

# Montgomery of Tasmania

Henry and Maud Montgomery in Australasia

Robert Withycombe



ACORN PRESS

Published by Acorn Press Ltd, ABN 50 008 549 540

Office and orders:

P O Box 282

Brunswick East

Victoria 3057

Australia

Tel/Fax (03) 9383 1266

International Tel/Fax 61 3 9383 1266

Website: [www.acornpress.net.au](http://www.acornpress.net.au)

Orders: [orders@acornpress.net.au](mailto:orders@acornpress.net.au)

© Robert Withycombe, 2009

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry

Author: Withycombe, Robert S. M.

Title: Montgomery of Tasmania: Henry and Maud Montgomery in Australasia/Robert Withycombe.

Edition: 1st ed.

ISBN: 9780908284788 (hbk.)

Notes: Includes index.

Bibliography.

Subjects: Montgomery, H.H. (Henry Hutchinson), 1847–1932.

Montgomery, Maud.

Church of England—Tasmania—Bishops—Biography.

Church of England—Tasmania—History.

Bishops' spouses—Tasmania--Biography.

Dewey Number: 283.092

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, no part of this work may be reproduced by electronic or other means without the permission of the publishers.

Original documents quoted in this book use imperial measurements.

Their metric equivalents are:

1 mile	1.61 kilometres
1 foot	30.5 centimetres
1 inch	2.54 centimetres
1 acre	0.405 hectares

Cover Photograph: *The Bishop dressed for the West Coast*. From *Bishop Montgomery: A Memoir*, by M.M., SPG, 1933, p. 39.

Maps: Keith Mitchell, Canberra

Cover, text design & layout: Cogdell Design & Fine Art, Fullarton, SA.

Printing: Openbook Howden Design & Print, Adelaide.

# Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements	v
Map of Australasia	viii
Map of Dioceses of Australia 1901	ix
List of Photographs	x
Abbreviations	xii
Introduction	1
1. The Shaping of a Militant and Missionary Bishop	9
2. Missionary Advocacy – Envisioning the Church as a Missionary Agency	20
3. Applying Principles – Appointing a Bishop for the New Guinea Mission	35
4. Episcopal Missionary Leadership Challenged	42
5. Reviving Episcopal Missionary Leadership – The ABM, the CMS and the 1900 ABM Jubilee celebration	53
Map of Tasmania including Furneaux Islands	66
6. Caring for Bass Strait Aborigines – The Mutton Bird Bishop	67
7. An Itinerant Bush Bishop – Visits to Tasmania’s West and North-West Coast Frontiers	88
8. The Australian Anglican Primacy – Ideals and Reality	100
9. Envisioning an Australian Anglican Identity and Mission	117
10. A Diocesan Bishop Militant	133
11. Centralising Diocesan Leadership for Growth	142
12. Anglican Wholeness and Unity through Missionary Engagement	155
13. Defending a Fragile Diocesan Unity	166
14. Being a ‘Citizen Bishop’	185
15. Maud Montgomery – the Colonial Bishop’s Wife	204
16. Maud Montgomery – the Bishop’s Partner in Promoting Diocesan Goals	226
17. A New Leader for the SPG	251
18. Montgomery and his Legacy	264
List of Sources	285
Index	291

# Introduction

HENRY HUTCHINSON MONTGOMERY SPENT TWELVE ACTIVE YEARS in Australia as the Anglican Bishop of Tasmania, 1889–1901, building a reputation of vigour and enthusiasm. His distinctive pattern of colonial episcopacy, and the impetus he gave to reforming his church’s national leadership structures, all expressed the priority he gave to fulfilling Christ’s final missionary commission. So strong was his reputation for developing missionary engagement that in 1901 he was recalled to London to a central missionary posting as the first Episcopal Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG). Sadly, the record and memory of his contribution to the Australian Anglican Church has largely been eclipsed.

This study reassesses Bishop Montgomery’s importance, both in the light of his times, and in the light of issues that continue to shape the Anglican Church in Australia and beyond. It offers a timely reappraisal both of his Tasmanian episcopate and his continuing relevance to contemporary Anglicanism.

Missionary engagement was paramount in his paradigm of colonial Anglican episcopacy and he wanted it to dominate and unite his Anglican church. This book explores how he struggled to model, justify and sustain his ideal of Anglicanism in Australia and Tasmania. He pressed for reform within the perimeters of his own diocese, but especially he sought to reform his Anglican Church’s Primacy (i.e. the role of its senior bishop, the Primate) to become a focus of national episcopal leadership and a source of initiative. Accordingly, he envisioned his General Synod as a national instrument for united growth through missionary engagement. Central to this vision was a revitalised national Australian Board of Missions (ABM). These issues dominated his episcopate and continue to remain important for the Australian and wider Anglican Church in the twenty-first century.

This Introduction identifies the key interlinking elements of Montgomery’s episcopate through which he tried to unite his diocese and Australia’s Anglican Church in militant and zealous engagement in Christian missionary work. Later chapters explore these elements separately and in greater detail. Studying these distinctive emphases of his episcopacy and his extensive achievements demonstrates how undervalued has been his contribution to Australia’s religious history, to the religious history of Greater Britain, and to Anglican self-perception.

When Montgomery was consecrated as the fourth Anglican Bishop of Tasmania in 1889 there were few definitions or models of how a colonial episcopate was to be discharged. F.W. Farrar’s sermon at his consecration set its gaze on the heroic examples of New Zealand’s G.A. Selwyn and Melanesia’s martyr bishop, J.C.

Patteson. Montgomery had no previous experience of being a bishop before his arrival in Hobart. He and his wife landed feeling alone and isolated, with ‘a sense of utter desolation’. ‘For my part I was to exercise an office about which I knew nothing, and I should have no one of my own order near me to give me assistance. In truth we felt like Abram when he crossed the River.’ He felt overwhelmed by ‘the sense of incompetence’.<sup>1</sup>

Montgomery learnt episcopacy largely through what he experienced. Several letters written home to his former Harrow school friend and now fellow bishop, Randall Davidson, wrestle with fulfilling his proper role as bishop and express the wisdom Montgomery was gaining by hindsight. Montgomery’s later typescript, ‘Thoughts on the Work of a Bishop and its Special Dangers’,<sup>2</sup> is based on notes he compiled for preparing Gilbert White for consecration as the first Bishop of Carpentaria in 1900, and draws on Montgomery’s reflections on discharging the office of a colonial bishop. In describing his perceived episcopal role to his diocese he made frequent recourse to his missionary vision, and to military metaphor.

Montgomery envisaged the task and role of a colonial bishop to be more than that of gathering, converting and nurturing its British immigrants. His ideal, like other Evangelical Anglicans, was to be a missionary and, like the Tractarians and High Churchmen, above all to be a missionary *bishop*. His episcopate was to carry the Gospel and the ministrations of his Anglican Church to the British Empire’s rapidly expanding margins, of which his see was one its remotest. So remote it was that after he accepted the post, he rushed to the Athenaeum Club’s library to discover just *where* Tasmania was – way down there! Hence his ebullient delight that the Bishop of Moosonee, whose tasks encompassed the most northern arctic wastes of Canada, should participate (through Montgomery’s own initiative) in his consecration as a bishop ‘who has no land between his diocese and the South Pole’.<sup>3</sup>

He never concealed his zealous appetite to help fulfil his church’s missionary task, declaring in his enthronement sermon on his arrival in Hobart: ‘My brethren, I have from earliest days been much in the society of missionaries; I have learnt to esteem them highly for their work’s sake... For years there has grown in me a burning desire to aid the mission cause with all my heart.’ At the outset he mentioned the Melanesian Mission and identified New Guinea as having a ‘primary claim upon the church in Australia’. He concluded: ‘Surely you and I consider the good news of God to be so perfect as to be desired for all that we cannot rest till each remotest nation – for we are all God’s children – shall hear Messiah’s name’.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H.H. Montgomery, ‘My Tasmanian Life’, ‘written at New Park, Easter Monday, 13 April 1903’, Lambeth Palace Library (LPL), Miscellaneous MSS 4530, ff.200–241., f.204. He adds: ‘I remember going into the Cathedral at once to kneel at the rails.’

<sup>2</sup> Montgomery, ‘My Tasmanian Life’, LPL, Miscellaneous MSS 4530, ff.290–352.

<sup>3</sup> *Bishop Montgomery: A Memoir*, by M.M. (Maud Montgomery), SPG, 1933, p. 28; LPL, Miscellaneous MSS 4540, f.202; Montgomery to E.W. Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, 15 April 1889, LPL, Benson Papers, Vol. 81, ff.238–9.

<sup>4</sup> *Church News for the Diocese of Tasmania [CN]*, November 1889, p. 173.

This engagement in his church's Christ-given charge to evangelise meant much travel. As a 'Bishop Itinerant' he tramped the rain-forested mountain slopes of North-West Tasmania to pioneer pastoral care for its isolated settlers, railway construction teams and miners in its new areas. Every year he spent weeks in visiting the storm-swept islands of the Bass Strait to care for marginalised lighthouse keepers, for mutton birders (and the mutton birds), and for the welfare of the Aboriginals ('half-castes' as he called them) whom Europeans had dumped there. He published absorbing accounts of these diocesan missionary travels; some are cited in Chapters 6 and 7.

His vision went beyond Tasmania. His ideals for his episcopate fed a determination to imbue not only his diocese but the whole Australian Anglican Church with a vision for undertaking missionary work in its region. Accordingly he seized an early opportunity to visit the Anglican Church in Australasia's pioneering zone of missionary work, the one on its South Pacific frontier, the Melanesian Mission, which the renowned Bishop George Augustus Selwyn had led since 1849. Bishop J.C. Patteson was made its leader in 1861 only to be martyred in 1871. His successor, Bishop J.R. Selwyn had retired undermined by ill-health in 1891. That Mission needed a bishop to visit in the interim till a successor was appointed, so Montgomery volunteered to go. That visit was for him more than a duty: it was an adventure. He sailed in 1892 along the equator for three months overseeing Anglican mission stations in the Solomon Islands, as he breathlessly confided to his friend, Bishop Randall Davidson.

I am off in the Flag Ship to Auckland, and soon I will be in the Southern Cross in this romantic and most interesting journey. I cannot help feeling that I shall be greatly helped myself. I feel the difficulty of being a Missionary among the mass of pastoral duties. I think there is little risk, if any, of attacks from natives. I am not likely to go much into new districts. And I may even hope to escape fever. It was a strange experience yesterday buying tobacco and pipes, and axes, etc., as 'trade'.

Fancy going to lands where the name of Ireland has never been heard.

It proved a wonderful experience of South Seas mission, an 'out of this world' milieu in which no fellow Australasian bishop had shared. 'It has been like a visit to the planet Mars.'<sup>5</sup>

His decision to be 'a Missionary among the mass of pastoral duties' also fed his determination to revive the ABM to become the primary instrument for Australian Anglicanism's missionary growth and for re-educating Australian Anglicans to their wider missionary responsibilities. His missionary zeal led him into close friendship with the ABM's former General Secretary, F.T. Whittington, who was soon after to be his adjutant in Tasmania. That zeal also drove him to foster Australian Anglican missions in New Guinea and later in northern Australia. It lay behind his enterprising planning for an Anglican Church Congress (preceded by a bishops' meeting) in Hobart in February 1894, and another in Ballarat in 1898.

<sup>5</sup> Montgomery to R.T. Davidson (Bishop of Rochester), 14 July 1892, LPL, Davidson Papers, Vol. 33, ff.7-9; and 23 December 1892, LPL, Davidson Papers, Vol. 36, ff.279-83.

The 1900 ABM's Jubilee of Missions became a major focus of his missionary zeal. His campaign attempted, like his previous Self-Denial Movement and later Thanksgiving Fund of 1894–95, to activate Australian Anglican dioceses into funding mission within and beyond their extensive and resource-consuming boundaries. Accordingly, in order to promote commitment to Anglican mission at home and abroad, he travelled in 1900 to all Australia's southern states delivering lectures and preaching on missions. Bishop Montgomery (with several other Australian bishops) managed with difficulty to attach their next General Synod meeting to the ABM Jubilee of 1900 and to convert it into an occasion for spotlighting their Australian Anglican Church's national identity and missionary vocation, and to do so just before a new century was launched with Australia's Federation. 'Men are so ready to do some great thing, roused by Federation and Imperialism, that I really do not know what we might not do', Bishop Montgomery claimed enthusiastically.<sup>6</sup> Montgomery's national advocacy of mission is explored more fully in the chapters below. His departure in 1901 deprived the Australian Anglican missionary movement (and certainly the ABM) of its most earnest advocate.

Existing Australian Anglican Church structures became his targets for change wherever they impeded his national and missionary vision. He called for leadership in missionary enterprise and in educating the Australian Anglicans to fulfil their mission, but was disappointed to find that both the Australian General Synod and their bishops were not the ready allies that he in his optimistic missionary enthusiasm would have wished them to become. He focussed on the Primate who was the President of that Synod and the formal leader of its bishops. Already by 1892 he was complaining to Davidson: 'Out here we groan under a Primate still who has no zeal, no power.'<sup>7</sup> Thus Montgomery's missionary-oriented paradigm of the modern Anglican episcopacy shaped debates on the role of the Australian Anglican Church's Primacy. It also gave added pressure to reform the role of its General Synod. Both Primacy and General Synod remain warm subjects of contemporary Australian Anglican debate.

When Archbishop Frederick Temple summoned him back to head the SPG because it was a 'missionary' posting, Montgomery protested complaining that 'it is because it is all missionary here that I love it so!'<sup>8</sup> Indeed, Montgomery himself, by word and action, had in Tasmania modelled the place that he believed active engagement in missionary work should have in any Anglican self-definition, whether parochial, diocesan or national. Later chapters will outline its outworking: how in his athletic enterprise he startled West Coast miners by visiting their remote and rigorous work sites; how in his concern for other miners in the north-east (Chinese immigrants among them) he met frustration; and in his persistent care for the surviving Tasmanian Aboriginals deposited in the Furneaux Group in Tasmania's Bass Straits.

<sup>6</sup> Montgomery to Davidson, 24 May 1900, LPL, Davidson Papers, Vol. 519, ff.248–56.

<sup>7</sup> Montgomery to Davidson, 23 December 1892, LPL, Davidson Papers, Vol. 36, ff.279–83.

<sup>8</sup> Montgomery to F. Temple (Archbishop of Canterbury), 7 June 1901, LPL, F. Temple Papers, Vol. 49, f.34.

Bishop Montgomery wanted ‘engagement in Christ’s mission’ to be adopted as another essential mark of true Church and Anglican identity. That is, he went beyond those listed in Article 19, which identified the true church as one where ‘the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ’s ordinance...’ The ‘historic episcopate’ was another mark that the 1920 Lambeth Conference’s Quadrilateral advocated. To Montgomery’s mind, however, episcopacy was subordinated to a dynamic engagement in missionary work, of whose command structure he saw episcopacy as the necessary component. Yet what sanctioned missionary work for Montgomery was not primarily the historical engagement of bishops in it, but the teaching of Christ in Scripture. Thus, as a moderate churchman of Evangelical upbringing, he constantly located his vocation to missionary work in the governing authority of Holy Scripture (as set out in Article 6). He soon discovered that to ignite Anglicans’ interest in missionary work, they needed first to be ‘soaked’ in Scripture, before being fired either by human compassion or imperial vision.

Political circumstances have changed since 1901. The British Empire, with its associations and its responsibilities, was for him an international context of reference in defining responsibility for Anglican mission and vocation. This is no longer true. Dr Steven Maughan argued that after 1901 Montgomery failed to make Britain’s imperial destiny an effective argument for Anglicans’ responsibility for mission work through the SPG.<sup>9</sup> Before 1901 Montgomery was certainly swimming in a strong current of imperial feeling in Australia and Tasmania; yet this study claims that for Montgomery, imperial responsibility was always an ancillary argument or at best an analogy for Anglicans’ persistent engagement in Christ’s mission. That very change in the place and role of the British Empire in Anglican identity world-wide has only created greater scope for new debates today regarding what grounds and in which roles Australian and other Anglicans should engage in the brave (and tawdry) new world of the twenty-first century.

Several colonial church factors made Montgomery’s militant exercise of his episcopate harder. Anglican laity had long held a place and power to vote in Australian colonial synods which their United Kingdom home church counterparts did not yet possess in their diocesan conferences, Convocations and Houses of Laity. Montgomery never fully learnt to deal with this new factor. Colonial church laity generally proved a conservative force. Becoming responsible for most colonial church funding was a novel obligation that colonial circumstances imposed upon the laity and it reinforced an outlook that was always more cautious and parochial than national. His laity’s struggle for self-sufficiency and localised horizons retarded Montgomery’s endeavours to expand their missionary vision. Their conservatism, with its suspicion of change and determination to identify themselves with the home

<sup>9</sup> Steven Maughan, ‘Imperial Christianity? Bishop Montgomery & the Foreign Missions of the Church of England, 1895–1915’ in Andrew Porter (ed.), *The Imperial Horizons of British Protestant Missions, 1880–1914*, Eerdmans, Cambridge, 2003, pp. 32–57.

church and to conform to its norms, challenged Montgomery's attempts to distract his flock from the mire of English fin-de-siècle partisan controversies by a united, irenic and elevating engagement in their Church's ongoing and world-wide mission.

The extraordinary manner in which his wife, Maud Montgomery, became his active partner in his episcopal mission warrants study in its own right. She did so by caring for the weak and fallen, as well as by sharing in his travels to care for outlying members, by inspiring women and children to pray and fund missionary work, and finally by fund-raising for diocesan work in general. She sustained this wide range of work whilst caring for a growing family and providing the hospitality required of a bishop's wife at Bishopscourt. This study examines her distinctive model of the proactive wife of an equally proactive colonial bishop, and how difficult she found it to continue this role after her return to England.

Bishop Montgomery's proactive and militant model of Anglican episcopacy was likewise more easily expressed in a colonial than in any contemporary English home diocese, where bishops often controlled the appointment of less than 25 percent of their diocesan clergy, and where their time and flexibility were encumbered by a range of administrative responsibilities imposed upon an established church by custom and parliamentary statute. While colonial bishops might struggle to find and fund clergy fit for the task, they had more power over clergy tenure to enable bishops to deploy them to good effect. Thus there was more scope for robust episcopal initiatives (if fewer human and financial resources to sustain them) in the colonial dioceses of 'Greater Britain' than in England during the nineteenth century.<sup>10</sup> Once again, what were church principles or ideals at home might take more visible and concrete form abroad. George Augustus Selwyn's episcopate in New Zealand was one early and famously heroic exemplar of this new episcopal freedom. Montgomery shared in this greater freedom, though he too faced problems in manpower management as this study will later demonstrate.

Bishop Montgomery also exemplified the way in which Anglican experience in dioceses abroad shaped Anglican church life at home, not least through the perceptions he brought home to Britain in 1901 when he began his twenty years' service as the first episcopal Secretary of the SPG. Overseas experiences provided models for home church reform just as overseas dioceses offered scope for adapting home patterns and in undertaking controversial experimentation, embodying what had only been church 'ideals' at home. This broader reflex effect of colonial on home church life warrants more exploration, although it is beyond the scope of this study of Montgomery during his Tasmanian episcopate.

A posthumous biography, *Bishop Montgomery: A Memoir* by 'M.M.' is a loyal wife's wreath on the grave of her late husband. It is invaluable, but incomplete. P.R. Hart's unpublished MA thesis, 'The Church of England in Tasmania under Bishop

<sup>10</sup> See my article, 'The Anglican Episcopate in England & Australia in the Early Twentieth Century: towards a comparative study', *Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 16, No. 2, December 1990, pp. 154–72.

Montgomery, 1889–1901’,<sup>11</sup> inevitably provides good background, not least where it maps Montgomery’s own distinctive contribution. Geoffrey Stephens’ pamphlet, ‘H.H. Montgomery – The Mutton Bird Bishop’<sup>12</sup> delineates another unusual aspect of his episcopate. Steven Maughan has reassessed Montgomery’s work as SPG Secretary.<sup>13</sup> Briefer references have been made (some of them negative) to Henry and Maud Montgomery’s role as parents in biographies of the Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery of Alamein.<sup>14</sup>

No full study of Montgomery has yet been made that reveals his contribution to remodelling the modern Anglican episcopate, and examines the importance which his missionary-oriented expression of the Anglican episcopate has for the life of his Anglican Church in Australia and in the wider Anglican Communion. To this end this study has drawn on his many letters in Lambeth Palace Library archives as well as on local Tasmanian sources. It offers a reassessment of his importance in the light of his times, and in the light of issues that continue to shape twenty-first century Anglicanism whether in Australia or beyond.

Seizing the opportunity to reshape models of Anglican episcopate in Greater Britain called for a bishop who was physically, intellectually and spiritually ready to do so, and then be able to take and exercise command. Henry Montgomery was one of this kind.

Montgomery made frequent recourse to military analogy to explain and justify his role as an episcopal commander. This had several facets and outcomes, which later chapters will examine. It is, nevertheless, a measure of his high esteem of the military career as a Christian vocation (perhaps learnt earlier during his young childhood in India) that he sent his two oldest sons to train at Sandhurst.

The next chapter will examine what shaped and formed the missionary and ministerial vocation and thinking of this bishop, who made such frequent recourse to imperial (and to military) analogy to articulate it.

---

<sup>11</sup> University of Tasmania, Hobart, 1963.

<sup>12</sup> University of Tasmania, Occasional Paper 39, Hobart, 1985.

<sup>13</sup> For example, S. Maughan in A. Porter (ed.), *Imperial Horizons*, pp. 32–57

<sup>14</sup> For example, Brian Montgomery, *A Field Marshal in the Family*, Constable, London, 1973 and in Nigel Hamilton’s *Monty: The Making of a General 1887–1942*, Vol. 1, H. Hamilton, UK, 1981.

# The Shaping of a Militant and Missionary Bishop

**B**ISHOP MONTGOMERY'S DISTINCTIVE MISSIONARY COMMITMENT came first of all from his family and upbringing. His clergy training and later London parish experiences reinforced this orientation.

Family mattered much to Henry Montgomery, especially his father. His father was born at Moville, Co. Donegal, and attended Foyle College in Londonderry, along with other Anglo-Irish boys (like the Lawrence brothers) who were likewise to achieve great prominence through Indian service. When introducing himself to his people on arrival in Tasmania, Henry Montgomery referred first to his father as one 'to whom he owed so much'. Robert Montgomery, he said, had been a 'North of Ireland man' who went out to India supported by his merits but not by 'influence'. His abilities had promoted him to the position of co-Administrator of the Punjab in Lahore as the Mutiny approached in 1857. There he was to be faced with a critical and fateful decision – as his son then explained to them:

The troops at Lahore were about to mutiny, and it was for him to decide, upon his own responsibility, whether he would disarm them or not. It was a thing that had not been done in the Empire before, but four regiments were disarmed, and by that prompt step he believed he was correct in saying India had been saved for the Empire.<sup>1</sup>

These patriotic and filial remarks of their newly arrived bishop were (predictably) met with cheers. Robert Montgomery had later been knighted for his enterprise and cool-headedness during that 1857 emergency, and was often later applauded as 'the man who saved India'. His father had thus become famous through his loyalty and commitment in overseas service. His son would undoubtedly have gained from his father's reputation built on his actions in Lahore and later as Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab. Above all Henry Montgomery learnt from him the tradition of service to a higher and imperial cause.

After Sir Robert returned from India in 1865, their relationship became closer and more personal. Henry Montgomery obviously revered his father. From him he claimed to have learnt such lessons and gained counsel on so many occasions as to be eternally thankful to God. He always found him 'the wisest of men, not only in secular matters, but those connected with the clerical profession.'<sup>2</sup> His grandson, Brian

<sup>1</sup> *CN*, November 1889, pp. 173–4

<sup>2</sup> *CN*, November 1889, p. 174.

Montgomery (Bishop Montgomery's youngest son) refers in his book on Sir Robert to recollections of Sir Robert's Indian experience conveyed through his son, Henry, 'who meticulously recorded much of their conversation in his own handwriting, and also in his (unpublished) short history of Sir Robert.' Henry Montgomery apparently spent long hours later in his life talking with Brian about his revered father.<sup>3</sup>

The religious training he received from his parents to whom he professed to owe so much was even more significant in his formation. Sir Robert Montgomery was a man of deep religious conviction, grounded in an Evangelical and Northern Irish Protestant Anglican piety that he shared with his first wife, Fanny, who died in India of smallpox on 23 March 1842, after eight years of marriage. Her three young children were sent back to England to the care of her elder sister Eliza, wife of George Hutchinson (later General, who became Henry's godfather. He was killed during the Mutiny in Delhi in 1857).<sup>4</sup> On furlough in England, Robert in May 1845 married his second wife, Ellen Jane Lambert. Fifteen years his junior, she was no stranger to India having been born there, the daughter of a Calcutta merchant. Sharing her husband's Evangelical piety, she is said to have exerted a great influence on her husband and on her children, Henry among them, who inherited many of her strong qualities.<sup>5</sup>

Henry Montgomery's parents shaped his early religious convictions and helped plan his early career. Henry was born in Cawnpore in 1847 and sent back to England eight years afterwards for schooling, never to return to Lahore until 1913. Henry recalled how, just before he left them, his father and mother 'took me into a room and we knelt down and my father commended me to the keeping of God.' Montgomery later commented: 'I cannot remember the words, but the memory of that prayer I can recall very clearly.'<sup>6</sup> Not surprisingly, they sent him to a school at Brighton conducted by a Miss Baker who was, according to family tradition, 'a most fervent Christian of the strictest Evangelical principles. She aimed at teaching her pupils the Bible and making them realise the great truths of revelation.' Bishop Montgomery himself recalled how, despite the odours of brimstone, 'on the whole such diet has done me immense good, for it has left behind in me an awful sense of the Holy Will of God. The thunders of Sinai should not be forgotten by any Christian.'

In 1861 Henry Montgomery went to Harrow School which then had a poor reputation for promoting godliness. Yet the influences of a clergyman master and of the chapel there were both fondly remembered, and indicate that Henry's personal spiritual regimen could withstand the scorn and brutality of his peers. He recalled, on the first night of his having been made head of his house, 'the intensity of my

<sup>3</sup> Brian Montgomery, *Monty's Grandfather: Sir Robert Montgomery GCSI, KCB, LLD, 1809-87*, Blandford Press, Poole, Dorset, 1984, p. vi.

<sup>4</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 17; Brian Montgomery, *Monty's Grandfather*, pp. 38, 86.

<sup>5</sup> Brian Montgomery, *Monty's Grandfather*, p. 39 portrays her as 'a beautiful girl with dark brown hair, a high intelligent forehead and full mouth, large grey eyes, and wonderful colouring. She was completely different from Robert's first wife, being strong physically, very determined and not shy in any way; she was a powerful character, full of common sense.'

<sup>6</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 4.

prayers at what seemed to be a solemn crisis of my life.’<sup>7</sup> At Harrow he excelled at games, both football and cricket, and rose to be head of his house. This trained him in leadership, and in the virtues of team loyalty.

From Harrow Henry Montgomery went up to Trinity College, Cambridge in 1867. Montgomery was not a scholar. His wife’s memoir claims ‘He did not win intellectual honours at school or college’ but ‘he was what was perhaps better, a plodder’. He took his degree in the Moral Sciences Tripos, being bracketed eighth with A.J. Balfour. Yet he never lost his intellectual curiosity and appetite for note-taking, reading and study, and later in Tasmania he persisted in this reading and writing. At Cambridge he kept up his football and cricket, captaining the Trinity College eleven. He made a reputation by jumping up the dining hall steps at Trinity. Equipping him in stamina of mind and body, and without damaging his moral reputation, Cambridge remained for Montgomery a golden memory. ‘God who kept me from the temptations of school life did not desert me at college, and who can adequately tell the blessing of looking back over a university career without pain or remorse.’<sup>8</sup> Puzzlingly, no accounts of Henry’s Cambridge days record where he found his spiritual home and sustenance. Perhaps, like Harrow, it was partly through the college chapel.

His adult relationship with his father was renewed after the latter’s return to England in 1865. Henry later remembered going to meet him:

I was eight when I last saw him, at Lahore before the great mutiny, and I was now seventeen and a Harrow boy. I expected to see a tall man; I found quite a short one. Moreover, I had really to make his acquaintance, and it took years till I respected and loved him; I do not think I fully realised his great merits till I read his record, and he wrote to me so frequently.<sup>9</sup>

After Sir Robert returned to England his surviving letters to Henry clearly transmitted and shared an Evangelical thrust and piety.<sup>10</sup> As this filial relationship was renewed as adults, an Evangelical expression of the Christian faith was one common bond between this young London clergyman and his eminent father. A brief personal note later written by Sir Robert to Henry in 1878 conveys both his pride in his imperial service and the closeness of their spiritual companionship:

My dear Henry, I arrived in India on 13 November 1828. Today, 13 November 1878, I complete a service of fifty years, and I am still in harness! How merciful God has been to me. I landed in India not knowing anyone, for I was not at Haileybury; I had neither talent nor interest. But I was advanced in my career from step to step, and received wealth sufficient for all purposes, as well as honours. A review of the past, thankful as it is, is very humbling – when I look back on the numbers I started with in

<sup>7</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, pp. 8–9.

<sup>8</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, pp. 11–13.

<sup>9</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 124.

<sup>10</sup> LPL Miscellaneous MSS, Vol. 4537, ff.86–179. The lay and evangelical piety of his father, Sir Robert Montgomery, that he expressed as administrator, widower and parent in India, is well revealed in his grandson Brian Montgomery’s biography.

life, almost all gone, and I am spared. The goodness of God has indeed been great to me, and in the fullness of my heart I cannot help writing a few lines to you.<sup>11</sup>

Sir Robert actively recruited Christian converts for the Indian public service; and later received glowing tributes in *Friend of India*, a journal of the Church Missionary Society, of which body he was made a Vice-President.<sup>12</sup> When the son of this ‘great missionary-hearted ruler of the Punjab’ later became the SPG’s Secretary, that Society’s attitude to the CMS ‘became much warmer and more sympathetic than it had ever been before’.<sup>13</sup> Bishop Montgomery never lost his respect for the CMS’s missionary zeal. It would seem, then, that his father not only helped to inspire Henry with a sense of family vocation to imperial service and the clerical profession, but in endorsing his son’s decision to become an Anglican clergyman he had also imbued it with a distinct Christian missionary commitment and Evangelical zeal for the Gospel. He coached and guided his son in embarking on his career, even in negotiating suitable early appointments for him.<sup>14</sup> Sir Robert died ‘in harness’ and in his London (7 Cornwall Gardens, SW1) residence on 28 December 1887. His body was conveyed to the family grave in St Augustine’s Cathedral, Londonderry, since there was no consecrated gravesite at his family home at New Park.

As the second son of the second marriage of the owner of a small northern Irish estate, Henry Hutchison Montgomery might therefore have sought a Commission to serve in India or, like his grandfather, a clerical vocation. At some time and place, he chose the latter. How and when this occurred is still conjecture. Like his elder brother he went to Harrow. He loved it, however academically unreformed it still was. Harrow was not a military college for sons of officers or budding officers. Yet young Henry Montgomery could scarcely have escaped the affects of celebrating British military glory, growing up as he did during the military repression of that Indian Mutiny, the Crimean Wars and later military campaigns that secured British interests in India and in southern and western Africa. He was in his first parish when General Gordon was killed in Khartoum.

Becoming an Anglican clergyman was certainly a family tradition. Sir Robert’s father, Samuel Law Montgomery, was an Anglican clergyman, Rector of the local parish of Moville. He was owner of a small estate, much of it now occupied by a resort town. Bishop Henry later wrote a sympathetic account of Samuel Law Montgomery for his children in his *A Generation of Montgomerys*, which he intended as a testimony ‘owed to those who trained and inspired’ a later generation. “Family histories create

---

<sup>11</sup> LPL Miscellaneous MSS, Vol. 4537, ff.125–6.

<sup>12</sup> LPL Miscellaneous MSS, Vol. 4537, f.121.

<sup>13</sup> Eugene Stock, *A History of the Church Missionary Society*, Supplementary Vol. IV, CMS, 1916, p. 546.

<sup>14</sup> Surviving letters from Sir Robert Montgomery to his young clergyman son, Henry, during the 1870s pass on the spiritual depth and perceptive earnestness of his Evangelicalism. LPL, Miscellaneous MSS Vol. 4537, ff.86–179.

traditions” he would say, “and I hope traditions of honourable life.”<sup>15</sup>

When Henry Montgomery developed his sense of vocation to become a clergyman is less certain, even if he was following a family tradition for second sons. At Cambridge he had bravely collected CMS subscriptions from undergraduates, and become a Sunday School teacher at Jesus Lane School, later commenting, ‘I knew I was to be ordained, and felt that I must know how to teach.’<sup>16</sup> He took his degree at Christmas 1869, and in January 1870 he began preparing for holy orders under Dr Charles Vaughan, Master of the Temple. It was on Dr Butler’s and Dr Westcott’s recommendation that another Harrow boy, Randall Davidson, went from Oxford in April 1872 to read under Vaughan as one of his ‘Doves’. Perhaps it was on Butler’s advice as Master of Trinity that Montgomery, too, had gone to join them, but Sir Robert Montgomery checked Vaughan out and made the necessary financial arrangements. Dr Vaughan’s strength lay in his sermons that ‘were not only brilliant in phrasing and delivery, but also charged with a strong moral appeal.’<sup>17</sup> This was an apprenticeship model of Anglican clergy training, and Montgomery later regarded his élite preparation by Dr Vaughan as a ‘unique experience’. Dr Vaughan’s emphasis lay on personal religion, human sinfulness and the Saviour. By tradition he respected the Anglican Prayer Book. His tutelage meant much engagement in pastoral activity followed by careful reflection upon it.

Montgomery’s ordination was an outcome his father endorsed. The day before Henry was made deacon (on Trinity Sunday 1871 in Chichester Cathedral), his father visited him and asked him ‘to kneel with him whilst he prayed, having composed a special prayer for the occasion.’<sup>18</sup> A sequence of strenuous curacies followed. His first curacy at Hurstpierpoint, under Canon Borrer, supplied lifelong friends, and two and a half years of very hard work in visiting, daily teaching in schools and sermon preparation. So fatigued had Henry become that his father helped to fund a four month’s holiday in the East. He returned in May 1874 to another curacy at Christ Church, Blackfriars Road, where he again worked so hard in that slum parish that his robust and athletic health nearly collapsed.<sup>19</sup>

Dr Vaughan then recommended Montgomery to Dr Farrar (formerly housemaster at Harrow and headmaster of Marlborough, and father of his bride-to-be), newly appointed in 1876 as Vicar of St Margaret’s Westminster. Sir Robert also favoured it and negotiated the financial and other terms of his son’s appointment. Sir Robert’s letters discuss Farrar’s sermons and Henry’s homiletic efforts. For his part, Canon

---

<sup>15</sup> MS written in Tasmania, 1891–92. A transcribed copy (with family photographs) is held in the Tasmanian State Archives, Hobart. [Perhaps it was the copy that belonged to Una Holden, née Montgomery, who returned to Tasmania.] This saying is reported in M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 1.

<sup>16</sup> Autobiographical notes in LPL, Miscellaneous MSS 4540, ff.30–44.

<sup>17</sup> G.K.A. Bell, *Randall Davidson: Archbishop of Canterbury*, 3rd edn, Oxford University Press, 1952, pp. 27–9. Dr Vaughan’s alternative pattern of clergy training to that of the more novel theological colleges is sketched on pp.28–9.

<sup>18</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, pp. 15–16. See also letters in LPL Archives, Miscellaneous MSS 4537.

<sup>19</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, pp. 16–18.

Farrar worked to advance Montgomery's career, later telling Sir Robert, 'during his three years here I have brought his name prominently before the Archbishop, the Bishop of London, and the Queen and I cannot but rejoice that he will have lost nothing by coming to work with me.'<sup>20</sup> Canon Farrar's sermons attracted crowds; St Margaret's furnishings and ornaments were 'restored' to mid Victorian standards, and soon paid for. The working of the parish, however, which included 'some of the wickedest streets of London', was soon left in the hands of his two curates. Amidst this busyness, Henry Montgomery's education was widened. He was invited to become companion, and secretary, to the widowed Dean Stanley of Westminster. 'Montgomery became like a son of the house... Intellectually it was like being in a forcing house. He met continually every prominent literary Englishman.' When in 1879, Archbishop Tait appointed Montgomery to the living of St Mark's, Kennington, Stanley was grief stricken at the prospect of separation. In 1880 Montgomery accompanied Stanley on a tour of southern France and northern Spain. Dean Stanley wished to perform the marriage of Montgomery to Maud Farrar in the Abbey but this was forestalled by his dying a week beforehand. Montgomery was by his bed when he died. With the Abbey bedecked in mourning, it was Archbishop Tait who married Henry and Maud in the Abbey's Henry VIIIth Chapel on 28 July 1881.

Other influential men besides his father, therefore, had already shaped Montgomery's understanding of ministerial service: Dr H.M. Butler, Dean C.J. Vaughan, Dean A. Stanley; Dr F.W. Farrar, Bishop A.W. Thorold of Rochester, and, more remotely, Archbishop A.C. Tait. In their own ways, all would have accentuated his zeal to win alienated souls to Christ – not only in London's slums but in Britain's growing Empire abroad.<sup>21</sup>

The ten strenuous years Montgomery spent as the vicar of the inner south London parish of St Mark's Kennington strengthened his pastoral and evangelistic skills. He shared responsibility in working it with at least three curate colleagues and they met weekly to monitor pastoral needs and progress. Dean Stanley, while he lived, remained a mentor, and Dr Farrar came increasingly to be his confidant and friend. Chapter V of Maud Montgomery's *Memoir* gives an empathetic account of his developing pastoral enterprise. His mission strategy encouraged intensive visiting and then adult confirmations. His congregation grew partly through sustaining his pastoral principle, viz., 'Never let go anyone you once get hold of'. This soon became physically exhausting, even for a man of his drive, physique and energy.<sup>22</sup> The parish magazine, all written by him, became 'an immense engine' in his hands, and set a precedent for his later use of the Tasmanian diocesan *Church News*. Similarly he found time somehow to read, and to write – on Kennington, on Oval cricket, and on the nearby Vauxhall Gardens.

<sup>20</sup> F.W. Farrar to Sir R. Montgomery, 9 July 1879, LPL, Miscellaneous MSS 4537, ff.86–8, 104–8, 140, 157, 179.

<sup>21</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, pp. 19–21.

<sup>22</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, pp. 22–7.

Bishop A.W. Thorold of Rochester was another formative influence. While at Kennington Montgomery became his examining chaplain, and from his moderate Evangelical churchmanship he would learn pastoral skills. Indeed, he found Thorold's advice on the work and spiritual responsibilities of a bishop so valuable that Montgomery recounted it on his arrival in Tasmania and later recorded it in his 'Thoughts on the Work of a Bishop'. For his part Thorold wrote to reassure the Tasmanian diocesan Administrator, Francis Hales: 'You have an admirable successor in Montgomery. He has sagacity, great manliness, and enthusiasm of duty, the theological instinct and a knack of influencing as well as of ruling men.'<sup>23</sup>

Montgomery was also learning parenthood. The pattern of home life that was being shaped in those ten busy years in St Mark's vicarage was later recalled by his wife:

Home life – how much was possible in this crowded time? Five of their nine children were born at Kennington, and no press of work was allowed to interfere with his happy intercourse with his family. The children all had meals with their parents, the 'baby' lying on a pillow on the floor. Their father had a great power of concentration. He could work in his study with the children playing about the room, and many of his sermons were written in the nursery overlooking the Oval cricket ground, while matches were being played. Every Saturday evening he and his wife dined with his father and mother; on Sundays they had supper with his wife's father and mother at Dean's Yard, and thus in the midst of hard work happy family intercourse was kept up. Monday, as far as possible, was kept as a 'day off'. And every summer they went over to New Park, where Henry renewed his strength among its beloved hills and the children learnt to love their old Irish home.<sup>24</sup>

They built on this early Kennington experience when they and their young family lived in the confines of Bishopscourt, Hobart, where their home became increasingly the headquarters for much diocesan work. This was work initiated both by his wife, Maud, as well as by Henry himself. Her growing partnership in his vocation to missionary work and diocesan oversight is the subject of later chapters.

His breadth of pastoral experience, his strong interest in Christian missionary work, and the diverse and broad sources of his spiritual and clerical formation, were all to find dramatic new scope when in 1889, Canon Farrar conveyed the invitation to his forty-two year old son-in-law to agree to be consecrated and to be sent out as the next Anglican Bishop of Tasmania.

Timothy Yates has reminded us<sup>25</sup> that the concept of 'a missionary bishop' was not Montgomery's invention. It had a wider context. It was resurrected amidst 1830s

---

<sup>23</sup> CN, July 1889, p. 107. For Montgomery's enthronement sermon reference, see CN, November 1889, p. 172; Montgomery, 'Thoughts on the Work of a Bishop, and on its Special Dangers', Unpublished MS, outlined in 1900 and later extended, p. 1. Intended as a Handbook for briefing new bishops and never published, this typed text was first assembled in 1905, and revised in 1908.

<sup>24</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 27.

<sup>25</sup> Timothy Yates, 'The Idea of a "Missionary Bishop" in the Spread of the Anglican Communion in the Nineteenth Century', *The Journal of Anglican Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, June 2004, pp. 52–61.

Tractarian interest in the ‘primitive episcopacy’ as a divinely chosen church agency, untrammelled by Erastian or secular statute. Samuel Wilberforce rediscovered the ideal of a ‘missionary bishop’ in writing his history of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States (published in 1844), though he was already discussing it in 1837 with John Henry Newman. Newman agreed that ‘doubtless the only right way of mission-izing is by bishops’. Yates traces the ideal back to the sermons and writings of the United States’ Bishop G.W. Doane of New Jersey. According to Doane’s understanding, the bishop was ‘*sent forth* by the church...going before to organise the Church, not waiting till the Church has been partially organised – a leader not a follower.’ The exigencies of missionary work shaped practice and then theology. Yates argues that this concept was embodied in the 1863 consecration (by Robert Gray, Bishop of Capetown) of Bishop Mackenzie to the Zambesi mission of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa. This was for Bishop Gray to be a missionary diocese set up beyond the legal boundaries of Britain’s empire, and of his province. An earlier embodiment was recognised in the ‘missionary’ Bishop G.A. Selwyn of New Zealand, whose pioneering work with the Melanesian Mission and the Maori had by 1867 established him as an Englishman’s paradigm of the ‘missionary bishop’. This was a view of missionary strategy in marked contrast to that of the CMS, whose leaders at that time regarded the appointment of a bishop in any mission field as the proper capping stone to a previously established missionary church structure.<sup>26</sup> These differing concepts of mission management were to emerge later in Montgomery’s arguments with his Primate, Bishop W.S. Smith, over the way their New Guinea Mission should be instituted, and are discussed in Chapter 3.

Contemporary heroic idealisation of the ‘missionary bishop’ surfaced in the sermon which Canon Farrar, Montgomery’s father-in-law, preached at his consecration. One assumes it was now an exalted vision of episcopacy, as well as of missionary method, that Montgomery himself was then to share. Henry Hutchinson Montgomery was consecrated in Westminster Abbey on 1 May 1889, by the Archbishop of Canterbury (E.W. Benson), assisted by the Bishops of Rochester (A.W. Thorold), Antigua (W.W. Jackson), Moosonee (J. Horden), and Ballarat (S. Thornton). There Canon Farrar delivered (according to *The Church News for the Diocese of Tasmania’s* report) ‘an eloquent address on the growth of the colonial empire of England [*sic!*] and the extension of the Episcopate, and the blessedness of an episcopal organisation.’<sup>27</sup> This sermon outlined these high views or expectations of the Anglican ‘missionary’ episcopate, with a certain British racialism. It reflected also something of the imperial euphoria that lingered (in London at least) after the 1887 Jubilee celebrations of the accession of their Queen Victoria, then also their ‘Queen and Empress’, and the paraded ornamental glory of her far-flung multiracial empire.

<sup>26</sup> See also Owen Chadwick, *Mackenzie’s Grave*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1959, pp. 19–24.

<sup>27</sup> *CN*, July 1889, p. 98.

In this imperial context, Farrar's sermon recounted how Tasmania was first settled by the British race only as recently as 1803, 'yet already Australasia [was] an empire with a giant's youth'. There had been no deliberate human plan in this spread of their race: 'we seem, as it were, to have conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind.' Yet, in contemplating the 'accidental manner' in which their colonies had 'sprung into power and grandeur', they must recognise 'the silent workings of that Divine Providence which shapes the history of man with so little reference to man's conscious purposes.' Consequently 'this island of ours in the northern seas, which the Romans regarded as the farthest limit of the world' had become 'the mighty mother of empires, greater than Rome.'<sup>28</sup> He also played the keys of the old argument that empire brought with it a moral responsibility for the welfare of Britain's subjects.

Britain's behaviour had sadly not matched her exalted role. Farrar continued: 'Would to God that we could always rise to the height of this immense and sacred responsibility; our responsibility which, before the century is over, may embrace one-fourth of the human race.' Farrar was quick to reprimand the British for their contaminating and morally-destructive effect on the 'darker and feebler races of the world whom we have ruined by our encroachments or decimated by our vices.' Nor had they shown proper pastoral concern for their mother country's children living in distant lands. They should, therefore, cry to God for mercy, and thank him for His favours.<sup>29</sup>

Among such favours was the growth of the Anglican episcopate abroad (then numbering seventy-five dioceses). Farrar then reviewed the spiritual leadership and missionary zeal of past bishops in East and West, and their mountain-treading promotion of peace and good tidings. Memorable, too, he insisted, were images of 'the humblest of our missionaries'. (He being the son of CMS missionaries in India knew his missionary hall of fame!)

We think of New Zealand, and

With furrowed brow and eye serenely fair,

The calm wind wandering o'er the silver hair,

His arm uplifted and his wasted eye

Fixed in deep rapture on the golden sky

the figure of Samuel Marsden rises before us. We think of Schwartz, and Carey, and Marshman, and Henry Martyn, in Hindustan; of Williams, the martyr of Erromango in Polynesia; of the lonely deathbed of David Livingstone in Ilala.

Yet in all these lands 'the humble Bishops' also had 'placed themselves in the very forefront of toil and peril' and 'done a work which it is only possible for Bishops to achieve'. They too had set a heroic and a military pattern. Referring to India he recalled 'the fair spirit of Reginald Heber, the quiet wisdom of George Cotton'. In

<sup>28</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 98.

<sup>29</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 99.

Newfoundland he recalled ‘the apostolic labours of Bishop Field for thirty-five years’. In New Zealand ‘the image of Selwyn seems to rise before us’. In Sierra Leone, three English Bishops had died in seven years, ‘each stepping where his predecessor had fallen’. Then, ‘how many a brave and self-denying standard-bearer of the Cross’ had there been among the bishops that met only last summer in that Abbey! He also applauded the pioneering evangelism in North Canada of Bishop Hordern of Moosonee, who was then sharing in Montgomery’s consecration.

In contrast to the luxury and materialism so visible at home he extolled ‘the aureola of martyrdom’ that had been seen ‘shining softly round the brows of Bishops we have known’. He cited Bishop Charles Mackenzie and Bishop Coleridge Patteson as examples – and somehow as vicarious sacrifices. (Were their ‘vicarious’ deaths an atonement for the sins of past neglect, or had his emotion exceeded the bases of his theology?) Farrar continued thanking God that even the life of this nineteenth century had been ‘redeemed and enobled by the imperial purple of martyrdom’. ‘Such, in age after age, has been the episcopate, and above all that which corresponds most nearly in its conditions to our Episcopate in the colonies. Nor can God have given it a nobler mark of His blessing than in putting into the happy hands of these bishops the palm of martyrdom.’<sup>30</sup>

He then turned to Montgomery – with not a little affection and paternal poignancy: ‘And you, dear friend and fellow-worker, almost my son in years and now my father in spiritual dignity, you, too, in the providence of God, are now called forth to join that noble company of men, whose prelacy has so often been a pre-eminence of toil.’ He recalled how Montgomery’s late father had, as much as any man, ‘helped to save India for us in the great mutiny’ and ‘we know that you, his eldest son, have inherited his righteous and sterling qualities, and are, as he was, a man who feareth God and worketh righteousness.’ After English schooling and London parochial service, the son had not been found wanting. ‘You will go forth to lands under the Southern Cross “to fight God’s battles and His work pursue.”’ He would leave nearest and dearest, and live out his remaining life in a distant hemisphere. Farrar wished Montgomery might ever see in its constellations ‘the Cross of Christ, the sign whereby you shall be able to conquer and endure; the emblem of that absolute humility, and that absolute self-sacrifice which will be, I trust, the very keynote of your episcopate.’<sup>31</sup>

The themes and expectations in Farrar’s sermon would later accord with Montgomery’s own language in identifying a special Divine mission for Britain’s Anglican episcopate in the late nineteenth century. Montgomery on his arrival in Tasmania did not conceal his dedication to such an exalted ideal of active episcopal missionary engagement.

---

<sup>30</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 99.

<sup>31</sup> M.M., *Bishop Montgomery*, p. 100.



*Montgomery, newly consecrated Bishop of Tasmania, London, 1889. Allport Library and Museum of Fine Arts, State Library of Tasmania. [AUTAS0011225882977 'Bishop']*