

11

LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA

BISHOP NIXON AND CONFLICTS WITHIN
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN TASMANIA.

IN THE 1850s.

NEIL BATT.

Dissertation submitted in part requirement for
the degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honours in
History in the University of Tasmania.

1962.

SYNOPSIS.

Francis Russell Nixon had a troubled period of office while Bishop of Tasmania (1842-62). In part this was due to his own vision for the church and his uncompromising character. Many of his problems were, however, caused and aggravated by the difficulty of transferring English institutions to colonial soil.

The assumption of government control over chaplains, the vague legal position of the Church and the radicalism of the settlers caused him much concern.

The major conflict in his episcopate was one which is always latent in the Anglican church, the struggle between High and low Anglicans. This was sparked off because of the Sydney Conference of Bishops in 1850, drew many of the strands of earlier conflicts into its orbit, was allowed to grow because of the legal difficulties and radicalism inherent in a colonial diocese, and was nurtured by the Bishop's most vigorous opponent, H. P. Fry. Conflict followed conflict as the Bishop sought to create a satisfactory organisation for the church. Compromise was finally reached, but not before the church itself had suffered.

I. EARLY TROUBLES.

Francis Russell Nixon was born in 1803 into a clerical and intellectual family; his father, the Reverend Robert Nixon D. D. of Kent, was a fellow of the Royal Society. Nixon was educated at the Merchant Taylor's School and at St. John's College, Oxford, graduating in 1827. After serving as Chaplain to the Embassy at Naples, he was appointed one of the Six Preachers at Canterbury Cathedral, and Chaplain to the Archbishop. He held the Parish of Sandgate and the perpetual curacy of Ash next Sandwich. In 1842 he was appointed Bishop of Tasmania by Letters Patent from Her Majesty Queen Victoria; a fitting choice to meet the difficulties of a colonial Diocese.

Nixon was forceful, cultured and eloquent, A character sketch, written in 1847, described him as

rather a remarkable man, both in appearance and character, good looking, coal-black hair clustering in thick curls on a round head, piercing black eyes, and full, rather thick lips; tenacious of his rights, extremely anxious to be correct with regard to

costume and all other points of etiquette, devoted to the fine arts and a beautiful draughtsman. ¹

Nixon arrived in the colony in July, 1843.

He came to an island with an area of 26,000 miles and a population of 57,420.² Since little more than 5,000 square miles were effectively settled³ this made the population more accessible than would at first appear. Yet the twenty three clergymen⁴ he had to serve what was still a dispersed population were inadequate, and the seven more he obtained⁵ still left him short of trained men, though by comparative English standards he was not badly placed.⁶ The high proportion of convicts in the population, 20,332 of them actually serving sentence⁷ did however call for a concentration of trained men especially

-
1. N. Nixon: Pioneer Bishop in Van Diemen's Land 1843-63 p.
 2. Statistical Account of Van Diemen's Land compiled by Hugh M. Hull, Tasmania 1856.
 3. John Barrett: Religious Provision in Australia. p.21
 4. Civil Establishment of Van Diemen's Land for year 1842, CS
 5. History of Church of England in Tasmania: W.R.Barrett p.8
 6. John Barrett: Religious Provision in Australia. p.2
 7. Statistical Account of Van Diemen's Land compiled by Hugh M. Hull, Tasmania 1856.

since early nineteenth century Anglicans tended to regard the whole population as theirs by right and responsibility.

Nixon had left England at the time when the Oxford Movement was drawing to its climax with Newman's conversion to Rome in 1845. This movement had far-reaching effects on the Church of England, arousing the hostility of the Evangelicals and creating a deep division within the Church. The Tractarians emphasised the catholic, sacramental and priestly aspect of the English Church inherited through an Episcopate which derived its authority unbroken from the Apostles. They rested their faith upon the Bible, and upon the existence and authority of the Church. With their emphasis upon the priesthood, the Tractarians were reluctant to allow the laity any influence on Church doctrine. Although claiming the same title of Catholic, they were hostile to Roman pretensions, but disclaimed the titles of Protestant or Dissenter. By contrast, the Evangelicals did accept these titles and saw the Church of England as created by the Reformation; they placed little emphasis on the Church, and believed the Bible to

embody all revealed truth. Unlike the Tractarians, they held that the priest was merely a minister of the congregation and that direct communion with God was not limited by priest or rite. Dislike of priestly domination made them eager to give lay members an important influence in the Church. After Newman's conversion and its emulation by many of his followers, the Evangelicals were especially fearful of Rome and of any emphasis on High Church doctrine or ceremony.

Nixon's background made him sympathetic to the Tractarians. In Lectures, Historical, Doctrinal and Practical on the Catechism of the Church of England, published in 1843, he had emphasised the episcopal and catholic character of the English Church. In his Primary Charge to the clergy of Van Diemen's Land, delivered in St. David's Cathedral in April 1846, he stressed the necessity to keep "even pace with the extraordinary energy that has latterly marked the efforts of the Church at home," ¹ and pleaded for "that revived attention to the too long dropped usages of a strictly Catholic character which has recently distinguished it." ²

1. Primary Charge May 1846. p.12

2. Ibid.

However, Nixon opposed Romanizing practices. He was never fully committed to the Tractariaas, or entirely antagonistic to Evangelicals. At heart he was always a high churchman who saw the Catholic Church of England in her grandeur and tradition divided within and attacked from without. To meet the challenges he sought to keep the Church true to the faith as laid down by the English Fathers, staunch against compromise. His fighting creed was that

soundness in the faith with regard to the Sacraments of Christ is a probation against Romanism on the one hand and Puritanism on the other. ¹

Nixon was unfortunate in his superiors. At Canterbury the High Churchman, Dr Howley (Archbishop of Canterbury 1828 - 1848), who opposed Catholic Emancipation, had been followed by J. B. Sumner. Sumner was an Evangelical whose status and opinions gave weight to the cause during his episcopate. Likewise in Australia, W. G. Broughton, appointed first Bishop of Australia in 1836, and a friend and supporter of Nixon, was followed in 1854, by F. Barker. Barker was an Evangelical whose appointment as metropolitan gave support to the evangelicals in Australia and made

it difficult for Nixon to maintain his position.

The Tasmanian See presented a challenge to Nixon with its unhappy convict legacies. In 1843 he told the Leeds District Association of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel of the moral depravity and spiritual degradation of the Australian colonies.¹ He could well echo the comment of W. G. Broughton

the question now at issue is really a very great one; no less than whether pure Christianity shall flourish or not over a sixth part of the inhabitable world.²

To Nixon this great question could only be solved by the cessation of transportation and by the influence of the Church through her educational and spiritual offices. Yet the abolition of transportation proved simple compared with the complexity of many Church problems.

1. Speech of the Lord Bishop of Tasmania at the Annual Meeting of the Leeds District Association of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 28 November, 1842. (Leeds 1843)
2. Letter to E. Coleridge; M. Roe: "Society and Thought in Eastern Australia, 1835-51," Doctoral Thesis, Australian National University, p. 6.

The attempt to reproduce in Australia the ascendancy of the Anglican Church in England had failed by the time Nixon arrived. Though Anglicans could claim the highest statistical proportion of adherents, their majority was not decisive,¹ and in the new colony the challenge to establishment was more effective than in England. The Church and Schools Corporation, an attempt to endow the Anglican Church, was dissolved in 1833 and the Tasmanian Church Act of 1837 (1 Vict no.16) assisted Roman Catholics and Presbyterians as well as Anglicans on the basis of numbers, not of privilege. Similarly the education system which had been almost exclusively controlled by the Anglicans until 1838 was replaced in that year by the British and Foreign system, based on union of all sects.²

Shocked by these invasions, Nixon wanted to reassert what he considered to be the rightful ascendancy of the Church of England. Even Lieutenant Governor Sir Eardley Eardley Wilmot

1. John Barrett: Religious Provision in Australia.
2. Ibid.

was impressed, though unconvinced; he reported to Downing Street in 1843:

I believe the Bishop of Tasmania to be conscientious, sincere and a zealous Christian and to have the good of the colony, and its inhabitants at heart, but His Lordship is not aware of the relative position in which the Church of England stands as to the churches of different creeds, and that it does not rest on the same foundations of power and pre-eminence as it does at home. ¹

Undeterred, Nixon sought to impose on the colony the machinery of an established Church. To defend Church Schools he organised opposition to the government education scheme, and to strengthen his legal powers, he pressed for a Consistorial Court ² (a right given him by his Letters Patent) and a seat in the Legislature, ³ as well as the one he held by right on the Executive Council. But the inveterate opposition of Evangelicals and Dissenters was too strong. ⁴ Nixon was accused of attempting to

1. G O 25 11 p.22. 4 November 1843.

2. Nixon letter to Governor. March 10, 1846 (M.L.microfilm)

3. G O 33 (outward despatches) Vol.46 no.27 p.808
Nov.17, 1843.

4. C S O 11 vol.222 October 12, 1846

establish clerical dominance.¹ His Letters Patent were amended by the Home Government, omitting his power to set up a court, he failed to alter the educational system, and even his right to a seat in the Council was challenged by the Presbyterians.

Another serious problem for Nixon was the control of his clergy. With no Consistorial Court he could not try ecclesiastical offences. This was important, for Nixon not only wanted to emphasise the episcopal nature of the Church and the position of the Bishop; he also had to prevent lapses from professional conduct,² and to create in the diocese a Church faithful to the letter and law of the Anglican Communion. He was well aware of the "considerable disadvantages as a consequence of the absence for so many years of effectual resident Episcopal supervision."³ Some of the clergy had been in the colony for a long time before his appointment and had

1. Examiner Editorial November 25, 1843 and Murray's Review. December 1, 1843.

2. Nixon letter to Governor. June 14, 1849 (M.L.microfilm)

3. Primary Charge 1846, p.9

learnt to relish their freedom.¹ Some had become lax, others independent in doctrine and procedure.² The Bishop's firm hand was resented, especially when he emphasised High Church attitudes.

One leading cleric who repudiated Nixon's control was Dr William Bedford. He had been in the colony since 1823 and was the incumbent of St David's, which had been made a cathedral church on the elevation of Tasmania to a See. Three times he refused to present his commission to the Bishop for inspection, and he continued to deny the Bishop's right to use the Cathedral for his Lent lectures in 1845, until brought to heel by the Bishop's ultimatum.³

A further complication in the control of the clergy was the government's power to pay colonial clergy, and particularly the convict chaplains over whom it claimed absolute control. Nixon resented

1. Courier, September 25, 1844 p.3

2. Tasmanian Church Chronicle, November 1, 1853

3. C S O 8. vol. 181 3082, April 19, 1845

this usurpation of his episcopal rights and came into conflict with the Governor, Sir Eardly Eardly-Wilmot.¹ Fierce in his desire to control the Church and stern in conflict, he did not shrink from attacking the moral character of Wilmot in letters to England. The Governor was recalled by W. E. Gladstone (Secretary of State for the Colonies) partly because of the imputations.²

Another challenge to his episcopal authority came from the Roman Catholics, who, taking advantage of the greater freedom in the Australian colonies, established their hierarchy in 1842, eight years before doing so in England. When R. W. Willson arrived as Bishop of Hobart Town in 1844 Nixon protested both to the local and home authorities at the effrontery of the title, maintaining that

I have no choice...I must either break my oath, violate the laws which I have sworn to obey, abandon the real position to which the sovereign has appointed me, or else protest against the establishment and occupancy of another see within my own diocese.³

1. C S O 11 Vol 221 638 September 2, 1846. See also Nixon's private letter to Wilmot March 6, 1846. (M.L. micro)

2. M. Roe; "Society and Thought in Eastern Australia, 1835-51", Doctoral thesis, Australian National University, pp. 22-3

But his protests were unsuccessful and he was reduced to a solemn reading of his formal protest, which was then placed on the altar of the Cathedral.

These perennial conflicts and disappointments used up much of his time and robbed him of support and friendship. Yet he persisted in struggling with his difficulties, found money from England to establish denominational schools, and sought to control his clergy, even when his authority to dismiss a clergyman was challenged in the Supreme Court.¹ Every problem made him increasingly aware of the need for the legal organisation of the Anglican Church in the colony. With relief, therefore, Nixon found himself among like-minded peers at the Sydney Conference called by Broughton in 1850. The Conference provided him and the other Bishops with the opportunity of publicly stating their opinions, of working towards a smoother organisation of the Church, and of supporting one another in the difficult colonial situation. But the Conference did not fulfil Nixon's hopes. Instead the publication of the Conference Minutes began a longer and harsher conflict than he had yet encountered.

1. C S O Vol. 11 No.7 August 20, 1845.

II GROUNDWORK FOR THE MAJOR CONFLICT

The Conference of October 1850, attended by the six Bishops of Australasia, met to;

consult together upon the various difficulties in which we are at present placed by the doubtful application to the Church in this Province of the Ecclesiastical Laws, which are now in force in England; and to suggest such measures as may seem to be most suitable for removing our present embarrassments; to consider such questions as affect the progress of religion, and the preservation of Ecclesiastical order in the several Dioceses of this Province. ¹

Their suggested solution to the legal problem was the creation of Diocesan and Provincial Synods to establish rules and organisation for the Church in Australia.

They defined a Synod as a body composed of one or more Bishops, with representatives chosen from among the clergy. The laity were to meet in separate conventions, but only to decide, with the assistance of the clergy, upon questions affecting the temporalities of the Church.

In considering "such questions as effect the progress of true religion" ² the Bishops dwelt on baptism. There was much agitation throughout the Church of England

1. Minutes of Proceedings of a Meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops of the Province of Australasia, held in Sydney October 1, A.D. 1850. Section I; Objects of the Conference.

2. Ibid.

on this subject after March 1850, when the Privy Council delivered the Gorham judgment. The decision that "a clergyman of the Church of England need not believe in baptismal regeneration".¹ was approved by the Evangelicals and happily accepted. The High Churchmen objected both to the decision and to the overruling of the Church Court by the Privy Council. The concept of a Church State had been damaged by the admission of Dissenters into Parliament and the High Churchmen, aware of the intellectual challenge of Rome, saw that the Church's acceptance of this judgment was Erastian.

Most of the Bishops gathered at Sydney were in opposition to the judgment. Even the minority opinion given by Charles Perry, (Bishop of Melbourne 1847 - 1876), was not in outright disagreement with their statement that:

regeneration is the work of God in the Sacrament of Baptism by which infants baptised with water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, die unto sin, and rise again unto righteousness,

1. Gorham v. The Bishop of Exeter.
Moore's Special Report, (Gorham Case)

and are made members of Christ, children of God and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. 1

The Conference reflected the predominantly High Church character of the Australian Bishops. The publication of their Minutes caused concern both in England and the colonies. There was opposition from the Evangelicals to the opinions on baptism and the organisation of Synod. The desire to exclude the laity from participation in important Church affairs was particularly galling as the Minutes were sent to the Bishops and Archbishops of England and could have influenced legislation on the organisation of the colonial Church. Even moderate churchmen could see it as an attempt to force an arbitrary clerical domination on the Church without reference to either the clergy or the members. Those in opposition gained support from non-Anglicans. The exclusion of the laity ran counter to the colonial dislike of authority. The Minutes thus sparked off a conflict between High and Low Church which was always latent in the Anglican Church.

-
1. Minutes of Proceedings of a Meeting of the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops of the Province of Australasia, held in Sydney October 1, A.D. 1850 Section 8.

The Tasmanian See might have escaped with a brief minor eruption but for the influence of Henry Phipps Fry, colonial chaplain and rector from 1839 to 1858 of St Georges, one of Hobart's most important parish churches. Until he left for England in 1848, Fry had been more inclined towards Tractarianism than had Nixon. He had published Thoughts on the Apostolic Ministry and Tradition, (1843) which was strongly Tractarian in flavour, and had edited the Herald of Tasmania, an ultra-Anglo-Catholic paper. In 1847 the Britannia, another Hobart journal, criticised the Puseyite practices and appointments at St George's, and concluded a news item on Fry with "Why does not the Reverend Gentleman be religiously honest, and turn Catholic at once." ¹ The parson was on good terms with the Bishop, who spoke highly of his ministry ² and assisted him to get leave in 1848.

Fry was an odd character. An extremist by nature, he often seemed to be carried away by the force of his own oratory, considering that disagreement came

1. Britannia, January 7, 1847.

2. C S O 26 2582, 1848

from a fool or a knave. Perhaps this affected his standards of honesty and fair-play, which were too subtle for normal standards and were little modified by his varied religious opinions.¹

On the way back to the Colony in 1850, Fry swung from one extreme to the other. A fellow-traveller on the outward voyage wrote.

Dr. Fry came on board a strict ritualist, as he had been for many years previously, but left the ship a devoted Evangelical Minister of Christ, and afterwards in Hobart Town maintained the glorious doctrine of Grace... 2

His new faith was not without works. While the ship waited in Adelaide, he wrote an article to the South Australian Gazette and Mining Journal, condemning the attitudes of the Bishops at their conference.

Arriving back in Hobart on February 3, 1851, he began organising anti-Puseyite forces, beginning the conflict by a reprint of his Adelaide article in the Hobart Town Courier (February 22, 1851.). It is indicative of the man that he altered the internal arrangement of St George's to conform with his changed opinions.

1. C S O 26 2582, 1848 and C S O 11 224 November 5, 1846.

2. John Singleton, Incidents in the Life of a Physician. M. L. Hutchinson, Melbourne, 1891.

Strange to say, not one voice of protest came from what must have been, a bewildered congregation.

The nature of colonial society fermented the conflict. Writing to England in 1855, Nixon commented on the ill odour in which the Diocese was held in England and complained, with reference to Fry:

...you in your better ordered communities can but little understand the evil that one determined clerical agitator can effect where "Public Opinion" is a might; where there is no aristocracy, and where each man is as good as his neighbours; provided he pays his way and keeps out of the Insolvent Court... none want support here who lifts himself up against legal authority, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical. ¹

It is interesting to quote a similar comment from a Wesleyan clergyman, written almost twenty years before. He claimed "the people here are like tinder, prepared to ignite at every falling spark of radicalism." ²

At this particular period in colonial history, this tendency to enjoy conflict with authority may have been even more than usually helpful to those who wished to oppose the Bishop. This was a period of general disturbance in the colony with feeling on transportation running high, and with the people being encouraged by

1. Letter to McKenzie (Mitchell Library) October 1, 1855.

2. Letter of Orton to Hoole, August 16, 1837 M L M S A 1

their leaders to vocal opposition against those in power. T. J. Knight was perhaps the best example of the connection between the two types of dissent. He was generally active in opposition to the Bishop, and at the same period was dismissed from his position as a Justice of the Peace for taking part in the burning of an effigy of Earl Grey.¹ Others who were involved in opposition to the Bishop and were also foremost in the ranks of the antitransportation movement were Michael Fenton, William Henty, W. P. Weston and R. G. Kermode. At the public meetings observers noted a considerable number who attended, though they had no allegiance to the Church of England. The spectacle of the discomforture of the Bishop, and of dissension within the favoured Church was gratifying to a particular element in the colonial society.

The conflict then was a reaction to the Sydney minutes. It began as a general expression of discontent against Tractarianism, fostered by Fry on the basis of the colonial readiness for conflict and the lack of sympathy towards the Bishop which his authoritarianism

1. Courier, September 17, 1851

engendered. This discontent centred in criticism of Nixon's views as represented in the Sydney Minutes, particularly his views on Baptism, and on lay participation in any future meetings of Church Councils or Synods.

1851
 III A YEAR OF CONFLICT

In writing to the Courier on February 22, 1851, Fry prefaced the republishing of the Adelaide letter by stressing the need to uphold Evangelical opinion in the light of recent Tractarian activity in the colony. He held up for emulation the action of those in Adelaide who organised a public meeting to dispute against Tractarian influence.

Fry's letter was moderate in tone, putting out feelers for action, suggesting that peace was possible providing Nixon did not seek to enforce his private opinion on baptism. Two aims for the colonial Church were set forth - the prevention of any infringement on the liberty of laity or clergy and the obtaining for the laity of a share in the administration of Church affairs. He feared that Church membership and admission to orders might be limited by demanding adherence to the Bishop's views on baptism.

He was also concerned with the Bishop's control over clergy. Before 1850 Nixon sought to control his clergy, and the Bishops' Conference had been a step towards realising this aim. He was now faced with

opposition to this control from the Evangelicals. Nixon had altered the form of the clergyman's licence which had been in force when he arrived, and the new licence gave him the right to supersede any of the parochial clergy and to revoke a licence whenever he saw just claim. Fry was opposed to this. It is an interesting comment on the conflict that the new licence, commonly in use elsewhere, had been in force in the colony for two years before any criticism of it was made. Fry, however, had accurately outlined three major points of conflict. He sought to defeat the Tractarian influence, and saw that lay participation, independent ministers and emphasis on salvation by faith unassisted by a sacrament would do this.

Nixon himself wisely chose not to comment on Fry's letter. The comments did not however, go unchallenged. F. H. Cox, later editor of the Tasmanian Church Chronicle and the Church News, and a moderate and reasonable supporter of the Bishop, disputed with Fry through the columns of the Courier.¹ This particular correspondence was concluded by Fry's condemnation of the 1850 Conference "which would tend to

expel the Evangelical Brethren from the Church - which would deprive the laity of a voice in the laws by which they are to be governed - which would render the clergy entirely dependent for their offices on the arbitrary will of the Bishops - which would offend and widen the breach between us and our Protestant brethren of other communions." ¹

Nixon sought to rally the clergy to approve the general tone of the minutes. The Southern clergy were called together on March 20 by Archdeacon F. A. Marriot, and an address was proposed signifying approval of the Bishops' comments. This was Fry's opportunity, and the meeting escaped from Marriot's control. The Address sent to the Bishop reproved the Sydney conference for introducing the question of Baptism. It maintained that the particular construction, if imposed, would constitute a new article of faith, and that "the dogmatical determination of the question which has ever been practically considered an open one virtually narrows the terms of communion within our Church." ²

1. Courier, March 19, 1851.

2. Text of Address; Courier, March 22, 1851.

The meeting also resolved that Bishops, clergy and laity should participate equally in administering Church affairs and that the licence should be amended to guarantee an independent clergy.

After the meeting of the clergy Fry organized the inaugural meeting of Members of the Church of England for Maintaining in Van Diemen's Land the Principles of the Protestant Reformation, known locally as the Protestant Association. This meeting adopted resolutions condemning the Bishops' Conference.

Marriot's public assertion that the Address was adopted without due deliberation by a minority of the clergy in the colony ¹ did little to tarnish Fry's victory. Through the meeting Fry had managed to convey to the public the image of an illiberal Bishop, seeking to tyrannise over his clergy, to prevent the laity from having their rightful voice in Church affairs and to narrow the terms of communion in the Anglican Church. A further Address, adopted later by a minority of clergy at the meeting, and the Bishop's reply, however gracious, did little to dispel the effect, since several other clergymen subsequently supported the original Address. 2.

-
1. Courier, March 26, 1851.
 2. Courier, April 16, 1851.

With the clergy organised in opposition, and with public opinion aroused, Fry sought more spectacular action. He was assisted by popular complaints that the Minutes aimed to influence legislation in England on the colonial Church and that therefore, they should not have been promulgated at all by the Bishops without reference to the clergy or the laity. Opposition was intended to prevent an unsatisfactory constitution being foisted on the Church.

Accordingly, on May 3, five hundred colonists petitioned the Bishop to convene a public meeting of members of the Church of England to consider the decisions of the Conference, and the questions arising from it.¹ This petition Nixon greeted with a blank refusal. Meanwhile Fry not to be inactive used the monthly meeting of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and Society for Propagation of the Gospel to raise the banner of Evangelical opinion. He proposed an Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, indicating approval of the Gorham judgment and stressing the Evangelical, anti-Roman sentiment of the clergy in the colony. In spite of

1. Courier, April 26, 1851.

a more moderate address proposed by F. H. Cox, Fry's address was passed and sent to the Archbishop.¹

Nixon's position as Bishop gave him an advantage in any Church conflict, and he used it by calling together the clergymen of the Diocese in order to deliver a Charge. In this Charge, the Bishop, with tact, great skill and lucid argument, criticised and embarrassed the opposition, and did not forget a personal aside for Fry's benefit, that he did not want "to be among the number of those who are compelled in after-life to suppress or repudiate the recorded principles of earlier years."²

In his Charge Nixon answered the criticism levelled at the Bishops for making a statement on baptism. He argued that the Bishops had a duty to guide, though not to command, the church when a theological matter was in dispute.

1. Courier, May 3, 1851.

2. Charge, 1851. p. 52

The Bishops had suggested that future synods consist of Bishops and clergy, and that the laity should meet separately. The Tasmanian critics swung to the other extreme and demanded that all have an equal say in the deliberations and judgments of the Church. This, said the Bishop, would be revolutionary, and would destroy episcopal christianity, each order should keep to its own function.

Criticism had also been levelled at him because of licences. He denied any desire to arbitrarily dominate his clergy and quoted from the Sydney minutes which expressed a similar attitude.

Tactful on other points, Nixon was definite on baptism. He denied that the Gorham Judgment was binding on the church and claimed that the erroneous views held by Gorham were not the same as those held by Evangelicals. Maintaining that it was the Bishop's place to protect the Church against Rome and the Dissenters and to keep her to the truth as laid down by the English Fathers, he threatened to exclude any who held Gorham's belief. Finally he completed his Charge on the high and optimistic note of unity.

The Charge was partly effective. It was well received by the press and two clergymen heeded the plea for unity and withdrew their signatures from the opposition address. But Nixon's argument failed to impress his extreme antagonists. On May 24, in spite of the Bishop's disapproval, the lay members of the Church were called together by the Protestant Society to discuss the Minutes. This meeting was chaired by T. J. Knight, who was supported by Kermode and Captain Fenton. It criticised the Minutes, disagreed with those very points the Bishop had raised in his Charge, and called upon the public to assist the Protestant Society to resist "the alarming growth" of Romanising tendencies in the colony. The use of C. H. Bromby's Theophilus Anglicanus to prepare men for orders at Christ College, the theological training college, was claimed as evidence of these tendencies. Maintaining that peace could only be restored in the Diocese by the submission of the Bishop to their demands, they transmitted their resolutions to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Secretary of State of the colonies.¹

The Evangelicals then began their witch hunting and the Rev W. Tancred of St David's was criticised for distributing a supposedly Romanising book Steps to the Altar, by Wordsworth.² Subsequently, Tancred's alleged

Romanising tendencies were denied in a petition signed by two hundred members of the Church of England.¹

Both Theophilus Anglicanus and Steps to the Altar came in for a great deal of criticism, though their Romanising tendencies were doubtful, and though few who criticised them had read them, or had the intellectual ability to question their theology. The Bishop wisely circularised his clergymen when these books came under criticism, requesting the suspension of their use during the crisis.² This did not prevent those in opposition from maintaining that they were still in use, and quoting this, as evidence of continuing Romanising tendencies. Steps to the Altar had been circulating in the colony for two years before it created a disturbance.

By July of 1851 the conflict had spread to the north of the island. Following on some correspondence with the Bishop, five of the nineteen clergymen in the Archdeaconry of Launceston presented an Address to Nixon.³ Claiming that they represented all the clergy of the North, they suggested a general meeting of the church to discuss the Sydney Minutes. These five clergymen included

1. Courier, August 9, 1851

2. Nixon's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, (B.C.) with enclosed copy of circular. September 17, 1853.

Dr W. H. Brown and Alfred Stackhouse, who had both been in the colony for many years. Along with Dr Bedford of the Cathedral Church they were Fry's main clerical supporters in the struggle with the Bishop. Dr Brown felt so strongly about the matter that he forfeited a friendship "of forty years standing" with Archdeacon R. R. Davies, one of the Bishop's most trusted supporters, though himself not a high-churchman.¹

The Address disputed the Bishop's opinion, given in correspondence dated July 3, 1851, that the relationship of the Church to the Queen, and the necessity for her assent prevented the holding of such a meeting. They queried the two perennial matters of licences and baptism and concluded by saying:

The frequent general imputations of ignorance and inexperience in those clergymen who may venture to address Your Lordship on matters in which your judgment happens to differ from theirs, are calculated to lessen their right-ful influence and depreciate the character of the church in this colony. 2

On September 5, 1851, the Protestant Association with T. J. Knight in the chair, met, and a Solemn Declaration was produced by Fry and signed by those

1. Letter from Browne to Davies (B. C.) undated

2. *Continued* July 16, 1851

present.¹ The co-operation of members of the Church of England and of all members of other Evangelical Churches was solicited, particularly in reference to demands that Theophilus Anglicanus be banned from Christ College, and that ministers of Evangelical principles be placed in charge of preparing men for the ministry. The signatories also demanded that ministers be nominated by their congregations, the Bishop retaining the right to approve the nomination. This was based on the argument that since the public either through donations or taxes supported the minister, they had the same right as those who endowed cures in England. Yet direct nomination and support by the congregation would endanger the peculiar position of the clergy, subjecting them to the congregation, and destroying the episcopal character of the Church.

The Solemn Declaration was the crux of the continuing conflict. This was an attempt by Fry to organise his evangelical opposition around a specific document.

1. Courier, September 6, 1851.

The crucial point of the declaration was the phrase concerning private judgment - "denying the right of any church or minister to prescribe to individuals in matters of religion in opposition to their own judgment."¹ This was not a challenge on particulars, as previous challenges had been, but a challenge to the authority of the Church itself. Nixon saw this attempt to enthrone the individual reason above the collective reason of what was, to him, God's ordained Church, as something on which he could not compromise.² A year of conflict had deepened the rift and determined the major point of future conflicts.

-
1. Solemn Declaration of Ministers of Church of England in Van Diemen's Land on the Present Condition of the Church in that Colony.
 2. Tasmanian Church Chronicle, July 3, 1852.

IV PUBLIC CONFLICT

One of the main aims of the 1850 Conference was to gain for the Church in the colony the right to organise itself. In January, 1852 the Bishop sought to unite the clergy and laity with him in working for a Synod. This was an aim in which all could unite, especially since Nixon mentioned only the general principle of a Synod and omitted mentioning detailed organisation.¹ The clergy met on January 28, and petitioned the Queen to remove the disabilities of the Act 25 Henry VIII C19 and allow the colonial Church to meet in Synod. On the Bishop's suggestion a committee was set up to work out a way in which the laity could give their assent to this petition. The published complaint that the Bishop had cheated his clergy into the adoption of illusive measures by the prospect of concessions² was an indication of the temper of his opponents, but did not detract from the wisdom of the move.

1. Tasmanian Church Chronicle, February 1852.

2. Tasmanian Church Chronicle, April 1852.

Fry was not impressed by the Bishop's attempts. In a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in February stressing the necessity for a church constitution, he claimed "that the Bishop and his party are in reality reluctant to our obtaining a constitution until such a number of Tractarian clergy shall be introduced as may Romanise the Church and be a majority in the Assembly."¹ He also mentioned "the unrelaxing attempts to render our colonial church a Tractarian sect",² and contemplated "establishing a church in opposition to the Bishop."³ The publication of this letter brought a quick demand from Nixon for proof of his statements,⁴ and Marriot and Davies circulated a Declaration refuting Fry's opinions.

This dispute faded into the background when the Bishop's attitude towards the signatories to the Solemn Declaration became clear. He refused to accept G. B. Smith as a candidate for orders on the grounds that his testimonials were signed by clergymen whose religious opinions were unsound.⁵

1. Letter from Fry to Archbishop, February 20, 1852. (B.C.)

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Letter from Nixon to Fry, March 8, 1852. (B.C.)

For the same reason he refused to sign the testimonials of the Rev F. Batchelor, a clergyman seeking to leave the colony.¹ Nixon objected to the clause concerning private judgment. The retribution was important since none of these clergy on leaving the colony could be sure of another position. His refusal concerning a candidate for orders bade to stop a supply of Evangelically-minded clergymen from growing up in the colony, or at least robbed the signatories of their influence on candidates for Orders. It is doubtful indeed if any other action was open to him. Any attempt by him to dismiss the involved clergymen would have been fraught with difficulties. Even on a matter unconnected with the disputed point of theology the Rev Thomas Wigmore had retained his convict-chaplain's pay for twelve months after the Bishop had dismissed him in June, 1844. Though the colonial court had ruled that the Bishop had the right of dismissal in cases of misconduct, the application of the Gorham Judgment to the colonial situation would have rendered a dismissal on doctrinal grounds doubtful. A further point was that

1. Tasmanian Church Chronicle, May 1852, and correspondence between Nixon and Batchelor dated February 21, 1852. (B.C.)

57
whither do these struggles tend? It may be - nay it ought to be, a serious consideration with us all, how far the notoriously divided condition of the Church of England in this colony can ultimately conduce to her permanent well-being. 1

An ominous note for the state-subsidised Church sounded from the Courier - "It is quite evident that the public will not consent to pay salaries for the purpose of promoting squabbles." 2

Meanwhile the committee of the clergy appointed by the Bishop to get lay opinion on the petition sent to the Queen concerning the organisation of the Synod had organised a meeting of representatives of the laity. Meeting on June 23, 1852 the layment considered the petition was not in accord with their views and wishes. Though called for a specific and limited purpose they resolved themselves into a standing body of delegates and passed motions embodying the evangelical party's opinions, including one:

That it is the opinion of this Assembly that the Church of England in this Diocese is not in that condition of efficiency calculated to further the objects of the Divine Mission.

-
1. Substance of a Reply to a Deputation appointed at a Public Meeting of Members of the Church of England, held in Hobart Town on April 22, 1852.
 2. Courier, Editorial, April 24, 1852.

That the Constitution and form of church government suggested in the proceedings of the Bishop and clergy which have been taken with reference to this subject are, as tending to substitute the supremacy of the local Ecclesiastical heads of the Church for that of the Sovereign, repugnant to the opinions and wishes of this meeting and of the members of the Church of England generally in this diocese. That this Assembly further expresses opinion, that the full legislative power for the ecclesiastical affairs of this diocese should be confided to a convention of the Bishops, clergy and laity, deliberating in one Assembly: every question to be decided by a majority of votes; and in the event of votes being equal, the Bishop shall have a casting vote independent of his original vote. But that a perfect union should be preserved with the Mother Church in England. ¹

The retaliation of those loyal to the Bishop was immediate. The meeting was accused of being unrepresentative and of using unfair tactics. Indeed the evangelical party had been active in putting forward candidates for election and at least the Longford election was disputed.² Written opinions from some parishes unaccompanied by a delegate had been ignored and many parishes were unrepresented.

1. Report of meeting of Lay Delegates, Courier; July 3, 1852.

right to nominate ministers. F. H. Cox who spoke against the petition was greeted with loud hises. A further petition, to the Protestant Defence Association in England, requesting them to send out Evangelical ministers was moved by Fry who claimed that there were "not a dozen of them remaining in the colony."¹

Before the petition could be presented to the Legislative Council the proposed Church Act had been withdrawn² because of opposition expressed within the colony. Nevertheless the petition was presented and Captain Fenton moved a motion "that in the opinion of this Council it is desirable that provision should be made by legislative enactment for giving the lay members of every denomination of Christians who may desire it and who receive support from the public revenues of this colony, a voice in the nomination of their ministers."³ Although the Council was sympathetic to congregations having a voice in the nomination of ministers the vagueness of the motion led to its defeat.

1. Report of public meeting. Courier: September 12, 1853.

2. Report of Legislative Council Proceedings: Courier
September 17, 1853.

4

A more definite bill was then brought before the Council by R. G. Kermode, an influential land-holder, It proposed that, before receiving his salary from the Colonial Treasurer, a minister had to produce a certificate showing that he met with the approval of his parishioners.¹ The legislation on the colonial church which was then before the House of Lords influenced members against the bill. It was felt that any colonial legislation passed might contradict imperial legislation, and the bill was defeated by nine votes to seven. This was a setback to the evangelicals, but an indication to Nixon that those who paid for the minister expected to have a say in his selection.

The number of those within the evangelical camp was declining but enthusiasm made the evangelicals a force to be reckoned with. The natural concern over the organization of the church enabled them to use their influence to the limit yet the time of effective opposition was drawing to a close.

1. Courier: September 21, 1853.

V. THE TIRED PEACE

The activity of the evangelicals was not an indication of continuing support. Many had adhered to their party because of a general fear of Rome. One who withdrew his signature from the Solemn Declaration wrote:

I joined the other Party and my reason for doing so was a dread of Popery...when I perceived that the party I had joined were going too far and seemed inclined to do away with all authority I pulled out. 1

Others also had withdrawn their names from the Solemn Declaration; according to the Bishop:

twenty-two clergymen originally signed the Declaration. Of this number, two have died... two have gone home on leave of absence, two have resigned their Chaplaincies...one several months before affixing his signature...fifteen of the original subscribers are now in the Diocese, out of which number, five have repudiated the clause denying the Church's authority upon the same grounds which induced me to refuse my sanction to it, viz.: its inconsistency with the Twentieth Article. 2

Fry's very extremism tended to alienate his supporters. Even the opinion of Charles Perry,³ the Evangelical Bishop of Melbourne (1847-1876), that the

1. Letter from J. Bishton to R. R. Davies. July 30, 1852

2. Bishop's letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, September

clause on private judgment was contrary to the Twentieth Article¹ did not moderate his opinion. Unmindful of his ordination oath to

"reverently obey your Ordinary and other chief minister, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments. 2

he had spoken of setting up a Church in opposition to the Bishop³ in his Reply to the Right Reverend F. R. Nixon D. D., published in 1853, he likened Nixon to the tempter of mankind.

Indeed there was little that the evangelical party could hope to achieve in the way of permanent success. Even the success they did have in restricting the use of Romanising books lost them support as it satisfied moderate demands. They could not depose or change the Bishop, and few could contemplate a complete division within the Church. Perpetual irritation could win them few friends.

1. Twentieth Article: The Church hath power to decree Rites on Ceremonies, and authority on Controversies of Faith (Articles of Religion: Book of Common Prayer.)

2. Book of Common Prayer, The Ordering of Priests

3. Fry to Archbishop of Canterbury, February 20, 1852. (B.C.

The appearance of the Protestant in September 1853 was an indication of this loss of support. Edited by Fry, this paper was the evangelical's answer to the Tasmanian Church Chronicle, and was intended to whip up enthusiasm for the evangelical cause. The editorial in the first issue pleaded with readers not to sign the Address to Nixon, circulated by Davies, exonerating him from Romanising tendencies. This had little effect and the widely signed Address was presented in October 1853.

A further attempt to regain their fortunes was made in January 1854. They sought to produce home-grown evangelical clergy by founding an Evangelical Collegiate Institution in opposition to Christ College.¹ Nothing beyond the proposal ever came to light. Neither did the appeal for evangelical clergy sent by the meeting on September 29, 1853 to the Protestant Defence Association in England bear fruit.

A temporary stimulus giving the evangelicals a respectability their actions did not always warrant, came in June when Nixon received a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury siding with some of the opinions of the

1. Tasmanian Church Chronicle, February 1, 1854

evangelicals.¹ Surprisingly Nixon published this letter, though the Church Chronicle commented adversely on Sumner's status as a theologian.² In August the Protestant ceased to exist and even Medland gave up hope of receiving his prize and having preached a sermon at St. George's condemned the Bishop, he departed from the Colony.³

The conflict had tired Nixon as well. In his third charge, given in St David's Cathedral on May 22, 1855, he lamented the fact that the previous four years had "been fraught with more of anxious care than has befallen me at any previous period of my existence."⁴ He was concerned too that the conflict had stopped those contributions "which hitherto have flowed so largely into this remote Diocese from the parent land".⁵ This was a serious consideration since the grant given to convict chaplains was to cease in July 1856, and there were indications that all state aid would soon be withdrawn. The difficulties Nixon had because of

1. Tasmanian Church Chronicle: October 1, 1853

2. Ibid. July 1, 1854.

3. Ibid. December 1, 1854.

4. Charge, 1855 p.1

5. Ibid p.1

4

state aid perhaps caused him to think this neither unjust nor unreasonable,¹ but alternative avenues had to be found

To meet this need he conceived the Sustentation Fund. This was an attempt to endow the Church through local contributions and was eventually intended to embrace all Church finance.² The committee of the Fund was to consist exclusively of laymen and was to nominate all clergy paid out of the Fund; the Bishop retaining his right to accept or reject the nominations. This answered the laity's demand for a voice in the selection of ministers while it prevented the choice going to individual congregations. This was a compromise, though the Bishop claimed that participation of the laity was

not tardily invited because the advanced intelligence and earnest practical spirit of the times will no longer permit their exclusion.³

In creating the Sustentation Fund Nixon was laying the foundations for synodical action. He conceded that the laity should meet with the Bishop and clergy in the Synod and the Sustentation Fund was to give them experience in the affairs of the Church. It had been decided that nothing prevented the Church holding a Synod. After the Imperial

1. Charge 1855, p.17

2. Tasmanian Church Chronicle, May 1, 1855.

Parliament had failed to pass an act to regulate the Colonial Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the law officers of the Crown gave their opinion that the Colonial Church was not bound by the Act of Submission.¹

On May 22, 1855, Nixon conferred with the clergy on the details of the Fund. Fry promised at the beginning of the meeting that he would not create dissension but at the end he presented a formal protest against the development of the Fund while the evangelicals were disregarded.² Supported by Stackhouse and Kermode, Fry afterwards attempted to dissuade people from contributing. The Fund failed to endow the Church,⁴ but this was due rather to the ambitiousness of the project than to their opposition. It had little hope of success, especially with the depressed state of the colony after 1855, and the drain of resources to Victoria.

Fry and his sympathisers had lost most of their support and negative irritation was the limit of their

1. Report of Clergy Conference, Courier: May 25, 1855.

2. Courier; May 28, 1855

3. Courier: February 19, 1857, and Tasmanian Church Chronicle, June 1, 1855.

4. Receipts and Expenditure of General Church Fund in Archdeaconery of Hobart Town. 1859. (T.S.L.)

activity. In July 1855 the Bishop created All Saints Parish out of the Northern part of St George's. Fry agreed to allow the new minister, J. T. Gellibrand, the use of the Bethesda Chapel, which was built by private subscription. After arrangements and advertisements for the first service were completed, Fry claimed the Bethesda as his personal property and informed Gellibrand that he could only use it if he preached acceptable doctrine.¹ This was unacceptable both to the Bishop and to Gellibrand.

Dr Fry, who claimed for himself the right of private judgment and who was opposed to the Bishop having power over the clergy, sought to limit Gellibrand's right of private judgment, and tried to impose on him an arbitrary domination. Not only was such action contradictory but ^{was not} likely to gain him support among Anglicans and he increasingly found fellowship only among Dissenting ministers.²

1. Tasmanian Church Chronicle; July 3, 1855.

2. Tasmanian Church Chronicle; September 1, 1856

It is one of the curious inconsistencies ever attendant upon shallow wits, to find the desire to tyrannize on the judgment and conscience of others, proceeding from those who have so loudly claimed the plenary right of private judgment and who repudiate the church's authority to prescribe or overrule it. ¹

The establishment of Synod drew near and was seen by some as a way to end conflict and restore harmony, as without a Synod all parties claimed to speak for the Church, and there was no united voice.² In May 1857 the Bishop appointed a Council of Advice to plan the Synod's organisation and showed his desire for unity by inviting R. Q. Kermode and T. J. Knight to join the Council. They both declined, perhaps aware that they had little hope of exerting influence.³

Synodical government might solve the problems and restore the unity of the Church, but the conflict had taken its toll. Both sides were aware of a decline in attendance, and this made them anxious to look for

-
1. Nixon letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, September 1 1853. (
 2. Examiner: June 9, 1857 - Editorial.
 3. Courier: May 28, 1857.

opportunities for peace. As early as 1851, Nixon, speaking on the conflict, mentioned

some deserting the Church's ranks in her hour of extremist need, and seeking in other communions that rest and peace which they are too impatient...to look for in their own.¹

A similar opinion was put forward at the first meeting of Synod in 1857. Dr Brown lamented that "the number of Church of England members has been very lamentedly reduced of late years."² The Courier agreed and added sourly that "the Churches generally, and the Church of England are eaten up with the canker of indifferentism - reduced to a mere skull, with little vitality, and less earnestness."³ Church records give point to their lament. The average attendance was given in 1853 as 10,712.⁴ yet in spite of a substantial rise in population the attendance for 1855 was given as 7,063.⁵ A visiting evangelical clergyman gave a dreary picture of the Church in 1857. Regretting

1. Charge: 1851 p.3

2. Report of first Synodical Meeting; Hobart Town Advertiser: October 7, 1857.

3. Courier: Editorial, December 30, 1857.

4. Tasmanian Church Chronicle: April 1853.

5. Ibid: April 1, 1856. Fenton gives the figure for 1855 even lower at 6,014. James Fenton: History of Tasman

5

its failure to compete with other denominations, he complained: "I have not discovered any instances of conversion under any ministry in the country; nor do I believe any occur."¹ He particularly mentions Dr. Fry who "appears to have paid much attention to the Puseyites and Papists, neglecting his own people."²

The decline in Church attendance, though affected by the conflict, cannot be placed entirely at the feet of those who disturbed the peace of the Anglican Church. In this context, it is interesting to compare the theory of Oscar Handlin in The Uprooted, where he claims that the unfamiliarity of the American scene tended to make the immigrants identify themselves with their national church. This does not appear to have been the case in Tasmania, though the proportion of convicts in the population may have been a factor. More likely, in reference to Australia, there was sufficient ethnic familiarity with the homeland to give a sense of identification, though insufficient of "those associations which, in England, tend to keep up the love of which I speak."³ But the challenge was met by a divided church, which itself was affected by the colony.

As the meeting of the Synod drew near, some sought to urge a renewed evangelical effort, and the Rev. A. Stackhouse urged the selection of delegates of sound evangelical and protestant principles, since "we seem to have failed to stem the tide by resolutions of public meetings, and petitions of clergy and laity."¹ The supporters of Fry had, however, been even more sadly reduced. In 1857, Fry made a rather hysterical appeal to Nixon's superior, the evangelical F. Barker, Bishop of Sydney, and complained that only three or four still adhered to the Solemn Declaration. Barker, in a tactful reply, made a statement on private judgments:

if the Church prescribed anything contrary to the word of God, it is no man's duty to yield obedience to such a decree. If an individual, in the exercise of his private judgment, conscientious and prayerfully, seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit, believes a prescription of the Church in matters of religion is contrary to the word of God, it becomes a case of conscience in what way he shall signify his dissent or oppose what he believes to be an unrighteous decree.²

In spite of Fry maintaining that the conflict could not be solved on a matter of words,³ it was Barker's statement which provided the formulae for compromise.

1. Letter to the Courier, 1857

2. Letter to Fry, included in Appendix to Fry, M.P.:

In a letter to Stackhouse, who was contemplating withdrawing himself from the preliminary meeting and of relinquishing his licence, Nixon indicated that he was willing to accept the Bishop of Sydney's statement as not contrary to the Prayer Book. At the Synodical meeting Fry gave notice of a motion that called for reconciliation and removal of the disabilities under which some of the clergymen still laboured. Nixon replied to this motion, agreeing to the reconciliation.

His Lordship here left his place, and approaching the Revd. Dr. Fry, cordially shook hands with him (this interesting and affecting ceremony illicited another burst of applause).¹

Thus the bitterness of the conflict toned down and compromise came on a matter of words; both the Bishop and Fry agreed that neither had changed his opinions. A further challenge to the Episcopal organisation of the Church, an attempt to make the three orders rate as one in the Synod, received only minor support.

1. Examiner: October 2, 1857

Fry for the short remainder of his time in the colony vented his spleen on the alcoholic trade and the Roman Catholics.¹ In 1858 he went on leave to England, not to return, complaining of "general debility and exhaustion and from severe and long-continued pains in the head".² Nixon remained a little longer, left to reflect on the hindrances to his vision.

1. Hobart Town Advertiser: May 18, 1857

2. C.S.D. I Vol. 123 No.4531: January 20, 1858

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

NEWSPAPERS.

Britannia	1846 and 1847.
Examiner	1842-4, 1856-7.
Hobart Town	
Advertiser	1857.
Hobart Town	
Courier	1842-57 (referred to as <u>Courier</u>)
Murray's Review	1843.
Protestant	1853
Tasmanian	
Church Chronicle	1852-56.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES.

G.S.O.	Colonial Secretary's Office.
C.S.D.	Chief Secretary's Department.
G.O.	Governor's Office.

PRIVATE COLLECTION.

Church correspondence owned by Bishop W. R. Bar
referred to as (B.C.)

PRINTED SOURCES.

1. Barrett, John : Religious Provision in Eastern Australia, Before and After the Church Acts 1836-37 Work in Progress Seminar Australian National University 1962.
2. Barrett, W. R. : History of the Church of England in Tasmania, Hobart 1942.
3. Denison Sir W. : Varieties of Vice-Regal Life (2 vols.) London 1876
4. Faber, G. : The Oxford Apostles - a character study of the Oxford Movement, London 1933.
5. Fenton, James : History of Tasmania, Hobart 1884.
6. Fry, H.P. : An Appeal to the Right Reverend Lord Bishop of Sydney, Metropolitan of Australia.
7. Fry, H.P. : Solemn Declaration of the Minister of the Church of England in Tasmania on the present condition of that Church in that Colony, Hobart 1851.
8. Giles, R. A. : The Constitutional History of the Australian Church, London 1929, including minutes of 1850 conference.

9. Hull, Hugh M. : Statistical Account of Van Diemen's Land, Tasmania 1856.
10. Moore : Moore's Special Report (Gorham' Case)
11. Nixon, F. R. : Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania 1846 Hobart 1846.
12. Nixon, F. R. : Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania 1851 Hobart 1851.
13. Nixon, F. R. : Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania 1855 Hobart, 1855.
14. Nixon, F. R. : Lectures, Historical Doctrinal and Practical on the Catechism of the Church of England, 5th. Ed. Hobart, 1853.
15. Nixon F. R. : Substance of a Reply to a Deputation Appointed at a Public Meeting of Members of the Church of England Hobart 1852.
16. Nixon, F. R. : The Church in the Colonies. The Diocese of Tasmania or Van Diemen's Land. An Appeal to the Public on Behalf of the Colonies and Diocese of Tasmania, Hobart
17. Nixon, F. R. : To the Lay Members of the Church of England in the Diocese of Tasmania Hobart, 1855.
18. Nixon, F. R. : Speech of the Lord Bishop of Tasmania at the Annual Meeting of the Leeds District Association of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 28 November 1843. Leeds, 1843.

19. Nixon Novah : Pioneer Bishop in Van Diemen's Land; letters and memoirs of F. R. Nixon collected and compiled by Novah Nixon, Hobart 19
20. Pike, D. : Paradise of Dissent, London 19
21. Roberts J. : A Mirror of Religion and Society in Tasmania, Hobart 1857.
22. Roe, M. : Society and Thought in Eastern Australia, 1835-51; Doctorial thesis Australian National University, 1960.
23. Roe, M. : Sir William Denison
24. Singleton John: Incidents in the Life of a Phy
M. L. Hutchinson, Melbourne, J
25. West, J. : History of Tasmania, Launceston
26. Whittington F.I.: William Grant Broughton, Sydney
27. Whittington F.I.: Augustus Short, Adelaide 1887.
28. Receipts and Expenditure of General Church Fund
Archdeaconary of Hobart Town 1859. Hobart 1859.