ and the Greens of ‘Goomburra’. These new acquaintances were closely observed. Mr. Wildash, for example, was very agreeable and gentlemanly, while Mrs. Wildash was quiet and kind, and evidently accustomed to every luxury, ‘but hardly a lady in her education, judging by her speech!’\textsuperscript{83} L.E. Lester was the resident manager of Rosenthal, but Mrs. Lester was not a lady, though ‘exceedingly good-natured and kind-hearted’.\textsuperscript{84} Katie’s comments imply a kind of hierarchy among the squatters and station managers. There were those like the Gores who were Anglo-Irish gentry, and the Hodgsons and Weinholts who were English

\textsuperscript{78} This was written in the immediate wake of the financial crisis in Queensland in 1866, which had precipitated the failure of the Bank of Queensland.
\textsuperscript{79} Bonnin, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{80} From the booklet Harrisville Centenary Celebrations 1863-1963, no publication details, pp.7, 8. I am indebted to Val Hillier of Chinghee Creek for access to this booklet.
\textsuperscript{81} Katie’s pet name for the family home at High Wycombe.
\textsuperscript{82} Bonnin, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{83} Bonnin, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{84} Bonnin, p. 28.
gentry. They contrasted with the *nouveaux riches*, whose bourgeois origins were betrayed by their speech and ‘taste’, like the Lester, Wildash and Taylor wives. No doubt these social differences were more obvious to Katie as a recent arrival, but betray her expectation that elite women should be ladies, such as Mrs. Gore, Mrs. Hodgson and Mrs. Weinholt. On another level, Drayton life amused Katie. She regarded Drayton as a village rather than a town, and that to have a mayor and aldermen as being somewhat pretentious. She feigned horror at the mayor being a publican and that the milkman (at that time in gaol) was an alderman.85 She was also cynical about cutting up runs for selections for the ‘Poor Man’.86

Katie’s letters date from the beginning of Walter’s career as a government surveyor and in 1864, before his marriage, he was receiving £325 a year.87 As commissioner for Crown Lands from 1872, he was probably getting about £450 a year. This was an income befitting a gentleman, and enabled Katie to have a ‘maid of all work’ from the beginning of her marriage.88 Nevertheless, she did some housework and cooking herself. She delighted in gardening and persevered with a vegetable and flower garden in spite of the vicissitudes of drought and flooding rain. Walter complimented her household management, especially her skill with a sewing machine, with which she made clothes for him, herself and her children, and such things as blinds and curtains.89 Katie incorporated the domestic servants into her life and her writing, as Nora Murray Prior also did. She wrote affectionately of her Irish servant, Margaret, and was adaptable enough to allow

85 Bonnin, p. 33.
86 Bonnin, p. 34.
87 This figure comes from the civil list for 1864.
88 Higman suggests the lowest family income that could support the employment of a servant in 1901 was about £200. Typically only one servant was employed. Barry Higman, *Domestic Service in Australia*, Melbourne, MUP, 2002, pp. 46-47.
89 A woman’s skill with a needle could be extended in the bush; Rachel Henning ‘added lining saddles to my knowledge of fancy needlework’; Adams, p. 165.
Margaret to attend Mass, even though at times it was inconvenient.\textsuperscript{90} Blanche Mitchell’s Brisbane diary, in contrast, does not even record the names of the numerous domestic servants in the Drew and Heath households where she stayed, let alone incorporate them as characters into her text. Katie Hume was confident and outgoing, and at ease in most social situations, whereas Blanche was uneasily conscious of her class.

Most women were pragmatic enough to realise that the creation of a family would almost inevitably mean the death of one or more of their children: only three of the eight Hume children survived infancy. After carrying a child nine months and experiencing the pain of childbirth, most women needed time and space to grieve when a child died. Two days after the death of her three-week old son, Katie Hume wrote at length to her mother, putting her grief into a religious context:

Oh, it is such a sad disappointment, for he was such a fine little fellow, so much fatter and stronger than Ethel until he got Thrush at ten days old, but I try to bear my trials with patience, knowing that it is my Heavenly Father’s will, & He knows best for us all! \ldots I send you a tiny piece [of hair?] in remembrance of yr little Grandson who will have been longer in his ‘Saviour’s bosom’ than he was in his mother’s care when you read this! May we all join him there \ldots about nine o’clock he sank from exhaustion & lay, just alive but unconscious for about an hr. I sent for the Doctor again before 9 & for Mr. Nevill, for I suddenly remembered in the midst of my anguish that my Lamb was not baptised. Arthur fetched Mr. Nevill, who came just in time to administer that sacrament before the little spark of life was quenched and my Baby became an Angel in Heaven! \ldots of course a tiny baby like my little treasure cannot be missed by others as he is by his Mother. To me there is a dreadful blank . . . \textsuperscript{91}

Katie’s acceptance of the death of her son draws on ideas of God’s providence, and is a way of spiritualising her emotional pain to make it bearable. Nevertheless as she was coming to terms with the finality of death, she does acknowledge that the cause of death was natural, which counterbalances the sense of resignation to God’s providence. The

\textsuperscript{90} Bonnin, pp. 36, 37.
\textsuperscript{91} Bonnin, p. 143. That Walter shared her sentiments can be found in his letter to Katie’s sisters, p. 142.
stress on baptism of the child at the last moment is important. After her first child, Ethel (pictured in Plate 6.2) was born, Katie had written:

It was a moment of almost overpowering joy when I presented my little one for admittance into the visible Church of Christ & received her into my arms ‘wet with baptismal dew’.  

This rite of passage, in which the child was named and incorporated into the Church, the body of Christ, was a way of acknowledging that the child was a person, who was part of the Hume family and of the wider Christian community. This acknowledgement ties in with her hope of meeting her dead child again in the heavenly kingdom. It was another way of taking away a little of the emotional pain of separation in this world. They will be re-united again in the next.

Katie found consolation for the death of her babies in several ways. She derived special comfort that her daughter Ethel was a lively, healthy and engaging child. When her son Walter Logan died after a brief illness in 1869, Ethel was just one year old and already walking and ‘chattering her own particular gibberish’. Katie also rejoiced in her own good health. It was a theme she returned to on several occasions, which suggests that she was reassuring herself of that fact as much as the members of her family to whom she was writing. She also found comfort in the sympathy of her family and friends, many of whom would also have experienced the grief of the death of a child. It was at times such as this that separation from family was acutely felt, and Katie sent her mother a lock of the

92 Bonnin, p. 108.
94 Bonnin, p. 144.
95 Bonnin, pp. 144, 208.
96 Bonnin, pp. 144, 145, 157. The letter from Rose Paterson to Nora Murray-Prior is a good example of a letter of consolation on the death of a child, and of the kind of support a family member could provide; Colin Roderick, ed., Rose Paterson’s Illalong Letters 1873-188, Sydney, Kangaroo Press, 2000, p. 62.
baby’s hair as a keepsake.\textsuperscript{97} It was common for women to find consolation for the loss of one baby by the birth of the next.\textsuperscript{98} For Katie, the creation of a family was important, as she reveals in a letter to her mother, after the death of her daughter Katie: ‘Though the loss is soon to be made up to me I cannot help looking forward with trembling joy, after losing two little ones in succession’.\textsuperscript{99} Comfort was found in the growing family as her comments on the growth of her second surviving child, Bertram, indicate.\textsuperscript{100} Walter was a compassionate husband and a great strength to her in these trials, as letters to her family from both of them show.\textsuperscript{101}

Katie’s life was undergirded by her faith. The editor of her letters, Nancy Bonnin, has written:

Katie could not have maintained her stability in the face of such constant almost yearly sorrows during her twelve childbearing years without the consolations of religion. It seems that her faith was total, and that she accepted the losses as the will of God.\textsuperscript{102}

For Katie Hume her Christian faith is a central component of the identity she projects in her letters. Like Nora Murray Prior and Julia Cross, she reveals an intimate knowledge of the Bible, and appropriates scripture into her own writing, often with a sharp sense of humour. Her young sister-in-law, Elizabeth, was likened to an incipient Jehu in the way she drove the horse and buggy. The grapes from the rector’s garden were likened to the gigantic bunches coming from the Promised Land. And, on a more sober note, she was

\textsuperscript{97} Bonnin, p. 143.
\textsuperscript{98} On the consolation for the death of a child by the birth of another, Hazel King, ‘Lives in Exile: Elizabeth and John Macarthur’ in Penny Russell, ed., \textit{For Richer For Poorer}, Melbourne, MUP, 1994, p. 39. Also see Rose Paterson’s comments on the birth of a daughter to Nora Murray Prior a year after the death of her daughter Emeline; Roderick, pp. 66, 67.
\textsuperscript{99} Bonnin, p. 209.
\textsuperscript{100} Bonnin, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{101} Bonnin, pp. 142, 143, 211. This is in contrast to the lack of sympathy shown to Nora Murray Prior by her husband at such times. See pp. 289-290 below.
\textsuperscript{102} Bonnin, p. 220.
grateful for the ‘goodness and mercy’, which had followed her thus far. On a more practical note, she played the harmonium in church. It was a poor instrument, and did little to add to the solemnity and reverence she craved in the liturgy. Her letters indicate that she was of High Church proclivities and sympathised with the Tractarian and Ritualist move towards greater ceremony and formality in worship. She regularly received *The Churchman*, which helped her keep up to date with news in the English Church. This she passed on to the Drayton rector, the Rev. J.C. Clayton, and when he left for Warwick she intended to pass it on to the new low-church rector, the Rev. Edmund Neville, as a means of ‘screwing him up a little’. This background explains her interest in church music and her great relief when the Tate and Brady psalms were superseded by *Hymns Ancient and Modern* – the latter being much more suited to congregational singing. This interest in church music echoed that of Mary Nicholson, as we have seen, who was also keen on elevating the standard of music at Grovely. For both women memory of worship ‘at home’ was the yardstick for worship in the colony.

Her husband Walter shared her faith. He accompanied her to church when he was at home, and was active in parish affairs when he was stationed at Stanthorpe early in the tin boom (Plate 6.3). His few letters in the collection show a reserve in discussing religious matters with his sisters-in-law, which is in accord with norms of masculine behaviour of the time. His letters to them are generally light-hearted, and he often sends

---

103 The Biblical references are to 2 Kings 9:20; Numbers 13:23; and Psalm 23:6 respectively.
104 Bonnin, pp. 21, 23, 31, 52, 58, 63, 67, 75, 77, 85, 86, among many others.
105 Bonnin, p. 98.
himself up. His most self-revealing and serious moment is in the letter he wrote to Katie’s sisters with the news of the death of their baby son.\textsuperscript{107}

Katie Hume’s letters are a vibrant testimony to the notion of a separate, domestic sphere for middle-class women, and are peopled by her husband, children, women servants, and a circle of similarly placed women. The studio portrait of her projects an image of motherhood (Plate 6.2). Her days were filled with housework, gardening, sewing, caring for children, reading and playing her beloved piano. She found recreation at the occasional ball or party, and in visiting and being visited by her Darling Downs friends. The self she has constructed in her letters is very similar to the middle-class wife and mother described by Davidoff and Hall, a life centred in domestic activity; her relationships being mainly with other women; and finding consolation and strength in her Christian faith.\textsuperscript{108}

\textit{Of Death and Marriage: The Diary of Blanche Mitchell}

Blanche was from the Sydney ‘elite’. Her father, Sir Thomas Mitchell, was Surveyor-General of NSW at the time of his death in 1855, when Blanche was twelve years old. Mitchell’s widow, Mary, had a financial struggle, and was eventually awarded a pension of £200 in 1861.\textsuperscript{109} Blanche was active in Sydney’s social life, but she was diagnosed as consumptive in December 1865 and was sent to Brisbane in the hope that a change of air

\textsuperscript{107} Bonnin, p. 142, but see also, pp. 67, 68, and 121.
\textsuperscript{108} Davidoff & Hall, pp. 172-92.
\textsuperscript{109} Foster, p. 489.
would benefit her health.110 In Brisbane she stayed with the Drew family at Toowong, Mrs. Drew being a family friend.111

Of our women writers, Blanche is the only one who showed real angst about her social position, reflecting her concern about her financial situation. Her natural social milieu was the ruling/governing class, to which her Brisbane hosts belonged. For example, Edward Deas Thomson, a former Colonial Secretary in New South Wales, was visiting Brisbane with his daughter.112 Blanche knew them in Sydney, and so visited them at Government House where they were staying. The Governor, Sir George Bowen, took the Thomson daughter to return the visit to Blanche at the Heaths at Kangaroo Point before the Thomsons left Brisbane. Others on the visiting list were Patsy (or Patty) Geary and Minnie Mackenzie, who were Brisbane’s most eligible young women at the time.113 She also mixed with the Mackenzies, Bells, Broughtons, Gibbons, Elliots, Thorntons and Ramsays, all of whom were members of Brisbane ‘Society’ with political connections.

During her visit to Brisbane, Blanche renewed her acquaintanceship with Fanny Moffatt (nee Laidley) who visited the Drews with Mrs. Heath after the death of Mrs. Drew’s mother, Mrs. Hely. Blanche returned the visit a couple of weeks later:

The house is like a little cabin, so small, but Mrs. Moffatt has everything very clean. But I thought what a contract was this little box, and one servant of all work – to the well-furnished mansions of her sisters with their large establishments, and out of their magnificence, could not allow a trifle to give more comfort to the curate’s wife. Ah well! In this world we would get on but badly if we had only to trust to our own – for this very often, are the most selfish, and most censorious.114

---

111 Mr. Drew was the Under-Secretary of the Treasury at the time.
114 *BMD*, 25 October 1866.
This reflection on the living situation of the Moffatts suggests that Blanche’s expectations for herself were better, that she would not like to live in such reduced circumstances. She wrote rather peevishly in her diary when her mother’s letters drew attention to her expenses. Blanche’s solution to their problems was for her to find a husband:

To my great delight the letters arrived and I received a kind terrible one from mama telling me how to act and as much complaining of her monetary affairs . . . My [?] bills are so immense Mama says how is she to pay them . . . Oh, I wish I were married and had a comfortable home and mama could live with me in peace and rest where I could repay her back all her kindness. This is my great wish in life, this is what I pray for night and morning, and patiently try to wait God’s time in fulfilling my prayer.¹¹⁵

The trap in which Blanche found herself was no less binding than that of Julia Cross. Whereas Julia found the solution in hard work to earn money, for Blanche the only prospect was to marry well. For both women, class and gender limited their options as they perceived them.

Blanche’s visit to the Drews at Toowong was overshadowed by the death of Mrs. Drew’s mother, Mrs. Hely, soon after her arrival. Two weeks later, Mrs. Drew’s baby died after a brief illness. These sad events dominate the writing and give a rare insight into the way that a colonial family grieved.¹¹⁶ When it became clear that Mrs. Hely would not recover from the ‘fainting fit’ that was the first symptom of her illness, her grandchildren were taken to the room to see her. Then Mr. Drew went in and prayed with her and read passages of scripture to her.¹¹⁷ Two doctors were called, and they were of the opinion that the end was near, so the Rev. John Bliss was called to read the prayers for the sick, with

---

¹¹⁵ BMD, 21 September 1866. See also 5 October 1866, for a similar entry.
¹¹⁷ BMD, 10 September 1866. Bradley notes the practice of taking children in to the deathbed of family and friends to impress upon them the finality of death; Bradley, p. 192.
Mr. and Mrs. Drew and Blanche kneeling by the bedside. Blanche captures the solemnity of the moment with dramatic urgency:

Mr. Bliss read the service for the sick. His beautiful voice, and she so solemn. The low voice of the clergyman uttering words of life and comfort, the short breathing of the dying, the groans of the mourners, and our suppressed crying. Then after we had risen, Mrs Drew kissed her mother, exclaiming – Mama dear – darling mama – speak to me – it is Gertrude – oh, speak to me – Mama darling – Mr. Drew said, “Grandmama, don’t you know us – it is Gertrude, speak to Gertrude.” Mrs. Hely moved slightly and said in a strong voice “Nell, my dear”. Mrs. Drew then said, “O, Mama, may God bless you! Only say that – that we shall meet again – but I know we will meet again – Yes, I will see you again – We shall be together once more!” Mrs. Hely made no more sign, and we left the room.\(^\text{118}\)

Mrs. Hely died the next morning without recovering consciousness. The passage has remarkable affinities to the deathbed genre in popular evangelical literature. The highly emotionally charged, very direct form of writing; the emphasis on imminent death in the conversation with Mrs. Hely; and the confidence that they would be re-united in heaven are particular themes of the style. The genre has provided Blanche with the appropriate language to express her own grief and to describe the grief of the family.\(^\text{119}\) Her meditation on the experience reveals her introspective nature, interpreting the event as an act of divine providence and a personal warning for her to ‘pause and reflect in the midst of this ungodly careless life I am leading’.\(^\text{120}\) Blanche seems to be unduly harsh upon herself, but the death was a reminder of the importance to be always prepared for the dreadful moment.

The morning of the death, Mr. Drew read the prayers ‘as usual’, choosing John 14 as the reading. This passage, in which Jesus spoke to his disciples of the many rooms in His Father’s house, where he was going to prepare a place for them, brought them all to

\(^\text{118}\) BMD 9, 10 September 1866.
\(^\text{120}\) BMD, 10 September 1866.
tears. At the intercessions for the afflicted, Mr. Drew broke down altogether and left the room. This scene of domestic grief allows us to see him in an intimate light as pater familias and, as in the deathwatch the night before, as the spiritual leader of the household. It is a picture Blanche reinforces on other occasions.

Blanche recorded some of the mourning rituals considered appropriate at the time. Soon after Mrs. Hely’s death, Mr. Drew put up curtains in the dining room and darkened the whole house. The womenfolk wore black or trimmed their clothes with black. The hearse and mourning coaches arrived at 9AM the next morning, and the body was placed in the coffin, which was then draped with black velvet. The Drews attended the funeral, but Blanche did not. There seemed only to be a graveside service.

Blanche was very concerned that as a family friend staying in the house, she should be in full mourning and decided to buy a black dress. It echoes the concern expressed by Mary Nicholson, who wrote of the funeral of a child at the Grovely church:

No-one in this country thinks of wearing mourning, not even the father on this occasion – we do want to raise the standard, even in little things, but it is so difficult.

This concern about the proprieties of mourning reflects the values of religious people of the time, especially women. The influence of evangelical attitudes to death can be detected in both Mary Nicholson’s and Blanche Mitchell’s writings.
The illness, decline and death of the Drew baby just a fortnight after the death of Mrs. Hely was a second shock to the family. Blanche’s narrative of the child’s death is punctuated by meditative reflections on the process of death; it is a very introspective and melancholy account. Her speculation as to whether the child had any knowledge or perception of what was happening, and of the escape of the soul from ‘the bond of the flesh’ echoes themes in ‘good death’ literature. Blanche shared the Drew’s understanding that after death the baby girl would be with her Saviour. A striking idea in her view of the final stage of death is that the child ‘had been called away to become an angel in its father’s Kingdom’, which echoes Katie Hume’s expression, ‘my Baby became an Angel in heaven’. This rather sentimental picture of the soul in heaven is in sympathy with other similar expressions used by Blanche describing the child as an angel or a cherub, provide an interpretive framework for understanding the child’s death. A heavenly home for the infant was beyond doubt, as she had experienced ‘no sin, no sorrow’. This spiritualisation of death interpreted it as a blessing as the child had been ‘untouched by care or sorrow’. Blanche comforted herself with passage from the funeral service:

Rejoice, for thou shalt hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on thee, nor any heat, - for God shall wipe away the tears from thine eyes.

The next day’s entry begins with almost maudlin solemnity: ‘The house so quiet, hushed and still as the presence of death still hovered around it and the solemn flapping of the
mysterious angel’s wings appeared to be still over the house.133 Mrs. Drew, her neighbour Minnie Rogers, and Blanche did not attend the funeral, but remained at the house. The three women knelt by the bed and Minnie read the funeral service, with Blanche answering the responses. They remained in silent prayer for a while afterwards. Blanche commented that: ‘Though most solemn and affecting, yet it was most comforting and relieving to our souls and we felt the gracious promises that it contained’.134 In this simple act of faith on the part of the three women, they appropriated the usual male role of leading worship to provide a ritual form to express their grief.135

After the death of her baby, Mrs. Drew went to stay with her sister in Sydney. Blanche then stayed a few days with the Rogers in Toowong, and then went to the Heaths at Kangaroo Point.136 This was a much more social visit, and allowed Blanche to recover from the traumas of the Drew household. She went riding several times, and frequently went calling on neighbours and friends with Mrs. Heath. Family prayers and churchgoing were the norm in the Heath home, and there were prayers before retiring to bed. Both households are pictures of domestic busy-ness and sturdy Anglican piety.137 There is an element of ‘seriousness’ to the faith of the Drews and the Heaths without it being especially evangelical though Blanche seems to express a more conventional evangelical piety, possibly inherited from her father’s Scottish Presbyterianism.138 She read ‘improving’ books on Sunday, and even during the week her reading was substantial fare.

133 BMD, 29 September 1866.
134 BMD, 29 September 1866. This in part bears out the comment of Davidoff and Hall that ‘women were beginning to be considered too delicate to bear the public rituals of death’; Davidoff & Hall, pp. 408-409.
135 Jalland also remarks on how unusual this domestic ritual was; Australian Ways of Death, p. 82.
136 For these localities, see map 4, Appendix 1.
137 Family prayers were still prevalent in some circles; Rowan Strong, ‘The Reverend John Wollaston . . .’, p. 277.
138 Foster, pp. 5, 77, 446-447.
She found at least one opportunity for conversational German, and Goethe was among her authors. She did not enjoy ‘light’ reading and scoffed at a book Mr. Drew had lent her:

I must go through it somehow, this light style of reading, and amount of foolish improbable adventures so clearly the composition of a man’s brain, does not interest me in the least.

Not all male authors disappointed, and she read *The Bertrams* by Trollope. Other novels included *Sylvan Holt’s Daughter*, *Harry Lonegan*, and *Digby Grand*. Sunday reading reveals Blanche’s serious side; she read *Recreations of a Country Parson* and *Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson*, both of which had wide currency at the time. She dipped into some sermons by Dean Stanley and another unnamed author, and at a time of angst, *The Mind of Jesus*. This latter was occasioned by a letter from her mother about her money woes. The letter unsettled her as once again family finances appeared to be an intractable problem, and she felt guilty about her contribution to it. She prayed about the matter, seeking a ‘contrite spirit’ and to be thankful for blessings. She found consolation in reading verses from the Bible and passages from *The Mind of Jesus*.

This introspective dimension of Blanche’s diary reveals a rather immature and insecure woman whose life was overshadowed by her illness. She was distressed when she discovered that her close friend Alice Bradley had become engaged – the distress was that she heard it from a visitor from Sydney and not from Alice herself. It was exacerbated

---

139 BMD, 23, 26 October 1866.
140 BMD, 24 September 1866.
141 The author was A.K.H. Boyd, a Broad Churchman. The essays first appeared in *Fraser’s Magazine*. Both books were published in 1863 in Boston (England) by Ticknor and Fields. He published many such volumes down to 1896. For clerical conduct literature, see B. Heeney, *A Different Kind of Gentleman*, London, Archon, 1976, pp. 11-34.
143 BMD, 14 September 1866.
by a catty remark from Minnie Rogers, who was with her when she first heard the news.

Blanche confided in her diary:

I as Alice’s oldest friend, claimed certainly the right of being told at once from herself and they had time since Thursday to write – a whole week.\(^\text{144}\)

A little further on she wrote:

We were three such happy friends together Alice, Lizzie and myself and now the bond is broken for our interests are no longer the same. I think I could get someone to love, to care for me, all my life I have longed to be loved – all my life I have been disappointed. With me everything appears to go wrong but I must not complain. Times are in God’s hand. He portions out what is necessary to all and what is right and best. We cannot do better than place our entire hope and trust in Him and hope patiently for the best. God, give me a will to bend to thine.\(^\text{145}\)

There is an element of jealousy in Alice’s good fortune, but the depression was more of a fear that she would never experience Alice’s happiness, and we have noted before her eagerness for marriage to give her security. When she eventually received letters from Alice and Lizzie she was much more resigned and equable about the forthcoming marriage. Lizzie’s choice of prayer for her friend, from Numbers 6:24-27, indicates the extent of the worldview the women shared.\(^\text{146}\) It is almost as if Lizzie anticipated Blanche’s angst and was reaching out to her in her distress. Blanche’s resort to the idea of the providence of God to help her resolve her feelings about the engagement is a strategy she adopts elsewhere and is used by other women writers of the period. Both Julia Cross and Katie Hume use the idea themselves in times of stress; it acknowledged the limited control they had over their lives. The dilemma for Blanche was then to decide whether she would go to the wedding at Goulburn, and she certainly agonised over the decision. In the

\(^\text{144}\) ibid.
\(^\text{145}\) ibid.
\(^\text{146}\) The text refers to the Aaronic blessing: May the Lord bless thee and keep thee; the Lord make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee and give thee peace. And they shall put my name upon the children of Israel; and I will bless thee.
end she legitimised her going by arguing to herself that the sojourn in Brisbane was meant to improve her ‘asthma’; her health had not improved significantly; therefore there was no good reason for her to stay in Brisbane.\textsuperscript{147} She went to the wedding.

Blanche Mitchell created an image of herself fitting into a strictly domestic sphere. It is a world of women’s business: children, drawing rooms and social niceties. It reflects a kind of boredom that educated women experienced in a tightly confined domestic environment. This kind of ennui is a theme of Praed’s Policy and Passion.\textsuperscript{148} Her heroine, Honoria Longleat yearned for something more than the ‘placid, monotonous existence’ of a conventional marriage that ought to ‘satisfy a woman’. The yearning was for intellectual stimulation and mature autonomy, which were part of Praed’s own life journey, as Beverley Kingston, Michael Sharkey and Kaye Ferres demonstrate in different ways.\textsuperscript{149}

For Blanche, home was a stronghold of faith into which the unpleasantness of the world does not intrude. Though sometimes plagued by self-doubt and very aware of her unstable health, she longed to have her own home, and to be loved and cared for. Blanche used her diary to dialogue with her ‘other’ self in a cathartic process that allowed her to explore perplexing and distressing experiences.\textsuperscript{150} Resolution was achieved by drawing on her religious capital. There is some similarity in this process to that used by Nora Murray Prior in her letters to Rosa Campbell Praed whom Nora uses as a sounding board for ideas of a different kind. It is to that sequence of letters we now turn.

\textsuperscript{147} For example BMD, 27 October 1866. Blanche avoids the idea that she had tuberculosis; it was ‘asthma’.
\textsuperscript{148} Honoria’s extended conversation with Dyson Maddox in chapter eight is a meditation on the dilemma; Praed, Policy and Passion, pp. 54-59.
\textsuperscript{150} Jalland, Australian Ways, p. 79
A Colonial Liberalism: Nora Murray Prior’s Letters to Rosa Campbell Praed

Nora, born in 1846, was a member of the respected Barton and Darvall families. After a sound education at home, she spent some time in England with relatives before returning to join Lucy Osburn as a nursing trainee. In 1872, she married Thomas Lodge Murray Prior, a member of the Queensland Legislative Council and former Postmaster-General.

Her sister, Rose, was Banjo Paterson’s mother, and a sequence of letters from Rose to Nora has been published. Nora lived out of the mainstream of colonial life at Maroon, at the head of the Logan River (Map 3, Appendix1). The setting is described by Beverley Kingston and well-captured in Plate 6.4, showing the homestead with Mount Maroon in the background. It was used as the setting for some of the novels of her step-daughter, Rosa Praed. Kooralbyn in Policy and Passion is very evocative of the country around Maroon. Maroon was one of several cattle stations owned by the Murray Priors.

Nora’s letter-writing was very important in her personal life; the sequence of letters to her step-daughter, Rosa Campbell Praed, provided a cathartic outlet; some are very long and give much insight into everyday life at Maroon, and into her personal world. No subject was taboo, and she wrote intimately and feelingly about everything from family matters and religious beliefs, to the price of cattle and jam-making.

Nora had access to the highest echelons of Brisbane society, though there is nothing snobbish about her. Some of the people she mentions are the same as those in the

---

151 For biographical background on Nora, see Clarke, Rosa! Rosa!, pp. 29-30. For Nora’s brief career in nursing, Judith Godden, ““Be good, sweet maid”: Sister Probationer Nora Barton at the Sydney Infirmary, 1869-72”, Labour History, 80, May 2001, pp. 141-156. See also, Roderick, pp.15-16.
152 Roderick, op. cit.
154 Praed, Policy and Passion, p. 48. It also figures in her autobiographical work, My Australian Girlhood, and the novels The Head Station and Outlaw and Lawmaker, Clarke, Rosa! Rosa!, pp. 22-23, 58
155 For an outline of Thomas Murray Prior’s early life, see Clarke, Rosa! Rosa!, pp. 1-30.
Heath and Drew circles referred to by Blanche Mitchell – the Elliots, Harts, Bells, Palmers, Tullys, Barkers, Scotts, Littles, and Heaths are some she writes about. It was an elite circle and predominantly Anglican.

Being in charge of a station household, wives of squatters had to ‘entertain’ people from all walks of life, often in their husband’s absence. Like Rachel Henning, Nora had many visitors and travellers to entertain; from neighbours to cattlemen, and agents to itinerant preachers. This aspect of life is well captured by Rosa Praed in her novel, Policy and Passion, which has echoes of Nora’s letters in Rosa’s depiction of station life; her account of the visit of Lord Dolph Bassett and of Corny Cathcart’s description of the visit of an itinerant preacher reflect the tenor, and often the detail of Nora’s letters.

The Murray Priors were well-integrated into the local Maroon community, which comprised a few squatters and free selectors. The selectors were glad of the opportunity of casual work at Maroon. Eleven year old Emily Hawes filled in as a nursemaid when needed, and Hooper was employed as a station hand till his own selection could support his family. When a neighbour died, leaving a widow with small children, the Murray Priors bought the selection on a ‘walk in/walk out’ basis, thus enabling the widow to return with her children to her family in Sydney. This was not simply noblesse oblige; Nora’s concern for the woman’s plight as a widow in a remote place was genuine. That they had the resources to buy the property underlines their material prosperity.

---

156 For example, NMPL, 14 June 1881; for Rachel Henning, Adams, p. 137.
158 NMPL, 14 April 1880.
159 Ada Cambridge describes some of the difficulties faced by widows with small children; Cambridge, pp. 39-41.
160 NMPL, 4 September 1884.
There was a steady procession of governesses, nursemaids, cooks, housemaids and gardeners at Maroon.¹⁶¹ In such an out-of-the-way place, it wasn’t easy to keep staff, and neighbours were sometimes called in to help.¹⁶² Nora could fill in, in most roles when necessary, and lent her hand to bread-making; was at one time her own dairy maid; and kept up a supply of jam, jelly and marmalade.¹⁶³ Her claim that the Murray Priors were bush people was fair – there was a resilience and adaptability necessary to live in a remote area, but there was a measure of comfort appropriate to their class location.

The life of women in early Queensland was home-centred. Marriage and family were normative, no matter to what social class women belonged, with a structural dependency on men for social, economic and personal security. Blanche Mitchell acknowledged this when she saw her future only in terms of marriage.¹⁶⁴ A wife was expected to be helpmeet of her husband, providing emotional support; a quiet, ordered home life; and children to be the family’s heirs. For most women bearing and rearing children occupied much of their adult life. In the colonial context it could be extremely taxing because of primitive living conditions, geographical isolation, the limited availability of medical assistance, the social structure of the local community (such as the presence or absence of other women), the weather, natural disasters, and so on.¹⁶⁵ Often men’s work took them away from home, which could contribute to feelings of insecurity.

When Nora married, her stepdaughter, Rosa, was only five years younger than her, so when Rosa married, both women were busy with children and the joys and anxieties of

¹⁶² NMPL, 13, 27 November 1881.
¹⁶³ NMPL, 7 February, 9 July 1883.
¹⁶⁴ BMD 25 September, 5 October 1866.
¹⁶⁵ Thomas Murray Prior’s first wife Matilda feared childbirth in the absence of medical assistance: ‘Having neither doctor nor nurse, and knowing that I might die before there was any hope of medical assistance, I endeavoured to prepare my mind for leaving this world’; Clarke, *Rosa! Rosa!*, p. 8
child-rearing. On these subjects Nora’s letters are very rich, as she was extraordinarily frank with Rosa.  

Realising she was once again pregnant, she wrote:

Open confession is good for the soul and nothing can be hidden forever, and perhaps you can imagine some little of the mortification, chagrin and disgust with which I have been forced to recognise myself once again in the valley of the shadow of baby. I cannot at all describe the unfathomable bottomless slough of despond in which I wallowed for some months after the truth broke upon me.  

(My emphasis.)

The expression *in the valley of the shadow of baby* is an arresting line adapted from Psalm 23; ‘even though I walk through the shadow of the valley of death’. Nora well-realised that every pregnancy was overshadowed by the spectre of death; of the mother, the child or both. She had already lost two babies, and at 37, recognised the increasing danger she was in with each pregnancy. On hearing that Teesie Mort  

was having a difficult time with her first pregnancy, Nora wrote:

Oh! These babies, these babies. I am sure the day will come (that I shall never see) when a plan of ‘artificial maternity’ shall be matured and the present clumsy way of populating the world be done away with . . .

Nora clearly felt a sense of injustice that women experienced repeated pregnancies. Just after the birth of her sixth child she identified with her sister Rose, who was ‘under a sense of woe’ at such times, ‘and I may add a sense of injury to, which perhaps I should find hard to define’. Nevertheless, once the babies were born, she delighted in them, and she rarely fails to fill a page or three describing the children and waxing lyrically about their gifts and abilities. Part of the chagrin was the lack of sympathy from men, as she explained to Rosa:

---

166 For the importance of the relationship and the letters that illuminate it, see *Rosa! Rosa!* pp. 37-38.
167 *NMPL*, 3 December 1883.
168 Teesie was daughter of John Douglas and his first wife. Douglas was a politician and later civil servant.
169 *NMPL*, undated letter; it is letter one in the second volume of the letters held in hard copy in the Oxley Library. Teesie was bridesmaid at Rosa’s marriage to Campbell Praed. Clarke, *Rosa! Rosa!*, p. 31-33.
170 *NMPL*, 16 May 188(1?).
Coming babies weigh heavily both mentally and physically . . . It is a trouble with which [Papa?] has no sympathy, so he gets cross with [my?] being miserable. He looks upon it as a sign of my free thinking tendency and want of faith of the [?] and thinks one ought to feel grateful for what providence sends, even tho’ it costs one’s health, strength [and?] life . . . but I cannot feel that providence [has?] all the responsibility of what we take such a large share in bringing about. 171

This is a strong critique of men claiming their conjugal rights at the cost of women’s health and well-being, which Murray Prior’s first wife would have applauded. Matilda’s seven living children from eleven pregnancies destroyed her health. Nora also severely criticised Minnie Lightoller’s doctor husband for refusing Minnie chloroform during childbirth. Nora’s nursing experience and her own experience of childbirth was the background to this clear articulation of her case:

Dr Lightoller is a staunch opponent of chloroform tho’ his chief argument against it seems to be the cowardice of taking it. I think it is a question for the sufferer to decide, and could not help telling him keenly, that were it a misfortune which both sexes were liable chloroform would have been given long ago. He looked astounded at my venturing to discuss the subject, looking on it as becoming in a man and a Dr to lay down the law – for women ‘theirs is not to reply – theirs not to reason why – theirs but to suffer and die’, a view of the case wh[ich], as one of the suffering class, protest vehemently. 172

These passages demonstrate just how deeply patriarchal colonial society was, but more importantly, how advanced Nora’s own value system was. Her argument anticipates a shift from the view that at marriage a woman became a man’s chattel, to that where she had rights over her own body. She challenges Victorian assumptions about a man’s rights and privileges in the marriage relationship – and the lack of rights of women. Nora was in a privileged position. She had nursing experience and she kept herself well informed. 173

Her letters demonstrate how widely she read, subscribing to several English periodicals,

171 NMPL, 16 May 1881(?). Letter eight in the Oxley Library bound volume 2. The letter is frayed on one side. Words in brackets try to fill the gaps.
172 NMPL, 3 April (1881?). Letter 21, vol. 1.
and getting hold of a wide variety of reading matter locally. She applied her knowledge and her financial resources to her own situation, seeking the best available accommodation and care at childbirth, and praised the skill of Dr. Hobbs in delivering her babies. For many women that level of care was not available, and according to their means had a nurse or midwife to attend them. Mrs. Lightbody, Nora’s neighbour, hired a nurse from Sydney to look after her at their property near Maroon.

Babies in well-to-do households were cared for by nursemaids who washed, fed, and dressed them, and Blanche Mitchell’s diary describes the care of the Drew’s nursemaid for their dying baby. In the Heath household, Blanche assisted with one of the twin boys while the nursemaid was busy with the other, often walking up and down the verandah with the baby in her arms. As a family grew, a maid was often employed to look after the small children, and governesses had the responsibility for teaching older ones. Both the Drew and Murray Prior households followed this pattern, with the children’s mother assisting with reading and writing especially.

The Murray Priors were geographically remote from the institutional church. Nora’s children were baptised at Brisbane or Ipswich and when in Ipswich or Brisbane they attended the Anglican church. At Maroon, family prayers were held on Sunday and itinerant preachers were accommodated. One gets the impression that this distance from the institutional church suited Nora. She described her own background as Broad Church, and on another occasion she referred to her own ‘free-thinking tendencies’

---

174 For medical assistance in the bush, see Cambridge, pp. 104, p. 148.
175 BMD, 25, 26, 27, 28 September 1866.
176 BMD, 11, 12, 17, 25 October 1866.
177 NMPL, e.g., 6 October (1880?), letter 11, vol. 1, OL.
178 NMPL, 27 January 1879, NMPL, part letter, no. 8 in vol. 1, OL.
179 NMPL, 3 April 1881.
inherited from her own very interesting family circle. Nora’s aunt, Susannah, had married John Sterling in 1830. John and Susannah died within months of each other in 1843-4, leaving three orphan children. Susannah’s younger sister, Anna and her husband, the Rev. F.D. Maurice, took these children in. Maurice’s second wife was largely responsible for raising them. Sterling and Maurice were foremost among England’s liberal theologians. When Nora was in England with her extended family as a young woman, she was influenced by the liberal intelligentsia, introduced by these older Sterling cousins fostered in the Maurice household. In England, Nora moved in literary circles and claimed that she ‘used to meet authors daily – Kingsley, Froude, Max Muller, the Fawcetts and all the Cambridge clique for whom Macmillan used to publish’. However, being young, she did not appreciate the privilege she had. Because of this early interest, she read widely and deeply. Her most quoted periodical was The Nineteenth Century, in which she had read Harriet Martineau, Frederic Harrison (especially his writing on positivism), and W.H. Mallock. Other journals included Cornhill, Blackwoods, The

---

181 Roderick, pp. 71-74. One of Nora’s sons was christened Frederic Maurice in his honour (NMPL, 17 April 1881); another was Robert Sterling (Robin).
183 NMPL, February 1881; & another fragment of the summer of 1879-1880 or 1880-1881, letter two in vol. 2, OL; Clarke, Rosa! Rosa!, p. 29.
184 For Kingsley, there is a good biography; Susan Chitty, The Beast and the Monk: A Life of Charles Kingsley, London, Hodder, 1974; for the Fawcetts, see DNB, 2004 edition, pp. 167-171 (Henry) and pp.177-182 (Dame Millicent).
185 ibid.
186 Rachel Henning is another who gives us some idea of the reading matter of the well-educated lady. She mentions Cornhill, the Saturday Review, the Illustrated London News, London Society, All The Year Round, and Punch, and that she was re-reading The Heir of Redclyffe; Adams, p. 140.
187 NMPL, 16 May, 188(1?). For Auguste Comte and the British positivists, see Corsi, pp. 174-177. For a lively account of Harrison’s positivism, see the item in the DNB, vol. 25, 2004 edition, pp. 494-497. W.H. Mallock was a conservative theorist, best known for his satirical novel, The New Republic published in 1877, in which he parodied the views of prominent men of letters. According to Daniel Traister he
Athenaeum, Saturday Review, Temple Bar, Whitehall Review, and the Pall Mall Gazette. She also occasionally read Home News, the Daily News, The World, and Vanity Fair and had access to freethinking material published in America and lent her by the Barkers of Tamrookum (a nearby property).189 ‘Old Mrs. Thornton’ of Kangaroo Point also shared these liberal interests and she enjoyed their infrequent discussions.

Nora’s theological doubts were less concerned with liberal views of scriptural interpretation than the inconsistencies she saw between theology and Christian practice, between ‘dogma’ and the exercise of private judgment. For example, she was attracted to Harrison’s ‘devotion to abstract good’ and saw that:

> the most religious people are not those who best distinguish right from wrong. To pamper devotional feelings is only a form of self-indulgence and weakens the character rather than strengthening it and it is not uncommon to see people [giving?] up hours to prayer and communion with their god and coming away confirmed in spite and selfishness and uncharitable feelings . . .they have dragged their Deity down to their own level and made [Him?] partner in their petty squabbles and jealousies.”190

Seeing Christians as hypocritical is a theme of much radical Victorian rhetoric and Houghton devoted a whole chapter to it in his magisterial book The Victorian Frame of Mind.191 For Nora, to be enslaved to the forms of Christianity is somehow to be dishonest and wanting in maturity, independence and intellectual integrity. Later in the letter she responded to Lizzie’s account192 of a woman trying to convert Rosa to Catholicism:

> I cannot imagine you surrendering your private judgment even to Cardinal Manning – there is so much to tempt one to ‘go over’. A good Catholic religion is

---

189 Mrs. Barker was the sister of Matilda, the first wife of Thomas Lodge Murray Prior.
190 NMPL, 31 May 1880.
192 Lizzie was Rosa’s younger sister, who was on a visit to England at the time, sent there in the hope that her ardour for Jack Jardine might cool.
so elevated and pure – so overflowing with love and [?] but still it is an innocent child’s paradise and I cannot imagine anyone who has ever thought out truths for themselves foregoing that privilege, and believing because they are told.\textsuperscript{193}

Nora makes the Catholic faith an example of what she is rejecting, as it lacks the maturity (it is an innocent child’s paradise), independence (believing because they are told), and intellectual integrity she values (to think for one’s self). Nora also betrays an anti-dogmatic stance common to freethinkers and some liberals in questioning the institutional authority of the church, personified in Cardinal Manning. Dogma was taboo.

Nora had difficulty with the idea of divine providence. She felt the burdens of pregnancy keenly, and in announcing to Rosa that she was expecting another child, she contrasted her husband’s view - ‘[he] thinks one ought to be grateful for what providence sends, even tho’ it costs one’s health strength and [very?] life’ - with her own - ‘I cannot feel that providence has all the responsibility of what we take such a large share in bringing about’.\textsuperscript{194} Nora does here what Julia Cross and Blanche Mitchell cannot do – she doubts the guiding hand of providence in all human existence. She recognises the role of human will both inside and outside the church - in humanity in its broadest sense:

The vague idea of a guiding providence who is to be coaxed by a few supplications to interfere on our behalf and put straight what we have deliberately chosen to kick crooked, has been weakening and enervating to our sense of right and justice . . .\textsuperscript{195}

It is an eloquent plea for humans to take responsibility for their own actions, and not to shift the blame elsewhere. In this same letter Nora gives voice to the oft-repeated idea that the world was passing through a transitional stage.\textsuperscript{196} It was an age of change and in this could be found the explanation of the current mood of scepticism and ‘deadness to

\textsuperscript{193} \textit{NMPL}, 16 May 188(1?)\textsuperscript{194} Both quotations from \textit{NMPL}, 16 May 188(1?).\textsuperscript{195} \textit{NMPL}, 31 May 1880.\textsuperscript{196} Houghton, pp. 2, 3, 22, 271.
spiritual things’. She felt it was because ‘he should go away for a time, that we may take the world more on our own shoulders’. This is an indirect reference to God, using John 16:7 as a referent, where Jesus says he has to go away for a while till the comforter, the Holy Spirit, comes. For Nora the absence of God is felt, and humans have to step into the breach. Is there a suggestion here humanity will have to redeem itself?

In this context that Nora classes herself alongside ‘Bohemians and outsiders (who get a clearer view of many things I think by not being hampered by conventional proprieties)’. The conventional proprieties are presumably dogma and conventional attitudes and values, but why does she perceive herself in this way? I suspect it is in part, at least, a rejection of a parental value-system and of current notions of women’s role in society. We are led back to Nora’s introduction to liberal ideas by the Sterlings. F.M. Turner has suggested that young people embrace new ideas as part of the process of achieving psychological independence and autonomy. This process will normally involve the modification of, or even rejection of, the religious faith of their parents. In reconstructing the environment of the Barton family home, Colin Roderick creates a picture of stolid Anglican piety, underwritten by British military and naval tradition. If this is so, it is not surprising if Nora found the sentiments of the older Sterling cousins, fostered in the Maurice household, refreshing and exciting. Nora was of an independent cast of mind as her career in nursing before her marriage showed. She was certainly exploring alternative models of feminine lifestyle to those available in colonial society.

197 NMPL, 3 May 1980.
199 Roderick, pp. 9-11.
200 Roderick, p. 16.
Although attracted to the writings of positivists, Nora could not fully embrace their philosophy. In the end she longed for ‘the old comfort the “ever-present help in trouble”, the “friend that sticketh closer than a brother” which supported our mothers and grandmothers thro’ their trials’ (my emphasis). Hers was not a fully embraced radical position, but a ‘free-thinking tendency’, which enabled her to sit loose to ‘conventional proprieties’. It certainly allowed her to sit loose to the institutional church and its traditions and allowed her the freedom to send up the hapless itinerant Methodist preacher Mr. Fuller, whose preaching stimulated the train of thought in this letter. Underlying Nora’s theology is a healthy regard for the idea of private judgment, extending it from its origins as the right of individuals to interpret scripture for themselves, to make informed judgments in a variety of matters – even questioning doctrine. She seems to have enjoyed reading about and vicariously participating in theological debate, especially when religious orthodoxy was made uncomfortable or its authority and complacency were challenged. Only once did she admit to enjoying an ‘orthodox’ book – Jellet’s *The Efficacy of Prayer* – otherwise, ‘If I at once take up an orthodox book, I become opposive and unbelieving again’. In 1884, she was interested in Madam Blavatsky, theosophy and Buddhism, but could not locate the books in Brisbane’s libraries. It was all grist to the mill in which she formed her opinions, but she shied away from the extremities of free-

201 *NMPL*, 16 May 188(1?).
202 *NMPL*, 13 May 1880.
203 For the doctrine of private judgment, see Peter Toon, *Evangelical Theology 1833-1856; a Response to Tractarianism*, London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979, pp. 135-137. It is worth noting that the Rev. F.D. Maurice had been forced to resign his professorship of King’s College, London, for challenging the doctrine that obstinate sinners would be condemned to everlasting punishment; Edwards, p.150.
204 *NMPL*, 9 February 1879; February, 1881; 8 January 1882; June 15 in vol.3, OL.
thinking, especially the current scientific naturalism which reified scientific method.206 Her objection was expressed in the context of her role in passing on to her children a sound basis for their moral and religious development:

Fancy my putting Meta [her daughter] through a catechism compiled from the creeds of freethinkers of the day. “What is your origin?” “My ancestors were originally evolved from primordial germs and the race after taking many forms of animal life in different ages have at last reached the stage which I represent.” “What is your chief aim in life?” “To glorify and worship the no-god wh has not created and who does not govern the universe and to prepare myself for a state of glorious annihilation.” “What will become of you after death?” “My life and consciousness will drop quietly out of the life of the planet and my body will fertilize the earth and take new forms ad infinitum.”207

Nora had as much difficulty with the dogma of the orthodox as with scientific naturalism, but created a space for herself in the liberal, Broad Church tradition from which position she could critique both, but remain within the Anglican fold. Her letters stand out among women’s writing in colonial Queensland for the insight they give to one woman’s quest for intellectual autonomy in a social and geographical context that militated against it.

**Women’s Business**

In the context of discussing the Victorian ‘crisis of faith’, Turner outlined the way in which the family had become ‘a major religious institution’:

For evangelical religion the family, far more than the church, constituted the centre of Christian nurture. Parents and devout relatives were the chief Christian teachers of their children. The household was the scene of family prayers and devotions. The Bible, along with the evangelical devotional literature, provided the text for the family-oriented religious training. The image of domestic evangelical Christian piety was frequently associated with the pious mother. It was also generally accepted that women, whether mothers, grandmothers, or aunts, would be very active in the process of Christian education. Indeed, the maintenance of a Christian home, the education of Christian children, and the sustenance of a Christian husband constituted a major part of the gender-defined social role for evangelically reared women. In some cases there also existed a darker side to this family faith. It


207 NMPL, 9 February 1879.
might involve harsh discipline, personal physical and psychological conflation between God the Father and the father of the household. Many British Christians whose personal theology did not mesh with those of evangelicals nonetheless still embraced the model social expectations of the evangelical family.\textsuperscript{208} [My emphasis.]

Turner has concisely summarised the religious role of women in the domestic sphere in this passage. The only referent omitted is class, but in respect of that, working-class evangelicals, of whom there were many, especially in Wesleyan/Methodist circles, would have shared the view. So, too, would middle-class evangelicals such as the Nicholsons at Grovely. Turner thus defines women’s business. The faith is transmitted from one generation to another through them. Biologically trapped in the domestic sphere, the lives of most women were centred in producing, nurturing, and educating the next generation.

The writings of the Anglican women covered in this chapter give weight to the concept of the domestic sphere and to Turner’s argument. Two issues arise from the material discussed. First, the concept of the domestic sphere is not necessarily class-bound. Although the women whose writings are discussed are (in English terms), broadly speaking, middle-class or upper middle-class, Julia Cross’ letters show similar characteristics. Julia and her daughters, who went into service and then married, were governed by the same biological trap; to produce, nurture, and educate the next generation. Though by this time general education in the colony was in the hands of the State or the Church, religious and moral formation of children was largely dependant on parents, even if they relied on Sunday schools, or in Julia’s case, the children’s temperance movement, the Band of Hope, to help them.

The second matter is that of theological perspective or churchmanship. Turner makes his argument for an evangelical faith and then broadens it in the words I have

\textsuperscript{208} Turner, p. 21.
emphasised. The writings explored are from pens of different theological perspective. Mary Nicholson is close to the type of a middle-class evangelical. Nora Murray Prior places herself in the Broad Church/liberal party. Katie Hume had Tractarian/Ritualist proclivities. Blanche Mitchell and the people she writes about are those who are culturally Anglican – that is, their religious belief and practice is inseparable from their English Protestant heritage. Blanche seems to have been influenced by evangelicalism, and the Drews and Heaths may have been more High Church, though Blanche’s diary is not definitive on the point. Julia’s letters do not give enough definitive information to make a judgement about her churchmanship. These Anglican women expressed a diversity of theological viewpoint, covering a wide spectrum of current opinion. Notably, all of the women and those written about (including the free-thinking Mrs Thornton) see the communication of religious faith and/or some basis for ethics, as part of a woman’s role in the domestic sphere. It was, clearly, women’s business. The fall-off in church attendance by men as the nineteenth century wore on has sometimes been noted in the colonial context. Is this because ‘church’ was seen as women’s business? Did the domestic ideology of the nineteenth century and the shift in educational responsibility to the State exclude colonial men from the process of religious identity formation in their children? These are big questions for another context, but in the next chapter we will begin to address the role of men in the church.
Chapter 7

Men’s Business: The Public Face of the Church

The Rev. R. Creyke here came forward, and requested permission to read a document which he held in his hand. It was signed by about thirty or forty of the parishioners who earnestly exhorted their fellow parishioners, for the sake of peace, to abstain from any further proceedings that might lead to contention and ill-will in the matter.

A sharp discussion followed the reading of this document; several gentlemen contending that it had nothing whatever to do with their proceedings, and moreover, that it was signed by ladies and by persons who did not form part of the congregation. It was further suggested that many might have signed it who did not know the meaning of it.

Report of meeting at St John’s, Brisbane; MBC, 10 March 1855.
The elaboration of gender roles in colonial society has for its point of departure the values emigrants from Britain brought with them. However, colonial Queensland was not Victorian England and, as we have seen, the socio-economic class structure was different in significant ways. Social formation in colonial Queensland would take dearly held values and re-express them in a new context. There was a sense in which all fractions of the community were striving to improve their social and material well-being. Part of the process included the appropriation of the ideology of separate spheres to define gender roles. This ideology placed women in the domestic sphere in which women concentrated their attention on their responsibilities within the home, regardless of their social or economic class.\(^1\) A man’s primary role in the family, whatever his social class, was to be the material provider,\(^2\) and in colonial society this was critical as there were limited work options for women to contribute to the family economy.\(^3\) Middle class men were unwilling to enter marriage without the economic security to support a household and the immediate prospect of children.\(^4\) Among the well-to-do, a marriage settlement could make things a little easier.\(^5\) The different spheres for

---


\(^4\) Davidoff & Hall, pp. 322-324; Tosh, pp. 108-109.

\(^5\) For example, Katie Hume brought £600 to her marriage. It was invested in Treasury Bonds at 10%. Nancy Bonnin, ed., *Katie Hume on the Darling Downs*, Toowoomba, DDI Press, 1985, p. 15.
men and women in the middle and upper classes were especially evident in widowhood. Women were expected to live almost cloistered lives in deep mourning with little expectation of remarriage, whereas men were encouraged to return to the public arena quickly, and most did not remain widowers for long.  

Even in working class debate, there was a desire that women should be kept out of paid employment, and that men should be the breadwinners, as Anna Clark and Sonya Rose have argued for London. In colonial Queensland, that meant that men would be working away from home most of the day, whether they were labourers or public servants. Only some artisans who had workshops at their home and some small farmers were likely to be working ‘from home’. Generally, men’s workplaces were separated from the domestic sphere. Similarly, the locations of men’s sociability such as clubs, pubs, and voluntary societies took men away from the family home, and accentuated the difference between the domestic sphere of home and family, and the public sphere of work, business, politics and male sociability.

It was on the basis of their citizenship, their right to the franchise, that men claimed their role in public political life. The notion that politics and public life was the realm of the landed gentry and aristocracy did not apply in colonial Queensland in the way it did in England. As we have seen earlier, the majority of the population was working class and socially upwardly mobile bourgeoisie, and men from these classes sought public positions that gave them social leverage. The restrictive nature of the franchise excluded

---

7 Clark, pp. 197-232, 266-268; Rose, p. 145.
8 Compare Tosh, p. 3.
9 Much of the substance of Lake’s study covers this ground; Lake, pp. 116-131. See also, Moore, p. 43.
all women and most working class men from voting. Furthermore, as politicians were not paid, a man needed to have a substantial income to consider a political career. The rising ‘middle class’ of shopkeepers, small businessmen (often from an artisanal background) and professionals satisfied their political aspirations in areas of office-holding in the parish, in voluntary societies, and in municipal politics. These areas of activity were within the public domain, and were part of the definition of the public sphere in which men moved and worked, and which were largely closed to women. Penny Russell has documented the story of the Melbourne Orphan Asylum, founded by a group of women in 1849. Till 1854 it was managed by the women, who then appointed a committee of men to manage its financial affairs. By 1862, the institution was run by the men, with a very circumscribed role for the Ladies Committee. This shift in control illustrates very clearly that men had effective control of ‘the public domain’ and reflects masculine notions of what women’s place was. Russell also makes the point that usually women who were involved in philanthropic societies did not necessarily want to run them on their own: ‘Philanthropic work was the only exception to the general prescription that a lady “eschewed” the public world’, but generally women relied on men for the more administrative and public functions of such organizations. In Sydney and Melbourne, however, women did engage in limited public debate by writing to newspapers, as Caroline Chisholm or Annie Dawbin did, when issues impacting on women were raised,

---


but they rarely, if ever, spoke at public meetings.  

In the Brisbane papers there is minimal evidence of this kind of letter-writing before 1875. This may reflect a different kind of colonial society or simply a much younger community, but when contentious issues such as land legislation or education were raised, there is no evidence of women becoming involved in the public debate in this way. Shoemaker claims that newspapers were ‘defined as masculine and public, while magazines for women were characterised as private and feminine’. This division almost reflects the gendered nature of the ‘separate spheres’, and it is not surprising that newspapers, and more particularly public opinion, were a male preserve, and were a locus of ‘men’s business’.

Newspapers can be a problematic historical source, and are not necessarily representative or mirrors of social practice and attitudes, as Judith Allen has pointed out. Letters written to the editor of a newspaper come from people who are highly motivated to present their point of view, which may well be a minority one. Rather, ‘Their significance for historians is in the realms of the meteorological – winds, climates, storms that figuratively can be gauged’. Furthermore, there is an element of theatricality in newspaper letters. The choice of writing style, the stance of the writer, and the nom-de-plume adopted often give insight to how the writer represented him/her self. For example, the use of Latin and Latinisms may represent a claim to be ‘educated’. A nom-de-plume may be chosen to identify the writer as a member of a party or be a way of claiming
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13 Shoemaker, p. 307.
14 Shoemaker, p. 239. For the role of the colonial journalist in the public sphere, see Denis Cryle, ‘Colonial journalists and journalism: an overview’ in Denis Cryle, ed., *Disreputable Profession*, Rockhampton, Central Queensland University Press, 1997, pp. 10-16. Lake makes a persuasive case along the lines I have argued here for *The Bulletin*; Lake, pp. 117-122. But see Cryle’s comments, p. 15.
special privilege to legitimate his/her point of view. For example, one who signed a letter
*One of the Congregation* makes a claim to be ‘more in the know’. Newspapers frequently
reported the proceedings of church and church-related meetings, and there is often an
element of performance in reports of public meetings, and even of some meetings which
were not public, like parish meetings. Speakers at such meetings would know that there
was a reporter present, and there seemed to be a tendency to perform for the
newspaperman. Maurice O’Connell’s hand-wringing performance at the meeting at St.
John’s in 1864, to debate the bishop’s education policy, is a good example.17 It was
pitched at wavering opinion and sought sympathy for, and deference to, the bishop.

Captain Wickham put on a good performance of righteous indignation during the offertory
controversy by claiming that he had been unjustly misrepresented.18 Again, it was
designed to garner support for his side of the issue. Even newspaper reports themselves
dramatized meetings by parenthetically recording the audience responses.19

But it was public meetings that were the greatest theatrical productions. The
meetings arranged by the bishops to debate education in 1864/5 are a good example of the
public meeting as entertainment. The towns were placarded before the event, and the
newspapers primed their readers with background material for the debate. The rituals of
reviewing who requisitioned the meeting, of electing a chairman, and of clarifying the
format of the debate were assiduously observed with the local worthies seated on the
platform with the key speakers. The next day the papers published the proceedings in
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16 Penny Russell uses the idea of performance in *A Wish For Distinction* to explore the ways the Melbourne
social elite defined and maintained their ‘social’ space, and performance is a thread connecting the different
styles of Victorian manliness discussed by James Eli Adams in *Dandies and Desert Saints*.
17 *BC*, 9 November 1864.
18 *MBC*, 14 April 1855.
19 *BC*, 5 May 1865.
great detail, often with editorial comment. This whole performance was for men. It was a
gendered production. Women did not attend the meetings; that was men’s business.

Church life was gendered, too. In the mid nineteenth century there is a noticeable
bifurcation of religious practice by gender. Men kept control of church leadership and held
a monopoly over public religious responsibilities, both in the ecclesiastical hierarchy and
in the field of lay endeavour. Women were perceived to be more pious and devout than
men, but were encouraged to avoid meddling in controversy. Their role was as moral
agents, with the responsibility of elevating feelings and refining behaviour, and it was in
this context that Caroline Chisholm spoke of women as ‘God’s police’. Men were the
philosophers, with greater intelligence, and a broader field for thought. The field of
activity in the parish for men was to be responsible for the public face of the church, while
women undertook fundraising and sensitive philanthropic and pastoral work behind the
scenes. This division of responsibility was essentially patriarchal, with ultimate
authority in both the public sphere and the private sphere resting on men’s shoulders.
Women’s agency was ‘permitted’, rather than being a woman’s right, as the example of
the Melbourne orphanage demonstrates.

Much of what has passed as ‘Anglican history’ in Australia has not considered the
gendered nature of Anglican experience. In the previous chapter I explored aspects of
Anglican women’s experience of colonial Queensland life from their letters and diaries.
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20 Shoemaker, p. 216; Kingston, p. 22; Ruth Teale, ‘Matron, Maid and Missionary: the Work of Anglican
Women in Australia’, in Willis, pp. 119-120.
21 Kingston, p. 22. The writer and cleric, Charles Kingsley, affirmed women’s intellectual capacity, but
believed their special quality to be spiritual more than cerebral, their responses finer, and their strength
22 Shoemaker, pp. 24-25
23 Teale, pp. 118; Tosh, p. 133.
24 Anne O’Brien, “‘A Church Full of Men’: Masculinism and the Church in Australian History’, *Australian
Few of their husbands or brothers seemed to have shared their literary proclivities. More often than not we are dependent on public sources for data on men’s activities. These public sources include records in archives recording business and legal transactions, but it is to newspapers, as a distinctive medium for public debate in the period, that we will turn to here. In public debate about church affairs, it is possible to discern some of the ways that Anglican men perceived their church – how they thought, spoke and wrote about it. We will try to get some answers to the question, ‘What was the public face of the church?’, and in doing so will address issues of authority, churchmanship, gender, and class, and how public debate about contentious issues contributed to ideas of what the church ‘should’ be.

**The Collection Controversy**

Very early in the history of St. John’s Church, a controversy arose which defined some of the areas for contention among Anglicans for many years to come. The controversy became public with the publication of the proceedings of a meeting held in the St. John’s schoolroom which discussed the simple act of passing a collection plate during Morning Prayer on Sundays.²⁵ This practice began when the new church building was opened for worship, and at the instigation of the Bishop of Newcastle, William Tyrrell. It had been the bishop’s policy that the offertory be introduced in each new church, as a way of encouraging people to contribute to the parish’s expenses on a week by week basis. Using the strategy of petitions and public meetings developed by English Radicals and Dissenters to seek redress of grievances, a group of forty-nine parishioners petitioned the bishop to have the practice stopped, claiming that St. John’s was no new church – that the

---

²⁵ *MBC*, 10 March 1855.
congregation had been gathered before the church was built. By this they distinguished the church as the congregation from the church as a building.\textsuperscript{26} Further, they claimed that ‘the pure faith of our Fathers long since consigned this ritual to oblivion as inimical to religious feeling, and an unseemly interruption of the Worship of God’ and that the writings of Luther legitimated their action. The petitioners were almost exclusively drawn from the petty bourgeois businessmen and professional class in the town. The bishop replied to their petition defending the practice and his authority to sanction it. A meeting was organized by some of the petitioners to discuss the bishop’s response. The subsequent controversy is interesting in the light it sheds on the contested area of authority in the church and on the real fear of Tractarian innovation undermining the Protestant nature of the Church of England.

Those calling the meeting invited the incumbent, the Rev. H.O. Irwin, to attend. He declined on the basis that the meeting had been irregularly called, and could not be regarded as being a meeting of the congregation. It would have no binding authority on the congregation or on him as incumbent. His letter declining the invitation was read as the first part of the business of the meeting. The original petition to the bishop was then read, followed by his reply. The Rev. Robert Creyke chimed in with a letter from about thirty or forty members of the congregation, ‘who exhorted their fellow parishioners, for the sake of peace, to abstain from any further proceedings that might lead to contention and ill will in the matter’. Contention and ill will was immediately manifested, as some at the meeting protested that the letter had been ‘signed by ladies, and by persons who did not form part of the congregation’, which, it was claimed, made it unrepresentative. Thus

\textsuperscript{26} This idea of a gathered congregation was not quite Anglican, but reflected the polity of Old Dissent (Congregationalists, Baptists, Independents, and Presbyterians).
even before the subject of the meeting had been discussed, issues of authority had already been canvassed. Irwin had already made it clear that he did not consider the meeting to have any authority in relation to the congregation and the meeting itself had privileged men’s voices in church affairs as authoritative.\(^{27}\) The exclusion of women’s views was not disputed further. The meeting clearly set the boundaries: the public business of the parish was specifically men’s business. The names of the women on the letter calling for a peace between the differing parties represent a significant claim to be heard, but were forced to be silent.\(^{28}\) This action stigmatized the peace and reconciliation group that backed the clergy because women had given it their support. It was a tactic to ‘feminise’ the clerical party and thus marginalize it. This, in turn, reinforced the masculine code of those involved in calling the meeting. This strategy represents the assertion of hegemonic masculinity as described by Bob Connell, and the subordination of a masculinity that sought the inclusion of, or rapprochement with, women.\(^{29}\)

This explanation has more force because the issue was over an allegedly ‘Tractarian’ innovation. Tractarianism was increasingly viewed as unmanly (Plate 7.1)

\(^{27}\) Sonya Rose discusses a similar phenomenon in the labour movement in England. Rose, pp. 170-171.
\(^{28}\) The report is quoted at the head of this chapter. \textit{MBC}, 10 March, 1855. The women signatories were Miss Macarthur, M. Mayne, Margaret Langtree, Rachel Jones, Charlotte Sutton, Sarah Smith, Anne Denyer and M.L. Jones. Rachel Jones can be positively identified as the wife of a storekeeper at Kangaroo Point. Miss Macarthur may have been a sister of Hannibal Macarthur and thus a relative of Mrs. J.C. Wickham, the government resident. She was of independent means, and in 1855, she would have been 57 years old. In the list she appears after F.R. Chester Master, who had married Hannibal’s youngest daughter, Emma Jane, in 1852. M. Mayne may have been Mary, the wife of the ill-famed Patrick Mayne. Charlotte Sutton may have been a relative of William Samuel Sutton publican of the Commercial Inn, North Brisbane. Isaac Salisbury (also on the list) was an employee of Sutton. Ann Denyer may have been a relative of Charles Denyer who lived in North Brisbane in 1850-51. M.L. Jones (Mary Louisa Jones) was the widow of Richard Jones of New Farm. I am indebted to the Rev John Steele for much of this information. Anne Dwyer is not identifiable. \textit{MBC}, 31 March 1855. Note: at this stage the \textit{Moreton Bay Courier} was a weekly newspaper.
and Tractarian clergy were demonized for their alleged undue influence over women.\textsuperscript{30} As Irwin had Tractarian sensibilities, the marginalization of the clerical party fits this rhetoric. This power-play by the anti-offertory party can be interpreted as an attempt to assert a patriarchal hegemony – a conservative, Protestant one that was concerned to mark itself off from a Tractarian one bent on Romanising ‘innovation’.\textsuperscript{31}

In responding to the disputation about the letter he had read, the Rev. Robert Creyke made high claims for the bishop’s ultimate authority to decide the issue, and that anyone claiming to be a member of the Church of England had to be prepared to submit to that authority. Creyke claimed that all he was seeking was peace and order, that he deprecated Radicalism, and went so far as to say that the man who opposed his King opposed God. This echoed old-fashioned High Churchmanship and its theories of passive obedience, and Stuart notions of kingship, which were dismissed by the meeting as unProtestant, and diminished the rights of the laity.\textsuperscript{32} The alternative congregationalist point of view was expressed by Mr. Boyes who contended that the congregation formed a church, and had power to decide on subjects like these.

Plate 7.1 Cartoons depicting two Tractarian clergy. The one on the left is the Arthur Tooth, who was imprisoned in England under the Public Worship Regulation Act. Tooth was the son of Robert Tooth, a wealthy Australian businessman. The other is Alexander Mackonochie, who was a contemporary of Tufnell at Wadham College. Both men were victimized for their advanced ritualism. Of Tooth, the *Irish Times* suggested that he had ‘stepped out of a pre-Raphaelite painting . . . if the Christian teacher should look like a Roman Catholic priest, then Mr. Tooth is to be congratulated on his exclusively sacerdotal appearance and manner’. The cartoons emphasise an otherworldliness and piety that contemporaries equated with femininity. The cartoon of Tooth is from *Vanity Fair* 10 February 1877; that of Mackonochie (by ‘Ape’) from *Vanity Fair*, 31 December 1870. Both are taken from B. Palmer, *Reverend Rebels*, pp. 116 and 64, respectively.
This view had no room for bishops or priests in decision making. In fact the debate surrounding authority in this controversy highlighted the acute need for some more adequate means of church government in the colonies, where the Church of England was not the Established Church.

The meeting passed five resolutions, four of which identified the introduction of the offertory as a Tractarian innovation. Fear was expressed that this was the thin edge of the wedge and that other innovations, such as large candles on the communion table or auricular confession, would follow. In this context, the concerns were Protestant ones about the Romanising tendency of Tractarianism, ‘priestly supremacy’ and a threat to the right of ‘private judgment’. The secession to the Church of Rome by the leading Tractarians, Newman (October, 1845) and Manning (6 April, 1851) had marked Tractarians as a Romanising party. Any innovation was considered to be a Tractarian move toward Rome, even if it had the sanction of the Book of Common Prayer (BCP). Memory of the Romanising attempt at interpretation of the thirty-nine articles had bred distrust of the Tractarians.

As the offertory was being represented as a collection of alms, on the authority of the BCP, it is surprising that in one of the resolutions a claim was made that it was not needed, as there were ‘no parish poor’ to support, and that the funds were being

---

33 One of the tendencies of Tractarianism was to increase the clericalisation of church life, succinctly described thus by Norman Vance: ‘As the influence of the Oxford Movement spread there were frequent attempts to foster a more exclusively clerical consciousness, a sense of the clergyman as primarily a priest of God rather than a man with an education and a black coat.’ His wry description captures a real shift in clerical self-awareness as the nineteenth century wore on. Norman Vance, Sinews of the Spirit; The Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought Cambridge, CUP, 1985, p.16. Geoffrey Best uses the expression anti-sacerdotalism in relation Protestant rhetoric concerning Roman Catholic or Tractarian/Ritualist clergy. Many of the ideas he puts forward concerning popular Protestantism are articulated to this notion; Best, pp. 116-118. For a simple explanation of private judgment, see Peter Toon, Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856; A Response to Tractarianism. London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979, pp. 135-137.

misappropriated as the ‘alms’ were being used for other purposes. Another resolution represented that there were Anglicans being ‘driven into dissent by the proceedings of the Tractarian party’, and yet another called for the creation of a Church of England Association to defend the Church and for the education of its people. On a practical level, those at the meeting decided to withdraw from the church after the sermon, and before the offertory. This practice was followed for some weeks and was duly reported in both Brisbane and Sydney papers.

The controversy was further inflamed the following month at the Annual General Meeting of the parishioners. The Parish Treasurer was Captain Wickham, who took exception to the assertion made at the meeting and in the *Sydney Morning Herald* that church funds had been misappropriated, and rejected any notion that he had been responsible for any such action. This issued in a further outbreak of hostilities on both sides with paid advertisements in the *Moreton Bay Courier*. One such advertiser who signed himself *N*, and belonging to the anti-offertory party, shifted the issue more squarely into the arena of authority. The writer challenged the bishop’s authority to direct that the practice be observed, especially because of its divisiveness in the Brisbane congregation, and because there was scope in the thirty-nine articles for local variation in liturgical practice (article 34). The writer challenged the incumbent’s insistence on the ‘effete and offensive ceremony’ and claimed the right of private judgment on the part of the laity in their opposition to both the bishop and the clergyman: ‘The laity will have a voice in the affairs of their churches.’ These advertisements prompted further responses in the columns

---

35 *MBC*, 10 March 1855.
36 *MBC*, 17 March 1855; *SMH*, 23 March 1855.
37 *SMH*, 22 March 1855. The editorial on this day covers all the issues well, and chides everyone involved for disturbing peace and quietness.
38 *MBC*, 14 April 1855.
of the *Courier* and, at a meeting on 27 April to elect a churchwarden, the matter was again aired. This time the Rev. Irwin showed more of his hand when he suggested that ‘men not qualified by dint of previous pursuits and the experience of their past lives should not aspire to pronounce judgment on the matter’. This comment is a double sided one. In it he claimed that the complainants did not have the background or experience to make judgment on the matter, and claimed the prerogative of the educated class to make these kinds of decisions. It draws attention to a key point about Anglicanism in early Queensland. A large proportion of Anglicans were from a social class which had had no experience in church leadership. Lay leaders in the Church in England were usually from educated classes, especially the landed gentry and aristocracy of which there was a negligible number in early Brisbane. This meant that upwardly socially mobile petit bourgeois colonists were seeking lay offices and lay leadership in the parish situation. Irwin’s exhortations to them to defer to their betters, especially the bishop ‘who ought to be and must be obeyed’, merely inflamed the ire of the disputants.

A long written response to the situation from the bishop was discussed at a parish meeting in August. He had especially objected to the practice of the parishioners walking out of the service after the sermon, and indicated that he could refuse them communion if they continued to do so. This was interpreted by the parishioners as being a high-handed response, but they decided to discontinue the practice, and simply refused to contribute to the offertory. Thus in a sense, the bishop won his point, but at the cost of parish harmony. The dispute also weakened the bishop’s authority by creating a climate of distrust among some of the parishioners. Those opposing the offertory turned to the authority of the
scriptures and the thirty-nine articles and claimed the right of private judgment to oppose the bishop. It was a singularly Protestant stance.

In all of the debate, the Rev. H.O. Irwin was singled out for much criticism. There was much anxiety about the claims to authority by the bishop and Irwin. Such pretensions were interpreted as Tractarian and as undermining the rights of the laity. There was a fear of centralized authority being placed in the bishop or being claimed by the bishop. Although the evidence is slight, part of the motivation for the controversy may be found in Irwin’s alleged Tractarian sympathies. The letters of A.E. Selwyn suggest that there may be some basis for making such a claim. The offertory stayed. H.O. Irwin didn’t.

Conveniently, his wife’s poor health called him to a Tasmanian parish later that year.

The Education Debate

The issues of episcopal authority and Tractarianism in the Church of England did not go away. They resurfaced a few years later with the formation of the new colony of Queensland out of part of the colony of New South Wales (‘Separation’), when the new legislature had to decide how it would organize elementary education. The education debate has attracted the attention of several historians down the years. It is not my
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39 A.E. Selwyn, *The Selwyn Letters*, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1902. Selwyn’s stay with Irwin in Brisbane is recorded from p. 14. The visit took place four years earlier, in 1851.
40 Irwin was a graduate of Cambridge University, and had been a curate at the Park Street Chapel, Grosvenor Square, London. There is little information on Irwin’s ministry in Tasmania, where he stayed till his death in 1882, at Hagley. Mrs. Frances Irwin was the daughter of a South Australian priest, the Rev George Newenham. See A.P. Elkin, *The Diocese of Newcastle*, Glebe, Australasian Medical Publishing Co., 1955, pp. 142, 144, 155, 167, 177, 187, 739, 741.
intention to revise their assessments of the controversy; rather I will examine how
Anglican laymen viewed the issues, and in order to try to understand how they saw the
Church of England and how they presented that view to the public in debate.

At Separation, education in the colony was provided by two parallel systems, the
National system, run by a board directly responsible to the colonial government, and a
Denominational system, run by the Denominational Schools Board, which comprised
representatives of the principal religious denominations. This board apportioned the funds
provided for denominational schools to the various denominations. These funds were
separate from aid given by the state to the main religious denominations for clergy
stipends and infrastructure from the Civil List. At the time of Separation there were ten
Denominational schools and three National schools in Queensland. Only one of the
National schools was operating. On his arrival, the new Governor of Queensland, Sir
George Bowen, undertook to maintain the dual system until the new legislature could
meet and make its own arrangements.42

That religious issues were to be significant in the election was clear from the start
of the campaign. Nearly all candidates supported a system of National education, some
specifying that it be secular education. Only one candidate gave denominationalists any
hope, Henry Buckley unequivocally supporting the dual system.43 There was more debate
over state aid for religious purposes. Some candidates had advocated some support for
clergy stipends and infrastructure in the less densely settled districts. These candidates
were Anglicans, and not surprisingly they were often squatters who had a vested interest

---

Queensland, 1962.
42 Gawne, p. 52.
43 *MBC*, 21 February 1860.
in having the burden of supporting the Church lifted from their own shoulders. Until the matter was debated in parliament there was a flurry of letters to the newspaper editors. In the first sitting of parliament, all State Aid for religion was abandoned and the National system of elementary education was established as Gawne has neatly documented. All this activity took place before Bishop Tufnell had even arrived in the colony – he faced a fait accompli.

The decisions made by parliament made Tufnell’s task in setting the Church of England on a firm footing very difficult. Prior to leaving England he had been told to expect both State Aid for the support of clergy stipends and parish infrastructure and support for Denominational schools. On arrival in September, 1860, he was immediately faced with this substantial financial setback and set about getting the parliament to change its mind in respect of support for schools. The editor of the Courier soon made it clear that there would be solid opposition to the bishop. The bishop agitated consistently on behalf of existing Anglican schools and for the right to open new ones with state support. In this campaign he gained the support of the Roman Catholic bishop, the Right Rev. James Quinn, who also sought support for his diocesan schools. This unlikely alliance became notorious when the two bishops began a public campaign of petitions and public meetings to debate education policy. The Governor was perplexed as he pointed out that the Education Bill would not have passed both houses of parliament without the

---

44 Candidates supporting such limited State Aid included Charles Coxen, Thomas de Lacy Moffat, John Kent, R.G. Herbert, Arnold Weinholt, Nehemiah Bartley, and George Thorn. See the editorial, MBC, 8 May, 1860.
45 Gawne, pp. 56-62.
46 MBC, 15 September, 4 October, 1860; see Lawry, p.181.
47 The editor of the Courier was the Rev. Geo. Wight, a Congregationalist minister, and a vigorous campaigner for the abolition of Sate Aid and of denominational education. MBC, 3 November, 1860.
substantial support of Anglican members. Late in 1864, the bishops toured the larger towns to build up support for their point of view. Public meetings to discuss education were held in Dalby, Drayton, Toowoomba and Ipswich in 1864 and in Brisbane in early 1865. Anglican laymen were prominent on both sides of the public debate.

From the Anglican point of view there were two kinds of rhetoric. One kind related to internal matters in the Anglican Church concerning churchmanship and authority within the church, and flows on from the offertory debate. The second set related to the place of Anglicans in wider society. As in the offertory controversy with Bishop Tyrrell, some Anglicans were very critical of the way in which Bishop Tufnell exercised an almost autocratic power; he had control of diocesan finances and church property; he made appointments to parishes; and appeared to be answerable to no-one. All these issues were aired at the visitation of the Metropolitan and Bishop of Sydney, Bishop Barker, in July of 1864.

Bishop Tufnell based his authority on his Letters Patent, and much of the rhetoric he used was articulated to this central idea. He claimed that to resist his authority was to resist the authority of the Sovereign, as Letters Patent were issued by the Crown. The argument filled out the passive obedience theme enunciated by the Rev. Robert Cr eyke during the offertory controversy some years earlier. These ideas had their adherents among the laity. At a meeting called to discuss the bishop’s education policies in October

---

48 Lawry, p. 193 where he quotes from one of the Governor’s despatches. See also the speech by R.R. Mackenzie at the meeting held at St. John’s Church, BC, 9 November 1864.
50 The bishop made these claims at a meeting at Ipswich to discuss the appointment of a successor to the Rev. Lacy Rumsey. BC, 6 December, 1864. The Roman Catholic bishop used similar logic for his claims to authority when he was dealing with dissident parishioners, also in Ipswich, when he said; ‘I am a sacred person; I have been ordained and received the Holy Ghost: anyone attacking my character commits a most gross and sacrilegious act.’ Whereas Bishop Tufnell based his authority on civil law, Bishop Quinn rested his on his episcopal ordination. For Quinn, see T.L. Suttor, *Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia, 1788-1870*, Melbourne, MUP, 1965, p. 290.
1864 a high doctrine of episcopal authority was espoused by Colonel Maurice O’Connell (the president of the Legislative Council), Mackenzie Shaw, William Coote and others. For them there was a duty of submission to the bishop as a properly constituted authority, drawing on a Tory theory of a hierarchically organized society in which each had his or her own place. It was a rhetoric that emphasized duties, not rights, and which interpreted open debate as defying episcopal authority and verging on ecclesiastical anarchy.\footnote{Colonel O’ Connell’s impassioned speech in defence of the bishop at the meeting at St. John’s Church is an example of this view. \textit{BC}, 9 November 1864. Even Bishop Barker’s visitation address makes large claims for a colonial bishop’s power. \textit{BC}, 19 July 1864.}

In this meeting the Bishop was also condemned for his ‘unholy alliance’ with Bishop Quinn.\footnote{The expression was first used by the \textit{Queensland Times}. See \textit{BC}, 21 October 1864.} As Norman has noted in the English context, Tractarianism and Roman Catholicism were bracketed together.\footnote{E.R. Norman, \textit{Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England}, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1968, p.105, Best, p. 117.} In the wake of the secession of Newman and Manning to Rome, the road from Oxford to Rome seemed easy and wide, and Tufnell’s Oxford and Tractarian connections were widely known.\footnote{He was a contemporary of R.W. Church and A. Mackonochie at Wadham; the curate of the Rev. G.A. Denison; and friend of Bishop W.K. Hamilton, the first openly Tractarian bishop in England. To use Joh Bjelke Peterson’s apt phrase, ‘if you fly with the crows, you get shot with the crows’, and Tufnell was always suspected of Tractarian sympathies, though he never publicly proclaimed them.} Rhetoric in newspaper editorials and letters helped readers connect the dots. In one letter to the \textit{Guardian}, a correspondent suggested that the two bishops debate which the apostolical one was, a reference to the Tractarian concern about the apostolicity of the Anglican Church, and an implication that Tufnell was Tractarian in sentiment.\footnote{Letter signed J, \textit{QDG}, 29 September 1864.} The bishop’s power was seen by this paper’s editor as being autocratic or monarchical and one correspondent who supported the bishop’s party identified a fear of priestcraft in the opposition’s polemic.\footnote{Letter signed Vivis Sperandum, \textit{QDG}, 25 October 1864.} Lewis Bernays described the bishop’s alliance as ‘unsound in principle and irreligious in character’ and
questioned the propriety of an alliance with the leader of a denomination to whose
doctrines Anglicans could not subscribe.57

There was also a pervasive distrust/dislike of Irish Catholics that is best illustrated
by Twopeny’s assessment of Irish servants as being ‘liars and dirty’ and their
characterization as being ‘dimwitted’.58 There was also an underlying rhetoric that
stigmatized their Catholic culture. The Presbyterian minister, the Rev. John Dunmore
Lang, had been an exponent of this tradition in his crusade to keep Australia Protestant;
Bernays’ comments were made in the wake of the big public meeting in Ipswich, which
resulted in violence that was attributed to the Irish Catholics supporting Bishop Quinn.59
He deprecated any involvement of the Anglican bishop in a situation in which the
‘shillelah’ could be brought into use. A parishioner at an Ipswich meeting shortly
afterwards criticized the bishop on the same grounds.60 These ideas were inflamed by
editorial rhetoric, the editor of the Guardian writing that Bishop Tufnell was doing the
work of the Bishop of the Roman Church, supported in the ‘ unhallowed compact’ by ‘an
unthinking Irish mob’.61

Similar sentiments were used by Governor Bowen in a dispatch of December,
1864. Bowen was Anglo-Irish and not very sympathetic with Irish Catholics. He was also
worried about public expressions of Irish Nationalism. Drawing on English stereotypes of
the Irish (as in Plate 7.2) he wrote of ‘the physical force of Bishop Quinn’s Irish

57 BC, 12 October 1864.
58 Twopeny, p. 51; Rachel Henning makes a similar remark about a ‘dull Irish servant’, David Adams, The
59 BC, editorial, 3 October; article on the meeting 7 October 1864; editorial 12 October 1864. For Lang, see
Barry Bridges, ‘John Dunmore Lang’s Crusade to Keep Australia Protestant’, Church Heritage, 11(3),
60 BC, 21 October 1864. The speaker was A. Fitzgibbon, the Commissioner for Railways.
61 Editorial, QDG, 11 October 1864.
supporters’, portraying Tufnell as an ‘instrument of Irish Romanists’. He also criticised those with whom Tufnell associated in this campaign, mentioning W.H. Groom, a parliamentarian and ‘twice-convicted felon’ and Dr. K.I. O’Doherty, who was ‘one of the Irish conspirators transported with Mr. Smith O’Brien’. Bowen attributed Tufnell’s principles to the influence of the Rev. G.A. Denison, the rector of Tufnell’s first parish, and whose Tractarianism had attracted negative attention. The rhetoric used later in the dispatch reflects the ways in which Tractarianism had been portrayed as feminine and unmanly, recalling the rhetoric of the offertory controversy. Of Tufnell, he wrote:

He is doubtless activated by feelings familiar to all who know the University of Oxford by that mixture of almost feminine obstinacy with nervous dislike of publicity which induced the heads of colleges to refuse all information respecting their revenues to the Royal Commissioners of Enquiry . . .

The Premier was Robert Herbert who, like Bowen, was Anglican. He also criticized the bishops’ stance on government policy and the attempt to change the laws concerning education. He did not give way to the pique that Bowen did, but his position reflected that of politicians who supported the education bill and many other Anglicans too:

I may say that I have felt my duty very difficult as a member of the Church of England, and one holding the bishop of that church in this colony in the highest respect, in dealing with this educational question. I have differed with the head of my church so materially on some points, as to lead him to think it advisable to express himself very strongly, and to make great efforts to have the position of this question altered. Now, I felt that when a law was passed by Parliament establishing a national system of education, I was protected by the law, that I could not be molested by persons who might be expected to have a strong tie on me . . . I do not say the bishop of Brisbane brought stronger pressure to bear upon me than I was able to resist; but if I had any doubt as to the way the Parliament desired the laws to be carried out, I might have given way.

---

62 Best also refers to Punch cartoons; see Best, p. 134.
64 Dispatch 1759, Queensland, dated 18 December 1864. CO234/11; AJCP reel no 1912, ANL.
Herbert repudiated the bishop’s claim to speak for all Anglicans and others such as his fellow parliamentarian R.R. Mackenzie, strongly agreed with him. Many Anglicans felt that the Protestant nature of the Anglican Church was under threat by the alliance, one writer claiming that the two churches were ‘diametrically opposed in doctrine and faith’. Their vision of the church was an episcopal Protestant one, and its corollary was that it was anti-Catholic. The division between Protestant and Catholic was doctrinal and political, and Protestant Anglicans sought to ally themselves with other Protestant groups, both to form a Protestant hegemony and to prevent the Catholics from gaining any advantage from the State, however slight. The feeling was that it would be a disaster if the State supported doctrinal error. These observations are consistent with Linda Colley’s understanding of the English constitution being essentially Protestant, and defined over and against a Catholic ‘Other’, which was discussed in an earlier chapter. In this case the ‘Other’ is Irish and Catholic.

66 Mackenzie, an Anglican, had served as chairman of the Board of Education, and also later served as Premier. He was speaking at a meeting in defence of National education. BC, 22 October 1864.
67 BC, 24 October; 5 November, 1864, quoting a letter to the Darling Downs Gazette.
Plate 7.2 William Ewart Gladstone as Prospero, protecting his daughter Hibernia, from the barbarian Irish Catholic rebel. This cartoon is an example of the ways Irish Catholicism was represented in the public domain as evil, and is a visual reinforcement of the nature of the strength of anti-Catholic and anti-Irish rhetoric that surfaced in colonial debate. From *Punch*, 19 March 1870; taken from Walter Arnstein, *Protestant Versus Catholic in Mid-Victorian England; Mr. Newdigate and the Nuns*, p.193.

Plate 7.3 Bishop Walter Kerr Hamilton, Bishop of Salisbury. Hamilton was Tufnell’s bishop at the time Tufnell was preferred to the See of Brisbane. Hamilton was the first Tractarian bishop to be appointed in England, and it was under his auspices that the Salisbury Hymnal was compiled. Picture from Philip Barrett, *Barchester: English Cathedral life in the Nineteenth Century*, between pp. 236 and 237.
The bishops’ opponents took an old idea that it was perfectly permissible to resist a king who exceeded his powers and thus threatened the rights and liberty of the people, and applied it to the autocratic rule of Bishop Tufnell.\(^1\) They rejected any notion of a divinely ordained hierarchy, and were consequently rather democratic in tone in suggesting that the members of the church should choose their own clergy and bishops. In this controversy, the laity claimed that there was a need to find a more equitable means of administering the diocese in co-operation with the laity and of diluting the bishop’s autocratic power. It became very clear that Tractarianism and Romish sympathies were unacceptable to the majority of Anglicans. This latter concern was thrown into sharp relief soon after the education debate started to die down in the early months of 1865.

**The Salisbury Hymnbook**

One of the areas of ‘innovation’ in the 1850s and 1860s was liturgical music. It had been a part of the diocesan renewal process in Salisbury diocese before Bishop Tufnell came out to Queensland.\(^2\) Colonial bishops and clergy joined in the attempts to involve the congregation in the liturgy, especially through improving the music. Janet Scarfe has documented these developments for Adelaide, and James Grant for Victoria, although in Victoria, Bishop Perry was not sympathetic to the musical innovations of some of his clergy.\(^3\) In most churches it meant the introduction of an organ or harmonium to accompany the singing, and the replacement of Tate and Brady’s metrical version of the

---

\(^1\) Editorial, *QDG*, 7 October 1864.
psalms with hymns. Bishop Tufnell introduced the ‘Salisbury hymnbook’ to the Diocese of Brisbane. Another that was becoming popular was *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. The Salisbury Hymnbook had been produced under the guidance of Bishop W.K. Hamilton (in episcopal dress, Plate 7.3) and there had been objections to the hymnbook in that diocese itself, and a Brisbane writer drew attention to this dispute to raise the issue of its theological suitability by writing to the editor of the Brisbane *Courier*. It did not precipitate a big public issue on the scale of the education debate, but it does draw attention to issues already raised in earlier public debate, that bothered some ‘rank and file’ Anglicans. At the time of the discussion of the hymnbook, Bishop Tufnell was back in England, so he was not directly involved in the debate. The debate raised issues concerning ecclesiastical authority (who had the authority to introduce a new hymnbook into a parish); Romeward looking Tractarianism; and a suggestion of masculine anxiety about undue reverence to the Virgin Mary.

The occasion of the initial letter to the *Courier* was the use of a hymn at the Ash Wednesday service, containing the lines:

> When our heads are bowed with woe,  
> When our bitter tears o’erflow,  
> When we mourn our lost ones dear,  
> JESUS, SON OF MARY hear. [Original emphasis]  

It is the last line to which objection was made. The writer objected to two other hymns in the book which used the expression ‘son of Mary’, another which named Mary as one

---


75 *BC*, 15 April 1865. The Bishop of Salisbury was W.K. Hamilton, a friend of Tufnell and his former diocesan. Hamilton was a Tractarian, and his Tractarian views as expressed in a diocesan charge were the origin of the dispute in Salisbury diocese. The hymnbook was further evidence of his ‘unsound’ theology. The dispute was aired in the newspapers the *Bridport News* and the *Dorset, Devon and Somerset Advertiser* on 28 January and 4 February respectively. For this background, see *BC*, 29 April 1865. This is an excellent example of the maintenance of close links between Queensland immigrants and their place of origin.

who, with Salome and Mary Magdalene, anointed the body of Jesus; one referring to St Michael; and three that made references to the virgin birth. The theological inaccuracies of the letter were pointed out by other letter writers.\textsuperscript{77} The original writer interpreted all these as examples of the way in which Roman Catholic devotion was being introduced into Anglican worship and piety by according Jesus’ mother Mary greater dignity than he felt was appropriate. In light of the recent education debate, NWW wrote;

No marvel that the worthy Bishop of the Anglican Church can act so cordially with the equally worthy Dr Quinn [the Roman Catholic Bishop]. The hymnbook which the former introduced into the English Church in Queensland, might, if Latinized, be used without impropriety by the Church of Rome.\textsuperscript{78}

The writer’s anxiety is most focused in references to Mary’s virginity. In quoting the following lines, the writer’s confusion becomes clear:

\begin{quote}
In the \textit{blessed virgin}’s \textit{womb}
\textit{Purest flesh} thou didst assume. [Original emphasis]
\end{quote}

The writer erroneously understood this as a reference to the recently promulgated doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, rather than the virgin birth of Christ. The former was defined in the papal bull \textit{Ineffabilis Deus} in 1854,\textsuperscript{79} the latter doctrine dating back to earliest Christianity and a part of orthodox Anglican doctrine.\textsuperscript{80} This kind of doctrinal fogginess was also displayed by an Ipswich parishioner who uncritically repeated the misunderstandings in NWW’s letter, describing the hymnbook as having ‘several direct

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{BC}, 25 April, 3 May 1865. The Mary referred to with Mary Magdalene and Salome was not the Virgin Mary, but Mary the mother of James; and that the writer had confused the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the generally held belief in the Virgin Birth of Christ.

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{BC}, 15 April 1865.

\textsuperscript{79} The bull states that ‘the most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her conception, by a unique grace and privilege of the omnipotent God and in consideration of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of original sin’. H.T. Kerr, ed., \textit{Readings in Christian Thought}, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1966, p. 245. For an excellent overview of the doctrine, its significance to Australian Catholics, and of its importance to the Irish, see John N. Moloney, \textit{The Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church}, Melbourne, MUP, 1969, pp. 94-102. For the theological nature of the doctrine, see John Macquarrie, \textit{Mary For All Christians}, London, Collins, 1991, especially pp. 51-77.

\textsuperscript{80} It can be found, for example, in Article 2 of the Thirty Nine Articles, and in the Apostle’s and Nicene Creeds.
\end{footnotesize}
and unpleasant references to the Virgin Mary’ which had the effect of ‘sanctioning a
doctrine of which they disapproved’, presumably the doctrine of the Immaculate
Conception.81 A neat rejoinder to these views was expressed by the editor of the
Queensland Times and republished in the Courier.82

In a second letter, which is mixed up with editorial comment, NWW described the
offending hymns as ‘worship of the Virgin Mary’, and objected to ‘hymns to the Saviour
being mixed up with any allusions whatever to the Virgin Mary’ and felt that ‘there was
no sanction for so constant reference to the virginity of the mother of Jesus according to
the flesh, in the New Testament scripture’.83 This later production was enough to bring
further support to his cause from a letter-writer who alleged Tractarian innovations in the
performance of the communion service at St. John’s Church84 and again from Mr.
Fitzgibbon, who raised the matter at an Ipswich parish meeting. Fitzgibbon argued
strongly that the hymnbook was the thin edge of the Tractarian wedge and would allow
Puseyism (Tractarianism) a footing in the diocese.85 Fitzgibbon’s speech and the
clergyman’s response were portrayed rather dramatically with the audience’s responses in
parentheses (‘laughter’; ‘cheers’; ‘hear, hear’; ‘applause’). The Rev. John Mosely played
down Fitzgibbon’s worries by saying that the hymns were no more likely to lead to
worship of the Virgin Mary than ‘the prayerbook [BCP] lead to Romanism’. In spite of the
editor declining to continue the hymnbook debate in the pages of the Courier, other

81 BC, 21 April 1865. The parishioner was Mr. A. Fitzgibbon, the Commissioner for Railways.
82 BC, 25 April 1865.
83 BC, 29 April 1865.
84 BC, 2 May 1865.
85 BC, 5 May 1865.
writers then drew attention to further instances of alleged Tractarianism in ritual and private devotions.86

The anxiety about Mariolatry and ‘worship of saints’ was characteristic of Protestant anti-Catholicism in the nineteenth century.87 Much anti-Catholic polemic rested on a demonstration that Roman Catholic doctrine could not be upheld on the basis of a Protestant interpretation of scripture.88 The popularly held view that the Roman Catholic Church withheld the scriptures from her people, and that only the church and her clergy had the authority to interpret them, was the basis of the claim that the church kept the laity in superstitious ignorance.89 The Sydney Morning Herald reported the promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in passages taken from the London Times and from The Examiner. These were couched in Protestant anti-Catholic rhetoric and towards the end of the Times report, we read:

We shall wait with some curiosity this bold experiment on the credulity of mankind and if it succeeds . . . we shall certainly be disposed to admit . . . that having done this with impunity no amount of absurdity, however gross, - no deception however transparent - no fraud or falsehood, however glaring, can shake the empire of the Roman Catholic Church over the minds of men, or teach them to apply to her the same canons of common sense and reason with which they measure all other subjects. She is about to make two immaculate conceptions out of one; if she proceed to multiply miracles at his rate and with this facility, she may incorporate into Christianity all the lying wonders of the Hindoo Pantheon.90

---

86 BC, 1, 2, 3 June. These accusations included the allegation that the Rev. Thomas Jones found Salvatore Rosa’s painting of ‘Mary at the foot of the cross’ devotionally helpful. Jones denied the allegation.
88 An excellent example of Protestant attitudes to Catholic teaching and devotional practices is to be found in a series of four letters to the editor of the Sydney Morning Herald in the wake of the promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The letters were signed Ex Dissentientibus. SMH, 7, 8, 14, 18 May 1855. For an example of Anti-Catholic sentiment and a violent response, see Catherine Boer, ‘An Early Clergyman of the Hunter’, Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society, 72(2), 1987, pp. 130-148; also, Bridges, op. cit.
90 SMH, 3 May 1855.
In response to the promulgation of the bull, the Anglican Bishop of Sydney, Frederic Barker, took a line typical of conservative Protestant Anglicanism:

The Church of England as a faithful Protestant communion will always find itself in opposition to the Church of Rome. We cannot expect that it will ever be otherwise, or that our protest against the assumptions of the Bishop of Rome will cease to be required. Since the days in which our forefathers cleansed the sanctuary, and returned to old paths, preserving the ancient order and rule, little change and no improvement has taken place in the doctrines taught by the Church of Rome. The decrees of the Council of Trent, and the recent addition to the creed of the article of the Immaculate Conception, more than justify the charge of corrupting and perverting the Word of God brought by our reformers against the Church of Rome, and unless we are prepared to exchange our scriptural light for her darkness, there can never be peace with Rome.  

Barker expresses a traditional Protestant view of the centrality of scripture as the rule of faith and challenges the right of Rome to impose an unscriptural doctrine like that of the Immaculate Conception on Catholics. He was simply restating the thrust of Article 6 of the thirty nine articles, which says in part;

Holy scripture containeth all things necessary for salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite to salvation.

By this reckoning, the definition of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was not warranted. It was an uncompromising view, but thoroughly Anglican. Bishop Perry of Melbourne was Barker’s contemporary and of similar evangelical opinions. Writing in the first issue of the *Church of England Messenger* in 1850 he was rather more inflammatory when he condemned the Roman Church as ‘an apostate and idolatrous Church, the subject of prophetical denunciations of Daniel, St. Paul and St. John’ whose adherents were victims of a ‘satanic delusion’.  

---

to one of the issues at the heart of the Protestant anti-Catholic polemic - allegations of idolatry and superstition.

The promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception brought some of the more virulent anti-Catholic sentiment to the surface. A series of letters to the *Sydney Morning Herald* gave vent to Protestant myths about Catholic devotional practices. As *Ex Dissentientibus* wrote, the Roman Church had moved from ‘worship of Christ to worship of Mary’; and from ‘service of the redeemer to devotions to the Queen of Heaven’, and quoted some extreme examples to illustrate his point. It was a dogma combined of ‘superstition and ignorance’ that perceived Romanism falling back into paganism, having developed ‘the worship of the virgin into a Goddess’. *The Australian Banner* went further and sexualized the imagery, calling Mary ‘the Great Whore’ and deplored ‘The foetid womb of the papacy’ which ‘conceived, and brought forth the impious dogma’. This rhetorical strategy suggests that devotion to the virgin was very unsettling to the gender identity of some colonial men. The doctrines objected to transgress nineteenth century notions of both male and female sexuality, and ascribe to Mary qualities that other women did not have, especially with reference to original sin. She no longer seemed as human as other women and was promoted out of the norms of human femininity to have quasi-divine nature, the origin of accusations underlying Mariolatry. Furthermore, the Protestant perception that Catholics prayed to Mary as another deity threatened to undermine the monotheistic understanding of the Trinity.

93 *SMH*, 8 May 1855.
94 The writer alleged that a Capuchin friar had published a set of prayers to Mary’s body parts – the hair, ears, womb, etc. *SMH*, 17 May 1855. He also quotes some rather excessive examples of devotion to St. Anne, the putative mother of Mary. *SMH*, 14 May 1855.
95 Moloney, pp. 100, 102.
96 This is the substance of the argument of *Ex Dissentientibus*.
97 There is a good discussion of this kind of literature in Gregory, pp. 252-254.
The emphasis in NWW’s letters on Mary’s virginity seems to be a milder expression of this gender anxiety. Doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and the Virgin Birth undermined contemporary masculine self understanding, especially with regard to male gender roles. In the nineteenth century there was a strong attitude that men should be the initiators of sexual activity, and that women should be sexually passive. Virginity and celibacy were highly charged issues for some Victorian men. For example, Charles Kingsley was bothered by sexual purity itself – as in Newman’s ideal of clerical celibacy, and in the context of women Religious, rejected the idea of virginity as a lifestyle choice for women, all of whom he believed should marry. Just as some men like Kingsley took a high moral ground concerning celibacy and virginity, and sex within marriage, the frequency with which men adopted the sexual double standard was just as strong a challenge to the high standards celibacy and virginity (and marital fidelity)

98 Shoemaker, pp. 8, 9, 17, 27, 68.
99 Adams, pp. 98, 101, 103-104; Tosh, p. 108; Charles Barker, ‘Erotic Martyrdom; Kingsley’s Sexuality Beyond Sex’, Victorian Studies, 44(3), Spring, 2002, p.p. 467-469. In this context, the requirement that Roman Catholic priests take a vow of celibacy was often condemned as being unnatural, and that marriage and paternity were seen as normative for men. Even some Catholics, such as H.M. Moran, had difficulties with clerical celibacy; see Edmund Campion, Australian Catholics, Ringwood, Penguin, 1988 [1987], p. 108-109.

100 Maynard, pp. 89, 143. Buckton makes a good case that the Newman-Kingsley controversy which issued in the publication of Apologia Pro Vita Sua by Newman, stemmed in part from Newman’s perceived ‘perversion’, ‘a term that included both his religious transgression and his sexual ambiguity’. Buckton argued that: ‘The chief problem in exploring these issues is that Kingsley’s attack was clearly over-determined, suggesting a range of anxieties not reducible to any one causative factor. For example, Newman’s Catholicism represented (for Kingsley and others) the foreignness of Romanism and the frightening mysteries of Catholic ritual and belief in miracles. At the same time, Newman’s celibacy (connected with, but by no means separable from, his Catholicism) produced another range of anxieties concerning the precariousness of marriage as an institution and the instability of gender (particularly masculine) roles.’ The term perversion is elaborated by Buckton, who sees a strong link to notions of Newman’s effeminacy (p. 361), but it is difficult to sustain allegations of his homosexuality (pp. 366-369). Oliver S. Buckton, ‘“An Unnatural State”: Gender, “Perversion”, and Newman’s Apologia Pro Vita Sua’, Victorian Studies, 35(4), pp.359-383. Barker (p.467) draws attention to Kingsley’s ‘fervent anti-Catholicism’. For the rhetoric of unmanliness of Tractarians, see D. Hilliard, pp 181-210; though Adams’ reservations concerning Hilliard’s interpretation need also be taken into account; Adams, pp.74-106. See also; Tosh, p. 108.
101 Maynard, pp. 89, 94; Barker, p. 469.
demanded. Protestantism delighted in exposing the failures of sexual repression in the virtuoso asceticism of Catholic (and Tractarian) clergy and Religious. Kingsley argued the Protestant view in which the central positive attitude to marriage is a response to God’s injunction to fruitfulness and that marriage was for the procreation of children. This kind of attitude made the old maid or spinster a figure to be pitied – they had not experienced what was the gender norm for women – marriage and family. In fact, as late as the 1970s, Pope Paul responded to this kind of criticism in his Apostolic Exhortation Marialis Cultus when he said ‘Mary’s choice of the state of virginity was not a rejection of any of the values of the married state’.104

The doctrine of the virgin birth sits uneasily with these gender roles as it denied any male human role in the conception of Christ, and is dependent on the theological idea of miraculous conception of Jesus. In the light of the ‘new’ Biblical criticism and advances in science, miracles were at something of a discount. Macquarrie describes the situation concisely when he writes that ‘The whole scientifically based structure of modern society is based on a view of nature which excludes the prescientific supernaturalism which was associated with traditional Christianity’. Unsurprisingly, the virgin birth as the foundational miracle of the Christian faith was not without its critics. Likewise, the idea that Mary was born without the taint of original sin subverted an important element of Protestant theology.107

102 Weeks, p. 22, 38,
103 Maynard, p. m137.
104 Macquarrie, p. 15.
106 Macquarrie, p. 120.
The anxiety about the Salisbury hymnbook brings together discourses of religion and sexuality in ways that were disturbing for colonial men. It was an anxiety that is not really resolved, but demonstrates that there was a conjunction of ideas between Tractarianism, Catholicism, gender and questionable Catholic doctrine. Perhaps what was just as unsettling for Protestant Anglicans was that the Anglican Church seemed to be becoming broader – that it was in the process of comprehending greater doctrinal diversity, and that its identity as a ‘reformed’ church was in danger of being lost.

**Men’s Business**

Anglican men in early colonial Queensland created a public space in which they could give expression to how they perceived what is was to be Anglican. It was a gendered space. The creation and maintenance of the public face of the church was men’s business, the business of laymen and clergy. The only input to the debate by women was presumably in the privacy of the domestic sphere, when husbands and wives may have discussed the matters that men spoke and wrote of in public. Both the public meeting and newspaper discourse were the preserve of male contributors.

In shouldering civic responsibilities or public duties, a man made a claim to ‘respectability’ and moral probity, and above all to make a contribution to public debate. In the cases we have explored above, there was more than one point of view expressed by the protagonists. There were those who supported the traditional Anglican ecclesiastical polity which vested a great deal of power and authority in the bishop and clergy. Many of these were from the upper echelons of colonial society, and Maurice O’Connell, John Clements Wickham, and William Coote were among those who represented something of the Tory High Church ideals of those who promoted the Anglican Church and the
expansion of the colonial episcopacy to buttress imperial civil power, as I argued in chapter one. These views had to contend with those of a more Protestant group of Anglicans, such as Abraham Fitzgibbon, T. Vokes Dudgeon and Lewis Bernays who were seeking the devolution of some of the power of the bishop and clergy. They wanted lay people to be more actively involved in the administration of church affairs, especially its temporalities, but they also wanted to contribute to the theological debate as well. They rested their argument on their right to private judgment, which legitimated their opposition to the control of church affairs by the bishop and clergy.108

There was also a deep concern on the part of the more Protestant Anglicans that the church was drifting Romewards, under the influence of Tractarianism. Although hard evidence of Tractarianism is not always easy to find, the Protestant Anglicans approached every innovation into church life with a hermeneutic of suspicion. They felt they had to defend the church from the enticements of ‘feminine’ Tractarianism and the threat to the independence of the church that any connection to the State may bring. There was a fear that the church would be enervated by such forces.109 Sometimes they drifted toward a kind of congregationalism and at one stage there was a move to ‘bring out’ an evangelical clergyman to Brisbane, independently of the bishop.110 The editor of the *Daily Guardian* remarked on this when there was a bill before parliament to regulate the affairs of the Church of England in the colony, without referring it to the bishop or the Anglican people:

> [the bishop’s] most strenuous opponents have been mistaken in the constitution of the Church of England, if we read it rightly, when they have threatened to set up a

---

108 This idea was actively promoted by the editor of the *Queensland Daily Guardian* in opposition to the bishop. See for example the editorial of 7 October 1864.
109 Letter to the editor, from *A Churchman Who Does not Believe in a State Church*, QDG, 27 May 1865.
church, and get a minister of their own, and pay for him. They might perform in such a church after throwing off the authority of the Bishop, the ritual of the Church of England, but they would cease to be the Church of England.\footnote{QDG, 25 April 1865.}

The challenge for the church was to respond to the demands of its colonial situation; to find new ways of expressing the Anglican polity and ethos without jettisoning those qualities and values that made Anglicanism distinctive. The problems were common to most Australian dioceses and in Adelaide, in particular, an actively ‘Protestant’ element agitated over episcopal authority and fear of Tractarianism.\footnote{N.K. Meaney, ‘The Church of England in the Paradise of Dissent – a Problem of Assimilation’, \textit{Journal of Religious History}, 3(2), 1964-5, pp. 144-145.} In the following chapter I will explore some of the facets of parish life to see how the colonial Anglicans adapted to their changed circumstances.
Chapter 8

Beyond One Man’s Power: Anglican Parish Life

[ADVERTISEMENT]
To all members of the United Church of England and Ireland, residing in or near Brisbane.
MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS. – As there are numbers of inhabitants of this town and neighbourhood who are baptised members of the United Church of England and Ireland, yet cannot enjoy the Ordinances and Spiritual privileges of their religion for want of sufficient church accommodation, your minister respectfully, but earnestly, invites your attendance at a MEETING to be held in our School Room, on MONDAY EVENING. The doors will be open at six o’clock, and the Church bell will ring from a quarter past six till half-past, when business will begin.

The main objects of the Meeting are to lay before you, and obtain your opinions concerning, some plans for making our Church more useful and practical. And since it is beyond one man’s power without the constant good-will and assistance of the laity – a Committee will be formed, by which every class of society will be represented; and this committee will be composed of both sexes. The duties of the gentlemen will be to elect their own officers, to call meetings, and to consult for the benefit of our religion &c. The ladies will receive cards, and undertake to do their utmost in obtaining subscriptions for increasing the number of sittings in the church, and maintaining a second clergyman, &c.

Our community has, I fear, hitherto failed to act together as heartily and unanimously as we have a right to expect from Christian brethren, whose duty it is to “consider one another to provoke unto love and good works”. We have incurred the charge, I fear deservedly, of being too exclusively the church of the rich. The beginning of the year is a fitting time to endeavour to retrieve our character, and show the world we are in earnest. It is hoped that all classes of our communion will embrace this opportunity of meeting their Minister, who now so anxiously invites their co-operation and sympathy,

I remain, my Christian friends,
Your faithful Minister and brother,
E.K. Yeatman

St John’s Parsonage, Jan. 4th, 1856.

- Moreton Bay Courier, 5 January 1856
When the Rev. Yeatman published the above advertisement (and Plate 8.1) to stir up his parishioners in 1856, the wording confronted several critical issues that faced the colonial church. Church accommodation was inadequate and he invited the parishioners discuss the matter. The ringing of the church bell evoked memories of English country ritual and of the village church, whose bell called people to the church for worship. The meeting was to commence a consultative process, involving the co-operation of the laity and clergyman. Yeatman clearly envisaged a church committee including all classes and both sexes, though he does delineate gendered roles for the people; men in administration and women as collectors/fundraisers. He called for unity and community in the wake of the divisive offertory controversy of the previous year, during the ministry of the Rev. H.O. Irwin. ¹ Finally he acknowledged the accusation that the Church of England was perceived to be the church of the wealthy and needed to pay attention to those who were not. In a way he was setting the agenda for the colonial Anglican church, recognising that it was not the Established Church and, if it was going to be an effective organisation for the spread of the Gospel, it had to face the different circumstances in the colonies, which were radically different from those of the church ‘back home’ in England. Those who attended the church were called upon to fund the building, the stipend of the clergymen, and the incidentals of running the parish. As I have demonstrated in an earlier chapter Anglicans were predominantly from the working classes and the petite bourgeoisie; they were the backbone of the church in early Queensland, rather than a wealthy land-owning class. It was from among these people that parish leadership needed to come.

¹ For Irwin’s departure, see p. 294.
MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,—As there are numbers of inhabitants of this town and neighbourhood who are baptised members of the United Church of England and Ireland, yet cannot enjoy the Ordinances and Spiritual privileges of their religion for want of sufficient Church accommodation, your Minister respectfully, but earnestly, invites your attendance at a MEETING, to-be-held at our 'School Room, on MONDAY EVENING. The doors will be open at 6 o'clock, and the Church bell will ring from a quarter past six till half-past, when business will begin.

The main objects of this Meeting are to lay before you, and obtain your opinions concerning, some plans for making our Church more useful and practical. And since it is beyond one man's power to do this, without the constant good-will and assistance of the laity—a Committee will be formed, by which every class of society will be represented: and this committee will be composed of both sexes. The duties of the gentlemen will be to elect their own officers, to call meetings, and to consult for the benefit of our religion, &c. The ladies will receive cards, and undertake to do their utmost in obtaining subscriptions for increasing the number of sittings in church, and maintaining a second clergyman, &c.

Our communion has, I fear, hitherto failed to act together as heartily and unanimously as we have a right to expect from Christian brethren, whose duty it is to “Consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works.” We have incurred the charge, I fear deservedly, of being too exclusively the church of the rich. The beginning of the year is a fitting time to endeavour to retrieve our character, and show the world we are in earnest. It is hoped that all classes of our Communion will embrace this opportunity of meeting their Minister, who now so anxiously invites their co-operation and sympathy.

I remain, my Christian friends,
Your faithful Minister and brother,
E. K. YEATMAN.
St. John's Parsonage, Jan. 4th, 1856.

Plate 8.1 The advertisement placed by the Rev E.K. Yeatman, in the Courier of January 5, 1856. A great deal of parochial business, including the proceedings of parish meetings, was published in the newspapers of the day.
The first priority was to somehow increase church accommodation. The small church of St. John, previously the penal colony’s brick carpenter’s shed, was inadequate to provide for the rapidly increasing population in Brisbane, and it was to be a principal concern for clergy in the small towns that were nucleating along the coast and inland. ‘Going to church’ meant having a place set aside for worship. In the early days of settlement, it was fine to meet in a room at a pub, or on the verandah of someone’s house, but Anglicans in Queensland associated Sunday worship with the parish churches of England, and they all yearned for the same in the colony. In the appeal for the involvement of all social classes and in the reference to the church being that of the rich, there is an echo of contemporary discussion in England about the need to increase church accommodation for the working classes who could not afford pew rents, by providing free sittings, and the fear that these same people would be lost to the ‘schism shops’ of dissenting congregations.

Yeatman seemed to have just these people in mind.

The Anglican Church in Queensland was not well-endowed financially, and had to develop strategies to plan and finance parish infrastructure – schools, churches, and

---

2 For the early St. John’s, Keith Rayner, From Brick Hut to Cathedral, Brisbane, Publications Committee of St John’s Cathedral, 1976. For the Darling Downs, Maurice French has documented the rapid growth of the towns of Toowoomba, Warwick, and Drayton especially; Maurice French, A Pastoral Romance; The Tribulation and Triumph of Squatterdom, Toowoomba, USQ Press, 1990; - Pubs, Ploughs & ‘Peculiar People’; Towns, Farms and Social Life, Toowoomba, USQ Press, 1992. For the Diocese of Newcastle (which covers Queensland to 1859), Professor Elkin’s study still has great value, especially in his understanding of Bishop Tyrrell’s strategic planning; A.P. Elkin, The Diocese of Newcastle, Glebe, Australasian Medical Publishing Company, 1955.

3 Mary Nicholson’s letters testify to both Sunday services at their house at Grovely, and her yearning for a ‘house of God’ in which to worship. Isobel Nicholson, Grovely, Grovely, Grovely; Brisbane, Boolarong, 1984, pp. 24-51. There are similar references in Katie Hume’s letters; Nancy Bonnin, Katie Hume on the Darling Downs; A Colonial Marriage, Toowoomba, DDI Press, 1985. See also, letter to the editor from M.A., BC, 5 December, 1865; GD, 3 May, 18 November, 1855.

parsonages – and pay the clergy.\textsuperscript{5} In England, the initiative to build a new church could be that of a wealthy benefactor who, seeing a need, would approach the bishop on the matter; or it could be that of a clergyman, who would, with the bishop’s approval, set about planning and constructing a new building; or in the case of urban churches it may be with the Church Building Commissioners.\textsuperscript{6} Bishops needed founders to be able to provide an adequate stipend for the incumbent as well, by providing a sufficient endowment. In the colonies, church-building had to have congregational support as there were few wealthy benefactors and no church building commission to fund such projects, especially in post-Separation Queensland which boasted that there was no state aid at all for religious purposes.\textsuperscript{7} All the funds had to be raised locally, sometimes augmented by donations from friends, family or missionary societies ‘back home’.\textsuperscript{8} In Queensland, the exception was on the Darling Downs, where wealthy squatters such as the Gores of ‘Yandilla’ and the Greens near Warwick, built timber churches for their family and employees.\textsuperscript{9}

\textbf{‘Founding’ a Parish}

The first parishes or parochial districts were created by episcopal fiat – St. John’s, Brisbane; St. Paul’s, Ipswich; the Darling Downs; and Wide Bay and the Burnett

\textsuperscript{5} QDG, 15 December 1860. This is in contrast to the generous endowment of the diocese of Adelaide by Baroness Burdett Coutts; N.K. Meaney, \textit{The Transmissibility of the Church of England to South Australian Conditions (1836-1881)}, unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1956, p. 47.

\textsuperscript{6} For a privately funded parish church, see Webster, p. 71. Tufnell, when curate at Broad Hinton, initiated the construction of the church at Broad Town in Wiltshire; pp. 80, 83, 84. For the Church Building Commissioners, see Norman Gash, \textit{Aristocracy and People, Britain, 1815-1865}, London, Arnold, 1979, pp. 68-69; Chadwick, p. 88; and a very full account in Webster, pp. 64-70.

\textsuperscript{7} In chapter 5 I demonstrated the social diversity of Anglicanism, especially the strength of its working-class membership. Colin Holden, John Spooner and Morna Sturrock have noticed a similar phenomenon, especially the scarcity (and parsimony?) of wealthy Anglicans; Colin Holden, \textit{Church in a Landscape; A History of the Diocese of Wangaratta}, Armadale, circa books, 2002, pp. 1, 7, 8. See also, John Spooner, \textit{The Golden See}, Surry Hills, John Ferguson, 1989, p. 58; Morna Sturrock, \textit{Bishop of Magnetic Power; James Moorhouse in Melbourne, 1876-1886}, Melbourne, Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2005, pp. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{8} In the diocese of Brisbane, SPG and SPCK did provide limited support, and CBF organised some of the funds to endow the bishopric.

\textsuperscript{9} All of the localities mentioned in the text are indicated on Maps 3 and 4 in Appendix 1.
(Gayndah and Maryborough). These were early centres of population, and on the appointment of a clergymen to a district, parish organization depended on good will and co-operation between the clergymen and his parishioners. There was no regulatory framework to guide them. Generally speaking it was a slow task. Having been used to buildings being provided by earlier generations or generous benefactors, and where clergy stipends came from endowments, the colonial population did not adequately support the church. Many were too poor to provide much financial support; most were unsure of their future and were trying to accumulate both real and personal property for future security; and not a few were simply parsimonious. Nevertheless as the population grew, so did a sense of community and the basis of financial support, and as Anglicans slowly adapted to voluntaryism they became enthusiastic church builders.

New parishes were created by several strategies, with more or less episcopal involvement in the decision. The size of Benjamin Glennie’s parish of the Darling Downs demanded more clergy and, soon after arriving in Queensland, Bishop Tufnell sent men to Warwick, Drayton, Dalby and Toowoomba to make the task more manageable. There is no doubt that he consulted with leading Anglicans on the Downs, especially the squatters, some of whom contributed significantly, and Glennie, who after ten year’s ministry there, was well aware of the needs of such a huge district with a scattered population.11

Brisbane’s population grew rapidly in the 1860s and 1870s, and spread out from the central business district. This created a crisis of church accommodation. In the 1850s, it stimulated the development of worship centres at Kangaroo Point under Benjamin

---

10 John Spooner constructed his history of the diocese of Ballarat, founded in 1875, around the difficulties of financing the project; Spooner, The Golden See, passim.
Glennie; and at South Brisbane in 1855 or 1856. These centres were across the Brisbane River from St. John’s and it was not easy for residents in those districts to get to St. John’s Church – it was easier for a clergyman to go over by boat or on the punt. The parish of Fortitude Valley began during Yeatman’s incumbency in order to relieve accommodation pressure on St. John’s, and to provide for the growing population at Fortitude Valley and the small farmers at New Farm and Breakfast Creek, who were a long way from the parish church of St John. This issue of distance is very important in understanding the pattern of parish nucleation in Brisbane. A church needed to be within walking distance as most people lacked transport to travel any great distance to church. The churches at Tingalpa, Lutwyche, Grovely, Oxley Creek, Milton and Toowong were built with this in mind. In Mary Nicholson’s letters she made this quite explicit:

We are but 6 miles from town and English ideas would naturally suppose us quite within reach of Ministerial privileges; but facts tell a different tale. While it is an easy and pleasant ride for the owner of a tolerable steed, it is difficult and in many instances impracticable to the labourer who has toiled all week and on the seventh day naturally shrinks from a twelve mile walk in the sun, which has been scorching there many.

The ‘district church’ on Wickham Terrace was specifically built to increase church accommodation within the town of Brisbane itself, at the instigation of the parishioners of

---

12 These localities are marked on maps 3 and 4 of appendix 1. For Kangaroo Point, see GD, 7-8 February 1849; typescript copy, BDA. Also see, A E Selwyn, The Selwyn Letters, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1902, letter dated 12 May 1851. For South Brisbane (St Thomas’), begun by either H.O. Irwin or E.K. Yeatman; see The Church Chronicle, 1 August 1931, p. 274. According to a pamphlet on the church’s history, published by the parish, the church was built of rubble and stone in 1855 or 1856. It was used as a school during the week. A copy of the pamphlet which has no publication details is in my possession. An application for a block of land for the church was made in 1849, MBC, 24 March 1849.

13 BC, 29 June 1907. Like the church at South Brisbane and the first church on Wickham Terrace, it was built of rough stone, and opened in 1857.

14 The Rev. Thomas Jones made the point that some could go to St. John’s in their carriages, but that ‘many others were poor and ignorant’, and that the services at the Mortuary Chapel filled a special need for the latter; QDG, 28 August 1866. For the building of Christ Church, Tingalpa, see BC, 28, 31 October 1868.

15 Nicholson, p. 18; and for Oxley Creek (Sherwood), BC, 10 November 1869.
St. John’s and with the concurrence of the bishop and the incumbent. Unlike Fortitude Valley, which was effectively an independent parish from its inception, the Wickham Terrace church began as a daughter church of St. John’s.

The suburban parishes were founded by two other strategies. At Lutwyche and Grovely, the initiative came from local Anglicans – Judge Lutwyche, and John and Mary Nicholson. In both cases the sites were given by the initiators, and in both cases there was a numerous population of labourers and small farmers living at a considerable distance from an existing church (more than 10km). Judge Lutwyche and the Nicholsons were the facilitators of the church building, but the funds were raised by the locals. Both Lutwyche and Nicholson acted as lay-readers, conducting services in the absence of a clergyman, and both provided a significant measure of spiritual leadership to ‘their’ congregations, in a kind of benevolently patriarchal kind of way. Their social roles were different, though; Lutwyche was wealthy, and more of a local ‘squire’, with a greater social distance between himself and the general population. John Nicholson comes across rather as an evangelist on a similar social footing as the surrounding farmers at Grovely.

In the 1860s Brisbane’s cemetery was at Milton, the present site of the Suncorp Stadium (Lang Park). There was a little brick chapel there, known as the ‘mortuary chapel’. This building was used for Sunday worship by people living in Milton, Auchenflower and Toowong. Blanche Mitchell describes it in her diary, and writes of

---

16 It was ultimately known as All Saints; D.L. Kissick, *All Saints’ Church, Brisbane, 1862-1937*, Brisbane, Shipping Newspapers, 1937, p.14; *QDG*, 28 August 1861; *BC*, 18 March 1862.

17 It has also been claimed by Addison et al., that the Rev. James Matthews initiated the founding of St. Andrew’s Lutwyche. I have been unable to find any corroboration of the claim. K.H. Addison et al., eds., *The Growth of the Parish of Lutwyche*, Published by the parish, 1951, p. 6.

18 For the church at Lutwyche, see *QDG*, 2, 6 November, 1 December 1866; 2 January, 19 July, 2 December 1867; Addison et al, pp. 5-11. For Grovely, see Nicholson, pp. 24-51.
walking there from the Drew’s house at Toowong through lightly timbered fields.\(^{19}\) It was serviced by clergy from the Wickham Terrace church. It soon became overcrowded, and the people who worshipped there were behind the construction of the churches at Milton (Christ Church) and Toowong (St. Thomas’). It seems that the initiative came from the local people, supported by the Rev. Thomas Jones of the Wickham Terrace church. In both cases there were well-to-do civil servants to provide organizational expertise, but among the initiators of the Toowong building were working-class men and poor farmers such as Samuel Skinner and George Carr. Furthermore, the construction of the Toowong church took place while Bishop Tufnell was in England and seems to have happened without his consent, a matter of which he complained. The Milton church was debt-financed, but the little timber church at Toowong was built on land given by R. L. Drew, and cleared by the parishioners and their employees. This testifies to the fact that there were a good number of well-to-do residents in the area who employed staff on their properties.\(^{20}\) The church still had a debt of about £100 when it opened for worship.\(^{21}\)

The strategy at Tingalpa differed from that used at Toowong. The Tingalpa church was built by the farming community for whom it was too far to walk to the church at Kangaroo Point. The initiative in this case came from the locals who approached the bishop about their plan for a church, and whose relatives in England collected some of the funds to build a little timber church.\(^{22}\) The land was given by a local man and cleared by the farmers themselves. Most of the shingles for the roof were provided (and cut) by the locals. This is consonant with the nature of a farming community where labour was drawn

---

\(^{19}\) BMD, 9 September 1866.

\(^{20}\) Meeting, 6 May 1865; Toowong Parish, Minutes of Easter and Special Meetings, TOOWS 141-4, BDA.


\(^{22}\) BC, 12 March 1867; October 31 1868.
from within the family, rather than paid for. These were far less materially wealthy people than those at Toowong. It seems that Charles Coxen, a Darling Downs squatter and parliamentarian who lived on acreage at Tingalpa, was co-opted to be the chairman of the building committee, in a way reminiscent of the ‘gentleman leader’ co-opted by working class people in England when they needed a spokesman with ‘clout’. Another ‘outer suburban’ church was at Oxley Creek (Sherwood). This district had been served by lay-readers from South Brisbane who regularly conducted worship in one of the farmhouses in the area. As the congregation grew, the people decided to build a little church.

At Tingalpa and Oxley Creek, women took a prominent part. Women were principal fund-raisers at Tingalpa, much of the money being raised by women in England. One of the trustees of the church, W.R. Wood, pointed out that of the £220 collected by October 1868, £150 could be attributed directly or indirectly to the efforts of women, and he particularly noted their work in collecting money by going from house to house. I have already noted men’s expectation of women doing such collecting, and one wonders how women actually liked doing it. Ada Cambridge noted one woman’s response to a canon’s proposition that women should do the collecting for a memorial:

I heard a sigh and a *sotto voce* ejaculation behind me – ‘the poor clergymen’s wives’ – and the incident exactly shows how their male belongings treat them.

Clearly Ada Cambridge agreed, and refused to be a female curate. Sadly, an account of the building of the Tingalpa church, published in 1923, writes out this contribution of

---

23 *BC*, 11 April 1868; *QDG*, 26 February, 5 March 1868.
25 *BC*, 3 December 1870; 20 April 1874.
26 *BC*, 8 December 1868, 17 April, 19 May 10 November, 1869; 7 June 1870.
27 *BC*, 5 March 1868; 21 March 1870; 31 October 1871.
28 Cambridge, p. 89.
29 Cambridge, p. 90.
women altogether. Women also seem to have been a driving force behind the church being built. Likewise, at Oxley Creek, Mrs. Revel was the ‘prime and indefatigable originator of the movement for the church’, a fact overlooked by the officials who attended the dedication of the church. Especially interesting is Mrs. Neilen of Lutwyche parish. She was a regular attendee of parish meetings from the inception of the parish. She was one of the first eight people to sign the parish roll in 1866. Mrs. Neilen was the sister-in-law of Judge Lutwyche. Mrs. Neilen and Mrs. Lutwyche had a very plebeian background. Mrs. Lutwyche was the widow of Judge Lutwyche’s groom, and her social class had a significantly negative impact on her husband’s subsequent career. Prior to building of the church, services were held in the Neilen home, on land adjacent to that on which the church was later built. It is significant that a woman of such a background became such a pillar of the church, no doubt in part because of the benign influence of Lutwyche himself. As with Mary Nicholson at Grovely, these women, more than their town-dwelling sisters, took an active part in the nucleation of new congregations. It is also significant that all four areas – Lutwyche, Grovely, Tingalpa and Oxley Creek - were farming communities, suggesting that farmers’ wives exercised greater freedom in the life of their communities than in urban and pastoral districts where men were more in control.

There are more ways of being written into history than carving one’s name into a tree, and many Anglican laymen are especially remembered through the ways they

30 *The Church Chronicle*, 1 August 1923.
31 The matter was mentioned by the local schoolteacher, Mr. Boyd, in his speech. Mrs. Boyd trained the choir that sang on the day, and provided the harmonium for the event. *BC*, 7 June 1870.
32 Lutwyche Parish Council Minute Book 1866-1911, LUTWS 085-8, BDA.
34 Letter from Jo Lutwyche to Mrs. Young, 29 December 1954; Lutwyche cuttings file, OL.
35 *ADB*, vol.5, p. 111.
36 Addison et al., p. 9.
fostered the parish in which they lived. E.T. Aldridge at Maryborough, Judge Lutwyche at Lutwyche, John (and Mary) Nicholson at Grovely and R.L. Drew at Toowong are good examples. Their generosity in giving land or other assistance ensured their remembrance. It is easy to be cynical and say that these gestures were those of upwardly mobile bourgeoisie seeking recognition and affirmation of their social status, but it would be difficult to separate that from other motivations including genuine Christian commitment; a desire to create community locally; and a yearning for the ‘old ways’ of home. Those attending the initial meeting to build a church at Toowong were a diverse group ranging from small farmers (George Carr and Samuel Skinner) and a grocer (Mr. Robinson), to the government printer (Belbridge) and a property developer (R.L. Drew). Within a couple of years the parish was firmly in the hands of ‘men of affairs’; a property developer, a retired army officer, an accountant, a schoolteacher, a senior civil servant and two lawyers can be identified as seven out of the eight at a parish meeting in 1868. In the first ten years, the parish’s churchwardens were always drawn from the ranks of professional men, businessmen, and senior civil servants. This is symbolic of much of the Anglican Church. One could ask for example, what happened to the farmers who attended the 1865 meeting? The men mentioned lived at Indooroopilly and Long Pocket at quite some distance from Toowong, where the meeting was held, and it is unlikely that either could afford the time to attend meetings, especially if they had to walk there and back. Furthermore, we know

---

37 Meeting, 6 May 1865, St Thomas’ Toowong, Minutes of Easter and Special Meetings, TOOWS 141-4, BDA.
38 Meeting held 16 November 1868. St Thomas’ Toowong, Minutes of Easter and Special Meetings. TOOWS 141-4, BDA
Carr, who was then in his early thirties, was barely literate, and may have had little to offer in terms of parish administration.\footnote{From conversation with his grand-daughter Miss Leila Carr; see also, obituary, BC, 29 December 1917.}

This pattern of office holding in colonial Queensland differs somewhat from that in England where peers of the realm, clergy, parliamentarians, certain professionals, serving military officers and ale-house keepers could not serve as churchwardens. Drawing on the records of Lincoln diocese in particular, Frances Knight noted that tradesmen and farmers predominated and commented that it did not seem to be ‘a suitable occupation for a gentleman’ and that few gentry held office. In industrial towns the social status of churchwardens was higher, and she interpreted this as an ‘indication that the office of churchwarden was seen to confer additional status on a man whose worldly fortunes were rising’.\footnote{Frances Knight, The Nineteenth Century Church and English Society, Cambridge, CUP, 1995, p. 186.} In the colony, this worldliness seemed to have invaded the church. The public association of politicians with parish office-holding seems to have been a form of self-recommendation to the voting public, and provided an opportunity for businessmen and professional men to bring their names before the public.\footnote{W.H. Wilson at Toowong; C. Coxen and W.D. White at Tingalpa; M. O’Connell at St John’s, Brisbane; James Taylor and W.H. Groom at Toowoomba, and others such as W.H. Walsh, John Panton, and F.A. Forbes.}

Church affairs at Tingalpa were also in the hands of ‘men of affairs’, in particular, Charles Coxen and William Duckett White, but in this they were supported by members of the farming community such as Emmanuel Stanton, W.W. Weedon, W.R. Wood, and Thomas Weedon. This fits perhaps more comfortably with the picture of parish office-holding in rural areas of England, as described by Knight.\footnote{Knight, pp. 185-186.} Whether in town or country, it was attractive to the upwardly socially mobile in a brashly confident colonial society.
Building the Church

The church building was read by the community as a potent symbol of the vigour of the denomination to which it belonged. By 1865 the wooden slab church of St. Luke in Toowoomba was inadequate for the congregation and very ‘down-market’. A report in the *Darling Downs Gazette* of a parish meeting called to discuss the possibility of building a new church, ended with a pointed comparison with the efforts of the Roman Catholics; ‘for in point of wealth the members of the episcopal church ought to be well able to compete with their friends in Neil Street’. 43 The congregation heeded the free advice, but it was not till 21 December, 1869 that the new church was opened for worship.

Competitiveness and architectural anxiety were also expressed by a parishioner of St. John’s, Brisbane in 1865, in a letter to the Brisbane *Courier*, when plans were made to enlarge the church. Ecclesiastical competitiveness was poorly hidden:

> I hope, in common with every member of our Church in Brisbane, to secure for that Church a building worthy of the occasion and affording proof that we are not behind members of other communions in our endeavour to erect to God’s glory a building fitly framed for His worship. 44

This writer seems to imply that whatever Anglicans built, it would have to be as good as or better than their denominational rivals.

There were several strategies for initiating the construction of a church which varied according to the local situation. For example, the needs of the pastoral districts were quite different from those of the Brisbane suburbs. The population on the Darling Downs was very scattered, with widely spaced villages or towns. Before Separation the towns of Warwick, Toowoomba/Drayton and Dalby were more than a day’s journey apart.

43 *DDG*, 11 March 1865.
44 *BC*, 5 December 1865.
It made sense to have church buildings in these centres, and squatters were encouraged to provide some kind of space for Sunday worship. On some properties, like Jondaryan, Yandilla, and Goomburra, the owners provided a simple church building – the church built for Jondaryan was of timber slabs, and is still in existence, though on a different site.\(^{45}\)

These were serviceable, and provided adequate accommodation for the station workers and their families. Jondaryan also provided a school for the children of the workers.\(^{46}\) In the 1850s, Glennie raised funds from residents to build slab churches at Drayton, Warwick and Toowoomba (Plate 8.3).\(^{47}\) During the week these served as schools, and were used for worship on Sunday. Glennie’s diary indicates that he made the initiative to build these churches and that he co-opted assistance from the squatters and the residents of the small towns to build them.\(^{48}\) Slab and sawn timber churches were cheap, and were within the capabilities of bush carpenters to build, though the wind would whistle through the cracks in the walls or blow them down, as in the case of the first churches at Rockhampton and Tingalpa. Timber churches were not confined to the country but were built also in towns and Brisbane suburbs (Lutwyche, Kangaroo Point, Tingalpa, Toowong and Oxley Creek as in Plate 8.4). They were susceptible to termite attack and this was probably the reason that the bishop reported that the South Brisbane church was decrepit\(^{49}\) and that the congregation at Kangaroo Point decided to replace their wooden building.\(^{50}\) The little

---

\(^{45}\) For the opening of St John’s Church at Goomburra, see \textit{QDG}, 8 July 1863.

\(^{46}\) \textit{BC}, 25 August 1863; Walker, pp. 57, 102; Bonnin, p. 64.

\(^{47}\) For Drayton, see \textit{GD}, 11 November 1854; Warwick, \textit{GD}, 15 November 1854.

\(^{48}\) There are quite a few brief entries in Glennie’s diary about these buildings. The church at Warwick was first used on 8 February 1857; Toowoomba, 22 March 1857; and Drayton, 23 January 1859. Brightman, p. 19; Kathleen Simmons, \textit{A History of the Anglican Parish of Drayton}, Toowoomba, Toowoomba Education Centre, 2000, p. 14.

\(^{49}\) \textit{BC}, 25 August 1863.

\(^{50}\) The original church was susceptible to flooding from the Brisbane River, and was eventually blown down. On the state of the church; \textit{QDG}, 7 January, 7 March 1861; 20 August 1864. On termites, see W. Ross Johnstone, \textit{Brisbane; The First 30 Years}, Brisbane, Boolarong, 1988, p. 75.
church at Kangaroo Point cost £80 when it was built in mid-1849, but was already described as being dilapidated in 1870, when plans were afoot to replace it with a permanent structure. Twenty-two years was a short life, but it reflects the problems of building with timber in a sub-tropical climate without the benefit of modern timber treatments against dry rot, termites and weather. The first church at Stanthorpe was built for tin-miners and was simply a bark shed which cost £80 to build and furnish (Plate 8.2). Often a timber church was considered adequate, because there was no guarantee that once a village nucleated, it would necessarily grow, as was the case of Drayton, which was quickly overshadowed by nearby Toowoomba. Drayton did not get a ‘permanent’ church till 1887, nearly twenty years after Toowoomba. These little churches were invariably considered to be only temporary and were rarely consecrated. They served their towns well until there was a population big enough and laity keen enough to replace them with permanent structures.

The construction of a permanent church at Warwick was a staged affair, with each stage paid for before the next was commenced. On the other hand, St. James’ Church at

---

51 One resident said of the Kangaroo Point church that it ‘was worse than a barn, it was not a place that any respectable farmer of the colony would think of storing his corn or oats in’. QDG, 20 August 1864.
52 Benjamin Glennie chaired a meeting to inaugurate the ‘parish’ was held on 28 April 1873; Stanthorpe Annual General and Parish Council Minutes 1873-1893; STANS 129-5, BDA; BC, 19 October 1872.
53 Johnstone, pp. 73-85, 121-136. Even Brisbane was not expected to grow, prior to Separation. Governor Gipps complained of the wide streets set out in the surveying of Brisbane: ‘Oh, the idea of wasting such a lot of land for a street in a place that will be nothing else but a paltry village!’ J.G. Steele, Brisbane Town in Convict Days 1824-1842, St Lucia, UQP, 1975, p. 307.
54 Note 16, above.
55 The original church at Kangaroo Point was neither named nor consecrated; The Church Chronicle, 1 June 1932, p. 190.
56 For the replacement of the little church at Toowoomba, see Brightman, pp. 43-46 (St James, 1869) and pp. 75-81 (2nd St Luke’s, 1895-1897). The foundation stone of St Mark’s Warwick was laid by Bishop Tufnell on 19 March 1868; The Church Chronicle, 1 September 1898. Drayton’s permanent church was opened on 22 December 1887; Simmons, pp. 36-37.
57 BC 10 January 1870; 27 May 1873. There are detailed records in the parish Vestry Minute Book in the Brisbane Diocesan Archives (BDA). WARWS 145-7, BDA.
Plate 8.2 The Rev. Frederick Richmond, standing outside the first church building at Stanthorpe, 1872. Though built out of sheets of bark, it nevertheless has Gothicised windows, recalling the idealized parish church of England. From Jean Harslett and Mervyn Royle, *They Came to a Plateau*, Stanthorpe, Girraween Publications, 1972.

Plate 8.3 The first church of St Matthew at Drayton was built out of wooden slabs, with a shingle roof. Similar churches were built at Toowoomba and Warwick. That built at Jondaryan Station, St Anne’s, still exists, having been moved into Jondaryan township. Source of picture not recorded.
Toowoomba, built to a plan by the Brisbane architect, R.G. Suter, was debt financed, and completed in one operation. It was built for £1400 but at the time it was opened £600 was still owed on it. It was not consecrated till debt-free.\(^{58}\) Significantly, the building project was heavily supported by ‘pure merinos’, men who had the collateral to secure the debt; the land was provided by a squatter (James Taylor); and the squatter brothers Henry and Frederick Isaac were generous in legacies totaling about £380.\(^ {59}\) D.B. Waterson makes their motivations obvious when he describes St. James as ‘a monument to material progress and personal advance’, and suggests that the building of the permanent church of St. Luke was initiated by shop-keeping Anglicans who felt excluded from offices and influence at St. James. They wanted a place of their own where they could ‘pursue that social distinction and display they so detested when practiced by their social betters’.\(^ {60}\) This was a significant case of ecclesiastical one-upmanship founded on class differences within the Anglican fold.\(^ {61}\) In larger towns, there were usually a few men of substance with the skills and contacts to facilitate the construction of major churches, such as at Ipswich (George Faircloth, the Norths, the Bigges, John Panton, George Harrison Wilson, F.A. Forbes), Toowoomba (Isaacs, James Taylor) and Warwick (George and Charles Clark, Dr. Margetts). It was when there were wealthy merchants or property holders that the parish contracted a debt to pay for the church and the resulting church was probably extravagant, as in the case of St. Paul’s Ipswich, opened in 1856, but still struggling under

---

\(^{58}\) For the consecration of churches only when they were debt-free, see Cambridge, p. 255.  
\(^{59}\) Brightman, pp. 43-46.  
\(^{61}\) Brightman only noted that the old church was in need of repair, and that the parishioners had decided to build a new one; Brightman, p. 64.
the huge debt of £2,500 in 1860 (Plate 8.5). For a little parish the burden was a running sore, as a parishioner noted in an article on Christ Church, Milton, in 1900:

According to the facile but fatal method in vogue at that time, the balance [required] was got by borrowing; and when the building . . . was opened and dedicated by Bishop Hale, there was on it a debt of several hundred pounds, the nucleus of that burden which has so grievously hampered the congregation ever since.

The tendency where the population was less grand was to build within their means (Tingalpa, Toowong, Grovely, Lutwyche, Oxley Creek). When a town or suburb expanded, the locals set about building a more substantial structure of stone or brick (Milton, Toowong, All Saints, Kangaroo Point). Even stone and brick were no insurance against disaster. The stone church at Milton (on which the debt was owed) was wrecked by a storm in December, 1890 and St. Mary’s at Kangaroo Point was partly demolished by a cyclone in April, 1892. One wonders at the credentials of the architects and builders of such catastrophes. That brings us to an important point - a church had to look like a church - and in the nineteenth century that meant that it had to be somehow ‘gothic’.

The original, temporary church at Rockhampton, even though built of timber had a gothic appearance, according to a contemporary newspaper report, and the little slab church of St. Luke at Toowoomba had to be ‘Gothicised’ in 1884 to give it a more ecclesiastical

---

62 MBC, 4 October 1860; QDG, 28 August 1861. The latter account attributed much of the discharge of the debt to the wealthy Ipswich Anglicans. An attempt to get the government to repay £1000 of the debt was greeted caustically and was unsuccessful; QDG, 30 March 1861.

63 The Church Chronicle, 1 March 1900. Note that it was dedicated, not consecrated. The consecration of a church is celebrated by a bishop in a special liturgy that recognises the building’s sacred character. Temporary churches and buildings which are also used, such as the colonial practice of using the building for a school, are dedicated. Dedication can be performed by a priest, and is a ceremony in which the building is blessed.

64 The contract price for the Lutwyche church was £186, of which all but £39:4:0 was paid before it was opened; QDG, 2 November 1866. A similar church was built at Toowong for £183:10s; QDG, 2 November 1865.

65 The collapse was attributed to poor foundations in the design of R.G. Suter, who designed the churches at Warwick and Toowoomba (St James’); The Church Chronicle, 1 March 1900, pp. 116-117.

66 Knight, p. 61.
appearance. All of the permanent church buildings built before 1900 were more or less gothic in style, in keeping with the current infatuation with the gothic revival in England.

The motivation for building churches in the 1860s was usually the lack of accommodation for those wanting to attend church. The Wickham Terrace church was built in 1862, but by 1864 it was already inadequate to meet the needs of the churchgoing population. Services were commenced in the School of Arts to try to deal with the problem; the Mortuary chapel was too small for the congregation that gathered there and prompted the construction of churches at Toowong and Milton. St John’s Church in Brisbane was also too small; and Drayton was also very well-attended.

The business of church building raises some interesting questions about the Anglican community. Why did they build such churches? Why would the people in Ipswich commit themselves to such a debt? The Cathedral church, begun in 1900, and still unfinished in 2006, will be the last word in nineteenth century ecclesiastical architecture when it is completed – and an expensive behemoth bequeathed to the twentieth century by late nineteenth century visionaries. We get clues to this from contemporary writers who were nostalgic for the village churches of England. Of the church at Warwick was written:

Warwick possessed a church correct and dignified in design, substantial in structure, pleasing to the eye, and recalling as perhaps no other church in Queensland does so fully, one of the sweet old country churches of England . . .

Someone obviously felt that the ideal church was the English country church. As Frances

---

68 Wickham Terrace; QDG, 17 August 1864; 16 February, 20 June 1866. Mortuary Chapel; QDG, 10 March, 1864. Toowong; QDG, 2 November 1865. St John’s; QDG, 19 August 1865. Drayton; QDG, 26 January, 9 February 1866.
69 The final stage at present under construction will cost in the vicinity of $25,000,000.
70 The Church Chronicle, 1 September 1898.
Plate 8.4 The little church at Lutwyche, near the house of the local ‘squire’, Mr. Justice Alfred Lutwyche. Like the church at Drayton, this little building had a bell-tower. Bells were an important part of trying to evoke the feel of an English village in colonial settlements. Taken from The Illustrated London News, 4 May, 1867.

Plate 8.5 St Paul’s Church and Rectory, Ipswich, 1876. From A.M. West, St Paul’s Church at Ipswich.
Knight has claimed, this is precisely what the gothic revival aimed at, and she spells it out thus: ‘It was hardly surprising that Victorian Anglicans should have alighted upon the medieval parish church, and the orderly, God-fearing society with which they associated it, as a most potent emblem of the world they were losing’. Emigrant Anglicans were doing precisely the same thing on the other side of the world.\(^{71}\)

A writer to the *Courier* had a far more poetic vision for an enlarged St. John’s:

An opportunity is now afforded us as members of the Church in this colony (would that we could say the Church of England) by securing by means of the fabric, some of those hallowed associations so intimately bound up with our fondest memories. True it is that Time, with his mellow hand will not have stained the battlements with bosses of rich lichen, the stones of the aisles will not have greeted the willing feet of those who, for successive centuries, have gladly gone up to the House of the Lord; no learned Hooker will have preached from its pulpit, or saintly Herbert ministered at its altar. Our church cannot attain the venerable majesty of a cathedral, nor the hallowed homeliness of the village church; but we can, by raising a well-proportioned building, assist our devotions by catching some of that fire which was lighted at the altars of our former homes. In the springing of the arches and the colour of the walls, and in the notes of the choir, we can find something that shall week by week remind us that we are still worshipping the same God; that the outward temple, though built on another soil, is still filled with the same Divine presence; and that the same Church will receive us at her font as we enter life, be with us in all the varied stages of life, and at our last hour attend us in death.\(^{72}\)

This letter captures some of the homesickness, that yearning for the familiar, that prompted Anglicans to build English country churches in their towns, and what prompted Anglicans to build the folly of a French Gothic Cathedral in an antipodean city.

It was not just the familiar shape and style of the building that was important.

Church bells were a part of the recreation of a little England, as Yeatman’s advertisement tells us. When living at remote Exmoor, west of Rockhampton, Rachel Henning yearned

---

\(^{71}\) Knight, p. 61. The rhetoric was used in relationship to the Grovely church by Sir George Bowen and the Rev James Matthews; *QDG*, 24 September 1867. For a further comment about the Englishness of the church at Warwick, see *QDG*, 23 March 1868.

\(^{72}\) Letter from M.A., *BC*, 5 December 1865.
for the sound of a church bell to mark Sunday off from the rest of the week. A hankering after the traditional forms of English church music was important. Some of the community rituals of churchgoing and Sunday observance were important. In an alien environment, the re-creation of familiar patterns of English religious observance tended to ignore or subsume the local altogether in the search for assurance.

**Funding the Vision**

The colonial church had to pay its way. There were no church commissions, endowment funds or voluntary societies to take up the slack. The greatest costs were for the minister’s stipend and for infrastructure (churches, school buildings and parsonages). Central to all fund-raising were the offertory, pew rents, and subscriptions to the stipend fund. Special funds were created for projects such as building churches, halls, organs, and parsonages.

After the offertory row during the incumbency of Irwin at St John’s, Brisbane, the offertory became an established part of Anglican church-life. Taking figures from reports of 1868 Easter Meetings, the offertory represented 32.6% of the parish income at Fortitude Valley (£132:18:10) and 33.9% at St Paul’s, Ipswich (£220:14:7). Subscriptions to the stipend fund were usually in the form of promises from members of the flock to make a regular payment for the clergyman’s stipend each year. In the Warwick parish records there are lists with the amounts of each of the subscribers. In 1873 the amounts ranged from 2/6 to £20, and amounted to just over £330 from 118 people. In Warwick these

---


74 The account of the liturgy and music at the opening of the timber church at Maryborough in 1866 prompted the reporter to the QDG to write that it reminded him ‘of the many cathedrals and churches of old England’; QDG, 11 June 1866.

75 In the same year, at the Wickham Terrace church where there were no pew rents, it amounted to £401:19:6. At Fortitude Valley and Ipswich, pew rents represented 19.4% and 25.5% of income respectively; QDG, 15, 18 Apr, 1868. In Victoria in 1865, pew rents represented 25% of parochial income, and up to 75% in some parishes; Geoffrey Quaife, ‘Money and Men: Aspects of the Anglican Crisis in Victoria, 1850-1865’, Journal of Religious History, vol. 5, 1968-9, p. 55.
subscriptions were collected by the churchwardens and three vestrymen, who took over the task from the rector several years earlier. Mrs. Colas, a publican’s wife, gave half a guinea (10/6) and Samuel Evenden, who was something of a town rentier, paid £4. Dr. Balls-Headley, a flourishing doctor, gave fifteen guineas (£15:15).76 As well, about half as much again was collected from the offertory, double the previous year’s amount. Station owners or managers paid £10-£20 (the difficulty in getting stations to subscribe threatened to bring the ministry of Roma’s first clergyman, the Rev. H.J. Campbell, to an end).77 When Talgai station stopped giving to the stipend fund, the Warwick clergy stopped providing services there.78 The parish finances at Warwick were in good condition and they finished the year with a small balance in the bank. It wasn’t always quite so good. In the vestry minutes for 5 July 1869, it seemed many were in arrears in their subscriptions, and the secretary was to round up the backsliders. At the end of that year, the quarterly statement showed a deficit of £150.79

The actual process of collecting subscriptions is itself interesting. Occasionally there was an agent for the parish who collected the subscriptions and received a commission for his work, as at Fortitude Valley.80 Sometimes the members of the vestry did the collecting themselves.81 Most often however, it was the ladies of the parish who did the collecting.82

---

76 Subscription List in the 1873 annual report for St Mark’s Church, Warwick; WARWS box 7, BDA.
77 BC, 8 Augus, 1868.
78 Warwick Vestry Minute Book, 7 January, 1870; WARWS, box 7, BDA.
79 Warwick Vestry Minute Book, 5 July 1869; note that the secretary was paid for his work for the parish; WARWS 145-7, BDA.
80 Fortitude Valley AGM; QDG, 26 January 1864.
81 Warwick Vestry Minute Book, meetings on 7 July 1866; 24 July 1868.
operation of the ladies of the district be solicited’. In fact the only references to women in the Toowong parish minutes book up to about 1874 were in reference to fundraising. This is also true for the same period for Warwick parish. This was formalised in the annual report of Warwick parish which the Rev. James Love had printed from his first year in the parish in 1873. In that year the ladies collected £93:9:7 to furnish the church with new seats; and Miss Davis organised a concert to raise funds to buy a bell for the church, and raised £22:2:6. These were substantial contributions to church finances considering that the stipend fund collections by the vestry men amounted to £240:1:9.

Pew rents were one of the more contentious issues in parish life, and the passion aroused sometimes spilled into the public arena. Renting pews was a widespread practice in England and Scotland in the Anglican and Nonconformist traditions. Pew-renting began at St. John’s in Brisbane very early, and the practice continued in virtually every new church from the time it opened. It is unclear what the rate was in most churches, but in Toowoomba in 1863 it was £1 annually per sitting. In Rockhampton there was an attempt to increase the pew rent from 10/- to £1 a sitting in 1864. It would therefore be a costly business for a large family. Sometimes subscriptions were deemed to give the subscriber a ‘right’ to an allocated pew, as in the case of two new subscribers of £10 to the stipend fund at Kangaroo Point in 1861. It was an important source of revenue.

---

83 Meeting, 1865, St Thomas’ Toowong; Minutes of Easter and Special Meetings; TOOWS 141-4, BDA.
84 Warwick Vestry Minute Book, annual report for 1873; WARWS 145-7, BDA
86 For Toowoomba, QDG, 1 August 1863; for Rockhampton, QDG, 6 February 1864.
87 QDG, 7 January 1861.
Pew allocation was the responsibility of the churchwardens, and they seemed to allocate pews according to the parishioner’s generosity. A parish meeting broke up in near riot at Toowoomba when the plutocrats at the helm of business in St. James’ parish church managed to pass a motion that those who subscribed five guineas (£5:5:0) or more, should have preferential selection of seats, an effective property qualification that bears out Waterson’s assessment of class relations in that parish. The poor were treated poorly. Most churches had some free seats. Initially Rockhampton let half of the seats on the northern side of the church to raise funds to install more seats; the rest were ‘free’. Toowoomba had a certain number of free seats, and the Wickham Terrace church was let on one side and free on the other.

There were obvious problems with this pew-renting system. The situation at Toowoomba revealed the importance of good pews for the social elite and for those striving for acceptance among the ‘better’ classes of society. The attitude was one that hardened class divisions in the community, as both Brown and Welch have pointed out for Glasgow and London, and in both cases they attribute pew-renting to the alienation of the working classes. In the 1860s in Brisbane, when population growth was rapid and churches crowded, there were not enough seats altogether, let alone adequate seating for the poor who could not afford to rent a pew. The problem was exacerbated by ‘strangers’ who would appropriate any empty seat when they came to church. Strangers were likely to be new immigrants who were often living temporarily in Brisbane till they found work, but the term sometimes seemed to refer to non-pew holders who may nevertheless be

---

88 *QDG*, 7 January 1861; *BC*, 1 January 1870.
89 *BC*, 1 January 1870, Waterson, p. 70.
90 For Rockhampton, *QDG*, 15 May 1863; for Toowoomba, *QDG*, 1 August 1863; for Wickham Terrace, *QDG*, 4 July 1864. The pew rents at Wickham Terrace were paid half-yearly; *QDG*, 6 July 1864.
regular attendees. When they took an allocated seat, the pew owner would be indignant, as more than one letter to the newspaper made clear.\textsuperscript{92} Sometimes a further injustice was applied to non-pew holders. Under the Bourke Act, only pew holders had a right to vote for parish officers.\textsuperscript{93} This situation disenfranchised many parishioners who could not afford to pay pew rents. The class distinctions involved were simply expressed by \textit{Vindex} in a letter to the editor of the \textit{Guardian}, who claimed that only pew holders were parishioners. His letter implied that many who attended church, presumably not pew holders, and presumably ‘poor’, went to church ‘only to gape and stare at the ceremonies’.\textsuperscript{94} Even as late as 1867, Abraham Fitzgibbon challenged the bishop’s view that all \textit{bona fide} Anglicans could vote for representatives at the Church Conference to discuss the creation of a diocesan synod. Fitzgibbon objected to non-subscribers voting for delegates. When Fitzgibbon lost his point, he left the meeting in a fit of pique.\textsuperscript{95}

\textit{Vindex} was writing about affairs at the Wickham Terrace church. In response to a petition from some members of the parish, the bishop declared all seats in the church to be free. Another correspondent claimed that few of the signatories to the petition were pew holders, and that such a petition should come from pew holders only. However, it was unlikely that reform would come from them - they had been disadvantaged by the decision and now had to jostle for seats with all comers.\textsuperscript{96} This decision by Tufnell was designed to free up church accommodation, as the three churches in Brisbane were inadequate for

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{92} \textit{QDG}, 6 April 1861 (St John’s Church, Brisbane); 26 February, 1863 (Wickham Terrace church); \textit{MBC}, 1 April 1861.
\item \textsuperscript{93} \textit{QDG}, 24, 26 April 1862; 16 July 1867.
\item \textsuperscript{94} \textit{QDG}, 16 July 1867.
\item \textsuperscript{95} \textit{QDG}, 23 August 1867, compare with \textit{QDG}, 5 September 1867.
\item \textsuperscript{96} It has been pointed out to me by Dr. John Steele, that this was in the days before ‘obsessive’ personal hygiene, and that some attendees probably belonged to the ‘great unwashed’.
\end{itemize}
those attending.\textsuperscript{97} Other responses were to enlarge St. John’s Church and to begin regular services at the School of Arts.\textsuperscript{98} The cost of these services fell on the Wickham Terrace church, and without the money coming in from pew rents and meagre collections at the services at the School of Arts, they found themselves in financial difficulties; so much so that they were in arrears with the rector’s stipend at the end of 1866.

The situation also draws attention to the belief that rented pews were a form of property, as correspondents to the newspapers sometimes argued.\textsuperscript{99} In England it was not uncommon for a pew to be ‘handed down’ from one generation to another within a family, and sittings were known to have been sold on the open market, implying notions of proprietorship of pews. This is clearest in Brisbane when G.H. Parminter tried to circumvent the system by seeking to have Mrs. Mary Mayne’s sittings at St. John’s Church transferred to him. Mrs. Mayne was a long term resident of Brisbane, and it seems that Parminter aspired to having a ‘front’ pew, more suited to the social position to which he aspired. The church wardens refused this, as the allotment of sittings was something they wished to control. Pew renting was clearly a vexed question in the colony, and it underlines the class interests of pew-renters, and the distinctions they wished to emphasise.\textsuperscript{100} Rented pews were a constant reminder of the class structure of the local Anglican community.

\textbf{Fund Raising Functions}

Something had to be done to cover the gap between parish income and expenditure, and largely it was done by women. Beverley Kingston has elegantly argued that this has been

\textsuperscript{97} The incumbent of the parish, the Rev. Tommy Jones, was in favour of all free seating as a way of lessening class distinctions in the parish; \textit{BC}, 10 June 1870.
\textsuperscript{98} See for example, \textit{QDG}, 8, 9 March, 5 April 1867.
\textsuperscript{100} Pews were rented in Queensland churches into the twentieth century.
(deliberately?) overlooked by male church historians, a position with which I agree.\textsuperscript{101} The churches depended on the voluntary labour of women to keep afloat.\textsuperscript{102} What is more interesting in the case of colonial Queensland was that the bishop was opposed to bazaars, which were the main means of feminine fundraising. He believed that the church should be supported by the free-will gifts of the people, rather than bazaars, a view in which he was not alone.\textsuperscript{103} Perhaps it was too redolent of ‘trade’, or perhaps it brought women out of the domestic into the public sphere, and offended his gentlemanly sensibilities.\textsuperscript{104} However, once it was realised bazaars could be big money-earners they were here to stay.

Economically bazaars were a bonanza, and especially important for raising funds outside the Anglican community for the church. The \textit{Guardian} noted that the bazaar at Rockhampton in 1863 was so successful that the church debt was wiped out and that a ‘handsome surplus remained in hand’.\textsuperscript{105} A bazaar at Ipswich netted over £425 in 1862.\textsuperscript{106} In 1864, bazaars in aid of the Wickham Terrace and South Brisbane churches each ran for several days; the latter brought in £211, £185 of which was used to retire debt.\textsuperscript{107}

The bazaar held by the Wickham Terrace church gives us some insight into the gendered way such an occasion was organized. A parish meeting was advertised for the purpose; about fifty ‘ladies’ and a few ‘gentlemen’ turned up. The chair was of course taken by a man – John Douglas – but all the business of the meeting was dealt with by the women. A group of men were nominated to be trustees of moneys earned, though Mrs.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[102] A position also taken by Teale; op. cit., pp. 118-119. Ada Cambridge attests to their importance; Cambridge, pp. 42, 119-125.
\item[103] Ada Cambridge had a similar point of view; Teale, p. 118.
\item[104] \textit{QDG}, 28 August 1861.
\item[105] \textit{QDG}, 18 August 1863.
\item[106] \textit{BC}, 12 June 1862.
\item[107] \textit{QDG}, 28 July 1864.
\end{footnotes}
Douglas was elected as treasurer and Mr. Robinson as the secretary. The ladies cast their nets high and wide and sought a dazzling array of patronesses: Lady Bowen, the governor’s wife; Mrs. O’Connell, the wife of the president of the Legislative Council; Mrs. Cockle, wife of the Chief Justice; Mrs. Elliott, wife of the speaker of the House of Assembly; and Mesdames Pring, Macalister, Moffatt and Mackenzie, all of whom were wives of members of the Cabinet. Seven ladies offered to organise stalls, and arrangements were made for receiving donations and goods for sale. The saccharine effusions of the (obviously male) reviewer of the opening of the bazaar are the epitome of patronisation:

In our youthful days it was one of the strongest articles of our social creed that ladies never looked so lovely as at a bridal, except when they presided at a stall at a fancy fare.

The ladies took up to £120 a day, and seemed to have averaged more than £100. They put a lot of work into making the fair a success, decorating the hall and the stalls with greenery, flags and ‘inscriptions’. Most of the goods for sale were some form of needlework or embroidery, dolls and toys. There was a harmonium on a dais in the centre of the room to provide occasional music; an appropriately attired fortune-teller; and the ubiquitous refreshment room. By pitching their public relations to the elite in their selection of patronesses, the ladies succeeded in getting the wealthier portion of Brisbane

---

108 QDG, 7 March 1864.
109 QDG, 1 June 1864. Similar patronizing remarks were common. See comments of a Mr. Chubb, in relation to young women who helped with the Sunday school at Ipswich; BC, 21 October 1864, and in relation to women’s efforts raising money at Ipswich; BC, 3 June 1862.
110 QDG, 2 June 1864; NA, 1 June 1864.
society to attend and to part with their money.\textsuperscript{111} The nett takings were a welcome £527.\textsuperscript{112}

Besides the obvious financial importance of bazaars and other fund-raising activities, there were no doubt other benefits. Kingston gets to the nub of the matter when she writes:

\begin{quote}
It may be that the ultimate relationship of ‘fetes’ to ‘faith’ is far from a frivolous matter, but lies at the very heart of the nature of religious experience and religious activity.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

Without the direct evidence from women’s writings, it is hard to put this to the test, but simply on the basis of the amount of work and dedication women put into these activities, it suggests that the object of their effort, that is, the maintenance of the church, was a significant issue for them. They were making a statement of the value of the church’s life and witness through their contribution. It reinforced women’s networks as they worked and planned these occasions, as a brief note about the women of Toowoomba organizing contributions to a bazaar in one of Katie Hume’s letters shows.\textsuperscript{114} Most striking is that in spite of their obvious success in both the material and social benefits to the churches, patriarchal structures did not give these women much affirmation. There is no mention of the bazaar in the report of the Wickham Terrace church AGM in the following year, and women were still excluded from parish office-holding for which they were obviously qualified.\textsuperscript{115} The latter change was many decades away.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{QDG}, 4 June 1864.
\textsuperscript{112} Kissick, p.25. This pales into insignificance beside the £3000 raised by the Mercy Sisters from a bazaar in 1867; Anne McLAY, \textit{James Quinn, First Catholic Bishop of Brisbane}, Toowoomba, Church Archivist’s Society, 1989, p.126.
\textsuperscript{113} Kingston, p. 21
\textsuperscript{114} Bonnin, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{BC}, 19 April 1865.
Bazaars were not the only way of raising money. Another common fund-raising activity was the concert. These usually took one of two forms. ‘Sacred concerts’ were rather more highbrow, drawing on local professional talent. The programme typically included excerpts of such works as Handel’s ‘Messiah’, Rossini’s ‘Stabat Mater’ and Mozart’s ‘Requiem’. These were sometimes supported by solo instrumental works or ensemble pieces such as Mozart or Haydn trios. When All Saints, Wickham Terrace, St. John’s Brisbane, and Holy Trinity, Fortitude Valley, bought organs, concerts were organised to raise funds for the purchase, and organ recitals were added to the list of fund-raising opportunities. Perhaps most popular were ‘amateur concerts’ which were often part of a tea meeting. Besides raising funds they were also an opportunity for supper and socialisation. The programme often included recitations of poetry or excerpts from plays. It was light family entertainment, and an extension into the public sphere of domestic forms of entertainment. Katie Hume described occasions when she and her husband and friends sang both popular and classical songs and glee5s around the piano, and Blanche Mitchell records similar after-dinner gatherings in homes she visited in Brisbane. These amateur nights were often organized by the women of the parish who

---

116 BC, 15 May 1867; BC, 2 November 1865.
117 BC, 27 May 1867
118 Meeting, 1 August 1873; Toowong Parish Minutes of Easter and Special Meetings; TOOWS 141-4, BDA.
119 The subscription list for the purchase of an organ for St Mary’s Kangaroo Point is published in BC, 3 August 1876.
120 BC, 2 November 1865.
121 A tea meeting at Toowong in July 1870 raised over £34 for the building fund; 174 tickets were sold at 2/- each. Meeting on 12 August 1870; Toowong parish Minute Book for Easter and special Meetings; TOOWS 141-4, BDA.
122 Bonnin, pp. 45, 115, 138; BMD, 4 October 1866; October 19 1866.
also provided the refreshments. Another popular night out was to view lantern slides, often pictures of the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{123}

There was more to sacred concerts than just the entertainment. Some clergy, like John Mosely, were competent musicians who used concerts to introduce people to sacred music and as a part of his strategy to improve church music, especially to lift the standard of singing of the church choir.\textsuperscript{124} It may also have been a way of enticing music lovers among the upper classes to church.\textsuperscript{125} It did mean that competent musicians like R.T. Jefferies, Sylvester Diggles and the Atkinson family were drawn in to church activities by this strategy.\textsuperscript{126}

No parish get-together was complete without a meal of some sort. Mary Nicholson described the feast prepared for those attending the ceremony to lay the foundation stone of the Grovely church. She seemed to be very competently in control of the organisation, co-opting members of the congregation (including men) to assist.\textsuperscript{127} Three hundred sat down to eat on that occasion.\textsuperscript{128} Considering the cooking facilities available, it was a prodigious feat of catering, duly acknowledged in newspaper accounts of the function.\textsuperscript{129}

It was a lot of hard work, but all of these activities did more than raise funds for church purposes; they were instrumental in contributing to a sense of community.\textsuperscript{130} Most of the colonial settlers, being immigrants, had little or no family nearby, and church activities were central to creating a local community and forming friendships that were

\textsuperscript{123} Bonnin, p. 116.
\textsuperscript{124} BC, 27 May 1867; QDG, 13 June 1864, 5 June 1867.
\textsuperscript{125} BC, 24, 28 September 1864.
\textsuperscript{126} QDG, 2 June 1860; 30 May 1864.
\textsuperscript{127} Nicholson, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{128} Nicholson, pp. 35-37. The women at Oxley Creek provided a banquet for 400 under large marquees on the day the foundation stone was laid for their church. BC, 19 May 1869.
\textsuperscript{129} This was especially true of Sunday school and day school treats; BC, 3 January 1867; QDG, 3 January 1861.
\textsuperscript{130} See the accounts of the treats mentioned at note 118; for fund-raising, see QDG, 30 May 1864.
essential for both personal well-being and for the growth of church life. Again, drawing on Mary Nicholson’s letters, she wrote poignantly of this aspect of life at Grovely. Her sense of isolation was acute when awaiting the birth of her second child in 1865:

I cannot help dreading the future at times. Who to be with me in the hour of my suffering as no dear loving sisters to soothe my pillow in weary hours afterwards . . .

It is in the same letter that she recounted the isolation felt by a young Manchester couple who lived nearby. Once a decision to build church at Grovely had been made, the project brought people to work together for a common purpose, and became the means by which friendships and community grew. In a letter of 1867, Mary reported that eighty people had worshipped in their house on a Sunday afternoon, largely due to the efforts of the Nicholsons in gathering a congregation. By 1869, Mary wrote of an impromptu gathering of neighbours around a bonfire on a Sunday evening:

Four years ago such social gatherings were never dreamed of and there stood a nice little party in Sunday clothes that would not disgrace England. Heads of families, too, all pleased to meet us there and pleased too with their share of the day’s [religious] performances . . .

The first rites of passage celebrated in the little church seemed for Mary to be a divine seal on the little community at Grovely.

**Nostalgia for the Past**

Church life cannot be reduced to fundraising and Sunday services, to buildings and parish committees. It was a substantial part of the culture colonial immigrants brought with them,
and satisfied a yearning to be part of a community in an unfamiliar and often bewildering environment. In creating community in the colony, Anglicans used the physical and social structures and religious forms with which they were familiar at ‘home’. In doing so, they were rather conservative, driven by a nostalgia for an idealised past of settled social relationships in a rural village to assuage their sense of separation from what had been lost in their migration. This is borne out by the way that many congregations nucleated in patterns reminiscent of English social relationships and the style of architecture used in building churches. It is also evident in the kind of relationship of priest to congregation typified by Benjamin Glennie on the Darling Downs, Thomas Jones at Wickham Terrace, John Mosely in his ministry at Brisbane and Ipswich, and James Matthews at Fortitude Valley. Although clearly gentlemen in the English understanding of the term, they were also effective pastors to their entire parish in the best of Anglican tradition.136

When the High Church Tories were envisioning a colonial church, it was something like this that they had in mind. Although colonial circumstances, including the physical environment, demography and legal context militated against a carbon copy of the English church in the colonies, the settlers themselves took comfort in their achievement of something approximating the English church.137 A writer for The Church Chronicle in 1929 lamented the changes at St Mark’s Warwick over the years:

I visualise St Mark’s as I first really knew it . . . the days when the dear little spire-crowned church of Freestone across the green-sward was ivy-clad and bowered in a setting of English oak and English elm. Gone is the ivy, and gone are the oaks and elms; and gone, too, with them, a certain spirit and association that has never returned.138

---

136 For Mosely especially, see MBC, 15 November 1856; for Glennie, see Simmons, p.16; for Thomas Jones, Kissick, pp. 31-37.
137 Nicholson, pp.38-45; Sir Arthur Morgan, St Mark’s Church, Warwick: Some Reminiscences, Warwick, Warwick Argus, 1912 (unpaginated); The Church Chronicle, 1 March 1929, pp. 54-55.
138 The Church Chronicle, 1 March 1929, p. 55.
Perhaps the next generation, of Australian-born men and women, did not identify with this nostalgia for ‘home’, and the spirit and associations of the founding settlers began to be transmuted into something new. This transmutation also applied to the administration of the church to which we now turn.

Chapter 9

Establishing a Synod for the Diocese

*That the Colonial Episcopate is in a very unsatisfactory position has long been felt by the friends of the English Church. A colonial bishop occupies an anomalous standing. His letters patent give him a status he cannot assert and invest him with powers he cannot enforce. His authority over his clergy has no legal sanction.*

*QDG, 17 February 1864, undated quote taken from the *Adelaide Observer*. 

The view of a colonial bishop’s standing, cited at the head of this chapter, was from an article in response to one of the Privy Council judgments concerning the Anglican Church in South Africa. It was one of a series of legal decisions which questioned the way in which colonial episcopal appointments were made. Bishop Tufnell was appointed to the See of Brisbane by means of Letters Patent, issued by the Crown in 1859, and they were read in full by John Bramston, the governor’s private secretary, at the bishop’s installation. On several occasions in the early years of his episcopate Tufnell legitimated his actions by appeal to those Letters Patent. Two of these occasions are worth quoting because of their context. They highlight problems a bishop could face in the exercise of his duties. The first occasion was early in 1861, when the matter of appointing trustees to hold the title of church property at Kangaroo Point was discussed at a parish meeting. Lewis Bernays, a parishioner, had raised the matter with the bishop in private conversation which he then related to a meeting of the congregation:

the bishop declared that he, by letters patent, was the sole trustee of church property, and declined to accede to any arrangement which connected him with local trustees, or rather that he declined to enter upon consideration of the matter at present.¹

The bishop felt that Bernays had misrepresented their conversation to the meeting of the congregation and in a letter to the editor of the Guardian he wrote:

I said, however, that by Her Majesty’s Letters Patent, the bishop was constituted a corporation for the purpose of holding in trust land and hereditaments and that I

¹ QDG, 7 January 1861.
presumed this power to be created with a view of avoiding the expense attendant upon new trusts where individuals and not corporations were appointed.²

Some members of the congregation led by Bernays (Plate 9.1) were challenging the propriety of the bishop having sole responsibility for church lands, conceivably because he or his heirs might covert them to their own purposes, and because he seemed to have no legal accountability to the rank and file of the church for such property.

When the same matter of trustees became an issue in Ipswich parish in 1864, the bishop maintained that the legal situation pertaining to trustees of church property was still not clear. At the time, there was a dispute about the rights of presentation to the parish.³ Some people were claiming the right of presentation on the basis that they paid the clergyman’s stipend, and felt that they were in a similar position to the proprietor of an advowson in England with the right to appoint their clergyman, subject to his being licensed by the bishop. The bishop refused to institute a priest to the parish on that basis, which would be an unwelcome precedent, claiming the right of presentation was conferred on him by his Letters Patent.⁴ These two cases underline the potential for conflict between the bishop and laity, and the legal ambiguity of the foundations of the diocese.⁵

² QDG, 10 January 1861.
³ The right of presentation was the right of selecting a clergyman for a parish. In England, the right was held by the patron of the advowson or benefice. A patron could be a bishop or other person, or a corporation such as a college or school. The patron ‘presents’ the candidate for the office to the bishop for institution and induction to the parish. The bishop may reject the candidate if he considers the candidate unsuitable. Legally, an advowson is a property right.
⁴ QDG, 7 December 1864; BC, 6 December 1864.
This legal ambiguity had been tested in the courts in South Africa, and the matters had ended up in appeals to the Privy Council.\textsuperscript{6} The legal issues were complex, but the kernel of the issue was set down by Lord Campbell in a case heard in Queen’s Bench, who held that ‘the Established Church of England could have no legal existence in the colonies, particularly when there was a separate legislature’.\textsuperscript{7} Further judgements on appeal to the Privy Council affirmed the judgment and clarified its implications.\textsuperscript{8} They allowed that Letters Patent could create bishops and define sees, but had no power to give bishops coercive power. Colonial bishops could only exercise jurisdiction in sees where there was a colonial legislature if they could convince the local legislature to enact legislation to govern the church or to pass legislation enabling the creation of a diocesan synod, or for the bishop clergy and laity to form some kind of mutually binding contract.\textsuperscript{9} All this legal activity had implications for Queensland, where there was a legislature in place at the time the see was created. In effect the Privy Council decisions disempowered the bishop who, with the people of his diocese, then had to create a way out of the tangle.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{The Practical Problems}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7} Hinchliff, \textit{Colenso}, p123, c.f. pp. 33-45.
\item \textsuperscript{8} Hinchliff, \textit{Colenso}, p. 125, 152-156.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Hinchliff, \textit{Colenso}, p. 125.
\item \textsuperscript{10} There is an extensive literature on the constitutional issues concerning the church in the colonies including Australia, that reproduce many of the early documents, such as letters patent and constitutions. None is recent. R.A. Giles, \textit{The Constitutional History of the Australian Church}, London, Skeffington, 1929; Henry Lowther Clarke, \textit{Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions Beyond the Seas and in Other Parts of the Anglican Communion}, London, SPCK, 1924; Ross Border, \textit{Church and State in Australia; a Constitutional Study of the Church of England in Australia}, London, SPCK, 1962. Also useful is J.S. Gregory, \textit{Church and State: Changing Government Policies Towards Religion in Australia; with Particular Reference to Victoria since Separation}, Melbourne, Cassell Australia, 1973. For a study that is helpful for ideas about the Anglican Church’s self-understanding, see Desmond Bowen, \textit{The Idea of the Victorian Church}, Montreal, McGill University Press, 1968, especially pp. 341-393.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Bishop Tufnell returned to England at the beginning of 1865; he wanted to consult with churchmen in England about his legal position in the diocese; he wanted to raise further much-needed funds; and he wanted a rest from his labours. 11 Unforeseen circumstances kept him away for two years. 12 Prior to his departure a whole raft of problems had arisen in the administration of the diocese, caused by the ambiguous nature of his Letters Patent. There is no doubt he believed that Letters Patent more or less gave him monarchical powers within his diocese, and Bishop Barker of Sydney, his metropolitan bishop, seemed to agree. 13 I have already referred to two matters that were problematical for the bishop; those of trustees of church property and of presentation to parishes. In what follows I will return to these two issues, and to several others to illustrate the range of problems the bishop faced in administering the diocese, and the laity’s perceptions of them.

The context of the argument between Lewis Bernays and the bishop was the anomalous position of the congregation at Kangaroo Point. As in so many centres the people met in the school-house, not in a purpose-built church, and the district was not a properly constituted parish. On this basis, Bernays believed that they were disadvantaged in not officially being able to appoint churchwardens (and presumably a vestry), so he believed the congregation could make whatever arrangements they saw fit to administer the district. Furthermore he believed that the laity ‘really’ constituted the ‘church’. His logic then demanded that the Diocesan Church Society (DCS), which Tufnell was proposing to administer church finances, should be representative of the laity, but that the bishop and clergy should only be ex officio members, and that the decisions of the

11 He had had at least one serious illness in 1864.
12 In 1865 and 1866 he had life-threatening illnesses; one was smallpox, and the other, possibly typhus.
13 In fact, during a visit to Brisbane in 1864, Barker said of episcopal control of funds raised by the bishop for his diocese, ‘that every colonial bishop deemed that he had entire control over such money’; BC, 23 July 1864.
majority of the members of the DCS should be ‘directory’ to the bishop. It is not surprising that the bishop did not concur with Bernays’ views, which would so radically encroach on the powers of the bishop and clergy, as to effectively deny the bishop and clergy any role in the administration of the diocese or its parishes. In contrast to familiar Anglican polity, Bernays was promoting a kind of congregationalism. Bernays’ proposal concerning the appointment of trustees to hold the title deeds of church property in the district were not as strong as his rhetoric, and in the end he suggested the bishop be appointed, along with two ‘other gentlemen – men of property and position in the district’. Bernays’ objection to church property being held by individuals (in the case of Kangaroo Point, by the Rev. B. Glennie) was that on the death of the trustee, his heirs could lay claim to the title as private property, and the implication was that this could happen in the case of the bishop, too, should he be the sole trustee. Bernays was a competent bush lawyer and a persuasive speaker and seems to have garnered considerable support among the Kangaroo Point congregation.

Bernays repeated his tactic of trying to gain control of church property for the congregation of the Wickham Terrace Church two years later. The church had been built with funds loaned on interest by the bishop. He argued that as the debt was repaid from the offertory and from pew rents:

---

14 *QDG*, 7, 10 January 1861.
15 *QDG*, 7, 10 January; 7 March 1861.
16 Not surprisingly, he was the chief clerk of the Legislative Assembly, and may have learned his oratorical skills from the members of parliament.
17 The church was built at the bishop’s initiative because the existing church of St John was crowded. The idea was that when the money was repaid by the congregation it could be used to fund church building elsewhere. The money was some of that collected by the bishop in England, and over which he claimed discretionary power for its use; *QDG*, 6 January 1863.
the interests of members of the church in the district *require* that the land upon which the building is erected – having been originally set apart for church of England purposes – be vested in trustees.18 (My emphasis)

Bernays’ concern was primarily that the congregation should have control of the church for which it was paying, and by vesting the property in trustees, no bishop could ride roughshod over their wishes. There was some similarity with the position of the congregation at Kangaroo Point, as the Wickham Terrace congregation were considered to be part of the parish of St. Johns – that is, it was not an autonomous district.19 The issues raised by Bernays were dealt with publicly by the bishop about a year later. Tufnell repudiated any suggestion that title to church property held by him could in any way be impugned. He went on to criticise a previous meeting’s nomination of lay trustees on two grounds; trustees should be contributors to the building fund, and they needed to be propertied men residing in the district.20 In spite of the bishop’s protestations, members of the congregation still sought the establishment of a trust to hold the property.21 In the context of a debate about the election of trustees in Ipswich parish late the following year, the bishop explained that it was still not clear what legislation, if any, governed the appointment of trustees of church property in Queensland.22 Lewis Bernays represents the most strident voice opposing the bishop’s claims to authority, and seems never to have been convinced that title to the property was secure.

Another area in which the bishop’s authority was challenged was in respect of the right to presentation to a parish, as we have already noted. The issue was most vehemently

18 *QDG*, 6 January 1863.
19 There seemed to be an informal connection between the churches at Fortitude Valley and Kangaroo Point.
20 This requirement was so that the trustees should be easily contactable if necessary, and that they had the financial means of meeting any costs that might be associated with the trusteeship. Brisbane was still not large, and the bishop would well have known the circumstances of those nominated. In 1864 the census gives a total population of 12,543 for North and South Brisbane, Fortitude Valley and Kangaroo Point.
21 *BC*, 20 February 1864.
22 *QDG*, 7 December 1964.
contested in Ipswich parish, where the congregation claimed the right to presentation in the same way patrons did in England. At Ipswich, it was Abraham Fitzgibbon who was most vocal in congregational rights (Plate 9.2). He rested his argument on similar foundations to Lewis Bernays, claiming that under the voluntary system of church support in the colony, the bishop and clergy were ‘dependent altogether on the laity’ and claimed that the voluntary system demanded the co-operation of the laity.\(^{23}\) The implication was that Fitzgibbon was threatening the withdrawal of lay support for the bishop and clergy.

The similarity with Bernays’ views does not end there. According to the bishop,

![Plate 9.1 Lewis Adolphus Bernays, chief clerk of the Legislative Assembly and vocal critic of Bishop Tufnell’s policies on the church’s temporalities, and an advocate for synodical government. He helped draft the standing orders for the synod. Here he is very formally dressed in this picture to project an image of social importance. The picture was taken in about 1900. Neg. No. 118418, JOL.](image)

\(^{23}\) As there was no state support for any denomination, all had to find their own means of support.
Plate 9.2 Abraham Fitzgibbon, an Irish engineer and one-time commissioner for Railways. He was active in Ipswich parish; another critic of the bishop. Picture from John Kerr, Triumph of the Narrow Gauge; a history of Queensland Railways, p. 5. Fitzgibbon maintained a congregationalist view of church polity, which he repudiated:

Mr Fitzgibbon had stated that every congregation was a church, whereas, although the church was a congregation, each congregation was not a separate church, and special care was taken that this should be so.24

Fitzgibbon’s views represent a challenge to traditional Anglican views of the relationship of the bishop, clergy and laity, and may be understood as a manifestation of the developing democratic tone of colonial society or as an expression of a Broad Church outlook, which both Ada Cambridge and Richard Twopeny noted as prevalent in the colonies.25 The parish sought legal opinion from the Attorney General, Ratcliff Pring, concerning the rights of presentation to a parish. It seems extraordinary that the

24 QDG, 7 December 1864.
25 For developing democracy in colonial Australia, see John B. Hirst, The Strange Birth of Colonial Democracy, Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1988. It is a pity that Hirst did not examine the importance of democratic practices in the non-episcopal churches. Also useful for an understanding of the Roman Catholic Church in its relationship to colonial democracy is T.L. Suttor, Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia, Melbourne, MUP, 1965; for Broad-churchmanship; Twopeny, p. 119; Ada Cambridge, Thirty Years in Australia, London, Methuen, 1903, p. 105.
Instructions to the Governor at his appointment gave him the right of appointment to the
cure of a parish, rather than the bishop. The governor wrote to the Colonial Office seeking
their urgent opinion on the matter. His despatch demonstrates the depth of confusion that
existed concerning the church in the light of the Privy Council decisions.26

Another area of contention was finances. Bishop Tufnell was called upon to
publish a statement of diocesan finances on several occasions, and the fullest account was
made during the visit of Bishop Barker in 1864. In particular he was asked to account for
the ways in which money he had collected in England on behalf of the diocese had been
spent. 27 Bishop Barker maintained that monies collected by colonial bishops in England,
apart from those collected for the diocesan endowment fund, were normally used at the
bishop’s discretion, as they were given for him to use as he thought fit. Mr. Shepherd
Smith, who was treasurer of the Diocesan Church Society, dissented in strong terms:

There was an impression on the minds of the laity that the bishop had an
inexhaustible fund upon which he could draw for any purpose. He (Mr. Smith)
differed in opinion from the rev metropolitan that the bishop should account any to
the people in England for funds subscribed by them. It was very objectionable,
indeed, that any secret funds should be in the possession of the bishop.28

In pleading strongly against the bishop’s sole responsibility for the church’s temporalities
Smith argued for a synod in which clergy and laity could participate. This call for
episcopal accountability has a modern r
participation in the church’s temporal affairs echoed English debates of the time.

26 The matter is fully covered in dispatch no. 6, dated 14 January 1865; CO234/12, AJCP reel no 1913,
ANL. Then government printer produced a pamphlet which includes the parish resolutions, request for a
legal opinion, the legal opinion, and copies of the governor’s Instructions and the bishop’s letters Patent.
This is filed with the dispatch.
28 BC, 23 July 1864.
From an early date, money collected in the diocese for stipends, buildings and parish needs were administered by the Diocesan Church Society.\textsuperscript{29} Even this was problematical, in spite of the publication of the balance sheets each year, showing very clearly the way funds had been spent.\textsuperscript{30} In this case, the objection was against centralisation. When the Rev. D.C. Mackenzie called a meeting at Gayndah to discuss the bishop’s proposal to form a local branch of the DCS, communicated through him by letter, the Hon. B.B. Moreton and Mr. G.W. Elliott moved a motion that all funds collected for church purposes ‘can be disposed of to greater advantage by a local committee’ than by DCS in Brisbane. The motion was passed unanimously, and the meeting went on to elect its own committee.\textsuperscript{31} There was also some resistance to the bishop’s oversight of stipends from Toowoomba, when there was a deficit in the Rev. Vincent Ransome’s stipend. Some parishioners believed that the bishop offered funds to cover the stipend if they were short, which in the event he refused to do, claiming they had misunderstood him.\textsuperscript{32} At a parish meeting at which the matter was discussed, it was proposed that all money raised be retained locally and not handed over to the bishop. Ransome intervened to have this resolution withdrawn.\textsuperscript{33} Whether or not there was a misunderstanding of the bishop’s intentions in the matter, the disagreement had the lingering effect of distrust of the bishop and of centralisation of financial administration. The claims made by laymen about their ability to administer the parish funds were not always good – the Wickham Terrace church was in serious financial difficulty early in 1867. As a letter to the editor of the \textit{Guardian}
made clear, the problems centred in the cost of holding services in the School of Arts, but the implication that the churchwardens were not the best of money managers came out in a meeting to discuss the matter. The incumbent had survived off his ‘private resources’, supplemented by £100 from the Church Missionary Society. That there was a place for a centralised stipend fund to ensure that clergymen were paid had become very clear.

The Role of the Brisbane Press

In all of this, the press provided rhetoric and support to those who were challenging the bishop’s authority. Even prior to Separation and to the bishop’s arrival in the colony, editorials were critical of episcopal authority. The rhetoric initially employed by the newspapers portrayed episcopacy in terms of its wealth, social status and temporal power, and drew upon the language of English Radicals. The following extended quotation, published under Swan’s editorship of the Courier in 1858, prepared the ground for Bishop Tufnell’s arrival:

Even as Shakespear said “Divinity doth hedge a King”; so we say there is, in the routine of Episcopacy, much fuss about a Bishop. We are shortly to be blessed by one of those vice-regents of church Government, against whose decisions there

---

34 QDG, letter from ‘Laicus’; 9 March 1867. The report of the meeting is in the same issue.
35 QDG, editorial, and account of parish meeting, 13 July 1867.
36 Nonconformists were very important to Queensland newspapers, especially in the early years. Immediately prior to Separation the owner and editor of the Brisbane Courier was James Swan, a Baptist, and through the 1860s was owned by T.B. Stephens. Under his ownership it was first edited by T.P. Pugh, a Wesleyan, and then D.F.T. Jones. Up until Jones became editor the Courier was not sympathetic to Anglicanism, and under Pugh’s editorship was unrelenting in the pressure it applied to Bishop Tufnell, especially in the matter of his education policy. The Guardian was initially owned by John Fairfax and edited by the Congregationalist, Dr. Hobbs. The Rev. Geo Wight, a Congregationalist was a frequent contributor under the non-de-plume, Willinghood. Wight became owner of the paper in 1863 (QDG 14 July 1862). It too, was unsparing in its treatment of the Anglican Church and Bishop Tufnell. The Ipswich paper, the North Australian, owned by the Roman Catholic bishop, James Quinn, gave unqualified support to Tufnell, presumably on account of his support for denominational education. Regional newspapers often took material from the two Brisbane papers and were more inclined to take an independent line, depending on the issue. Denis Cryle, The Press in Colonial Queensland; A Social and Political History 1845-1875, St Lucia, UQP, 1989, p. 25-38, 167; Denis Cryle, The Press in Colonial Queensland; A Social and Political History 1845-1875, St Lucia, UQP, 1989, pp. 154,170.
will be no nearer redress than the dictum of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has a very nice palace in the neighbourhood of London. Brisbane is to be converted into a see; and, rising in dignity as we approach the realization of episcopal dreams of orthodoxy, we must, of course, have a cathedral . . . Those who know anything of the grandeur of the Established church at home, with its ten millions of property, and its desire to maintain the domination given to it by the connection with the state, will, perchance, look upon this appointment with other than the spirit of Christian meekness. We do not know that there was any necessity for the appointment. What there is at present to be bishop of we do not know. In England, the bishops live on the fat of the land, dwell in palaces replete with earthly splendour, and endeavour, in the House of Peers, to constitute a spiritual tyranny, against which millions rebel. Good and pious men, who have served the lord and themselves as bishops, under the unfair administration of Church property at home, have at times, when dying, managed to bequeath £150,000 to sorrowing relations. The Church at home never made a greater mistake than in giving to the Peers spiritual the right of Peers temporal, nor never has the state incubus in matters of conscience, been shown more fully than the hurried appointment of bishops for the colonies.

These themes continued in editorials and letters to the editor for years to come. The papers strongly advocated voluntaryism and equality among Christian denominations and represented the Church of England as seeking state support and a pre-eminent place in colonial society. Without a sympathetic journalistic voice, Bishop Tufnell and his church struggled to have much impact at all on public opinion.

In late 1864, when the bishop was fiercely engaging in battle for denominational education alongside the Catholic Bishop, and in the midst of the debate with the congregation at Ipswich about presentation rights, there was a perceptible shift in debate in the *Courier* toward Anglican polity and administration of the church’s temporalities.

---

38 For example, *MBC*, letter from ‘An Englishman’, 30 July 1859; editorial, 15 December 1859; letter from ‘A Scottish Presbyterian’, 22 December 1859; letter from John Dunmore Lang, 29 March 1860; editorial, 3 November 1860; editorial, 14 February, 14 April 1862; editorial, 23 August 1863; letter from ‘Alpha Beta’ 2 April 1863; editorial, 10 April 29 September 1864; *QDG*, 1 December 1860; 7 January 1861.
The *Guardian* had been addressing these issues from a much earlier date\(^{40}\) and soon after acquiring the paper, Wight began to specifically address Anglican matters.\(^{41}\)

With the visit of Bishop Barker in 1864, the issue of the church’s temporalities came into the spotlight.\(^{42}\) Barker received an address from church members in Brisbane at a meeting at St. John’s. The core of the address was a plea to assist the Bishop of Brisbane:

> in removing many of the difficulties attendant on the establishment of our church in the colony, and more especially in organizing such a system of administering its temporalities through the conjoint action of the clergy and laity as may give due publicity and stability to its financial position\(^{43}\)

In a formal reply, Bishop Barker supported Tufnell’s efforts concerning diocesan finances, and only went so far as to say that the co-operation of the laity for such purposes was ‘necessary’. However, enlarging on the formal reply later, he advocated a synod as the best means of bringing the laity into the administration of church affairs, citing Adelaide, New Zealand, Melbourne, Tasmanian and Canadian precedents, though both Barker and Tufnell claimed that the key laymen they had consulted on the matter had said ‘Not yet’.\(^{44}\)

At this point it is worth making several points about the distinctive nature of the debate about creating a synod for the diocese of Brisbane. The pressure was coming from the laity with the support of the press. The main concern was for better administration of the temporalities of the church and for the involvement of the laity in church administration. In all the debate there was no question of a purely clerical synod; nor was

---

\(^{40}\) For example, *QDG*, editorial, 7 January 1861; letter from Tufnell, 10 January 1861; ‘Summary of Events’, 13 April 1861; letter from James R. Dickson, 24, 26 April 1862; account of the DCS meeting, 22 May 1862; editorial, 6 September 1862; letters from James Dickson and from Tufnell, 6 September 1862.

\(^{41}\) *QDG*, 14, 26 March 1863; and writing as ‘Willinghood’ in the editorial of 6 April 1863.

\(^{42}\) *QDG*, letter from ‘Lover of Civil and Religious liberty’, 22 July 1864; editorials, 22, 23 July 1864; article on Barker’s visit, 23 July 1864.

\(^{43}\) *QDG*, 23 July 1864.

\(^{44}\) Ibid.
any question raised as to whether or not such a synod would debate theological issues (such as the control of ritualism); nor was there any discussion of the need of a tribunal for the discipline of clergy. All these were component issues in the debate elsewhere.

In a sense the question of the involvement of the laity had been settled by the conference of bishops in Sydney in 185045 and in the colonies, the English idea that the laity represented the Church of England in the House of Commons did not apply.46 It was still an issue elsewhere, as in England.47 Tractarians like Pusey objected to the proposed presence of laymen in debate on theological issues48 and even when the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury instituted a House of Laity in 1885, a restriction was placed on theological debate by the laity.49 Others fussed about how laymen were to be selected, and who would be appropriate for participation in synods.50 One of the key elements in the debate in England about synods was how they could be employed to quell theological controversy, such as the issue of Bishop Colenso’s orthodoxy, or Gorham’s beliefs about baptism.51 Back in Australia, Perry of Melbourne was concerned to have a constitutional structure that provided for clerical discipline, a matter in which Bishop Broughton in Sydney had had much bitter experience, and most of the issues had been canvassed in the

---

48 Crowther, p. 209.
50 Burns, p. 245.
51 Burns, pp. 244-246, 249-250.
consultative process leading to the formation of a synod for Adelaide. In the short life of the Church of England in Queensland, there had been no cases requiring clerical discipline, and apart from the ongoing angst about Tractarianism and ritualism, there had been no major theological debate requiring some kind of doctrinal statement.

**While the Bishop’s Away . . .**

Bishop Tufnell’s absence from the diocese from early 1865 provided the context for an interesting shift in the debate about Anglican affairs. When he was in the colony, much of the debate was directed to him. In his absence the *Courier*, especially, took a more moderate tone. The bishop’s detractors made the best possible use of his absence by introducing a bill to the House of Assembly ‘to regulate the affairs of the Church of England and Ireland’. The bill was introduced by R.R. Mackenzie, and was drawn up by the Colonial Secretary, Robert Herbert. The content of the bill is set out by Daw, who made the following assessment:

> The bill as published was a thoroughly unreasonable measure. It was ill-conceived and loosely framed, and would have drastically altered the whole basis of church government in Queensland. Although it preserved the bishop’s position in some respects it was to a very large extent an attack on his rights and functions and would have left him with no control whatsoever over church funds and properties and with such minimal and ill-defined control over the appointment and dismissal of his clergy as to make it virtually meaningless. In parish affairs, there was no meaningful definition of church membership; and anyone who had contributed

---


53 This may reflect the impact of a new editor, D.F.T. Jones, of whom I have found little information.

54 BC, letter from ‘A Layman’, 21 August 1867; Bowen to Cardwell, Despatch No.15, 16 February 1865; CO234/12, AJCP reel no. 1913, ANL; BC, 24 May 1865.

55 See despatch mentioned at note 53.
even minimally to church funds, whether Anglican or not, would be able to take part in the administration of parish affairs and the appointment of clergy.  

Reading newspaper accounts of the debate in parliament, one gets the feeling that the attempt to introduce the bill in the bishop’s absence was retribution for his antipathy to the government’s education policy.  

Daw’s pithy assessment was that the initial debate on the bill was ‘marked by confusion and by a depth of feeling far exceeding the depth of knowledge displayed’.  

The papers questioned the wisdom of such legislation, on the basis that the church depended on the voluntary support of its members rather than the State, and therefore should not seek the legal protection of the State.  

It was clear that the bill would have a difficult passage through parliament.  

Anglicans supporting the bill, apart from its promoters, Herbert and Mackenzie, were Ratcliff Pring (who had given legal opinion against the bishop to Ipswich Parish in the controversy about presentation) and the ‘king’ of Toowoomba, James Taylor. Apart from the issue of education, Herbert’s negative assessment of Tufnell is known from his letters to his family. It was a view shared by the Governor, Sir George Bowen.  

Pring’s speech reflects his legal training, wanting to ‘tidy up’ the statute books and Taylor’s contribution showed considerable animus against the bishop.  

Anglicans who spoke against the bill included; W.H. Groom, Charles Lilley, 

---

56 Daw, p. 366.  
58 Daw, p. 367; compare his comments on page 365 (passim).  
59 QDG, 29 April, 1865, quoting the Weekly Herald; ‘Notes by a Silent member’, 18 May 1865; editorial 30 May 1865; copy of petition to the Legislative Assembly, 5 June 1865; editorials, 29 June 14 August 1865; BC, editorial, 24 May 1865; 26 May, 1865; 11 September 1865.  
60 For the debate, see, QDG, 17 May, 1865; Daw, p. 366.  
61 Bruce Knox, The Queensland Years of Robert Herbert, Premier: Letters and Papers, St Lucia, UQP, 1977, pp. 37, 86, 148, 215, 218-219, 224; Bowen to Cardwell, despatch No. 71 15 December, 1864 (especially pp. 10ff) and private despatch, 18 December 1864 (especially p. 6), CO234/12, AJCP reel no 1912, ANL.  
62 QDG, 17 May 1865.
John Gore Jones and W.H. Walsh. Groom, who spoke in the second debate on the bill, caustically remarked that the bill had ‘been brought in more for purposes of settling quarrels between the bishop and a few disaffected members of his church’. In spite of the apparent lack of unanimity of Anglicans on the matter (there were petitions to parliament from both sides) the overall impression from the newspapers is that Anglicans were not in favour of the bill. Nevertheless, it was clear that the church needed to be put on a much more secure legal foundation, a matter that even opponents of Mackenzie’s bill would allow. The bill was withdrawn on 5 July, 1865.

The decision of the Privy Council in the Colenso case was brought down on 20 March of that year, and the Queensland legislators had it to hand before debate on the ‘Queensland Church Bill’ began. However its importance is less on the impact it may have had on the parliamentary debate in Queensland than on Bishop Tufnell, who had just arrived in England. Tufnell’s presence in England precisely at this moment allowed him to discuss the matter with his English advisors. The bishop’s lengthy absence from his diocese allowed matters to settle, and there was virtually no debate about church affairs till his return in the first part of 1867. Once his return was nigh, the newspapers again took up the fight. In an editorial in late April, referring to a speech by the Bishop of London in the House of Lords, the Guardian questioned the exact nature of the connection between the colonial church and the church ‘at home’, and wondered whether the Act of Uniformity

---

63 Ibid.
64 One presented by Groom of Toowoomba had 500 signatures.
65 Daw, p. 369.
66 BC, 24 May 1865, and see references to the decision in the parliamentary debate published in the same issue. Also, Daw, p. 368.
applied in the colonies. The writer also called for legislation to sever all connection
between church and state in the colony, and to sanction ‘absolute independence’.

‘Some Carefully-considered Form of Synodical Action’

On his arrival back in Brisbane, a meeting was called at which Bishop Tufnell was
presented an address welcoming him home. The address was signed by the clergy and
churchwardens of the Brisbane parishes. It reviewed events in his absence (population
increase due to immigration, economic recession, anxiety about providing for a
burgeoning population), especially the legal relationship between the colonial church and
that in England, and called for the creation of synodical government for the diocese. It is
revealing that no mention was made of either his two life-threatening illnesses or his
marriage, though there may have been another address that covered these matters.

The bishop’s reply was a well-considered mix of affirmation of the vitality of the
diocese; reassurance that the Privy Council decisions were not as disastrous as some were
claiming; and confidence that in a co-operative venture, synodical government for the
diocese could soon be made a reality. He planned a conference of representative laity and
clergy which he hoped would ‘lead to the adoption of some carefully considered form of
Synodical action’. After delivering the formal part of the address, the bishop indicated that
he would convene a conference for September.

---

67 Editorial, QDG, 25 April 1867. The Acts of Uniformity (1548, 1115, 1558, and 1662) prescribed the use of
the Book of Common Prayer and the censures for absence from church on Sundays and Holy Days. The
writer of the editorial in the QDG was questioning whether a bishop could be consecrated in the colonies
according to the BCP, without the consent of the sovereign; that is, he was asking whether colonial
Anglicans were bound by the Act of Uniformity.
68 QDG, 20 June 1867; BC, 20 June 1867.
69 QDG, 19 June 1867, c.f. 25 July 1867.
70 QDG, 20 June 1867.
course of action proposed by the bishop. It was the very best response he could hope for
and provided the context for positive public opinion.71

Early in July, Tufnell issued a pastoral letter outlining his plan for a conference.72
He made it clear that anyone who was prepared to sign a statement that he was a *bona fide*
member of the United Church of England and Ireland was entitled to vote and,
furthermore, that representatives at the conference must also be *bona fide* members of the
church, but not necessarily residents of the district. The effect of this was to maximize the
number of Anglicans eligible to vote.73 There were objections to these guidelines. Various
people wanted a stricter test of membership. For example, the Rev. Thomas Jones insisted
that delegates should be communicants, though this was not stated in the letter.74 This was
raised in the context of the election of W.H. Groom at the Toowoomba meeting, where it
was claimed that Groom would make his communion before the conference in order to
qualify.75 Some Toowoomba people objected to the election of Brisbane solicitor Robert
Little as their delegate, because he ‘was not resident in the district’.76 Dissent in
Toowoomba about the election of Groom and Little became quite heated, and there were
suggestions that a small coterie of Toowoomba parishioners had elected them as the
bishop’s candidates, though this claim was not made good.77 At Ipswich, Abraham
Fitzgibbon objected to the wide franchise too, claiming that under the Burke Act only
those who subscribed to the clergyman’s stipend or to the support of the church should

71 BC, 3 August 1867; QDG, 13 July 1867.
72 The letter is to be found in an account of the meeting of the Wickham Terrace congregation at which
deleates were elected for the conference; QDG, 20 August 1867.
73 That is all adult *male* members of the church.
74 QDG, 20 August 1867.
75 QDG, 31 July 1867. It was not uncommon in this period for Anglicans to abstain from communicating at
the eucharist; Frances Knight, *The Nineteenth Century Church and English Society*, Cambridge, CUP, 1995,
pp. 53-57.
76 QDG, 5 August 1867.
77 QDG, 31 July, 5,10, 20 August 1867; BC, 1,3,10 August 1867.
vote. Fitzgibbon’s objection was adroitly handled by the chairman, the Rev. John Mosely, who pointed out that the Burke Act did not provide for synodical action, and could not be construed to cover the situation. It was a good bush lawyer’s response. In the end, the mood of the meeting being very keen on synodical action, it followed the chairman’s ruling, and Fitzgibbon pointedly left the meeting.  

These objections to the extent of the franchise which sought to limit it by some kind of doctrinal test or the equivalent of a property qualification were not very subtle attempts to exclude the less literate and less financial members of the congregations from participation in the electoral process. The Courier actively encouraged the laity to fully participate in the process by taking advantage of the generous franchise. Tufnell’s more democratic direction ensured a broad support for the conference. Nevertheless it is very revealing to note who was elected to be lay representatives. The Courier listed 27 representatives all but two of whose occupations have been determined. Using the socio-economic categories defined in chapter 5, fifteen delegates were from the governing class; nine were from the ruling class, and one from the professional class. It was a distinctively ‘elite’ gathering and included nine members of parliament, the Chief Justice, the second most senior judge, and six senior civil servants. Nine had squatting interests. Anglicans seem to have taken to heart the advice of the Guardian editorial:

It is right and fit that the members of any congregation . . . should select for representatives at the forthcoming Synod gentlemen who are members of the Church in the full sense of the term – acquainted with its ancient laws, and versed in the tenets and principles on which it is founded. [My emphasis.]  

---

78 QDG, 23 August 1867.
79 The tests have echoes of the English Test Acts. Suggested ‘tests’ included communion, or subscription to the thirty-nine articles, or even as one correspondent facetiously suggested, the Athanasian Creed – ‘Communicant’ to BC, 6 August 1867. Financial contribution to the church either as subscribers or pew-holders was effectively a property qualification that excluded the poor.
80 QDG, 13 July 1867.
Perhaps they were not quite the noblemen who would co-operate in the formation of the colonial society, as envisaged by Tory High Church theorists, but they were an educated and experienced legislative group, skimmed from the cream of Queensland’s governing and ruling classes.  

The Diocesan Conference

The conference gathered on September 4 as convened. Only two of the clergy and four lay members failed to appear. The bishop’s presidential address was a judicious mix of scripture, theology, tradition, law and pragmatism. It received the approbation of the Courier when it acknowledged that:

The address read by the Bishop at the commencement of the Conference was however, eminently clear and practical, setting forth in a simple and forcible manner his reasons for calling the Conference and the questions he deemed it necessary to consider.

The bishop emphasized that the two core concerns that the meeting were to decide were whether they were prepared to form a synod, and, if so, whether to do so on the basis of legislative enactment or consensual compact. Significantly, he preferred consensual compact as the better path. In summarizing the legal situation of the church in the colony he took the view that if the Wesleyans and Presbyterians could administer their affairs without legislative enactment, so, too, could Anglicans. His own position was very clear; as bishop of the diocese he wanted to administer the diocese in and through the wisdom and authority of synod, and he maintained that the three components of the synod could

---

81 Chapter 1, pp. 2, 3.
82 BC, 6 September 1867.
not claim superiority or independence of the others.\textsuperscript{83} It was quite a conciliatory approach as he was prepared to accept whichever form of constitution the conference proposed.\textsuperscript{84}

Once the bishop had spoken, Mr. Justice Lutwyche moved ‘that the time had come for taking Synodical action’. Charles Coxen seconded the motion. It was put and passed. Before considering the form that synodical action may take, the conference dealt with the significant procedural issue of how voting was to be carried out. After discussing the matter, the bishop’s view that all three orders needed to be in agreement, and that the bishop could not veto a matter separately agreed to by the clergy and laity, were broadly accepted.\textsuperscript{85} The negotiation of the matter demonstrated the value of having Lutwyche during a debate, and the experience of members of parliament in procedural matters (Plate 9.3). The debate also displayed caution on the part of some members (Gibbon, Douglas, Dudgeon, and Rev. John Bliss), best characterized by Douglas’ comment:

They must be careful of what steps they took at the outset, because the steps they now took would govern the whole of their future proceedings.\textsuperscript{86}

This caution carried forward to the issue of the form synodical government might take, with the conference appointing a committee to report the next morning on the systems of church government in other Australasian colonies. In the wake of this, Lutwyche took the initiative by moving that the synod should be formed by consensual compact; the seconder was Archdeacon Glennie. This was an astute move, as they were the second most senior law officer in the colony and the senior cleric, both of whom were widely respected. The caution of the conference again surfaced and several delegates wanted more time to consider the matter, and it was adjourned till the following day, when

\textsuperscript{83} The three components being the bishop, the clergy and the laity.
\textsuperscript{84} \textit{QDG}, 5 September 1867.
\textsuperscript{85} This is a more nuanced reading of the debate than in Daw, p. 370.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{QDG}, 5 September 1867.
debate was decisive. Only two delegates showed any inclination at all toward legislation, but in the end supported the motion in favour of consensual compact. It was passed unanimously and applauded. Supporters of the motion reiterated several key elements in favour of consensual compact. First, it would mean that people would have to choose to be a member of the Anglican Church, and to support the form of church government for which the conference opted (Lutwyche, Groom, Rev. Thomas Jones); in no sense was it enough to be a citizen of the State, as in England. Second, it would avoid any necessity to depend on the legislature which was already hostile to the idea (Lutwyche, Rev. Benjamin Glennie, Rev. John Bliss, Rev. J.R. Moffatt, Cockle, Coxen) and which could revoke it at any time (Lutwyche, Bliss, Moffatt). If they found it necessary, they could apply to the legislature in the matter of administering the church’s temporalities (Ramsay, Blakeney, Moffatt, Tufnell, and Coxen). Third, there was a general feeling that if other denominations could successfully administer their affairs without application to the legislature, then so, too, could Anglicans (Lutwyche, Bliss, and Moffatt). The Anglican
Plate 9.3 Judge Lutwyche was the principal framer of the constitution of the diocese. Source of picture not recorded.

Plate 9.4 A parliament house for the diocese; St Luke’s Synod Hall was built in 1904. By 1977 it was found to be too small and synod has since been held at Churchie School. St Luke’s was sold in 1988, and is now a restaurant. Picture courtesy of the Brisbane Diocesan Archives.
Church was a voluntary society. Having turned this corner, the conference turned its attention to the process of calling the first synod.

Bishop Tufnell was very firm in his desire ‘to get men of all classes in society to feel that they were really members of a spiritual body’. 87 This strong democratic tone is significant, as it avoided all socio-economic markers or theological tests on who could vote. Tufnell had moved a long way from the Coleridgean position he had taken just a few years earlier, when, in response to an address in support of his education policy from a group of workingmen, he said, in relation to the franchise for the colonial parliament:

a large number of intelligent workingmen will, I trust, each year, by the divine blessing upon their honest industry, obtain the privilege of the franchise . . . 88

He was moving away from his High Church conservatism, perhaps influenced by Lutwyche, whose strong support for democratic institutions was well-known. 89

Although in the end the franchise for synod was the same as that for the conference, there was considerable debate about how many delegates could be returned for a parish and how districts without resident clergymen could participate. The conference decided on a form of proportional representation, with parishes sending up to three delegates. This meant that parish rolls would have to be compiled and maintained in order to decide the appropriate level of representation. These issues and the procedures to be followed in elections were all resolved with little difficulty. The key decision was to

87 QDG, 6 September 1867.
89 A perceptive view is given in P.A. Howell’s entry in ADB, vol. 5, pp. 109ff. See also, QDG, 2 January 1868. In this, the diocese was following the 1832 Reform Act of England which disenfranchised women property owners by stipulating that electors be male only. Catherine Hall sees this exclusionary definition of the male political subject as contributing significantly to the ‘distinction between the rational public world of men and the passionate private realm of women’. See James Vernon, Politics and the People; A Study in English Political Culture, c. 1815-1867, Cambridge, CUP, 1993, p. 39.
appoint a sub-committee to draft a constitution for the consideration of the synod when it met. The committee comprised the bishop, Archdeacon Glennie, Rev. John Bliss, Chief Justice Cockle, Mr. Justice Lutwyche and John Douglas. It was clearly a competent group with the skills and background for the task. Among the last items of business, the conference tightened up the franchise. The Rev. Thackeray pointed out that the way the qualifications had been framed, women had not been specifically excluded from voting. He made the point that he had no objection to women voting. The conference thought otherwise and altered the qualifications accordingly.\(^9\)

Little had changed since the offertory controversy in 1855. Women’s voices were not to be heard.

When the first synod met, not only were women’s voices silent. In spite of the broad franchise and eligibility guidelines for Anglicans to be delegates, the representatives sent down to Brisbane by the parishes were, like its predecessor the diocesan conference, drawn from the governing and ruling classes – with the exception of two, a farmer and a jeweller. When one considers that the clergy, ‘the gentlemen in the parish’, were the social equal of the ruling class, it was an elite group. Synod was not representative of all social classes within the Anglican Church by any means. It was dominated by ‘men of affairs’ and ‘men of business’ and they proved to be a cautious assembly.

**The Meeting of the First Synod**

In delivering his presidential address, Tufnell had some very powerful ammunition. Since the meeting of the diocesan conference the first Lambeth Conference had taken place,

\(^9\) *QDG*, 7 September 1867.
with seventy-six Anglican Bishops in attendance.\textsuperscript{91} Among the many issues discussed was the matter of the establishment of diocesan synods. Of its resolutions, Tufnell said:

It will, I am sure, be satisfactory to you to learn that the resolutions adopted by our conference in September last, were almost entirely in accordance with those which were adopted by the conference of Bishops of the Anglican communion assembled at Lambeth at the same time.\textsuperscript{92}

The coincidence was hardly fortuitous. The speed with which Tufnell had called the diocesan conference on his return to the colony, and the quiet confidence he had shown suggests that he was well-prepared, and that the principles for the establishment of diocesan synods had been circulating freely in England before he came back to Brisbane. Some matters, such as the qualifications for electors of delegates to the conference may simply represent commonsense with a democratic colouring, but the following recommendations from the Lambeth Conference have very strong echoes of the conference debate in Brisbane:

That the Bishop, clergy and laity should sit together, the Bishop presiding. That votes should be taken by orders whenever demanded, and that the concurrent assent of Bishop, clergy, and laity should be necessary of all acts of synod.\textsuperscript{93}

No doubt, too, as a member of the sub-committee called upon to draft a constitution for the diocese, the bishop was able to make available other aspects of the Lambeth Conference resolutions to Justice Lutwyche, who was principal framer of the draft.

Apart from the bishop’s address, and some organisational business, the reading of the draft was the main business of the first day of synod, and its consideration was deferred till the next day. Much of the debate on the next two days of synod was whether or not the synod should debate the draft constitution. Two groups emerged during this

\textsuperscript{91} An excellent account is still Alan M.G. Stephenson, \textit{The First Lambeth Conference}, London, SPCK, 1967. It is very much the view from the metropolis. A view from the periphery has yet to be written.

\textsuperscript{92} \textit{BC}, 7 May, 1868.

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{BC}, 7 May, 1868.
debate; those who could be called the confident, who wanted to get on with the matter, and the cautious, who, for various reasons, wanted to adjourn the debate. Some of the latter wanted to print the draft constitution and circulate it throughout the diocese, enabling the parishes to consider it before synod did. Some delegates wanted to study it more closely themselves, before they debated it. In the end, by a majority of one, the synod adjourned for one month. The *Courier* was scathing in its criticism of the cautious;

While giving every credit to the earnestness and zeal for the welfare of the church, to those who advocated this delay, it really seems an excess of caution and a waste of time.  

In seeking explanations for the delay, the *Courier* editorial wondered whether those who sought the delay did so because they wanted ‘to depart in some respects from the doctrines, books, formularies and articles of the mother Church’, which suggests that the editorial writer was aware of such feeling, and that there may have been a faction which wanted more time to prepare for the debate. However, the writer of the editorial diplomatically dismissed this and suggested instead, that when the synod met, the cautious had but a ‘very vague idea’ of what they had to do or how it was to be achieved. There may be more than an element of truth in this, too, as the establishment of the synod was breaking new ground. None of the delegates had working experience of a synod, and one could seriously wonder whether the lay delegates knew much about the theological basis on which the synod had been called into existence. In response to a suggestion that the synod should construct a constitution *ab ovo*, the editorial writer pithily remarked:

The presence of so many persons possessed of an unlimited right to differ, and an almost unlimited power to make speeches, would be fatal to the despatch of business if it were commenced in this fashion.  

---

94 Editorial, *BC*, 11 May 1868; see also, 28 May 1868.  
95 See letter from ‘Yours of Maranoa’, *QDG*, 13 May 1868.  
96 *BC*, 28 May 1868.
This was almost certainly an observation on the capacity of some of the delegates to pontificate frequently and at length, often sharing their ignorance of both the procedure and substance of the debate. The editorial was written in response to debate in other newspapers, especially the *Guardian*, the tone of which tended to be in opposition to the bishop and clergy. That there was an ‘evangelical party’ in synod in opposition to the bishop and his ‘Puseyite clergymen’ is attested to in a letter to the *Courier*, but the caution was not confined to synodsmen of evangelical sympathies.\(^97\)

Into this debate a legal heavyweight thrust himself, generally in support of the bishop’s authority to convogue a synod, rather than the proposed constitution itself. The contribution to the *Courier* was signed ‘C’, and may have been written by Chief Justice Cockle.\(^98\) It was didactic in tone and clearly designed to inform prospective delegates to the synod. It is interesting that with the exception of the parish of Ipswich, there is little evidence of debate in parishes of the provisions of the constitution itself, which suggests that there was little confidence among Anglicans or the public in general, to try to do so, possibly reflecting the ignorance that the correspondent to the *Courier* recognised.\(^99\)

When the synod reconvened it began the long process of considering the draft constitution, clause by clause. Generally the debate on the constitution was unremarkable, except for clause 3 of the fundamental provisions.\(^100\) Debate of the clause in the committee stage highlighted the structure of the synod. The bishop and clergy sought a definition supporting a ‘branch’ theory of the church, and wanted to include as much as

\(^{97}\) *BC*, 28 May 1868.  
\(^{98}\) *BC*, 6 June 1868.  
\(^{99}\) *BC*, 29 May 1868.  
possible of the church’s doctrinal values as possible to indicate that they were members of
the United Church of England and Ireland, not a ‘new’ church: the whole of the Bible; the
Book of Common Prayer; the sacraments, rites and ceremonies of the Church of England;
the metrical psalms; the form of ordination of bishops, priests and deacons; and the thirty-
nine articles. 101 W.L.G. Drew, a layman from Toowong, wanted a much simpler and
more inclusive statement of an Arnoldian cast,102 but the most vociferous were the three
Irishmen, Blakeney, McDonnell and Dudgeon. Their concern was to exclude ritualists and
crypto-Catholics. This is understandable as the Church of Ireland was distinguished by its
staunch Protestantism by which it distanced itself from the Roman Catholic majority.103
These three wanted to frame the fundamentals to read more ‘Protestantly’.104 For example,
Blakeney objected to the inclusion of the words ‘rites and ceremonies of the Church of
England’ as he felt they condoned the ritualism of St. Alban’s, Holborn in London where
the Rev. Alexander Mackonochie was the incumbent, claiming that the ritual there
approached the Church of Rome.105 This was a pointed comment. Mackonochie was a
fellow student of Tufnell at Wadham College, Oxford, and the implication was that
Tufnell may have shared some of Mackonochie’s proclivities.106 Furthermore, he wanted
to bind the diocese to only those changes to the articles, in liturgy, and in formularies of
the church ‘made by any competent authority of the Church of England and Ireland in the
United Kingdom with the consent of the Crown and Convocation’.107 Effectively that

101 See speech of Lutwyche when he was introducing the clause, BC, 11 June 1868.
102 BC, 11 June 1868; and letter to the editor, BC, 12 June 1868.
104 See debate BC, 10, 11, 17 June 1868.
105 BC, 11 June 1868. Bernard Palmer, Reverend Rebels: Five Victorian Clerics and Their Fight Against
106 Later in the debate Tufnell responded to this by praising Mackonochie’s pastoral ministry, but claiming
that he had tried to dissuade Mackonochie from his ‘advanced’ ritual. BC, 18 June 1868
107 BC, 11 June 1868
would have meant that the synod of the diocese of Brisbane was not competent to change the fundamentals in any way. John Douglas, who was one of the framers of the draft constitution, had reservations about the fundamental provisions. He felt that they amounted to the creation of an ‘act of uniformity’, binding the laity to assent to the whole of the rites and ceremonies enjoined by the prayer book and to which clergy assented at their ordination, but which heretofore were not binding on the laity. There is some sympathy here with Drew’s position, and a reluctance to define the fundamentals too closely. Douglas summed it up thus:

He merely wished to state that . . . he might have to undertake greater obligations than he was now called upon to undertake as a member of the Church of England.¹⁰⁸

However, it was the Anglo-Irish Dudgeon who was quite clear as to what he opposed:

A large proportion of the laity had a great dread that the clergy would be importing objectionable practices from England. He thought it would be an improvement to leave out the words ‘and other rites and ceremonies of the church, according to the use of the Church of England.’¹⁰⁹ [My emphasis.]

Two attempts at modifying the clause along these lines failed. Significantly, the amendments were not supported by the clergy. And when the clause was finally voted on only one clergyman opposed it, along with the Irishmen, Dudgeon, Blakeney and McDonnell; Drew, the self-confessed broad churchman; and four other laymen. The matter did not end there. Before final approval of the constitution, it was recommitted to allow debate on clause 3 again.¹¹⁰ The debate on re-committal revealed more starkly the anxieties of some of the laity, who feared the development of a clerical ‘party’. The debate was led by the Darling Downs squatter, Green, who again focused on

---

¹⁰⁸ ibid.
¹⁰⁹ ibid. The impression is that such innovations would never come from Ireland.
¹¹⁰ BC June 18 1868.
the words ‘rites and ceremonies’ as providing the thin edge of the wedge of ritualism. Several clergy, notably, the Revs E.G. Moberly and J.R. Moffatt, supported re-committal even though they did not want to see substantive changes to the clause. For the first time in debate (as distinct from presidential addresses), Bishop Tufnell made his own views crystal clear. First he favoured re-committal so long as the clause ‘was enacted with a large majority’. In a long speech, he tried to be reassuring, making several points in favour of the clause as it stood. He pointed out that the prayer book, the services for ordaining bishops, priests and deacons, and the metrical psalms were distinctively Anglican and necessary. A full recognition of scripture was imperative as a hedge against heresy, in which context he quoted the errors of Bishop Colenso. Importantly, he claimed that there was no need to fear ritualism if the clause were agreed to. Finally he addressed the issue of there being a ‘clerical’ party, reassuring the laity in their caution:

With regard to the circumstance that the clerical members had voted unitedly on one occasion, he might state that he was exceedingly glad that they had done so. It had not been the practice of the Church for the laity to take part in Synods, but it was most necessary that they should. And, during the recent debates, they had seen enough to show that much care should be exercised in this respect. If the clergy had not, on that occasion, voted unitedly for the standards of the Church, it would have been held up to ridicule at home. He believed the laity were merely frightened at a few words in the clause which it would be a misfortune to omit.111

In a majority of 19 to 17, including two clergy, the constitution was re-committed. The two amendments were debated briefly, and lost, though the numbers in favour included more laity than previously. Thus, the original clause stood, but with greater lay support, just as Tufnell had hoped. It was a defining moment, as Tufnell recognised the need to carry all Anglicans into the colonial future in spite of any theological differences that may

---

111 BC, 18 June 1868.
have existed among them. What was important was that synodical government be a medicine against religious/spiritual anarchy.

Beside the obviously deep anxiety about ritualism, the debate suggests that many of the lay delegates were quite unacquainted with some of the defining documents of Anglicanism. On the other hand the acceptance of the fundamental provisions by the clergy is understandable in the context of their education and the subscriptions required of them at ordination. The rest of the constitution including all the matters relating to the administration of the church’s temporalities elicited little debate, and Daw’s assessment that the atmosphere of the debate was ‘never bitter’ is substantially true. An editorial in the *Courier* also recognized this:

> The division on the third clause of the Constitution, when re-committed, marked a turning point in the synod’s affairs, and it was satisfactory to see that, when defeated, the best men of the minority accepted the decision of the body with good grace, and assisted at its after deliberations in the spirit which should animate men undertaking so solemn a responsibility.

The synod also passed its first canon, concerning the election of synodsmen. The laity had finally achieved their coveted goal – a place in the administration of church affairs.

**Church Government with Blessing of ‘Nobleman’ and Parson**

There is no doubt that Tufnell stage-managed synod well. The involvement of Lutwyche was extremely important. He was one of those colonial ‘gentleman leaders’ who had the confidence of a broad spectrum of the population. His sympathy for the democratic temper of the times and his legal acumen gave him an authority few could deny. By giving Lutwyche the lead in drafting and introducing the constitution, Tufnell, as president of the

---

113 Daw, p. 371.
115 There is an excellent exposition of the idea of the gentleman leader in Vernon, pp. 251-294; see also, W.L. Guttsman, *The English Ruling Class*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969, pp. 139-140.
synod, was out of the limelight, and consequently the constitution was never seen as ‘his’. The alliance proved to be a very beneficial one.  

Tufnell saw the synod as the ‘parliament’ of the church of the colony. The venue for Synod was the ‘hall of commerce’ in the Town Hall, which provided a suitably businesslike place for the serious deliberations to take place, and eventually the diocese built a synod hall for the specific purpose (Plate 9.4). It was also a convenient location for all the members of parliament and senior civil servants whose offices were nearby. The use of parliamentary procedure including a set of standing orders based on that of the colonial parliament contributed to this parliamentary vision.

From the very first meeting of the diocesan conference, in September 1867, the bishop’s perception of synod had a parliamentary cast. In debating whether the bishop’s vote was or was not a veto, the bishop explained that he would assent to any measure ‘carried by the clergy and laity, voting as separate orders, unless some matter of vital importance was concerned’. He described the situation as being like that of the legislature ‘at home’. ‘The two Houses deliberated, and the Queen had the power of assenting to their measures.’ And again he reiterated:

The concurrent action of the three orders was necessary. The Bishop generally signified his assent to a measure just as the Sovereign or the representative of the Sovereign, gave his to measures passed by parliament.

The care he took in explaining the close parallel with English parliamentary procedure was an important element in legitimating the whole project by appealing to a respected and functional precedent. The bishop’s role as equivalent to the sovereign or the vice-regal

---

117 BC, 7 May, 9 June 1868.
118 Lewis Bernays was mainly responsible for drafting the standing orders, and once on the ‘inside’ of church administration was never as hostile towards the bishop as he had been in the past.
119 BC, 5 September 1867.
representative is underscored by his use of the presidential address at the beginning of the sitting of the first conference and later of the synod. The address reviewed matters concerning the life of the Church and outlined the programme of the current sitting of synod, much in the way the sovereign or the vice-regal representative did at the opening of a parliamentary session. It differed in that the bishop presided at synod and that the two ‘houses’ sat and debated together. All the parliamentary language and allusions were not trappings. They were an integral part of enhancing the solemnity and authority of synod, and in the serious matter of legitimating the bishop’s action in convening a synod.

The parliamentary model also probably accounts for the socio-economic standing of the delegates. To be a synodsman was a sought after prize for those who wanted to assert their place in colonial society. Nevertheless it is salient to point out that, in the process of devolving the bishop’s temporal power to synod, it was to men of similar social standing as the bishop himself. There is a sense of closure against the ‘middling’ and working classes who comprised the majority of church members. It is hard to detect the causes of this in the sources. Was it an echo of deference? Or perhaps was it feelings of inadequacy of education or polish? Or was it the self-promotional skills of those who were elected? Whatever the cause, synod was composed of members of colonial Queensland’s socio-economic elite. To what extent their future management of the diocese reflected their class position and how the composition of synod changed with time is too large a project for this study, but although they were not English nobility, they were the best the colony could offer, and to that extent the church, at least, was governed by ‘nobleman and parson’.

120 For a note on working class deference to political leadership, see Guttsman, pp.139-140.
Conclusion

*I long for the old comfort the ‘ever-present help in trouble’, ‘the friend that sticketh closer than a brother’ which supported our mothers and grandmothers thro’ their trials . . .*

Nora Murray Prior in a letter to Rosa Campbell Praed, 16 May 1881.
The Tufnells left Brisbane for England early in 1874. Quite a crowd of friends and well-wishers gathered at the pier to see them off. There was no ‘official’ farewell, as there was to be for his successor. In the past this has been interpreted as Tufnell’s failure in his position as founding bishop of the see. It is too harsh a judgment. There is no doubt that his campaign for denominational education alienated many Protestants, Anglicans included, who objected to his co-operation with the Roman Catholic bishop and resulted in the rise of a much more broadly based civic Protestant hegemony. This was a political, as much as a religious, process and successfully sidelined Roman Catholics as a political force till the rise of organised labour in the 1890s, and perhaps more noticeably during the First World War conscription debate. Anglicanism became a more privatised experience as Anglicans turned more to their own affairs, such as the workings of synod, rather than making much impression on public debate.

Anglicanism is essentially English and the culture of Englishness was cultivated by English bishops and clergy. They were supported in this endeavour by the laity. From the 1850s there was steady immigration into Queensland from England. Mostly working class or petty bourgeois settlers, but with a smattering of professionals and landed gentry, many were Anglicans who, driven by nostalgia and homesickness, wanted to recreate as

---

1 *BC*, 28 February, 11 March 1874.
3 Robin is very negative about Tufnell’s episcopate. It is based on chapter 6 of Rayner’s Ph.D. thesis.
far as possible the religious experiences of home. Church architecture, liturgy and music were derived from the familiar patterns of home. Those active in parish life were as keen to follow new trends in church music or liturgy as they were the latest fashions of London or Paris or the European political news. Although in a settler colony far from England, they were still ‘English’, and part of the ‘English’ church. This was especially manifest in the concern to ensure that the constitution of the Synod of the Diocese should not create a ‘new’ church, but a recognisable ‘branch’ of the mother church in England, tied by bonds of affection and tradition. At the heart of this tradition were the rites and formularies of the church ‘at home’ – the Authorised Version of the Bible, the catechism, Book of Common Prayer, and the thirty-nine articles. It was to be identifiably Protestant, and much concern was expressed both in debate on the constitution of the synod of the diocese and in public controversy about the threat of Tractarianism in weakening those bonds.

There has been a pre-occupation with Tractarianism, Anglo-Catholicism and Evangelicalism in colonial Anglican history which overlooks other Anglican traditions, such as Broad Church and liberal traditions and Low Churchmanship on one hand and High Churchmanship on the other. In a diocese such as Brisbane in its early years, it is hard to estimate numbers representing these tendencies. It is probably fair to describe most of the clergy as High Church with a Tractarian colouring, sympathetic with their bishop, and the laity, as Twopeny did, as mostly Broad Churchmen, with liberal/democratic sympathies reflecting the social composition of the church.  

Received opinion has identified Anglicanism with the governing elite (with some justification) but it overlooks the numerical strength of working class and petty bourgeois Anglicans. Anglicanism in colonial Queensland was both a class-based and gendered
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6 Twopeny, p. 119
experience; both determined who would be involved in parish and diocesan leadership and administration. Parish office-holding provided a venue for upwardly mobile men of bourgeois background to create a niche for themselves in the public sphere. This was sometimes achieved, for example, by the explicit exclusion of working-class parishioners. The failed attempt to confine the franchise for election of members of synod to donors to church funds reflects similar class-based attitudes. Election to membership of synod and the senior lay offices of the diocese (standing committee of synod, registrar, chancellor) were initially, at least, the preserve of the governing elite. At both the parish and diocesan level, women were excluded from office-holding, consistent with current attitudes to women’s place in the public sphere. Women’s responsibilities were largely confined to the domestic sphere as nurturers and educators of their children. Paradoxically, the parish organisation depended on (mostly middle-class) women as fundraisers. Though women were responsible for collecting subscriptions and raising funds through concerts and bazaars, financial management was firmly held in male hands.

The gendered nature of Anglican experience of ‘church’ is most revealingly portrayed by the letters and diaries of women considered in this study. All of the sources used testify to the importance of the socio-economic location of the writers. Blanche Mitchell, Julia Cross and Nora Murray-Prior exhibit varying degrees of frustration with the norms of feminine behaviour demanded of them by society, and all show some irritation with the accepted standards of masculine behaviour. In spite of their disparate social locations, all three experienced in some way the trap of gender and class. Julia Cross’s struggle to make ends meet because of her husband’s drinking; Blanche Mitchell’s

---

7 The registrarship could be held by a clergyman, and there were clerical members of standing committee, but the gendered, class nature of the offices is unchanged by that qualification.
concern to find a husband with wealth enough to keep her and her mother in the manner she desired; and Nora Murray Prior’s volcanic rumblings about the impact of repeated pregnancies on women’s health all bear witness to dissatisfaction with the lot of women in their society and to the cultivation of a seed-bed in which first-wave feminism could grow.

This study reveals some aspects of the gendered nature of spirituality. All of the women’s sources raise the issue of divine providence as an explanatory device when their life situations were hard to understand or resolve. Both Nora Murray Prior and Katie Hume question the hegemony of this ‘explanation’ of the ‘lot of women’. Katie recognises both human agency and natural events cannot be necessarily attributed to divine will, and Nora goes further and suggests that human beings should take far more responsibility for what befalls them rather than explain away misfortune as divine providence. These issues of women’s theological self-understanding provide an access point for further exploration of women’s spirituality. Whereas in this study women’s spirituality was accessed through personal documents, men’s spirituality has been glimpsed through newspaper controversy, and is therefore in a much more public place. The controversies discussed reveal a concern with masculine identity and with the construction of the hegemony of a Protestant civic polity, and the marginalisation of anything redolent of Catholicism.8 In the understanding of some men, Tractarianism was bracketed with Catholicism, and threatened to undermine the Protestant nature of the Church of England. They publicly rejected the theology they believed was expressed in the Salisbury Hymnbook; they rejected any liturgical practice not sanctioned by the Book of Common Prayer or local custom; and they repudiated any political alliance with Roman Catholics, who were perceived as superstitious, effeminate,

subversive and idolatrous. This put Anglicans into a very Protestant space, especially in matters political. Anyone standing for public office had to canvass non-Anglican Protestant for votes, or risk opprobrium if they courted Roman Catholics. This political concern led to the rejection of all state aid for religious purposes by the first parliament.

Anglicans in Queensland had to ‘make do’ for themselves. They found themselves in a quite different demographic, legal and political context in the new colony. The church that came into being could not be a copy of the church ‘back home’ because it had to adapt to the challenges of this new and different climate from its very beginning. It was identifiable with its parent in England. By using the organisational, architectural, and liturgical traditions of the English church, it conserved Anglican heritage in Australia.

What of the Tory High churchmen and their vision for the colonial church? The vision of a partnership between Church and State in social formation in the new settler colony was never realised. The estrangement of the bishop and governor over the issue of education ensured the eventual secularisation of elementary education, and removed a plank from the platform on which High churchmen stood. Their understanding of the role of the church in the education of all the people, not only in the ‘three Rs’, but also in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, could not be implemented. This restricted the role of colonial clergy to an ‘in-house’ one of ministry to those who claimed allegiance to the Church of England. In turn, this moved more power into the hands of the laity than had been the case in England. The tentative debates of the early meetings of synod bear witness to a church finding its way through totally new territory. Even though the colonial church did not retain the advantages of Establishment enjoyed by its parent church, it did experience a kind of spiritual autonomy that the parent church lacked, because of its non-
Established status. The State could not interfere with its internal affairs. The High Churchmen would have applauded Bishop Tufnell’s masterly presidency of the first synod, at which he ensured the passage of the fundamental provisions as part of the Constitution to ensure that the Church of England in Queensland was a ‘branch’ of the church in England and to ensure the continuity of the English Anglican tradition in the colony. In a discussion of the logical positivism of Frederic Harrison, which attracted her, Nora Murray Prior could nevertheless still write:

I long for the old comfort the ‘ever-present help in trouble’, ‘the friend that sticketh closer than a brother’ which supported our mothers and grandmothers thro’ their trials . . .  

The comfort of tradition was a strong element in the cultural baggage of Anglican immigrants and still significant in the character of the present church in Queensland.

The question is what Tufnell’s episcopate achieved, rather than where it may have ‘failed’. There are three marks for assessing the degree of autonomy of a church emerging from a missionary origin; it must be self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. When Tufnell left Brisbane for England, the Church of England in the Diocese of Brisbane was self-supporting. It was not receiving any significant amount of funding from the missionary organisations in England for its ordinary expenditure. It was also self-governing. The creation of synodical government by consensual compact was a signal achievement, and especially remarkable for the unanimity of the decisions of
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9 NMPL, letter number 8, volume 1, 16 May, 1881.
11 At the time there were twenty-two priests serving in the diocese. The diocese received £300 from SPG in 1874. This is the equivalent of one clergyman’s stipend, and was used to fund the work of a travelling ‘missionary’ in the outback; SPG Annual Report for 1874, AJCP, M1446, ANL.
the initial conference convened for the task. It is the third mark of ecclesiastical autonomy that the diocese failed to achieve before Tufnell’s departure. It was not self-propagating. The diocese depended on England for most of its clergy, a fact of concern to Tufnell’s successors, Hale and Webber. The dependence continued, though to a lesser extent, into the 1970s, especially for recruits to the Bush Brotherhoods. Furthermore, the diocese was quite dependent on English assistance for the appointment of bishops till the election of Archbishop Sharp in 1921. On Tufnell’s resignation, the synod failed to ‘elect a successor or delegate the appointment to the church at home’, and the bishops of Australia and Tasmania nominated Bishop Hale of Perth. In Robin’s account of the synod deliberations on the matter, ‘the clergy wished to nominate a candidate from one of their rank already in one of the Australian colonies’, but the laity demonstrated their conservatism and ‘were adamant the appointment should be delegated to the archbishop of Canterbury’.12 The choice of successor of Bishop Hale was delegated to the Archbishop of Canterbury and W.T.T. Webber was consecrated for the see. His successor, Bishop Donaldson, was also chosen by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the same way in 1904.13 The first Australian-born bishop was consecrated 1990 (Peter Hollingworth).14 The first Principals of the diocesan theological college were also English.15 The effect of this was to perpetuate a
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12 Robin, p. 158.
14 Frank Coaldrake was elected to the Archbishopric in July 1970, but died on July 22, before his consecration. There is a qualification of sorts; Melbourne-born Bishop Stretch became co-adjutor bishop of Brisbane in 1895, and later the fourth bishop of Newcastle. Stretch was the first Australian born Anglican bishop. www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A120139b.htm George Merrick Long, consecrated for Bathurst in 1911, was the next. www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A100126b.htm The first Australian born Catholic bishops were William Bernard Kelly, appointed to Geraldton in 1898; John Henry Norton for Port Augusta in 1906; Patrick Dwyer for Maitland in 1909, and his brother Joseph for Wagga in 1919. I am indebted to Father Greg Burke, OCD of Varroville, NSW for this information. For the Dwyers, see www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A080414b.htm
15 St Francis’ College; see Stegemann, pp. 9-16, 20, 26.
strong English influence into the late twentieth century. This Englishness bears witness to
the power and the vision of nineteenth century English High Churchmen.
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Appendix 1.

Location maps.

Map 1
Map 2. The diocese of Brisbane comprised the area of Queensland south of latitude 21°S (Mackay). Northern Queensland was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Sydney.
Map 3. Southeast Queensland, showing main centres mentioned in the text.
Map 4. Brisbane and Ipswich area.
Appendix 2.

Methodology for analysis of Baptismal Registers.

1. *The Data in the Baptismal Registers.*

This analysis draws on data from the baptismal registers held on microfiche by the Anglican Diocese of Brisbane in its archives. The microfiche is of the original handwritten data entered in the registers by the parish clergy, and are available for historical research. The original registers are also held in the archives. Considerable difficulty was faced from time to time in deciphering the handwriting by the minister recording the baptism. After a while some skill was developed in the art of reading these mysteries, and ultimately very few evaded interpretation, and none had to be entirely ignored because of illegibility. To date these records have not been used for any kind of historical analysis apart from gaining information from individual registrations. The information recorded includes the date of baptism; the name and date of birth of the baptised person; the names of the parents of the child; where they were domiciled; the occupation or ‘quality’ of the father; and the signature of the officiating minister. Very rarely the person being baptised was an adult, in which case the name, birthdate, place of domicile, and occupation refer to the person being baptised. Occasionally, the baptism of the child of a single woman was recorded, but rarely is the occupation of the mother in the register. Data concerning single women was included in the analysis on the basis that such a woman was the principal income earner of the family, and as such constituted the head of the family. Relevant information was filed in a simple computer database that allowed for sorting according to surname or occupation of the male parent, and year of the entry. As the name of the baptised person was not needed for the purposes of this study, those names were not entered into the database. The occupational category, as discussed below, was also
included in the database, to provide an additional sorting parameter.

The use of this kind of data to explore facets of colonial life has been limited. Glenda Strachan et al. have used marriage, baptismal, and burial records of the church of England Parish of Dungog for social reconstruction purposes, along with other kinds of sources such as census data, agricultural records and newspapers.¹ In another related study, Strachan has used civil birth registration data which records information about those attending the birth of a child, to discover who assisted at births of non-Aboriginal women in the Dungog District.² I have been unable to locate any other use of Australian colonial parish records in these ways, and neither of the studies just cited refer to other historians making use of such material. Strachan’s use of parish records for social reconstruction purposes and my use of baptismal records to uncover patterns of social stratification of the Anglican community in early Queensland are the only ones.

The data used covers the life of the Moreton Bay District/Queensland up to the end of Bishop Tufnell’s episcopate; that is from the beginning of 1843, with the arrival of the Rev. John Gregor to Brisbane, to the end of 1874, when Bishop Tufnell returned to England permanently. This period began with the proclamation of free settlement for what had been the Moreton Bay penal colony; and covers the first fifteen years of the colony of Queensland, thirty-two years in all. The data analysed comes from four parishes: St John’s, Brisbane; St Paul’s, Ipswich; St Matthew’s Drayton; and St Mark’s, Warwick. The first three are the three oldest parishes in what was to become the colony of Queensland. Warwick became a parish in its own right in 1860, along with Dalby and Toowoomba, on the arrival of Bishop Tufnell and additional clergy for the new Diocese of Brisbane. The raw data comprises 9,307 registrations of the baptism of a child. Each ‘multiple registration’, that is, the baptism of more than one child from a family on one day, was

treated as a single registration. In effect this meant that the father was counted only once for each calendar year.

The data is presented in two main forms. The first approach is to unite the data from each year, for the four parishes, to get some idea of the overall Anglican population in each parish for the period under consideration. The second looks at the year-by-year changes in data for each congregation. Finally the data for the four parishes is united to give an overall picture of the socio-economic profile of the Anglican Church for the entire period, counting each couple only once. (Occasionally a couple does appear in more than one register.)

2. Categorising Occupations.

Analysis of data of the kind discussed here is not easy. The records contain a plethora of different occupations, some of which occur very infrequently. For example, in the Ipswich register there are 205 different occupations listed for 2668 individual entries. It is necessary then, to try to organise the data in a way that both simplifies and clarifies. Much work has already been done on English pollbooks and baptismal records, making the task here much easier. Frank O’Gorman’s discussion of the issues, in the context of the unreformed (pre-1832) electoral system in England, is an example of one approach broadly suited to this study, and for Queensland, Bill Thorpe has established a system of classification of occupations which has contributed to the one followed here (Table 1).  

---


5 This is most accessible in Bill Thorpe, *Colonial Queensland; Perspectives on a Frontier Society*, St Lucia,
Thorpe discusses some of the issues related to categorisation of occupations, but as he was not so concerned with applying the scheme to particular data, no detail of how to fit the occupations into the categories is given. For this I have relied on the listing of occupations by O’Gorman. Any application of such a scheme involves a certain degree of idiosyncrasy. O’Gorman was unsure how to categorise a billiard room keeper and a birdstuffer. I also had a taxidermist, and was faced with lighthouse keepers and a billposter. The unusual occupation is just that, unusual and though which category it falls into may be debated eternally, it will not skew the data noticeably and bears testimony to the eccentricity of some Anglicans and what some people must do to earn a livelihood.

O’Gorman has a grab-all category for agricultural occupations which does not attempt to bring agricultural/pastoral activities into relationship with other industrial groups; in this study I have placed those in what I feel are appropriate categories.

There is a good discussion of the categorisation of occupations by Bradley in his book, *Religion, Revolution and English Radicalism*. His discussion covers the kinds of occupations to be found in English urban contexts for a slightly earlier period than that considered here but unfortunately does not discuss agricultural occupations.\(^6\) In the context of colonial Queensland, Jan Walker discusses class relations within the pastoral industry in her study of Jondaryan Station, and her insights have been used as a guide in this study.\(^7\) The categories are listed in Table 1.

---

\(^6\) Bradley, 1990, appendix 2, pp. 436-446.

Table 1  The class structure of paid occupations, based on W. Thorpe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unskilled labourers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>skilled labourers/artisans/craftsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>rural and urban petty bourgeoisie, including small farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>overseers/foremen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>professions/managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>gentlemen/manufacturers/ ‘big landholders’/merchants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>‘governing’ class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The figures in some parishes are ‘inflated’ by the records of the baptism of Lutheran children by Anglican clergy. From the late 1840s, there was an increasing number of Germans migrating to Queensland. Most were Lutheran, and in the absence of a Lutheran pastor, often brought their children for baptism to the Anglican font. There were many such registrations among the Warwick data, and quite a few for Ipswich and Brisbane. These were deleted from the database where they could be identified readily.

Unfortunately, some clergymen anglicised German names, and so Schmidt became Smith, Schumacher became Shoemaker, and Batterfeld became Butterfield. Generally this anglicisation extended to given names as well. For example, Heinrich, Wilhelm and Carl became Henry, William and Charles, respectively. This anglicisation can usually be identified by comparing the registrations of different clergy, working in the same parish, across the years. Sometimes in the Ipswich registers, the ethnic identity was given along
with the occupation, such as ‘German labourer’. There were a few occasions where additional local information led to such data being retained with the Anglican registrations where a German man had married an Anglican woman and effectively became an Anglican himself. An example is the case of Fred and Grace Bracker, whose children were baptised at Warwick.

4. Other Ethnic Groups.

The ineffectiveness of the Anglican Church to reach the Aboriginal population of the colony is evident. No baptisms were recorded. Significantly there are a few registrations of the children of white stockmen and sailors who had taken Aboriginal wives, otherwise Aboriginal people are invisible. There are some registrations of the baptism of Chinese men working as shepherds or labourers, and of the children of Chinese men who had married Anglican women. These latter men had small businesses, such as running a bakery, a boarding house, a store or a market garden.

5. Weaknesses in the Methodology.

There are some obvious weaknesses this methodology. Not all Anglicans were married; and not all married Anglicans had children. Presumably some Anglicans with children did not have their children baptised. Perhaps some Anglicans came to the colony after their child-rearing had been completed. In fact the data treated here refers only to those who brought children to the Anglican font for baptism. Another problem is that of nominalism. In England, Ireland and Wales, where the Church of England was the Established Church, everyone in the community had de facto access to the church and to its pastoral services for baptisms, marriages and funerals. The church was obliged to be

---

8 The Reverend John Mosely was one who noted German ethnicity. At one stage he provided German language worship for the German people around Ipswich; NA, February 22, 1859. The Rev Benjamin Glennie spoke German, Italian and French, enabling him to minister to Germans on the Darling Downs. The St. John’s schoolroom in Brisbane was used by Lutherans for worship in 1861; BC, January 10, 1861.
there for the whole community, not just its active members – in a sense it was the ‘official’ church. In spite of the fact that the church was not ‘Established’ in the colonies, people would still expect the church to fulfil those obligations. How many of those who brought their children for baptism were active Anglicans is impossible to determine. However, the Anglican Church did accept those obligations, and it can be claimed that Anglicans were those to whom the Anglican Church ministered, and all those who brought children for baptism, or were married or buried with Anglican rites should be treated as Anglicans. By doing so, there was a voluntary affiliation to the Anglican Church. This is certainly a different standard to say Methodism, where the test of membership may have been participation in a ‘class’, or the Baptist or Congregationalist Churches where one’s name was on a membership roll. In spite of these weaknesses, there is value in the analysis, as there is no other more complete set of data to work with. Anglicans records do not retain membership or parish rolls with data concerning occupation from which to work. However, the results are more than just indicative, and do give some genuine insight into the socio-economic stratification of the Anglican community.

**Occupational Categories**

Category 1 is that of unskilled workers. These were people who lived primarily from the sale of their own labour, and ‘who had no or minimal control over the labour power of others, or the physical means of production, investments or the accumulation process’.

---

9 The argument has recently been put to me in these terms by two Anglican priests currently serving in the diocese of Brisbane.


11 Thorpe, p. 146.
shepherds, fencers), domestic servants, navvies, seamen (including ferrymen and stewards), miners, timber workers (including sawyers), transport workers (horse drivers, bullockies, draymen), railway workers, quarrymen (and stonecutters) and wharf labourers. They were all wage-earners (as distinct from salaried workers), and Thorpe makes the point that their employment was often irregular and precarious. There are anomalous cases. Brick-makers have been treated as unskilled labourers (category 1); in fact in the Ipswich register, some men are sometimes registered as brick makers and sometimes as labourers. This contemporary perception probably needs to be taken seriously. Likewise stonecutters and quarrymen are treated as unskilled labourers in contrast to masons, who are in the category of skilled labourers. Thorpe puts up a good argument to consider stockmen as unskilled labour, a suggestion followed here.

Category 2 is for skilled workers. These were craftsmen or artisans who are still labourers in the sense that they sold their own labour, and may in fact have worked from some kind of artisanal workshop, but were not necessarily retailers of goods. In colonial Queensland it included leatherworkers (saddlers, harness makers, whip-makers), building trades (shinglers, slaters, bricklayers, carpenters, joiners, cabinet makers, masons, painters, paperhangers, glaziers, plumbers), the food trades (butchers, bakers, cooks, biscuit bakers, pastry cooks), and others with particular skills (horse breakers, carriage makers, wheelwrights, blacksmiths, vinedressers). Some skilled occupations fall on the boundary of being petite bourgeoisie. Whereas a baker is a skilled occupation (category 2), the retail baker, employing other bakers and operating from his own premises is really bourgeois, and is in category 3 along with other retailers. In this study only bakers known to have a retail business are included in category 3. Butchers are treated in a similar manner.

---


13 Pugh gives the same figure for the wages of stockmen and shepherds, bearing out Thorpe’s argument. T. Pugh, Pugh’s Almanac, Brisbane, Pugh, 1861, p.160; Thorpe, p.142.

14This judgement was made on the basis of newspaper articles and advertisements; from business directories
Jewellers and confectioners are treated as retailers, as they were usually ‘shopkeepers’. Another anomalous occupation is that of carrier. Thorpe’s perception of carriers suggests that they should be in category 3; he makes the observation that they were sometimes farmers who had a cartage business on the side. I agree with this assessment; a couple of baptismal entries are for ‘farmer and carrier’. A carrier had to have a reasonable amount of capital to establish his business; maintaining a cart, dray or other vehicle and the appropriate tack; draft horses or bullocks to pull it; and paddocks for his animals. At this stage of Queensland’s history, even with the advent of the railway, there was a lot of business carting wool and other primary produce to the nearest railhead or port.

*Pugh’s Almanac* for 1861 gives a guide to the wages of skilled and unskilled workers. Day labourers received five to six shillings a day (£1/10/- to £1/16/- for a six-day week). Farm labourers, stockmen and shepherds could earn £30-40 a year with rations. (Walker and Trollope give similar figures. Bullock drivers and gardeners could earn a little more (£35-45). Servants were not well paid; men receiving £30-35; boys, £10-20; and maids, £16-25 a year. Women’s work was not nearly so well paid. The *Statistics of Queensland, 1867*, gives some idea of their levels of women’s pay. Cooks could earn £25-30 a year; laundresses and general servants received £20-26; farmhouse servants, £20-25; and housemaids and dairywomen, £20. Nursemaids only received £13-15.

*Pugh’s Almanac*, pp. 160-161. Trollope’s figure of 15/- a week is the equivalent of £39 a year. Trollope’s figure for gardeners and grooms, 20/- a week with rations, is slightly higher than Pugh’s figure for gardeners.

These figures include board and lodging. Trollope noted: ‘Maidservants in the towns are paid 10s a week - being hired almost invariably for the short term, and not, as with us, by the month’, a contemporary testimony to the insecurity of unskilled labour.

Skilled workers not receiving board or rations earned rather more. Bricklayers, blacksmiths and wheelwrights earned ten to eleven shillings a day; masons and stonemasons got ten to twelve shillings a day; plasterers, painters, coopers and saddlers could expect to get 8/- to 10/- a day; and carpenters, joiners and upholsterers, earned eight to twelve shillings a day. At a later date, Trollope had masons and carpenters earning rather less, 6/- to 7/6; miners at Gympie were getting £3 a week.\(^{21}\)

Unskilled or semi-skilled workers paid by the state occupy an anomalous position somewhere between categories 1 and 2. They are not very numerous in this period in the baptismal registers. Letter-sorters and letter-carriers (working in the postal service), policemen, messengers (in the government offices), and railway guards and porters all received about £100 per year. Labourers in the Botanic Gardens were quite well paid at £84 pa.\(^{22}\)

Thorpe discusses wages extensively, noting that the suggestion that wages for the labouring classes in Australia were substantially better than in England is probably a myth created by those marketing Australia as a potential home for British migrants.\(^{23}\) There were periods when shortage of a particular kind of labour forced wages up, as in Townsville in the 1880s, when building workers could earn £4 a week.\(^{24}\) Likewise there were periods of acute hardship as in the late 1860s, when the depression put many out of work.\(^{25}\)

\(^{21}\)Ibid, pp. 80, 26.

\(^{22}\)Civil List in Table VIII, pp. 25-50, Statistics of Queensland, see note 16, above; henceforth, Civil List.


\(^{24}\)Thorpe, pp. 170-183.

\(^{25}\)Thorpe, pp. 174, 181.
Category 3 comprises the petty bourgeoisie (urban and rural) of Thorpe; I have included here all retailers, such as drapers, grocers, fruitiers, booksellers, music sellers, ironmongers, nurserymen, seedsmen, butchers, bakers and confectioners, jewellers and tobacconists. The urban petty bourgeoisie also includes schoolteachers, clerks of all kinds (bank, merchant’s, lawyer’s, railway, public service, book-keepers), inspectors (scab, railway, seals, roads), publicans (innkeepers, lodging-house and boarding-house keepers), and small farmers (agriculturists, dairy farmers). In categorising occupations in this way, small farmers or selectors are treated in much the same way as shopkeepers and master craftsmen who were property-holders, and as such were in the business of accumulating capital. Crossick and Haupt make the observation that the petty bourgeoisie is distinguished by ‘the fact that its livelihood was derived from the use of both its own capital and its own labour’. This sets them apart from the labouring classes described in categories 1 and 2, and justifies the categorisation of small-farmers and retailers in the same category. The category also includes salaried occupations such as schoolteachers, clerks and inspectors, who were marginally more financially secure than the labouring classes.

Some idea of salaries of these workers can be gleaned from the Civil List of 1866. Class V clerks could earn £100-200; class IV clerks to £280; and senior clerical staff over £300, according to seniority. For example the chief clerk in the Customs Service received £450 pa; his second in charge was on £375. There were four Class III clerks in the Office of the Treasury receiving £350-375. Inspectors of sheep and cattle categorised here, received £100-200 a year. The salaries of schoolteachers are to be found in the regulations governing Queensland’s Primary Schools. Masters received from £100-200, and Mistresses from £80-170, according to their classification. Assistant teachers received

---

26Crossick & Haupt, p. 9.
27See discussion by Crossick & Haupt, p. 5.
28Civil List, pp. 25-50.
£100-150 (men) and £65-100 (women). Pupil teachers earned £30-60 (men), and £20-40 (women), depending on the number of years in training.\(^\text{29}\) Again, there is a noticeable gender bias against women in their rates of pay.

Thorpe’s Category 4 is an anomalous one, and in it I have placed occupations which are somewhere between the petty bourgeoisie and management categories, especially that pastoral phenomenon, the overseer.\(^\text{30}\) On sheep stations he had the role of supervising the shepherds and lambers. It was an important function in the operation of a sheep property, where the increase in flock numbers was critical. The overseer reported directly to the manager. The task of the principal overseer was something like middle management and he was responsible for all stockwork and all outstations, each of which had an overseer in charge. Walker, who described the duties of overseers on Jondaryan Station, noted that Winks, an overseer for William Kent from 1858 to 1873, received a salary of £100 initially, rising to £220 a year. Overseers at the Codrington and Bear outstations received £45-50 in 1858-9 and £80 in 1863-64.\(^\text{31}\) Because it is numerically small, category 4 has been combined with category 3 (with which it is most closely associated) in the graphs.

Category 5 comprises the ‘professions’ of the church, the law, and the armed services. It also includes management positions in which men ‘in private industry and the state apparatus . . . possessed executive powers which derived primarily from authority relations’; ‘managers and supervisors who are remunerated for their function as managers and supervisors’.\(^\text{32}\) In particular, people such as bank managers and mine managers have been placed in this category. It isn’t so easy to put a figure on the income of professional and managerial salaries. The income of professionals such as doctors and lawyers is difficult to assess, but again, the *Civil List* can give us some kind of a guide for some

\(^{29}\) QSA, EXE/E2, 60/58, regulations 22-25.
\(^{30}\) Thorpe, p. 144.
\(^{31}\) Walker, p. 76.
\(^{32}\) Thorpe, p. 150.
occupations. Kearsey Cannan, surgeon-superintendent of the Woogaroo lunatic asylum, was on an annual salary of £500. The roads engineers Robert Austin and Frederick Byerly had an annual salary of £600; as did the colonial architect, Charles Tiffin, who designed the Anglican Church at Grovely, and the Government Printer, W.C. Belbridge.

Accountants did not receive quite as much; F.O. Bryant, in the Auditor-General’s office, was on £450, and the accountant in the office of the Commissioner of Railways received £400. The Rev. J.R. Moffatt, an Anglican clergyman and the Parliamentary Librarian, and the two parliamentary shorthand writers received £300 a year. Bishop Tufnell’s policy was that clergymen should receive £300 a year, plus a house. In some rural areas, such as Warwick and Drayton, that may have been augmented by a glebe, on which a clergyman could grow vegetables, fruit and horse fodder.

Category 6 comprises the principal accumulators of capital: merchants, proprietors of large businesses, manufacturers, mine-owners, squatters (sheep-farmers, graziers), planters, station managers, and ‘gentlemen’; gentlemen being men of leisure who lived off the earnings of their investments. It is interesting to note that several clergymen eschewed the use of the term ‘squatter’, in favour of ‘sheep-farmer’. With Thorpe and in the light of Walker’s discussion of the relationships of squatters to their station managers, the latter are included in this category.33

The pastoral industry was a key opportunity for capital accumulation. Both Waterson and Walker provide evidence for the kind of money to be made. Walker states that the Jondaryan operation of Kent and Weinholt produced a profit of £80,000 in three years during the sixties, mainly by the sale of sheep into the Victorian market during the gold boom.34 By 1864 these same squatters sold the Rosalie and Cooyar runs for £70,000. In the light of workingmen’s wages these were enormous sums of money in the mid-

---

33Walker, p. 75. Walker discusses the relationships between various groups and occupations throughout this excellent study. See also, Thorpe, p.144.
34Walker, pp. 58, 104.
1800s. The profits and losses on the St Ruth and Rosenthal runs were quite variable and depended on the season, but in 1875, there was a profit of £15,316, and in 1887 a profit of £18,256.\textsuperscript{35}

For urban capitalists, capital accumulation was frequently achieved by the acquisition of real estate. An excellent example is afforded by the career of Patrick Mayne, documented in a lively manner by Rosamond Siemon.\textsuperscript{36} In the mid 1840s he started as a butcher at Campbell’s Boiling-down Works at Kangaroo Point. He then established himself as a retail butcher, probably using illegally acquired capital.\textsuperscript{37} Mayne invested his profits from this business carefully. By 1858, he was receiving rents from two hotels, shops, houses, farmland, and the hire of his stockyard to the auctioneer, R. Davidson.\textsuperscript{38} When Mayne died, his widow managed the estate with the advice of George Raff and later John Petrie. She was a competent manager, especially as she steered her way carefully through the financial problems of the late 1860s. Her financial problems shed light on the way others made their money. In 1869, she mortgaged some of her property to pay off outstanding debt. It was Bishop Tufnell (a representative of category 7, the governing class) who came to the rescue with £4,000 at a very generous 3.75% interest.\textsuperscript{39} One of the criteria for selecting colonial bishops was the extent of their private income, so that if necessary, they could ‘live of their own’ if the colonials did not provide an adequate salary. In the early years of his episcopate, this is what Tufnell did, using income from the See Endowment Fund for general purposes, rather than for his episcopal salary. While in England in 1865-7, Tufnell arranged a loan of £10,000 from his elder brother and a cousin to invest in mortgages in Brisbane, of which the mortgage provided

\textsuperscript{35}Waterson, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{36}Rosamond Siemon, The Mayne Inheritance, St Lucia, UQP, 1997.
\textsuperscript{37}The claim that he murdered and a robbed a man is debatable. He allegedly confessed to the murder on his death-bed.
\textsuperscript{38}Siemon, pp. 50-52, 70.
\textsuperscript{39}Siemon, p. 125.
to Mrs. Mayne, represented a significant part.\textsuperscript{40} It was a lucrative business for those with money to invest. Tufnell also invested heavily in urban real estate, provoking the indignation of the Governor, Sir George Bowen.\textsuperscript{41} These examples taken from the pastoral industry and the urban capitalists are probably representative of the colonial ‘gentry’, the ‘big’ bourgeoisie.

In category 7 are the politicians and principal public servants of the colony, the bishop, the governor, and members of cabinet. Besides the income from their pastoral activities, businesses or investments, some received a good income from the Civil List. The Governor (of whose private income I have no detail) received £4,000 a year; the ministers of the Crown were on £1,000 pa; and the two chief judges (Cockle and Lutwyche) received £2,000. Unfortunately for the Bishop, he was not paid from the Civil List, as State aid for religious purposes was enthusiastically abolished just before he arrived in the colony.

Category 8 contains occupations I found impossible to categorise, and those whose occupations were not given in the registers.

\textsuperscript{40} There is record of this in the family archives at Langleys, Great Waltham, Essex; of which I have a photocopy.

\textsuperscript{41} Bowen to Cardwell, private despatch, 18 December, 1864, p. 9. CO234/11; AJCP, reel no 1912, ANL. Bowen quoted the Archbishop’s Agent as having said that ‘the Bishop of Brisbane will soon be as rich as the Archbishop of Canterbury’.
Appendix 3.

Categorisation of Occupations.

**CATEGORY 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundary rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bushman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camp sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>club waiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cokeburner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘gasworks’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husbandman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter carrier/-sorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mariner/seaman/sailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miner/coal-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘on steamer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paddock keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police constable/sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railway guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railway labourer/worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘sawmill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servant/general-/farm-/gent’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shingle splitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steward/house-storeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vanman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wardsman/hospital-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water policeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billposter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brick-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>club servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ferryman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaol warder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lighterman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mineworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcels delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puntman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railway porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>railway storeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sawyer/hill-/circular-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slop cutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stockman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timber cutter/-getter/-splitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiter/hotel-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warehouseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waterman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yardman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boatman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullock driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabman/drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chimney sweep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coachman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dairyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engine cleaner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fireman/rail-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horse driver/-man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labourer/general/farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lime burner/-worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messenger; govt.-/PO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navvy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>packer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarryman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rail messenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mail driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>splitter/&amp; fencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stonecutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storekeeper’s assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biscuit baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boiler maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheese maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clock maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engine driver/man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glazier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harness maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house decorator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machinist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oven maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piano tuner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plate layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rope maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ship’s carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sugar boiler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vinedresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wellsinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whitesmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woolstapler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aide-de-camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articled clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(retail) butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cab proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpet salesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chief/principal turnkey clerk (various)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotton farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dairy farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emigration agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspector of rolling stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lodging-house keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scab inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ship’s chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stock-keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tidewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undertaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing clerk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>farm overseer</td>
<td>government overseer</td>
<td>head turnkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master mariner</td>
<td>overseer</td>
<td>quarantine station supert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreman</td>
<td>railway supervisor</td>
<td>sheep overseer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accountant</td>
<td>architect</td>
<td>associate to chief justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attorney</td>
<td>bank manager</td>
<td>barrister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military captain</td>
<td>chief constable</td>
<td>civil/roads engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergyman</td>
<td>deputy registrar</td>
<td>deputy surveyor-general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctor/physician/surgeon</td>
<td>engineer</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mine manager</td>
<td>naval officer</td>
<td>naturalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registrar of supreme court</td>
<td>solicitor</td>
<td>surveyor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>banker</td>
<td>boot manufacturer</td>
<td>brass-founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broker ‘&amp;c’</td>
<td>cordial manufacturer</td>
<td>editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>ginger beer manufacturer</td>
<td>government printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>iron founder</td>
<td>grazier manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheep farmer/squatter</td>
<td>planter/sugar-</td>
<td>‘settler’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station supervisor</td>
<td>sodawater manufacturer</td>
<td>station manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wharfinger</td>
<td>stockholder</td>
<td>timber merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ass. commissary general</td>
<td>attorney general</td>
<td>barrister/MLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bishop</td>
<td>chief justice</td>
<td>treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government resident</td>
<td>police commissioner</td>
<td>crown solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deputy registrar general</td>
<td>gentleman/MLA</td>
<td>governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grazier/MLA</td>
<td>metropolitan judge</td>
<td>MLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC</td>
<td>postmaster general</td>
<td>secretary of treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solicitor/MLA</td>
<td>squatter/MLA</td>
<td>undersecretary of works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undersecretary (treasury)</td>
<td>under colonial treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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