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I must confess, to my distress,
That I have many foes,
And every day for them I pray
With thumb unto my nose.
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ABSTRACT

G.W.L. Marshall-Hall began work as first Ormond Professor of Music at Melbourne University in 1891. In July and August 1898 he published a book of poems and gave a public address, which, together, led to demands for his dismissal. The outcry against him came largely from a section of the community which Matthew Arnold, some thirty years earlier in England, had identified as Hebraic. The radical contrast between, on the one hand, the underlying assumptions of this group, particularly its epistemology and axiology and, on the other, the Hellenic, Existentialist axioms that informed Marshall-Hall's thinking, created a situation which was structurally conducive to the hostile outbreak of collective action that occurred. This structural conduciveness was reinforced by a number of elements of strain - a belief in the debased character of the times; a pervasive Manicheanism; various misunderstandings in regard to Marshall-Hall's views, deriving from the unsystematic and frequently allegorical manner of their exposition; and contemporary perceptions of his role as a university teacher, and of the tone in which his outbursts were couched (itself the outcome of a blend of conscious beliefs and unconscious motivation). All this, together with the undoubtedly indecent, irreligious and irreverent character of his utterances of mid-1898, made it inevitable that the latter would
precipitate widespread demands for his removal from the University. His failure to secure a renewal of his current contract, which expired at the end of 1900, reflected principally the strength of this pressure, the shrewd tactics employed by his opponents, as well as the tactical ineptitude of his supporters, and the particular composition of the University Council at the time.
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While no part of this thesis has been published in verbatim form, some of the argument is included in my 'Roosevelt in Australia', Overland 99 July 1985, and 'Hellenism and Hebraism in Australia: a Case Study', due to appear in the Journal of Religious History during 1986.
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INTRODUCTION

Australians have developed something of an unenviable genius for endeavouring, successfully and otherwise, to sever university professors from their chairs. The honour roll of those so affected includes, in the 19th century, Edward Jenks and George Marshall-Hall in Victoria, and Joshua Ives in South Australia; and in the 20th, Arnold Wood and Christopher Brennan in New South Wales, and Sydney Sparkes Orr in Tasmania. Whether these unfortunate episodes exhibit any common, connecting features which could enlarge our understanding of the evolving national ethos is a question which must await investigation, detailed studies having been made only of the last three cases.¹

The object of the present work is to rectify the omission in respect of the second - to explore the controversy that raged about Marshall-Hall's head in the closing years of the century, with a view, broadly, to discovering why such widespread² and vehement opposition


²Embracing, that is, all Christian denominations, most of the colony's private schools and two of its three daily newspapers. Support for the professor was also widespread and vehement.
emerged to his continued occupancy of the chair, and why it was successful in having him removed.

1. The Story in Brief

First, a summary of the events will be useful.

George William Louis Marshall-Hall was born in London on 28 March 1862.\(^3\) His surname, as it appears on his birth certificate, was actually Hall, Marshall being the last of his four given names, but as he and his family generally used the hyphenated form\(^4\) (presumably to commemorate their connection with his celebrated physiologist grandfather\(^5\)), I shall, in deference, follow their example.

\(^3\) Certified Copy of An Entry of Birth, Given on 22.1.1975 at the General Register Office, London, No. BC871181

\(^4\) See e.g. Marshall Hall (senior, George's father) to J.H. Collins, 18 September 1875 and 21 October 1875 in Archives of the Mineralogical Society, London; 'Tristan and Isolde', article by John E. Marshall-Hall (George's brother) in Musical World, 18 January 1889; Hubert Marshall-Hall (George's son) to Herbert Brookes, 2 November 1920, in MHRM Group 1/5; G.W.L. MH to Alfred Deakin, 31 January 1913, Deakin papers NLA MS 1510.2392 Series 1 Box 1; G.W.L. MH to F.S. Delmer, 9 April 1902, in possession of Margaret M.S. Delmer, Woollahra, N.S.W.; G.W.L. MH to Ivy Brookes, 18 July 1911, Ivy Brookes papers NLA MS 2000 Personal Correspondence File; also articles signed by MH in e.g. Argus, 25 July 1908, 9 February 1908, 15 July 1907, 23 February 1907, 25 January 1907, 21 April 1911; Australian Musical News, August 1911, December 1911; Musical World, 8 February 1880, 2 February 1883; Monthly Musical Record, 1 July 1889, 1 September 1889; School, November 1889, September 1888, January 1889; Magazine of Music, September 1888, June 1888.

After a short period in Brighton, where he began his schooling, the family moved to Blackheath\(^6\). In 1873 he became a student at the Blackheath Proprietary School\(^7\). There his academic performance was mediocre\(^8\), but his interest in music, first aroused apparently by his paternal grandmother and her organist-composer brother\(^9\), was probably further stimulated with the appointment in August of the Rev. E. Wilton South, a musical enthusiast, as head\(^10\).

In October 1878, at the age of 16\(^11\), he went with his family to live in Montreux, Switzerland\(^12\), and during the next year or so, travelled on the Continent, returning to

---

\(^6\)Typescript in MH papers MHMA Group 1/1/2; the writer identifies himself as C.W.L. MH's brother, but it is not clear whether this is John E. or Algernon S. MH.

\(^7\)Principal's Register, New Boys: Visitors' Book, of Blackheath Proprietary School in Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.


\(^9\)J.E. MH to William Moore n.d. (context early 1920s), MHMA Group 1 1/1/2.


\(^11\)Not, as Radic claims, when he was 12 (M.T. Radic, 'Some Aspects of Musical Associations in Melbourne 1888-1915', Ph.D. Thesis, Melbourne University 1977, hereafter cited as Radic, Ph.D.). Radic's whole account of Marshall-Hall's early life is highly confusing and inaccurate, relying as it does on the incorrect descriptions found in Table Talk, 16 January 1891 (Radic, Ph.D., p.193).

\(^12\)Typescript by John E. or Algernon S. MH in MHMA, loc.cit.
England late in 1879 or early 1880\textsuperscript{13}. He next took up a residential position as organist and assistant language\textsuperscript{14} and music master at the Oxford Military College, Crowley\textsuperscript{15}, where he remained until April 1882\textsuperscript{16}. In September 1883 he enrolled at the Royal College of Music in London\textsuperscript{17}, but left after only one term\textsuperscript{18} to become organ master and teacher of French, German, Pianoforte and Theory of Music at Newton College in South Devon\textsuperscript{19}.

By this time any doubts he might have had about his future career seem to have been resolved, since

\textsuperscript{13}Radic's assertion that he spent six years in Europe (Radic, PH.D., p.193) is incorrect.

\textsuperscript{14}He claimed to be proficient in French, German, Latin and Greek, and to have a reading knowledge of Spanish (G.W.L. MH to MUC, 3 January 1889, MUCLB 3, p.294, MUCR).

\textsuperscript{15}Typescript by John E. or Algernon S. MH in MHMA, loc.cit.; see also MH's programme note on 'The Defence of Earl Godwin before the Witan', a scene from his early opera, Harold (performed February 1888) MMCA; John Tecklenborough, Seven Years' Cadet-Life. Containing the Records of the Oxford Military College. Anecdotes of Cadet-Life and Essays on Education, Oxford, 1883, p.12; Radic, relying on a testimonial from the head of the College, A.A. Bourne, dated 13 January 1882, and saying that MH had been in his employ 'for three years and a half' (MUCLB3, 295), asserts that he must have been sixteen and a half years old when he began (Radic, PH.D., p.191), (actually it would have been closer to sixteen and a quarter); however, sources cited above make it clear that Bourne was mistaken; no doubt he meant to write one year and a half.

\textsuperscript{16}Tecklenborough, op.cit., p.12.

\textsuperscript{17}Typescript by John E. or Algernon S. MH, loc.cit.; Students' Register, Department of Portraits, Royal College of Music, London.

\textsuperscript{18}John Runciman, in Magazine of Music, June 1892; Students' Register, Department of Portraits, loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{19}Testimonial from the head, G. Townsend Warner, dated 21 October 1885, MUCLB 3, 295 MUCR.
at the end of 1886 he gave up this position because, according to the headmaster, with 'so much work he has not been able to give so much attention as he could wish to his legitimate profession, music.'\textsuperscript{20} The College magazine says that he had found employment as an organist in Lausanne, Switzerland\textsuperscript{21}. If so, he was soon back in England working; first, as musical director of Wellington College in Crowthorne, Berkshire\textsuperscript{22}, and then, beginning in 1888, as orchestral and choral conductor and teacher of composition and singing at the London Organ School and Instrumental College of Music\textsuperscript{23}, where he supplemented his income with freelance musical journalism\textsuperscript{24} and by taking private pupils, including, according to Table Talk, the well-known baritone, David

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{21} Newtonian, Vol.12, p.176.

\textsuperscript{22} This was not, as Radic claims, a military college (Radic, Ph.D., p.198), but there is some mystery concerning his sojourn there. He, himself, said the school was in nearby Farnborough, Hampshire (Harold programme, op.cit.), but the only school with that name, and answering to the description given of it – opposite a 'lunatic asylum' (now the Broadmoor Hospital) and whose head at the time was E.C. Wickham, a son-in-law of Gladstone – is in Crowthorne, but has no record of his ever having been on the staff (letter in my possession from I. Hist (?), master of Wellington College, 27 January 1975). Yet a testimonial from A. Gray, the school's musical director, says he taught there for two years (MULB.3, 297); see also Harold programme scene loc.cit. and Table Talk, 20 March 1896, 15 January 1891, 2 June 1893.

\textsuperscript{23} J.E. MH to William Moore, loc.cit.; G.W.L. MH to MUC 3 January 1889, loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{24} J.E. MH to William Moore, loc.cit.; J.F. Runciman, in Magazine of Music, June 1892; and see e.g. Manchester Examiner, 31 August 1889; Magazine of Music, June 1888, August 1888; Musical World, 23 February 1889, Magazine of Music, September 1892, March 1893, July 1893.
Bispham 25. (This, however, was not corroborated in Bispham's memoirs.) 26

It was at this point that the path of Marshall-Hall's life intersected with that of Francis Ormond 27 who, in May 1887, had presented the sum of £20,000 to the University of Melbourne for the funding of a chair of music 28. Marshall-Hall's subsequent claim that he was twice recommended for the position by the London selection committee from a total of six hundred applicants, and that the sole reason for the Council's failure to accept the first recommendation was that he had been 'four years under the required age' 29, does more credit to his imagination than his memory. In fact, there were 18 applicants when the position was advertised in March 1888, but Sir Graham Berry, the Victorian Agent-General in London, informed the Melbourne authorities that the interviews 'were not satisfactory', and that, consequently, the committee members were unable to recommend 'any of them

25 Table Talk, 20 March 1896.


27 Not Sir Francis, as Radic would have him (see her 'Music of the Centennial International Exhibition', in Australia 1888, No. 7, April 1981, p. 85 ; and Radic, Ph.D., p. 18.)

28 MUCMB, 2 May 1887.

29 Argus, 1 February 1893; the last statement is repeated by Doreen Bridges in 'The Role of the Universities in the Development of Music Education in Australia 1885-1970', Ph.D. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1970, p. 11.
as being in their judgements competent to fill the position of Professor of Music at the University of Melbourne, although one member, Sir Alexander Mackenzie, had written, 'Only one is, in my opinion, near to the mark; that one is Mr. Marshall-Hall'.

It is true that an age of 'not less than thirty' had been stipulated in the job description, but there is no evidence that it was Marshall-Hall's youth that prevented the Committee from recommending him on this occasion. In fact, when the position was readvertised later in the same year, he was, although still well below the specified age, included among the four who were shortlisted, but whom the Committee felt unable to rank in order of merit.

In the end, it was Sir William Cleaver Robinson, a musical amateur and one-time Lieutenant-Governor of

---

30 G. Berry to Sir A.C. Brownless, 1 May, 1888, MUCRCP 1888/31.

31 A.C. Mackenzie to G. Berry, 30 May 1888, MUCRCP 1888/31; another member of this committee, Frederick Ouseley, Professor of Music at Oxford University, said that while 'among the applicants are the names of some eminently respectable men, and good musicians in the ordinary sense of the words', there were 'certainly not five - hardly one - of whom I could honestly speak as first class .... The best men have not become candidates' (Ouseley to Berry, 3 May 1888, ibid.); and a third, Charles Halle, expressed the view that the candidates 'have not, with one exception, perhaps (that of Mr. Marshall-Hall), proved such as to warrant our recommendation' (Halle to Berry, 27 April, 1888, ibid.).

32 MUCMB, 15 August 1887, MUCR.

33 Berry to Brownless, 1 February 1889, MUCRCF 1888/32; MUCMB, 11 March 1889, MUCR.
Victoria, who broke the impasse. Robinson, after discussions with Sir Alexander Mackenzie, Sir George Grove (Director of the Royal College of Music), and Frederic Cowen (erstwhile conductor of the Melbourne Exhibition orchestra), and after interviewing Marshall-Hall, concluded the last was a man whose 'musical abilities and knowledge [were] ... so great that ... he would ... command the respect and confidence of the musical profession in Victoria', and that, therefore, 'in the interests of the Colony no better arrangement could be made than to appoint Mr. Hall to the Chair.'

On receiving this advice, the Council consulted with Sir Charles Halle, a member of the original selection committee, who happened to be in the colony on a concert tour in 1890. Halle's endorsement of Robinson's favorable opinion clinched the matter, and on 1 September it was resolved to offer the chair to Marshall-Hall.

Thus, Cowen's subsequent contention that - 'it was entirely owing to the favorable opinions I expressed of Professor Hall's merits in a long conversation I had with Sir William Robinson ... that His Excellency succeeded in

---

34 Robinson to Berry, 19 June 1890, referred to in Brownless to Berry, 1 September 1890, MUCLB 3, 351 MUCR.

35 Australian Critic, 1 October 1890; Melbourne University Review, October 1890.

36 Brownless to Berry, 1 September 1890, MUCLB 3, 351 MUCR.

37 Ibid.; also telegram from Brownless to Berry, 2 September 1890, MUCLB 3, 353 MUCR.
inducing the London committee to reconsider the estimate
they had formed of Professor Hall ... and to appoint
him to the Chair of the Melbourne University, is
an evident distortion of what had occurred. That the
appointment was very much of a pis aller is borne out
by the unwillingness of both selection committees to
rank Marshall-Hall as superior to the other candidates,
as well as by the patently less than whole-heartedly
enthusiastic tone of Robinson's letter of recommendation,
which said, 'As I think it a real pity that this chair
should remain unoccupied ... I have no hesitation, after
consulting the authorities named in advising you to
recommend the appointment be offered to Mr. Hall to begin
with.'

Be that as it may, Marshall-Hall arrived in Melbourne
early in 1891 to take up his appointment in what was
only the second chair of music to be established in the
Australian colonies. (It is difficult to determine
whether Thérèse Radic accepts this chronology. At one
stage she claims that the Adelaide University chair only
came into being in 1897, and that, consequently, 'the
Ormond Chair was the earlier seat,' while later she
(correctly) gives priority to Adelaide, whose first

38 Argus, 31 January 1893.
39 Emphasis mine: Robinson to Berry, 19 June 1890, MUCRCF 1890/30.
40 Radic, Ph.D., pp.176-7.
41 Ibid., p.225.
professor, Joshua Ives, was in fact appointed in 1885.

It soon became clear that Marshall-Hall intended to make a contribution to Victoria's cultural life extending well beyond that of teaching the handful of students enrolled in his classes in the early nineties; in December 1892 he gave the first of a series of orchestral concerts whose number during the next twenty years was to reach 111; in 1895 he became first Director of the newly founded University Conservatorium, formed at a time when professional musicians were still suffering severely from the effects of the economic depression; between 1898 and 1902 he conducted the Melbourne Liedertafel, and all the time he never ceased to work actively as a composer, producing among other works a

---

42 Bridges, op.cit., p.3, 5.

43 Programmes of the Marshall-Hall concerts MMCA, including programme of the 'Fifth and Final Concert of the Season (1912) ... being the 111th since its inception' performed on 5 October 1912 at 3 p.m.

44 Leader, 9 March 1895.

45 Minute book of the Professional Musicians' Union of Australia, New South Wales Branch, 27 February 1899, in Musicians' Union papers in Australian National University Archives, Canberra.

46 Argus, 1 August 1898; MLMB, 10 September 1887, 10 June 1898; ML 30th Annual Report 1897-8 PG; actually, he remained as 'Honorary Conductor' in 1903 (ML 36th Annual Report 1903-4) but did not conduct any concerts for the society after 1902; on 28 February 1902 he was invited to retain the position of Honorary Conductor (MLMB, 28 February 1902); in March 1901 Auguste Siede was appointed conductor.
concert overture in G Minor (To Giordano Bruno)\textsuperscript{47}, an Idyll\textsuperscript{48}, a symphony in E flat\textsuperscript{49}, incidental music for Euripides' play Alcestis\textsuperscript{50}, a quartet for strings in D minor\textsuperscript{51}, a dramatic ballad based on Keats' 'La Belle Dame Sans Merci',\textsuperscript{52} a study of Tennyson's 'Maud'\textsuperscript{53}, a Capriccio for Violin and Orchestra\textsuperscript{54}, a choral ode\textsuperscript{55}, a music-drama called Aristodemus\textsuperscript{56}, two operas entitled Stella\textsuperscript{57} and Romeo and Juliet\textsuperscript{58}, and a play called Bianca Capello\textsuperscript{59}.

In addition, he managed to startle his contemporaries from time to time with heterodox pronouncements on a

\textsuperscript{47} J.E. MH to William Moore, \textit{loc.cit.}; Table Talk, 17 February 1893, 11 April 1893.
\textsuperscript{48} Table Talk, 20 March 1891, 20 March 1896.
\textsuperscript{49} J.E. MH to William Moore, \textit{loc.cit.}
\textsuperscript{50} Alma Mater, June 1898.
\textsuperscript{51} Programme of Cathedral Hall Concert, 1 October 1909, MHPG, Scrapbook MH 12/1 at p.77; \textit{Argus}, 23 February 1907.
\textsuperscript{52} Table Talk, 25 August 1893, 23 December 1898.
\textsuperscript{53} Table Talk, 5 April 1911; Programme of MH concert 25 August 1905, Kenneth Hince Papers NLA 2691 Series 5 Box 1.
\textsuperscript{54} Prospectus of MH Concerts, Kenneth Hince Papers, \textit{loc.cit.}, Box 13.
\textsuperscript{55} Table Talk, 27 October 1899.
\textsuperscript{56} Punch, 27 December 1900; MLMB, 11 April 1901.
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range of subjects, truculently delivered in the concert hall, the lecture room, and in four books of verse.  

The *Argus* took offence at his first antipodean public lecture in July 1891, when he impressed upon his audience the great superiority of the artist to pedestrian humanity at large.  

In 1892 he raised local musical hackles with an attack on the allegedly low standard of Melbourne performances and musical taste, a theme to which he returned on several occasions. In 1893 he attacked Frederic Cowen, conductor of the 1888 Centennial orchestra, for the quality of his work and for his alleged mutilation of Beethoven's 5th Symphony. And, later in the same year, he launched an onslaught on music critics in general, and again upset the *Argus* by defending Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen against that paper's strictures. In 1895 he crossed swords with *Argus* music critic
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T.H. Guenett, whom he accused of crass musical ignorance. And in the following year another skirmish occurred with the same paper, this time over the professor's expressed hostility to the Trinity College of Music (London).

In 1892 he and his wife had a daughter. But, shortly afterwards, the marriage broke up - wife and child returning to England. By 1898 (perhaps a good deal earlier) he had formed a new relationship with Catherine Hore, to whom a son was born in December.

The first of his books of verse, To Irene appeared in 1895, and was followed by A Book of Canticles and Hymn to Sydney, both in 1897. All three were criticised for their departure from respectable sexual norms. Shortly after publication of Hymn to Sydney he contracted diphtheria, which put him out of action till the following

---
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76 Ernest Moffitt to E.F. a'Beckett, 2 August 1897, MUCRCF 1897/6.
year, when he became involved in a production by Trinity College (Melbourne) of Euripides' play Alcestis, for which he wrote and directed the music, and which was performed on 22 June 1898.\textsuperscript{77}

It was in July that his fourth and final volume of poetry was published – the ill-fated \textit{Hymns Ancient and Modern}. Initially it attracted little attention. But on 1 August he delivered an address to the audience at a Melbourne Liedertafel concert. In it he lamented the 'puiling, knock-kneed pseudo-religiousness' of his time, and declared popular concerts to be 'as depressing to a man vigorous in mind and body as a visit to an idiot asylum, or hospital or church'. Affirming war to be 'a good thing. Nay! the best of all things', he praised the vigorous, war-like virtues of Bismarck who, he said, was the very epitome of what men should be. In addition, he attacked 'the modern petticot movement', extolled the 'exceptional vital energy' possessed by artists, and deplored that 'foolish and futile saying, "Blessed is the peacemaker"'.\textsuperscript{78} Four days later the \textit{Argus} published a blistering attack on \textit{Hymns Ancient and Modern}. The hunt for Marshall-Hall's academic scalp was on.

His first reaction to the University Council's request of 12 August that he explain his conduct\textsuperscript{79} was to tender

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Church of England Messenger}, 1 July 1898.
\item \textit{Argus}, 2 August 1898.
\item \textit{MUCME}, 12 August 1898.
\end{itemize}
his resignation, which, however, he withdrew in the following October. The Council responded on the 24th with a motion affirming that, due to the 'libidinous character of [Marshall-Hall's] poems and other writings, coupled with his ostentatious disbelief in Christianity, or any other form of theism, and his contempt for those who held such beliefs ... [t]he Council ... thinks it fair to intimate to him that, in the opinion of the Council, it will be impossible to reappoint him when his tenure of five years has come to an end in 1900.

But when it came two years later to actually carrying out this intention, it became clear that a considerable section both of the Council and the community at large wanted him reappointed. A long and complex controversy began.

On 4 June a motion to replace him was defeated, and a subcommittee of the Council was instructed to discuss the question of re-engagement with him. The meeting took place on the 6th.
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By then, however, the opposition had started to mobilise its forces. \textsuperscript{86} Protests came pouring in. An anti-Marshall-Hall deputation addressed the Council on the 18th, \textsuperscript{87} and seven days later a motion to re-appoint him was narrowly defeated. \textsuperscript{88}

On 16 July the Council resolved to advertise the position, but declined to disqualify the current incumbent. \textsuperscript{89} A total of 45 applications were received, including one from Marshall-Hall. \textsuperscript{90} They were to be examined on 25 October by a selection committee in London. \textsuperscript{91}

Meanwhile, two seats on the Melbourne University Council had become vacant, elections for which were held on 14 September \textsuperscript{92} and 2 November. \textsuperscript{93} The most prominent issue in the campaigns was, not unnaturally, the Marshall-Hall affair. But the results were not a clear cut victory for either side. \textsuperscript{94} On 10 December the Council was informed
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\item \textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 25 June 1900.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 16 July 1900.
\item \textsuperscript{90} Andrew Clarke to Henry Wrixon, 2 November 1900 in ibid., 10 December 1900.
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that the London committee had recommended the appointment of Franklin Peterson, a Scot, and it was resolved to offer him the post.95

But, ten days later, a report that the Agent-General had withdrawn Marshall-Hall's name from the committee's consideration burst like a bombshell on the community96 and was confirmed at a Council meeting on the 22nd97. The focus of the struggle now shifted as Marshall-Hall's supporters sought to persuade the professor-elect not to accept the offer.98 But their last ditch efforts proved unsuccessful99 and Marshall-Hall lost his chair.

He remained in Melbourne as director of a rival conservatorium, and continued to conduct the annual series of concerts begun in 1892. In 1913 he returned to England to try to stage two of his operas100. Although war put an end to these hopes, by then Peterson had died and a successful agitation was raised in Melbourne to have Marshall-Hall reappointed to the Ormond Chair101. He

95 MUCMB, 10 December 1900.
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100 MH to J.W. Barrett, 28 October 1912 MHPG M-H 913-6; F.M. Gibson to J.W. Barrett, 2 November 1912, ibid.
101 MH to F.S. Delmer, 26 July 1914, in possession of Margaret M.S. Delmer, loc.cit., MUCMB, 20 July 1914.
returned to take up the position early in 1915, but did not long enjoy his triumph, succumbing to peritonitis and dying on 18 July\textsuperscript{102}.

2. The Current State of Knowledge

Surprisingly, the episode that ended with Marshall-Hall's removal from the University has received little attention from historians. Ernest Scott, his younger contemporary and, from July 1913, Professor of History at the University, gave the first full account in a chapter of his History of the University of Melbourne entitled 'Music Hath Charms ...'\textsuperscript{103}. In it he sets the events flowing from the musician's offensive utterances of July and August 1898 into the larger context of his life and personality, and of the development of musical culture in the colony. Scott reviews early efforts to establish a chair of music in Melbourne, and shows how philanthropist-grazier, Francis Ormond's offer of £20,000 was, after considerable controversy, devoted to that purpose\textsuperscript{104}. After examining the difficulties encountered in finding a suitable applicant, and the decision to appoint Marshall-Hall\textsuperscript{105}, he throws light on the youthful musical efforts and aesthetic philosophy of the foundation professor and the temperamental
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\textsuperscript{104}Ibid., pp.138-140.
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quirks which were to lead him into so much trouble\textsuperscript{106}. The early conflicts in which he became involved with local music critics and the \textit{Argus} newspaper are discussed, as are his educational work in general and his foundation of the University Conservatorium (in 1895) in particular. Finally, Scott performs a valuable service by tracing in outline the main events which led to his downfall\textsuperscript{107}.

The next important work to appear was that of W. Arundel Orchard, director of the New South Wales Conservatorium of Music from 1923 to 1934, who discusses Marshall-Hall's musical contribution both in the field of education and of performance but, curiously, fails to advert to the circumstances under which he left the University, saying merely that he 'resigned' his chair in 1900\textsuperscript{108}. Perhaps Orchard wished to avoid opening old wounds - an indication, if this was, indeed, the case, of the extraordinary longevity of the feelings that had been aroused.

No such scruples seem to have worried Geoffrey Blainey, current Dean of the Arts Faculty and Professor of History at the same university. Blainey, too, reviews the chain of events that stretched from Marshall-Hall's offensive utterances to his departure from his chair. He makes

\textsuperscript{106} \textit{Ibid.}, pp.144-5.
\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Ibid.}, pp.146-156.
an important contribution to the literature by showing the affair to have been symptomatic both of a shift in University policy from a secular to a more religious bias, and of the concurrent ascendancy of an educational utilitarianism which led to the establishment of the Conservatorium and to the subordination, in the Marshall-Hall case, of 'the claims of True Liberty' to those of financial solvency.\textsuperscript{109}

In the same year in which Blainey's book appeared Kenneth Hince published an article entitled 'The Case of the Dismissed Professor'.\textsuperscript{110} Hince seems to have been aware only of the poems that Marshall-Hall published in 1898, and not of the Liedertafel speech, which added so much fuel to the fire. He does, however, enlarge our understanding of the latter's motivation by drawing attention to the bitterly anti-Christian marginalia with which the professor annotated a work of Nietzsche.\textsuperscript{111}

More recently, the affair has received fuller treatment in Thérèse Radic's investigations into Melbourne's musical associations of the period\textsuperscript{112}, and in her article, 'A Man

\textsuperscript{109} G. Blainey, A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 1957, pp.113-119.


\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., p.27.

out of Season: G.W.L. Marshall-Hall\textsuperscript{113}, a somewhat expanded version of which has been published as a monograph\textsuperscript{114}. Radic performs a service by setting Marshall-Hall's contributions to Australian musical culture - educational, choral and orchestral - into the context of the work that had been done by his immediate predecessors in the orchestra of the Centennial International Exhibition\textsuperscript{115}, and the ill-fated Victorian Orchestra which rose from its ashes\textsuperscript{116} (adumbraters, as it were, of the advent of the Messiah). She sees his artistic success in this country as reflecting the determination of a cultured segment of the colonial middle class to consolidate the achievements of this earlier period by forging an alliance between itself and the new music department of the University\textsuperscript{117}. She provides the first detailed consideration of the foundation and operation of the University Conservatorium\textsuperscript{118} and the responses it evoked in the community\textsuperscript{119} (but fails fully to appreciate the relation between that body and the University\textsuperscript{120}).

\begin{enumerate}
\item Radic Ph.D., pp.8-54; also dealt with in her article, 'Music of the Centennial International Exhibition' in Australia 1888, Bulletin No.7, April 1981.
\item Radic, Ph.D., pp. 57-88, 100-131.
\item Ibid., pp.3, 5.
\item Ibid., pp.231-42, 250-2, 276-95.
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\item \textsuperscript{120} see discussion pp.623-625.
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She considers also the administration of Marshall-Hall's orchestral concerts and the disputes he conducted with local music critics. Of particular interest is her account of the conflict, between the orchestral management and the musicians' union, that began towards the end of the first decade of this century and played an important role in bringing the concerts to an end.

Her article and book have little to add. Like Blainey, she makes the point that Marshall-Hall acted as an 'anvil' on which the Melbourne community hammered out its attitudes to questions of freedom of speech, generally, and the role of the University, in particular, an exercise which undoubtedly contributed to the growing sense of self-awareness. Yet she maintains that the conflict over the professor's reappointment 'had its origins not in the poems at all, but in the confrontation between Marshall-Hall and Dr. Alexander Leeper, Warden of Trinity College,' an assertion which I shall be at some pains to refute.

Unfortunately, a good deal of Radic's account is inaccurate (as, to a lesser extent, is that of most other

121 Radic Ph.D., pp.356-76.
122 Ibid., pp.439-82.
125 see below, pp.431-454.
writers on the subject), and there are many important omissions. Because she examines Marshall-Hall's beliefs as isolated mental fragments, failing to recognise the all important connections between them, she is unable to attain an adequate understanding, either of his behaviour, or of the hostility it aroused. Her interpretations in general are too facile and her exploration superficial, barely penetrating the surface of the extraordinarily rich and complex lode of human ideation and interaction that comprised the conflict which raged in the last years of the nineties over the musician's egregious utterances. Much of my argument will be devoted to elaborating and substantiating these criticisms.

Warren Bebbington's interesting account of Marshall-Hall's operatic compositions appeared in 1978. In it he discusses the librettos, comparing them with the historical and literary originals on which they are modelled, and tracing the effect of the musician's conflict with Melbourne respectability on two of his subsequent works, Aristodemus and Stella.

---
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Bebbington analyses and evaluates the musical content of the works in question, challenging Geoffrey Serle's contention that Percy Grainger and Henry Tate were the first significant composers in this country, and attributing the defects of Marshall-Hall's music largely to his lack of formal musical training\(^{130}\) and his over-stressing of the emotional component of music\(^{131}\). He draws attention to the gap between Marshall-Hall's theoretical dicta and his creative practice\(^{132}\), and confirms contemporary perceptions of the influence of Wagner on his early works\(^{133}\), and of Puccini (after the Sydney performance of Madame Butterfly in 1909) on the latter ones\(^{134}\). In addition, he considers the interchange of ideas that occurred between Marshall-Hall and the local artists with whom he associated\(^{135}\), suggesting that the former had an important influence, especially on Arthur Streeton and Ernest Moffitt, and that he, in turn, drew some of his inspiration from them (particularly from Streeton)\(^{136}\).

The most unsatisfactory aspect of Bebbington's work is his use of individual quotations taken out of their larger

\(^{130}\) Ibid., p.2.
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\(^{132}\) Ibid., p.28.
\(^{133}\) Ibid., pp.68-71.
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context to delineate his subject's credo and the changes it allegedly underwent\textsuperscript{137}. Like Radic, he fails to grasp the musician's outlook as a systematic whole. His most interesting contribution is his (apparently unwitting) application of the Hartz-Rosecrance fragment theory\textsuperscript{138} to explain Marshall-Hall's ultimate failure to win fame and fortune when he returned to England in 1913. Having been cut off from the fundamental changes in direction that were taking place in the European musical world, Bebbington argues, he continued to compose, in the more traditional styles of Puccini and Wagner, works which were now largely irrelevant to the interests of the society whose attention he sought\textsuperscript{139}.

In the same year as Bebbington's thesis appeared, Len Fox published an article, 'Marshall-Hall and the Wowsers'. It sets the anti-Marshall-Hall agitation into the context of the patriotic feeling aroused by the Boer War, which broke out in October 1899, and by the relief of Mafeking in the following May. Fox throws some light on the relationship between Marshall-Hall and M.P. Fox\textsuperscript{140} and on the role of the latter in the administration of the former's orchestral concerts. And he

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., pp. 58-71, 89-95, 108-111, 114-116
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\textsuperscript{140} Brother of the artist E. Phillips Fox.
illustrates the 'opiniated and schoolboyish side' of Marshall-Hall's character by referring to some hitherto unpublished marginalia in a book now in the possession of M.P. Fox's daughter\textsuperscript{141}.

More recently, Manning Clark in the latest volume of his History of Australia enlarges our understanding of the affair by drawing attention to the professor's quasi-religious and elitist conception of art, his philosophical debt to Nietzsche, and his underestimation of the strength and determination of Melbourne Philistinism. In addition, with characteristic Clarkian appetite for the 'tragic flaw', he points out the gulf that existed between the depth of Marshall-Hall's appreciation of music and his great talent as a conductor, on the one hand, and the poverty of his creative powers as composer and poet, on the other\textsuperscript{142}.

Finally, 1984 witnessed the addition of three significant contributions to the meagre literature. One is Jim Davidson's excellent account of the foundation of the chair. By tracing the process from the first stirrings of Francis Ormond's desire to make a substantial contribution to the colony's musical culture, through the controversy over the precise form that Ormond's generosity should take, to the ultimate decision to apply it to the funding of a chair, Davidson highlights some of the major

\textsuperscript{141}Len Fox, 'Marshall-Hall and the Wowsers' in Overland, 72-1978, pp.46-49.

issues dividing the colony's musicians, and also the music-loving public at the time. His review of the vicissitudes experienced by the University Council when seeking to make an appointment also sheds light on the conservatism of that body and the crudity of its conception of music education.\textsuperscript{143}

Secondly, John Rickard's brief treatment of the subject, after an outline of the main events, is concerned almost exclusively with the part played therein by Henry Bournes Higgins. Rickard offers some interesting suggestions in explanation of Higgins' uncharacteristically firm anti-Marshall-Hall stand, declaring that he is likely to have been influenced less by a desire to defend religion as such, than by the musician's perceived violation of the University's religious neutrality, or by an expedient loyalty to various associates on the University Council. That Higgins objected to Marshall-Hall's verse, while seeing no harm in that of Walt Whitman, Rickard further speculates, may have been because, in the latter's work, 'sexuality was expressed in the image of comradeship', while that of the former, like Shakespeare's sonnets, 'reflected a kind of sensuality with which he [Higgins] was not comfortable'.\textsuperscript{144}

Thirdly, Martin Turnbull in an admirable, fourth year honours thesis, which became available only after the great

\textsuperscript{143} Jim Davidson, 'Francis Ormond, Patron' in Stuart Macintyre (ed.), Ormond College Centenary Essays, Melbourne, 1984, pp.11-17.

\textsuperscript{144} J. Rickard, H.B. Higgins The Rebel as Judge, Sydney, George Allen and Unwin, 1984, pp.156-61.
bulk of the present work had been completed\textsuperscript{145}, portrays Marshall-Hall as a man with a mission, whose philosophy of art, which bridged the gap between Romantic Victorian and fin de siècle aesthetics, provided a significant impetus to aesthetic thought in Melbourne\textsuperscript{146}. Turnbull's chief contributions are his use of Matthew Arnold's dichotomy between Hellenism and Hebraism to identify Marshall-Hall's supporters and opponents\textsuperscript{147}, and his characterisation of the perceived relation between morality and art, which informed the responses of the latter, as belonging to a school of thought whose 'religious ethics and notions of propriety coloured [its] cultural values', to the extent of impelling it to try to 'subject leaders of the Colony's cultural life' to the dictates of non-conformist respectability\textsuperscript{148}. His main weakness is his failure (inevitable in a work of this length) satisfactorily to define the two Arnoldian categories in their fin de siècle Australian context.


\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., pp.14-19.

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., p.5.

\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., p.50
3. The Issues Addressed

That, then, is the current state of research in the area. The gaps that remain are considerable. Commentators have been only too ready to 'account' for Marshall-Hall's conduct by describing him, in very broad terms, as, inter alia, a musical elitist, a 'bourgeois baiter', and a 'restless and unquiet spirit' with a 'seemingly insatiable ... zest for controversy'. But, as already indicated, little sustained attention has been given to exploring his outlook, identifying the logical and psychological relations between its component parts, and reconstructing it as a systematically articulated whole, which links his behaviour to its origins in conscious ideation. Nor has any sustained effort been made to relate this behaviour to his early childhood experiences, his state of health, his domestic problems, or his various musical enterprises and activities in Melbourne.

---
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Then, there has been no detailed and systematic inquiry into the broader differences between Marshall-Hall's supporters and opponents, with a view to throwing light on the controversy by distilling those underlying assumptions which define the protagonists, and thereby explain (in part) their behaviour. Previous investigators have been satisfied with dismissing members of the anti-Marshall-Hall party pejoratively as 'Philistines',\textsuperscript{154} 'wowers, frowners, and life-deniers',\textsuperscript{155} and representatives of 'Calvinistic cultural myopia'.\textsuperscript{156} And such sweeping condemnation, which reveals more about the writer than the subject, has taken the place of painstaking analysis of the responses in question, in the context, for example, of the broader views of the respondents on such related issues as sabbath observance, gambling, religious education, the drink traffic and sexual indulgence.

There is, moreover, no detailed study of the deliberations of the University Council, which resulted in the decision not to re-engage the professor, and of the tactics employed by his defenders and adversaries on that body - their motives, and the various political and personal cross currents that influenced the outcome. Finally, no close consideration has been given to the role played by the various members of the London selection committee in 1900.

\textsuperscript{154}Radic Ph.D., p.254.
\textsuperscript{155}Clark, op.cit., p.164.
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and particularly, by the Victorian Agent-General in London, in bringing the matter to its conclusion.

The present work sets out to make good these omissions - to discover exactly why Marshall-Hall behaved in a manner which gave so much offence, to identify the characteristics which divided his opponents from his supporters, and the circumstances which gave rise to a concerted demand for his removal, and to analyse the process as a result of which he failed to gain reappointment.

4. Sources

The surviving records from which these gaps must be filled are not un plentiful. But, apart from a few small concentrations, they are thinly strewn through a wide range of publications and archival collections. Perhaps this is why the affair has hitherto attracted comparatively little practical interest among historians.

There are two small collections of 'Marshall-Hall Papers' - in the Melbourne University Archives, and in the University's Percy Grainger Museum. The latter, in addition to musical scores, librettos, newspaper clippings, and a great many post cards (most of them written to his daughter by various school friends), consists mainly of correspondence concerning the administration and conduct of his concerts and other artistic ventures during the first 12 years or so of this century; while the former contains chiefly material collected in the 1920s by his friend Herbert Brookes, in
the course of researching a (never written) biography of the musician. The greatest concentration of relevant manuscript material is to be found in the University of Melbourne's correspondence files and letter books, and the minute books of the University Council, Senate, Professorial Board and Finance Committee.

In addition, there is a surprisingly large number of letters, diary entries, and other memoranda scattered among the archives, libraries and private holdings of this country and the U.K. The Kenneth Hince collection in the National Library\textsuperscript{157} contains some correspondence relating to the operation of the University Conservatorium, and the administration of the Marshall-Hall concerts between 1903 and 1911, as well as some annotated concert programmes. A considerably larger number of the latter is contained in the archives of the Melba Conservatorium of Music, together with a roll book and Conservatorium diaries for the period 1901 to 1915. The diaries of Alexander Leeper give valuable insights into the leading role played by that gentleman in the affair\textsuperscript{158}. Papers of F.S. Delmer\textsuperscript{159}, Arthur Streeton\textsuperscript{160}, Tom Roberts\textsuperscript{161}, S.W. Pring\textsuperscript{162}, Alfred
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\end{itemize}
Deakin\textsuperscript{163}, Fritz Hart\textsuperscript{164}, and Herbert Brookes\textsuperscript{165}, as well as those of the Victorian Artists' Society\textsuperscript{166}, and the minute book of the Boobook Society\textsuperscript{167}, shed light on the part played by the musician in the bohemian, intellectual and artistic life of Victoria and New South Wales, as does the Ivy Brookes collection\textsuperscript{168} which also provides insights into his relations with his students. His interaction with other musicians and with local music societies is documented in the records of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Liedertafels\textsuperscript{169}, the D.J. Coutts correspondence in Trinity College archives, the papers of the Musical Society of Victoria\textsuperscript{170}, of the Professional Musicians' Union of Australia\textsuperscript{171}, and of the Royal Melbourne Philharmonic Society\textsuperscript{172}.

The reactions of the Colony's educators to his activities are documented in the records of Trinity, Queen's and Ormond Colleges, the Methodist and Presbyterian Ladies' Colleges, Wesley College and Melbourne Church of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{163} MS.1540, N.L.A.
  \item \textsuperscript{164} Latrobe Library, Melbourne.
  \item \textsuperscript{165} MS.1924, N.L.A.
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  \item \textsuperscript{172} Held by the Society.
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England Grammar School. And useful glimpses into the lives and opinions of prominent participants in the affair can be obtained from the Grice family papers\textsuperscript{173}, The Harrison Moore papers\textsuperscript{174}, the J.W. Barrett papers\textsuperscript{175}, the Baldwin Spencer papers\textsuperscript{176}, the Rev. E.H. Sugden's letter files\textsuperscript{177} and the Archives of St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne. The Melbourne University Calendar is, of course, an important background resource.

Colonial and British newspapers and periodicals, both general and sectional, contain much information about the events themselves, the responses they evoked, and the broader belief patterns of those who played a part in the affair. Marshall-Hall's own outlook and temperament are reflected in his published literary works – his books of verse, a play, some operatic librettos\textsuperscript{178}, press accounts of his various public addresses, and articles he contributed, from time to time, to colonial newspapers and the British musical and educational press.

Marshall-Hall's life prior to his migration to Victoria is documented in the papers of the Blackheath Proprietary
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School and the Blackheathen\textsuperscript{179}; the Register of Students attending the Royal College of Music, and letters of Sir George Grove to Edith Oldham, both in the Department of Portraits, Royal College of Music, London; the Oxford University Calendar (1883); the records of Newton College, South Devon, and John Tecklenborough's published record of Oxford Military College\textsuperscript{180}.

What little can be gleaned about his family background is located in the Dictionary of National Biography\textsuperscript{181}, the Will Books of Somerset House, the records of births, deaths, and marriages in the General Register Office, London, the published Register of the Alpine Club, London, and in some letters of his father in the Archives of the Royal Mineralogical Society, London, as well as various periodicals to which his father contributed, or in which reference was made to him - Field Quarterly, the Geological Magazine, and the Mineralogical Magazine.

5. Procedure and Method

The organisation of the argument which follows is chiefly determined, not by chronological considerations, but by the structure of a number of over-arching and interlocking themes. This is not to say that I am unmindful of the danger of what J.R. Robertson has called

\textsuperscript{179} Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.

\textsuperscript{180} Seven Years' Cadet-Life ..., op.cit.

the 'distortions which arise from the telescoping of events which the thematic approach usually entails'. Nor, indeed, do I disagree with his contention that 'a strict chronological approach often can bring out relationships, and explain historical events, better than a thematic approach'.

But the opposite is also the case. Robertson seems to be employing a model of causality which, in Aristotle's terms, corresponds most closely to the category of efficient cause - and, no doubt, situations in which efficient cause is perceived as playing the most decisive, or most interesting role are most intelligibly portrayed by means of chronological exposition. In addition, the latter procedure can often make more sense than a thematic treatment of an agent's behaviour, by bringing to light the competing demands on his/her attention and energies at a particular point of time.

But, although the sequential character of human affairs can never be ignored, Gottschalk's assertion that cause 'is usually antecedent, though occasionally concurrent in time to effect' is by no means self-evidently true. In human affairs it may well be that the prime explanatory

---


considerations are more frequently final and/or formal, than efficient, causes. That is to say, developments may be more often decisively determined by (or the investigator may be more interested in), not discrete, precipitating, antecedent occurrences, but human aims and dispositional tendencies\textsuperscript{185}, as well as such contextual influences as a \textit{Zeitgeist}. Since these are 'concurrent in time' with the effects, a 'strict chronological approach' may well obscure the greater, or more interesting, formative role of factors other than mere sequence.

In devising such an account of the responses evoked by Marshall-Hall's conduct, I shall employ, as a loose theoretical framework, a simplified form of Neil Smelser's 'value added' model of collective behaviour, focussing on its three principal components - structural conduciveness, strain, and precipitating factors\textsuperscript{186}. The first two, comprising, as they do, final and formal aspects of causality, lend themselves more to thematic than chronological organisation (although divisions between the three categories are not sharp, and the decision to assign a given phenomenon to one rather than another is sometimes dictated as much by considerations of expository convenience as by any clear objective property of the phenomenon).

\textsuperscript{185} As distinct, be it noted, from the adoption or emergence of such aims and tendencies.

A state of structural conduciveness to collective behaviour embraces those inherent characteristics of a situation which either passively permit or actively 'invite' the behaviour in question, or prohibit other responses, or both. They are necessary, but not sufficient conditions of its occurrence.

In the case of hostile episodes, these can include such permissive elements as a perceived possibility of change and the availability of appropriate channels of communication for the expression of grievances, as well as such inviting ingredients as the existence of already established social cleavages. The presence of the former two in the Marshall-Hall imbroglio is easily demonstrated. Opposition could be, and as we shall see, was, expressed through the press, the pulpit, the governing committees of various public bodies, and through meetings especially convened for the purpose. The fact that this agitation sought, and obtained access to the University Council, demanding the removal of the peccant professor, is ample evidence of a belief that its object could be achieved.

Accounting for the outbreak in terms of its relation to similar pre-existent conflicts is more difficult but, I hope to demonstrate, crucially important. Firstly,
however, a possible philosophical objection has to be considered - namely, William Dray's contention that, showing that an event belongs to a class of similar phenomena 'is just not the same enterprise at all as explaining why it ... happened, or why it ran the course it did, or how it came about, or how it could have happened in the light of so-and-so'\textsuperscript{190}. Certainly, classification can never, in itself, constitute a comprehensive explanation. But it can endow a phenomenon with a wider dimension of intelligibility by asserting a necessary condition of its occurrence - this animal quacks (partly) because it is a duck. If it belonged to some other species it would not make the same noise.

Moreover, such a generic sine qua non implies (or embodies) a further genetic explanation - for example, that the quacking has its origins in a characteristic which is not peculiar to this animal, but common to the species of which it is a member. Thus, to point out that it is a duck and not a nightingale is a partial explanation, heuristic (and, therefore, falsifiable) in character, in that it indicates the direction which further investigation could take.

Likewise, determining the location of an episode of collective action in the wider ideological and controversial landscape acts as a conceptual signpost. It is,\textsuperscript{190}

after all, only by virtue of such categorisation that we are able to get our bearings in the world in the first place. It renders possible the hypothesis that the conditions that gave rise to a specific class of conflicts also account for the one under consideration. And it is a procedure which can identify some of the influences within the Zeitgeist, which have helped shape the motives and relevant beliefs of the protagonists. Ducks, presumably, do not quack, because other ducks have taught them to, but a person's perceptions of a situation and of the appropriate response to it, may be strongly conditioned by other cognate situations and other related community reactions. Once this is established in regard to the Marshall-Hall affair, it will become clear that Bebbington is wrong in asserting that 'no one could have anticipated the ferocity of Melbourne's reaction' to his utterances\textsuperscript{191}.

First, however, since what follows is, essentially, an attempt to explain human behaviour in terms of conscious ideation, some means of justifying the postulation of such a causal nexus must be formulated. The exercise clearly presupposes a negation of Marx's epiphenomenalism view that it 'is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their existence determines their consciousness'\textsuperscript{192}. But it does not.

\textsuperscript{191} M. Mus, p.135.

\textsuperscript{192} A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (transl. M.I. Stone from the second German edition), Chicago, 1904, p.10.
entail a commitment to the extreme idealism of Collingwood, with its belief that mental activity alone shapes human behaviour. So, there remains the question of how to justify the assertion of thought as an intervening variable between situational stimuli and the human responses to them, in a given instance.

Collingwood's answer, whereby understanding is achieved 'in a single act of intuitive insight', by means of imaginative re-enactment, is unsatisfactory, because, as has often been pointed out, it is accompanied by no means of verifying the intuitive judgment formed as a result of this empathetic leap of identification with the agent. Even Rex Martin, who argues that Collingwood's method is really inductive, rather than intuitive, concedes that it provides no way of objectively testing the hypothesis that an 'intelligible connection' exists between a certain action and the agent's thoughts, such that the former 'makes sense' or is 'appropriate' in the light of the latter.

---


196 Martin, op.cit., p.71.

197 Ibid., pp.63-4, passim.
A more promising solution has been provided by Martin, himself. Briefly, his contention is that the investigator is justified in regarding the agent's thought as an explanation of his/her action if it fulfils the following general conditions: 1. that the agent perceived him/herself to be in a certain situation and was disposed to act towards it in a certain way (this is the agent's situational motivation); 2. that a number of alternative courses of action were available at the time; 3. that he/she wanted to achieve a certain end which, it was believed, would satisfy the situational motivation; 4. that he/she believed this end could be attained by performing action A; 5. that there was no other action which he/she believed would achieve this end as well as or better than A; 6. that he/she had no overriding motive; 7. that he/she knew how, and was, in practice, able to perform A.

The conditional formula - if provisions 1-7 are satisfied, the agent will perform A - Martin calls R'. And it is this which I propose to employ, with some variation, to warrant my (partial) explanation of the

---

198 Martin, op. cit., passim - and also, in a slightly different form, by P.M. Churchland in 'The Logical character of action-explanation', Philosophical Review, Vol. 79, 1970, pp. 214-236. Martin's seems to me to be preferable, because, unlike Churchland's scheme, it stipulates (condition 2) that more than one course of action is open to the agent at the time. An action cannot, surely, be viewed as the result of the agent's intention if, in fact, he/she was obliged to perform it.

199 Martin, op. cit., p. 77.
events under investigation in terms of the conscious beliefs of the participants.

My modifications are as follows: Firstly, a link needs to be asserted in the first condition, between the agent's perceiving him/herself to be in a certain situation, and the crystallisation of a desire to act in a certain manner in view of that situation. Not that such an intervening factor is a necessary condition of permitting the deduction of the consequent from the antecedent part of R'. My point is simply that, to delineate the state of affairs perceived by the agent, is not, in itself, to state the motive for action. For a complete explanation, some link must be posited between the situational perception and the motivation referred to in condition 1, in order to show why this particular motivation arose under these perceived circumstances. This link, as will become clear, was structurally conducive to the episode under investigation.

Secondly, condition 2 requires expansion, in the form of a provision that there was, and that the agent believed that there was, more than one possible course of action. If it is believed, even incorrectly that there is only one thing that can be done under the circumstances, then the action can

---

200 This cannot be the end cited in condition 3, since Martin defines the latter, quoting Collingwood, as 'a purpose or state of affairs to be brought about in order to satisfy the situational motivation' (emphasis mine) (Martin, op.cit., p.69). That is, the motivation comes first and the objective is adopted as a means of satisfying it.
surely not be seen as the result of an intention to achieve an end deemed to be appropriate to the satisfaction of a particular situational motivation.

Finally, I believe Martin to be incorrect in respect of the logical status he assigns to R'. I agree with him that it is neither an analytic\textsuperscript{201}, nor a synthetic a priori proposition\textsuperscript{202} – that is to say, that it is logically possible that the seven antecedent conditions could be fulfilled without the specified act ensuing. But I cannot concur with his claims that such an eventuality would not falsify R', and that, therefore, it is not an empirical statement\textsuperscript{203}. I propose, on the contrary, to treat it as an empirical formula. But, to avoid distracting the reader with an involved and somewhat technical argument, my reasons, together with a discussion of the relation of R' to covering law theories of explanation, are affixed as an appendix\textsuperscript{204}.

6. Structure

In the discussion that follows, Chapter 1 analyses the underlying ideological configuration of the community into which Marshall-Hall's verbal bombshells were dropped,\footnote{Martin, op.cit., pp.167-8, i.e. true by definition.} \footnote{Ibid., p.202, i.e. one which is not true by definition, but which can be verified without resort to experience.} \footnote{Ibid., p.184, i.e. one which can only be verified by experience.} \footnote{See pp.643-654.}
and locates the responses they evoked within this configuration. The second chapter reconstructs and clarifies the often tangled web of Marshall-Hall's Weltanschauung, tracing it back to its logical and psychological origins in conscious ideation\textsuperscript{205}, identifying some of the influences that helped to shape it, and illuminating the crucial points of convergence and divergence between the Ormond Professor's underlying assumptions and those of his adversaries. In Chapter 3 I identify and explore a number of perceptions, both false and true, of the age in general and of Marshall-Hall's position in it, which prevailed among his contemporaries and further substantially influenced their responses to him. In Chapter 4 I inquire into the reasons why Marshall-Hall delivered his offensive utterances at the time and in the tone that he did. Chapter 5 considers the extent to which his opponents may have been motivated by considerations other than the religious and moral indignation which most of them evinced. This involves, inter alia, an inquiry into the musician's personal and professional relations with various other protagonists in the affair. Then, the comparative importance of the alleged irreligious and indecent content of his utterances is evaluated in Chapter 6. In Chapter 7 I discuss the structure and dynamics of the political process whereby the action unfolded. Finally, the Conclusion draws the threads together and summarises the judgments reached.

\textsuperscript{205} i.e., the formation of ideas (O.E.D.).
CHAPTER 1
HEBREWS AND HELLENES

1. Religious Belief and Unbelief as Differentiating Factors

The end which Marshall-Hall's enemies wished to achieve (condition 3) was his removal from the University chair of music, and there can be no doubt that what prompted them to this were his attacks on prevailing religious and related moral views\(^1\), which, therefore, constitute part of the situation mentioned in the first part of Condition 1. And, as most of his opponents were religious people, it is tempting to conclude that the pre-existing tension between Christian believers and unbelievers was a cardinal, structurally conducive circumstance, linking this situation with the hostile protests which followed it. This interpretation is borne out by the patent infidelity of such champions of the Ormond Professor as Joseph Symes, publisher of the fiercely atheistic \textit{Liberator}\(^2\), the agnostic Biology Professor Baldwin Spencer\(^3\) and his colleague Classics Professor T.G. Tucker (who in 1896 informed Dr. Alexander

\(^1\)See discussion below, pp.468-511.

\(^2\)See e.g. \textit{Liberator}, 20 August 1898, 13 August 1899.

\(^3\)At least he was an agnostic in 1883 - see Baldwin Spencer to Howard Gaulter, 5 March 1883, in Baldwin Spencer papers, Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford, Box 3.
Leeper, Warden of Trinity College, that he 'ddnt blve in
God at all'.

More commonly, however, the beleagured musician's
supporters made a point of insisting either that they
were 'totally opposed to Professor Marshall-Hall's
material and erotic philosophy', or at least, that they
did not wish their pleas 'to be taken as an endorsement
of his views'. Many of them were avowed and practising
Christians. They included the Rev. Llewelyn Bevan,
minister of the Collins Street Congregational church,
who urged the University to retain Marshall-Hall's

4 Diary of Alexander Leeper, 7 April 1895, in Alexander
Leeper papers in possession of Miss Valentine Leeper, South
Yarra, Melbourne; to these can perhaps be added MH's friend,
F.S. Delmer, who held MH's opinions 'to be in the main
right' (Herald, 22 August 1898), Frederick F. Smith, who
denied that Christianity had any moral value (Herald,
18 August 1898) and a couple of anonymous press corres-
pondents - 'Cosmopolitan', who, on behalf of the
independent free thinking people throughout the colony',
entered an 'emphatic protest against the ... persecution
of a brave and brilliant man that has the courage to speak
his mind openly (Herald, 19 June 1900), and 'Soap', who
contrasted the immoral teachings of 'the blessed patriarchs'
of the Old Testament with the 'pure but pagan ideas'
disseminated by MH (Herald, 19 June 1900). And no doubt
there were others who prudently kept their unbelief to
themselves.

5 'Orfea' in Herald, 1 September 1898; see also e.g.
'Another Sinner' in Herald, 20 June 1900.

6 Pro-Marshall-Hall petition in Outpost, 28 July 1900;
see also e.g. J. Mather to E.F. a'Beckett, 11 June 1900
MUCRF 1900/40; members of the musical profession to
University Council, 14 June 1900 in ibid.; George Eastgate
in Herald, 10 August 1898; Rev. E.H. Sugden in Spectator,
22 June 1900; John Grice in Argus, 26 June 1900;
Dr. J.R. Wolfe in Age, 17 August 1898; John Robertson in
Herald, 20 June 1900; Percy Frost in Herald, 14 June 1900;
Outpost, 14 July 1900; Table Talk, 12 August 1898, Orme
Masson in Argus, 9 July 1900; resolution of meeting of
University Conservatorium teachers in Argus, 19 June 1900;
Rev. L.D. Bevan in Argus, 9 August 1898.
services; his fellow Congregationalist, the Rev. E. Taylor, who, without going so far, argued that the transgression 'really deserves no more attention than the fly on the brow of a Colossus'; and the Methodist Revs. Brian Wibberley and E.H. Sugden. The latter pair, while explicitly declining to take sides, both came forward at the height of the controversy to give character evidence in favour of Marshall-Hall, the timing and tone of which leave one in no doubt that it was intended to give comfort to his defenders.

In addition, a number of Christian laymen took the musician's side. Among them were Professor E.E. Morris (Professor of English, French and German), a member of the Anglican Synod and of the Church's Christian Social Union; Professor E.J. Nanson (Mathematics), who was on the Council of the Anglican Diocese; Professor H.B. Allen (Medicine), 'a strong Church of England man', who

---

7 Bevan to Sir Henry Wrixon, 23 June 1900, in MUCRF 1900/40; also MUCMB, 25 June 1900.

8 Age, 29 October 1898.

9 See Wibberley's article, 'Professor Marshall-Hall', in Gleam, July 1900; and Sugden's letter in Argus, 18 June 1900; and see below pp.564-565; Turnbull is wrong when he says that Sugden explicitly favoured re-appointment, op.cit., p.59, 46.

10 Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1899; Ballarat Church Chronicle, 2 February 1898.

11 Southern Cross, 15 June 1900.

12 Church of England Messenger, 13 October 1899.
on 24 April 1906 assisted Nanson in reading the lesson at a thanksgiving service in St. Paul's Cathedral; Professor W.C. Kernot (Engineering), a deacon of the East Melbourne Baptist Church, and member of the Council of the Victorian Baptist Union, of which he was elected President in 1902; Professor Henry Laurie (Philosophy), a Presbyterian, who in June 1900 urged a Student Christian Conference audience to 'believe in the face of all difficulties that God is love'; Dr. John William Springthorpe, M.D., a member of the executive committee of the Congregational Union Council of Victoria; Dr. Augustus Leo Kenny, a papal knight, and Victorian secretary of the Australasian Catholic Congress in 1900; solicitor and politician Sir Arthur Snowden, active in the Anglican Church; banker John

13 E. Scott to E. Dyason, 27 December 1914 in Ernest Scott Papers, N.E.A. Series 10 703/10/20; Australasian Intercollegian, 1 June 1906.

14 Christian Citizen, 15 August 1903.

15 Southern Baptist, 10 November 1899.

16 Argus, 18 February 1902.


18 Australian Intercollegian, 1 July 1900.

19 Herald, 20 December 1900; Argus, 29 October 1898.

20 Bohemia, 21 January 1892.

21 Austral Light, 1 November 1900.

22 Circular letter co-signed by Snowden to 'the ladies of our church', relating to a recent law suit in which the Archbishop had been involved, 24 June 1912, in Leeper papers, loc.cit.; see also Church of England Messenger, 1 October 1898.
Grice, who in 1885 donated £1000 to Trinity College 'for the promotion of learning among candidates for Holy Orders in the Church of England'\textsuperscript{23}, and in 1903 erected a memorial window in the College chapel in memory of a son killed in the Boer War\textsuperscript{24}; and Percy Frost, a self-proclaimed Anglican 'church man and Christian Socialist'\textsuperscript{25}. In addition, one anonymous press correspondent declared him/herself to be a Catholic\textsuperscript{26}, while another defended Marshall-Hall as 'a matter of Christianity'\textsuperscript{27}. One religious journal, the Catholic Tribune\textsuperscript{28}, championed the Marshall-Hall cause, while four others, the Seventh Day Adventist Bible Echo and Southern Sentinel\textsuperscript{29}, Rev. Charles Strong's Australian Herald, and the Salvation Army War Cry, were conspicuous for their failure to refer to the controversy at all.

These instances clearly indicate (in accordance with Martin's second condition) that Marshall-Hall's enemies had before them examples of patently available alternative

\textsuperscript{23}Trinity College Calendar, 1885, p.45.
\textsuperscript{24}Wesley College Chronicle, October 1903, p.23.
\textsuperscript{25}Herald, 14 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{26}Herald, 18 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{27}Herald, 16 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{28}See e.g., 9 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{29}Its full name (adopted in 1895) was Southern Sentinel and Herald of Liberty, when it was initially launched in 1894 it was the Australian Sentinel and Spirit of Liberty.
courses of action. Instead of seeking the professor's removal from his post, they could, like Bevan and others, have urged his reappointment. Or, like Taylor, they might have dismissed the affair as not warranting serious attention. They could, in similar vein to Wibberley and Sugden, have confined themselves to making general, laudatory remarks about Marshall-Hall's character. Or, finally, like Strong and others, they might simply have ignored the imbroglio altogether.

2. Morality as a Differentiator

A closer scrutiny reveals that there was a significant correspondence between Marshall-Hall's supporters and his opponents, on the one hand, and those who took opposing sides in the disputes over the imposition of various (supposedly) Christian standards of moral behaviour upon the community, on the other. No doubt, the Christian conscience hopes to bring the whole range of human behaviour under the government of ethical imperatives. But for the purposes of my argument, an important distinction (though not a sharp one) to which discussion will often return, may be drawn between 'social' and 'moral' objectives. The former include, broadly, two sub-categories, namely, the control of those forms of conduct, such as murder and theft, which are, in fact, normally proscribed by law; and the alleviation of human suffering by means of charitable works and legislation. Both sub-categories are concerned with eliminating conditions
which, it is widely agreed, injure individuals and disturb social harmony, and because of this both are in principle non-controversial, occupying that portion of the ethical collage where 'secular' and 'religious' ethics overlap. There is relatively little dispute about the desirability of preventing crime and eradicating injustice and poverty - although there is deep disagreement on questions of precise definition and means.

The latter, or 'moral' sphere of Christian ethical endeavour, involves the application in the community of certain revealed laws of religion about the desirability of which there was in the nineties considerable debate. And it is the divisions in this debate, which exhibit a significant correlation with those obtaining in the Marshall-Hall dispute. The point is of such importance in the argument that follows that it has to be pursued at some length and in some detail.

That is to say (in part), it is my contention that the key to understanding the conflict that occurred is the fact that the organisations and individuals, who sought Marshall-Hall's removal from the University, tended to be prominent also in one or more of the campaigns to reduce, by persuasion or compulsion, the extent of gambling, drinking, smoking, theatre attendance, open disrespect for religion (especially in the form of sabbath desecration), and sexual laxity (together with everything believed to
encourage it, such as mixed bathing, ballroom dancing, artificial contraception, abortion, divorce and indecent literature). They were also more or less conspicuous in movements to expand the role of religious instruction in the education of the young, and they were almost never to be found among opponents of any of these objectives.

They did not, of course, constitute a precisely defined, because ideologically homogeneous, group, but a loose conglomeration of outlooks, accommodating a range of differences in respect to precise aims, preferred strategies, and strength of commitment. They disagreed strenuously about such matters as whether prohibition was a desirable or practical option\textsuperscript{30}, whether barmaids should be condemned\textsuperscript{31}, whether horse racing should be outlawed\textsuperscript{32}, to what degree State regulation should endeavour to minimise the desecration of the sabbath\textsuperscript{33}, and whether the introduction of scripture lessons into State schools, as part of the normal curriculum, should be accompanied by a separate grant to Catholic schools\textsuperscript{34}.

\textsuperscript{30}See e.g. Spectator, 29 September 1899, 3 August 1900, 16 November 1900; Australian Christian, 26 May 1898; E. Hulme in Southern Cross, 7 January 1898; Argus, 8 September 1900, 14 November 1900; Age, 13 April 1898, 1 July 1898; Rev. G. Tait in Argus, 17 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{31}Argus, 4 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{32}See e.g. Argus, 23 April 1898; Table Talk, 24 July 1894.

\textsuperscript{33}See e.g. PPGM, November 1897, Appendix p.cxxvii.

\textsuperscript{34}See e.g. Spectator, 23 March 1900; Archbishop Carr in Herald, 9 July 1900; Advocate, 15 October 1898; Bishop Reville in Argus, 16 October 1900.
Definition is facilitated (and interpretation conditioned) by the fact that, both singly and in combination, these movements comprised what Robert MacIver calls 'group', as distinct from 'aggregate', phenomena. That is to say, they are not simply observers' constructs, of whose existence the participants were unaware, or to which they were indifferent, but activities in which they designedly co-operated in a conscious effort to achieve common goals.

This was institutionalised in a variety of organisations, some of which were expressly formed in order to pursue more or less narrowly defined objectives of the type in question. They included an anti-smoking league, a Sunday Observance Society, the National Scripture Education League, and various bodies for the suppression of sexuality, as well as a plethora of anti-drinking societies.
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36 Age, 25 February 1903.
37 Argus, 15 June 1893.
38 Victorian Churchman, 2 January 1898; Argus, 18 October 1900; Southern Cross, 14 January 1898; Spectator, 14 January 1898.
39 Such as the Vigilance Society (Argus, 24 October 1893, 24 November 1892, 23 August 1892; Table Talk, 2 September 1892), a League for the Promotion of Public Morality (Table Talk, 2 September 1892; Argus, 23 August 1892), and an Australasian White Cross League (see pamphlets of Australasian White Cross League in e.g. Victorian State Library, Mitchell Library, Leeper papers).
40 Ranging from the Sons and Daughters of Temperance (see e.g. Argus, 6 June 1900, 17 January 1900), the Melbourne Total Abstinence Society (see e.g. Argus, 6 June 1900; Age 4 October 1898), the Central Prohibition League of Victoria (Age, 4 October 1901), and the Independent Order of Good
The essentially 'group' character of the total phenomenon is reflected in the interest which the temperance organisations displayed in the broader area of moral reform, raising their voices in favour of religious instruction in State schools and against Sunday desecration, gambling, indecent literature, juvenile smoking\(^1\), and the 'disgraceful innuendoes contained in popular songs'\(^2\).

It is further exemplified and institutionalised in a range of non-specialist bodies with a wide moral catchment area, such as the interdenominational Evangelical Alliance of Australia\(^3\), the Council of Churches\(^4\), the Christian Templars (Argus, 24 April 1901; Age, 22 June 1898; Ann M. Mitchell, 'Temperance and the Liquor Question in Later Nineteenth Century Victoria', M.A. thesis, Melbourne University, October 1966, pp. 60-61), to the Independent Order or Rechabites (Age, 17 February 1903, 20 February 1903, 15 February 1898; Argus, 17 July 1900); the Victorian Alliance for the Suppression of Intemperance (Argus, 7 March 1900, 10 May 1900, 6 June 1900, 7 August 1900; Age, 25 October 1898, 19 November 1898, 14 February 1903; Victorian Independent, October 1900, November 1900; Spectator, 14 September 1900), the Loyal Temperance Legion (Argus, 3 October 1900) and the Women's Christian Temperance Union (Argus, 12 February 1900, 6 June 1900, 8 October 1900, 26 October 1900, 5 November 1900, 21 February 1901; Advocate, 26 November 1893; Age, 19 November 1898.

\(^1\) Victorian Independent, December 1900; Argus, 5 May 1894, 7 July 1898, 5 November 1900, 6 June 1901; Age, 14 June 1894; Champion, 11 April 1896.

\(^2\) Herald, 31 August 1898; see also e.g. Argus, 21 February 1900, 15 March 1900, 30 October 1900.

\(^3\) See e.g. Australian Sentinel, August 1894; Argus, 16 May 1900, 6 June 1900.

\(^4\) Founded in 1890 (Argus, 9 July 1903) and not to be confused with the New South Wales body, which was called the Council of the Churches, and which, unlike its counterpart in Victoria, included the Church of England among its members (Spectator, 19 March 1897, 25 May 1900; Argus, 30 January 1900, 16 May 1900, 3 May 1901; Age, 26 January 1903).
Endeavour Society, the National Christian Citizens' League, and W.H. Fitchett's non-denominational Southern Cross, all of which were actively involved in the same causes.

The various Christian sects, too, highlighted the 'group' quality of the phenomenon under consideration by seeking these ends in their governing bodies, newspapers and morality committees. The Presbyterians were particularly conspicuous - acting through their Victorian General Assembly, and its Public Questions, State of Religion, and Temperance Committees, their Elders' Association, the Presbyterian Messenger and the
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45 Argus, 21 September 1898, 14 September 1898.
46 Christian Citizen, 1 April 1901, 1 November 1902, 4 October 1900, 1 July 1901, 1 November 1900.
47 13 July 1900, 4 November 1898, 8 April 1898, 5 October 1898, 11 February 1898.
48 Age, 19 November 1898; Argus, 9 June 1900, 9 May 1901, 27 April 1901; PPGM, November 1898, p.55, 57.
49 PPGM, November 1895, p.325; report of resolution of the Public Questions Committee of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria in Age, 4 February 1899; Age, 25 November 1898.
50 PPGM, November 1900, Appendix p.xix; November 1898, Appendix p.xi, November 1897, Appendix p.xxviii; report of the State of Religion Committee to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria in PPGM, November 1895, Appendix p.xviii and November 1892, Appendix p.xxiii.
51 PPGM, November 1896, Appendix p.xx, November 1897, Appendix p.xviii, November 1900, Appendix p.xix; Age, 25 November 1898, 4 February 1899.
52 Argus, 30 April 1901.
53 1 March 1901, 25 November 1898, 13 April 1900, 24 August 1900.
Presbyterian Monthly\textsuperscript{54}. The Baptist Union\textsuperscript{55}, together with its morality committee\textsuperscript{56} and journal, the Southern Baptist\textsuperscript{57}, was active in the same causes, as were the Associated Churches of Christ of Victoria, which supported a temperance committee\textsuperscript{58} and a weekly paper, the Australian Christian.

Methodists, while equally determined, in general\textsuperscript{59}, were more active than the other denominations in the struggle against juvenile smoking\textsuperscript{60}. And the Congregational Union\textsuperscript{61} pursued the same goals through its journal, the Victorian Independent\textsuperscript{62}, and its morality committee, created in 1898\textsuperscript{63}. Congregationalists, however, were

\textsuperscript{54} e.g., 1 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{55} Argus, 21 November 1898, 31 October 1900, 6 November 1900, 8 October 1900, 6 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{56} Southern Baptist, 3 May 1900.

\textsuperscript{57} 2 February 1899.

\textsuperscript{58} Australian Christian, 29 June 1899; Argus, 7 July 1898.

\textsuperscript{59} Prior to their union in 1901 Methodists were divided into Primitive Methodists, United Methodists, United Methodist Free Churches, Bible Christians, Free Connection Methodists, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church (Hans Mol, Religion in Australian, Melbourne, 1970, p.78; C.I. Benson, A Century of Victorian Methodism, Melbourne, 1935, p.1); Age, 7 March 1897, 10 June 1898, 19 February 1897, 5 March 1897, 9 April 1897, 3 March 1898, 2 June 1899; Argus, 7 March 1900, 16 November 1900, 19 November 1900, 8 March 1901, 6 June 1900, 1 March 1901.

\textsuperscript{60} Age, 2 March 1903; Argus, 7 March 1901.

\textsuperscript{61} Victorian Independent, February 1901; Argus, 13 May 1900, 12 May 1900, 6 June 1900, 24 January 1901; Victorian Independent, November 1900, November 1898; Age, 15 August 1900, 20 January 1901.

\textsuperscript{62} July 1899, March 1900, February 1901.

\textsuperscript{63} Victorian Independent, November 1898.
generally less enthusiastic than the other Protestant denominations about the Christian Citizens' League\textsuperscript{64} and the introduction of scripture lessons into State schools\textsuperscript{65}, although tepidly supporting both in this period.

While it was not coterminous with Evangelicalism, the outlook under consideration was more prevalent among Low\textsuperscript{66} than among High\textsuperscript{67} Anglicans. The latter, however, were resolute in their opposition to sexual 'impurity'. And the Anglican Assembly, representing the denomination as a whole, supported the Scripture Education League\textsuperscript{68}, and protested against secular encroachments on the sabbath\textsuperscript{69} and lax enforcement of the liquor regulations\textsuperscript{70}. Its White Cross League warned young people against attending the theatre\textsuperscript{71}. Its Mothers' Union campaigned against 'horrid literature' that taught women how not to become mothers\textsuperscript{72}. And its Temperance Society, which apparently

\textsuperscript{64} Victorian Independent, October 1900.
\textsuperscript{65} Victorian Independent, January 1900, November 1900, August 1899.
\textsuperscript{66} Victorian Churchman, 25 August 1900, 14 September 1900, 11 January 1901.
\textsuperscript{67} Mitre, 1 November 1897; Spectator, 27 April 1900.
\textsuperscript{68} Age, 28 April 1898.
\textsuperscript{69} Argus, 3 October 1901, 5 October 1901.
\textsuperscript{70} Argus, 6 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{71} Purity and Impurity, Sydney: Australasian White Cross League, n.d., p.5.
\textsuperscript{72} Age, 29 November 1898.
acquired 'new energy' in 1899\textsuperscript{73}, offered prizes for essays on the physical effects of intemperance\textsuperscript{74}.

Finally, Catholicism, while firmly in line with the more evangelical denominations in regard to its views on sexuality\textsuperscript{75}, irreverence, and (in principle) the religious education question\textsuperscript{76}, had no objection to Sunday amusement, or work\textsuperscript{77}, and was less censorious of drinking and gambling in moderation.

These differences, as we shall see, were reflected in the slightly divergent responses of the groups in question to the Marshall-Hall controversy. While the division between the professor's opponents and his defenders was, on the whole, clear cut, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that there were people with mixed feelings on the matter, as well as some whose desires respecting his reappointment did not, as required by Martin's condition \textsuperscript{6}, override other, competing motives, and whose conduct, therefore, was not always consistent with these desires.

\textsuperscript{73}Southern Cross, 25 March 1900.

\textsuperscript{74}Argus, 20 March 1900.

\textsuperscript{75}Advocate, 26 May 1900.

\textsuperscript{76}Argus, 16 October 1900; Advocate, 21 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{77}Austral Light, June 1900; Advocate, 15 October 1898, 10 November 1898, 12 October 1898.
For the moment, however, it is sufficient to say that the denominational bodies referred to were unanimous in their denunciation of the Ormond Professor. The Wesleyan Methodist Conference demanded his dismissal, in accordance with the recommendation of its Committee on Privileges and Public Questions.

The Presbyterian General Assembly passed a motion put by its Public Questions Committee, expressing 'its abhorrence of the utterances which have come from Professor Hall ... and ... its deep regret that Mr. Hall should be continued even for the present time in a University Chair.'

The Council of the Congregational Union expressed its 'deepest indignation' at the Professor's iniquities. And its journal, the Victorian Independent, declared the agitation against him to be 'wholly justifiable.'

The Australian Christian, mouthpiece of the Churches of Christ, called for his removal from the University, as

---

78 Letter from Rev. Thomas Adamson in Argus, 17 August 1900.

79 Rev. Thomas Adamson to E.F. a'Beckett, 14 July 1900 in MUCRF 1900/40; Argus, 16 November 1900.

80 Age, 25 November 1898; Southern Cross, 2 December 1898; Argus, 25 November 1898; British Australasian, 12 January 1899; see also Argus, 17 August 1898, 16 June 1900, 10 August 1898; Presbyterian Monthly, 1 September 1898.

81 Age, 29 October 1898; see also J.J. Hailey in Argus, 10 August 1898.

82 July 1900.

83 1 September 1898.
did the Southern Baptist\textsuperscript{84}, the Southern Cross\textsuperscript{85}, and the Christian Citizens' League, the president of whose Fitzroy and Collingwood branch said that the issue touched 'keenly the very raison d'être for such associations'\textsuperscript{86}.

These views were echoed by the Catholic Austral Light\textsuperscript{87} and Advocate\textsuperscript{88}, the Church of England Messenger\textsuperscript{89}, the High Church Mitre\textsuperscript{90}, and the Council of the Anglican Mothers' Union\textsuperscript{91}. Thus, opposition to the professor was by no means, as Turnbull believes, simply or basically an expression of 'extreme Victorian Protestantism', 'Calvinistic cultural myopia', or the 'nonconformist conscience'\textsuperscript{92}.

In the same way, many individuals opposed to the erring musician's reappointment were also actively involved in promoting these same moral reforms. Judge Edward Blayney

\textsuperscript{84}18 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{85}5 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{86}Argus, 16 June 1900; Christian Citizen, 1 December 1900; Herald, 15 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{87}September 1898.
\textsuperscript{88}13 August 1898; 20 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{89}1 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{90}1 December 1898.
\textsuperscript{91}Age, 29 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{92}Op.cit., p.37, 40.
Hamilton of the County Court crusaded against gambling and drink. Anglican Canon Robert Potter of All Saints' Church, St. Kilda, urged the expansion of facilities for religious instruction in State schools and the suppression of 'grossly sensual' literature. The Rev. S.G. McLaren, Principal of the Presbyterian Ladies' College, complained about the inclusion of immoral passages in the 1895-6 Matriculation English text book and urged the importance of Bible lessons in schools.

The Baptist Rev. Edward Isaac of the George Street church Fitzroy, prominent in the affairs of the Christian Citizens' League, fulminated against the theatre and Sunday cycling. The Congregationalist Rev. A.B. Roff was vice-president of the Victorian Temperance Alliance.

The Presbyterian Rev. J. Meiklejohn opposed Sunday labour and favoured State intervention to reduce liquor.

---

93 *Weekly Times*, 11 March 1899; Irish-born Hamilton was the son of a clergyman - see *Leader*, 17 September 1904.
94 *Argus*, 19 December 1892.
95 *Argus*, 1 October 1900.
96 *MUCMB*, 3 December 1894.
97 *Age*, 2 March 1903, 5 March 1903.
98 *Herald*, 15 June 1900.
99 *Argus*, 13 July 1897.
100 *Argus*, 26 August 1896.
101 *Argus*, 7 March 1900; *Southern Cross*, 5 August 1898; *Victorian Independent*, November 1900.
102 *Argus*, 9 May 1901.
consumption\textsuperscript{103}. The Rev. Alexander Marshall, minister of Scots' Presbyterian church, inveighed against gambling\textsuperscript{104} and in favour of religious instruction\textsuperscript{105}. Anglican Bishop of Melbourne, Field Flowers Goe, urged his clergy to preach against the 'insidious vice' of intemperance\textsuperscript{106}. School teacher Else Morres battled to protect juvenile minds from unclean thoughts\textsuperscript{107}.

Andrew Harper, Reverend Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament at the Presbyterian Theological Hall, Ormond College, and a member of the North and West Melbourne Christian Citizens' Association\textsuperscript{108}, agitated for religious instruction in State schools\textsuperscript{109}, and in May 1890 successfully moved a motion in the Commission of the Presbyterian Assembly, deploring the recent widening of grounds for divorce, which, he said, 'must inevitably ... promote licentiousness';\textsuperscript{110} Geelong organist J. Alfred Johnstone objected to alleged indecency in the operas of Richard

\textsuperscript{103} Argus, 17 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{104} Argus, 23 April 1894.
\textsuperscript{105} Argus, 22 October 1900.
\textsuperscript{106} Age, 18 March 1898, 11 October 1898; Argus, 20 March 1900.
\textsuperscript{107} Woman, 20 October 1907; Morres taught at Merton Hall for seven years; in 1906 she became foundation head of the Church of England Girls' Grammar School in Geelong, a post she retained for 27 years – see Age, 21 April 1933.
\textsuperscript{108} Christian Citizen, 1 November 1901.
\textsuperscript{110} Argus, 10 May 1890.
Strauss and Puccini. The Rev. Professor J. Lawrence Rentoul, Professor of Apologetics and Christian Philosophy at Ormond College, and joint convenor, with the Rev. Daniel MacDonald D.D. (another anti-Marshall-Hall campaigner) of the Presbyterian Public Questions Committee, denounced the Shiels Divorce Act, the sale of contraceptive devices, and moves to open the Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery on Sundays, and demanded more religious instruction in State schools.

Sir Henry Wrixon, Vice-Chancellor of the University, had, despite being a High Anglican, played a leading role in the banning of Sunday newspapers. In October 1895 he chaired a meeting at which Mrs T.R. Andrews spoke against free love. In May 1900, he protested against the presence of bookmakers at the University sports. And in the following September he supported

---

111 Musical Standard, 10 December 1910.
112 PGM, November 1897, Appendix p.xxx, cxxvi.
113 Advocate, 25 November 1899.
114 Outpost, 9 May 1900.
115 Age, 5 May 1898.
117 Argus, 29 May 1900; perhaps the wife of Thomas R. Andrews, Secretary of the Melbourne Hospital; she was a 'literary lady' who had published novels, including Kyrle and A Glimpse of Hell; see Table Talk, 23 January 1902.
118 Argus, 9 August 1895.
an attempt by temperance reformers in the Legislative Council to defeat legislation permitting the transfer of liquor licences from one public house to another\textsuperscript{119}. C.J. Ham, estate agent and M.L.C. for Melbourne Province, strove to keep the pubs closed on Sunday\textsuperscript{120}. Grazier M.K. McKenzie, M.L.A. for Anglesea, also resisted proposals for limited Sunday bar trading\textsuperscript{121}, as well as for the Sunday opening of the Melbourne Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery\textsuperscript{122}, and for the introduction of the totalisator betting machine on to race courses\textsuperscript{123}. The Catholic Primate, Archbishop Thomas Carr, declaimed against the circulation of 'sensual' literature\textsuperscript{124}, and declared the formation of a syndicate to market contraceptives to be 'the most disagreeable thing that has occurred in Melbourne'\textsuperscript{125}. Conservative politician and business man Robert Murray Smith\textsuperscript{126}, and Master of Ormond College, John Henry MacFarland\textsuperscript{127}, supported the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{119}Victorian Parliamentary Debates, op.cit., Vol.95, p.1162.
  \item \textsuperscript{120}Ibid., p.1166.
  \item \textsuperscript{121}Argus, 9 August 1895.
  \item \textsuperscript{122}Argus, 26 September 1901.
  \item \textsuperscript{123}Southern Cross, 12 August, 1898.
  \item \textsuperscript{124}Advocate, 22 September 1900.
  \item \textsuperscript{125}Advocate, 25 November 1899.
  \item \textsuperscript{126}Victorian Parliamentary Debates, op.cit., 1899, p.2057.
  \item \textsuperscript{127}A.G. Austin, The Webbs' Australian Diary 1898, Melbourne, 1965, p.74.
\end{itemize}
principle of Bible lessons in State schools. The Methodist Rev. T. Adamson, a member of the Northcote Christian Citizens' Association\textsuperscript{128}, complained of the prevailing immodesty of female attire\textsuperscript{129}. T. Smith, hat retailer and M.L.A. for Emerald Hill, was a member of the Total Abstinence Society\textsuperscript{130}. Robert Harper, merchant banker, manufacturer, grazier and brother of Andrew Harper, called for religious instruction in State schools\textsuperscript{131}, and opposed the Sunday opening of the National Gallery\textsuperscript{132}. Judge Hickman Molesworth of the insolvency court opposed the totalisator\textsuperscript{133}. The anonymous 'Onlys' objected to 'plays in any shape and to books unless they are educational,'\textsuperscript{134} And Dr. Alexander Leeper, Warden of Trinity College, expressed concern over the circulation of 'immoral' books\textsuperscript{135}, disapproved of games on Sundays\textsuperscript{136}, and urged the adoption of the religious lessons produced by the Royal Commission of 1900 on education\textsuperscript{137}.

\textsuperscript{128}Christian Citizen, 11 January 1901.
\textsuperscript{129}Herald, 13 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{130}Herald, 23 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{131}Table Talk, 28 August 1891.
\textsuperscript{132}Entry by Peter Cook in Bede Nairn and Geoffrey Serle (eds), Australian Dictionary of Biography, Melbourne, 1983, Vol. 9, p. 206.
\textsuperscript{133}Spectator, 15 October 1897.
\textsuperscript{134}Tocsin, 12 January 1898.
\textsuperscript{135}Argus, 18 March 1896.
\textsuperscript{136}Letter from G.W. Leeper, son of Alexander Leeper, to the author, 2 May 1985.
\textsuperscript{137}Minute Book of the Victorian Council of Public Education, 6 August 1912, held by the Council of Public Education, Spring St., Melbourne; A. Leeper, Christian Education in the University, Melbourne, n.d.
A similar correspondence is found between those who favoured Marshall-Hall's retention of his university post, and those who opposed the broader efforts and goals of the moral reformers. These people were less inclined to form organisations specifically to pursue their ends, apart, that is, from a Sunday Liberation Society and an Education Defence League, both of which had become moribund by this time\(^{138}\), and a number of groups, such as the Licensed Victuallers' Association and bodies administering race courses, whose vested pecuniary interests were involved.

Their activities were, however, institutionalised in a section of the press - the same which supported Marshall-Hall in his struggle for re-engagement. It included the Outpost\(^{139}\), which opposed the reintroduction of religion as a formal part of the curriculum of State-funded schools\(^{140}\), and attacked the 'people of feeble intellect' who comprised the Christian Citizens' League\(^{141}\); the radical Champion (founded in 1895 by Henry Hyde Champion\(^{142}\)),

\(^{138}\) Ronald Fogarty, Catholic Education in Australia, Melbourne, 1953, Vol.2, p.461; Champion, 31 August 1895.

\(^{139}\) Owned, oddly enough, by a 'puritan' called E.W. Carey - see Lionel Lindsay, Comedy of Life, Sydney, 1967, p.117; the description, however, may reveal more about Lindsay than Carey; the paper had been known before 26 May 1900 as Cycling News; it was edited from December 1900 to June 1901 by Harold Cavell; other editors are unknown; Norman Lindsay worked on it as cartoonist - see Lurline Stuart, Nineteenth Century Periodicals An Annotated Bibliography, Sydney, 1979, p.29.

\(^{140}\) 20 October 1900.

\(^{141}\) 3 November 1900.

\(^{142}\) Champion was also editor; from 1895 to 1897 it was owned by Champion and the Champion Printing and Publishing Company Ltd., in which Champion and E.W. Carey were partners - see Stuart, op.cit., p.11.
which deplored the censorship of imported newspapers and magazines\textsuperscript{143}, and the activities of the 'social purity party in general',\textsuperscript{144} the Sydney Bulletin, which also opposed censorship\textsuperscript{145}, state religious instruction\textsuperscript{146} and sabbatarianism\textsuperscript{147}; Melbourne Punch\textsuperscript{148}, which was in favour of dancing\textsuperscript{149}; the labour journal, Toosin, which opposed religious instruction by the State\textsuperscript{150}, stigmatised the W.C.T.U. as 'the ugliest collection of females it has been my misfortune to encounter',\textsuperscript{151} and anathematised sabbatarianism\textsuperscript{152}; and the Herald, an afternoon daily, which favoured Sunday transport\textsuperscript{153} and liberal divorce laws\textsuperscript{154}.

\textsuperscript{143} 13 August 1895.
\textsuperscript{144} 3 November 1900.
\textsuperscript{145} 10 June 1899.
\textsuperscript{146} 29 July 1899.
\textsuperscript{147} 12 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{148} Little is known of this journal in the nineties; it was modelled on the English Punch and its editor in 1899 may have been F.T.D. Carrington; see Stuart \textit{op.cit.}, p.109.
\textsuperscript{149} 15 June 1899.
\textsuperscript{150} 2 October 1897, 13 October 1898, 15 June 1899, 22 June 1899, 31 May 1900, 6 September 1900, 20 September 1900; but deplored gambling, not, however, for its immoral character, but because it had a 'sedative effect' on workers and if 'We hadn't such sedatives we would become inconsiderate enough ... to demand to have our wrongs redressed' (Toosin, 3 November 1898; see also 10 November 1898). Toosin at this time was edited by Hugh Corbett, Jack Castieau and Bernard O'Dowd - see Stuart, \textit{op.cit.}, p.158.
\textsuperscript{151} 24 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{152} 24 November 1898; 14 December 1898.
\textsuperscript{153} 11 October 1900.
\textsuperscript{154} 22 October 1900.
In the same category were the Leader, weekly stable-mate of David Syme's Age, which also opposed the religious instruction movement\textsuperscript{155}; Free Lance\textsuperscript{156}, which favoured liberal divorce\textsuperscript{157}, denounced Victorian prudery\textsuperscript{158}, and called for Sunday opening of the Public Library and Art Gallery\textsuperscript{159}; Joseph Syme's atheistic Liberator, which championed neo-Malthusianism\textsuperscript{160}, moderate drinking\textsuperscript{161}, and frank discussion of sexual matters 'in spite of Priest and Mrs. Grundy, and the nasty prudes of either sex',\textsuperscript{162}; the University student journal, Alma Mater, which hoped that laws against Sunday work would soon be 'consigned to the lumber room of dead and gone bigotry and ignorance'\textsuperscript{163}, and, in an article supporting Marshall-Hall, digressed to defend the proponents of the totalisator betting machine\textsuperscript{164}; and Maurice Brodsky's society weekly, \textsuperscript{155}27 September 1900.

\textsuperscript{156}Editor unknown; published in Melbourne by Walter Harrison (April to July 1896) and then William Henry Edwards (August to October 1896); Alec Laing and Lionel Lindsay were among its artists - see Stuart, op.cit., p.74.

\textsuperscript{157}12 September 1896.

\textsuperscript{158}28 May 1896.

\textsuperscript{159}18 June 1896.

\textsuperscript{160}3 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{161}21 November 1896.

\textsuperscript{162}16 January 1897.

\textsuperscript{163}September 1895.

\textsuperscript{164}September 1898.
Table Talk, which not only maintained that dancing, 'certain puritanical opponents to the contrary notwithstanding', could be 'a most healthful exercise',\(^{165}\), but also ridiculed the W.C.T.U. for trying to stop the sale of ice cream in Collingwood on Sundays\(^ {166}\). objected to censorship as 'incompatible with the idea of ... any free State'\(^ {167}\), opposed legislative attempts to suppress intemperance\(^ {168}\), supported the Shiels divorce bill\(^ {169}\), and said that religious instruction in State schools would 'result in an aggravation of the bitterness of denominational feuds'\(^ {170}\).

Individuals, too, who supported Marshall-Hall, were rarely to be found on the side of the moral crusaders, and were often opposed to them. Thus, Dr. S.T. Knaggs, pamphleteer and editor of the Australasian Medical Gazette, denounced sabbatarianism\(^ {171}\).

Journalist and mining speculator, Randolph Bedford's parliamentary platform, as candidate for Bourke West in 1900, included opposition to religious instruction in State schools.

\(^{165}\) 10 December 1886.

\(^{166}\) 16 February 1894.

\(^{167}\) 10 December 1886.

\(^{168}\) 10 March 1899.

\(^{169}\) 11 July 1890.

\(^{170}\) 28 July 1899; 6 February 1902.

\(^{171}\) *Alma Mater*, April 1899.
schools, and support for totalisator betting. Ophthalmologist and University lecturer, Dr James W. Barrett, deprecated 'any state interference' with the drink traffic, and praised the Launceston authorities for permitting open air concerts on Sundays. Linguist F.S. Delmer, on arriving in Yarrawonga as a school teacher in 1897, was at first determined to observe the Lord's day 'with immaculate orthodoxy', but 'the farce became too trying and lost its humour for me after two sawbaths of it', so he 'relapsed into complete heathenism', and felt 'much happier'. Sir Arthur Snowden, solicitor, ex-mayor of Melbourne and M.I.C. for Melbourne Province, moved in the Legislative Council, in the face of strong temperance opposition, to facilitate transfer of liquor licences from one licensing district to another. Dr. T.F. Bride, librarian and curator of deceased estates, opposed the suppression of Ovid's Art of Love. Victorian Premier, Sir George Turner, lawyer J.E. Mackey

172 Argus, 24 October 1900.
173 Ibid.
174 Champion, 21 November 1896.
175 Argus, 19 February 1910.
176 F.S. Delmer to Mrs Eccles 'April the something or other', 1897 in possession of Margaret Delmer.
178 Argus, 4 August 1894.
179 Argus, 20 November 1900.
and Professor of Natural Philosophy T. Lyle were against State school teachers giving religious instruction. Dr. J.W. Springthorpe defended moderate drinking. Painter Arthur Streeton conducted an art union to finance his projected trip to Europe in 1896 and boasted a taste for lager which flowed 'crisp amber from the tall bottle' from which he drank 'to the health and beauty of the fair one who dispenses from behind the bar.'

Thomas Brentnall, organist and chartered accountant, was involved in a syndicate, formed in 1899, to market contraceptives. The Lindsays (Percy, Lionel and Norman), History Professor J. Elkiniong and horn player Hermann Kuhr belonged to the Ishmael club, which refused to accept John Wesley as a member, on the grounds that he was 'a kill-joy and father of all wowsers.' Supreme Court Judge Joseph Hood dismissed a seaman's appeal against his conviction for having refused to work on Sunday,

---

180 Argus, 16 October 1900; Council of Public Education Minute Book, loc.cit., 6 August 1912.
181 Table Talk, 27 September 1895.
182 Table Talk, 16 October 1896.
184 Streeton to Tom Roberts, 9 December 1892, in ibid., pp.28-9.
185 Toosin, 23 November 1899.
explaining that any other verdict could have endangered
Sunday public transport in Melbourne\textsuperscript{187}. The Rev.
Llewelyn D. Bevan of the Collins Street Independent Church
smoked 'uncommonly fine' cigars\textsuperscript{188}, was attacked for
attending a Lord Mayor's ball in 1898\textsuperscript{189}, and believed
that 'the handing over of religious teaching to state
officials is distinctly evil'\textsuperscript{190} (although sadly necessary
at a time when neither parents, nor Churches were ful-
filling their responsibility in this respect\textsuperscript{191}). And
the Wesleyan Rev. Edward H. Sugden, Master of Queen's
College, was an enthusiastic patron of the theatre\textsuperscript{192},
lauded the Venetian authorities for permitting a band to
play in the Piazza San Marco on Sunday evening\textsuperscript{193}, and
had 'even been seen smoking a cigar in Collins Street.'\textsuperscript{194}

That, moreover, the struggle to unseat Marshall-Hall
was viewed, by those involved, as part of this larger
'group' phenomenon (which, therefore, formed part of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{187} \textit{Age}, 20 April 1898.
\item \textsuperscript{188} J.E. Ritchie, \textit{An Australian Ramble}, London,
1890, p.72.
\item \textsuperscript{189} \textit{Southern Cross}, 17 November 1898.
\item \textsuperscript{190} Jane Bevan (compiler and editor), \textit{The Life and
Reminiscences of Llewelyn David Bevan}, L.L.B., D.D.,
Melbourne, 1920, p.127.
\item \textsuperscript{191} \textit{Southern Cross}, 24 August 1900.
\item \textsuperscript{192} \textit{Alma Mater}, July 1900.
\item \textsuperscript{193} \textit{Argus}, 28 December 1905.
\item \textsuperscript{194} \textit{Punch}, 19 July 1900.
\end{itemize}
situation referred to in Martin's condition 1) is illustrated by temperance campaigner, E. Hulme's remark that, not only was the musician unfit to 'be in charge in any way of the instruction of the youth in the Colony', but the same was true of many State school teachers, 'who hold the same principles and who show it ... if not in school, in their lives and manners outside school, and particularly the desecration of the Sabbath; in having dances and other sports on the holy day', and in failing to instruct their pupils on the evils of alcohol.  

It is also implicit in an anonymous letter which berated the labour journal, Tocsin, for 'defend[ing] immoral men like Marshall-Hall', and went straight on to complain that 'there is too much drinking, smoking and gambling indulged in by leading labour enthusiasts'.  

And it is epitomised in the Presbyterian Messenger's remark that Marshall-Hall's defeat would be 'a victory for all good causes'.

The same consciousness of the connection between the Marshall-Hall controversy and those discussed above is evident in the tendency of the music professor's supporters to label his enemies with epithets generally reserved for the moral crusading section of the community.

---

195 Southern Cross, 30 September 1898; Hulme was the author of a pamphlet, Total Abstinence Defended, Melbourne, 1894.

196 Tocsin, 12 January 1899.

197 Presbyterian Messenger, 4 December 1900.
calling them, for example, 'Grundy-ridden mediocrities',\textsuperscript{198} the 'Stiggins crowd',\textsuperscript{199} and representatives of 'narrow-minded bigotry',\textsuperscript{200} which revealed itself in a variety of fields, whether 'the topic be gambling by machinery or the legitimate range of criticism of morals'.\textsuperscript{201}

Their typical representative was said to be the man who 'scruples to dip his tongue in wine',\textsuperscript{202} regards 'the playhouse as an abomination',\textsuperscript{203} and 'had set up a howl when "Chloe" was exhibited in the National Gallery'.\textsuperscript{204} They were accused of trying to suppress the works of Swinburne and Walt Whitman\textsuperscript{205} and Ovid's \textit{Art of Love}\textsuperscript{206}, of legislating against Sunday newspapers\textsuperscript{207}, exhibiting implacable hostility towards 'fallen women',\textsuperscript{208} and wishing to abolish barmaids\textsuperscript{209}. And they were said to have been prominent in the persecution of Bradlaugh, Dilke and

\textsuperscript{198} \textit{Bulletin}, 16 March 1901.
\textsuperscript{199} \textit{Outpost}, 26 March 1900.
\textsuperscript{200} \textit{Alma Mater}, September 1898; see also J. Buckley Castieau in \textit{Herald}, 18 August 1898; \textit{Outpost}, 8 September 1900, 23 June 1900; \textit{Bulletin}, 23 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{201} \textit{Alma Mater}, September 1898.
\textsuperscript{202} \textit{Outpost}, 21 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{203} \textit{Outpost}, 7 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{204} \textit{Tocsin}, 17 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{205} \textit{Bulletin}, 3 September 1898.
\textsuperscript{206} \textit{Outpost}, 23 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{207} \textit{Outpost}, 2 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{208} \textit{Tribune}, 23 June 1900; see also \textit{Liberator}, 20 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{209} \textit{Herald}, 16 June 1900.
Parnell, and to be now trying 'to have the Bible reintroduced into public schools'.

It is significant, in this connection, that denominations, whose commitment to these various specified moral causes was less than total, also tended to be less unanimously uncompromising in their condemnation of Marshall-Hall. Thus, the only denominational journal actively to defend the musician was the Catholic Tribune, representative of a denomination which, as we have seen, saw no essential evil in gambling, drinking, or a secular Sunday (while the Advocate and Austral Light, representing the same denomination were, as we have seen, uncompromisingly opposed).

By the same token, the Congregationalists, as a group were generally more reluctant than most non-conformists to assign a role in religious education to the State, and less enthusiastic about the formation of Christian Citizens' associations. They were also the only

210 Herald, 14 June 1900.

211 Toocsin, 3 November 1898; Outpost also remarked on the fact that Rev. W.H. Fitchett was a prominent opponent of sabbath breaking, drinking and Marshall-Hall (2 June 1900).

212 See e.g. Tribune, 9 June 1900 - owned by some thirty priests, and having a claimed weekly circulation of about 6000 (Tribune, 12 June 1901).

213 Victorian Independent, June 1900, November 1900, August 1899.

214 Victorian Independent, October 1900. To this extent Jackson overstates his case when he says that the 'Congregational Churches in Australia did not attempt to differentiate their product from those of other denominations'. See, Hugh Jackson, 'Moving house and changing churches: the case of Melbourne Congregationalists' in Historical Studies, Vol.19, No.74, April 1980, p.77.
denomination in whose governing body there was open disagreement about the propriety of censuring Marshall-Hall. The original motion of President-Elect, George Bell, to the effect that the musician was 'unfit to be a teacher of young persons'\textsuperscript{215}, was, after some debate, watered down to become merely an expression of 'deepest indignation'\textsuperscript{216} at his utterances, and a call for an enlargement of the University Council’s powers to deal with recalcitrant employees\textsuperscript{217}.

Of the four religious newspapers which refrained from comment on the Marshall-Hall affair, one, the War Cry represented a body which sought permission from Essendon Council to conduct a band concert in Queen's Park on Sunday, 6 May 1900\textsuperscript{218}. Another, Charles Strong's Australian Herald, firmly opposed sabbatarianism\textsuperscript{219}, its editor being an office bearer in the Victorian Sunday Liberation Society\textsuperscript{220}, (as well as an advocate of the introduction of German beer into Victoria\textsuperscript{221}). And the others, the

\textsuperscript{215} \textit{Age}, 29 October 1898.
\textsuperscript{216} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{217} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{218} \textit{Argus}, 1 May 1900.
\textsuperscript{219} \textit{Australian Herald}, March 1897, April 1903.
\textsuperscript{220} \textit{Champion}, 31 August 1895.
\textsuperscript{221} \textit{Table Talk}, 18 February 1887. It is significant that, although he was a member of the Royal Commission of 1900 which was charged with drafting scripture lessons for State schools, Strong, together with the Unitarian Rev. Mr. Lambley, presented a minority report whose lessons, according to Archdeacon Langley, it would have been an unfair use of the English language to call religious (\textit{Mitre}, 16 July 1900).
Seventh Day Adventist **Bible Echo** and **Southern Sentinel**, although against theatre-going\(^222\), dancing, smoking, drinking\(^223\), gambling\(^224\) and books that 'set the passions on fire'\(^225\), were (understandably) anti-sabbatarian\(^226\), objected to State involvement in religious education\(^227\), denounced a W.C.T.U. petition against the liquor trade\(^228\) and, with extreme Protestant dedication to the principle of salvation by faith\(^229\), attacked the Victorian Council of Churches for seeking 'not so much by religious influence as by the power of civil law to prevent men from doing that which it considers irreligious'\(^230\).

Thus, while the categories postulated cannot (usefully) be sharply delimited, and the coincidence of alignments noted is not precise, sufficient correlation existed to warrant the hypothesis that the broader moral cleavage was structurally conducive to the narrower episode of

\(^{222}\) **Bible Echo**, 21 November 1899, 21 February 1898, 21 August 1898.

\(^{223}\) **Bible Echo**, 21 August 1898, 19 March 1900.

\(^{224}\) **Bible Echo**, 1 August 1898.

\(^{225}\) **Bible Echo**, 11 April 1898.

\(^{226}\) **Bible Echo**, 20 February 1899.

\(^{227}\) **Bible Echo**, 15 May 1899; **Australian Sentinel**, August 1894, April 1898.

\(^{228}\) **Australian Sentinel**, August 1894.

\(^{229}\) **Bible Echo**, 27 December 1899.

\(^{230}\) **Australian Sentinel**, August 1894.
collective behaviour that occurred in response to Marshall-Hall's utterances of 1898. A fuller explanation of the relation between the two requires a closer examination of both.

3. Determinism and Free Will as Differentiators

David Denholm has bestowed the label of 'determinist' on those who, being 'preoccupied with the state of sin' and with 'lamentation for present sinfulness', were active in movements that sought the 'State-supported public extension of private morality, such as State-enforced Sunday observance, State censorship of literature and art, State prosecution of gambling ... of harlotry and of any public mention of an explicitly sexual nature'.231 That is to say, they constituted, he contends, a group whose central defining characteristic was the belief that God had left men 'free to make only trifling choices'.232 Those who did not thus favour the imposition of Christian morality on their fellows were, according to Denholm, proponents of 'free will', who, philosophically accepting the state of sin they had inherited from Adam, but declining to dwell on it, considered themselves 'free to make major choices' and, essentially, to control their own destiny.233

It is true that some confirmation for this categorisation is found in pronouncements like that of Bishop

233 Ibid., p.115.
Corbett of Sale, according to whom the 'Catholic faith teaches that we are unable to form a good thought, much less perform a meritorious work, without the grace of God'. It was corroborated also in the Congregationalist Rev. Thomas Laver's assertion that 'unless men become true children of God in Christ Jesus, even their temporal regeneration was impossible', and in that of the Southern Cross, which maintained that vice 'can only be cured by ... dependence; by surrender of the whole nature to the healing forces of Christ's redemption'.

But to identify this as the main thrust, or organising principle of the moral reformers' outlook, is both incorrect and (especially in the present case) radically misleading. Under the influence of the Romantic movement, as Ian Sellars has convincingly argued, the harshness of Calvinist predestination had given way in the 19th century to a softer Arminianism. The latter was perhaps partly also a reaction against the determinism of the Utilitarians. While, like all Christians, the moral reformers believed that salvation ultimately depends on the grace of God, they saw it as a synergistic process (involving both human will and Divine grace) and, in practice, emphasised,

---

234 Argus, 18 February 1899.

235 Toosin, 5 October 1900. Laver was the Rev. A. Gosman's predecessor as Pastor of the Augustine Congregational Church, Hawthorn - see Weekly Times, 4 October 1902.

236 Southern Cross, 5 January 1900.

237 Nineteenth Century Non-Conformity, London, 1971, p.21
not God's role, but man's. Indeed, it is crucial to my argument that the dominant animating determinant of their ethical creed and conduct, that which most radically distinguished their outlook from that of their opponents, was a firm belief in the individual's ability to choose between good and evil, to win redemption by the exercise of human will - without which divine assistance is not forthcoming.

They were, after all, bent, not only on enlisting the coercive powers of the State, but also on persuading people voluntarily to mend their ways, a notion that makes no sense on the assumption of determinism. In fact, Denholm's own characterisation of the life of the moral reformers as 'a relentless crusade by people who saw themselves powerless to take command of their own destiny', is, itself, a contradiction in terms the first part of which implies a profound faith in the individual's capacity significantly to control his/her own fate.

The Rev. W.H. Fitchett, Principal of Methodist Ladies' College, insisted that the belief that 'Everything is necessitated', and that, therefore, it 'is as logical to exhort a man to change his creed as to become, say, six feet high', was 'charged with perils to morality'. To 'hold it ... and to talk about it intelligibly ... is

\[^{238}\text{Op.cit., 118.}\]
impossible.\textsuperscript{239} For Fitchett, it was God, who lacked freedom, inasmuch as he 'cannot reveal himself to the unholy, for his character to them is unintelligible'. But 'a verification of religion [by means of such divine revelation] lies within every man's reach,' in that every man is free to make that 'effort to obey [which] scatters the shadows'.\textsuperscript{240} In similar vein, Bishop Corbett of Sale criticised Thackeray because, while he was most successful in denouncing vice and laying bare its turpitude [ , ] ... he exhibits it as universal, and by natural inference, unavoidable. If all the world around us is corrupt, how can we hope to maintain ourselves pure?\textsuperscript{241} And the Southern Cross deplored the 'tendency to deny the moral element in vice; to treat it as a form of disease, and to seek remedies for it in the pharmocopoeia'. This, declared the writer, 'is not mere folly, it is wickedness. It is a denial of the whole teaching of the Bible',\textsuperscript{242} which plainly said that the 'root' of wrong-doing is not impersonal disease, but a voluntary 'break-down of moral restraints, a sacrifice of duty and conscience to sensual joy'.\textsuperscript{243}


\textsuperscript{240} Ibid., pp.98-100, 107.

\textsuperscript{241} Argus, 6 September 1895.

\textsuperscript{242} January 1900.

\textsuperscript{243} Southern Cross, 25 March 1898; see also Argus, 20 March 1900; Fitchett, \textit{op.cit.}, p.271.
4. Hellenism and Hebraism as Differentiators

In view of this, it will be more congruous to abandon Denholm's nomenclature, in favour of that of Matthew Arnold, which, corresponding, as it does, more closely with the reality in question, has more heuristic value. Arnold's analysis stemmed, of course, from his mid-Victorian English experience. It grew, that is, out of the frustrating confrontation between, on the one hand, the liberal and cultural values inherited from his father, and which, in his student days, were reinforced by the urbane, rational atmosphere of the Oxford Movement, and then by his ten year occupancy of that university's chair of poetry (1857-67), and, on the other, his work as inspector of schools for an education system, suffocating in the combined embrace of Robert Lowe's Revised Code and of the blinkered utilitarianism that characterised the lower middle class Nonconformists who managed the schools Arnold visited and produced most of the children who attended them. The resulting strain was further aggravated, for him, by apprehension at the social unrest which erupted, firstly in 1866, in the wake of the financial and agricultural failures and the defeat of Gladstone's reform bill of that year, and then in the anti-Catholic campaigns of the egregious Mr. Murphy two years later. 244

All this led Arnold to detect two opposite ideological tendencies in the *Zeitgeist*, which he christened Hebraism and Hellenism, the former of which embodied, and the latter lacked a 'paramount sense of the obligation of duty' to lead and confine mankind to the narrow path of Christian virtue. Both sought perfection. But to Hebraism this meant an obedience to the moral law that required constant effort and great self control to overcome the ever-present, hostile, power of sin. To Hellenism it meant the dispelling of ignorance, the attainment of a right understanding of all phenomena, and an appreciation of their beauty. So, while the emphasis of Hebraism was on right conduct, that of Hellenism was on clarity of thought, on 'seeing things as they really are' and glorying in their 'sweetness and light'.

It is interesting that Turnbull, independently, hit upon this same dichotomy as a means of bringing the Marshall-Hall dispute into sharper focus (op.cit., p.5). But his analysis inevitably suffers from its failure substantially to redefine and elaborate the two categories in the light of the complex ideological conditions obtaining some 30 years after Arnold's work was first published (in 1869), and in a community that was some 12,000 miles distant from the one on which Arnold was reflecting.

---

245 *Culture and Anarchy*, op.cit., p.15.
248 To be quite fair, this would have taken him well beyond the limits of the project in which he was engaged.
What follows is an attempt to rectify this omission. It is not an effort to reproduce with photographic fidelity a fragment of our socio-ideological past. That is, of course, impossible, partly, no doubt, because what Karl Mannheim called the activist element\textsuperscript{249} - the analyst's own temperament - cannot be prevented from colouring the narrative; partly because, as Beard and Vagts have pointed out, 'Any definition of a complicated aggregation of events ... is an arbitrary delineation in time and space - an isolation of the "data" in the mind or the imagination; not outside the mind or the imagination'\textsuperscript{250}.

Even when thus envisaged as intellectual artefacts, Hebraism and Hellenism comprised, not distinct antithetical categories, but a single pervasive cultural configuration. The latter can usefully be viewed as located on an axis of biases, extending between two poles\textsuperscript{251}, such that particular complexes of beliefs are seen as Hellenic or Hebraic, depending on the position they occupy on this axis. And that position, given the notoriously fluid, vague and, often incoherent nature of human ideation, can rarely, if ever, be precisely specified. It is the poles which I propose to define, with a view to

\textsuperscript{249} Gardiner, \textit{Theories of History}, \textit{op.cit.}, p.244.

\textsuperscript{250} Quoted in \textit{ibid.}, p.409.

\textsuperscript{251} I have borrowed this image from Peter Burke, \textit{Tradition and Innovation in Renaissance Italy}, London, 1974, p.249, who borrowed it from W.T. Jones, \textit{The Romantic Syndrome}, The Hague, 1961.
producing an 'operational fiction'\textsuperscript{252}, certainly derived from the extraordinarily intricate and abundant data available, but far from identical with them. Its justification is its corrigibility, its usefulness in organising those data, and its consequent heuristic power as an exploratory tool capable of illuminating the Marshall-Hall imbroglio.

As the latter occurred in Melbourne, I shall of course concentrate on analysing this configuration of ideas as it was manifested in that city. But, just as any account of the dispute over Marshall-Hall's utterances would be incomplete and misleading if it disregarded the responses they evoked in other colonies and overseas, so also would any analysis of the broader ideological division between Hellenism and Hebraism, which confined itself exclusively to the same small community, paying no attention to the larger perspective of which that community was culturally, as in other respects, an integral part, and through which alone, therefore, it can be made comprehensible. However, defining the precise nature of the links between Melbourne opinion and that characterising the English speaking world in general, is a complex and lengthy task which is beyond the ambit of the present essay. I shall content myself, therefore, with the cruder exercise of indicating the existence of such links by drawing some, but not many, of my examples from the larger landscape.

5. Sin and Punishment - Stereotype and Reality

Contemporaries in Australia and elsewhere, commenting on Hebraism, especially those hostile to it, usually emphasised two of its reputed features. These were its narrow preoccupation, firstly, with sin, and, secondly, with a harsh, unforgiving moral code, to the exclusion of all concern with man's temporal welfare. Its typical exponents were said to be bent on 'making evil out of everything possible', to be 'everlasting holding up their hands against some alleged enormity', and to cherish a 'narrow conception of God as the God of righteousness alone and not also the God of joy, and beauty, and intellectual light.'

They were, moreover, accused of turning a deaf ear to 'any plea for the forgiveness of the woman who loves much', and abhoring any policy 'which ... doesn't actually reprove sin, and softens the way for the transgressor, instead of strewing spikes on it'. While expending much energy on the suppression of Zola's novels, they were said to be little disturbed by 'the cruelty and
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253. Who, however, rarely used the word.
254. Table Talk, 20 January 1910.
255. Table Talk, 2 December 1897.
immorality of cheap woman labour in coal mines'. And it was claimed that they believed 'the slum missionaries' only duty is to deliver tracts or give good advice', or to give the poor clothes, 'not because they wish to do a humane thing, but solely because they are alarmed lest the morality of the community might be undermined, should a suspicion of bare flesh obtrude itself through a rent in a garment'.

Like all stereotypes, this was a distortion of reality. Compassion was certainly not incompatible with the Hebraic outlook. While Renate Howe is, no doubt, correct in contending that the Wesleyan Central Methodist mission (founded in 1893) 'provided a focal point for social Christianity in Melbourne' at this time - caring, inter alia, for neglected children and the sick and aged poor, and calling for the abolition of capital punishment - it was far from alone in the field. In addition, the same denomination (partly through its Methodist sisterhood, established in 1897), was providing soup kitchens for the needy, and homes for derelict men, and 'Fallen Women,' and sending its workers into courts, jails

\[259\] R. Bedford, *op. cit.*, p.143; see also *Champion*, 8 February 1896; *Herald*, 14 August 1900.

\[260\] *Tocsin*, 28 February 1904; 16 October 1897.


\[262\] *Ibid.*, p.61, 64, 63.

and hospitals with practical assistance for the disadvantaged²⁶⁴.

Furthermore, in 1894 the Melbourne Anglican Synod appointed a committee to consider means of bringing questions of social justice 'to the bar of Christian equity'²⁶⁵. And in June 1898 the High Church Mitre argued for 'the application of the truths and principles of Christianity to social and economic reform'²⁶⁶. The Victorian Independent affirmed that Christianity stood, among other things, for 'right sanitary and drainage arrangements ... the building of houses with an eye to the comfort and health of the occupants ... the organising of relief for the destitute ... and the conducting of classes, or schools, or literary societies etc'²⁶⁷. Among the policies adopted by the National Christian Citizens' League on 11 October 1900 was the procurement of technical education and better housing for the poor²⁶⁸. And even Presbyterians, although not in the forefront of the movement, were not quite so lacking in practical concern as Howe suggests²⁶⁹. In November 1898 the

²⁶⁵Table Talk, 6 October 1894.
²⁶⁶15 June 1898.
²⁶⁷August 1900.
²⁶⁸Southern Cross, 26 October 1900.
Presbyterian Assembly urged 'the necessity for stringent measures for the protection of life in gas-laden and other mines'\textsuperscript{270}, while its Moderator, the Rev. P.J. Murdoch, at the same session, exhorted the Church to 'use its influence to bring about legislation righting social wrongs'.\textsuperscript{271}

But the stereotype was also part of another reality, namely, of the perceived situation in Martin's condition \textsuperscript{1}, which motivated some contemporaries to come to the professor's defence. Their participation in the controversy over his reappointment, that is, was to an extent conditioned by their perception of the relation between this dispute and Hebraism's alleged imperviousness to human suffering. This heightened the support Marshall-Hall received from the labour movement. His enemies, according to the Christian socialist, Percy Frost, were proponents of a 'sectarianism which would confine morality to the keeping of the seventh commandment and allow social theft, social murder, social lying, and social covetousness to be taught in our Universities without murmur'.\textsuperscript{272}

And 'Aurora' maintained that those people, who were 'spending so much time in the hounding down of a Marshall-Hall', represented the same groups which in England 'do little to help women chain makers in the Birmingham

\textsuperscript{270}PPCM, November 1898, Appendix p.lxxxii.

\textsuperscript{271}Argus, 16 November 1898.

\textsuperscript{272}Mitre, 2 July 1900.
and Wolverhampton districts or the London car men.\textsuperscript{273}

This was clearly related to labour's discernment of what is described as 'the general Tory tendency' of the anti-Marshall-Hall camp\textsuperscript{274}. \textit{Tocsin} declared that, in failing to re-employ the professor, the University Council had shown that it, 'like almost every other public institution in this unhappy land is nothing but a Fatman's monopoly\textsuperscript{275}, and that 'the University, state-supported as it is, does not exist for the community, but solely for the few prejudiced snuffle busting plutocrats who alone can afford to use it\textsuperscript{276}. And the same journal described Vice-Chancellor, Sir Henry Wrixon, whose casting vote sealed the unfortunate professor's fate, as a rabid anti-socialist\textsuperscript{277} and defender of class distinctions\textsuperscript{278}; while it referred to Robert Murray Smith, another anti-Marshall-Hall Councillor, as a person deluded by the 'superstition that the economic man of the Manchester school of political economy is endowed with a soul\textsuperscript{279}.

\textsuperscript{273} \textit{Herald}, 27 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{274} \textit{Tocsin}, 20 October 1897; see also \textit{Tocsin}, 20 September 1900, 30 December 1897, 1 September 1898, 24 November 1898.

\textsuperscript{275} 3 November 1899.

\textsuperscript{276} \textit{Tocsin}, 3 November 1898.

\textsuperscript{277} \textit{Labour Call}, 20 December 1906.

\textsuperscript{278} \textit{Tocsin}, 3 November 1898.

\textsuperscript{279} \textit{Tocsin}, 16 August 1900.
This is not, however, to say that the Marshall-Hall dispute was simply an element of the larger class conflict. The musician also had the support of conservative journals, such as *Punch*\(^{280}\) and *Table Talk*\(^{281}\). And among the 88 signatories of a petition of June 1900 in his favour were five consuls, four sharebrokers, three general bank managers, 21 lawyers, thirteen merchants, seven 'gentlemen', 12 doctors, the general manager of B.H.P., a civil engineer, a chemist and an architect\(^{282}\) - hardly a company one would expect to find at a May Day rally.

*Tocsin*, moreover, was just as hostile to many of his supporters, as to his opponents. The former included such 'useless' and 'bitterly conservative'\(^{283}\) 'champions of the sweater' as business and shipping magnate Sir Malcolm MacEachern\(^{284}\) and Sir Arthur Snowden\(^{285}\) as well as other enemies of labour such as Professor E.E. Morris, whose biography of Higinbotham was said to have emasculated its subject of his 'characteristically democratic virility'\(^{286}\), lawyer John Emanuel Mackey, who was said to entertain the 'curious notion that the community contains

\(^{280}\) 21 June 1900.

\(^{281}\) 12 August 1898.

\(^{282}\) *Hince papers, op.cit.*, Box 10 University Cuttings book.

\(^{283}\) *Tocsin*, 2 February 1899.

\(^{284}\) *Tocsin*, 29 December 1898.

\(^{285}\) *Tocsin*, 20 July 1899.

\(^{286}\) *Labour Call*, 13 June 1907.
a natural ruling class and he belongs to it,²⁸⁷ the Benthamite conservative banker H.G. Turner²⁸⁸, and even Marshall-Hall, himself, who was 'altogether too conservative and individualistic' for the labour journal²⁸⁹. It is noteworthy, in this connection, however, that, although continuing to favour his reappointment, Tocsin was considerably less outspoken on the subject in 1900, when it emerged again, than it had been in 1898. Perhaps this reflects the paper's newly formed alliance of convenience with the fiercely anti-Boer War (and anti-Marshall-Hall) Rev. Lawrence Rentoul²⁹⁰.

At the same time, the stereotype also, to a significant degree, mirrors the reality to which it refers. Hebraism was much occupied with sinfulness, prizing above all else whatever 'can make us shrink and shiver at the thought of sin'²⁹¹, and abominating anything 'that sought to minimise the awfulness of sin, and to tone down its ghastly ugliness'²⁹².

²⁸⁷ Tocsin, 15 November 1900.
²⁸⁸ Tocsin, 25 May 1899.
²⁸⁹ Tocsin, 18 August 1898.
²⁹⁰ Tocsin, 18 January 1907, 19 July 1900; in December 1898 Tocsin said that a recent attack launched by Marshall-Hall on the Presbyterian Assembly had been 'the only proper way to treat such miserable squirts as Ratty Rentoul' (1 December 1898); in December 1900 the same paper opined that 'All hope is not lost when such men as Dr. Rentoul come forth as champions of liberty' (6 December 1907).
²⁹¹ Southern Cross, 28 April 1899; see also Southern Cross, 14 October 1899.
²⁹² Rev. A. Isaacs in Argus, 16 November 1898.
This reflected the paramount Hebraic conviction - of critical importance as a structurally conducive determinant of the conflict under consideration - that humanity's most besetting problem was the heavy burden of inherited sin, which was believed to be 'universal in the human race'.\(^{293}\) Man, it was held, being 'naturally and federally in Adam, sinned and fell with him',\(^{294}\) and, therefore, 'enters life as a selfish being',\(^{295}\) whose 'outstanding feature' is 'Degeneracy'.\(^{296}\)

But this was no Gnostic heresy, teaching that man was altogether evil, and that, therefore, escape from the burden of original sin was impossible. Such a determinist position, indeed, vitiated the whole notion of sin for Hebraism. The *Presbyterian Messenger* condemned the notion that 'man is not sinful but blind ... because it rejects sin'.\(^{297}\) It was, declared W.H. Fitchett, 'a theory ... which destroys all morality,' because if free will 'could be denied, human responsibility would cease,' and with it, sin, since it would be 'as reasonable on this theory to blame [a man] for being a rogue as it would be

\(^{293}\) Rev. A. Stewart in *Argus*, 24 September 1902.

\(^{294}\) Rev. Professor Murdoch MacDonald in *Argus*, 23 March 1892.

\(^{295}\) Rev. Lyman Abbott in *Weekly Times*, 13 August 1898.

\(^{296}\) Rev. Professor Murdoch MacDonald in *Argus*, 23 March 1892.

\(^{297}\) 12 June 1914.
to blame him for having red hair. The same point is implicit in a story told by the Victorian Independent of a widow who, grief-stricken by the recent loss of her husband, began to drink. 'We always thought her a very good woman,' said the writer revealingly, 'and though at this time she took a little more than she ought, could scarcely believe it.'

Moreover, Hebraism often was distinctly reluctant to alleviate suffering, especially of a punitive kind. In August 1892 the Society for Promoting Morality objected to proposals for the establishment of a Poundling Hospital on the ground that it would mitigate the natural punishment for extramarital indulgence. The Anglican Dean of Melbourne 'did not like to hear mothers of illegitimate children called respectable.' The Advocate objected to a bill giving their offspring the same legal status as those born in wedlock. The Presbyterian Monthly commended the decision of the Ladies' Committee of the Women's Hospital to record the marital status of all patients in maternity wards on cards by their beds. And the Rev. W.C. Wallace, Moderator of the Presbyterian Church, lamented that 'One cause ...
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301 Argus, 23 August 1892.
302 21 July 1900.
303 1 July 1899.
the evil ... is the complete impunity with which it is tolerated. Wealth or influential connection or a pleasing manner, is too often allowed to purchase oblivion for the offence. A misreading of the Saviour's "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone at her" is too often allowed to condone the offence.\textsuperscript{304}

Similarly, in other areas: Henry Varley, evangelist and editor of Searchlight, was opposed to a New Zealand Contagious Diseases Bill, because it would 'make it easy and safe for vicious men and women to commit sin'.\textsuperscript{305} Contraception was denounced, partly because it 'will tend to destroy one great penalty which ... has saved thousands from falling who otherwise would have fallen'.\textsuperscript{306} The totalisator machine, it was asserted, would be no more acceptable if it made gambling 'safe'\textsuperscript{307} by reducing the level of crime on the race course\textsuperscript{308}, it being no business of government thus to 'protect the public from personal folly'.\textsuperscript{309} Both the totalisator and a foundling hospital,

\textsuperscript{304} 
\textit{Herald}, 6 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{305} 

\textsuperscript{306} 
\textit{Australasian Review of Reviews}, 20 November 1896.

\textsuperscript{307} 
\textit{Argus}, 16 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{308} 
\textit{Southern Baptist}, 1 November 1900.

\textsuperscript{309} 
\textit{Age}, 16 August 1898; see also \textit{Church of England Messenger}, 1 September 1898.
exclaimed the Southern Cross, were undesirable, because they 'would heal the hurt of people far too lightly'\textsuperscript{310}. And the same journal was ready to welcome an alleged cure for drunkenness only if it eliminated the appetite for liquor altogether, but not if it simply removed 'all the unpleasant consequences of drunkenness, so that, henceforward under the beatific influence of this new serum, the happy drunkard may get drunk as often as he pleases without paying the penalty of shaking nerves, a sodden brain, and a ruined digestion'\textsuperscript{311}.

Moreover, sinful conduct was no less strongly condemned when it mitigated unhappiness. Prescribing contraception for women whose lives would be endangered by pregnancy, declared C. Carr in Austral Light, was founded on the erroneous 'supposition that the prevention or immediate relief of pain, the speediest recovery of health, the greater comfort, convenience, or pleasure of the patient, are the first and indeed the only considerations which should influence the advice or the practice of the physician and surgeon'\textsuperscript{312}. The Rev. Canon Godby informed the Ballarat Anglican Church Congress in November 1898 that, in the case of divorce for adultery, even the 'innocent partner should be disadvantaged by being unable to remarry .... It seemed cruel. It seemed unjust, but let

\textsuperscript{310}12 May 1899.
\textsuperscript{311}5 January 1900.
\textsuperscript{312}Austral Light, January 1900.
those who have sinned think of that.\textsuperscript{313} In May 1890 the Commission of the Presbyterian Assembly resolved, on the motion of the Rev. Professor Andrew Harper of Ormond College, to instruct clergy not to marry people divorced under recent legislation on the grounds of cruelty, desertion, habitual drunkenness, imprisonment and violence\textsuperscript{314}. The Advocate, though conceding that 'the compulsory yoking together of men and women who have realised that marriage is a failure may lead to an immense amount of misery', objected to any relaxation of the divorce law\textsuperscript{315}. And the Presbyterian Monthly declared that Bishop Goe's refusal to allow an Anglican clergyman to marry his deceased wife's sister was a much needed corrective to the 'prevailing tendency to loosen the family tie at the demand of pity for the sake of convenience'.\textsuperscript{316}

6. Hebraism and Social Christianity

Alleviating structural unhappiness in the community was also low on the Hebraic scale of priorities. Ken Inglis argues persuasively that, from about 1880, the English

\textsuperscript{313} Argus, 24 November 1898; Godby was a High churchman who, two years later, defended his right to believe in the real presence - see Weekly Times, 13 October 1900.

\textsuperscript{314} Argus, 10 May 1900.

\textsuperscript{315} 14 May 1898.

\textsuperscript{316} 30 March 1900. The reluctance of temperance advocates and anti-gamblers to tax liquor sales and the proceeds of gambling in the interests of charity reflects the same viewpoint - see e.g. Age, 8 July 1898, 26 November 1898, 16 August 1898; Spectator, 26 August 1898; Australian Christian, 1 December 1898; Argus, 16 May 1900; Victorian Independent, June 1898, August 1898.
religious denominations came increasingly to accept their role in securing social justice. But this trend, as Kenan Howe has shown, was not mirrored in Melbourne, where the late nineties witnessed 'the triumph of traditional Protestant support for temperance and moral reform over more radical programmes for social change'.

Australian disquiet with the English trend was reflected in the Baptist Rev. T.J. Malyon's condemnation of the 'new notions about Christianity being mainly intended to work present social benefits'. Similarly, the Rev. F.B. Meyer attacked ministers who were 'drifting into preaching on social topics and questions of the day apart from the person, and work of the Saviour'. The Church, the Presbyterian Rev. Dr. Alexander Marshall warned his Scots Church congregation, should not be regarded as 'a glorified soup kitchen, as a cheap collecting agency for philanthropic institutions, as a soft-hearted and soft headed dispenser of benevolence ... or ... as a social reform league for adjusting the economic conditions of a community that has fallen into a state of disorder and discontent'. The Rev. Professor D.M. MacDonald, Professor of Systematic Theology and Church History at

318 Howe, loc.cit., p.60.
319 Southern Baptist, 3 March 1898.
320 Southern Baptist, 16 March 1899; and see Bishop Gore, in Argus, 4 September 1894.
321 Argus, 1 July 1906.
Ormond College, reminded a Presbyterian conference in October 1894 that the 'mission of the Church was ... primarily with the world's sin, and only secondarily with its sorrows and troubles'\textsuperscript{322}. And the Rev. C.H. Yatman warned that the 'diverting of the [Baptist] Church's energies from the work of regenerating men to the amelioration of their condition is a mischievous mistake'\textsuperscript{323}.

Far from exhibiting a determinist view of human behaviour, this reluctance to be involved in movements for social reform stemmed, in part, from the Hebraic conviction that the main determinant of conduct, and particularly sinful conduct, was free choice. This meant that sinfulness was independent of social conditions, and could not, therefore, be diminished by their amelioration. The Southern Cross denied that sin 'has its root, not in our character but in our circumstances,' and that, therefore, 'What men need is not a change of heart but a change of environment'\textsuperscript{324}. And the Advocate, although 'hesitating to oppose' a plan to cure drunkenness by improving the inebriate's physical surroundings, warned 'that where religious or domestic considerations exercise no restraint a good deal of public money could be wasted

\textsuperscript{322} *Argus*, 18 October 1894.

\textsuperscript{323} *Southern Baptist*, 19 October 1899; see also the Rev. F.E. Harry in *Australian Christian World*, 19 May 1894.

\textsuperscript{324} 22 April 1898.
to little purpose .... We must rely on self-respect and moral influences for the reform of the drunkard.\textsuperscript{325}

It is significant that those of Evangelical persuasion, who did continue to interest themselves in social questions, played no part in the anti-Marshall-Hall movement. They included such active members of the Anti-sweating League as the Rev. Charles Strong; the Congregationalist Rev. A. Gosman; temperance campaigner and member of Strong's Australian Church, Samuel Mauger; and the Rev. A.R. Edgar, who was also director of the Central Methodist Mission\textsuperscript{326}. In addition, there were the Revs. E.H. Sugden, and L.D. Bevan, both of whom actually lent the professor's cause some support. The latter was chided by the \textit{Southern Cross} in 1898 for not having reprimanded Ben Tillet when he informed a meeting, chaired by Bevan, that 'Parsons would put prayer in place of clean water and wholesome surroundings';\textsuperscript{327} while Sugden called on the authorities, at the height of the depression in 1893, to 'alter the laws, which permit in such a golden clime so unequal a distribution of wealth and the result of labour.'\textsuperscript{328}

\textsuperscript{325} October 1898.

\textsuperscript{326} See Howe, \textit{op.cit.}, p.62, 71; \textit{Tocsin}, 7 July 1900, \textit{Argus}, 20 October 1901.

\textsuperscript{327} 1 July 1898.

\textsuperscript{328} Howe, \textit{op.cit.}, p.65.
7. The Connection between Sin and Pain

Howe attributes the general absence of enthusiasm for social Christianity in Melbourne to a number of factors, including the lack of provision for theological study at the University, the regulation preventing non-matriculated students for the ministry from coming under Sugden's influence at Queen's, and the want of a 'self-conscious democratic tradition' and of the 'urban ecology and social conditions' that had been conducive to the rise of social gospel theology elsewhere.\(^{329}\)

But there was more to it. This reluctance to concern itself with man's temporal welfare also reflects a fundamental axiom of the Hebraic Weltanschauung (perhaps Hebraism's way of resolving the besetting Christian problem of theodicy), namely, the conviction that suffering was exogenically related to sin, but logically independent of it. In contradistinction to the Bulletin's Benthamite contention that 'the edifice of morality is based on human interests',\(^{330}\) Hebraism was, as nearly three decades earlier George Eliot had remarked, imbued with 'the notion that the highest motive for not doing wrong was something irrespective of the beings who suffer the wrong'.\(^{331}\)

Not that it failed to emphasise the misfortune that sin inevitably brought in its train, insisting, on the

---

\(^{329}\) Howe, op.cit., p.65.

\(^{330}\) Bulletin, 3 November 1900.

contrary, that the 'course of God's providence, and the repeated declaration of His Word show that there is an intimate connection between sin and suffering', and that anyone who ignored this 'must sooner or later be smitten with those retributive weapons with which nature is everywhere armed for its own protection'. Thus, easy divorce was said to 'spread misery among the children who are the fruit of the "lease-hold marriages"'.

Smoking reputedly inhibited growth, impaired mental energy and digestion, and weakened the eyes, heart and lungs. Sabbath desecration boosted the death rate through overwork. Illicit sex was charged with engendering racial degeneration, 'premature disease, shame and death'; gambling, with increasing crime.

332 Bishop Goe, quoted in Argus, 9 May 1893; see also e.g. Rev. P.J. Murdoch in Victorian Independent, November 1900.

333 Southern Cross, 1 December 1899.

334 Christian Citizen, 1 November 1900.

335 Harper's Young People, reprinted in Spectator, 2 November 1900; see also Spectator, 7 August 1914.

336 Victorian Independent, August 1900, March 1901; Rev. T. Collins cited in Argus, 7 March 1901; Southern Baptist, 1 October 1900.

337 Victorian Independent, August 1900, March 1901.

338 Southern Cross, 10 February 1899; PPGM, November 1897, Appendix p.cxxxi; Presbyterian Monthly, 1 September 1898; Spectator, 19 February 1897.

339 Victorian Independent, February 1901.


and poverty\textsuperscript{342}, and starving 'productive industries' of investment capital\textsuperscript{343}; and alcohol, with leading to evils too numerous to catalogue in the present work\textsuperscript{344}.

This conduct, however was deemed sinful, not because of the suffering it caused, but because it frustrated 'Divine ends',\textsuperscript{345} whose 'object ... was primarily to bring in the Kingdom of God and only secondly to give comfort and peace to individuals'. Such 'benefits would come to those who love God, only if the coming of the Kingdom would be furthered by that; and, conversely, when suffering on their part would further that coming, it would fall to their lot'.\textsuperscript{346} As Andrew Harper explained, the 'commandments are welcomed because they are indications as to how the will of a loving and redeeming God may be done,' not because they contained a recipe for happiness\textsuperscript{347}. Similarly Dr. Vance, Dean of Melbourne, denied that 'the real strength of the argument against gambling' was the misery it brought to the gambler and those associated with him\textsuperscript{348}. And the same view pervaded the literature of the

\textsuperscript{342} R. Ditterich, \textit{loc.cit.}; Australian Christian, 15 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{343} \textit{Spectator}, 3 March 1899.

\textsuperscript{344} See e.g. \textit{Spectator}, 30 December 1898, 22 February 1901; Mrs. Kirk in \textit{Victorian Independent}, November 1900.

\textsuperscript{345} \textit{Southern Baptist}, 30 March 1899.

\textsuperscript{346} A. Harper, \textit{James Balfour, op.cit.}, p.268.

\textsuperscript{347} \textit{Ibid.}, p.261.

\textsuperscript{348} \textit{Age}, 2 April, 1898.
Australasian White Cross League, which, while maintaining that 'nature ... marks her condemnation of [sexual impurity] by frightful penalties,' insisted that 'You must not be pure only because it is dangerous ... to be impure. You must be pure ... because it is the manly, noble, Christ-like course in life.'

Richard Arthur, medical hypnotist, eye, ear, nose and throat specialist and temperance reformer, summed up this Hebraic conception of the relation between sin and suffering when he reminded a conference of Young Men's Associations in Hobart in February 1902 that 'If God had not ordained a natural law of retribution ... you can picture to yourself the horrible mass of corruption that would be seething around you.'

That is to say, suffering was decreed as a means of persuading man to be virtuous - a notion that makes sense only on the assumption of free will. So the Outpost, in accusing its Hebraic enemies of saying that 'there shall be no more cakes and ale because some foolish people cannot look after themselves,' was wrong, not just because this caricatured the truth by exaggerating some of its features, but because it wrongly attributed to Hebraism the essentially Hellenic belief that a thing is immoral in proportion to the amount of pain it causes.

---

351 10 November 1900.
8. Morality, Dogma and Instinct

As virtue, then, was logically independent of the drive to happiness, and as man was born with the burden of Adam's sin, it followed that his inner impulses were not a reliable guide to virtuous conduct. Hellenic supporters of Marshall-Hall argued that the 'basis of morality ... is not found in any revelation, or, more broadly, in any extrinsic authority'\(^\text{352}\), but, like 'the physical senses and the intellectual faculties, it is implanted in man's structure'\(^\text{353}\). His Hebraic adversaries, by contrast, enjoined the renunciation and curbing of natural urges. Man, proclaimed the Southern Cross, should not be 'the slave of any desire or passion of his nature. Self-control is the power that keeps human nature sound and healthy.'\(^\text{354}\). The Southern Baptist commended Puritanism, because it 'preferred duty to delight, self repression to self-indulgence.'\(^\text{355}\). A paper read at a Sydney Catholic Congress on behalf of an anonymous group of Loreto Nuns, declared that 'neglect of duty was the result of the wrong direction given to the will when guided by passion and feeling.'\(^\text{356}\). And an Australasian White Cross League pamphlet called on young men to 'practise perfect self-control', to

\(^{352}\)Professor Henry Laurie, quoted in Australasian Schoolmaster, November 1890.

\(^{353}\)Tocsin, 7 July 1900.

\(^{354}\)14 January 1898.

\(^{355}\)12 October 1899.

\(^{356}\)Advocate, 20 October 1900.
'learn ... to have your passions so under the restraint of your will that they can be called to heel at any time.'\textsuperscript{357}

The source of moral imperatives, it was Hebraically insisted, is a network of externally derived rules. This was perhaps to be expected from Catholicism which, given the emphasis it placed on the priest's intercessory role, naturally refuted 'the shadowy religion ... which rejects dogma' and fails to recognize that 'external authority' is 'absolutely indispensable' in moral questions \textsuperscript{358}; and called on its adherents to 'Believe the faith which came down from heaven, and which is not spider-like, spun out of your bowels.'\textsuperscript{359}

But Protestant Hebraism, for all the lip service it paid to private judgment, and even to the view that 'conscience is the voice of GOD within us,'\textsuperscript{360}, was no less emphatic in its insistence on adherence to what Arnold called a 'fixed law of doing we have got already,'\textsuperscript{361} — that is, to the letter of scriptural morality. The Bible, urged the \textit{Southern Baptist}, 'defines ... the rights and duties of the state as it does of the individual.'\textsuperscript{362}

\textsuperscript{357} Purity and Impurity, op.cit., p.18.
\textsuperscript{358} Advocate, 27 October 1900.
\textsuperscript{359} Advocate, 10 March 1900.
\textsuperscript{360} Victorian Independent, October 1900.
\textsuperscript{361} Culture and Anarchy, op.cit., p.145.
\textsuperscript{362} Southern Baptist, 30 March 1899.
So, smoking was denounced, because it violated the injunction (1 Pet ii- 11) to 'Abstain from fleshly lusts that war against the soul,'363; sabbath desecration, because it broke the fourth commandment364; gambling, because it infringed the eighth and tenth commandments, as well as the teachings of Paul365 and Jeremiah366; drinking, because the Bible said 'No drunkard shall inherit heaven'367; theatre-going on the authority of Romans XIV and 1 Corinthians VIII 368; and pleasure seeking, generally, on those of Job XXI, 12-14369, and 1 Corinthians X, 23 and VI, 12370. Contraception was attacked as a repudiation of the command to 'Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth'371. And grounds for divorce 'beyond those sanctioned by Scripture,'372 were fiercely condemned373. Bishop Goe cautioned

363 Spectator, 26 October 1900.
364 Argus, 26 September 1901.
366 Ibid.
367 Spectator, 22 February 1901; see also Rev. J.W. Crean in Age, 26 November 1903.
368 Edward Isaac in Argus, 13 July 1897.
369 Southern Baptist, 18 January 1900.
370 Anglican Bishop of Ballarat in Argus, 17 May 1894.
371 Southern Baptist, 17 January 1901.
372 Christian Citizen, 4 October 1900.
373 Christian Citizen, 1 November 1900; Dr. Vance, Anglican Dean of Melbourne, in Argus, 1 October 1901; Presbyterian Messenger, 24 August 1900; resolution of Anglican Church Assembly in Argus, 5 October 1901; petition of New South Wales Anglican Synod in Argus, 24 September 1901; Archbishop Carr in Argus, 7 October 1901.
Anglican clergy 'to regard the subject not only as philanthropists desirous of promoting the welfare of society, but also as ministers and members of the Church of England, whose aim it was to follow the teachings of the Bible and the Prayer Book with respect to marriage.'

A prime motive of the campaign to increase facilities for religious instruction in State schools was the belief that the Bible alone was a source of moral guidance.

9. Vengeance and Forgiveness

A second corollary of this Hebraic view of the relationship between sin and suffering was a belief in a stern, vengeful and punitive deity, whose uppermost desire was to inspire fear. He was, Andrew Harper conceded, 'a God of love,' but 'wherever love is, there is a capacity for wrath,' and it was the latter quality which exponents of Hebraism emphasised. Theirs was not 'a good-natured God,' who 'appeals to lax untrained imaginations,' which had slid 'into an unstrenuous way of living.' Rather was he one 'whose love was ... all consuming fire towards all sin,' who was 'stern with triflers,' 'intolerant of curious dilettante reasoners,' and 'exact with the

---

374 Argus, 24 November 1898.

375 See e.g. J. Balfour's speech of 17 September 1898 in Andrew Harper, James Balfour, op.cit., p.20.

376 Australian Christian, 6 January 1899.

377 Ibid.

378 Rev. S. Peace Carey in Argus, 26 October 1906; see also the Very Rev. Dean of Ballarat in Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1898.
easy-going well-to-do people who expect to make the best of both worlds.\textsuperscript{379}

These twin convictions, that human behaviour was essentially voluntary, and that its effects were ordained by a vengeful deity as a disincentive to wrong doing, gave rise to a reluctance to tolerate and forgive the sinner, which had far-reaching consequences for Marshall-Hall, inasmuch as they were, in Smelser's permissive sense (see above, p. 38), structurally conducive to the outcry. The beleaguered music professor's supporters were labouring under a profound misconception when they accused his enemies of hypocrisy in seeking his downfall - of professing, that is, to believe on the one hand, that 'even the wickedest life-long criminal will have God's forgiveness,' while failing, on the other, to 'regard the example given by the Almighty [as] a good guide for themselves.'\textsuperscript{380}

It is true that, from the Hellenic point of view, the original transgression had been 'seven times purged by the gentlemanly amends'\textsuperscript{381} inasmuch as he had withdrawn

\textsuperscript{379} Quoted from the \textit{British Weekly in Southern Cross}, 14 April 1899; see also e.g. Rev. F.E. Harry in \textit{Australian Christian Herald}, 19 May 1899; the Very Rev. Dean of Ballarat in \textit{Church of England Messenger}, 1 August, 1898.

\textsuperscript{380} Frederick Tate in \textit{Herald}, 23 June 1900; see also \textit{Outpost}, 30 June 1900; \textit{Herald}, 20 June 1900, 21 June 1900; \textit{Tribune}, 23 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{381} \textit{Alma Mater}, July 1900; see also e.g. J. Mather to E.F. a'Beckett, 11 June 1900 MUCRF, 1900/40; University Professors to Council, 16 June 1900 in \textit{ibid.}; petition of 14 June 1900 to University Council in Hince papers \textit{op.cit.} Box 10 University cuttings book; letter to Melbourne University
his objectional books from sale, had expressed regret for the pain occasioned, and had kept a promise not to repeat the offence. This, no doubt, was why John Grice favoured reappointment despite his conviction that the Council's original censure of the professor (on 24 October 1898) had been thoroughly well deserved. Similarly, it was principally on this ground that the Rev. L.D. Bevan besought the University Council to retain Marshall-Hall's services.

'I yield to none,' wrote Bevan, 'in regarding the action of Marshall-Hall in some of his utterances and writings as deserving severe reprobation and were these alone to be regarded his continuance as a Professor would surely be impossible, but it must not be forgotten ... that he has expressed regret that he has outraged some of the dearest convictions and sentiments of the community ... and ... that he distinctly promises that no words of his in the future shall produce any such effect'. Moreover,

Council concerning the reappointment of Professor Marshall-Hall as Ormond Professor of Music, signed by W. Were and 87 others, in Melbourne University Pamphlets, V.1, No.26, Baillieu Library; Thomas Harlin, Captain F. Templeton, John Mather and A. Siede in Argus, 19 June 1900; 'Member of the Senate' in Herald, 20 June 1900; Tribune, 7 July 1900; H.W. Cambridge in Herald, 21 June 1900; Leader, 16 June 1900; W.R. Ray in Argus, 16 July 1900; R.I.J. Ellery in Argus, 26 June 1900; John Grice in Argus, 26 June 1900; 'M.A.' in Alma Mater, July 1900; Orme Masson in Argus, 9 July 1900.


283 Argus, 26 June 1900.
'the promise to respect the feelings of the community and the rule of the Council has been most sincerely and accurately kept by him.' These, Bevan believed, were 'facts which ought to weigh ... especially with those who believe and teach that there is forgiveness for error and even for moral delinquency.'

It would be well at this point to forestall a possible objection, namely, that, far from keeping his promise not to give further offence, Marshall-Hall had in November 1898 written a letter, 'running over with malice and bristling with insults,' to the Presbyterian Assembly. In it he reminded that body of Robert Burns's observation that 'the half-inch soul of an unfeeling, cold-blooded, pitiful Presbyterian bigot cannot forgive anything above his dungeon bosom and foggy head', and conveyed the writer's compliments particularly 'to Holy Willy himself, to the immortal Gugliamus Sanctissimus of Wyselaskie-Hall [i.e. Rev. Lawrence Rentoul].'

However, when the controversy erupted again in 1900, the musician's enemies, with the sole exceptions of the Argus, the Presbyterian Elder's Association, and

---

384 Bevan to Sir Henry Wrixon, 23 June 1900 MUCRF 1900/40; see also Bevan in Argus, 29 October 1898; Ave, 29 October 1898.

385 Southern Cross, 2 December 1898.

386 Argus, 29 November 1898.

387 14 July 1900.

388 Argus, 16 June 1900.
the Southern Cross, made no attempt to cite this letter as a violation of his pledge. This may have been partly because it attacked one denomination, rather than religion itself, and partly because it contained a passage which, if made the subject of public debate, could have ruptured the unity of the anti-Marshall party by arousing sectarian animosities that were never far below the surface of Hebraic polemics. It said that (for the writer) it had 'been right goodly and profitable to behold the godly indignation with which you smote the Catholic left cheek, and while waiting for the other to be turned, kept your hand in (to use profane parlance) on the wicked Australian natives, my wickeder self, and the wickedest world-in-general and his wife).

Be that as it may, the fact remains that, although rarely referring to this letter, Marshall-Hall's opponents obdurately insisted, like Shylock, on the execution of their bond, in the form of the Council resolution of 24 October 1898 not to renew the appointment when it expired at the end of 1900. This resolution was declared to be 'not only a verdict but a contract'.

---

389 13 July 1900, 8 June 1900, 2 December 1898, 22 June 1900, 13 July 1900.
390 Argus, 29 November 1898.
391 Southern Cross, 22 June 1900; see also Australian Christian World, 22 June 1900; A. Pizde(?), Secretary of Scotch College Council, to E.F. a'Beckett, 16 June 1900 in MUCCP 1900/40; Resolution of the executive of the Methodist Ladies' College, in M.L.C. Council Minute Book, 16 June 1900; Queen's College Council Minute Book, 16 June 1900; Queen's College, Melbourne; Southern Cross, 6 July 1900, 10 August 1900, 29 June 1900; Rev. Thomas Adamson in Argus, 15 June 1900; Mitre, 15 June 1900; Andrew Harper in Argus, 26 June 1900; Victorian Independent, July 1900.
They were certainly aware of the argument that 'his decorous behaviour during the last eighteen months should condone the offence.' That is to say, they were aware, as required by Martin's second condition, of an alternative course of action that was open to them other than seeking to replace him in the chair of music. But they rejected it on the characteristically Hebraic ground that it represented, not a freely embraced change of heart, but an accord exacted under duress. It was true, they conceded, that he had 'observed a wise silence' after the initial outbursts. But 'during this period Mr. Marshall-Hall has been under the sobering influence of the warning given him by the University Council,' that he continued in office on condition that he did 'nothing scandalous' for the remainder of his term. And it was this, rather than a voluntary renunciation of his offensive opinions, and a consequent resolution to sin no more, which had governed his behaviour. 'If there had been any evidence,' declared pastoralist M.K. McKenzie M.L.A., 'that the professor had recanted the views he had given expression to, or that he had seen the error of his views and changed them, that would be some justification for the proposed reappointment.'

392 Australian Christian World, 22 June 1900.
393 Southern Cross, 15 June 1900.
394 Argus, 18 June 1900; see also Advocate, 16 June 1900.
395 See e.g. Bishop F.F. Goe in Argus, 5 June 1900; Rev. A.B. Refe in Age, 29 October 1898.
396 Argus, 19 June 1900.
The Advocate, too, insisted that 'no man is held for all time responsible for indiscretions of speech or other divergencies', but added that

the wrong done in public stands against the transgressor till he has publicly made reparation in the proper spirit, and this Professor Marshall-Hall has not done. On prudential grounds only has it been said for him that he regretted the publication of his grossly indecent pamphlet.  

The sentiment was echoed by the Presbyterian Messenger, the Public Questions Committee of the Presbyterian Church, the Southern Baptist, the Southern Cross, Professor Andrew Harper, Sir Henry Wrixon, and an anonymous correspondent signing himself/herself 'In Medio'. Thus, far from being hypocritical in this respect, Hebraism was true to its (structurally conducive) creed that forgiveness is accorded on cessation of sin - construed as an act of free choice - but that, otherwise, God's vengeful wrath must run its course.

Hellenism's greater inclination, on the other hand, to tolerate and forgive the evil-doer derived from a

397 16 June 1900.
398 22 June 1900.
399 PPGM November 1898, Appendix p.1xxxiv.
400 28 June 1900.
401 22 June 1900.
402 Argus, 26 June 1900.
403 Argus, 13 July 1900.
404 Ibid.
conception of human behaviour which, contrary to Denholm's view, radically minimised the role of unfettered choice. Tocsin rejected the notion that 'the fundamental cause of social misery was human sin and depravity', declaring, on the contrary, that 'Man's conscience varies with the health of his brain and nerve system and of the rest of his organism' and that that, in turn, was the product, largely, of social conditions. Hence, the real cause of prostitution (for example) was 'deep down in our social system', it being hardly surprising, if girls have to 'keep themselves on a wage of nine shillings a week and pay board too,' that 'their lives should be none too respectable'. It was poverty also that 'turns many, who would otherwise rear families, away from nature to vice (i.e. to the use of contraceptives). Likewise, drunkenness was 'inseparable from the present imperfect stage of civilization,' and 'cannot be thoroughly vanquished unless the predisposing causes, crushing toil, long hours, bad housing be cured as social evils'. Not even the abortionist was to be blamed. 'The crime lies with society. The false basis on which

405 Tocsin, 4 November 1897.
406 Tocsin, 7 July 1900.
407 Tocsin, 17 November 1898.
408 Tocsin, 12 April 1900.
409 Tocsin, 17 January 1901.
410 Tocsin, 23 November 1899.
411 Tocsin, 6 August 1903.
our social system is built is responsible for this and every other outrage.412

The same brand of determinism is evident in claims, such as those of Charles Strong's Australian Herald, that, as gambling was 'the outcome of a vicious system' it was best countered by a juster redistribution of wealth413; and of the Sydney Bulletin that sexual (and, indeed, all) behaviour occurs 'under the dominion of undeviating law'. and that therefore 'the victim of unsound sex ... is no more to be condemned than the victim of unsound lungs'.414

This view was also implicit in the arguments of those of Marshall-Hall's Hellenic defenders who attributed his outbursts to nervous instability over which he had little or no control. He was possessed, it was pleaded in extenuation, by an 'exuberance which in artistic natures often over leaps the wisdom and caution which less excitable characters observe'415. This 'compulsiveness which is so necessary a quality for a good musician and artist', this 'overflow of the superfluous energy of genius',416 supposedly rendered him subject to an 'occasional

412Toossi, 26 January 1898.
413Australian Herald, November 1896.
41416 June 1900; see also Bulletin, 3 November 1900. The point receives some discussion in Chris McConville's article, 'The Location of Melbourne's Prostitutes 1870-1920', Historical Studies, Vol.17, No.1, 4 April 1980.
415Rev. L.D. Bevan to Sir Henry Wrixon, 23 June 1900 in MUCRCF 1900/40.
416Bulletin, 20 August 1898.
mysterious pressure which tempts nervous people to explode and run amuck ... to whoop and fight and rampage\(^\text{417}\). As a result, he 'must express himself or burst'\(^\text{418}\). And it was this which 'led him into the trouble'\(^\text{419}\). That his 'detractors have not committed themselves in a similar manner results from the fact of their not having that divine quality'\(^\text{420}\).

10. The Sacred and the Profane

The apparent insensitivity of Hebraism to human suffering, and its want of enthusiasm for social reform, are further explicable in terms of another of its essential defining characteristics, which was also structurally conducive to the eruption of the conflict in question. This was a radical determination to maintain a sharp distinction between the sacred and the profane — in both of Rudolph Otto's senses of the terms. The sacred, according to Otto, encompasses both the ethical and the numinous sectors of human experience\(^\text{421}\). That is to say, it embodies both the rules of conduct to which obedience is prescribed\(^\text{422}\) and the state of communion with what 'is
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\(^{417}\) Outpost, 7 July 1900.

\(^{418}\) Herald, 20 June 1900.

\(^{419}\) Ibid.

\(^{420}\) Herald, 16 June 1900.

\(^{421}\) Rudolph Otto, The Idea of the Holy, Harmondsworth, 1959, pp.19-21. However, the ritually unclean, although sacred in the Melanesian sense of possessing an excess of manu (see Ina Corinne Brown, Understanding Other Cultures, Englewood Cliffs, 1963, pp.124-5) is, in my sense, an element of the profane.

\(^{422}\) Otto, op.cit., p.70.
quite beyond the sphere of the usual, the intelligible, the familiar, in which 'the soul, held speechless, trembles inwardly to the furthest fibre of its being'. The profane consists both in disregard for those rules and in all states of mind from which such numinous communion is absent.

Hebraism, then, is defined partly in terms of the tendency of its advocates to view these two categories—the sacred and the profane—as mutually hostile, and consequently to be fiercely determined to keep them apart. The Hebraic personality fits Adler's description of the neurotic, as one who 'groups inner as well as outer events according to strictly antithetical schema ... and admits no degrees in between', and in whose mind, therefore, 'phenomena which do not belong together must ... be sharply separated by abstractive fiction.'

This was epitomised in what could be called Hebraic 'faddism', a word with a wide pejorative currency in the late 19th century. I shall use it to denote a

---

423 Ibid., p.31.
424 Ibid., p.70.
426 See e.g. Punch, 27 January 1898; Bohemia, 5 February 1891; Australian Christian, 21 February 1901; Argus 30 October 1891, 25 November 1893, 31 August 1895, 16 February 1900, 28 August 1900, 23 October 1900, 2 November 1900; Age, 3 December 1898; British Musician, January 1893; Table Talk, 2 December 1887, 28 June 1889; faddists, said Victorian labour M.L.A. J. Moloney, are 'men with one idea' (Argus, 28 August 1900).
disposition to ascribe value to the sacred alone, regarding all else as, at best, worthless, at worst, harmful. To the exponent of Hebraism, that is to say, the need to combat sin is always an overriding motive. As Arnold put it, he 'imagines himself in possession of a rule telling him the unum necessarium, the 'one full and sufficient measure of light' to which he is determined 'to enslave his whole life'. His conduct, therefore, always satisfies Martin's 6th condition. As a result, to quote Arnold again, those with a 'tendency to Hebraise' are inclined to develop 'one side of their humanity at the expense of the others' - more specifically, to 'sacrifice all other sides of their being to the religious side'.

This was caricatured in Joseph Crouch's story of the Wesleyan preacher who pronounced a book on English grammar to be worthless, because there was nothing about Christ in it. It was more accurately reflected in Bishop Corbett's complaint against works of fiction in which 'the one great essential is wanting, the Divine aid', and in the Christian Commonwealth's castigation of Fridtjof Nansen for alluding to God only once in his Farthest

427 *Culture and Anarchy, op.cit.*, p.5, 15.
432 *Argus*, 1 July 1900.
North. In more extreme form, it was exemplified in Andrew Harper's description of the Bible, not only as 'the great master-piece of English prose,' but 'the only poetry and philosophy our people will ever receive,' and in E. Stranger's belief that 'the world would be little poorer if all the books but the Bible were destroyed.'

It was embodied in a different way in the Australian Christian World's assertion that 'surely it is rational to suppose that no person will continue any longer than he or she sub-serves the ends for which God called this universe into being,' and in the injunction of the Southern Cross that 'There is no getting away from this rule, "Whatsoever ye do, whether ye eat or drink, do all to the glory of God".' It appeared in Lawrence Pentoul's extraordinary claim that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul had no support outside Christianity. And it was implicit in Hebraic references to that side of the synergistic exercise that did reflect a degree of determinism, namely the belief that 'no personality could be developed without Christ,' and

---

433 Quoted in Argus, 15 May 1897.
434 Harper, op. cit., p.175.
435 Spectator, 20 October 1899.
436 16 June 1899.
437 Southern Cross, 27 July 1900.
438 Argus, 5 September 1895.
439 Rev. P.J. Murdoch in Argus, 16 November 1898.
that 'all development and progress will be very short-lived if our people are not permeated with the principles and truth of God's word'\textsuperscript{440}.

It was also discernible in Hebraic attitudes to art, where it had a clear relation to the Marshall-Hall affair. Whether Serle is correct in asserting that the evangelical 'cast of mind' is not sympathetic to the artist's aim\textsuperscript{441} depends on how that aim is construed. The Hebraic view was epitomised in the Catholic writer M.J. O'Reilly's contention that art was legitimate only when it subserved the aims of religion\textsuperscript{442}, when it was 'used, as it should be, to raise the mind and heart to the Creator of all loveliness,' but not when 'it is made to be its own end'.\textsuperscript{443} Similarly, the Rev. J.A. M'Keen complained about those works that 'give us no more than the sense of beauty. They refine and elevate, but they do not make for righteousness',\textsuperscript{444} It is significant, in this connection, that one of the charges levelled against Marshall-Hall was that he had failed 'to reveal to us the Christ' in his work, thus 'cutting away art from God'.\textsuperscript{445}

\textsuperscript{440} Victorian Churchman, 11 January 1901; see also e.g. FRCM, November 1893, p.66; Southern Cross, 23 June 1899; Christian Citizen, 2 January 1902; Victorian Churchman, 28 September 1900; Spectator, 13 February 1914.

\textsuperscript{441} C. Serle, From Deserts the Prophets Come, Melbourne, 1973, p.216.

\textsuperscript{442} Austral Light, March 1900.

\textsuperscript{443} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{444} Great Thoughts, 15 January 1898.

\textsuperscript{445} Mitre, 2 July 1900.
and that, therefore, under his direction, the Conservatory would never produce 'composers like Stainer, Martin, Sullivan, etc., whose services, hymns and anthems have done more to stimulate and elevate man's spiritual nature than all the so-called classical productions put together.\footnote{446}

The same narrow faddism was exhibited in Hebraic distrust of the 'worldly', and the concomitant demand for a separation from the world in its general spirit and character\footnote{447}, even to the extent of a decision on the part of Christians to resign from the Australian Natives' Association, because its 'scope and purpose are earnestly "of the World" and therefore entirely outside the legitimate sphere of Christianity'.\footnote{448} The Rev. Alexander Marshall of Scots' Church told his Presbyterian congregation that they 'must insist on being more distinctly marked by character and profession from the world than they are now', that their lives should express 'Christ's idea of morality and religion as a separating [sic] equator between the world and God'.\footnote{449} And the Christian Endeavourer, James W. Sutherland, expressed displeasure with the practice of 'many Christian people nowadays ... [who] welcome the most worldly men and women to their drawing rooms, and converse with them on their own worldly level'.\footnote{450}

---

\footnote{446}Largo' in Herald, 20 June 1900.
\footnote{447}Spectator, 27 December 1914.
\footnote{448}CM' in Southern Cross, 5 May 1899.
\footnote{449}Argus, 12 August 1907.
\footnote{450}Southern Cross, 12 August 1898.
It was not, however, that worldliness was necessarily, in itself, considered a great evil, but that its inter-penetration with the sacred was greatly feared. 'If the conflict', explained the Anglican Rev. C.H. Nash, 'were a straightforward one between the true Church - a churchly Church - and the true World - a worldly World - the issue would be simple, and our dangers obvious and avoidable. But the saving influence of the Church upon the World is retarded by the incubus upon her of two ill-defined extensive classes - the Worldly Church and the Churchly World. These two are forever calling for peace between the two belligerents... and seeking to accommodate the responsibilities of a Christian profession to the indulgences of Worldly practice.' Thus, the 'churchly worldling' was 'far more dangerous to the cause than is the professed infidel.\footnote{Church of England Messenger, 1 July 1900. In 1906 Nash became Lecturer in the new St. John's Diocesan College in East St. Kilda. See James Grant, Perspective of a Century, Melbourne, 1972, p.106.}

Accordingly, it was in order to avoid the creation of a coalition between the church and the world\footnote{Edward Isaac in Argus, 13 July 1897.}, that clergymen were urged to keep aloof from things secular, including dancing\footnote{J. Lawrence Rentoul in Weekly Times, 17 June 1899.}, card playing\footnote{Anglican Bishop of Ballarat in Argus, 28 May 1894.}, horse racing\footnote{Rev. J.J. Chambers in Argus, 24 April 1894.}, and the theatre\footnote{Edward Isaac in Argus, 13 July 1897; Age, 4 July 1898; Argus, 16 July 1897.} - even when they were permissible to
laymen (who were not so closely associated with the sacred). If this was hypocrisy, it represented, not so much a tribute paid by vice to virtue, as a determination to prevent any blurring of the line between the sacred and the profane. (The same applied to the refusal of the House of Commons to allow Charles Bradlaugh to take his seat between 1880 and 1885 - he having failed formally to pretend to be a believer, although his atheism was a matter of public notoriety."

Similarly, the church was designated out of bounds to the profane. Church fetes were anathematised, because they had 'an appearance of competing with the world, providing amusement for the sake of gain'. Ministers were admonished to avoid remarks that 'will cause a grin or titter through the congregation'. One was criticised for quoting Shakespeare during a sermon; another for creating a mirthful atmosphere at a Salvation Army wedding; and others for engaging 'Prominent singers ... to contribute to the attractiveness of the services'.


459 Bishop Goe in Argus, 5 July 1898.

460 Age, 25 January 1899.

461 Southern Baptist, 2 February 1899.

462 Rev. J. Watford in Argus, 5 July 1898; see also W. Baines in Argus, 21 November 1896.
Congregations were cautioned against talking and laughing while waiting for the service to begin, and entertaining worldly thoughts while it was in progress. There was 'no room for amusement' in 'the worship of God, in the gathering together to praise his name,' the Rev. A. Hardie of the Richmond Presbyterian Church informed a Presbyterian conference in July 1894. The New South Wales Baptist was even criticised for devoting three or four column inches to the fortunes of a church cricket association.

Church music was also encompassed by this principle. When the Rev. W.S. McQueen held an orchestral service in Ballarat's Alfred Hall in 1896, a motion put to the local Presbytery, deploring this attempt to 'gratify a vain taste for music on the Sabbath', lapsed only because the chairman declined to break the 10-10 voting tie by giving a casting vote. Even the holding of organ recitals in church buildings during the week, quite separately from the services, gave rise to misgivings.

463 The Rev. Dean of Ballarat in Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1898.
464 Father Adamson, cited in Tribune, 10 March 1900.
466 Age, 9 January 1903.
467 Argus, 3 September 1896; see also Argus, 17 August 1896; H.J. O'Reilly in Austral Light, March 1900; Papal Motu proprio quoted in Musical Opinion, March 1913.
as it connected 'the house of God with the concert room'\textsuperscript{468}. And Bishop Goe was reported as evincing 'some hesitation' before acceding to such a request from the Cathedral organist, Ernest Wood, in 1891\textsuperscript{469}. There is an element of irony in the fact that in 1899 Franklin Peterson, soon to become Marshall-Hall's successor in the Melbourne chair of music, wrote to an English musical journal, complaining that he had been 'hauling over the coals' in the Scottish Presbyterian church where he was organist, for the secularity of his Bach voluntaries\textsuperscript{470}.

The Sabbath, too, had to be kept free from such profane, but otherwise innocent, recreative activities as secular band performances\textsuperscript{471}, social visiting, fishing, bicycling\textsuperscript{472}, newspaper reading\textsuperscript{473}, and celebrating the inauguration of the Australian Commonwealth\textsuperscript{474}. Even addressing Wesleyan Pleasant Sunday Afternoon gatherings on such worthy, but unspiritual, subjects as 'The Extermination of Rabbits' was condemned as an intrusion of the profane into the sacred\textsuperscript{475}.

\textsuperscript{468} 'G.S.' in Argus, 26 September 1891.
\textsuperscript{469} Argus, 19 September 1891.
\textsuperscript{470} Musical Opinion, 1 September 1899.
\textsuperscript{471} 'Z.Y.X.' in Southern Cross, 23 November 1900.
\textsuperscript{472} Rev. D. Gordon, quoted in Advocate, 19 November 1898; and see Southern Cross, 8 April 1898; James W. Sutherland in Southern Cross, 5 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{473} Presbyterian Messenger, 16 January 1900.
\textsuperscript{474} Victorian Baptist, 18 January 1900; John Webb in Herald, 6 March 1901.
\textsuperscript{475} Victorian Churchman, 9 November 1900; see also report of Methodist objections to social questions being discussed in one of Rev. A.R. Edgar's F.S.A.F in Australian Herald, January 1897.
The same fastidious nicety accounts for Hebraic distrust of social Christianity. The Rev. C. Thomas objected to the appointment by the Melbourne Anglican Synod in 1894 of a committee to examine the Church's duty in regard to industrial matters, on the ground that it would tend to secularise the Church. And the Victorian Independent, drawing 'a clear line of distinction ... between what pertains to a Christian as a member of a Church and the Christian as a citizen', insisted that the grievances of labour had no place in the former category.

Determination to maintain a cordon sanitaire between sacred and profane, in their ethical manifestations, found expression in the hostile reception accorded by the Hebraically-minded to the so-called 'problem play', which was denounced, partly, of course, because it 'dragged into irritating prominence ever-lasting variations of the sexual question', but also partly because it obscured the boundary between virtue and vice by representing characters whose conduct and motives did not fit exclusively into either mould. Such, for example, was the 'faithless wife or ... fallen woman of any other class' whose 'guilty heart' was probed 'with the objective of

---

476 Table Talk, 6 October 1894; this might have been the Rev. Courtenay Thomas who at one time was the first Methodist minister in Wonthaggi – see Irving Benson, ibid., pp. 476-7.

477 April 1900; see also e.g. Bishop Coe in Argus, 14 September 1894.

478 Argus, 17 July 1897.
extenuating guilt or making excuses for it.\textsuperscript{479} The Argus much preferred crude melodrama, even if badly acted, to the works of Ibsen, Pinero and Dumas, because the former portrayed simple conflicts between good and evil in which a thief is a thief, a wicked woman is a wicked woman; whereas in the more subtle dramas the impression is made that it is rather a laudable thing to be despicable tricky and dishonest for a season, provided there is a sort of death bed repentance in the last act.\textsuperscript{480}

Wilson Barrett's play, The Sign of the Cross, was welcomed in one quarter as a 'healthy reaction against "problem plays"' inasmuch as its plot ... is direct and simple, dealing with the triumph of early Christianity against paganism, sublime faith in conflict with the power, passion, lust of Imperial Rome.\textsuperscript{481}

But in another, it was denounced for failing adequately to separate good from evil.

The comic drama of the Restoration, [wrote W.L.F. Murdoch] was too foul to be endured for long by a healthy-minded nation .... But Congreve and Wycherley were at least honest in their obscenity. They were accused and rightly of everything but hypocrisy ... they wrote for Cavaliers and took no trouble to conciliate Roundheads. Mr. Wilson Barrett has changed all that. He has conceived the happy idea of appealing at once to the pious and most foul-minded in the community. He endeavours by a judicious mixture of Holy Scripture and very unholy dancing

\textsuperscript{479} Argus, 12 January 1907.

\textsuperscript{480} Argus, 19 December 1908.

\textsuperscript{481} Argus, 21 May 1897.
to cater both for the saint and the satyr in the gallery. 482

The same fault was exemplified in demands that the church must have no fellowship with the morally unclean man,483, even that it should deny membership to publicans and their patrons, and dismiss from its service non-teetotalling organists484. So impressed was the editor of the Southern Cross with a letter urging that 'the Christian cannot justify the voluntary association of himself with wrong-doers' and that rather than try to reform a body from within, they should 'separate themselves from all connection with vice, by coming out from amongst those who persist in carrying it on', that he had copies printed and offered for sale at cost.485.

What may be called Hebraic moral pedanticism - the notion that if conduct is wicked when carried to extremes, then even the most moderate indulgence was to be condemned - can be traced to the same source. The Southern Cross

482 Argus, 17 July 1897. Presumably this was Walter Logie Forbes Murdoch, essayist, and later to be foundation Professor of English Literature in the University of Western Australia (1912-1939). He was not a man usually to be found in Hebraic company. Perhaps this effusion can be put down to his youth - he was 23 - at the time of writing - see A. and M. Learmonth, Encyclopaedia of Australia, Sydney, 1973, p.367.

483 Australian Christian, 21 September 1914.

484 W.C. Houchins in Age, 11 May 1898; Rev. George Tait in Herald, 16 July 1900; Spectator, 3 August 1900; Southern Cross, 17 March 1898.

485 21 April 1899.
objected to fund-raising church raffles for trifling prizes, which, although in terms of their consequences, 'may be innocent enough', were 'a scandal of a very black and ugly quality' that 'compromise the honour of the Church that employs them'. The shilling art unions conducted by the Australian Natives' Association were excoriated on the same score. And the case for prohibition rested on the assumption that 'Light and darkness are no more opposites than the true children of God and the licensed saloon, for one is spiritual while the other is bestial'. This, of course, is consistent with the tendency, already shown to be a central defining characteristic of Hebraism, to categorise evil in terms that are independent of its consequences.

The public exposure of sin, even when it caused suffering, was, likewise justified as a means of preserving the distinction between sacred and profane. Thus, the Advocate congratulated the Ladies' Committee of the Women's Hospital for its policy of prominently displaying the marital status of occupants of the maternity ward on their beds. 'No one,' declared the writer, 'wishes that a fallen woman should be treated with harshness,'

---

486 4 February 1898; see also Southern Cross, 2 September 1898; Australian Christian, 15 August 1898; Revs. Gibson and M' Rae Stewart in Age, 25 November 1898.

487 e.g. 'T' in Age, 23 February 1899; Revs. Gibson and M' Rae Stewart in Age, 25 November 1898; Rev. F. Jolly in Age, 4 February 1899; Victorian Independent, December 1898.

488 Australian Christian, 26 May 1898; 15 September; Spectator, 22 March 1901.
but this refusal 'to ... place in the same rank wedded
and unwedded maternity' struck a blow against 'the
tendency ... to minimise the distinction between the two
cases'.

Underlying all this, and confirming its essentially
'group' character, was the Manichean belief that the profane
was actively antagonistic to, and radically endangered the
dominion of, the sacred. As Arnold remarked, Hebraism
was haunted by the thought of sin as a 'positive active
entity hostile to man'. Evil, declared the Southern
Cross 'always has a terrible power of infection'.
Surrender to one vice was said to weaken resistance to
others. 'Smoking led to drinking' and 'pilfering',
Slovenliness of dress led to uncleanliness in thought and
deed'. Theatre-going weakened family ties, and
gambling resulted in cheating, as well as exercising
an 'unhealthy fascination which is destructive of fine
moral perceptions' in general.

---

489 Advocate, 23 March 1901.
490 Arnold, op.cit., p.135.
491 10 February 1899.
492 Alfred Webster in Spectator, 1 July 1898; see also
493 Rev. Joseph Nicholson in Age, 18 August 1898;
495 Rev. Joseph Nicholson in Age, 30 January 1902;
496 Southern Cross, 13 August 1898.
Likewise, small sins were believed to give rise to larger ones. Thus, 'impurity of thought' led to sexual depravity. The 'first drop of liquor tasted often means the first step on the road to ruin'. Those who have learned to gamble with shillings in the totalisator will go on to gamble in heavier stakes with the "book maker". Dancing is such a fascinating pleasure that very few can indulge in it without going to excess. And the 'key that unlocks the door of the picture shows on Sunday would unlock the door of every theatre and every shop in the city.

Finally the strong, who are able to withstand temptation, will, nevertheless, infect the weak, who are not. So, Christians should refrain from smoking lest the young be tempted to follow suit, from dancing lest we become a stumbling block to the weak, and from even temperate drinking because it strengthens the drinking customs of

---

498 Richard Arthur, op.cit., p.3.
499 Spectator, 22 February 1901; see also Presbyterian Monthly, 1 August 1898.
500 Southern Cross, 15 July 1898; see also R. Ditterich in Spectator, 3 March 1899; 'T' in Age, 23 February 1899; Spectator, 9 September 1898.
501 Victorian Churchman, 11 August 1899.
502 Southern Cross, 22 January 1915; see also N.K. McKenzie in Argus, 15 June 1893, 26 September 1901; Australian Christian, 29 June 1899.
503 Spectator, 1 July 1898.
504 Spectator, 4 August 1899.
society, and thus indirectly binds the fetters of drunkenness on weaker men.\textsuperscript{505}

However, Arnold's further characterisation of the Hebraic unum necessarium as comprising 'the moral side of [man's] nature almost exclusively',\textsuperscript{506} if it was intended to exclude the numinous, was, in the Australian context at least, incorrect. Here the assumption that religion is the only thing that matters applied equally to its numinous manifestations. M.J. O'Reilly was attributing an unequivocally numinous function to art, when, as already noted (p.121), he confined its role to that of raising 'the mind and heart to the Creator of all loveliness'. Similarly, statues were considered (by some) to be out of place in church, because they tended to conceal 'the spiritual world ... from men's eyes, to lessen its importance in comparison with the mere phenomenal world'.\textsuperscript{507} The 'silly jest, the loud spoken joke, the senseless giggle', so often heard in church, 'even before the worshippers are out of the porch', were deplored, because they showed a want 'of that reverential spirit' that was so important in the Lord's house, and because they 'jar painfully on the ear of those who feel they have just been in the immediate

\textsuperscript{505} \textit{Presbyterian Monthly}, 1 August 1898; John H. Barrows in \textit{Christian Citizen}, 1 May 1901; Mrs. Kirk in \textit{Victorian Independent}, November 1900; \textit{Spectator}, 1 December 1899; Edward Isaac in \textit{Argus}, 13 July 1899.

\textsuperscript{506} \textit{Arnold, Op.Cit.}, p.145.

\textsuperscript{507} \textit{Southern Baptist}, 16 November 1899.
presence of God. And Church bazaars were frowned upon, because, by their means, 'the holy spiritual joy ... which is the fruit of the divine spirit, is confused with the coarse jubilations of a carnival.'

Music that was 'of the earth, earthy', also allegedly prevented people from entering 'a reverent frame of mind so that they shall be prepared for the service.' The masses of Mozart and Haydn, although 'often times magnificent, considered simply as music', were deemed 'unseemly and discordant' when played 'in church - where devotion, not amusement is in question.'

In the light of this, it could hardly have assisted Marshall-Hall's case that, in a city still musically dominated largely by the religious fare offered by a plethora of choral societies, he complained of 'the pious but artificially poor stuff which has mostly been set to intolerably vulgar and maudlin music' for religious services, or that he declared 'the horrible namby-pambyism' prevalent in the composition of the time, to be 'found in its most effeminate and sickly forms in our

---

508 Australian Christian, 25 August 1898.
509 Southern Baptist, 15 December 1898; see also e.g. Rev. Allan Webb in Argus, 21 November 1896.
510 Presbyterian Messenger, 22 May 1914.
511 The Rev. Dr. O'Reilly in Australasian Catholic Record quoted in Table Talk, 10 May 1895; see also Dr. Donnelly, Adjutant Bishop of Dublin in Australian Catholic Record, 1895, Vol.1, p.470.
512 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898.
513 F.X. M., 12 August 1898.
churches'. It was this sort of remark that prompted the *Australian Christian World* to wonder how 'such an artist should seem to have neither eye nor ear for those countless forms of art which owe their inspiration to the uniqueness of the personality of Christ'. And similarly, the pseudonymous 'Largo' bolstered his/her opposition to reappointment with a reference to the Ormond Professor's 'well-known antipathy to church music and his avowed contempt for composers thereof'.

By the same token, the presentation of Bible stories on stage was condemned, because the 'theatre does not lend itself to that reverential attitude which is expected from all who handle public interests regarded as holy because of their ultimate association with religious beliefs'. The primitive character of this interdiction is illustrated by an editorial observation of the *Argus* to the effect that a 'sense of reverence is demanded from anyone who touches the Bible records. There is, as the Maoris would say, a "tapu" on them.'

The very foundation of the sabbatarian case was, likewise, the assumption of an inherent hostility between 'the world' and the numinous frame of mind in which God

---

513 *Champion*, 4 January 1896.
514 *Champion*, 8 March 1901.
515 *Champion*, 20 June 1900.
516 *Argus*, 9 March 1907.
should be approached. The 'unseen world' was said to be obscured 'by the world around us',\textsuperscript{517} so that, after 'a week's struggle in the world,' the 'sensitiveness to spiritual impressions which the rude dominance of material things has dulled returns only by degrees', and, therefore, 'if we do not carefully shut out the stream of secular works on the Sunday ... we shall cease to see or feel the divine presence ... the spiritual life will be drained of its vitality, and will gradually or even speedily die.'\textsuperscript{518}

In the same way, 'innocent amusement' was not, itself, considered an evil\textsuperscript{519}, being, indeed, 'endorsed by God',\textsuperscript{520} and essential to life\textsuperscript{521}, provided, of course, that it was kept 'within proper limitations'.\textsuperscript{522} Nevertheless, distrust of pleasure is a conspicuous theme in Hebraic teaching, which often warned that nothing 'is more easily abused than the pursuit of recreation',\textsuperscript{523}, because it

\textsuperscript{517}Father John Murphy of Ballarat in the Irish Ecclesiastical Record reprinted in Austral Light, April 1900; see also e.g. Rev. W.M. Alexander in Argus, 5 September 1900; PGGM, November 1896, p.cxxxvii.

\textsuperscript{518}Presbyterian Messenger, 16 March 1900.

\textsuperscript{519}Rev. Alexander Marshall in Argus, 3 October 1892; see also Australian Christian, 29 September 1900.

\textsuperscript{520}Southern Cross, 14 January 1898; Spectator, 17 March 1899; Dr. Thornton, Anglican Bishop of Ballarat, in Argus, 13 September 1894; Australian Christian, 22 December 1898; Rev. J. Lawrence Rentoul in Weekly Times, 17 June 1899; Searchlight, July 1896.

\textsuperscript{521}Southern Baptist, 1 January 1898.

\textsuperscript{522}Australian Christian, 22 December 1898.

\textsuperscript{523}Southern Baptist, 2 March 1899; see also Southern Argus, 1 January 1898, 12 October 1899, 18 January 1900; Australian Independent, September 1900; Rev. J. Beck in Australasian, 4 March 1897; Spectator, 16 January 1914; Melbourne, 20 October 1900.
inhibited communion with the divine. 'Worldly amuse-
ments and pleasures', it was said, 'choke the word of
God in the heart',\textsuperscript{524} weaken 'our spiritual life',\textsuperscript{525}
and 'unfitted the mind for higher thought'.\textsuperscript{526} Just
as an unused physical organ loses its power, 'so the
soul, that never looks higher than gain or sensual
pleasure will lose its sense of God'.\textsuperscript{527} More specifi-
cally, and in addition, dancing was 'dangerous to ... 
spiritual life',\textsuperscript{528} as it made the mind 'unfitted for
prayer'.\textsuperscript{529} Smoking was a 'great hindrance to increased
spirituality in our churches'.\textsuperscript{530} And gambling 'dulls
the sense of solemn things'.\textsuperscript{531}

And the quest for social justice, although admirable
in itself should not, it was maintained, involve the

\textsuperscript{524} Southern Baptist, 2 March 1899; PPGM, November 1898,
Appendix p.xi; Advocate, 13 October 1900; Victorian
Standard, 31 October 1893; Australian Christian,
22 December 1898; Southern Baptist, 12 October 1899.

\textsuperscript{525} Christian Citizen, 1 June 1901; see also Rev. P.J.
Murdoch in Argus, 16 November 1898; PPGM, November 1898,
Appendix, p.xi; Southern Baptist, 2 March 1899; Southern
Cross, 14 January 1898.

\textsuperscript{526} Argus, 17 July 1894.

\textsuperscript{527} Southern Baptist, 2 March 1899.

\textsuperscript{528} Christian Citizen, 1 April 1901.

\textsuperscript{529} Spectator, 4 August 1899.

\textsuperscript{530} Spectator, 24 June 1896; Rev. T. Collins in Herald,
March 1901.

\textsuperscript{531} Spectator, 11 November 1898; see also Rev. Joseph
Rolson in Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser,
November 1903; PPGM, November 1893, Appendix p.xviii.
Church, lest it 'by degrees ... be allowed to push out or to take the place of those great themes which constitute the Gospel message, 532.

It is true that, in claiming for Hebraism an almost exclusive preoccupation with morality, Arnold was probably referring, in part, to the perceived moral obligation on the Christian to enter into and maintain an appropriately numinous, spiritual communion with God. He may also have had in mind the role of the numinous, in the Hebraic scheme of things, in reminding humanity of its essential sinfulness, in contrast to a sinless deity, compared with whom men were 'frail guilty creatures, unclean and condemned,' 533. There was,declared the Spectator, a disturbing 'flavour of profanity' in that 'creepy, uncanny theosophism, with its "spark of divinity" heresy' which taught 'that every man is a "little Christ,"' 534. A pre-eminent function of the numinous experience, as construed by Hebraism, was the rejection of this heresy, which denied original sin, and, thereby, minimised the distinction between the ethical/sacred and profane by vitiating the latter. 'If you analyse the spirit of reverence', declared the Rev. G.W. Torrance, First Warden of Trinity College, organist and composer, 'you will find that it depends on a profound sense of

532 Bishop Goe, in Argus, 24 September 1895.

533 British Weekly, quoted in Southern Cross, 14 April 1899.

534 18 September 1914.
personal unworthiness. In either or both cases, however, the fact (one of considerable importance in the Marshall-Hall affair) remains, that Hebraism did place a high value on the numinous experience as conceptually distinct (although, perhaps, in practice, inseparable) from the ethical imperative.

Hellenism, by contrast, did not divide phenomena into the sharply heterogeneous categories of sacred and profane. Nor did it ascribe value to the former alone. It emphasised, rather, as Arnold put it, 'the development of the whole man', with a view to the 'harmonious expression of all the powers which make the beauty and worth of our human nature'. What is necessary, declared the Rev. L.D. Bevan, Marshall-Hall's only unqualified supporter among the clergy, '... is not to divorce things secular from things religious, but to expand and uplift our secular life with spiritual thought and divine sanctions.' The Rev. E.H. Sugden, whose championship of the musician, although more equivocal (see below, pp.564-565), was nonetheless unmistakable, insisted that Christ was interested in men's health, as well as their souls. Table Talk commended Wilson Barrett for saying that it was enough 'if a man was

535 *Southern Cross*, 14 April 1899.
536 Arnold, op. cit., p.48; see also *ibid.*, p.154.
537 *Weekly Times*, 25 August 1898.
538 *Australasian Intercollegian*, 1 June 1901.
moderately moral\textsuperscript{539}, and urged that a 'play like a poem
... or a piece of music should not be primarily regarded
from the ethical standpoint\textsuperscript{540}. And the Bulletin, with
a tolerance bred of Hellenic determinism, maintained
that the 'pity of illegitimacy ... is that it almost
always befalls the children of loving women. The girl
who yields is often the richest in womanhood, the best
fitted to do credit to her sex. It is the wealth of her
nature which brings her to poverty. And it is often the
poor in spirit, the weak in sex, who in the social topsy
turnydom have the "virtue" (frigidity) and "the good name"
(absence of temptation)" so valued by respectability\textsuperscript{541}.

The difference between the two viewpoints was conspi-

cuously exemplified in the Marshall-Hall dispute. There
is no warrant for Radic's assertion that the 'letters and
petitions in favour of Marshall-Hall all came from people
who knew his work and valued it'\textsuperscript{542}. Some were written
by anonymous correspondents\textsuperscript{543}, whose views on the Ormond
Professor's musical activities cannot be gleaned from

\textsuperscript{539} 6 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{540} 5 February 1903.

\textsuperscript{541} November 1900.

\textsuperscript{542} Radic Ph.D., p.264.

\textsuperscript{543} e.g. 'Another Sinner' in Herald, 20 June 1900;
'Cynic' in Herald, 15 August 1898; 'Fiat Justitia Ruat
Socium' in Herald, 21 June 1900; 'Fair Play' in Herald,
10 August 1898; 'Honesty' in Herald, 18 August 1898;
'Joss' in Herald, 20 June 1900; 'Soap' in Herald, 19 June
1898; 'Verdant Green' in Herald, 24 August 1898; 'W' in
Ric, 19 August 1898.
their letters. One writer expressly denied being 'a musical enthusiast' and added that he/she 'would not weep a tear if the Conservatorium were closed to-morrow and the buildings let out next day to the promotor of a dancing academy for "young ladies and gentlemen"'.

And the artist, John Longstaff, although active in the campaign for Marshall-Hall's reappointment, 'could never', according to his biographer, 'subscribe to the Melbourne legend of greatness which ... grew around the memory of this dynamic professor of music', and 'had in fact the temerity to doubt Marshall-Hall's quality as a musician'.

Nevertheless, many did cite his musical contribution as an extenuation of his offence, urging, in effect, that in the evaluation of conduct, enrichment of the profane can count as a palliation for injury to the sacred, since the latter is not the unum necessarium. Despite the admitted gravity and 'tremendous folly' of his transgression, it was contended that consideration should be given to his usefulness and excellence as a teacher and musician ... before proceeding to any extreme measures against him, that, indeed, the community 'can afford

544 'R.H.D.' in Outpost, 14 July 1900.
545 See J. Mather to E.F. a'Beckett, 11 June 1900
MUCCF 1900/40.
547 Punch, 27 December 1900.
548 Herald, 29 August 1898.
to be blind to his faults so long as his music is faultless, his guilt having been 'purged by the ... all too active career that he has wasted on this foolish people'. The Rev. Llewellyn D. Bevan, while condemning his utterances, regarded reappointment 'as justified by the high service to art which will be rendered'. And A.L.H. Dawson, a member of the University Senate, summed up this attitude by saying that if 'they had a brilliant man at the University who was guilty of an occasional lapse it would be better to keep him, and drop an occasional tear over his peccadilloes'.

This, however, was anathema to Hebraism. With few exceptions, its adherents conceded that Marshall-Hall

549 A.L.H. Dawson in Table Talk, 6 July 1900.
550 Alma Mater, July 1900.
551 Bevan to Sir Henry Wrixon, 23 June 1900 in MUCRF 1900/40.
552 Argus, 1 December 1898; much the same point, with minor variations, was made by Sir Arthur Snowden (Argus, 19 June 1900), Captain F. Templeton (ibid), John Mather, Tom Roberts (ibid, and Mather to E.F. a'Beckett, 1 June 1900 in MUCRF 1900/40), John Grice (Bulletin, 7 July 1900), R.L.J. Ellery (Weekly Times, 30 June 1900), Thomas Harlin (Argus, 19 June 1900), Percy Frost (Mitre, 2 July 1900; Herald, 14 June 1900), George F. Pack (Herald, 16 June 1900), the Bulletin (23 June 1900, 8 September 1900), the Leader (16 June 1900), the Herald (28 September 1898, 18 June 1900), Arena (8 December 1900), Table Talk (13 December 1900), the Committee of the Melbourne Liedertafel (Minute Book, loc.cit., 15 June 1900), a petition of 14 June 1900 (Hince papers, loc.cit., Box 10, University cuttings book), and Marshall-Hall's fellow University professors, all of whom, Manning Clark to the contrary notwithstanding (A History of Australia, Vol.V, Melbourne, 1981, p.164) supported his reappointment (Professors to University Council, 16 June 1900, MUCRF 1900/40).

553 e.g. C.W. Russell in Argus, 24 December 1900; Methodist Messenger, 20 October 1900.
was 'a thorough master of his profession', 554, a 'musical genius and able teacher', 555, whose 'excellent work ... in the Conservatorium and the University', 556 had made him 'all that the most exacting public could require', 557, and who 'certainly deserves the undying gratitude of Melbourne for lifting us out of the sweet banalities of Mendelssohn, and the commonplaces of Sir Arthur Sullivan into the serener atmosphere of musical art'. 558

Moreover, Radic is mistaken in saying that 'Against him were people who seemed acquainted only with reports of him in the press', 559. In many cases (including, again, that of the numerous anonymous press correspondents 560), the entire lack of evidence makes it quite impossible to establish the truth or falsity of this proposition; while, in some, it can be shown to be manifestly false. The latter include W.A. Laver, D.J. Coutts and Ernest Wood, 561.

554 Spectator, 22 June 1900; see also Advocate, 16 June 1900, 13 August 1898; Southern Cross, 14 December 1900; Church of England Messenger, 1 September 1898.

555 Australian Christian World, 22 June 1900.

556 Argus, 11 June 1900.

557 Church of England Messenger, September 1898.

558 Mitre, 2 July 1900.

559 Radic Ph.D., p.264.

560 e.g. 'IN MEDIO' in Argus, 13 July 1900; 'Largo' in Herald, 20 June 1890; 'L.A.F.' in Argus, 3 August 1898; 'Rest Ye Forget' in Herald, 16 June 1900; 'Mephistopheles' in Herald, 20 August 1898; 'Onlooker' in Herald, 1 September 1898; 'A Parent' in Herald, 1 September 1898; 'President Melbourne' in Musical News, 13 April 1901.
who taught with Marshall-Hall at the Conservatorium\textsuperscript{561} (Coutts having previously been a student of his\textsuperscript{562}); Alexander Leeper, who attended his concerts\textsuperscript{563}, and had worked closely with him in mounting a production in June 1898 of Euripides' \textit{Alcestis} (see below pp.542-543); J.H. MacFarland, a member of the University Conservatorium Committee (see below pp.431-432); and those other Councillors (see below p.527), who, in expressing their determination on 24 October 1898 not to re-engage him at the end of his current, five-year term, nevertheless acknowledged 'the excellent work of Professor Marshall-Hall in the Conservatorium and in the University.'\textsuperscript{564}

But his enemies could not, given their narrow preoccupation with the defence of the sacred, allow this profane musical contribution to mitigate his offensive utterances, to the extent of justifying his continued tenure of the chair. This, declared the \textit{Spectator}, would be like saying that 'Joab was a brave man and a good general, therefore it is hostile persecution to blame him for murdering Abner and Amasa'.\textsuperscript{565} Alexander Leeper made

\textsuperscript{561}D.J. Coutts to E.F. a'Beckett, 12 November 1898 in MUCRCF 1898/5; Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 12 December 1898 in ibid.

\textsuperscript{562}Coutts to P. Banby, 3 September 1894 in MUCMB, 3 September 1894; Coutts to Professor H.B. Allen, 6 August 1894 in MUCRCF 1894/3; Coutts to Trinity College Council, 10 August 1892, in Trinity College Archives paper 4C 1892; Trinity College Council Minute Book, 26 August 1892 in ibid.

\textsuperscript{563}Including the fateful Liedertafel concert - Leeper Diary, \textit{loc.cit.}, 1 August 1898; see also Leeper diary, 4 May 1895, 6 July 1895, 25 August 1895.

\textsuperscript{564}MUCMB, 24 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{565}17 August 1898.
the same point when he said the aim of the anti-Marshall-Hall party was to ensure 'that in appointing professors the [University] Council would not allow considerations of morals to be subordinated to any other whatsoever.'\textsuperscript{566}

The \textit{Argus}, too, concurred, explaining that a reappointment 'would imply that there are considerations, such as the financial success of a University department or the popularity of a teacher, or his scientific distinction, or excellence in his art, to which the highest educational tribunal of the land attaches more importance than to the influence of its teachers upon the morals of the state and of the family.'\textsuperscript{567} And the \textit{Australian Christian} expressed it in its most extreme form by saying that, rather than reappoint him, 'it were better that music should be blotted out of the list of fine arts, and lost to the world forever.'\textsuperscript{568} In other words, Hebraic insistence on a complete separation of the sacred from the profane ensured that Marshall-Hall's enemies, unlike his supporters, had no motive overriding that of his removal from his post. Thus, their ideation satisfied Martin's condition 6.

To sum up thus far: There existed a significant correspondence between the division over Marshall-Hall's

\textsuperscript{566}\textit{Argus}, 19 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{567}5 June 1900; see also T.W. Eggleston in \textit{Argus}, 19 June 1900; \textit{Presbyterian Messenger}, 14 December 1900; in this sense, then, Turnbull is wrong to say that Marshall-Hall's enemies harboured 'an ideal for professors of ... narrow competence' - \textit{op.cit.}, p.51.

\textsuperscript{568}18 June 1899.
disappointment at the end of the century and that obtaining between Hellenic and Hebraic points of view. Hebraism was characterised by, and Hellenism lacked, a belief in free will, a determination to preserve the separation of the sacred from the profane, and a preoccupation with sin, considered as a universal human legacy, and defined, independently of its consequences, in terms of a body of external prescriptions laid down by a stern, unforgiving deity. These characteristics were structurally conducive to the outbreak of collective action that occurred, and they constitute some of the intervening variables between the perceived situation and the motivational response to it, of Martin's condition 1. That is to say, they help to account for the support the Professor received from the labour movement, and for the willingness of his friends and the refusal of his enemies to accept as mitigating factors the withdrawal of his book, his vow not to repeat the offence, the ebullient quality of his temperament, and the various contributions he made to Melbourne's musical life.
CHAPTER 2

MARBALL-HALL - HELLENIC EXISTENTIALIST

1. A Systematic Thinker

The same Hebraic characteristics were also conducive to conflict by virtue of the radical opposition obtaining between them and certain salient features of Marshall-Hall's Weltanschauung. The business of this chapter will be to explore that Weltanschauung with a view to explicating the antithesis in question. To this end I shall investigate the relations between his ideas, tracing them back to their origins in conscious ideation. I shall identify the principal influences on his outlook, refuting the views advanced, in this connection, by a number of previous analysts. And I shall lay the foundation for a subsequent discussion of the relation between his beliefs and the conduct which brought him into so much trouble in the late nineties.

Previous attempts to articulate Marshall-Hall's views have, without exception, been crude and misleading, principally because of their failure to recognise the essential unity of his outlook. His was not a temperament that sets out its beliefs in comprehensive and systematic

\[\text{See pp. 352-365.}\]
form. Rather were they fragmentarily scattered, piecemeal, throughout his publications. As a result, general statements were often widely separated from the qualifying conditions that restricted their scope. Links between different parts of the argument were often unstated — as were a number of key underlying assumptions and goals. And some crucial terms and concepts were inadequately defined.

This led numerous of his contemporaries to dismiss his utterances as the 'spluttering incoherencies'\textsuperscript{2} of an 'insubstantial rhetoric'\textsuperscript{3} which was 'hopelessly incomprehensible'\textsuperscript{4}, possessing 'neither grammar nor meaning'\textsuperscript{5}, nor 'coherence, consistency or clarity'\textsuperscript{6}. One observer summed up the prevailing view by claiming that they had 'unfortunately not yet been translated into English'\textsuperscript{7}.

Such criticism, however, reflects a failure to recognise his pronouncements as the scattered pieces of a single, conceptual jigsaw puzzle, which becomes fully intelligible only when reassembled in accordance with their own

\textsuperscript{2}Tocson, 24 August 1899.
\textsuperscript{3}Argus, 20 March 1915; see also Bulletin, 30 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{4}Figaro (London), 9 March 1893.
\textsuperscript{5}Programme of Queen's College Diamond Fete, 'A Night Out', 25 June 1897, in Latham papers in MLA, Series 12, 1899/12/1-35; see also Punch, 11 August 1898; 'Alice Through the Hall Glass' by 'J' in Alma Mater, September 1898.
\textsuperscript{6}Argus, 20 March 1915.
\textsuperscript{7}Alma Mater, July 1907.
underlying logic. It represents, moreover, a failure to appreciate the extent to which his meaning depended on what, in another context, Arthur Lovejoy called the *implicit or incompletely explicit assumptions, or more or less unconscious mental habits* operating in the thought of an individual ... which are so much a matter of course that they are rather tacitly presupposed than firmly expressed or argued for.\(^8\)

When all this is taken into account - when, that is, we rearrange the fragments and explicate the implicit statements which are puzzling, or seem self-contradictory, in one context, often become perspicuous and consistent when read in conjunction with the argument in another. And his beliefs are revealed, not as a random collection of unrelated and incoherent ideas, but a single unified web of reasoning. Some internal inconsistencies and gaps remain. And the argument is undoubtedly fashioned with a somewhat clumsier instrument than Occam's razor. But it still possesses sufficient etiological coherence to justify its characterisation as a system. And when thus construed, it becomes possible to trace a connection between his immediate motives for action and their logical and psychological sources in conscious ideation, or (in terms of Martin's first condition) between his situational interpretation and the motivational response to it.

2. Authenticity, Idealism and Influence

The chief organising principle and pervasive infra-
structure of Marshall-Hall's belief system, informing
and permeating all his utterances and actions, was his
passionate faith in the redeeming power of authentic
experience. The preponderating purpose that shaped his
life, its prime motivating impulse, was the restoration
of authentic experience among his contemporaries.

Much of what follows will be concerned with establishing
the truth and significance of this contention. Not that
Marshall-Hall, himself, ever used the expression 'authentic
experience', or, indeed, symbolised the concept in language
at all. It was the implicit - never explicitly arti-
culated - pivotal element of his outlook, which I am
identifying by means of a label borrowed from the vocabu-
larv of Existentialism. The quest for authentic selfhood,
as Sartre put it, 'aims at making me pass from one mode of
being to another mode of being' - to my genuine or
original self, that is, from that which has been adulterated
by factitious accretions in response to the dictates of the
world outside. The goal is to 'bring me to confess to
myself what I am in order that I may finally coincide
with my being.'

---

9 See e.g. John Macquarrie, Existentialism, Harmondsworth, 1973; W. Kaufmann (ed), Existentialism from
Hegel to Sartre, Cleveland and New York, 1970, p.50.

10 Quoted in Kaufmann, op.cit., p.264.

11 Ibid. and see e.g. Albert Camus, Carnets 1935-42,
transl. Philip Thody, London, 1963, p.35; Karl Jaspers,
F. H. Ashton, p.264.
Marshall-Hall was certainly not an original thinker. For the greater part of his life he does not seem to have been a thinker at all, since there was little perceptible development or change in his ideas, although there were some shifts in emphasis. It is, however, radically misleading to identify Schopenhauer, as does Turnbull, and as did a number of the Ormond Professor's contemporaries\textsuperscript{12}; or the 19th century Symbolists as do Bebbington, Radic and Virginia Spate\textsuperscript{13}, as leading influences on his thought. Indeed had he been more firmly under the sway of these people there is every chance that the controversy, which is the subject of this inquiry, would never have occurred.

This is not to deny the very real influence of Schopenhauer on his outlook. But Manning Clark\textsuperscript{14} and (again) Turnbull\textsuperscript{15} are closer to the truth in describing him as a follower of Nietzsche. Nevertheless, even this is an oversimplification. It obscures a crucially important component of his credo, and could perpetuate a serious error commonly made by his enemies. Indeed, the reason why he aroused so much hostility was that the

\textsuperscript{12} Op. cit., p.14, e.g. Table Talk, 5 August 1898; Southern Cross, 19 August 1898; To\-\textsuperscript{\textcopyright}sin, 20 July 1899.


\textsuperscript{14} Op. cit., p.163.

latter mistakenly attributed to him Nietzschean opinions which he did not hold\textsuperscript{16}.

As Marshall-Hall construed it, the notion of authentic selfhood embodied an element of unacknowledged disjunctive tension. That is to say, its ideational source can be viewed as residing in either of two initial premises, depending on whether one is principally concerned with the logical organisation of his ideas, or with their psychological role in precipitating his conduct. The philosophical systems yielded by these two starting points, although generally convergent, are not identical. And this accounts for some of the inconsistencies in his outlook.

The logical origin of his beliefs is to be found in philosophical idealism\textsuperscript{17} - which, no doubt, is one reason why Schopenhauer and the Symbolists have been, incorrectly, named as major influences on him\textsuperscript{18}. He held the world that is accessible to the senses to be a mere 'reflection or shadow of the "thing-in-itself"'.\textsuperscript{19} But this was a

\textsuperscript{16}See below, pp.263-268.

\textsuperscript{17}i.e. that tradition of philosophy bequeathed to modern thought by Parmenides, Plato and the Upanishads, which regards the phenomenal world of change and plurality, perceived by the senses, as a more or less nebulous and inferior copy of an indivisible and eternal noumenal essence.

\textsuperscript{18}For Schopenhauer's idealism, see e.g. de Witte H. Eker (ed), Schopenhauer Selections, New York, 1928, p.102; and for that of the Symbolists see e.g. Joanne Richardson, Mulfrain, London, 1971, p.274; Robert Goldwater, Symbolism, London, 1975, pp.144, 152.

\textsuperscript{19}Argus, 20 March 1915.
view held by most philosophers to whom he had access; and it is significant that the assertion of it which begins his Hymns Ancient and Modern - 'Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichniss'\(^{20}\) - is a quotation from, not Schopenhauer, but Goethe. Moreover, it is diametrically opposed to the chief governing axiom of Nietzsche's thought, namely, that 'To divide the world into a "true" and an "apparent" world ... is only a sign of decadence, a symptom of degenerating life.'\(^{21}\).

For Marshall-Hall, authenticity, at one level, involved the discarding of the illusory spatio-temporal dimensions of experience, whose defining characteristics were plurality and change. In their place, the individual is absorbed into the one supersensible reality - 'which persists through the perishing forms,'\(^{22}\) and 'of which existence is only a picture.'\(^{23}\).

This could be achieved in a number of ways, of which the most effective was artistic endeavour and appreciation. The 'method of art', Marshall-Hall explained, '... is the contemplation of the thing per se.'\(^{24}\) It is the artist's 'distinctive faculty ... to perceive the permanent quality

---

\(^{20}\) *Op. cit.*, 'Everything transient is only a likeness' (my translation).


\(^{22}\) *Argus*, 20 March 1915.

\(^{23}\) *Ibid*.

\(^{24}\) *Argus*, 23 July 1892; *Summons*, 1 September 1892.
in the fleeting phenomena, grasp the idea in transient forms. As a result, the 'nature of the thing-in-itself' is known to him 'more intimately than anything else'. And this knowledge is communicated in his work, which penetrates 'the superficial visibility of existence', revealing 'to us the reality behind the phenomena'. In calling this pure contemplation he was simply employing the readily available jargon of philosophical idealism to connote a mystical union with the au delà, and not, as Bebbington claims, moving closer to Hanslick's view of creative endeavour as an exercise in purely conscious reflection.

However, Marshall-Hall did not believe that noumenal reality is accessible to human consciousness. Phenomenal appearances, he insisted, are the 'effects produced on ourselves by causes unknowable', whose real nature 'we have no means of ascertaining'. Thus, our knowledge is permanently confined within the impenetrable compass of the temporal:

We are such specks on the shoals of time
That puff as we may, we ne'er shall climb
To overlook the ridge his ebbing waves heap up.

25 Alma Mater, June 1900.
26 Summons, December 1892.
27 Argus, 20 March 1895; see also Alma Mater, August 1900.
28 British Australasian, 2 July 1914; Argus, 20 March 1915.
29 Bebbington, M.Mus., p.138.
30 Alma Mater, August 1899.
31 Manuscript poem, MHMA, group 2.
Nevertheless, he believed that some 'relation of the transient to the Eternal' was possible. His account bears a marked morphological resemblance to that of the Existentialist Karl Jaspers of the same phenomenon. Briefly, Jaspers asserted that the bridge between existent man and transcendence is 'possible Existenz', the 'hidden ground in me to which transcendence is first revealed', but which is 'lodged, so to speak, in the body of empirical existence'. It is not a means of directly beholding the absolute, but 'a sign pointing towards the inaccessible being-in-itself of transcendence'. Jaspers called this a 'periechontological', as distinct from an ontological, theory.

And the same term can profitably be applied to Marshall-Hall's idealism, according to which noumenal reality was inaccessible, because it was 'located' in the unconscious mind - amidst 'those strange subconscious powers ... which lie behind and beyond processes of thought'. Some periechontological relationship

---

32 Argus, 20 March 1915.
33 See e.g. Alma Mater, April 1900.
34 Jaspers, op.cit., pp. 51, 72.
35 Quoted in Kaufmann, op.cit., p.192.
37 Macquarrie, op.cit., p.192.
38 The extra-spatial, extra-temporal cannot, of course, literally, have any location.
39 Argus, 20 March 1915.
with it can be achieved by probing the depths of that threshold region lying 'half, as it were, between conscious and unconscious life'\textsuperscript{40}, which Freud called the pre-conscious mind. In Marshall's credo it was equivalent to Jaspers' Encompassings, which are found 'in life in the depths where it touches Eternity inside Time.'\textsuperscript{41}

This boundary zone, in Marshall-Hall's view, could be illuminated by art, and especially music. This is because music springs 'from the pressing semi-conscious need of man'\textsuperscript{42}, and is, therefore, a concretisation of 'the effort of [man's] innermost being to attain conscious expression.'\textsuperscript{43} The artist is 'a mass of electricity sensitive points, each of which relates to some corresponding parts in the manifold depths of his being.'\textsuperscript{44} He is thereby intimately acquainted with the 'dim intricate forces, which lie hidden in the remote depths of our being, of which we are often not even conscious.'\textsuperscript{45} And he can embody them in music, which 'becomes as it were a miraculous incantation of the most secret and subtle workings of the inaccessible depths of our natures.'\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{40}Gleam, 20 November 1900.
\textsuperscript{41}Quoted in Lanciulli, op.cit., p.139.
\textsuperscript{42}Magazine of Music, October 1891.
\textsuperscript{43}Argus, 20 March 1915.
\textsuperscript{44}British Australasian, 2 July 1914.
\textsuperscript{45}Musical Standard, 11 March 1905.
It is unlikely that his thinking in this connection reflected any direct acquaintance with the writings of Freud, despite some prima facie resemblance between the latter’s postulated realm of suppressed conation and the Melbourne music professor’s characterisation of the unconscious as containing a ‘hidden wealth of desire, of longing,’\(^{47}\), of ‘propulsions, aversions, attractions’, all ‘yearning towards accomplishment’,\(^{48}\). At no stage did Marshall-Hall manifest a belief in the central, Freudian concept of unconscious desires that have been suppressed as too painful for conscious acknowledgement. And his surviving utterances contain no reference to the Viennese psychologist, whose first two works, \textit{Studien über Hysterie} (1895)\(^ {49}\), and \textit{Die Traumdeutung} had, after all, sold only 626 and 600 copies, respectively, by 1908\(^ {50}\).

The notion of an unconscious mind, moreover, enjoyed a wide currency, as L.L. White has shown\(^ {51}\), among educated pre-Freudian Europeans in the final decades of the 19th century. In 1883, for example, we find Gerhard

\(^{47}\)Ibid.

\(^{48}\)Ibid.


Gran writing. 'Beneath consciousness lies that great area of the soul (subconscious) which is still a total mystery, but which demonstrates its workings in dreams, in the somnambulist state, under hypnosis .... From there arise ... anxiety, the passions, love, hate and all that which occurs without reflection'\textsuperscript{52}. Eduard von Hartman's \textit{Philosophie des Unbewussten} went through nine editions between 1868 and 1882\textsuperscript{53}, and the likelihood is that Marshall-Hall (and, indeed, Freud) obtained his inspiration, directly or indirectly, from writings such as these. The idea of the pre-conscious mind could have been derived from his own inner experience, or from Leibnitz's \textit{petites perceptions}\textsuperscript{54} or both. And his representation of the subconscious as a mass of fluctuating desires perhaps indicated a debt to Herbart's notion of a conglomeration of discrete ideas all struggling for a place in consciousness\textsuperscript{55}.

3. Subjectivity, Individualism and Instinct

Be that as it may, Marshall-Hall was convinced that authenticity was to be found in the innermost recesses of the mind, where man 'not only \textit{is} but lives'\textsuperscript{56}. And

\textsuperscript{52}Quoted in Goldwater, \textit{op.cit.}, p.216.


\textsuperscript{54}D. Schultz, \textit{op.cit.}, p.227.


\textsuperscript{56}\textit{Magazine of Music}, July 1893.
this was the logical basis of his championship of the epistemological primacy of subjectivity. 'Search in yourself,' he advised, quoting Goethe again, 'and ye will find everything'. Such a view was clearly at odds with the value placed by Hebraism on external authority as the source of knowledge.

It derived from periechontological, rather than ontological, assumptions. Therefore, it did not entail the conclusion that, since all participated equally in a single, indivisible noumenon, everyone should subscribe to the same beliefs. On the contrary, Marshall-Hall insisted that, because 'Man knows no more of life than is reflected in the mirror of his soul ... each one sees life from a different standpoint'. Each 'has a mode and capacity of comprehension different from that of any one else'. So, each had a 'right to be himself; to live his own life, think his own thoughts, utter his own soul'. Nothing was more abhorrent to him than the person who 'is ever in a frenzy because the same lid does not fit every "billy"', and who, therefore, 'cannot reconcile [himself] to the idea that it is the balance

---

57 Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.
58 See above, pp.106-108.
59 Argus, 20 March 1915.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
62 Musical Opinion and Trade Review, 1 September 1894.
of conflicting individualities which constitute life.\textsuperscript{63}. With what was, for the times, rare appreciation of Asian culture, he praised the pre-industrial societies of the East, because 'it is not their custom to drill two or three million men to wear the same button in the same place and to button it at the same moment with the same movement.'\textsuperscript{64}

This shows a clear affinity with Nietzsche's loathing of 'the herd' that 'seeks to maintain and preserve one kind of man.'\textsuperscript{65}. And in this way, too, Marshall-Hall was sharply opposed in outlook to the exponents of Hebraism, who were interested in individuality only to the extent of wishing to eradicate it by forcing their fellows to conform to external norms.

Nor was Hebraism likely to take kindly to his championship of emotion and its source, instinct, which was a logical corollary of his perichontological subjectivism. Not that he explicitly traced the connection between the two. But it can be inferred from his conception of the structure and functioning of the mind. In contrast to 19th century associationism\textsuperscript{66}, he held the typically

\textsuperscript{63}Alma Mater, June 1900.

\textsuperscript{64}British Australasian, 14 May 1914.

\textsuperscript{65}Macquarrie, \textit{op.cit.}, p.91.

\textsuperscript{66}See e.g. G. Murphy and J.H. Kovak, \textit{op.cit.}, p.97.
idealistic view\textsuperscript{67} of the psyche as an indivisible unity\textsuperscript{68}, in which distinct, but not irreducible, functions can be discerned.

At first reading, his opinions in this connection seem to have undergone a significant change between 1888 and 1897. In the former year, he wrote, 'The consciousness of man is capable of tri-fold division, viz., Sense, Thought and Emotion'\textsuperscript{69}. Nine years later he was agreeing with psychologist Alexander Bain's contention that the 'phenomena of mind are comprised under three heads - Emotion, Volition and Intellect'\textsuperscript{70}. However, on the second occasion (when Sense seems to have been replaced by Volition) he added 'Herbert Spencer's emendation ... [that] the term feelings be substituted for emotions, to include and at the same time to distinguish between, sensations and emotions,\textsuperscript{71} (although, in practice, Marshall-Hall generally used 'feeling' and 'emotion' interchangeably to mean the latter\textsuperscript{72}).

Moreover, the earlier statement, which does not include Will, refers to the 'divisions' of consciousness,

\begin{enumerate}
  \item\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Ibid.}, p.104.
  \item\textsuperscript{68} \textit{Alma Mater}, August 1899.
  \item\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Musical World}, 22 November 1888.
  \item\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Alma Mater}, July 1899.
  \item\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Ibid.}.
  \item\textsuperscript{72} See e.g. \textit{Magazine of Music, July 1893; Argus, 12 March 1891; Musical Standard, 13 June 1891; Musical Herald, 1 June 1891}.  
\end{enumerate}
while the later one, which does, categorises its 'phenomena'. The distinction is important, since it is consistent with the view that he regarded Will, not as a mental component, of which experience (and therefore knowledge) can be predicated, but as denoting an observed (or inferred) causal relationship between emotion and behaviour. It represents, Marshall-Hall explained, once more quoting Bain, 'the great fact that our Pleasures and Pains ... prompt to action or stimulate the active machinery of the living framework to perform such operations as procure [pleasure] and abate [pain]'  

73. In other words, Will signifies our recognition that 'that which prompts us to action ... is ... our feelings'  

74. Thus, the components of mind capable of experience were intellect, sensation and emotion (which latter includes feelings of desire and aversion). Now, sensation, he said, (quoting Spencer) comprised 'those sentient states ... generated in our corporeal framework' as 'a direct result of ... action on the organism'  

75 - a definition which presupposes the existence of an organism and of something acting on it. Intellect concerned itself 'with the agreement and differences of [emotion and sensation], and also with their retention in consciousness, or

73 Ibid. (emphasis mine).

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid.
memory. Both, that is, were functions of the temporal sphere of plurality and relativity. Neither, therefore, was capable of authentic experience, which has to do with the absolute.

Emotion, on the other hand, was either an indirect result of action on the organism, or [still quoting Spencer] arises quite apart from such action. The latter kind was referred to by Spencer, in a passage not quoted by Marshall-Hall, but in the same essay from which the above extracts came, as consisting of 'representative feelings', which he (Spencer) said, 'are independently generated in consciousness' without the intervention of 'external excitements'.

It will perhaps be argued that it would have been more strictly consistent of Marshall-Hall had he identified authenticity solely with the 'representative feelings'. They alone, that is, arise spontaneously ex nihilo, or rather (in his philosophy) from the noumenal unconsciousness. Therefore, they alone, it might be asserted, are independent of spatial and temporal relations.

However, this ignores the essentially monist, neo-Platonic cast of his idealism, which held that, since

---

76 Alma Mater, August 1899.

77 Alma Mater, July 1899.

noumenal reality is indivisible, and the phenomenal world is its reflection, contemplation of an external object leads the individual to the same measure of communion with the absolute as does self-contemplation. Due to their 'innate unity', Marshall-Hall explained, the 'inner nature of all forms is identical'. Therefore, the 'intelligent contemplation of any form reveals to man his own inner nature; and in self contemplation he attains understanding of all other forms'. Both conditions constitute that 'higher grade of consciousness' which is authentic experience.

And Radic is incorrect in saying that he made 'no attempt to justify' his view that 'music was concerned primarily with emotion', simply accepting 'the established norms of his times'. On the contrary, as we have seen, he saw it as the function of art, and especially music, to bring man to authenticity through a periechontological relationship with the noumenon. And he believed that 'to the feelings alone is revealed the inscrutable inner meaning of the universe'. Through them alone, therefore, was authentic selfhood possible - 'emotion is the

79 Preface to Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit.
80 Gleam, October 1900.
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82 Preface to Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit.
83 Radic Ph.D, p.252.
84 Magazine of Music, July 1893.
back bone of our being ... man is what he feels.\textsuperscript{85}
From this it followed that art must be 'founded upon
man's natural instincts'\textsuperscript{86}, and that, in art, 'the
feelings are altogether paramount over the intellect'\textsuperscript{87},
by whose means it is 'neither explicable nor under-
standable'.\textsuperscript{88}

She is also wrong in contending that 'the unfolding
of [Marshall-Hall's] career reveals the classic Australian
confrontation between the enlightened visionary and the
anti-intellectual ... establishment'.\textsuperscript{89} She makes no
effort to identify the 'establishment' in question
(except, by implication, with Marshall-Hall's enemies)\textsuperscript{90}.
And anti-intellectualism, insofar as it serves as a
differentiating factor, was more characteristic of Marshall-
Hall than of his opponents. The former was very far
removed in outlook from the idealist tradition bequeathed
by Plato and Aristotle to Hegel and much of nineteenth
scientism, which regarded the rational mathematical
intellect as the key to success in the search for truth\textsuperscript{91}.

\textsuperscript{85}\textit{Argus}, 12 March 1891; see also e.g. \textit{Musical Standard},
13 June 1891; \textit{Musical Herald}, 1 June 1891.
\textsuperscript{86}\textit{Table Talk}, 12 May 1893.
\textsuperscript{87}\textit{Alma Mater}, August 1899; c.f. the assertion of ultra-
Symbolist, Alfred Orage, that art had 'nothing to do with
emotions' (quoted in Tom Gibbons, \textit{Rooms in the Darwin Hotel},
Nedland), 1973, p.129.
\textsuperscript{88}\textit{Table Talk}, 12 May 1893.
\textsuperscript{89}Radic Ph.D, p.3.
\textsuperscript{90}Or, indeed, to demonstrate that this was 'the classic
Australian confrontation'.
\textsuperscript{91}\textit{Op. Cit.}, p.23.
'With man,' he insisted, 'to reason is to err'. And the 'deepest knowledge is felt knowledge, which alone can counteract the stumblings of reason'. Therefore, music, which embodies the highest knowledge, on its 'intellectual side ... is in itself utterly uninteresting to any but pedants and is only beautiful and useful insofar as it is a means of adding to the emotional power of the whole'. It was Hebraism which distrusted human instinct as a means of enlightenment, replacing it with a body of doctrine extrinsic to man, and accessible to the rational intellect.

However, Bebbington, who acknowledges Marshall-Hall's essential anti-intellectualism, goes too far in declaring it to have been a 'cover' for his want of formal education in his art. It is at least as likely that the reverse was the case. That is to say, that the intellectual character of academic instruction caused him to shun it. The latter view gets some support from the following advice, given to a student in 1889 by Sir George Grove, Director of the Royal College of Music, in which Marshall-Hall had for one term been enrolled. The '1st thing in piano playing,' declared Grove, 'is technique - the second
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92 'Thought and Action' in Musical World, 8 March 1890.
93 British Australasian, 2 July 1914.
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95 Bebbington, M.Mus., p.100.
technique - the third technique ... your mistake is not looking at it as an intellectual exercise. Teaching based on this assumption would have been uncongenial to a young man imbued with Wackenroder's Romantic view of art as a miracle whose secrets are accessible only to intuition.

Marshall-Hall's view of the function of emotion in music was also, albeit in a different way, in fundamental contrast to that of Schopenhauer. Both men saw art as a means of achieving pure contemplation. In the latter's version, what happens is that 'Knowledge breaks free from the service of the will,' so that man, liberated from the 'principle of sufficient reason,' becomes 'the pure will-less subject of knowledge.'

Now, it is true that the Melbourne music professor described pure contemplation as 'the effect produced by the object on the subject when delivered entirely from volition.' He even said that art 'which recalls the ego to itself and awakens in it will and thus renders

96 G. Grove to Edith Oldham, 26 October 1899, in Department of Portraits, Royal College of Music, London, Grove papers.

97 See e.g. Michael Levey, A History of Western Art, London, 1977, p.237. It is not being claimed that MH was directly influenced by Wackenroder (of whom he may never have heard), but by the 18th and 19th century Romantic Zeitgeist in which the latter participated, and which, in turn, owed much, of course, to philosophical Idealism.

98 Quoted in De Witte H. Parker, Schopenhauer Selections, New York, 1929, p.98.

99 Summons, December 1802.
pure contemplation impossible ... is essentially popular
art, and possesses ... no intrinsic value \(^{100}\). But
this apparent identity of views rests on a semantic
coincidence, which conceals a more basic disagreement, one,
moreover, which is of the utmost importance to a correct
understanding both of Marshall-Hall's behaviour and of the
offence it caused.

Both men assert that it is will or volition which is
anaesthetised. But what Schopenhauer meant by human will
(as distinct from the noumenal Will) was those emotions
which are experienced as desires and aversions \(^{101}\). Marshall-
Hall, on the other hand, used the term, as we have seen
(p.162), to refer to our awareness of the connection between
our feelings and the actions which result from them \(^{102}\). Thus,
when speaking of the quieting of volition, he was, in fact,
referring to the temporary disappearance of this awareness.
Music, he insisted, concerned as it is with the noumenal,
reveals emotions in isolation from the actions and thoughts
ensuing from them. It 'nowhere attempts to present us the cause
and effect ... but only those stirrings of our inner being

\(^{100}\) Alma Mater, August 1899.

\(^{101}\) Parker, op. cit., p.xvi.

\(^{102}\) It is not really conceivable that the Ormond
Professor mistakenly believed himself to be a disciple of
the German philosopher in this regard, having incorrectly
understood the latter's notion of volition to be identical
with his own. This would have been an extremely serious
misinterpretation, virtually reversing the meaning of the
original, and it is excluded by his identification
(see p.189) of Schopenhauer's concept of will with his own
notion of energy.
which constitute, so to speak, a running commentary on, a metaphysical counterpart of these.\textsuperscript{103} It 'may be described as a series whose effects are not given.'\textsuperscript{104}

But, far from suppressing the emotions, it actually heightens and intensifies them 'to such a degree that intellectual operations seem almost suspended'. The 'most complex manifestations of pleasure and pain ... pass through us: ... so that the ego and its relations are, for the time completely obliterated, and ... we are in a state of pure contemplation.'\textsuperscript{105} The emotions thus aroused comprise all of which humanity is capable, including those of willing. Music, he insisted, embodies the entire 'history of the soul, its strivings, its failures, its fears, and its laughter, its frantic desires, its bitter disappointments, its hopes and its despair.'\textsuperscript{106} The only category of the beautiful, which did not, in his view, actively arouse desire, was the sublime.\textsuperscript{107} How markedly this differs from Schopenhauer's invitation to his readers to enjoy the 'transcendental view' of existence in a 'condition of mind [that] arises when intellect has got the upper hand in the domain of consciousness, where, freed

\textsuperscript{103} Marshall-Hall Orchestral Programme, 7 April 1906, MMCA.

\textsuperscript{104} Alma Mater, July 1899.

\textsuperscript{105} Alma Mater, August 1899.

\textsuperscript{106} Heralö, 28 February 1901.

\textsuperscript{107} Alma Mater, August 1899.
from mere service to the will, it looks upon the phenomena of life objectively.\textsuperscript{108}

It is true that Schopenhauer also taught that music expresses emotions. By this, however, he meant, not 'this or that particular definite joy, this or that sorrow, or horror, or delight, or merriment, or peace of mind, but joy, sorrow, delight, merriment, peace of mind, themselves, to a certain extent in the abstract ... without any particularisation.'\textsuperscript{109}

Marshall-Hall, by contrast, taught that these emotions are depicted, not in abstract, but in specific, concrete, particularised form, 'with the exactness of life itself.'\textsuperscript{110} They are 'only indefinite insofar as the emotions which a man can express are indefinite.'\textsuperscript{111}

Nothing could be further from the truth than Bebbington's claim that, since he drew 'his examples from Tristan and Isolde and Fidelio, rather than from symphonies, or quartets,' Marshall-Hall's efforts to illustrate his 'specific' musical language of the emotions showed 'in


\textsuperscript{110} Alma Mater, July 1899.

\textsuperscript{111} School, September 1888.
effect that only the vaguest and most general associations could be made between specific sounds and non-musical phenomena. In fact, his treatment of the emotional role of music drew on a much wider range of pieces, both operatic and purely instrumental. And its tone leaves one in no doubt that he believed them to contain concrete, specific emotions of great intensity, which actively involved the will (in Schopenhauer's sense of felt attractions and repulsions).

So much so, that they often produced the same physical effects as the emotions of real life - which, indeed, they were. Thus, in a performance by Mark Hambourg of Grieg's Ballade there 'were moments ... when one felt oneself grow pale with a sort of anxiety, and an involuntary shudder ran through one.' Listening to Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, 'We are in an electrically surcharged atmosphere. We feel that something terrible is going to happen ... we hold our breath - paralysed.' In Puccini's Madame Butterfly the pathos of the eponymous heroine's reply to Suzuki's assertion, that foreign husbands did not return to their wives, was for Marshall-Hall, so faithful to concrete reality 'that it is impossible to listen to it with dry eyes.' And, in
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112 Sebbington M.Mus., p.165.

113 Argus, 2 August 1908.

114 Alma Mater, August 1899; Marshall-Hall Orchestral Programme, 28 April 1908, MMCA; Marshall-Hall Orchestral Programme, 7 October 1907 in ibid.

115 Argus, 9 April 1910.
other unspecified works, you can 'feel ... your heart palpitate and your limbs quiver with the generous ardour and juvenescent enthusiasm of fertile life.\textsuperscript{116}

Certainly his descriptions did at times fall short of a minutely precise evocation of specific emotions. This, however, was not because he failed to regard the latter as particular and concrete in character, but because he was unable, or did not wish, to embody them in discursive language. Thus, he apologised for his 'poor ineffectual efforts to give some impression in cold shallow words of the emotions' expressed in Beethoven's Pathetic Sonata\textsuperscript{117}. And in a discussion of the same composer's B Minor Symphony, he said his intention was 'not to translate the music into words, but to convey my reader into the atmosphere of thought which I conceive enveloped Beethoven's mind as he wrote down his tragic poem.\textsuperscript{118}

4. The Natural

The structural conduciveness of the epistemology entailed by Marshall-Hall's periechontology, to the episode of collective action under investigation, was further enhanced by its axiological implications - that is, by its implications for his view of the grounds of moral discourse. His periechontology made him a champion

\textsuperscript{116}Herald, 28 February 1901.
\textsuperscript{117}Musical Standard, 2 January 1892.
\textsuperscript{118}Table Talk, 16 January 1891.
of the 'natural', in the second of John Stuart Mill's
two senses of the word - referring, that is, to 'What
takes place without the ... voluntary and intentional
agency of man'\textsuperscript{119}. Since the unconscious, by definition,
is incapable of intentional human activity, its emanations,
in the form of pre-conscious experience must be sponta-
necous. From this it followed that everything that was
deliberately brought about as a result of conscious human
agency inhibited authenticity. And 'natural' phenomena
(within the mind, at least), which occurred without
deliberate human contrivance, fostered it.

Among the latter, the most effective, as we have seen,
was art. So, predictably enough, it was his discussions
of art that principally exemplified the importance of the
'natural' in his outlook. As the true artist's business
is (periechontologically) with the absolute, he must
'pursue [his] own path, [his] own light with firm trust
in unerring nature'\textsuperscript{120}. He works, that is, 'purely from
the conviction of his own inmost individuality'\textsuperscript{121}, which
'evolves in its own way according to the innate character
of the individual'\textsuperscript{122}, but which he is quite 'unable to
control or direct'\textsuperscript{123}. The 'process is unconscious'\textsuperscript{124},

\textsuperscript{119}Quoted in Basil Willey, \textit{Nineteenth Century Studies}

\textsuperscript{120}Alma Mater, April 1899.

\textsuperscript{121}Table Talk, 2 August 1895.

\textsuperscript{122}Argus, 20 March 1915.

\textsuperscript{123}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{124}Alma Mater, August 1899.
and its product is 'the spontaneous expression of individual character.' Similarly, genuine lovers of music are those who listen 'without effort and without thought,' who, 'without reflection or doubt give themselves up to a naive enjoyment of what is presented to them,' and thereby have 'unconsciously attained the highest understanding'; understanding, that is, of the unconscious, man's closest approach to the absolute.

Marshall-Hall's own critical writings are, accordingly, heavily interlarded with references to naturalness, ease, spontaneity, effortlessness, unconscioness, naivety - all indicating the absence of conscious striving. He admired 'the pure, spontaneous, flowing, unbroken outline' of Mozart's work; the 'freshness and spontaneity' of Beethoven's; and the 'natural spontaneous' quality of Wagner's Parsifal themes. And among performers he praised Efrem Zimbalist's 'delightfully unconscious manner'; Maggie Teyte's 'easy and satisfying style,'
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125 Table Talk, 2 August 1895, 22 March 1895.
126 Musical Opinion and Music Trade Review, 1 September 1894.
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132 British Australasian, 21 May 1914.
that always seemed 'to spring from the spontaneous expression of the moment, always naïve and birdlike'; and the 'ease and spontaneous riot' of a successful production of Bohème.

The point is further illustrated by Marshall-Hall's habit of likening artistic creativity to the blind operations of nature. Music, he said, emanated from the conductor Arthur Nikisch 'as naturally and as inevitably as colours from a prism'. Of the singer, John McCormack, he wrote, 'The most lovely sounds float out of his mouth with the same ease as crystal water bubbles from a well.' Art, in general, was described as 'the efflorescence of the human mind', which 'blossoms in its sphere as the simplest flower'. And melody was 'a stream, and harmony ...

the bed over which it rushes.'

His repeated use of reflexive pronouns when describing his own manner of working also emphasized its unconscious, extemporaneous character. As he worked, a 'mood, or

133 Ibid., 14 May 1914.
134 Australasian Musical News, December 1911; Argus, 27 April 1902; British Australasian, 7 May 1914.
135 Ibid., 2 July 1914.
136 Unidentified Newspaper cutting, context 1911, MMCA.
137 Gleam, October 1900.
138 Table Talk, 22 March, 1895.

139 Bebbington maintains that passages in some of Marshall-Hall's compositions were simply adaptations from various of his earlier works (M.Mus., p.218, 129), but this surely does not support Bebbington's contention that Marshall-Hall did not, as he claimed, compose spontaneously (ibid., p.129). Nor does it show that he did not hold the views he advanced about creativity as an unconscious process.
atmosphere' would 'proceed to formulate itself musically'.\textsuperscript{140} The emotions 'translated themselves into music'. The 'indefinite homogeneous mass of ... harmony gradually crystallised itself into a definite heterogeneous melodic whole',\textsuperscript{141} and 'the work completes itself spontaneously'.\textsuperscript{142}

To Tom Roberts he wrote on one occasion,

\begin{quote}
I have a grand charcoal outline which I know contains something deep and solemn ... But which I can neither fill up, continue, or complete in any way, try how I will. Damn it! I have chucked it up. It must evolve without my aid and force itself upon me.\textsuperscript{143}
\end{quote}

In this respect, Marshall-Hall's values contrasted sharply with those of Symbolism. The latter's preference for the artificial over the natural was exemplified in the admiration of its exponents for Baudelaire's cult of the 'dandy',\textsuperscript{144} and in Puvis de Chavannes' desire 'to be not nature, but parallel to nature'.\textsuperscript{145} It was epitomised in J-K. Huysmanns decadent Symbolist hero, Des Esseintes, whom the author confessedly modelled upon 'a Monsieur Polantin ... who has discovered in artificiality a specific for the disgust inspired by the worries of life'.\textsuperscript{146}

Des Esseintes designed his room to look like a ship's cabin,

\begin{flushright}
140\textit{Alma Mater}, August 1899.
141\textit{Alma Mater}, August 1899.
142\textit{Ibid}.
144\textit{John Milner, Symbolists and Decadents, London, 1971, p.32.}
145\textit{Quoted in E. Lucie-Smith, Symbolist Art, London, 1972, p.84.}
\end{flushright}
complete with port holes, through which could be seen clockwork mechanical fish that become entangled in artificial sea weed\textsuperscript{147}. He yearned for 'rare and aristocratic plants from distant lands, kept alive with cunning attention in artificial tropics created by carefully regulated stoves!'. And when he 'tired of artificial flowers aping real ones, he wanted some natural flowers that would look like fakes',\textsuperscript{148}.

The likelihood of conflict between Marshall-Hall and Melbourne Hebraism was increased by the fact that, for the former (following, in this instance, not only Nietzsche, but also Wagner), the way not only to truth and beauty, but also to virtue lay in obedience, not to external prescriptions, but 'only to the safe dogmas of nature',\textsuperscript{149} residing in the 'immanent recesses of our being',\textsuperscript{150}. He commended Wagner's Tannhäuser, because 'all that he does seems entirely the outcome of spontaneous, uncalculating impulse',\textsuperscript{151}. Even his 'anguish of contrition for the wrong he has done to Elizabeth' derived, not from 'any religious superstition' but from 'his own inner sense of uprightness',\textsuperscript{152}. The point is concisely summed up in the following lines from the Book of Canticles:

\textsuperscript{147}Ibid., p. 34.  
\textsuperscript{148}Ibid., pp. 96-7.  
\textsuperscript{149}Argus, 20 March 1915.  
\textsuperscript{150}Herald, 28 February 1901.  
\textsuperscript{151}Herald, 29 March 1901.  
\textsuperscript{152}Ibid.
But when from my inner being the God that there dwells
Ordination irrevocable gives forth, then be mine
Resolution to follow where fate's mandate impels. 153

This was clearly at odds, not only with Schopenhauer's teaching of 'the natural baseness of human nature', 154, but also with the Hebraic proclamation of the innate baseness of humanity, due to its involvement in original sin.

5. Instinct, Emotion and Morality

And it only made matters worse that the name of the 'God' whose ordination Marshall-Hall wished always to obey, was instinct, sole parent of emotion. A 'virtuous action, to merit the name, must,' he insisted, 'be the undisputed manifestation of the passions and affections of the heart'. 155. Even, 'if the intellect could discriminate between right and wrong, its abstract decisions had no influence on actions, which followed in all cases as the unconscious or authentic result of the affections'. 156. All 'worthy action proceeded from and was the result of emotion', 157, and man 'is noble and good in proportion to his capability for emotion'. 158.

155 Alma Mater, July 1899.
156 Ibid.
157 School, June 1889.
158 Alma Mater, July 1899.
From this, it followed that people who, believing man's 'instincts are not to be trusted,159, tried 'to step in and foolishly hold back the hand of Nature,160, to suppress its decrees 'with ... curses, as vanity, poison, and sin,/ Evils the flesh must subdue ere the spirit Elysium may win',161, were not merely deluded, but positively immoral. Theirs was 'an immoral influence and the most dire catastrophe which can befall a man, and his life's supreme tragedy,162 —

    .... In darkness they kneel,
    For thy naked purity, Nature, their loose thoughts abhor,
    Their lascivious eyes drop before thee, unclean are they, lewd to the core.163

It is difficult to conceive of a viewpoint more fundamentally and diametrically opposed to the Hebraic policy of suppressing instinctual drives in favour of moral precepts intellectually derived from an external source. The 'root' of Marshall-Hall's 'evil language,' declared musician, J.A. Johnstone, was 'emotion, unrestrained by sober judgement and clear intellect',164.

Not that the Ormond Professor thought emotion incapable of producing evil results. But, for him, the 'ideal man'
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159. Age, 13 August 1898.
160. Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898, UCMR, 12 August 1898.
162. Alma Mater, June 1900.
163. Hymn to Sydney, op. cit., p.15.
164. Age, 9 August 1898.
was not one 'whose emotions are ... kept in hand by a strong will', 165 but 'one whose ... emotions are so noble that evil is naturally repugnant, good attractive to him', 166. He was 'not obliged ... to suppress evil emotions, for he knows them not'. 167

Yet, Marshall-Hall conceded, for most people this 'summit of virtue' was a condition 'to which there seems at present but little prospect of attainment'. 168 For them, life was 'a perpetual struggle between man's sensual instincts and his intellectual recognition of the necessity to restrain these'. 169 But by restraint he did not mean suppression. Indeed, he deplored the tendency 'to step in and foolishly attempt to hold back the hands of nature', 170, arguing that the harm was 'in the long run trebled by such a course'. 171 Rather 'must the instinct be given free play and led into harmless channels', 172, as the 'equal of, not slave to [man's] will'. 173

165 Musical Standard, 20 June 1891.
166 Unidentified newspaper cutting, dated August 1898 in MMCA.
167 Ibid.
168 Ibid.
169 Melbourne University Review, May 1891.
170 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898, MUCMB, 12 August 1898.
171 Ibid.
172 Ibid.
173 Musical Herald, 1 June 1891.
Implicit in this was a fundamental disagreement with Hebraism, which, as we have seen (pp.103-105) saw evil as a property of the conduct itself, so defined by divine injunction. Marshall-Hall, on the other hand, in true Hellenic fashion, construed it in terms of its consequences. For him, there was 'nothing essentially evil, even in the most violent passions. They are merely manifestations of force',\textsuperscript{174} a 'part of [man's] physical being, to be guided into right or wrong channels'.\textsuperscript{175} That is to say, they 'are active agents for good or evil',\textsuperscript{176} such that 'it is only some particular application of them to the necessary special social conditions that renders them obnoxious'.\textsuperscript{177} Thus, the sinner and the saint were actuated by the same emotions. 'It is only the harmful or beneficial result of their actions on the happiness of humanity at large which leads us to condemn the one and honour the other'.\textsuperscript{178}

One way of disarming potentially mischievous emotions, making their suppression unnecessary, was through music, which, because it deals with feelings independently of their consequences, can act as 'the safety valve of

\textsuperscript{174} Alma Mater, June 1899.
\textsuperscript{175} Musical Standard, 20 June 1891.
\textsuperscript{176} Musical Herald, 2 January 1892, emphasis mine.
\textsuperscript{177} Melbourne University Review, May 1891.
\textsuperscript{178} Musical Standard, 2 January 1892.
suffering humanity'. In music we can 'life [sic] cut every tendency of our nature to the full'. We can love and hate and repent, joy, grieve, triumph, despair, abase ourselves as criminals, throne us as monarchs, assume the will and shape of heroes, of gods; mount the winds, tumble with the billows of the sea, seat ourselves above the mountain tops and make the earth our footstool - and yet not ... harm the minutest insect that squirms upon earth.

By its means, 'with no pain ... the dreadful energy of nature can expand [sic] itself harmlessly'. And the 'passions which urge mankind along in the selfish struggle for existence, to self assertion, to power, to crime, spend themselves ... on the mere phantasm of these cruel realities'.

Emotions that had undesirable consequences he designated 'unhealthy', a transferred epithet, which did not apply to the emotions, themselves, but to the use to which they were put. All 'vice,' he said, 'is a form of disease'. The drunkard was 'a man whose instincts are unhealthy, he is decadent ... Nature has condemned him'. But exponents of Hebraism were no better.
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inasmuch as they tried 'to persuade [the world] that their own disease is a spiritual health and its sanity is perdition'\textsuperscript{186}. This notion, as will become clear, played a key role in linking his situational perception with the motivational response to it (Martin's condition 1).

What was nowhere explained was how emotions came to be misapplied in this way, when man's inner nature, from which they sprang, contained no evil. But this is merely to say that Marshall-Hall's ethical code was bedevilled by the same intractable problem of theodicy that is common to all which postulate a single benevolent cause of phenomena.

Nevertheless, the possibility of conflict with Hebraism was further increased by the fact that Marshall-Hall did not, in reality, invariably disapprove of emotions when their results were harmful. The inconsistency derived from a disjunctive element in his outlook - one, that is, which, although related to, was not entailed (even in a loose sense) by the foregoing. Nor are its constituent parts characterised by the same degree of internal logical coherence. This was the psychological root of his credo, comprising the more immediate driving principle of his conduct.

6. The Importance of Being Happy

It rested on two governing principles, both of which were in radical opposition to the views of Schopenhauer

\textsuperscript{186}Aberdeen Herald, 22 February 1901.
and the Symbolists. Unlike the former, Marshall-Hall did not believe in the impossibility of real and worthwhile happiness in this phenomenal world. He did not dismiss human life as no more than a pendulum swinging 'backwards and forwards between pain and ennui,' \(^{187}\), where, in 'constant suffering,' \(^{188}\), the most that could be hoped for was 'simply the preservation of [man's] tormented existence for a short span.' \(^{189}\). Nor did he, with the German philosopher, contend that virtue consists 'not [in] ... a striving after happiness ... but ... an effort in the opposite direction,' \(^{190}\) and therefore that humanity should shudder 'at the pleasures in which it recognises the assertion of life,' \(^{191}\), so that 'the satisfaction of the wishes, the sweet of life, shall not again arouse the will.' \(^{192}\).

By the same token, he shared none of Symbolism's taste for wistful melancholy \(^{193}\), exemplified in Puvis de Chavannes' preference for 'rather mournful aspects to all

\(^{187}\) Quoted in Parker, op.cit., p.231.

\(^{188}\) Quoted in Morse Peckham (ed), Romanticism. The Culture of the Nineteenth Century, New York, 1965, p.410.

\(^{189}\) Quoted in Douglas, op.cit., p.27.

\(^{190}\) Quoted in Parker, op.cit., p.255.

\(^{191}\) Ibid., p.235.

\(^{192}\) Ibid., p.272.

others'\textsuperscript{194}, and in Reynaud's 'deep incurable sadness' that had 'no delight which is not sombre and tormented'.\textsuperscript{195}

On the contrary, he insisted that happiness was not only possible, but both desirable and a moral duty - in the sense of one that is prescribed by 'health' and 'nature'. The 'effort towards happiness,' he declared, was the 'prime instinct and supreme necessity of healthy nature'.\textsuperscript{196}

Had he not so radically departed from Schopenhauer and the Symbolists, in this respect, his outlook would not have been so signally out of tune with the dominant, anti-hedonist bias of Hebraism (see p.136). His was a far cry from the incorporeal, other-worldly brand of happiness to which Christians looked as a posthumous reward for present submission. This Marshall-Hall scornfully stigmatised as the 'brain sick Phantom' of 'dull-witted priests',\textsuperscript{197}, who knew not that 'none other heaven there is but the heart, where the gods live and move'.\textsuperscript{198} Their ideal, he complained, was symbolised in the 'angel with the flaming sword' who, 'turns away the Christian from the garden of Eden'.\textsuperscript{199}

\textsuperscript{194}Quoted in Lucie-Smith, \emph{op.cit.}, p.184.

\textsuperscript{195}Quoted in Richardson, \emph{op.cit.}, p.273.

\textsuperscript{196}Musical Standard, 11 March 1905.

\textsuperscript{197}Hymn to Sydney, \emph{op.cit.}, p.10.

\textsuperscript{198}Ibid., p.15.

\textsuperscript{199}Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898, UVEC, 12 August 1898.
His, by contrast, was an ephemeral, temporal happiness, lodged firmly in this life. It was a 'right enjoyment of the world,' a 'mortal made enjoyment - to touch and be seen,' to be pursued in the light-hearted 'beautiful, healthy, careless life,' depicted in the poems of Herrick and his immediate successors, and again long after in the songs of Arne and his contemporaries. It was epitomised in Marshall-Ball's call to his fellows to come 'Be merry while we may,' since 'Nevermore 'twill be today,' and in his sensuous enjoyment of the sunrise, when

... through all things again warm life
is poured
Flaming the heart with passionate delight.

And it was to be enjoyed in the 'glorious ardours of the genial bowl,' so relished by 'those ancient cronies' who

... loved to pour
Libations to Jove's vine-crowned son!
And holding their jolly sides, and
drinking roar
Lo! Tempus Fugit! - one Toast more.

---

201. Hymn to Sydney, p.10.
203. To a Parson on his refusing a Glass of Wine with contumely' in Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit., p.12.
204. 'To my Sweetheart, to be Merry with me', in Book of Canticles, op.cit., p.12. It is surely not without significance that he called one of his sons Herrick - see Marshall-Ball gravestone, Brighton cemetery.
206. To a Parson on his refusing a Glass of Wine with contumely', loc.cit.
207. 'To a Parson on his refusing a Glass of Wine with contumely', loc.cit.
The patently anti-Hebraic tone of this was aggravated by the following lines in the same poem, addressed to a testotalling clergyman:

Trust me my friend, a glass of this clear wine
Is worth a deal of musty hymns,
And has more in it of the true divine
Than your fantastic whims
Or mine. 208

There is nothing in all this of Schopenhauer’s acclamation of that which 'lifts us out of real existence and transforms us into disinterested spectators of it' 209, nor is there anything of his disgust with the teaching that found life 'so important ... that we have to plunge into it with our whole soul if we are to obtain a share of its good.' 210 In fact, 'leading an active life among [one’s] fellows' 211 was precisely what Marshall-Hall advocated. His, by the same token, was a far cry from the policy of the Symbolists, who 'lived and created through reflection, through introspection ... rather than by conscious interaction with the surrounding world.' 212

He did not, like Huysmans' Des Esseintes, prefer to 'hide himself away, far from the world, in some retreat where he might deaden the sound of ... inflexible life.' 213.

208 Ibid.
209 Quoted in Parker, op. cit., p. 235.
211 Alma Mater, June 1900.
212 Goldwater, op. cit., p. 78.
The Importance of Energy

...But it was no more shallow, tepid, easy-going hedonism. The second of the two organising principles of the psychological component of Marshall-Hall's belief system was the conviction that humanity was at its best when engaged in the prolific expenditure of energy. The 'possession of an energy which cannot rest, which cannot look inactively on whilst others are pushing forward, but which thrusts determinedly on to the front', he declared, was 'the only attitude worthy of self-respecting beings'. By the same token, that 'which makes the greatness of a country is the possession of superabundant energy on the part of its citizens'.

Since the implications of this view were to lead him, in more ways than one, into more trouble than he had bargained for, further light can be thrown on his differences with Hebraic Christianity by tracing it to its ideological source. This will also bring into sharper relief the disjunction between the logical and psychological premises of his thought. He endeavoured to bridge the gulf between the two in two related, but not very satisfactory, ways. Firstly, he asserted (quite arbitrarily) that ultimate reality was energy. It was

---

215 Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.
216 Ibid.
217 Ibid.
identical with 'the mysterious hidden untraceable forms of energy which lie at the root of all matter', \(^{218}\). Being untraceably hidden, nothing, of course, could be known about them directly. But they were indirectly encountered when objectified in the conative preconscious as pure contemplation — when 'the ego and its relations in time and space ... disappear', \(^{219}\), and that 'form of energy which hitherto had possibly fusted in us unused, leaps forth', \(^{220}\), and pours 'through body and soul', \(^{221}\), arousing 'a flood of emotion so profound as to absorb well nigh the whole mental energy'. \(^{222}\) This was authentic experience.

The resemblance to Schopenhauer's teaching is, of course, unmistakable, and far from coincidental. Marshall-Hall, himself, acknowledged the debt, affirming that the term 'energy' as he used it was identical with Schopenhauer's notion of 'Will'. \(^{223}\) But his attitude to it was, as we shall see, very different. In view of his friendship with the Lindsays and other local artists, it may have contributed significantly to that 'vitalism', detected in contemporary Australian literature by Vincent Buckley,

---

\(^{218}\) *Glean*, 20 November 1900.

\(^{219}\) *Alma Mater*, August 1899.

\(^{220}\) *Musical Standard*, 18 March 1905.


\(^{222}\) *Alma Mater*, August 1899.

\(^{223}\) *Table Talk*, 12 May 1893.
which 'insisted on the almost metaphysical status of sheer will.'

The above reasoning, however, was a justification only of the intense experience (as distinct from expenditure) of energy. And it was, apparently, in recognition of this that Marshall-Hall subjoined to it a second argument, which involved an unacknowledged broadening of the meaning of the word, 'nature', in his thought, to include, not only what occurred within the individual, without conscious contrivance (which was normative because it emanated directly from the absolute), but also the operations of the external world. The prescriptive role of the latter in his axiology is legitimated, of course, by the objective dimension of his idealism, which equated the noumenal energy of human unconsciousness with the underlying essence of the external world. The latter, he said, was 'simply an objectification of energy through multifarious forms, each of which exhibits it in some peculiar and characteristic way.'

That the operations of this world were purposive had, Marshall-Hall believed, been revealed by Darwin's researches, which, he said, had unveiled a universe in


225 Table Talk, 12 May 1893.
which 'each atom [was] endeavouring as it were to follow a distinct use', and in which there is 'a fixed object to which life strains or ceasing to strain dies'. This appeal to the prestige of Darwinism was far from atypical of the extra-biological polemics of the day. But it actually owes more to vitalistic Lamarckian, than mechanistic Darwinian principles of inheritance.

However, while declaring that the 'world moves along according to a dim plan of its own', he insisted that we 'neither know nor can possibly perceive the ultimate object and result of creation'. This, in itself, represents a departure from Schopenhauer's teleology, according to which it is known that what 'the Will wills is always life'.

Nevertheless, Marshall-Hall believed that we 'are able to dimly trace the tendency and even the method of [nature's] progressive evolution'. It could be discerned in two complementary, but conflicting, phenomena, namely, the

---

226 Alma Mater, April 1899.
227 Magazine of Music, June 1888.
229 British Australasian, 28 May 1914.
230 Magazine of Music, June 1888.
232 Magazine of Music, June 1888 (emphasis mine).
'tendency towards concentration and dispersion' of energy, which, he said, 'is to be traced in all being, organic and inorganic'.

In the latter category we observe atoms clinging together 'Under a mighty impulse', which from time to time, is reversed. Then 'we behold a monstrous and awesome struggle between gravity and rigidity'. This may be manifested in an avalanche, an earthquake, a volcanic eruption, or, less dramatically, in 'the unending circle of liquid existence'. When springs 'burst forth from the bosom of the Earth, and distribute their waters in a thousand streams which again draw together and are poured into the ocean, the ocean melts into vapour, and the vapour is concentrated into cloud, and the cloud disburthens itself as rain, and the rain is gathered again to the spring ...'.

In the vegetable world, likewise, the 'life energy of the tree is compressed into the seed, and breaks forth in due course as root, stem, branch, leaf, flower, fruit to all perpetuity. And this is but a 'crude and primal revelation' of social forces which 'build and unbuild families, civilisations'. Finally, the individual mind 'obeys the same laws and exhibits the same tendencies, only, as it were, more vividly and significantly' by

---

233 Cleam, October 1900.
234 Ibid.
'reason of self-consciousness'. That is to say, man
'makes his mind a store-house of impressions and knowledge -
in other words, his mind accumulates energy, which when the
requisite intensity has been obtained, bursts forth in the
form of works of art, inventions of science, and practical
formative actions.\textsuperscript{235} This, however, was really little
more than a clumsy attempt to give a conceptual respec-
tability to a policy whose roots lay in the musician's
profound pessimism. His was not the gloom of a Schopen-
hauer, or of Huysmans' Des Esseintes, with its belief in
the impossibility of happiness. It was an anguish, rather,
which construes the human predicament in terms of a radical
opposition between free will and facticity\textsuperscript{236} - between
existence, that is, as possibility and constraint - in
which the latter is always ultimately victorious.

For Marshall-Hall, 'the real tragedy of human exis-
tence,\textsuperscript{237} lay in the 'conflict between the "would" and the
"must" of life ... between necessity and conscious
nature'.\textsuperscript{238} Certainly, there were 'Happy spaces where
the glad gods dwell\textsuperscript{239} and 'the soul of me trembles ...'

\textsuperscript{235} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{236} An Existentialist term designating the limiting
Factor in human existence, its radical finitude. See
W.J. Macquarrie, \textit{Op.Cit.}, p.150. As Streeton remarked,
it did not prevent him from being 'a very jolly pessimist'.

\textsuperscript{237} \textit{Herald}, 28 February 1901.

\textsuperscript{238} Marshall-Hall Orchestral Concert Programme,
October 1907 in \textit{WMCA}

\textsuperscript{239} 'Of Fate' in \textit{Book of Canticles, Op.Cit.}, p.30.
with over-great joy. But the struggle was an unequal one. Each joy was soon crushed beneath 'the restless foot of Fate', poisoned by the 'death-bitter cup of the future'. And man was left at the mercy of 'terrible and pitiless forces'. At their will he was 'tossed this way and that in joy and woe; in pleasure and pain ... a straw in the ocean, a grain of sand in the cyclone', a 'weak, impotent shadow amid the monstrous strife of Titans.

This is a manifestation of that quintessential 19th century phenomenon which Alex de Jonge, in another context, has called the loss of 'whole meanings' - of a world view, that is, 'in which every part stood in significant relation to every other part'. De Jonge does not explain what he means by 'significant' in this context. But it can be seen as describing those relations which embody the values or patterns (or some of them) on the basis of which a particular human society is, or, it is felt,

242. 'To Rene', loc.cit.
244. *Alma Mater*, June 1899.
should be, structured. A belief in whole meanings, then, is one according to which the rest of the cosmos is also organised on the basis of the same values and patterns.

The loss of this sense of security was epitomised in Arnold's 'Dover Beach'\(^\text{247}\), and in Marshall-Hall's concern with 'careless fate'\(^\text{248}\), which is 'untouched by pity, indifferent to results'\(^\text{249}\), and 'never by any chance looks after the sparrows or cares a twopenny damn whether they live or die!'\(^\text{250}\). (Harking back to his earlier argument, it is, perhaps, appropriate, since Darwinism had played such a key role in depriving the age of its peace of mind, that the same system - or what passed for it - should so often have been looked to as a means of restoring whole meanings.)

In Marshall-Hall's case the anomie manifested itself in a morose preoccupation with 'the death-worm naught will quiet'\(^\text{251}\), the 'death bell [that] clings in my brain, for the corpse in my heart that lies.'\(^\text{252}\). Of the finality of


\(^\text{248}\)Che Ricordasi il Benn Doppia la Noia' in Book of Canticles, op.cit., p. 34.

\(^\text{249}\)Marshall-Hall Orchestral Programme, 25 August 1906 in KMCA.


\(^\text{251}\)'Of the Sorrow of Things' in Book of Canticles, op.cit., p. 11.

\(^\text{252}\)'On the Long-Beach, Nordingale' in Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit., p. 23.
death, 'Time's sullen vengeance', he was in no doubt. He rejected with scorn 'the impertinent belief alike of the pistist and the most unconscionable rascal that his insignificant ego is destined to exist forever'. In fact, he maintained,

All our loves, our joys, our immense desires; - all,
All shall soon pass from us, and all
as though they had never been.

And we will vanish into 'blank oblivion's tentless shadow'.

This, no doubt, explains, in part at least, the attraction of philosophical idealism for him. The philosophical idealists prized unity and immutability in human life. So they fortified their confidence in whole meanings by making these qualities the governing principles of all phenomena, human and extra-human. Marshall-Hall, too, clearly derived some comfort from his monistic periechonto-logy, which endowed 'the manifold, confused, heterogeneous impressions' that constitute human experience, with a measure of meaningfulness, by subsuming them under 'the fundamental universal law of Beauty'. That is to say, his idealism, by tracing them to their preconscious origin, 'displays their inner connection', by whose means 'the


255. Alma Mater, April 1899.

256. 'On the Statuary of an Egyptian Sheikh...', loc.cit.
harmony of the universe is sustained, and man once more can 'feel his relationship to all that lies around him.  

There was, insisted Marshall-Hall, 'no joy, more voluptuous, more profound, more enkindling than that afforded by the sense that the individual is one indivisibly with the teeming activity of the eternal life around him, that he is a life drop in the immense heart of the universe' and 'that he himself but awaits the touch of the enchanter Death, to become once more resolved into those primary elements of whose manifold combinations he is but one. This moderated the musician's angst to the extent of permitting him, on one occasion at least, actually to welcome 'sweet Death! pale, patient peace giver' in whose 'soft arms the way-worn wanderer rests.'  

However, revealing the underlying unity of the apparently disparate clearly did not constitute for him an adequate assurance of cosmic concern for the human predicament. This is borne out later in the same poem, when, still addressing Death, he said,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I fear thee not, O fair, faint-featured form!} \\
\text{But watch thee drawing nearer day by day - 0 stay thy coming! - Kiss me sweet mother.}
\end{align*}
\]

257 Herald, 28 February 1901.
258 Alma Mater, June 1900.
260 Musical World, 8 February 1890.
261 Ibid.
So, another means of alleviating this anguish was clearly required. And this he found in the lavish expen-
diture of energy. Our 'stock of energy,' he explained,
"... enables us not only to partake to the utmost of the joy of living, but also to turn a determined resolute face to whatever the destinies confront us with."\(^{262}\). The same point was made in verse - with bland disregard for consistency of metaphor:

\begin{quote}
And yet it were most wanton-willed indeed
To wander through this wilderness of weed
Content to curse its wilfulness and woe,
Faint-hearted fingerings of rusty hoe;
Methinks it were more use to strip us bare,
Dig in good seed, uproot the noisome tare
Brace an ever trusty sinew for the swim,
And in a sea of action drown our care.\(^{263}\)
\end{quote}

Accordingly, the happiness Marshall-Hall prized was not 'a sort of cow-like quietude, a state in which we are as far as possible protected from all the ills of life'\(^{264}\), and in which we want 'only to take life as a thing of no consideration, to merely have as good a time as possible'\(^{265}\). His, on the contrary, was a celebration of joy - 'a condition of ultra-vitality, of superabundant life,'\(^{266}\), experienced when we plunge 'with fine frenzy of soul' into our affairs, 'becoming a passionate participant in their manifold sensations.'\(^{267}\). It was achieved 'not

\(^{262}\)Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.

\(^{263}\)Manuscript poem in MMMA, Group 2.

\(^{264}\)Musical Standard, 11 March 1905.

\(^{265}\)Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.

\(^{266}\)Herald, 28 February 1901.

\(^{267}\)Argus, 1 April 1911.
at those mild feeble times when [humanity] is most free from effort ... but when its vital forces are in their extreme exuberance, when its mighty energy is venting itself under a myriad splendid and novel forms, 268.

Far from advocating avoidance of 'the ills of life', he insisted that the 'overcoming of obstacles ... the mastery of that which resists and hinders us ... are not misfortunes from which to pray relief, but spurs to goad us on[,] ... the whetstone on which our faculty of happiness, our restless energy sharpens itself, 269.

And, accordingly, he called on the gods to give him

Strength to taste life to the full .......

............... Let them come, sweet and gall,
Fortune, spite, wrong and right, as they list - every one to the dregs would I drain. 270

This, again, was a viewpoint that manifestly stood in stark contrast to those of Schopenhauer and the Symbolists. Turnbull is literally correct in asserting that the 'idea of Schopenhauer's "will to life" underlies much of [Marshall-Hall's] writing' 271. But it is important to add that, to the latter, vigorous exercise of the will (in the former's sense of the term) was a great good. He defined desire 'as consciousness of active energy', and

269. Ibid.
270. 'A Canticle to the Gods', in *Book of Canticles*, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
'weakness of desire as poverty of energy'\textsuperscript{272}; while, to Schopenhauer, 'pure knowledge,' the highest mental state, was not only 'foreign to all willing'\textsuperscript{273} but 'becomes a guile of all and every volition'\textsuperscript{274}; 'original sin' was the 'assertion of will', while 'salvation' depended on 'denial of will'\textsuperscript{275}.

Certainly, as Margaret Wiley has argued in another context, the latter was not simply a condition of psychic 'nothingness'\textsuperscript{276}. Pure contemplation, Schopenhauer stressed, corresponded to the Hindu-Buddhist concept of Satwa-Guna, 'the only pure happiness which is neither preceded by suffering ... nor necessarily followed by repentance, sorrow, emptiness, or satiety.'\textsuperscript{277} It should not be confused with Tama-Guna, which was 'the greatest lethargy of the will'\textsuperscript{278}. Nevertheless, his description of the former as 'that peace which is above all reason, that perfect calm of spirit, that deep rest,'\textsuperscript{279}, is clearly incompatible with 'the

\textsuperscript{272} Alma Mater, June 1899.
\textsuperscript{273} Parker, \textit{op.cit.}, p.235.
\textsuperscript{274} Peckham, \textit{op.cit.}, p.143.
\textsuperscript{275} Quoted in Durant, \textit{op.cit.}, p.256.
\textsuperscript{277} Quoted in Peckham, \textit{op.cit.}, p.134.
\textsuperscript{278} Quoted in Parker, \textit{op.cit.}, p.238; see also Peckham, \textit{op.cit.}, p.137.
\textsuperscript{279} Quoted in Peckham, \textit{op.cit.}, p.145.
splendour and vigour of ... immanent, multiplied, voluptuous vitality,' celebrated by Marshall-Hall, when 'body and mind quiver and bound as though interpenetrated by an instantaneous current of electric fluid'\textsuperscript{280}, and all life's splendours 'pulse in the passionate blood and burst through the brain.'\textsuperscript{281}

The difference between Marshall-Hall and Schopenhauer in this respect arose partly from the fact, clearly recognised by the former, that, in the latter's argument, will was conceived of as a means to an end. Its exercise was objectionable, because it turned life into a 'constant transition from wish to fruition'\textsuperscript{282}, which produced, not enduring pleasure, but merely 'ennui.'\textsuperscript{283} To the Ormond Professor, on the other hand, the effort was the end. The goal 'consists in endeavour, not as Schopenhauer would have it, in the final gain.'\textsuperscript{284} Insofar as it did have an end beyond itself, it was that of self-perpetuation - residing in our 'power to recall the feelings of [a] virile period, as a manifest token of past power, and as a stimulus towards a new period of fresh exertion'. That is to say, in 'the attainment of the goal a certain form of energy

\textsuperscript{280} \textit{Musical Herald}, 1 May 1901.
\textsuperscript{281} \textit{Hymn to Sydney}, \textit{op.cit.}, p.10.
\textsuperscript{282} Quoted in Parker, \textit{op.cit.}, p.122.
\textsuperscript{283} \textit{ibid.}, p.231.
\textsuperscript{284} \textit{Musical Standard}, 11 March 1905.
came into play, and exhausted itself, leaving behind the seeds of future endeavour.²⁸⁵

In the case of Symbolism the disagreement was even greater, this being an outlook, which was more attracted to the 'life-numbing languor' of Tama-Guna²⁸⁶. Its chief interest, according to Gustave Moreau, a leading exponent of the movement, was in the 'Beauty of Inertia'²⁸⁷.

Examples can be found, at the Pre-Raphaelite end of the Symbolist spectrum in what the French critic, Robert de Sizeraine, called the 'impression of exquisite weariness,'²⁸⁸ of such Burne-Jones works as The Bequiling of Merlin²⁸⁹. At the decadent end it found expression in the 'extase langoureuse ... la fatigue amoureuse',²⁹⁰, and the 'ennui dense'²⁹¹ of Verlaine's 'Langueur'. It was epitomised in Poe's 'lethargy of will',²⁹², in Baudelaire's 'dismal forcing house of ennui',²⁹³, in the 'cerebral

²⁸⁵Ibid.
²⁸⁷Quoted in Lucie-Smith, op.cit., p.63.
²⁸⁸Ibid., p.46.
²⁸⁹Lady Lever Art Gallery, Port Sunlight.
²⁹⁰Richardson, op.cit., p.84.
²⁹¹In ibid., p.189, 24.
²⁹²In Huysmans, op.cit., p.191.
²⁹³Ibid., p.147.
lassitude' and 'sensual satiety' of Goncourt's La Faustine, and in Huysmans' Des Esseintes, who, 'exhausted by life,' was 'overwhelmed by an immense weariness, by a longing for peace and quiet.' Marshall-Hall's values were a good deal closer to those of Symbolism's arch enemy, Emile Zola, who coveted a 'sturdy, powerful temperament enamoured of the luxuriance of life, of full blooded vigour.' What the Melbourne musician most prized (on the psychological side of his philosophy) was 'constant activity ... constant striving,' which demanded 'our whole energy, our whole soul,' the 'exercise of [our] utmost capabilities.'

That significant similarities existed between his creed and those of Schopenhauer and the Symbolists is undeniable. All three, for example, shared the characteristic Romantic preoccupation with emotion, intuition and subjectivity. But if Romanticism is construed as a continuum whose poles are defined in terms of the value placed on energy expenditure through the exercise of will, then Marshall-Hall is located at one end, while Schopenhauer and the Symbolists are at the other. To put the musician at the Schopenhauer/
Symbolist extremity is to overstate the logical, at the expense of the psychological roots of his belief system.

8. Energy, Artist and Hero

It was his views on energy expenditure in the field of art that were particularly structurally conducive to conflict with Melbourne Hebraism. To attribute to Marshall-Hall, as Babbington does, the conviction 'that all could be left to the extra-musical vision, that the composer could abdicate from conscious consideration of musical construction and shape,' is to fail to consider his utterances in their entirety. It is true, as we have seen, that he placed great importance on the spontaneous and unconscious nature of creativity and appreciation. But he also emphasised the formidable character of the obstacles to success. In art, he insisted, there were 'no highways to greatness. The way lies through thick scrub, and must be traced axe in hand.' And this 'demanded continuous labour, unremitting attention and diligence, conscientious perseverance in drudgery ... and firm self-control.' Even genius 'has laboriously to acquire' the essential technical skill before it is 'able to make itself apparent to the world.'

300 Babbington, M.Mus., p.61.
301 pp.173-176.
302 Australasian Schoolmaster, March 1895.
303 Ibíd.
304 Musical World, 13 July 1889.
There is, of course, a degree of conflict between this and his teaching that art, to be authentic, must emerge spontaneously and effortlessly from the noumenal unconscious. It is symptomatic of the general disjunctive tension introduced into his thinking with its psychological premises. But it is not so grave as to fracture irreparably the broad unity of his outlook.

It is true that he considered the highest experience to be 'founded on man's natural instinct'\textsuperscript{305} - which arose spontaneously from the unconscious, and was expressed as emotion. But such spontaneous expression occurred only if the mind had been carefully prepared. And it was this which demanded much painstaking and strenuous effort. The psyche, he explained (invoking a, for him, rare mechanistic image), has three channels along which 'nerve force'\textsuperscript{306} can move, each representing a different kind of mental experience, namely sensation, reason and emotion. Of these, it will always take the most habitual and most open route\textsuperscript{307}. The energetic brain 'cudgelling',\textsuperscript{308} which was so important in artistic endeavour, acted 'as gradual emotive discipline'\textsuperscript{309}, which 'had the effect of widening the emotional tract'.\textsuperscript{310} It 'excavated a channel

\textsuperscript{305}Table Talk, 12 May 1893.
\textsuperscript{306}Alma Mater, July 1899.
\textsuperscript{307}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{308}Alma Mater, August 1899.
\textsuperscript{309}Alma Mater, July 1899.
\textsuperscript{310}Alma Mater, August, 1899.
through which emotions run automatically without any intellectual exertion. Only then did the composition come, 'all spontaneous and without brain cudgelling,' so that the artist is 'not aware that his brain has been at work' and he finds 'that his themes have developed themselves, but without his conscious aid. The episodes and codas have fallen into their right places.' It was in this sense that 'genius conceals the capacity for taking great pains.'

Thus, Marshall-Hall was able to complain, without contradicting himself, of a performance of Schubert's Unfinished Symphony, that 'the general effect lacked spontaneity.' It 'sounded to me as if it was being played without rehearsal, as probably was the case.' Similarly, he could insist that, before a concert, the listener should study the technical details of each piece, so thoroughly that it 'should, so to speak, have become a part of oneself, it should start up in one's mind at odd times and places, when one is scarcely conscious for the time what it is'. But once in the concert hall he should 'take his spectacles from his nose and throw his book to the dogs and give himself altogether to the sensuous impression of the work.'

\[\text{\textit{Ibid.}}\]
\[\text{\textit{Alma Mater}, July 1899.}\]
\[\text{\textit{Weekly Times}, 30 December 1899.}\]
\[\text{\textit{Argus}, 30 March 1907.}\]
\[\text{\textit{Unidentified newspaper cutting, context August 1910.}}\]
This image of mental functions taking place in cerebral channels whose laborious excavation enhances their effectiveness betrays a debt to the faculty psychology of his day, which saw the mind as consisting of discrete capacities for operating in certain given ways, called faculties - emotional, intellectual, aesthetic, etc. These, it was held, had to be trained in order to perform their assigned functions to maximum effect. Another prominent figure, whose views were tinged with the same theory, was the educationalist, Frank Tate, who became a friend of Marshall-Hall, and it is interesting to speculate on how the two may have influenced each other's educational thinking in this regard. However, Marshall-Hall was not, himself, a faculty psychologist, since he insisted, as we have seen, that the mind was an indivisible unity, the separation of whose functions was useful for heuristic purposes, but did not correspond with reality.\textsuperscript{316}

What helped to bring him into conflict with Hebraism was the view that art, in addition to its periechontological role of exhibiting the 'hidden unity in things apparently most diverse'\textsuperscript{317}, also helped to compensate for the loss of whole meanings by acting as 'a sort of storehouse of energy',\textsuperscript{318} (emotion being 'the play of active energy in conscious being').\textsuperscript{319} It embodied an

\textsuperscript{316} \textit{Table Talk}, 12 May 1893.
\textsuperscript{317} \textit{Alma Mater}, August 1899.
\textsuperscript{318} \textit{Alma Mater}, April 1900.
\textsuperscript{319} \textit{Alma Mater}, June 1900.
'overflowing vitality and ardent energy',\textsuperscript{320} an 'heroic God-like energy of resistance'.\textsuperscript{321} And this it could communicate - 'transmitting from mind to mind that inner depth of feeling which stirs up in man the will and power to act',\textsuperscript{322} whereby 'man has endeavoured to compensate himself for the inevitable malice of fortune'.\textsuperscript{323} By stimulating 'our vitality, our power, our will to an extraordinary degree',\textsuperscript{324} it fortified that 'masculine strength of the spirit',\textsuperscript{325} which enabled us to turn a 'determined, resolute face to whatever the destinies confront us with',\textsuperscript{326} and to rise 'superior to every adverse shock and to death itself'.\textsuperscript{327}

But to achieve this, art must be a 'depiction of excess energy'.\textsuperscript{328} Its creator must be, not merely a person of 'exceptional vital energy',\textsuperscript{329} but one whose 'heart is over-great for its surroundings and ... therefore is forced

\textsuperscript{320} Alma Mater, July 1900.
\textsuperscript{321} Quoted in Babington, M.Mus., p.63.
\textsuperscript{322} Argus, 2 August 1899.
\textsuperscript{323} Monthly Musical Record, 1 July 1899.
\textsuperscript{324} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{325} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{326} Marshall-Hall Orchestral Concert Programme, 19 June 1909 in NYCA.
\textsuperscript{327} Herald, 28 February 1901.
\textsuperscript{328} Weekly Times, 30 December 1899 (emphasis mine).
\textsuperscript{329} Herald, 28 February 1901.
to seek an outlet for its surplus energy in world's less material than this.\textsuperscript{330}

That is to say, the energy which artists embody in their art is that which is left over after they have expended themselves to the utmost in the practical business of living. So, before 'we can produce art that will live we must have first learned to live ourselves.'\textsuperscript{331}

Marshall-Ball deplored the popular idea of a creative musician, \textit{[as] a man who, removing his delicate self far from the roughness and coarseness of every day life, clad in slippers and dressing gown of the most "refined" mode, gives himself over to "delicious dreaming" languor, in which blissful state he evolves melting strains to captivate the hearts of moon-eyed ... damsels.}\textsuperscript{332}

Rather was he one who had applied himself to exuberant living with all the energy it demanded, putting 'his whole soul into his life.'\textsuperscript{333}, and extending 'as far as possible' his 'own emotional capacity.'\textsuperscript{334}

This, however, was incompatible with the strict maintenance of a sharp demarcation between the ethical sacred and the profane, by means of a scrupulous avoidance of sin. It clearly required the artist to taste life in 'all its phases,'\textsuperscript{335}, living 'fully and recklessly, not egg-like but

\textsuperscript{330}{\textit{Musical Standard}}, 15 December 1891 (emphasis mine).
\textsuperscript{331}{\textit{Alma Mater}}, May 1900.
\textsuperscript{332}{\textit{Musical World}}, 23 February 1899.
\textsuperscript{333}{\textit{Alma Mater}}, August 1899.
\textsuperscript{334}{\textit{Table Talk}}, 12 May 1893.
\textsuperscript{335}{\textit{Herald}}, 28 February 1901 (emphasis mine).
with passion, coming to know at first hand "the inexhaustible variety of sensations", gaining a manifold experience of life — somehow, anyhow.

Indeed, Marshall-Hall insisted that evils were "the invariable concomitants of a manifold vitality". He was convinced that "so long as man strives he must err". and striving was, of all activities, the one he most valued:

The soil where e'en wild oats won't grow
Is naught or little worth, I trow.

Therefore, he could not, he declared, quoting Milton,

praise a fugitive, cloistered virtue,
unexercised, and unpractised, that never
sallies out and sees her adversary ....
That virtue ... which is but a youngling
in the contemplation of evil, and knows
not the utmost that vice promises to her
fellows ... is but a blank virtue, not a
pure; her whiteness is but an excremental
whiteness.

To make matters worse, it was not only artists who, he argued, had to experience sin, but all who were possessed of 'heroic' — in the sense of 'supremely energetic' — temperaments. Their activities, he

---

336 Alma Mater, August 1899.
337 Herald, 28 February 1901.
338 Alma Mater, August 1899; Magazine of Music, October 1891.
339 Musical Standard, 5 December 1891.
340 Wild Oats' in Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit., p.41.
341 Alma Mater, July 1899.
342 Green, 20 November 1900.
believed, constituted 'the supreme manifestation of joy's strength',\textsuperscript{343} to attain which, however, they 'must taste life to the full,' experiencing 'its every phase',\textsuperscript{344}.

To them 'nothing human is strange',\textsuperscript{345} and therefore expends itself in many directions and not only in those we deem right and proper and best for humanity',\textsuperscript{346}.

That is to say, their passions were not 'unhealthy', even when mischievous in outcome.

Thus, Marshall-Hall preferred the morally imperfect Tannhäuser, who generates a 'much higher grade of objectification of energy and enriches the world by an infinitely greater amount of vital force',\textsuperscript{347} than does the 'blameless and docile ... and ... unselfish' Wolfram, who 'has no faults, and commits no sins', but who 'represents a very mild and ineffectual form of energy'.\textsuperscript{348} In the same opera, he preferred Venus, whose 'sins and ... virtues are all of an heroic, splendid cast', to the spotlessly virtuous Elizabeth, who had 'nothing of that splendid energy which impresses us as heroic'.\textsuperscript{349}

\textsuperscript{343}Herald, 1 October 1902.
\textsuperscript{344}Alma Mater, July 1899 (emphasis mine).
\textsuperscript{345}Marshall-Hall Orchestral Concert Programme, September 1896 in MMCA.
\textsuperscript{346}Alma Mater, July 1899.
\textsuperscript{347}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{348}Alma Mater, July 1899.
\textsuperscript{349}Ibid.
The offensiveness of this to Hebraic ears was, no doubt, enhanced by the fact that it was a period in which what had been called the Byronic obsession with the 'great bad man' was far from dead. It survived in Raskolnikov's justification of the brutal murder of Alyona Ivanovna, in Jacques Lantier's reflections on 'the right of the strong to destroy the weak who get in their way', and, of course, in Nietzsche's distinction between a 'master morality and a herd morality'. It was often embodied in contemporary portrayals of the artist, who, according to Henry Handel Richardson's character, Krafft, 'has as much to do with morality as, let us say, your music festivals have to do with art'. Similarly, Gilbert in Wilde's 'The Critic as Artist', declared that 'Even a colour sense is more important, in the development of the individual, than a sense of right and wrong'. And in 1885 Ruskin advised painters that if a man should 'die at your feet, your business is not to help him, but to note the colour of his lips'.

350 Lucie-Smith, op.cit., p.51.
353 Quoted Peckham, op.cit., p.328.
355 Quoted in R.W. Beardsmore, Art and Morality, London, 1971, p.31: the author's conviction for sodomy in 1895, no doubt, increased, in Hebraic eyes, the danger of the anti-Semitism he (and Marshall-Hall) were held to represent.
In Melbourne, *Table Talk* contended that musicians in general were 'hardly to be measured by the strictest standards of the ordinary citizen'. And, comparing Marshall-Hall's offence with George Eliot's extramarital relationship with George Henry Lewes, the same journal argued that his artistic 'eminence' should protect the musician, as it did the novelist, from Hebraic censure. Likewise, in 1913 'Epistemon' was to argue that Marshall-Hall was 'a person neither to be judged nor condemned by the ordinary standards that serve well enough in the case of the tame upholders of the parish pump'.

These, then, were some of the differences in outlook between Marshall-Hall and his Hebraic enemies, that were structurally conducive to the conflict that occurred. They reflected the Hellenic orientation of Marshall-Hall's Weltanschauung, which, while displaying an obvious debt to philosophical idealism, owed little of its characteristic thrust to Schopenhauer or Symbolism. It had much in common with Nietzsche's Dionysian protest against the futility and meaninglessness that, in the absence of traditional consolations, increasingly defined the age. But its very idealism was at odds with the latter's realism.

If the musician must be slotted into a philosophical category, perhaps the most appropriate is Existentialism.

---

357 June 1900.
358 Ibid.
359 *Triad*, 10 March 1913.
whose central thrust, like his, is the search for authenticity. And it is interesting to note the significant congruence between Sartre and Marshall-Hall in this regard. To the former, authenticity constituted a return to the non-intentional, pre-reflective cogito - that is to say, to 'the immediate non-cognitive relation of the self to the self', or to thought without an object. This is strikingly similar to Marshall-Hall's description of the same experience as that of being lost 'in the individuality of the object ... which thus exists at the time for the spectator (subject) as the only object in the universe, indeed (inasmuch as subject and object are one) as a more or less self-conscious (but otherwise unconscious) subject.'

Marshall-Hall's anguish at the irreconcilability of free will and facticity is also a quintessentially Existentialist attitude, as is his resolve to seek consolation in energy expenditure. That is to say, Existentialism, which also prizes emotion and instinct, is located at the same extremity of the Romantic continuum as was Melbourne's first Ormond Professor of Music.

---

362 My emphasis, *Summons*, December 1892.
363 Macquarrie, *op. cit.*, p.150.
365 See above, p.203.
It is true that Existentialism is generally regarded as a revolt against the idealist tradition\textsuperscript{366}. But, in practice, its exponents do not reject metaphysics quite as unequivocally as a reading of Nietzsche alone might suggest\textsuperscript{367}. Nor, as we have seen, were Marshall-Hall's ontological beliefs as important in shaping his behaviour, as a mere reading of the logical side of his ideation might suggest.

The structurally conducive conditions that helped bring him into conflict with the Hebraic section of the local community included the subjective character of his epistemology and axiology, which made instinct, for him, the source of knowledge and value. He treasured human differences, celebrated happiness gained in whole-hearted participation in the pleasures of this world, believed man to be naturally virtuous, and generally judged behaviour by its consequences, but subordinated morality to heroic energy expenditure.

His enemies, by contrast, distrusted instinct, viewing human nature as the essentially evil expression of original sin, and, therefore, to be suppressed. They defined evil without reference to its consequences, seeking knowledge and ethical imperatives in a body of external doctrine, which conserved whole meanings, and to whose decrees


\textsuperscript{367} See Clara Brinton, \textit{Nietzsche, op.cit.}, p. 90.
they demanded total conformity in thought and behaviour. And they insisted on a rigid separation of the sacred from the profane, which precluded toleration of wrong-doing in any form and under any circumstances, and reprobated Christian participation in the pleasures of this world. In terms of Martin's R', these Hebraic characteristics were some of the underlying factors that caused the musician's opponents to respond as they did to the situation perceived by them to exist. Others still remain to be considered at the appropriate place in the argument.
CHAPTER 3

STRAIN

But the structurally conducive elements were not, of course, on their own, sufficient to account for the episode in question. This requires, firstly, a consideration of the next stage in Smelser's value-added process, namely, that of strain\(^1\), which occurs when the 'relations among parts of a system' are impaired\(^2\) to the extent that the participants 'perceive the precipitating incident as symbolic of a troubled state of affairs'\(^3\) and are, accordingly, induced to 'mobilize to reconstitute the social order in the name of a [structurally conducive] generalised belief'\(^4\). Together with the precipitating event, strain constitutes the perceived situation, specified by Martin in his first condition, to which the protagonists react in the light of their underlying beliefs.

The main concern of this chapter, then, will be to identify and analyse the ingredients of that situation whose pressure on community tolerance was such as to

\(^1\)Smelser, op.cit., p.11.
\(^2\)Ibid., p.384.
\(^3\)Ibid., p.266.
\(^4\)Ibid., p.385.
increase significantly the likelihood of conflict over Marshall-Hall’s utterances of 1898. Attention will focus primarily on three areas of strain. Firstly, Hebraism’s assessment of the condition of contemporary morality and esteem for the numinous will be examined in the light of the (then) recent developments in Biblical and scientific scholarship. Then, consideration will be given to a number of misunderstandings that emerged concerning Marshall-Hall’s religious beliefs, and his ‘social’ ethics. And finally, the importance of his occupancy of an eminent position in a publicly funded educational institution, and the perceived use he made of it, will be investigated. In the course of these inquiries a number of additional structurally conducive beliefs will emerge, relating to Hebraic Manicheanism, contemporary conceptions of the connection between religious faith and civil order, and the vulnerability of youth, women and musicians to moral corruption.

1. The Degraded Present

Strain can assume a number of forms, which cannot always be sharply distinguished from either the conditions of structural conduciveness or the precipitating events with which it combines to produce an episode of collective action. It often occurs during periods of perceived rapid change, which one section of society, due to certain possibilities, feels called upon to resist[^5]. At such

[^5]: Ibid., p.291.
times, it can take the form of what Alex de Jonge, in another context, has called a strong sense of 'the degraded present' — a conviction, that is, that the debased quality of the times poses an exceptionally potent threat to the protagonists' values, and, therefore, demands an unusually resolute defensive response.

It is true that Melbourne Hebraism was far from unaffected by the faith in progress that was so characteristic of the age. It 'was,' declared the Rev. W.H. Fitchett, 'a mistaken fancy of the poets to say that the golden age lay behind us', since 'there had been more progress in Christianity during the sixty years of Queen Victoria's reign than during all the eighteen centuries that went before it'. This was reflected, according to various other Hebraic spokesmen, in 'a deepening spiritual life', an increasing 'evangelical ardour', a growing 'belief in the active influence of Omnipotence upon all human affairs', and in 'the immense strides we have made and are making to purer morals and nobler laws'.

6 Alex de Jonge, Dostoevsky and the Age of Intensity, London, 1975, p.16.

7 Southern Cross, 15 December 1898; see also e.g. Victorian Independent, February 1899; Southern Cross, July 1900.

8 PGC&M, November 1897, Appendix p.xvii.

9 Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1898.

10 Victorian Independent, July 1900.

11 Argus, 27 August 1896.
Yet, this optimism coexisted with a feeling that the world was passing through a period of momentous change in many directions, not all of them, by any means, undesirable, but which imperilled traditional values. In the nineties, remembered English poet, critic, editor and bibliophile, Holbrook Jackson, 'people felt they were living amid changes and struggles, intellectual, social and spiritual.'

The same sentiment was manifested in Melbourne by the Argus, which declared it to be 'by no means an unmixed blessing to live in an age of such rapid transition as that upon which the load of this generation has fallen.' Similarly, the Southern Baptist fretted about the 'new hitherto slumbering forces' that had in this 'time of unrest' been aroused 'by the newspapers and the other powerful stimulants of the modern world.' And the Dean of Ballarat assured a Church Assembly that 'the crisis now upon us is one of the most momentous importance to spiritual truth.'

Perhaps the most threatening symptom of this crisis was the battering to which the Bible had been subjected in the

---

13 Argus, 16 January 1895.
14 Southern Baptist, 2 August 1900.
15 Southern Baptist, 3 February 1898.
16 Church of England Messenger, 1 April 1899; see also Sir Henry Wrixon, The Religion of the Common Man, Vic., 1909, p.4.
19th century by literary and scientific criticism. While a degree of fundamentalist literalism persisted\textsuperscript{17}, the first shock of the major scholarly revelations had, of course, long passed by the turn of the century. In fact, it had already passed some 40 years earlier, even before the appearance of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859) and its companion piece, *Essays and Reviews* (1860), produced by the notorious 'seven against Christ',\textsuperscript{18}.

The high point of the controversy in the English-speaking world had occurred in the 1840s. Before that there had been some muted debate, largely confined to learned circles, over the implications of books such as Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (1830-2)\textsuperscript{19}, and the Rev. Hart Milman's *History of the Jews* (1830)\textsuperscript{20}, which raised questions about the age of the earth and the authenticity of Old Testament miracles.

Then, the main division had been, not between believers and unbelievers, but between 'liberals' such as Lyell, who

\textsuperscript{17} See e.g. Isaac Moore in *Age*, 2 May 1898; Revs. R.S. Patterson, W.M. Dill Mackay and W.S. Frackleton in *Argus*, 9 March 1894; 'Australian Native' in *Weekly Times*, 11 March 1899; Rev. J.H. Mackay in *Argus*, 6 July 1894; *Southern Baptist*, 18 January 1900, 14 April 1898; *Spectator*, 17 June 1897; *Southern Cross*, 22 February 1901; B. Borsa in *Argus*, 21 November 1900; W.H. Calder, in *Argus*, 11 June 1894.

\textsuperscript{18} i.e. six Anglican clergymen and a layman. It argued for a less literal interpretation of the Bible.


\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p.65.
inclined towards deism, denying the creator a continuing
role in the universe, and 'conservatives' such as Adam
Roddick, who insisted that new species came about as a
result of miraculous divine intervention. Neither side
had had difficulty conceding a universe far older than
would have been permitted by a literal interpretation of
the six 'days' of Genesis as 24 hour periods, the first
of which coincided with the commencement of time. And
neither had been attracted to the idea of new species
evolving from older ones. Most important of all, the
argument from design had remained firmly in place, having
been, if anything, strengthened by the 'Bridgewater
Treatises' of the 1830s.

It was the publication in 1844 of Robert Chambers'
highly speculative *Vestiges of the Natural History of
Creation* which brought the matter to the notice of the
public at large, and gave rise to impassioned and wide-
spread controversy. Chambers postulated evolutionary

---

22 Ibid., pp.67-8.
23 Ibid., pp.75-6, 87. There were, of course, exceptions, such as Baden Powell, who already favoured
24 Eight works commissioned by the will of the 8th Earl
25 Initially anonymous, Chambers' authorship was not
26 Ibid.
change guided by natural law without divine intervention\textsuperscript{27}. This rang alarm bells in Christian quarters where it was seen as denying both design and human immortality\textsuperscript{28}. Chambers' suggestion that evolution was still incomplete and could one day produce a 'higher' type than humanity was not likely to win favour among people who believed man to have been created in the image of God\textsuperscript{29}.

Nevertheless, the debate simmered down during the next decade\textsuperscript{30}, partly, no doubt, because little that was new and startling appeared between the publication of Vestiges and that of Darwin's \textit{Origin}, but partly also, one imagines, because of the return to economic prosperity after the 'hungry forties', when fears of 'godless' revolution had been endemic\textsuperscript{31}. The enormous popularity of Tennyson's 'In Memoriam' (first published in 1850)\textsuperscript{32} indicates that considerable sections of public opinion had become reconciled to evolutionism - a reconciliation for which

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., pp.103-4.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., pp.114-5.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p.113.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p.127.
\textsuperscript{31} It is significant in this connection that the reception given to the \textit{Descent of Man} was conditioned by its appearance at the time of the Paris Commune. John Morley recalled the manner in which the author had been reprimanded for 'revealing his zoological conclusions to the general public at a moment when the sky of Paris was red with the incendiary flames of the Commune', see Morley, \textit{Recollections}, London, 1917, Vol.1, p.101, quoted by Walter Houghton, \textit{The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870}, New Haven and London, 1979, p.59.
\textsuperscript{32} Puse, \textit{op.cit.}, p.151.
the poem itself was no doubt partly responsible\textsuperscript{33}. No great outcry greeted Anglican divine and Oxford professor, Baden Powell, when in 1855 he affirmed that 'a world evolved by a long train of orderly disposed physical causes is a higher proof of supreme intelligence than one in whose structure we can trace no indication of such progressive action'\textsuperscript{34}.

Michael Ruse is probably correct in regarding Chambers' book as a 'lightning rod' which had drawn off much of the fury that would otherwise have greeted Darwin and the authors of \textit{Essays and Reviews}\textsuperscript{35}. In addition, of course, the greater scientific merit of Darwin's work - conforming as it did more closely than \textit{Vestiges} to the hypothetico-deductive Newtonian model so prized by 19th century empiricism - helped to make it more acceptable\textsuperscript{36}. As a result, Darwin had a respectable following never enjoyed by Chambers. By the mid seventies both the president and secretary of the Royal Society (Hooker and Huxley) were Darwinists\textsuperscript{37} - the latter of whom, though an agnostic, had gone on record as supporting compulsory Biblical studies in schools\textsuperscript{38}.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., p.151.
\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., p.155.
\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p.127, 132.
\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p.268.
\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., p.265.
\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., p.251.
Yet, there still was an initial outcry against both the *Origin* and *Essays and Reviews*, the latter being fiercely denounced by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself. But evolution was soon being turned to Christian ends, although it was more often Lamarckian than Darwinian in colouring, natural selection being difficult to reconcile with Christian notions of design and of the special place assigned to man in creation. The fact that scientists generally had more trouble with natural selection than evolution may have rendered the latter less threatening to Christians. Also the 12-year gap between Darwin's initial discussion of non-human development in the *Origin* and the publication of *The Descent of Man* (1871) may have given people time to get used to one shock before being confronted with another — although the human implications of the earlier work had not gone unnoticed.

Be that as it may, there was soon no dearth of followers of the Duke of Argyll, who accepted evolution with the sole proviso that the human spirit was of direct divine origin, or of Harvard geology professor, Joseph Le Conte, whose Lamarckian *Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought* found particular favour among clergymen. Similarly,

---

39 Ibid., p. 239, 202-3.

40 See e.g. St. George Mivart's *Genesis of Species* (1871); Ruse, *op. cit.*, p. 229, 205.

41 Ruse, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

Herbert Spencer's *Factors of Organic Evolution* (1887) (also Lamarckian) had a significant impact on Christians, many of whom had little difficulty identifying Spencer's Unknowable - 'that through which all things exist' - with God. The respectability achieved by the new ideas, both scientific and literary, was symbolised in the appointment in 1896 as Archbishop of Canterbury of Frederick Temple, contributor to *Essays and Reviews*, who, in his 1885 Hampton Lectures, had denied any essential conflict between Darwinism and Christianity.

In Australia, too, the Hebraic cry by this time was, typically, that the Bible 'may be subjected to the same class of criticism as any other ancient documents of about the same age and style', and that Christians could safely make to both scientists and Higher Critics 'the frank concessions of all the modification of our theological position which the results of their work demands.'

---

43 E.g., Henry Ward Beecher, see *ibid.*, p.168.
45 *Southern Baptist*, 15 March 1900.
46 Rev. W.C. Wallace in *Argus*, 17 November 1900; see also *Spectator*, 15 February 1901, 23 November 1900; Church of England Messenger, 3 July 1914; Rev. R. Stephen in *Argus*, September 1898; H.F. Tucker in *Argus*, 27 August 1894; Rev. A. Gosman in *Argus*, 22 November 1900; Victorian Independent, November 1900; Alfred E. Gifford in *Spectator* September 1899; H.E. Merriman in *Spectator*, 22 September 1899; J. Lawrence Rentoul in *Victorian Standard*, 28 February 1900; Ross, *op. cit.*, p.373; Andrew Harper in *Argus*, 5 July 1900; P.J. Murdoch in *Argus*, 28 June 1900; Bishop F.F. Gore, 19 May 1893; Dr. A.M. Fairbairn in *Victorian Independent*, March 1900; Rev. S. Peace Cary in *Leader*, 7 November 1899; *Southern Cross*, 7 September 1900; *Austral Light*, May 1899; *Southern Baptist*, 12 July 1900; *Australian Christian*, October 1899; *Mitre*, 1 August 1899; *Presbyterian Monthly*, October 1899.
Nevertheless, even soli-disant champions of the new
teaching complained that it tended 'too often to unsettle
and perplex' the faithful\textsuperscript{47}, and served 'as a convenient
excuse for ... indifference'\textsuperscript{48} among 'those who do not know
the love of God, and are not in fellowship with him'\textsuperscript{49}.

The apprehension engendered is well illustrated by the
glee with which Hebraism commonly greeted the 'furious
civil war [that] rages amongst the critics'\textsuperscript{50} and,
especially, any report of an archaeological discovery\textsuperscript{51}, or
the utterances of an eminent scientist\textsuperscript{52}, that supported
a literal, biblical interpretation.

\textsuperscript{47} Dean of Ballarat in Australian Christian World,
20 January 1899; see also e.g. Southern Cross, 12 April 1900;
Rev. W. C. Wallace in Argus, 13 November 1900; Southern
Cross, 23 September 1898; Southern Baptist, 28 April 1898;
Ballarat Church Chronicle, 7 November 1900.

\textsuperscript{48} Rev. H. L. Jackson in Centennial Magazine, Vol. 2, No. 5,
December 1889; see also e.g. Dean of Ballarat in Church of
England Messenger, 1 August 1898; W. Blamires in Spectator,
1 September 1899; E. Stranger in Spectator, 4 November 1899;
Searchlight, July 1896; Ballarat Church Chronicle,
7 November 1900; Cardinal Moran in Victorian Standard,
28 February 1900; Australian Christian World, 9 March 1900;
Austral Light, May 1900.

\textsuperscript{49} Rev. W. Y. Blackwell in cutting from Spectator in
E. H. Sugden's scrapbook, context May 1904, in Queen's College
Archives; see also e.g. Southern Baptist, 1 March 1901,
12 April 1900; Dean of Ballarat in Church of England
Messenger, 1 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{50} Southern Cross, 7 September 1900; see also e.g.
Southern Cross, 3 February 1899; Australian Christian,
23 February 1899.

\textsuperscript{51} See e.g. Australian Christian, 26 May 1898; Southern
Cross, 3 March 1898; Cardinal Moran in Austral Light,
August 1899; Victorian Churchman, 26 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{52} See e.g. Church of England Messenger, 1 March 1899;
Southern Baptist, 1 December 1898, 29 February 1898; 'A.W.W.'
Southern Baptist, 18 January 1900; 'T.W.' in Herald,
3 September 1898; Searchlight, July 1896; Ballarat Church
Chronicle, 7 November 1900.
The trouble was (partly) that some of the prevalent theories, such as that of kenosis, and those which blurred the distinction between sacred and profane by proclaiming that man was 'the first cousin to the ape', were considered to be inconsistent with Christian profession. Others were said to obscure the limits of the sacred, and thus weaken adherence to prevailing religion, by encouraging people to regard the Bible, not as 'unique', but as in no essential different from 'the sacred books of the East'. Others, again, reportedly threatened orthodoxy by asserting that 'some is true and some is error' in the Bible, while providing (to Protestants, anyway) 'no authority outside of the Bible itself to guide the reader', forcing them, in effect, back to a

---

53 The belief that, in respect to wordly, especially scientific and historical matters, Christ's knowledge, during his earthly life, was not in advance of his times. See e.g. Southern Baptist, 16 August, 1 March 1901, 2 August 1900, 29 December 1898, 29 March 1900, 12 April 1900.

54 Southern Cross, 9 August 1898; see also e.g. Austral Light, January 1899; Ballarat Church Chronicle, 7 November 1900; J. Lawrence Rentoul in Argus, 12 September 1893, and in Age, 25 November 1898; Canon Robert Potter in Argus, 25 September 1898; Southern Baptist, 17 January 1901; Father John McEncroe in Austral Light, July 1898; S.S. Crispo in Church of England Messenger, 1 March 1899; 'Perplexed' in Herald, 30 August 1898; Australian Christian, 30 November 1899.

55 See e.g. Mitre, 1 August 1898, 1 February 1900; Rev. E.C. Wallace in Australian Herald, December 1900; Australian Christian, 25 January 1900.

56 T.J. Malyon in Southern Baptist, 12 April 1900.

57 Southern Baptist, 1 June 1899; see also e.g. Austral Light, May 1900; Spectator, 3 November 1894; Rev. G. McInnes in Argus, 9 March 1894.
subjective epistemology. And the danger posed in all these respects was believed to have been intensified by the recent spread of literacy, which, declared the University's Vice-Chancellor, Sir Henry Wrixon, meant that 'difficult, and at times perplexing' problems, which are involved in the question of the truth of Religion, and which used to tax the strength of the trained intellects of the world, are now passed on to the contention of the market place.\textsuperscript{58}

Christianity, itself, was said to be imperilled, having been, according to the Argus, under serious threat only three times in its history— at 'the collapse of the Roman Empire, during the Renaissance, and in the present day.'\textsuperscript{59} The sentiment was widely echoed by others who declared theirs to be 'a critical and sceptical age,'\textsuperscript{60} 'deeply impregnated' with 'scepticism of the heart and of the life.'\textsuperscript{61} They believed themselves to be witnessing 'a spreading indifference to the claims of Christ,'\textsuperscript{62} and 'a decline of practical belief in a higher power.'\textsuperscript{63} That 'section of

\textsuperscript{58}Wrixon, op.cit., p.3; see also e.g. Prebendary Wace in Victorian Churchman, 28 December 1900; Southern Baptist, 12 June 1900; Christian Citizen, 19 April 1900; Ballarat Church Chronicle, 17 November 1900; Rev. W.C. Wallace in Argus, 17 January 1900; Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop and Bishops of the province of Melbourne in O'Farrell, Op.cit., p.118; Austral Light, May 1900.

\textsuperscript{59}Argus, 9 May 1898.

\textsuperscript{60}Church of England Messenger, 1 April 1899; see also Australian Christian World, 20 January 1899.

\textsuperscript{61}Church of England Messenger, 1 January 1899.

\textsuperscript{62}Southern Baptist, 30 November 1899.

\textsuperscript{63}Argus, 13 August 1914; see also Rev. A. Webb in Victorian Churchman, 23 February 1900; Austral Light, January 1900; Southern Baptist, 2 February 1899; Church of England Messenger, 1 November 1899.
the community, utterly without religion', was said to be 'growing more influential and numerous every year', 64, while 'ministers of Religion, from the Pope down to the youngest curate, were tolerated more as relics of a superstitious bygone age, than venerated for their work's sake ...' 65.

This was seen to be reflected in a fall in the number of conversions 66 and a mounting propensity among unbelievers to 'scoff at religion', 67, to 'sneer at the Church and the religious institutions which their Godly parents loved'. 68 Among believers, it reportedly manifested itself in a 'growing indifference to, and alienation from, organised Christianity', 69, a 'growing tendency to stand aloof from the Church and its affairs', 70, and a consequent decline in


65 Rev. Dr. Torrance in Argus, 1 July 1895.

66 See e.g. Southern Baptist, 15 February 1900; Rev. A. Isaacs in Argus, 16 November 1898, Southern Baptist, 29 June 1899.

67 Australasian Intercollegian, 2 October 1899.

68 C.S. Ross, The Scottish Church in Victoria 1851-1901, Melbourne 1901, p.137; see also e.g. Southern Baptist, 15 November 1900; Ballarat Church Chronicle, 1 March 1894; Spectator, 3 September 1897, A. Harper, Op.cit., p.24; Victorian Independent, July 1900.

69 President of the South Australian Baptist Union voted in Tocsin, 15 December 1904.

70 Rev. H.L. Jackson in Centennial Magazine, 1899; also e.g. Victorian Independent, July 1900.
church connection\textsuperscript{71} and attendance, both on Sundays\textsuperscript{72} and during the week\textsuperscript{73}, as well as a growing disregard for strict Sunday observance\textsuperscript{74} and family worship in the home\textsuperscript{75}.

It was believed to have been accompanied by, and to reflect, a weakening in regard for numinous experience - an attenuation in 'the depth of fervour, the distinctiveness that used to mark Christian people',\textsuperscript{76} and which was being usurped by an increasing preoccupation with the world and its problems. Christianity, it was said, had

\textsuperscript{71}See e.g. Southern Cross, 15 December 1898; Presbyterian Monthly, 1 December 1898, 10 March 1900; Church of England Messenger, 15 December 1899; PPGM November 1897, Appendix p.cix, November 1899, Appendix p.xxvii, November 1900, Appendix p.xix; Presbyterian Messenger, 8 May 1900, 24 August 1900; Rev. W.C. Maconochie in Argus, 15 November 1900; Rev. D. Gordon in Argus, 16 November 1898; J. de B. Griffiths in Argus, 20 September 1898; Rev. W. Clark in Argus, 21 November 1896; Spectator, 8 July 1898.

\textsuperscript{72}See e.g. Southern Cross, 16 February 1900.

\textsuperscript{73}See e.g. PPGM, November 1897, Appendix p.xviii, November 1900, Appendix, p.xix.

\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., November 1898, Appendix p.xix, November 1897, Appendix p.xvii, cxxx; Southern Cross, 10 February 1899, 9 April 1898; Spectator, 22 September 1899; Southern Baptist, 1 February 1898; Christian Citizen, 11 July 1900; Victorian Independent, February 1901.

\textsuperscript{75}See e.g. PPGM, November 1894, Appendix p.xxxvi, November 1893, Appendix p.xviii, November 1896, Appendix xxxvi, November 1893, p.xvii, November 1896, Appendix xxx, November 1897, Appendix p.xvii, November 1899, Appendix xvii; Southern Baptist, 30 November 1899; Stralian Christian World, 15 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{76}Victorian Churchman, 16 February 1900; see also e.g. Southern Baptist, 13 November 1899; Argus, 9 May 1898; W. Dr. Torrance in Argus, 1 July 1895; Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1898; Austral Light, May 1900; W. J. Watsford in Argus, 5 July 1898.
entered 'an age of increasing worldliness'. The centre of religious interest had shifted from the 'mystical' to the 'more practical' sphere of 'better houses, better education, shorter hours of labour, regular work, just pay, a more equal distribution of wealth, perfect sanitation, the elimination of disease, the removal of pauperism'. And Christians now tended 'to dismiss all thought of the unseen world with an impatient wave of the hand, as if it were a meaningless intrusion on the immediate and pressing work of reform'. This, in turn (and significantly), had led to 'the almost total obliteration of the boundary marks between the church and the world', the former having grown 'worldly, frivolous and utterly unfit to fulfil [its] mission'.

In the moral sphere, too, the 'consciousness of guilt seemed to be now less prominent than it used to be'.

77 Southern Baptist, 14 December 1899; see also e.g. EPCH, November 1892, Appendix p.xxii; Southern Cross, 20 October 1899.

78 President of the South Australian Baptist Union in Rossin, 15 December 1904.

79 Mitre, 1 November 1897; see also Mitre, 15 December 1897.

80 Rev. C.H. Nash in Church of England Messenger, 1 July 1900; see also e.g. Southern Cross, 2 October 1899; Southern Baptist, 16 November 1899.

81 Southern Baptist, 16 November 1899; see also e.g. Southern Baptist, 30 November 1899; Ross, op.cit., p.311; Victorian Churchman, 26 February 1900.

82 Rev. P.J. Murdoch in newspaper cutting, Mrs. Ormond's scrapbook, p.90 in Ormond College Archives, context November 1898.
The old notion of a stern, punitive deity was believed to be dying, and instead, 'Our generation thinks of God as Nature grown benevolent.'\(^{83}\) As a result, gambling and alcohol consumption were declared to be on the increase\(^{84}\), as was vice in general\(^{85}\).

The more chaste novels of George Eliot and Jane Austen were, reportedly, being crowded out by modern 'chronicles of illicit passion.'\(^{86}\) English drama was 'suffering from an invasion of ... "Sex maniacs"', amongst whom 'reticence [was] almost a lost virtue.'\(^{87}\), and according to whom life had 'no other interest and literature no other theme than a particular set of relations between men and women.'\(^{88}\)

And the dangers were held to have been multiplied by 'a growing custom to deny that in the touching and handling of pitch there can be any danger of defilement.'\(^{89}\), and in consequence, a 'startling change between the former

\(^{83}\) *Spectator*, 18 September 1914.

\(^{84}\) *Victorian Independent*, August 1900.

\(^{85}\) See e.g. PPGM, November 1893, p.48; *Southern Baptist*, 10 November 1899; *Victorian Independent*, August 1900.

\(^{86}\) *Argus*, 18 April 1903.

\(^{87}\) *Argus*, 15 August 1902; see also e.g. PPGM, November 1893, p.48; *Austral Light*, 1 October 1897; *Southern Cross*, April 1900; *Argus*, 17 April 1900; *Christian Citizen*, June 1901; *Advocate*, 17 April 1900; Rev. W.E. Secomb in *The Lifeboat*, 4 July 1898.

\(^{88}\) *Argus*, 20 April 1895; E.F. Benson is wide of the mark in saying that the literary movement of the nineties encountered little hostility from moralists, 'Victorianism' being 'already dead and buried'; As We Were. *A Victorian Show*, London, 1930, p.317.

\(^{89}\) *Argus*, 8 April 1895 - to deny, that is, the threat to the sacred by the profane.
policy of fencing in the innocent mind and the licence of today.\textsuperscript{90}

The upshot was that Hebraism believed itself to be living in 'a wicked and adulterous age',\textsuperscript{91} in which the 'old idea of marriage forever is fading'\textsuperscript{92} in the face of a 'tremendous and fast-coming revolution which is to abolish marriage, emancipate women and create a new sexual morality',\textsuperscript{93} and ominous adumbrations of which had already appeared in the form of a rising divorce rate\textsuperscript{94} and growing use of contraception\textsuperscript{95}. A time had come, wailed the \textit{Southern Cross}, when the churches 'will have to fight ... as they have never fought since the world was heathen, for the purity and preservation of family life'.\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Argus}, 15 August 1902.

\textsuperscript{91} See e.g. \textit{Searchlight}, June 1896; The Dean of Melbourne in \textit{Argus}, 23 August 1892; Bishop Gallagher in \textit{Herald}, 22 October 1900, \textit{Argus}, 12 October 1895, 6 December 1895; \textit{Southern Baptist}, 30 November 1899; \textit{Southern Cross}, 1 December 1899.

\textsuperscript{92} \textit{Southern Cross}, 10 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{Argus}, 30 March 1895; see also e.g. \textit{Argus}, 12 October 1895, 6 December 1895; \textit{Southern Baptist}, 30 November 1894; \textit{Southern Cross}, 1 December 1899, 10 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{94} \textit{Christian Citizen}, 4 October 1900; see also e.g. \textit{SCH}, November 1892, Appendix p.xxix; \textit{Southern Cross}, 13 August 1900; \textit{Southern Baptist}, 30 November 1899; \textit{Advocate}, 21 July 1900; Bishop Gallagher in \textit{Herald}, 22 October 1900.

\textsuperscript{95} See e.g. \textit{Austral Light}, 1 October 1900; \textit{Southern Baptist}, 17 January 1901.

\textsuperscript{96} 15 December 1899.
And Australia was believed to have been infected by a particularly virulent strain of the virus—a fact that was variously attributed to the youth of the country, its climate, its great size and convict origins, the Aladdin-like chances and changes of the gold fields, the migratory character of the population, the large number of women in the work force, and the inadequacy of facilities for religious instruction in State schools. The Leader was not exaggerating very much when it said, 'A stranger in Melbourne who has been living here and heeds the language of the many church parliaments, must have formed a bright opinion of Victorians as frantic gamblers, attending race courses all day, and putting in the nights smashing all the commandments and painting the town red.'

---

97 See e.g. Sir Henry Wrixon in Table Talk, 28 June 1889; Australasian Review of Reviews, 15 March 1898; Presbyterian Monthly, 1 June 1898; Southern Baptist, 14 December 1899; Argus, 1 May 1907.

98 See e.g. Southern Cross, 8 December 1899; Southern Baptist, 30 November 1899; Sir Henry Wrixon in Table Talk, 2 June 1899; Dr. Torrance in Table Talk, 28 June 1895; Spectator, 17 August 1900; Christian Citizen, 2 January 1902; Dr. Carty Salmon in Tocsin, 11 May 1899; Bishop Goe in Herald, 16 July 1900.

99 See e.g. Presbyterian Messenger, 14 May 1900; Argus, 6 August 1900; Australasian Intercollegian, 1 July 1900.

100 'A Hard Working Slum Missionary' in Argus, 6 August 1900.

101 Southern Cross, 16 June 1899; see also e.g. Presbyterian Messenger, 10 August 1900; Australasian Review of Reviews, 5 August 1898.

102 Southern Baptist, 30 November 1899.

103 Rev. E. Harris in Southern Baptist, 30 November 1899.

104 See e.g. Presbyterian Monthly, January 1898; Southern Cross, 8 December 1899; Rev. E. Isaacs in Argus, 26 August 1900.

105 3 December 1898.
When, at a Church Congress in November 1898, the Anglican Bishop of Ballarat, Dr. Thornton, attacked Australians for their alleged dishonesty, worldliness, addiction to gambling, 'intemperance, profanity, materialism and lust', there was widespread agreement in the Hebraic camp (as well as firm denials from such pro-Marshall-Hall activists as Punch and the Rev. L.D. Bevan).

Their, it was claimed, was 'among the most selfish and narrow spirited communities on the globe'. There was no 'community which is more deeply impregnated with the gambling spirit than the Australian people are'. Its members were said to suffer from 'a comatose spirituality', an 'inordinate desire for wealth' and 'a

---

106 Age, 23 November 1898, 25 November 1898, 26 November 1898.

107 See e.g. Bishop Montgomery of Tasmania in Age, 23 November 1898; Southern Cross, 25 November 1898, 2 December 1898, 9 September 1898.

108 Argus, 26 December 1898.

109 Argus, 25 November 1898.

110 Argus, 20 September 1895.

111 Presbyterian Messenger, 10 August 1900; see also e.g. Southern Baptist, 30 November 1899; 1 December 1899; Southern Cross, 9 December 1898; Argus, 5 December 1898; Church of England Messenger, 1 December, 1898; G.A. Maxwell in Age, 5 December 1898; Rev. Henry Howard in ibid.; Presbyterian Monthly, 1 December 1898, 2 January 1899; Dr. Reville in Age, 24 December 1898; Rev. J.L. Rentoul in Argus, 24 December 1898; Rev. A.S.C. James in ibid.

112 Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1898.
comparative weakness of domestic ties.\textsuperscript{113} The 'passion for pleasure burnt more fiercely' in them 'than in the people of Europe'.\textsuperscript{114} They exercised less control over their children\textsuperscript{115} and turned 'more towards what is material and practical than towards meditation and metaphysics'.\textsuperscript{116} They neglected the 'means of grace'\textsuperscript{117} and scorned 'real religious activity'.\textsuperscript{118} And in their midst a large and 'dangerous class' was emerging among whom 'Caring for others, truthfulness, thrift, are conspicuously absent', and 'Love of pleasure, greed of money, determination not to work ... fraud and deceit and oppressiveness, reckless want of thought for the morrow, shamelessness, readiness for jobbery, impurity, infanticide, want of natural affection, are familiar features'.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{113} Letter of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Australia to the Second Plenary Council 1895, in O'Farrell, \textit{op.cit.}, p.105.

\textsuperscript{114} Rev. E. Isaacs in Argus, 26 August 1896.

\textsuperscript{115} See e.g. Rev. T. Adamson in Herald, 13 July 1900; Bishop Goe in Herald, 16 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{116} Argus, 1 May 1907; see also e.g. Church of England Messenger, 1 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{117} Southern Baptist, 17 February 1898; see also e.g. Ross, \textit{op.cit.}, p.316.

\textsuperscript{118} Church of England Messenger, 1 September 1898; see also e.g. Presbyterian Monthly, 1 November 1899.

\textsuperscript{119} Southern Baptist, 3 February 1898; see also e.g. Six Henry Wrixon in Table Talk, 28 June 1889; Commander Booth in Herald, 21 August 1900; Baptist Union Report in Leader, 18 November 1899; Dean of Melbourne, Dr. Vance, in Age, 2 April 1898; Southern Cross, 2 July 1898, 29 July 1898; Spectator, 10 March 1899; Australian Christian, 15 September 1898; Rev. W.H. Pitchett in Herald, 16 July 1900; Southern Baptist, 12 May 1898; Advocate, 21 July 1900; Rev. W.C. Wallace in Herald, 6 August 1900; Rev. T. Adamson in Herald, 13 July 1900; Church of England Messenger, 1 July 1900.
3. Hebraic Manicheanism

The severity of the perceived crisis, and the urgency of the consequent need to defend the old values found expression in the (at times eschatalogical) Manicheanism of Hebraic pronouncements on the subject. Attention was drawn to the great 'conflict between right and wrong, good and evil, which exists in the last days of this evil age.'\(^{120}\) The 'enemy is busy,' warned the chairman of the Methodist Conference in 1899, 'we must not sleep, if we love our children, our home and our country.'\(^{121}\)

Lavish recourse was had to military metaphors in order to accentuate the momentous nature of the threat as well as the intractable maleficence of the enemy. "This is no "war game" in which we are engaged," thundered the Rev. C.H. Nash, but WAR, with all its responsibilities, its anxieties, its sudden lightning-flashes of opportunity seized and lost forever.\(^{122}\) The Church was exhorted to bring its 'invincible armory into bolder relief' in 'the warfare of irreligion and Divine Truth'\(^{123}\), to train its 'highest intellects to fight God's battle in Victoria,'\(^{124}\) and 'to stir up Christ's slumbering soldiers to the holy war.'\(^{125}\) Christians were urged to view life as 'a

\(^{120}\) *Searchlight*, June 1896.

\(^{121}\) *Spectator*, 3 November 1899.

\(^{122}\) *Church of England Messenger*, 1 July 1900.

\(^{123}\) Cardinal Moran in *Austral Light*, December 1899.

\(^{124}\) W.L. Bowditch in *Austral Light*, January 1900.

\(^{125}\) *Victorian Churchman*, 14 September 1900.
warfare', 126 a 'battlefield, where such mighty opposites as sin and righteousness, God and Satan contend', 127. Accordingly, they were pressed to take up the 'weapons of the Church's warfare', 128, to 'wage war against ... worldliness', 129, and to join both the 'war over the Sabbath', 130 and the 'war being waged against the family', 131.

The Argus editorialised about 'the great battle' that was 'in progress between the church and agnosticism', 132, and besought 'moralists' to 'put on their war paint against these new marriage ethics'. 133. Anti-drink campaigners referred to themselves as a 'temperance army'. 134. An Anglican organisation for combating 'the appalling ignorance and vice of the vast population of the Fitzroy and Collingwood suburbs', 135, was christened the Church Army 'in unmistakable imitation of the Salvation Army'. 136. And Henry Varley summed up his work in Melbourne in the

126 Presbyterian Monthly, 1 November 1898.
127 Southern Cross, 16 March 1900.
129 PPGM, November 1898, Appendix p. xvii.
130 Spectator, 22 September 1899.
131 Southern Cross, 1 December 1899.
132 25 July 1891.
133 14 December 1895.
134 Spectator, 3 August 1900.
135 Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1898.
136 Ibid.
ninetics in a pamphlet called 'The War between Heaven and Hell'.

The enemy was commonly personified, although sometimes endowed with supernatural characteristics, such as the 'awful power ... to transform himself into a serpent' and magically 'incite the wicked to deeds of cruelty and bloodshed'. Sometimes he was eschatologically portrayed as, for example, preparing to lead a vast army of assorted and deceased alcoholics, infidels, betel nut chewers, opium smokers, dynamitards, libertines and defrauders in one last, decisive assault on the Regiments Ecclesiastic and Angelic, which were even then vigorously intoning 'Alleluias', sounding hosannas and raising doxologies in readiness for the same event.

More often he was portrayed as exhibiting the temporal, albeit still quasi-demonic, aspect, worn by those involved in the 'vast number of agencies for the allurement of lives into sin'. Such were the 'heartless publicans';

---

137 Table Talk, 20 February 1891.
138 Australian Christian, 1 December 1898; see also Australian Christian, 15 September 1898.
139 Searchlight, June 1896.
140 Victorian Independent, April 1900.
141 Mrs. Press, President of the W.C.T.U., in Advocate, 26 November 1898; see also e.g. Southern Cross, 11 February 1898; Spectator, 1 September 1899, 10 September 1897; Southern Baptist, 3 February 1898; Presbyterian Monthly, 2 October 1898; Australian Christian, 26 May 1898.
the brewer who 'treads his way to fortune through the
blood of souls';142; 'the body-and-soul grinding directors
and shareholders', whose 'reckless greed' compelled their
employees to 'sacrifice ... opportunities for religious
edification ... to the hope of higher dividends', by
working on Sundays;143; and the professional gamblers with
their 'low moral look and cunning faces',144; led by that
'acknowledged human vampire on his sport', the bookmaker145.
(The Hellenic Tocsin, by contrast, insisted that the 'clubs,
the bookmakers, the two-up schools are not the creators,
but merely the creatures of the gambling evil.146).

The significance of all this for the Marshall-Hall affair
lay in Hebraism's perception of the musician both as a
contributor to the debased character of the times, and
as a leading adversary in this Manichean struggle of
darkness against light - a perception which further rein-
forced the determination of his enemies to remove him from
the chair of music. With respect to the first category,
the Southern Cross saw his heterodox views as a 'tragic
illustration of the sort of moral colour blindness which
has overtaken so many otherwise intelligent men,147, while

142 Southern Baptist, 3 February 1898.
143 Southern Cross, 24 November 1898.
144 Spectator, 3 March 1899; see also e.g. Spectator,
15 October 1897, 12 August 1898; Searchlight, August 1896.
145 Australian Christian World, 19 May 1899.
146 2 August 1906.
147 10 August 1900.
the *Australian Christian World* said it was 'a straw on the current revealing one of the drifts of thought that in the present day would give a more pliable standard of morals'.

With regard to the second, he was charged with being a 'crusader against' and 'an enemy to the death of [.,] the Christian faith', a man with 'a special personal feud with Christianity', which religion he was 'openly combatting' and 'striving to overthrow' and 'destroy'.

He was, it was maintained, determined 'to stab ecclesiastics as a body'. And to this end he had set himself in opposition to those engaged 'in the great fight against immorality'. His name, moreover, had 'become a battle-flag' under which 'the enemies of religion and morality rallied in the promotion of a conflict, which, to at least one of his detractors, prefigured the coming Armageddon. Commenting on a charge that the anti-Marshall-Hall party comprised a 'quaint reunion' of heresy hunters, usually fiercely at odds with one another, E.A. Crawford conceded

---

148 *Argus*, 15 August 1898.
149 *Argus*, 15 August 1898.
150 *Victorian Independent*, April 1901.
151 Andrew Harper in *Table Talk*, 14 March 1901.
152 *Argus*, 16 June 1900.
153 *Austral Light*, September 1898.
154 Dr. Crowther in *Argus*, 19 June 1900.
155 *Southern Cross*, 30 November 1900.
156 Perhaps the same E.A. Crawford who, in 1872, had been the second student to enrol in the newly opened Trinity College (see James Grant, *Perspective of a Century*, Melbourne, 1972,
that there 'are matters on which we are divided as sects, and parties, to our great discouragement and loss', but added that 'we are looking forward to a great impending conflict to unite us as we have not been united in times of prosperity and peace; and every such 'quaint reunion' we shall welcome as a harbinger of the greater reunion that is to be' 157.

3. Misunderstandings

A further element of strain, which also constitutes part of the perceived situation of Martin's first condition, is contained in the frequent misunderstandings to which the musician's utterances were subjected. These arose partly as a result of his unsystematic manner of presenting his views, and partly because of the failure of his critics (as of more recent analysts) to recognise the essentially allegorical character of much of his discourse — entailed by the periechoontological idealism which animated it.

Thus, for example, he was widely accused by contemporaries of being 'a materialistic atheist' 158 who, suffering from 'a singular insensibility to the higher

111 and who as Rev. E.A. Crawford was a member of the Council of the Melbourne Church of England Grammar School in 1908, Leader, 11 April 1908.

157 Argus, 13 July 1900.

158 Vitre, 2 July 1900; see also e.g. 'Parent' in Herald, September 1898; George Bell in Age, 29 October 1898; Theatro Magazine, 1 September 1915; Southern Cross, 29 June 1898.
harmonies in the realm of spiritual life,\textsuperscript{159} had spoken against all religion.\textsuperscript{160} More recently this charge has been reiterated by both Bebbington\textsuperscript{161} and Radic\textsuperscript{162}, despite Marshall-Hall's own repeated denials\textsuperscript{163}.

It was certainly not the only reason for the agitation against him or even, by itself, the principal one. But it was a significant contributing factor. In the minds of some of his adversaries it was crucial. Such was the correspondent who declared 'the central point of the attack' to be the charge of 'communicating views that are opposed to all forms of Theism'\textsuperscript{164}. Others were, no doubt, actuated less by the allegation of atheism itself than by a structurally conducive belief, typical of Hebraic faddism, that godlessness necessarily entailed immorality\textsuperscript{165}. It was in this respect that the Hebraic outlook (and the Christian outlook generally) was deterministic, holding

\textsuperscript{159} Australian Christian World, 9 June 1899; see also Southern Cross, 8 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{160} Southern Cross, 8 June 1900; see also e.g. Punch, 16 November 1899; MUCMB, 24 October 1898; PPGM, Appendix p.lxxxiv.

\textsuperscript{161} M.Mus., p.11.


\textsuperscript{163} See e.g. Argus, 25 October 1898; Age, 25 October 1898; Marshall-Hall to University Council n.d. MUCMB, 24 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{164} Outpost, 30 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{165} See e.g. Southern Cross, 23 June 1899; Christian Citizen, 2 January 1901; Rev. P.J. Murdoch in Argus, 6 October 1900; PPGM, November 1893, p.66; Victorian Churchman, 28 September 1900; Sir Henry Wrixon, The Religion of the Common Man, op.cit., p.11.
that relief from the burden of original sin could be achieved only with divine assistance (which must, however, be freely sought). As the *Southern Baptist* put it, 'the actual facts of daily life prove there is in human nature a force which makes for evil ... which only religion can subdue.'

If unbelief had been widespread, declared Methodist clergyman W.H. Pitchett, the Church's 'restraining power against vice would crumble into ruins', and human conduct would be governed by 'the ethical ideas of the brothel and of the slaughterhouse.'

Similarly, the Rev. Dr. Alexander Marshall warned that the growth of religious scepticism 'augurs ill for the moral stability of the community.' And, according to his fellow Presbyterian minister, J. Meiklejohn, the Marshall-Hall case showed 'that without belief in God ... there was no sure foundation for morality.'

Hebraism was also deeply imbued with a dread of 'anarchy' - the political expression of immorality - the seeds of which were commonly detected in anything deemed likely to contribute to the break down of favoured political and social structures, whether by undermining established values, assassinating heads of state, or abolishing private property. Fear of it had been fuelled in the nineteenth

---

166. 14 January 1898; see also e.g. J. Burt in *Gleam*, October 1900.


century by the publication of the Communist Manifesto in 1848; the first International of 1864, and the Paris Commune seven years later\textsuperscript{170}; as well as by the rebirth of British socialism; and the assassination of, inter alia, Alexander II of Russia in 1881\textsuperscript{171}, the Empress of Austria in 1898\textsuperscript{172}, and King Humbert of Italy\textsuperscript{173} and (very nearly) the British Prince of Wales, both in 1900\textsuperscript{174}. In Australia apprehension had been further reinforced by the militancy of the trade union movement of the early nineties\textsuperscript{175}.

Anarchism, too, was held to be causally related to religious unbelief. It was, declared the \textit{Southern Cross}, "only atheism drawn out in its logical consequences.\textsuperscript{176}"

The 'dreadful affirmation of "no God", when translated into political terms means anarchy\textsuperscript{177}, and the only reason

\textsuperscript{170}See F.W.J. Hemmings (ed), \textit{The Age of Realism}, Harmondsworth, 1974, p.361.


\textsuperscript{172}Leader, 17 September 1898; Argus, 12 September 1898; \textit{Kilroe}, 1 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{173}See e.g. \textit{Southern Cross}, 3 August 1900; \textit{Southern Baptist}, 16 August 1900; \textit{Presbyterian Messenger}, 3 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{174}See e.g. \textit{Presbyterian Messenger}, 13 April 1900; \textit{Advocate}, 26 January 1901.

\textsuperscript{175}Southern Baptist, 23 June 1898; see also e.g. T.J. Hibble \textit{White in Centennial Magazine, Vol.12, No.3}, October 1899; Argus, 25 February 1905, 26 November 1898.

\textsuperscript{176}23 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{177}\textit{Southern Cross}, 3 August 1900.
why there were, admittedly, 'many people who are practically Atheists .... Yet ... are decent citizens', who 'pay their debts and want to murder nobody, and shudder, like anybody else, at the dreadful portent of anarchism ... is that they breathe an atmosphere charged with Christian elements ... they unconsciously accept the standard of external conduct they find in their Christian neighbours'.

According to G.P. Barker, the strikes of the nineties had been a forewarning of the fact that, in the absence of religious instruction, the State schools were producing 'thousands of white heathens ... who threaten to grow into a malignant force which will some day sweep like a tornado over the colony, and rival the scenes enacted in the French revolution'. 'Withdraw the influence of the Spirit of God ...,' echoed the Spectator, 'and into what barbarous wreck our social life would fall'.

The Rev. E. Isaacs numbered the 'forces of anarchism and socialism' among the 'evidence of the presence of heathenism in Victoria'. And the Advocate published an address, given by the Rev. J.J. McGlade in Omagh, saying that without God children would become a prey to the 'socialist demagogue', who argues that 'Man ... owes allegiance to no superior. Therefore the ruler who takes away his bread by taxing him should get the dagger's

---

178 Southern Cross, 23 September 1898.
179 Southern Baptist, 13 January 1898.
180 Argus, 26 August 1896.
point. It had, no doubt, not gone unnoticed that the Melbourne Anarchists' Club was founded, in 1886, as an offshoot of the Australian Secular Association.

It is little wonder, then, that Marshall-Hall, too, was identified with this outlook. 'Had he adopted a political career,' opined 'Arpeggio' in the Theatre Magazine, 'probably one would find him among the anarchists, or waving the bloody flag of liberty somewhere on the planet.' And the Rev. S.G. McLaren, Principal of the Presbyterian Ladies' College, warned that the professor's supporters 'represented a body of opinion in Melbourne which had a magazine of its own, an organ which represented the restive, lawless, destructive element of society, backed by the licence that was asked for in this case.'

Yet the Ormond Professor was, in fact, far from being the religious unbeliever his contemporaries (as well as recent analysts) took him for. It is true that, by the late nineties, he found 'it impossible to subscribe to [the] precepts' of 'the Christian Church', which, quoting Higinbotham, he declared to be 'starred by

1822 March 1901.
183F. E. Smith, op. cit., p. 283.
184Theatre Magazine, 1 September 1915.
185Argus, 30 November 1898 - a reference, presumably, to Joseph Symes's atheistic Liberator.
186Age, 13 August 1898.
And when he came across the passage in Nietzsche's *Anti-Christ*, where the author calls Christianity 'the one great curse, the one great intrinsic depravity, the one great instinct of revenge, for which no expedient is sufficiently poisonous, secret, subterranean, mean', he inscribed in the margin the word, 'Bravo!' 188.

But the possibilities of religious belief are not exhausted by Christianity. Nor is the concept of a deity confined to the personal, anthropomorphic constructs of the Judeo-Christian-Islamic tradition. To argue otherwise would be to deny religious status to (among others) Buddhism, Jainism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Taoism, Theosophy, Pantheism and the animistic creeds of Australian and New Guinea tribesmen. What all these systems have in common is an acknowledgement of and reverential engagement with what Rudolph Otto calls 'something wholly other', 189 an invisible higher power which it is humanity's noblest function to serve 190.

As Basil Willey has put it in a reference to George Eliot, the defining characteristic of the religious outlook is

---

187 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898 in MUCMB, 12 August 1898.


190 See e.g. Wilson, *The Outsider*, *op. cit.*, p. 95; Magiulli, *op. cit.*, p. 102.
'the faculty of reverence, the capacity to acknowledge the reality of the unseen'.

Now, it is true that Marshall-Hall described himself as an agnostic. But a closer consideration of his utterances shows that he must have been using the word in its quite common, contemporary sense, referring to the unknowability of the deity, not to doubts about whether it existed.

Not that Bebbington is correct in attributing to him Spiritualist beliefs, deriving (according to Bebbington) from French Symbolism. Certainly, he spoke of an 'invisible world surrounding us of which our universe is but the most insignificant fragment', and in which, 'in legions untold/Flock the spirits of the air'.

191 Nineteenth Century Studies, op.cit., p.248; I am, of course, using the notion of religion, here, in what Richard Ely calls the 'exclusive' sense - involving belief in and worship of some metaphysical entity - as distinct from the much broader 'inclusive' sense, which embraces attitudes that have the same quality as the former, such as, for example, the 'worship' of money or nature. See Ely, 'Secularisation and the Sacred in Australian History' in Historical Studies, Vol.19, No.77, October 1981, p.559.

192 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898, MUCMB, 12 August 1898.

193 Willey, Nineteenth Century Studies, op.cit., p.40; Agnosticism, said the Rev. W.H. Fitchett, declares 'that any knowledge of God is impossible', Unrealized Logic of Religion, op.cit., p.187; 'Atheism says the throne of the Universe is empty .... Agnosticism says something is on the throne, something infinite and omnipresent. This infinite something is our creator, but it sits with veiled face and shrouded in darkness', ibid., p.186.

194 M.Mus., p.60, 62.

195 British Australasian, 25 June 1914.

196 'Daemonic' in Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit., p.29.
Nor did he totally dismiss the possibility of such notions containing a degree of literal truth. For example, he said that certain 'strange analogies with human life and human experiences' lead one to 'half doubt whether we are right in denying consciousness to inanimate nature'. And he hazarded the speculation that in 'sounding the depths of our emotional capacity', we become conscious of those 'passions by which, the whole of the animal world is moved, and possibly, for all we know, the vegetable and inorganic world as well'.

But this was no more than conjecture. He was careful to point out that when he alluded to 'souls inhabiting streams and oceans, and trees and flowers', it was only 'a metaphorical way of speaking'. He insisted that he 'must not be taken literally' when he said that 'the quiet pleasure we feel in contemplating the vegetable world' arose 'from an intimate apprehension of its inner nature, owing to ourselves, when self-consciousness is for the moment laid aside being capable of the same quality and degree of energy'. It was, he said, 'as though in past ages we had successively passed through the several stages of development, had worn the shape of trees, and flowers ... and, having attained self-consciousness, we are dimly able to recall these remote experiences'. But, in

197 MHMA, Group 2.
198 Argus, 2 December 1910.
199 Gleam, 20 November 1900.
case that 'as though' should be overlooked, he added that this formulation was simply 'a fantasy which helps make clear my way of viewing existence'.

To appreciate his religious outlook, it is important to remember that it was incommunicable, except by means of such 'fantasies'. For him the 'wholly other' - Otto's object of numinous reverence and source of grace - was the infinite noumenon, which 'some call God, others the unknowable, others Force'. And it is obviously impossible to give precise, unambiguous, linguistic formulation to ontological concepts which by their very nature are not accessible to the finitude of language. In dealing with them, therefore, words function not as symbols or names of what they are intended to represent, but as ideograms, corresponding immediately with familiar notions which, because of their associations, act as tenuous evocative analogues of less familiar entities. Failure to grasp this has led to serious misunderstandings of Marshall-Hall's beliefs.

He, himself, pointed out that the object of his religious faith could be depicted only 'in allegorical form'. And that that was the function of the artist. Marshall-Hall's discussions of art were liberally garnished with

---

200 Ibid.
201 Summons, December 1892.
202 Ibid.
religious allusions. Artists, he declared, were 'High priests', who had been 'ordained and sanctified by God himself'. They possessed the 'God-imparted power' of bringing 'the Gospel of art' to all. To them, therefore, 'the true rendering of every phrase is a religious duty', by virtue of which man is able to worship the 'magnificent joy-god'.

This was no mere mechanical employment of a conventional religious vocabulary in isolation from its original meaning. On the contrary, for him it was literally true that from 'the artist's point of view, religion and art are identical', because for him, no direct communication with the wholly other, the ultimate ontological reality, was possible. Art, he maintained, revealed the 'presence of that occult divine power, which in higher states of civilisation is openly worshipped'.

But it could do so only indirectly - by means of 'the sacredness of illusion', which is 'art's mistress, man's

---

203 School, January, 1889.
204 Monthly Musical Record, 1 July 1889.
205 Quoted in Kelba Memorial Conservatorium Magazine 'Con Amore', No.12, 1945.
206 Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.
207 Magazine of Music, October 1891.
208 Herald, 28 February 1901.
209 Musical Standard, 15 December 1891.
210 Herald, 16 October 1902.
nearest guess at truth'. It created 'a fictitious, not a real world', a world which is inhabited by 'things that never were', but that 'remain beautiful and eternal as the truths of which they are symbols'. That is to say, art, confined, as it is, to the periechontological, revealed the numinous, but not the noumenal – the 'relation of the transient to the Eternal', 211, not the Eternal itself; not God; but 'the remnant of God's image', 212. It merely mitigates 'our passion for absolute truth by the immediate conviction of absolute beauty'. 213.

His, then, was a truly religious viewpoint. Those who believed him to be unaffected by religious music (see above p.135), ignored the high regard in which he held the 'grand and truly religious chorales of Germany', 214, and particularly Beethoven's Mass in D – that 'great and sublime offering of worship from man to his maker'. 215. What he rejected was not religion itself, but the kata-pathic beliefs 216 prevailing among his contemporaries.

211 Argus, 20 March 1915 (emphasis mine).
212 Magazine of Music, October 1891.
213 Address to be given to the Brown Society on 30 July 1915, MHMA, Group 2.
214 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898 in NUCMB, 12 August 1898.
215 Magazine of Music, August 1888.
216 i.e. beliefs capable of direct embodiment in discursive conceptual form.
The difference between this view of the function of art and Symbolist aesthetics—which also emphasised the use of objects as 'a sublime alphabet to express Ideas'—is that, for the Symbolists, the symbol was an end in itself, employed, not because the entity for which it stands is otherwise inexpressible, but because beauty consists in hinting at a truth rather than bluntly proclaiming it. The 'idea,' warned Jean Moréas in his Symbolist Manifesto of September 1886, 'should not make its appearance deprived of the sumptuous trappings of external analogues, for the essential character of Symbolist art consists in never going straight to the conception of the idea itself.' And the Symbolist, Stéphane Mallarmé, complained that to 'name an object is to suppress three-fourths of the enjoyment ...; to suggest, that is the dream.' Aesthetic gratification 'consists in the pleasure of discovering things little by little.'

For Marshall-Hall, on the other hand, beauty consisted in the expression, in allegorical form, of that which was, itself, both inexpressible and unknowable, namely, the ontological object of religious reverence. In this respect, his views reflect the influence, not so much of Symbolism, as of the religious demythologising that was 

218 Quoted in Milner, op.cit., p.52; see also Goldwater, op.cit., p.145.
219 Quoted in Lucie-Smith, op.cit., p.54.
220 Ibid., p.55.
a conspicuous characteristic of the theological 'Zeitgeist', and which was epitomised by Roland Williams when he warned readers of *Essays and Reviews* against interpreting the Bible 'with that dullness which turns symbols and poetry into materialism'.

Further strain resulted from misunderstandings about the musician's moral convictions. His contemporaries accused him of being 'animated by a fanatical and intolerant aversion to Christian morality', an uncompromising opposition 'to any system of Christian ethics'. And, more recently, Bebbington, too, has described him as a 'vocal opponent of Christian morality'.

On closer examination, two specific allegations are found to be contained in these charges. Both had their origin in the 'social', as distinct from the 'moral' component of Christian ethics (see above p. 50), and, more particularly, in that part of it which was concerned with the alleviation of suffering. One was the claim that, in the course of 'a sort of dithyrambic chant in honour of war' (the Liedertafel speech), he had sought to promote 'the apotheosis of brute force'. He believed and
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222 E.B. Hamilton in *Argus*, 13 June 1900.
223 *Advocate*, 4 September 1915.
224 *M. Mus.*, p. 11.
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preached, it was contended, that 'fighting is the only thing worth living for', that 'no manhood is to be got except by ... "laying on like a butcher"', and that a 'prize fight or a battle which slays ten thousand lives is ... a form of art praiseworthy as ... a sonata by Beethoven, or a chorus by Wagner'.

Now, there is no doubt that he was influenced in this respect, not only by Nietzsche, but by the generally prevalent Social Darwinism of the period, whose literature, as Jacques Barzun has observed, was 'one long call for blood', which 'poeticised war and luxuriated in the prospect of it'. Marshall-Hall, too, had declared war to be 'a good thing, nay the best thing' - a 'splendid sign of vigorous health', which 'determines the worth of men'. Further, he had smiled approval on 'the vast armaments of the nations preparing for the struggle for

226 Australian Christian World, 9 June 1899.
227 Leader, 20 August 1898.
228 Age, 6 August 1898.
229 Southern Cross, 5 August 1898.
power', and had argued that 'there is nothing in life worth having but what is gained by conquest and held by main force'.

Like the Social Darwinists, also, he justified this view with an appeal to external nature, all of which, 'organic and inorganic,' he observed in a remark pregnant with the influence of Herbert Spencer, 'is based on a system of universal struggle for power'. This was exemplified in one sphere 'by chemical action and reaction', and in another by 'physical and intellectual conflict'. Man, he argued, whether he liked it or not, was 'plunged ... in the terrible struggle for existence in which ... the weakest must go to the wall'.

At first glance, there seems to be no essential difference between his values, in this regard, and those of his Hebraic enemies. The latter were epitomised in that most highly acclaimed celebration of international blood-letting, written by the Rev. W.H. Fitchett, and first serialised in the Argus in 1896, under the title of Doeds that Won the Empire. Its descriptions, declared the Rev. Thomas Nisbet, in a sermon delivered at Hawthorn
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Presbyterian church in September 1896, 'roused the fighting instinct within us, and made us thrill with approbation.' And the *Argus* expressed approval for all Kiplingesque 'literature of action', on the ground that it was 'one unflagging appeal to the fighting instincts of our race', which fulfilled 'a healthy and invaluable purpose', inasmuch as 'it unconsciously incites the English race to emulate the exploits of its heroes.'

The outbreak of the Boer War further fuelled the fires of Hebraic bellicosity. There was more than a little truth in one correspondent's claim that many of those who denounced the Ormond Professor for 'glorifying the blood red deeds of battle [sic]', were among the same people who 'heartily condone the present awful war between fellow-Christians in South Africa.' In June 1900 a 'great military parade' was held in the Anglican and Catholic cathedrals. The *Australian Christian World* in October 1899 castigated the Rev. J.L. Rentoul for his opposition to the war. And Pitchett's *Australasian Review of Reviews* compared it favorably with the Sudan hostilities of 1885, when 'the despatch of a contingent by one colony set the pulses of all throbbing with
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236 *Argus*, 3 October 1896; see also *Argus*, 25 September 1896.

237 18 February 1899; see also e.g. *Argus*, 23 February 1905.

238 *Herald*, 16 June 1900; see also e.g. 'Verdant Green' in *Herald*, 24 August 1900; *Tocsin*, 17 November 1898; *Outpost*, 12 October 1900.

239 *Australian Christian World*, 8 June 1900.

240 13 October 1899.
aspiration not then gratified.\textsuperscript{241} The Southern Baptist denied that such military ardour was unchristian, maintaining that there was an important distinction between 'personal and public wrongs', such that 'personal wrongs should be borne, but public wrongs ought to be avenged and, if necessary, with the sword.\textsuperscript{242}

The perceived difference between this outlook and Marshall-Hall's was that the former legitimated and tempered its pugnacity by appealing to the justice of the cause. It scorned 'the man who fights for the mere love of fighting and finds in the career of the soldier the only occupation congenial to his taste'.\textsuperscript{243} Pitchett insisted that he had penned his sanguinary tales 'not to glorify war but to nourish patriotism'.\textsuperscript{244} And the Southern Cross declared that, while the Christian should turn the other cheek when struck by another Christian in order to shame him,

\begin{quote}
\begin{itemize}
\item in dealing with people who are not Christian, with people who are systematically violent, selfish, and unjust, the Christian could in many cases do them no wrong more fatal than thus to give up all his right. They need the discipline of resistance.\textsuperscript{245}
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{241} 15 October 1899.
\textsuperscript{242} 16 November 1899.
\textsuperscript{243} \textit{Australian Christian}, 1 September 1898; see also e.g. Argus, 21 January 1899; Presbyterian Messenger, 17 August 1900; Spectator, 24 March 1899; Age, 18 February 1899; Australasian Review of Reviews, 15 September 1899.
\textsuperscript{244} W.H. Pitchett, \textit{Deeds that Won the Empire}, London, 1910, p.v.
\textsuperscript{245} 31 March 1899.
Marshall-Hall, on the other hand, was seen as one for whom the question of the righteousness of the occasion was immaterial. The second component of the charge of immorality brought against him was the contention that the only ethical code he recognised was one which enjoined the heedless gratification of every selfish whim and desire. It was maintained that he 'glories in self-indulgence', believing that 'all the appetites of life - are their own justification', that 'every instinct is entitled to fulfil itself', and that the highest life was that in which 'the passions of men were unbridled and let loose'. From this, it was held to follow, for him, that 'charity is a humbug', that 'love was nought', that people should 'cease all attempts at self-restraint and self-repression, and do as they liked rather than as they ought', that man should 'trample underfoot all that stands in the way of his schemes', and (by implication) that 'the French sailors, who chopped off the fingers of women clinging to their boats were excellent moralists'.

246 Mitre, 2 July 1900.
247 Southern Cross, 19 August 1898.
248 Rev. J. Gibson in Argus, 8 August 1898.
249 Spectator, 5 August 1898.
250 Rev. J. Gibson in Argus, 8 August 1898.
251 Church of England Messenger, 12 April 1901.
252 Australian Christian World, 9 June 1899.
253 Southern Cross, 19 August 1898.
This, however, reflects a profound misconception of the Ormond Professor's ethical views. I have already shown that he did not (except in the case of 'heroic' individuals) favour the 'unbridled' indulgence of instinctual drives, but, judging behaviour, like all true exponents of Hellenism, by its results, rather sought to divert impulses with a pernicious tendency into channels, in which they could do no harm.

To see him as a moral nihilist who gloried in slaughter, is, again, to ignore the essentially allegorical character of his discourse. His critics, he justly protested, in attributing to him a love of bloodshed, 'misunderstand my interpretation of the world war,' which he had been considering only from an 'abstract standpoint,' independently, that is, of its human consequences. In 'saying that war was the best thing', he had not intended to be taken literally, but simply to 'imply that this competition was the best of symptoms, for it was a symptom of virility, of vitality' and of 'superabundant strength'. Since man is able to 'find again, in the fighting, the full consciousness of himself and the entire possession of his strength,' war, for Marshall-Hall, served as a convenient symbol for that 'feeling of power' that betokens

254 pp.180-183.
255 Age, 8 August 1898.
256 Glean, October 1900.
257 Age, 8 August 1898.
258 Age, 2 August 1898.
259 Marshall-Hall Orchestral Programme, 19 May 1906, MMCA.
the possession of great energy. It was the feeling engendered by war, not the activity itself which he esteemed. And in this respect he did differ markedly from his Hebraic enemies, who, as the Southern Cross put it, held that 'all that Christ would desire' of those engaged in righteous conflict 'is that there should be no personal anger in His disciple's heart.' It was precisely this element of 'anger' which Marshall-Hall most prized.

But, far from advocating a Nietzschean transvaluation of conventional values, he insisted that 'pity, unselfishness and kindred characteristics are indispensable' to human life, since 'self-abnegation and general brotherhood alone enable mankind to live together proportionately [sic] - and free to cultivate their higher Natures.' A 'policy of egoism, of selfishness,' he declared, 'can lead to universal misery.' So the 'great and noble man' was he 'whose first interest in life centred in the lives and happiness of those around him.'

To accuse Marshall-Hall of callous indifference to human suffering is, moreover, to disregard the central

---

261, *31 March 1899.*
importance, in his value system, of the notion of sympathy -
'the suffering with, the entering into the joys and
sorrows of others.' Sympathy, he declared, in a
classic statement of nineteenth century utilitarianism,
was the 'foundation of morality and justice,' since it
promotes unselfishness by elevating man above the
ordinary petty exclusive considerations of mere personal
advantage and [showing] him his interest as coincident
with the interests of his fellows. A corollary of
this was that 'every cruelty and bestiality proceeds from
a want of profound feelings of sympathy.'

And the need for sympathy was, for him, essentially
a religious imperative. Radic is quite wrong in asserting
that it is 'impossible to imagine' what Marshall-Hall
meant when he said opera was 'for mental change, rest
and refreshment and the finer emotions of love and
sympathy'. How 'opera was to "educate" the "higher
nature" (whatever that may be),' she adds, '... is anyone's
guess.' There is nothing mysterious about this at
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What he said was, 'What is opera for? It is, while giving
us mental change, rest and refreshment, for the keeping
live of those finer emotions of love and sympathy towards
our fellow creatures which the hard struggle for a livelihood
and the attractions of a life of selfish ease ever tend to
reduce' (Table Talk, 28 May 1891).
all, when considered in the context of the role played by art in his religious periechontology.

By man's 'higher nature', he meant that part of human experience - the numinous part - that is close to the interface of the phenomenal and the noumenal, and which it is art's prime function to evoke. This, he believed, was also the source of moral rectitude. As we have seen\(^\text{272}\), he considered humanity to be virtuous by 'nature' - when acting, that is, solely under the influence of those innermost impulses which derive from the noumenal unconscious.

But he also saw a descent into the twilight zone of preconsciousness as conducive to virtue in two additional, closely related ways, which clearly reflect the essential consonance of his views with the 'social' ethics of Christianity. Firstly, since, in this condition, plurality disappears, there is revealed 'to us not only the obscure depths of our own nature, but [thereby] of natures entirely different from our own'\(^\text{273}\). We discover, that is, that our 'infinitesimal, yet indispensable ego [is] bound by the unbreakable chain of causation to other kindred egos'\(^\text{274}\). And this enables us 'to understand all human temperaments, however different from [our]\(^\text{275}\).

\(^{272}\) p.177.

\(^{273}\) Cutting from Argus, context 1908, in MCMA.

\(^{274}\) Clearn, October 1900.
own'\textsuperscript{275}, to 'feel akin to all mankind, from the criminal to the crucified Jesus'\textsuperscript{276} (itself an interpenetration of the sacred and profane that was intrinsically abhorrent to Hebraism). Above all, it enables us to 'understand the emotions of others' and to exert 'our sympathy with such emotions'\textsuperscript{277}.

Secondly, musicians, being 'veritable priests', are, themselves, by nature, 'noble and unselfish'\textsuperscript{278}. Possessing, as they do, 'an extraordinary capacity for sympathy'\textsuperscript{279}, they are persons 'of large heart ... and noble aspirations to better and make happier the lot of [their] fellows'\textsuperscript{280}. And these aspirations - 'the godly thoughts of godly men'\textsuperscript{281} - they can reproduce in their art, and communicate to their audience, thus 'awakening in the breasts of others, at all events for the time being, the same nobility of feeling'\textsuperscript{282}. The more we contemplate these high qualities, 'the more we are disposed to let our own actions be guided by them'\textsuperscript{283}.

\textsuperscript{275} Alma Mater, July 1899.
\textsuperscript{276} Musical Standard, 15 December 1891.
\textsuperscript{277} Alma Mater, July 1899.
\textsuperscript{278} School, January 1889.
\textsuperscript{279} Musical World, 2 February 1889.
\textsuperscript{280} Monthly Musical Record, 1 September 1889.
\textsuperscript{281} Musical Standard, 15 December 1891.
\textsuperscript{282} Monthly Musical Record, 1 July 1889.
\textsuperscript{283} Magazine of Music, June 1888.
Art, in other words, is also in this ('social' ethical) sense, 'true religion - binding force of humanity', inasmuch as, by portraying 'to us man as he might be - man in the image of God' - it 'fills our hearts with divine love for all creation' and 'leads us to abhor those deeds which tend to make the well-being of the many subservient to that of the few'. And this was a function which opera was particularly well fitted to perform. Thus, works, such as Wagner's Parsifal, 'by setting forth the inherent possibility of nobleness, greatness, happiness in man, by holding up a lofty ideal of what we should be - make us discontented with what we are; urge us on in the path of virtue and unselfishness; make us look on our fellow men with feelings of love and compassion'. There was no real contradiction between this and his celebration elsewhere of ferocity and conquest, since the latter, unlike the former, was concerned with the feelings, without regard to their human consequences - which, consistently with his Hellenic assumptions, could not be considered immoral. Nothing, therefore, could be further from the truth in this regard, than Turnbull's claim that Marshall-Hall 'proclaimed art to be independent of conventional morality' and that he
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had been influenced by 'Nietzsche to find in art the antagonist of Christian morals.'

Another charge levelled against Marshall-Hall, which, being part of the situational interpretation of his opponents (Martin's condition 1), increased the element of strain that rendered conflict likely, was that of misogyny. It, too, was grossly unjust. He had neither expressed 'scorn for the female mind,' nor sneered 'loftily at womankind', or 'at all womanly ideals', or 'feminine aspirations'. He never gave an 'impromptu address ... on the stupidity of most women', containing 'side slaps' at either 'skirt government', or 'the New Woman'. Nor did he regard women as 'mere hand maids in the temple of manhood', who 'can't have careers'. (The greater part of his working life, after all, was spent in preparing girls for careers.) All these allegations, he correctly dismissed as 'absurd and unjust'. And the same applies both to Radic's claim that in the
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Liedertafel speech (or, indeed, elsewhere) he had referred to the question of women's rights, and to Manning Clark's, that he had 'condemned "petticoat wearers" to perpetual inferiority.'

The error, again, arises from a failure to appreciate his practice of expressing himself allegorically on religious subjects. As he, himself, pointed out, 'many poets have used women characters purely as a type of the "ever-womanly", in contrast to their men.' Therefore, in 'studying a drama or poem it is well to distinguish whether the woman stands there as woman or purely as the feminine element.' And the latter, poetic 'idealisation of woman', while 'truthful enough in art', would, he insisted, be 'absurd and unjust in actual life.'

The same is true of his own polemical utterances. He used woman to represent the 'feminine element' in two quite different, though related, ways. Sometimes she symbolised the 'softer, more beautiful side of [human] nature', its 'sentient, suffering', and 'beseeching,yielding' aspect, whose characteristics included
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'Delicacy', 'refined gaiety', 'exquisitely dainty feminine grace', and 'I know not what of pity, of tenderness, of consolation'. These, however, were not exclusively the attributes of females. But, together with the more 'compelling energetic' ingredients, the 'vivacity [and] robust energy' of masculinity, they comprised the 'twin elements' of every individual, the 'elemental sides of human nature as generalised in the terms masculine and feminine'.

Far from sneering at the latter, he declared that 'the true woman ... is to mankind what melody is to music'. What was important for him was that the two qualities should be evenly balanced in each person, since 'where one without the other of these elements was neglected a man tends to become brutal and effeminate. An excess of the masculine qualities gives rise to a
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'policy of egoism, of selfishness [which] can only lead to universal misery'\textsuperscript{313}.

The second meaning he gave to the notion of woman was the pejorative one which implied a depreciation of the masculine side of human nature. It was forcefully expressed in his contention that 'There is something perfectly absurd in the modern petticoat movement - in these dear creatures with their nerves, their sensibilities, their hysterics, scent-bottles, artistic yearnings\textsuperscript{314}. But in saying this he was derogating neither women nor contemporary feminism. In fact, insofar as the latter embodied an aversion to the institution of marriage, he was, to some extent, sympathetic to it (see below, pp.499-508).

What he was condemning was the 'effeminate', in the sense of the temperament lacking in the necessary power (or energy) and toughness to recognise and face reality. It manifested itself, he declared, for example, in the 'sickening effeminacy' of such 'musical diseases' as the popular drawing room pieces of the period, and the 'nauseous British oratorio sentimentality' which, being 'the outcome of debility, of impotence'\textsuperscript{315}, were filled with sickly unreal sentiments.\textsuperscript{316} In Literature, it
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was found in such chimerical lucubrations as Plato's Republic, More's Utopia, 'the servant-girl stories of the "Family Herald", [and] the ideal state promised by modern socialists', whose authors were 'too mentally effeminate to take back terms of abstract thought to their sensual source; that is, to keep in touch with experience'. Instead, they allowed themselves to 'meander along in an intoxicated dream, wherein the relations of cause and effect have no place', and which, therefore, has 'no counterpart in the world of reality'.

But most important of all (since it was structurally conducive to his offensive outbursts), the same 'feminine' lack of energy, which prevented its possessors from recognising the true state of human affairs, was, he believed, conspicuous in the outlook of the Hebraic moral reformers. Being 'altogether too negative, effeminate, lacking in power of resistance', they were without 'the necessary robustness, energy, hardiness, to front, to understand life as it is'. They 'comfortably refuse to face the hard facts of life', and, instead, 'reconstruct the world according to their own pseudo-philanthropic imaginations'. As a result, they 'compacently assume
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that the world can be what they think it should be, and 'rail and wax indignant because things obstinately continue to be as they are necessitated to be. They wrongly ascribe this, moreover, 'not to [their] lack of observation and common sense, but to the wilful malice and perversity of those who refuse to share [their] enterprise, because they share neither [their] self-deception nor [their] error.'

It was these unrealistic people, and not the female sex, who were the 'women' he excoriated in his Liedertafel speech for wishing to 'play the part of saviour to unregenerate man - to make him mild and moral', to 'see that he is tucked up in bed by half past eight o'clock out of harm's way', and that he does 'not read naughty books, nor use naughty words.' This clearly had nothing in common with Symbolism's well-known mistrust of woman as the temptress who, by arousing man's animal passions, concomitantly erodes his spirituality and his capacity to make contact with the ideal.

4. Marshall-Hall's Public Role

One reason why the structurally conducive components of the situation did not, alone, give rise to the hostile

---
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323 Bohemia, 29 January 1891.
324 Australian Musical News, August 1911.
325 Argus, 2 August 1898.
326 See e.g. Goldwater, op.cit., p.154, 226, 227.
outburst that occurred, is to be found in an element of what Smelser calls social control, which inhibits the accumulation of determinants to collective action.\textsuperscript{327} There was in the Zeitgeist a profound commitment to freedom of speech, espousal of which was practically mandatory for anyone wishing to obtain a serious hearing on any subject. And that included Marshall-Hall's enemies. The latter were not, as his supporters maintained, merely engaged in 'the ... persecution of an atheist ... on account of his opinions,'\textsuperscript{328} or 'because he is conscientiously unable to believe in the divinity of Christ or the existence of God.'\textsuperscript{329} Nor were they seeking to procure 'unanimity with regard to the spiritual and ethical basis of life ... by means of compulsion.'\textsuperscript{330}

On the contrary, they repeatedly insisted that, since 'Liberty of conscience and speech is every man's birthright,'\textsuperscript{331} Marshall-Hall and those in sympathy with him 'may think as they please about politics, religion and morals.'\textsuperscript{332} It is true that a few of them drained the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{327} Smelser, \textit{op.cit.}, p.17.
\item \textsuperscript{328} P. Frost in \textit{Mitre}, 2 July 1900.
\item \textsuperscript{329} P. Frost in \textit{Herald}, 14 June 1900; see also e.g. 'W' in \textit{Age}, 19 August 1898; James A. Brown in \textit{Herald}, 16 June 1900; \textit{Outpost}, 16 June 1900.
\item \textsuperscript{330} F.S. Delmar in \textit{Herald}, 22 August 1898; see also e.g. J.E. Atley in \textit{Herald}, 27 August 1898; Frederick F. Smith in \textit{Herald}, 20 August 1898; J. Buckley Castieu in \textit{Herald}, 19 August 1898; \textit{Herald}, 25 August 1898; \textit{Leader}, 27 August 1898.
\item \textsuperscript{331} \textit{Victorian Independent}, September 1898.
\item \textsuperscript{332} \textit{Presbyterian Monthly}, 1 September 1898; see also e.g. \textit{Southern Cross}, 29 June 1900.
\end{itemize}
action of freedom of practically all its useful meaning by declaring that while 'a man was at liberty to express his views ... he should be prepared to take the consequences' as liberty did not mean 'that licentiousness in publications should go unchecked, but only that men should be left to publish, and to take the consequences.' But such vitiating qualifications were rare.

The more general sincerity of Hebraism's commitment to real freedom was borne out in June 1900 by the opposition of its exponents to proposals to penalise three Board of Works employees for declining to join in a celebration of the relief of Mafeking. Although generally strongly disagreeing with the views implied by their action, Hebraic voices overwhelmingly insisted (in two cases on the same page as articles opposing the reappointment of the Ormond Professor) that 'Genuine toleration consists in tolerating not only opinions we like, but opinions we do not like', so that if there was 'a minority among us opposed to the war, and some even who contemplated British successes with a sigh, they must be permitted to cherish those wrong-headed views in peace.'

---

333 'Onlooker' in Argus, 19 June 1900; see also T.W. Eggleston in ibid.
334 Argus, 15 August 1898.
335 Presbyterian Monthly, 15 June 1900; Southern Cross, June 1900.
336 Southern Cross, 8 June 1900.
To discover why the same principle did not hold in Marshall-Hall's case, further elements of strain need to be examined. One was simply the fact that the author of the heterodox utterances in question was a teacher at the University. "Had Professor Marshall-Hall been merely a private citizen, holding no such position," declared 'Onlooker', 'he might have gone on publishing "poems" so called ... without anyone troubling much about the matter.'\(^{337}\) The Southern Cross agreed, saying that Mr Marshall-Hall, in his rhymes, can commit as many assaults on the ... canons of good taste and the beliefs of his fellow citizens as he pleases ... as a question of literary freedom .... But Mr Marshall-Hall is a Professor of the Melbourne University .... Such a position carries with it certain limitations. A clown may dress himself in motley and make grimaces at a street corner; but a University Professor may not.'\(^{338}\)

Similarly, the Spectator said, 'If we had to deal with him only as [a] private individual, it would not be necessary to say anything about his utterances ... but as to whether it is barely decent to have such words coming from the mouth of a University Professor is quite another question.'\(^{339}\) The Rev. Lawrence Rentoul insisted that

\(^{337}\) 'Onlooker' in Herald, 27 August 1898; see also e.g. Bishop Goe in Leader, 9 June 1900.

\(^{338}\) 12 August 1898; see also Southern Cross, 28 October 1898, 8 October 1898; Mitre, 1 September 1898.

\(^{339}\) 12 August 1898.
the poems were 'worthy of notice only as coming from a highly-paid Professor of the University'\textsuperscript{340}. And the Argus remarked that a University professor, while 'within his rights as a citizen' in publishing material of the type produced by Marshall-Hall, was no more entitled to do so without penalty than is a 'clergyman who vociferated the odds upon a race course as a bookmaker, and who squabbled in public bars', or an 'officer in the army who published a vehement denunciation of the wars in which English troops were engaged'.\textsuperscript{341}

Even the pro-Marshall Bulletin was 'of opinion that to reach its maximum of usefulness ... a University ... while honoring freedom of thought, should restrict its own freedom of action so as not violently to run counter to the ideas or prejudices of the people whom it aims to benefit',\textsuperscript{342} and that, consequently, it had been 'decidedly unjustifiable' of Marshall-Hall, 'to publish in his own name verses attacking current creeds, conventions or prejudices .... For his public acts cannot be dissociated from his professorship'.\textsuperscript{343}

What was implied in these accounts was, of course (although, in part only), a conviction that Marshall-Hall

\textsuperscript{340} Argus, 25 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{341} 15 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{342} 27 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{343} 20 August 1898.
would exercise an undesirable moral and/or religious influence on his students. This was a central, but not, as I shall argue, in itself, a decisive, ingredient of the situation referred to in the first condition of Martin's R', when applied to this affair. The claim that the Ormond Professor had written nothing more indecent than had Smollet, Fielding and Swinburne, was, declared 'Teacher of Thirty Years' Standing', 'beside the question', since the 'impurities of these men's writings would have unfitted them to be teachers of boys and girls. It is perfectly consistent to maintain this, and yet admit that they are English Classics'.

5. Classroom Indiscretions

The perceived unsuitability of Marshall-Hall for his post, in this respect, was much heightened by another element of strain, and of Martin's perceived situation, namely, what were referred to as the 'many grievous tales', which were reportedly 'current as to things said by the Professor of Music amongst his students. Just how much truth they contained is, with one exception, difficult to determine.

344 See e.g. Archbishop Carr to Alexander Leeper, 29 November 1898, in Leeper papers, loc.cit.

345 Herald, 10 June 1900; see also e.g. Bishop Goe to Sir W. Wrixon, 5 August 1898, MUCRF 1898/5; George Bell in Victorian Independent, November 1898; 'Onlooker' in Herald, 1 August 1898; Presbyterian Public Questions Committee in Argus, 25 November 1898; Southern Cross, 22 June 1900; Presbyterian Monthly, 1 September 1898, 24 June 1900; T. Ibsen in London Musical Courier, 8 December 1898; Advocate, 23 June 1900, 13 August 1898; A. Leeper, Argus, 15 June 1900; Bishop Goe in Argus, 18 June 1900; E.B. Hamilton in Argus, 13 June 1900; Dr. Crowther in Argus, 19 June 1900.

346 Southern Cross, 12 August 1898; see also Professor H.B. Allen in Argus, 26 June 1900.
Allowance has to be made, in considering their plausibility, for the fact that Marshall-Hall's was one of those colourful personalities which attract apocryphal stories. One such, which was almost certainly untrue, concerned a church organist who allegedly complained to the University authorities that, when he had sought advice from the professor on which of two ways to write a certain musical passage, the latter had replied, 'It doesn't matter a damn'. When the Council broached the matter with Marshall-Hall, he reportedly replied, 'I have the honour to acknowledge your communication ... and in reply beg to state that it really did not matter a damn'\textsuperscript{347}. However, there is no record of this incident, either in the Council Minute Book, or in the University's extensive correspondence files.

It is not clear on what, if any authority the Outpost referred to charges that he had made improper remarks to students, as 'lying scandals'\textsuperscript{348}. But they gain little in plausibility from County Court Judge E.B. Hamilton's claim, with its blatantly cavalier disregard for the rules of evidence, to have 'been furnished with the names of those who, if he could use them, would convince the Council', that some, at least, were true. Unfortunately, he grieved, parents 'would not permit their daughters to be brought before the Council to be examined and cross

\textsuperscript{347} Musical World, 25 January 1902.
\textsuperscript{348} 14 July 1900.
examined on matters which had been mentioned in their classes.\textsuperscript{349}

Thomas Harlin\textsuperscript{350}, on the other hand, claimed to be speaking on behalf of some forty parents, who, he informed the University Council in June 1900, had agreed 'that the characters of their children had not suffered in any way by having been enrolled among his students'.\textsuperscript{351} But parents, it need hardly be said, are unlikely to declare otherwise. And, apart from Harlin, himself, only two actually came forward publicly to deny the charges. They were Frances P.J. Bowley\textsuperscript{352} and the Rev. E.H. Sugden, Master of Queen's College. Of the former nothing further is known. The latter's 'daughter [had] been for three years a student at the conservatorium', a fact, which, he said, 'may be taken as evidence that I have satisfied myself that the Professor has abstained from using his position in order to inculcate upon his pupils ideas in opposition to religion and morality'.

Sugden's value as a witness is enhanced by two further circumstances. One was that he had, himself, been for

\textsuperscript{349} \textit{Argus}, 19 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{350} Harlin, a mathematician, had been first Principal of Brisbane Grammar School (1869-1875) and then lecturer in mathematics at Sydney University (1876). In the following year he became second master of Melbourne Church of England Grammar School, a position he held until his retirement 10 years later (Latrobe Library Biography File).

\textsuperscript{351} \textit{Argus}, 19 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{352} \textit{Herald}, 21 June 1900.
some time a member of Marshall-Hall's orchestral class, and had

never heard him say a word, even in the excitement of rehearsal and when his patience has been sore tried by the incompetence of an orchestra mainly composed of inexperienced amateurs, that was either ungentlemanly or in the slightest degree immoral in tendency or expression.

The other was that he had 'become acquainted with a considerable number of the students' at the Conservatorium, but had 'never heard from any of them of anything objectionable or immoral in the Professor's lectures'. Nor had he 'observed in their conduct any such results as might have been expected had the Professor's influence on them been of the character that has been suggested'.

Yet, while all this clearly belies Feldman's contention that Hymns Ancient and Modern 'became the target for the long suppressed antagonism of the Undergraduates' parents', it hardly amounts to a very convincing case in Marshall-Hall's favour. Nor was such a case made by the further corroborative testimony of two of his fellow teachers, Auguste Siede and Elise Wiedermann. The truth of the matter is that, in his ten years of office, Marshall-Hall must have had so much contact with students — in large classes, small groups, and individually — that it would be impossible to prove that he had not on occasions let fall remarks that were indelicate to Hebraic ears.

---

353 Argus, 16 June 1900.
354 Feldman, op.cit., p. 89.
355 Argus, 19 June 1900; Herald, 21 June 1900.
But, of the impropriety of the remarks believed to have been made, there can be little doubt. Not a great deal is known of the content of the rumours under consideration, which, according to the Outpost, could 'only be suggested, because they were unprintable'. Some, nevertheless, did find their way into print.

One contemporary claimed that the origin of the 'hubbub' was a Conservatorium lecture in which Marshall-Hall had 'declared Beethoven to be of more importance than the Bible'. The Bulletin said it had all stemmed, not from the 'professor's little green-covered book of "Hymns" and other pagan utterances', but from 'a particular statement which a certain spinster made to her influential pa ... who lodged a podsnapian protest with the Bishop [i.e. Bishop Goe]'. The 'spinster', it seems, 'went to the Professor for advice on a musical subject, and he gave his opinion in a sentence which might have been worded quite as explicitly without venturing so close to the knuckle'. This could refer to an incident, recounted nearly half a century later by J. Sutton Crow, one-time secretary of the Conservatorium, who said that a number of parents had objected after a student, who went to Marshall-Hall 'for advice as to her future', was told that she was 'now an accomplished musical machine', but lacked

---

356 14 July 1900.
357 Murdoch, *op. cit.*, p.166.
358 30 June 1900.
'temperament'. When asked how this commodity could be procured he reportedly replied, 'There are many ways of awakening the soul, perhaps the simplest is to fall in love'. 'Do you propose to teach me?' asked the student. 'Oh no,' he answered, 'it is for me to point the way only, not to arrange personally conducted tours'.

Another such tale, for which there is a degree of independent corroboration, appeared in the Bulletin in August 1898. It concerned 'a certain somewhat famous Australian musical class' in which 'the theory was one day officially pronounced that no one who had not run away with his friend's wife could appreciate "Lohengrin"' - which apparently provoked from a female student, the question, 'Please Professor, would a friend's husband do?' The authenticity of this anecdote is supported by a note in the handwriting of Herbert Brookes in the Melbourne University archives. Headed 'Marshall-Hall and Rev. Brian Webberley [sic]’, it apparently consists of material obtained in the 1920s by Brookes when engaged in writing a memoir of the musician, from Brian Webberley, one of Marshall-Hall's early students. It says simply, 'Wagner ran away with Bulow's [four illegible words] the "Idyll" and had orchestra play beneath his window. "I would have run away with anyone's wife if I could have written that Idyll".

---


360. 26 August 1898.
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Such ex cathedra indiscretions, innocent enough, perhaps, to the Hellenic temper, are likely to have been viewed by Hebraism as dangerous to Christian belief among students, encouraging them to sexual experimentation in the interests of art.

At the time, however, public attention, at least, focussed on the one story that was authenticated beyond all doubt. It was revealed by the prominent Anglican Canon Robert Potter of St. Mary's Church, North Melbourne, first Lecturer in Christian Apologetics at Trinity College and for a time (till 1894) College Chaplin\textsuperscript{362}, in a letter that appeared in the Argus on 11 July 1900, and which accused the embattled musician of having 'recommended a class of girls under his charge to study the Kreutzer Sonata ... not a piece of music, but a novel and a nasty novel at that'. (This is not to be confused with Bobbington's unsupported claim that Alexander Leeper had heard a rumour about Marshall-Hall telling 'a female violin student that before she could play the Kreutzer Sonata of Beethoven with any feeling she would have to break the seventh commandment\textsuperscript{363}).

Tolstoy's long short story, preoccupied, as it is, with copulation, albeit in strong disapproval thereof, was not of a kind that would meet with Hebraic approval.

\textsuperscript{362} J. Grant, \textit{op.cit.}, p.96, 105.

\textsuperscript{363} Bobbington, M.Mus., p.139.
as reading material for young girls. Potter called it 'a very dirty and disgusting diatribe', adding that he had never read 'a Book so full of vile descriptions and viler insinuations'. The Argus, as early as 1895, had described it as, morally speaking, 'absolutely loathsome', and some five years later, declared that 'If Professor Marshall-Hall did so recommend this novel surely the question is settled'. In 1902 Marshall-Hall's successor in the Ormond Chair, Franklin Peterson, perhaps intent on scoring points against a predecessor in whose towering shadow he was compelled to work, affirmed it to be 'little short of blasphemy to associate the diseased, neurotic' contents of this 'horrible novel' with 'the pre-eminently sound, wholesome natural life' portrayed in Beethoven's work. He, himself, he smugly added, never lost 'an opportunity of warning students against the crime of associating them' (surely an infallible way of increasing the book's readership). Even the Outpost, while insisting that 'the "Kreutzer Sonata" by Tolstoy is NOT a "dirty and disgusting novel" at all', conceded that 'there is a "dirty and disgusting" translation of it published in the "Secrets of a Fair Girl's Bedroom" series,'

364 Argus, 11 July 1900.
365 Argus, 14 July 1900; see also e.g. Rev. Evelyn Brogass in Argus, 16 July 1900.
366 31 August 1895.
367 11 July 1900.
368 Argus, 6 May 1902.
however\textsuperscript{369}. I have, unfortunately, been unable to obtain a copy of the latter, or, indeed to ascertain whether it was this version that Potter and others had in mind when they attacked the musician.

Marshall-Hall, himself, admitted the offence. And by acknowledging its gravity, he provided evidence that it violated not only Hebraic moral norms. In extenuation, he claimed that at the time he 'had not recently read the book but had a general recollection of it, and knew that it was regarded as an interpretation of the first movement of Beethoven's sonata'. After receiving a letter from the father of a student 'pointing out quite courteously that it was not a proper book to recommend to young ladies', he had re-read it, agreed with the judgment, and withdrawn his advice in class.\textsuperscript{370}

His enemies, however, were not appeased. Canon Potter refused 'to believe that a man who had read it should so far forget its character as to think it allowable to set it for a study to a class of young women'.\textsuperscript{371} And to others it was additional proof of the fact that Marshall-Hall was a man of 'limited or non-existent discretion'.\textsuperscript{372}

\textsuperscript{369} 21 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{370} Argus, 13 July 1900; Marshall-Hall gave this account of the affair to Orme Masson, requesting him to make it public. So our knowledge of it comes from Masson's letter to the Argus, not directly from the musician.

\textsuperscript{371} Argus, 14 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{372} Southern Cross, 22 June 1900.
who, suffering, as he did, 'from an unhappy incontinence of speech which overflows all barriers, and disregards all conditions of fitness and taste', was 'not in the least likely to practise a more heroic reticence in his classroom than he does in his poems, or the conductorship of the Melbourne Liedertafel'.

He was, therefore, 'not a fit and proper person to hold the Ormond professorship'.

But, while such a proven misdemeanour undoubtedly strengthened Hebraic hostility and may have been crucial in procuring the musician's ultimate downfall (see below p.608), it was not a necessary condition of the clamour for his replacement. The latter arose, rather, from a combination of perceptions of his general character, as revealed by the offensive utterances of 1898, and the structurally conducive belief of Hebraism in the infectiousness of sin (see pp.131-138).

Even if he did not 'introduce into the lecture room, either openly or covertly, sentiments or teachings not related to his subject in a purely scientific and proper sense', it was argued that he would 'exercise unconscious influence on young people', since every man
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expresses more by his mere personality than perhaps he has any intention of doing.\textsuperscript{377} Therefore, his 'views and opinions, in spite of himself, and perhaps insensibly, must impress themselves upon, and influence those around him'.\textsuperscript{378} It was not true, insisted Cambridge graduate and one time school head, inspector, and secretary of the Denominational Board, R. Hale Budd, that a teacher, who 'keeps his opinions on religion and morals to himself ... will not influence his pupils'. Since a 'man's opinions give a tone to his life and conduct, and this tone exercises more or less influence upon all with whom he associates', teachers, like Marshall-Hall, necessarily 'exercise a powerful influence upon the formation of their pupils' characters and opinions by means of what I may call the atmosphere which their opinions generate around them'.\textsuperscript{379} And the Argus maintained, in the same context, that the 'young and impressionable are liable to be swayed by chance words, by veiled allusions, by suggestive promptings, by moral atmosphere, even when the teacher imagines that he is reticent'.\textsuperscript{380}

6. Student Vulnerability

The fear of moral infection, in this case, rested, in its turn, and was greatly strengthened by the structurally

\textsuperscript{377} T.W. Eggleston in \textit{Argus}, 19 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{378} 'Onlooker' in \textit{Herald}, 3 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{379} \textit{Argus}, 13 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{380} 15 August 1898.
conducive belief that University students were 'at the most susceptible period of their lives',\textsuperscript{381} (According to Blainey, the average age of students entering Melbourne University in the nineties was 15 to 16\textsuperscript{382}. ) Marshall-Hall's influence, it was maintained, was being 'brought to bear at a time when the mind was most plastic and the impulses were least under control'.\textsuperscript{383}

And the danger was seen to be intensified by two elements of strain in the contemporary \textit{Zeitgeist} - both components of the 'degraded present'. One was the belief that Biblical criticism was having its most pernicious effect among 'empty headed youth'.\textsuperscript{384} The other was a conviction that theirs was an age in which parental 'authority ... is not exercised as in former generations',\textsuperscript{385} and when the 'reaction from the stern discipline of home, and school ... that prevailed in the early years of the generation now passing away' was 'as foolish as it was fond, and as hurtful as it is well-intentioned'.\textsuperscript{386}

\textsuperscript{381}Dr. Crowther in Argus, 19 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{382}Blainey, \textit{A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne, op.cit.}, p.97.
\textsuperscript{383}J.G. Duffy MLA in Argus, 19 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{384}Rev. H.L. Jackson in Centennial Magazine, Vol.2, No.5, December 1889; see also e.g. J.B. Shepherd in Argus, 16 November 1900; \textit{Southern Baptist}, 12 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{385}Christian Citizen, 2 January 1902; see also e.g. \textit{Southern Baptist}, 2 February 1899; Commander Booth in Argus, 2 August 1900; \textit{Victorian Independent}, August 1900.
\textsuperscript{386}\textit{Southern Baptist}, 30 November 1899; see also e.g. Mr Henry Wrixon in \textit{Table Talk}, 28 June 1889; \textit{PPCM}, November 1895, Appendix p.xvii.
farm, declared the Advocate, in the course of an attack on Marshall-Hall, was 'increasing rather than decreasing each succeeding year'. And its chief manifestations were held to be a burgeoning 'tendency of young people to drift away from Christian profession and service', a growing 'lack of reverence among our young folks', and a 'rising tide of ... youthful depravity'.

Predictably, the hazards were believed to be greatest among university students, who 'in an entirely non-religious atmosphere', many of them, paradoxically, far 'from home with all its protections and sanctities', were being taught to 'criticise, to examine, to turn inside out anything and everything under the sun ... however venerable'.

As if this was not enough, music students were deemed to be particularly at risk. Music, 'perhaps more than

---
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392 A. Harper, op.cit., p.23; see also Australasian Intercollegian, 1 August 1900.

393 R.M. Robson, in Australasian Intercollegian, July 1901; see also e.g. Cardinal Moran in O'Farrell, ibid., p.194; Advocate, 13 August 1898.
anything else, if made use of in a wrong direction," declared pastoralist Robert Gillespie, pleading with the University Council not to re-appoint Marshall-Hall, "had an ill effect on the minds and hearts of young persons at their most susceptible age. Under the cover of music more damage could be done, perhaps, than in any other direction." His fellow deputationist, Catholic lawyer John Gavan Duffy, MLA, Postmaster-General in the Turner ministry (1894-9), concurred that it "was the most impressionable of the arts, and ... when misused it became a source of grave danger." And in another context, but, apparently, in all earnestness, the society paper, Tit Bits, declared that it was impossible to 'count the tunes which may have driven weak souls to the dramshop, to the laudanum bottle, or even the gallows.'

Implicit in this was a fundamental antithesis between the Romantic Hellenism of Marshall-Hall and the Hebraism of his enemies, an antithesis, which is crucial in accounting for the hostility that emerged. Both agreed that the impact of music was primarily emotional. It was, said the Mitre, 'a subject which appeals more strongly than
any other to the emotional side of [students'] natures'. 398 But Hebraism distrusted emotion, and, therefore, distrusted ‘the condition of subjectivity’ which ‘is essential to musical efforts’. 399 The Victorian Churchman, like Marshall-Hall, used the metaphor of depth as a figurative measure of value, and agreed with the Ormond Professor that music was the expression of emotion. But in significant and fundamental contrast to him, argued that by ‘fixing attention so much upon what is superficial, [it] may, if cultivated to excess, positively hinder the mind and the soul from studying that moral beauty which lies so much deeper than the surface and is so much more real’. 400 The upshot was that Marshall-Hall, for whom emotion was anything but superficial, was declared unfit to be ‘a teacher of the most emotional of all arts to the most susceptible of all pupils’. 401

7. Female Vulnerability

A second danger perceived to be inherent in the study of music was the fact that most of those engaged therein were female. And Marshall-Hall was widely held to have particularly demonstrated his unfitness ‘for the directorship

398 Mitre, 2 July 1900.
399 Advocate, 6 October 1900.
400 Victorian Churchman, 22 August 1898; see also Australasian Intercollegian, 2 May 1898; Southern Cross, 15 March 1900; Argus, 8 June 1895.
401 Southern Cross, 31 August 1900.
of classes largely composed of girls. This reflected a further complex of structurally conducive beliefs, notably that, from a moral point of view, the distinction between men and women hinges on the different ways in which they have inherited the common burden of original sin. For women the danger lies in the external environment. In their natural state (that is, when free from outside corrupting influences) they were the very 'embodiment of purity and refinement,' since, in this condition, they had only to do 'with the foundation of sweet waters, clear as crystal that flows from the throne of God, not with the sewer that flows from the foul imagination of man.'

But, at the same time (and this was their legacy of original sin), they were deemed to be 'more sensitive to impressions of every kind' than man; which meant that they had less will-power to withstand external temptation.

402 J. Redford Corr, Extracts from the Published Works of Professor Marshall-Hall, Latrobe Library Pamphlet, 17 July 1900; see also Advocate, 29 October 1898, 16 June 1900; Musical News, 15 September 1900; Southern Cross, 28 October 1898, 18 August 1898; Victorian Independent, November 1898; J. Alfred Johnstone in Argus, 9 August 1898; 'Onlooker' in Herald, 27 August 1898; Bishop Goe in Argus, 5 June 1900; A. Harper in Argus, 8 June 1900.

403 Woman, 21 October 1907; see also e.g. 'Galahad' in Champion, 19 October 1895; 'Alethea' in Argus, 9 March 1895.
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'The victory over self,' declared the Argus, 'is the result of force of will; and physiology teaches that in the power to execute their will men are more amply provided than women ... the average man is endowed with more executive power than the average woman; and, that being so, he is better armed against temptation.\(^406\). Men, therefore, would be more virtuous than women, were their virtue independent of ... other considerations\(^407\), namely of the strong internal drive to evil, which is absent in women. But, when 'woman errs on the side of excess she finds it exceedingly difficult to pull up and retrace her steps. She is in danger of becoming the mere helpless slave of a vicious habit.\(^408\).

It was partly because of this supposed susceptibility to external temptation that many contemporaries were determined to exempt women 'from the fighting duties of citizenship\(^409\) — that is, from voting. Politics, it was argued, was 'a very dirty business\(^410\), participation in which would cause woman to become 'as man, knowing good and evil,\(^411\), and more likely than Adam's sons to succumb to the latter.

\(^406\) Argus, 25 February 1899.
\(^407\) Ibid.
\(^408\) Argus, 13 March 1900.
\(^409\) Argus, 17 February 1897.
\(^410\) R. Harper in Argus, 9 October 1896.
\(^411\) Anon correspondent in Ibid.
And the same assumption gave rise to the prevailing obsession with protecting women from even the slightest unnecessary exposure to sexuality. Thus, judges advised them to leave the court room when evidence of an 'indecent' nature was about to be given, and newspapers censured those who failed to do so. Matriculation text books were bowdlerised when they were of such a nature that they could not be taught in ladies' schools. The theatre was judged to be 'full of pitfalls for the weaker sex'. The art gallery life class allegedly endangered morality by requiring 'pure minded girl students ... to work from such [nude] models, and portray on paper or canvas such indecent pictures'. And 'respectable' girls were still commonly chaperoned when attending 'any public or promiscuous gathering'.

It is little wonder, then, that Marshall-Hall came under attack, especially as he was deemed to have been doubly culpable in this respect. He had expressed opinions 'so wild and erroneous', and given such graphic accounts
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of sexual relations as to render his continued occupation of the chair of music most dangerous to 'that sex the most prized feature of whose character a breath might sully, so delicate and so sensitive is it.'\textsuperscript{419}

But, more than that, he had offended against the Hebraic policy of maintaining an almost unbridgeable psychic distance between woman and the physical appetites of carnal man. To this end, Hebraism set out to drain the former's image of all vestige of sensual content, of anything, in short, that made her attractive to a prospective sexual partner. She was to be treated with 'respect' and 'veneration', to be placed 'on an altar where man could worship her.'\textsuperscript{420} with 'a feeling approaching reverence.'\textsuperscript{421} - all notions which, consistent with their sacred associations, lacked any profane physical element. To bring her down from the pedestal, to represent her, that is, as occupying the same sordid ground as profane, sensual man, was to infuse her with an aura of sexual availability, to create a situation, in which 'to many boys the word "girl" calls up associations of intrigue and vulgar badinage, if nothing worse.'\textsuperscript{422}, rather than of unapproachable divinity.

\textsuperscript{419} Advocate, 16 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{420} G.D. Carter in Champion, 17 December 1895.
\textsuperscript{421} A.S. Dyer, Appeal to the Chivalry of Young Men, London, 1892, p.2.
It was this that accounted for Hebraic hostility to
'the so-called up-to-date woman who moves about like a
man,'\(^{423}\), and to mixed bathing which caused women to
'appear under immodest circumstances in public.'\(^{424}\).
It was this, also, which explains the protests against
Marshall-Hall's 'Sapphics'. This was one of the poems
the Argus deemed too indecent to print. Turnbull
misses the point, when he characterises it as containing
'little that could have been considered risqué even
then.'\(^{425}\). It was offensive, not only as a representation
of carnal anticipation, but also, and chiefly, because it
'attributes lewdness to the woman,'\(^{426}\) in a manner 'which
causes the gorge of the true man to rise'. That is to
say, it depicted her as the initiator of sexual behaviour -
as a 'shame-faced maiden', gliding noiselessly through the
night 'towards the Beloved's chamber.'\(^{427}\). And that
gave rise to 'doubt as to ... the propriety of girls or
even young men, being left under [his] tutorship.'\(^{428}\).

The gravity of such doubts was increased by the belief
(a further element of strain) that women, too, had fallen
victim to the degraded present. This was seen to be

\(^{423}\) Archbishop Kelly in O'Farrell, \textit{op.cit.}, p.261.

\(^{424}\) \textit{Ibid.}


\(^{426}\) Argus, 5 August 1898.

\(^{427}\) \textit{Ibid.}

\(^{428}\) Advocate, 13 August 1898.
reflected in the 'steadily lowered standard of decency in female costume', 429 in a 'frightening increase' in gambling among women, 430, and, more generally, in the 'essentially diseased' and 'morbid psychology' of the 'new woman'. 431 The latter 'with her new and very startling morality', it was lamented, 'is disposed to treat marriage as the one unpardonable variety of wickedness'. 432 She strove 'to stir up discontentment among wives', blinding them 'to the dignity, the responsibility and the holiness of maternity', and speaking 'with contempt of domestic duties'. 433 As a result, complained the Rev. T. Adamson in July 1900, women were 'losing their love for domestic arts ... in the lower ranks they prefer to go to the factories rather than devote themselves to domestic work. In the next grade they choose business and still higher they look for a profession such as medicine'. 434

It is clearly pertinent to the present inquiry that this undesirable state of affairs was commonly attributed to the increased access recently gained by women to post-primary education - a result of the 'multiplication of

429 Argus, 17 July 1897.
430 Dean of Melbourne, Dr. Vance, in Age, 2 April 1898.
431 Argus, 16 August 1907.
432 Argus, 5 May 1895.
433 Mrs. T.R. Andrews in Argus, 9 August 1895.
434 Herald, 13 July 1900.
high schools for girls', and the 'opening of our universities and of the leading professions to women'. The trouble, declared the Argus, was that 'Our candidates for matriculation read and study books of which their mothers were hardly allowed to know the existence until they were married, and are familiar with physiological facts and processes the very mention of which would have reduced their grandmothers to indignant and blushing confusion'.\(^{435}\) Censorship, it seems, did not need to be strict in France, where, according to the same paper, education had not produced the same dangerous results, since, there, 'young girls are supposed not to read novels',\(^{436}\) and their parents 'would think twice before escorting a young girl to witness a performance of Madame Rejane at the Vaudeville';\(^{437}\) while, in English speaking lands, 'girls and women are the greatest readers of fiction', enjoying 'almost unrestricted liberty of choice in the catalogue of the circulating library'.\(^{438}\)

7. The Problem of Popularity

It should not have been unexpected, then, that such stress was placed on protecting them from the likes of Marshall-Hall, especially in view of the charisma that the latter undoubtedly possessed in the eyes of his students.

\(^{435}\) Argus, 13 August 1898.

\(^{436}\) April 1898.

\(^{437}\) 5 August 1903.

\(^{438}\) Ibić., 4 April 1908.
That 'he is a strong and attractive personality,' maintained the Church of England Messenger, 'is proved by the devotion of his female students.' And John Gavan Duffy argued that the 'fact of his personal magnetism made the case worse. If Marshall-Hall were only a dull clod the scandal of his actions would raise no difficulty', but, given his 'fascinating personality [,] the likelihood of his impressing the young carried very grave danger.' Similarly, T.W. Eggleston pointed out that, being 'a man of strong personality', he 'would be sure to exercise an unconscious influence on young people.' Robert Potter, in the same context, complained that such a 'very fascinating personality enables a little argument to go a long way.' And the Southern Cross agreed that the risk was increased by the fact that, 'by the consent of all parties, Mr Marshall-Hall is a man of vivid personality.'

The support he received from the student body, in the struggle to retain his chair, served to confirm such fears, and was, therefore, probably, on the whole, counter-productive. In August 1898 forty-three students of the Conservatorium, most of them female, protested, in a letter to the press, at 'the hostile persecution of

---

439 Argus, 19 June 1900.
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Professor Marshall-Hall. At the Commencement ceremony in 1899 the traditional student song contained a stanza, supporting the music professor, in the form of a reference to *Hymns Ancient and Modern* as 'divinely sweet', followed by a warning that since

... the Argus raised a howl,
... future bards must tarry,
And see their verse is gay as a hearse,
And approved by "Fighting Larry".  

In June 1900, when both the Boer War and the controversy over the chair of music were at their height, Conservatorium students were reported to be replacing the 'hero buttons', attached to their hatbands in celebration of Roberts, Kitchener and Baden-Powell, with ones honouring Marshall-Hall. In the same month they tried (unsuccessfully) to send a deputation in his favour to the University Council. And in July the student journal, *Alma Mater*, referred to the Ormond Professor's adversaries as a 'pack of scurrilous news-mongers and their paltry associates of the pen'.

But the action which attracted most attention, and most intensified the doubts already entertained as to the
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musician's suitability for his pedagogical role, occurred on 18 June 1900. On that day, while the University Council was receiving an anti-Marshall-Hall deputation, a group of students (estimated variously as between 150 and 300) gathered outside and interrupted proceedings by giving three groans for Dr. Leeper, its leader, and three cheers for Marshall-Hall, followed by the singing of 'For He's a Jolly Good Fellow'. When the deputation left, its members were followed by the students, who boarded the tram with them, alighting at every stop from the University to Collins Street to give a rousing three cheers for Marshall-Hall. One of the deputationists declared that the episode 'shows what sort of influence this man is exercising in the University'. And the Argus said it had made 'one thing clear', namely, that Professor Marshall-Hall has obtained great influence over young people with whom he is brought into contact. They regarded him as a hero, as a man to be admired with enthusiasm ... the guardians of youth are not at all likely to be reconciled to the idea of the reappointment of Professor Marshall-Hall by this discovery.

9. The University Connection

But, while the perceived influence of the Ormond Professor on the morals and religious beliefs of his...
students caused great concern, it did not, in itself, produce the outcry against him. What was objected to was not simply his pedagogical role, but the fact that he performed it under the aegis of Melbourne University. It was repeatedly asserted that 'against Mr Marshall-Hall as a private teacher no one will say a word'. And, indeed, when, after 1900, he set himself up as head of his own conservatorium, no effort was raised to prevent him.

The point is important, in view of the light it throws on the real reasons for the clamour against him. Underlying it were a number of important structurally conducive themes. One was the anxiety of the churches to be accorded public recognition in the form of government endorsement of their activities and values. This expressed itself at the time in a variety of well-documented ways, quite independently of the Marshall-Hall affair. It was implicit in the repeated demands that 'the Government recognises God as the supreme law-giver', and that
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Commonwealth Parliamentary sittings open with a prayer. It is also seen in clerical pleas for the declaration of an official day of prayer for rain to break the drought, and in protests against the officially proclaimed Melbourne Cup holiday, the various proposals to legalise totalisator betting, and 'the action of the Governor of this State in attending the public function for the reception of a leading representative of purely betting and gambling institutions'.

And it was evident in the criticisms of Marshall-Hall, who could be tolerated as the head of a private institution, but not as the employee of one that obtained a substantial portion of its funding from the public purse. Although at liberty to utter any views he wished, declared the Australian Christian, he was 'certainly out of place as a representative of the State'. And the Australasian Schoolmaster remarked, in explanation of its opposition to
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the musician's reappointment, that in Victoria 'the greatest possible freedom is enjoyed by private citizens for the expression of religious opinions, but ... those holding public official positions necessarily have much restricted freedom'\footnote{462}.

It is significant, in this connection, moreover, that the Seventh Day Adventists, who refrained from taking sides in the Marshall-Hall case, also opposed the use of the State to achieve the 'moral', as distinct from the 'social' objectives of Christianity (see p. 50). 'Religion,' they insisted, 'should grow from its own inherent vitality, and not from state culture or support'\footnote{463}. And, therefore, 'If the Church of God would cease going down to Egypt for help, and humble itself before the God of heaven ... more would be done towards stemming the tide of ungodliness'\footnote{464}. Accordingly, they averred that the law of the State should deal only with crime, not with sin\footnote{465}. They objected to efforts on the part of the Council of Churches to get Christians elected to Parliament\footnote{466}. And they opposed (of course) the State enforcement of Sunday observance\footnote{467}, and the recognition of God in the federal constitution\footnote{468}.

\footnote{462}{June 1900.}
\footnote{463}{Southern Sentinel, first quarter 1897.}
\footnote{464}{Bible Echo, 21 August 1899.}
\footnote{465}{Australian Sentinel, October 1894.}
\footnote{466}{Australian Sentinel, June 1895.}
\footnote{467}{Bible Echo, 31 January 1898.}
\footnote{468}{Southern Sentinel, first quarter 1897.}
No doubt Richard Ely is correct in attributing this desire for State endorsement of the religious function to a clerical hunger for 'public status' in the shape of a 'formal recognition by the community at large of the validity of those religious roles (prophetic, didactic, intercessory etc.) undertaken by clerics on the community's behalf.' But there was more to it than a desire to enhance clerical prestige. There was also the belief, particularly important in this case, that, in condoning vice, the State endowed it with a respectability that diminished its awfulness in the eyes of the morally weak.

'To legalise the totalisator,' it was argued, would be 'to convert the present legal reprobation of gambling into national sanction,' and, thereby, to clothe 'the greatest evil in Australia with a garb of respectability.' All 'the Church teachings' would be 'rendered nugatory through the minds of the young becoming poisoned by seeing and bearing that the law has legalised gambling in the way indicated.' Similarly, the Churches were said to be 'seriously handicapped in their fight against the mercenary vice of gambling by the favour shown to the [Melbourne] Cup race by the Government,' in the form of an official proclaimed holiday.

469 R. Ely, op.cit., p.129.
470 Ibid., p.6.
471 Joseph Nicholson in Age, 16 August 1898.
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473 R. Wigmore in Spectator, 15 October 1897; see also Sir. Southern Cross, 8 July 1898; Southern Baptist, November 1910.
474 Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1899.
And the same applied to the proposed reappointment of Marshall-Hall. It, too, was opposed on the ground that it would confer an official imprimatur of respectability, which would undermine public virtue.

Few things [explained Alexander Laepe] could be imagined more likely to be disastrous to the higher life of the community than that an impression should be created in the mind of the public that there were considerations which the governing body of the University ranked above influence on morals.\textsuperscript{475}

The Mitre reminded its readers that the Ormond Professor was 'a man in a position of trust whose utterances derive from his public office, an importance which they would not have of themselves'.\textsuperscript{476} Archbishop Carr, in the same context, pointed out that the 'higher the source from which the stream descends the more force it acquires and the more good or evil it is capable of effecting'.\textsuperscript{477}

And the Southern Cross wanted the musician 'dismissed to a position where he might compose what poetry, and secrete what oratory he pleased, in the full liberty of private life', because, then he would not be, by implication, attaching to either his poetry or his oratory the weight a University Chair confers.\textsuperscript{478} 'What must be the effect on the minds of the University students generally,' asked the latter journal, 'when they see the Council of the University

\textsuperscript{475} Argus, 19 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{476} 1 September 1898.
\textsuperscript{477} Argus, 11 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{478} 28 October 1898.
first formally classifying a gentleman as the author of ridiculeous poems, and an acrid atheist and then crowning him with the dignity and authority of a great University appointment?" 479.

The Rev. Professor Andrew Harper of Ormond College advocated the inclusion of a reference to God's supremacy in the Australian constitution, on the ground that it was one of those 'externalities', which, although not in themselves a guarantee that citizens would be moral or religious, 'yet remain an incitement to aspiration and an encouragement to us in our sincere moments, to aim at an ideal in our conduct'. They 'influence,' he added, 'most potently men's conception of what they are and ought to be, and thus smooth the way to action in the direction in which they point.' 480. And the removal of Marshall-Hall was another such 'externality' in the eyes of his Hebraic critics.

2. The Notion of Religious Neutrality

Another way in which his occupancy of a University chair was seen as magnifying the gravity of his offence lay in the damage he had allegedly inflicted on the public institution that employed him, and whose capacity to render adequate public service was said to have been impaired.

22 June 1900.

480 Australia Without God. An Appeal to the Churches of Stralia to Secure an Acknowledgement of God in the Australian Constitution, Melbourne, 1897, P.16.
His reappointment, it was argued, 'would be detrimental to the interests of the University',\textsuperscript{481} inasmuch as he had 'infringed [its] religious neutrality'.\textsuperscript{482} In re-engaging him, warned Harper, the Council would be disregarding 'its obligation to be neutral in matters of religion'.\textsuperscript{483} And Alexander Morrison, Principal of Scotch College and member of the University Council, agreed that it 'would be incompatible with the neutrality on moral and religious questions which the Directors of such an Institution are bound to maintain'.\textsuperscript{484} That the said Directors were impressed by this argument is clear from their resolution of 24 October 1898, which said, \textit{inter alia}, that the Ormond Professor's offensive utterances 'have infringed the principle of neutrality in religious matters which has so conduced to the usefulness of the University'.\textsuperscript{485}

On closer examination, this charge is found to contain two distinct elements. One, a legacy of the acrimonious, internecine religious discord of the recent past, especially in the area of State education, was that he had made himself the centre of religious altercation. In an institution

\textsuperscript{481} Wesley College Executive in Argus, 14 June 1900; see also Archbishop Carr in Argus, 11 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{482} M.K. McKenzie in Argus, 19 June 1900; see also e.g. P.B. Hamilton in Argus, 13 June 1900; Argus, 14 July 1900; A. Harper in Argus, 8 June 1900; Hickman Molesworth election committee statement in Argus, 5 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{483} A. Harper in Argus, 8 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{484} Alexander Morrison in Argus, 25 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{485} MUCMB, 24 October 1898.
"which its founders intended to be absolutely non-
sectarian," he had, it was charged, "surrounded himself
with an atmosphere and influence bitterly sectarian," intro-
ducing "in their most pernicious form", the "religious
disturbances and rancour and controversy which afflic-
ted the colleges in other parts of the world," and which, if not
firmly suppressed, would turn Australian universities into
mere centres of strife."

Secondly, as well as reflecting a deeply felt, structurally
conducive aversion for the denominational feuding with which
the colony's history was tainted, the allegation of having
violated the University's religious neutrality also embodied
the notion that his utterances had offended against the
prevailing liberal temper, by effectively disqualifying people
with certain religious convictions from enrolling in the
Conservatorium. It was, argued Morrison, the University's
responsibility "to see that entrance to it either as Teachers
or Students should not be barred to any by reason of their
opinions", and Marshall-Hall, he added, had "rendered it
impossible for a large and respectable section of the
community on conscientious grounds to permit their children
to receive instruction in the University School of Music
so long as he is Professor."

486 Hickman Molesworth in Argus, 5 July 1900.
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The Presbyterian Messenger declared it to be 'the first duty of the University Council ... to see that the benefits of the University are made accessible to everyone in the community', but, so long as he remained in his chair, those who agreed with 'the Council's own resolution [of 24 October 1898] as to the character of Professor Marshall-Hall's writings ... will be deliberately and wilfully shut out from the University'. The Argus maintained that the question at issue was whether the University was 'to be kept open to those who strongly and conscientiously hold the views which have been publicly outraged by the Professor of Music', adding that it was unjust that 'the schools and colleges [should] be compelled to either send on pupils to this particular teacher or to forego University advantages'; while Harper affirmed that reappointment would 'shut the University school of music to us and those who think with us'.

Thus, the reason why there was no objection to Marshall-Hall's operating a private school was that, in that case, only those need go to him who choose to do so. Those

491 22 June 1900; see also e.g. Presbyterian Messenger, 14 November 1900.
492 5 July 1900; see also Argus, 26 June 1900.
493 Argus, 26 June 1900.
494 Ibid.; see also Argus, 27 June 1900.
495 Southern Cross, 14 December 1900; see also e.g. Southern Cross, 22 June 1900, 11 January 1901, August 1898.
who value music above all things will not of necessity lose his services', while 'those who do not will have the University School of Music and Conservatorium open to them. That is precisely how it ought to be, and it was to secure that that those who disapproved of Mr. Marshall-Hall have been fighting', B.A. Crawford went a step further, maintaining that the difficulty arose from the fact that Victoria had only one university.

If there were two universities available [he argued] - one of which appointed as professors the most capable men who offered, regardless of the fact that they published, while holding office, verses of such a character as those under notice, while the other university declined to appoint such men to its teaching chairs even though their talents were supreme, then the case would not be quite the same.

A corollary of this view, together with the belief that a large majority of the community had taken mortal offence at the professor's behaviour, was the contention that, if he continued in its employ, the University would suffer the injury of significantly reduced enrolments - at least in its music department. On all hands, it was asserted that reappointment 'would have the effect of closing the University to many persons', or a 'large

496 Church of England Messenger, 1 July 1900.
497 Presbyterian Messenger, 21 December 1900.
499 Argus, 13 June 1900.
500 Provisional Council of Melbourne Church of England Girls' Grammar School in Argus, 18 June 1900.
number of responsible persons'\textsuperscript{501}, or 'many young
women'\textsuperscript{502}, or 'many parents'\textsuperscript{503}, or 'a large number of
parents'\textsuperscript{504}, or even 'most of those who desire to avail
themselves of the educational advantages offered'\textsuperscript{505}.
Even the pro-Marshall-Hall Punch believed that 'there are
many parents who hesitate to send their girls to the
conservatorium on account of the anti-religious opinions
and the free love utterances the Professor has indulged
in'\textsuperscript{506}. The Advocate warned that the authorities 'must
be prepared to either allow Mr. Marshall-Hall to go or
his classes to be thinned out nearly to the point of
disappearance'\textsuperscript{507}. And the University Council reflected
this fear by declaring, in its resolution of 24 October
1898, that Marshall-Hall had 'by his book and addresses
endangered the future of the School of Music and of the
Conservatorium of Music'\textsuperscript{508}.

\textsuperscript{501} Presbyterian Messenger, 22 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{502} William Morris to E.F. a'Beckett, 16 June 1900 in
MUCRCP, 1900/40.

\textsuperscript{503} Alexander Leeper in Argus, 19 June 1900; see also
Southern Cross, 28 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{504} Alexander Marshall to E.F. a'Beckett, 11 June 1900
in MUCRCP, 1900/40; see also Andrew Harper in Argus,
16 June 1900; Argus, 5 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{505} Provisional Council of Melbourne Church of England
Girls' Grammar School in Herald, 16 June 1900 (emphases mine).

\textsuperscript{506} 21 June 1900.
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The evidence, however, does not support these Cassandra-like predictions. Although the Council of the Presbyterian Ladies' College declared it to be 'within the personal knowledge of members of this Council that since the publication of the ... resolution [of 24 October 1898] some parents have been prevented from sending their daughters to the Conservatorium',\textsuperscript{509} not one such parent, or student, was ever identified. It is true that the Reverend Mother of the Loreto Abbey cabled the University Council 'in the name of all convents of our institute', expressing her determination 'not to send pupils music if reappointed'.\textsuperscript{510} But this would have been binding on neither students nor their parents. \textit{Punch} did not name the 'one or two ... gentlemen who are most prominent in the movement for the appointment of a new Professor', and who, according to the writer, 'took up the matter simply because they did not care to send their daughters to be trained by Professor Marshall-Hall'.\textsuperscript{511} But even if they existed, it does not follow that their daughters would have been forbidden to enrol, had he been reappointed.

The figures available, although incomplete, strongly suggest that, if the dispute had any perceptible effect at all in this regard, it was actually to increase enrolments.

\textsuperscript{509} Alexander Marshall to E.F. a'Beckett, 11 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{510} Rev. Mother Loreto Abbey to University Registrar, 4 June 1900 in \textit{ibid}.
\textsuperscript{511} 14 June 1900.
In February 1899 Marshall-Hall triumphantly informed the University Council that 'the general entry of students of the Conservatorium this year is very much the largest we have yet had', representing 'an increase of fifteen percent on full-course students alone'.

His fellow professors, in a subsequent letter of support, claimed that 110 students had been attending the Conservatorium in August 1898. By the end of the following year, they said, this had risen to 152 and in June 1900 there were 120, 'with the prospect of the considerable increase which usually takes place as the year progresses'.

The University's own records, fragmentary as they are, and, although they do not always specify the time of year to which figures apply, confirm this general picture. One document shows that in 1898 there were 71 full course students and 44 doing a part of the course only. In 1899 these numbers are given as 84 and 58; and in 1900, as 69 and 55. Another gives the total for August 1900 as 144.

And a third tells that, in the first term of 1898, 56 students were enrolled in the subject Form and Analysis, 21 in first year Counterpoint, and 90 in Interpretation of Works, while a year later these numbers were 67, 16 (rising to 20 in second term), and 110.
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respectively. All this surely supports the assertion of Marshall-Hall's brother professors that 'it can scarcely be maintained that the reappointment of the professor is likely to injure the institution. 516

Their view is further substantiated by the fact that in 1901, the first year of Peterson's occupation of the Chair, according to official records, the number fell to 30 full course and 45 part course students. 517. Exactly how many Marshall-Hall had is not clear. An entry in his Conservatorium diary for 12 March 1901 said, 'First of the Course lectures by the Director not very well attended'. 518. But this throws little light on the matter, as there is no indication of what the writer meant by 'not very well attended', and even if there were, attendance does not necessarily reflect enrolments. In the same month the Outpost, Tribune and Arena gave the numbers as 70, 63 or 65 and over 70, respectively. It is possible that, at this early stage of the year, and, especially, given the peculiar circumstances of the case, a significant number of intending students were yet to make a choice.
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This could explain Marshall-Hall's claim, two months later, in a private letter to his friend, F.S. Delmer, to have 168 students for the full course and single subjects, as compared with 45 of the other Cone. If so, it, no doubt, also accounts for Peterson's twice claiming in later years that he had had only 17 students when he took office. On both occasions, his aim was to show the Council, with whom he was in conflict over his salary and conditions, how successful he had been in increasing enrolments. It is likely, therefore, that to strengthen his case, he selected the lowest figure for 1901.

But the figures, whatever they were, do not necessarily simply reflect the differing moral or religious outlooks of students or their parents. That religion was a factor is, to an extent, borne out by the formation, shortly after Peterson's arrival, of a Conservatorium branch of the Melbourne University Christian Union, which ran two groups of weekly Bible study classes and sang hymns once a month at the Gospel Hall in support of the City Mission. No similar activity had occurred during Marshall-Hall's
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professorship. Nor, apparently, was any such associated with his conservatorium after the severance of his links with the University.

It does not, however, follow that music students with religious leanings, who enrolled at the University in 1901, would not have done so had Marshall-Hall remained in office. Some, no doubt, were motivated principally by a desire to study under a particular teacher of their instrument. Piano teacher, W.A. Laver, claimed that 'Practically all my students continued with me at the University Conservatorium'.

Others were probably chiefly influenced by the prospect of getting a university degree, whose usefulness in furthering their careers as teachers could be expected to continue long after the Marshall-Hall scandal was forgotten. Perhaps this was why Clare Nanson, whose father, Mathematics Professor E.J. Nanson, had been a staunch Marshall-Hall supporter, re-enrolled at the University Conservatorium at the beginning of 1901—although by May she was back with Marshall-Hall. The discrepancy between the figures given by the quondam Ormond Professor in the latter month, and those appearing in March in the three journals cited above, may indicate that she was far from being the only student thus to drift away from the University, as it

527 _Age_, 7 September 1911.
528 _Arena_, 25 May 1901.
became clear how different Peterson's approach was from that of his predecessor. (He did not, for example, run the interpretation classes that were such a conspicuous feature of Marshall-Hall's course.)

So, reactions to the Ormond Professor's outbursts of 1898 were significantly conditioned by respondents' perception of him as aggravating the already dangerously debased spirit of the time and place, a perception which fed the characteristic Manichean paranoia of Hebraism. A further exacerbating factor was the failure of many of his enemies (as of later commentators) to distinguish more clearly between his views and those of Nietzsche - the former involving neither a rejection of theism or of Christian 'social' morality, nor a contempt for women. The error led some to identify him with widely feared forces of political disorder. His employment as head of a University department, whose neutrality he was believed to have violated, together with suspicions that he had used the position to inculcate dubious religious and moral ideas, further strengthened the conviction that he had forfeited the immunity normally accorded to heterodox utterances by contemporary libertarian values.

CHAPTER 4

TONE AND TIMING

But, while the above argument has brought us closer to a conclusive account of Hebraic motivation in the Marshall-Hall case, further refinement is still called for. Geoffrey Blainey is not, in fact, correct in claiming that the agitation against the musician reflected a conviction that 'the professors of a secular university could preach Christianity but not oppose it'. This allegation was vehemently refuted by Marshall-Hall's enemies. 'Professors and teachers' in 'a secular institution like the University,' insisted the Presbyterian Monthly, 'may teach in their own science or art what they hold to be demonstrated truth, however much it may contradict' accepted views, 'nay they are bound to set forth what they hold to be demonstrated by their researches, though it may lead some minds to doubt or denial of religious faith'. And Potter said he would never 'refuse to give a vote which would help a qualified candidate to a professorship, on the ground that he was an agnostic or an atheist'. It was, Potter pointed out, 'an open secret that several chairs in the University are filled by agnostics, and no shock as far as I am aware has ever been made upon them

---

1 Blainey, op. cit., p. 117.
2 September 1898.
on that score; and if such an attack were made no one would be more forward to denounce it than I.3

This chapter will consider, firstly, the role played by the tone of Marshall-Hall's utterances in overcoming such scruples, in his case. The source of his insulting manner of expression will be sought in his temperament, his early childhood and current domestic situation, and his adult beliefs about energy expenditure as an obliterator of anomie and about the relation between the individual's authentic selfhood and that of society at large. Secondly, an inquiry will be made into the timing of the Liedertafel speech in relation to the speaker's state of health, his need of publicity for his concerts, and the death of Bismarck.

1. Tone

Marshall-Hall, too, it was widely agreed, had 'a right to perfect freedom in regard to religious views'4. He would freely 'have published works containing highly unorthodox statements on [music ... poetry, ethics, or religion'] and still have kept well out of the reach of official censure'5 - provided that his opinions 'are not offensively paraded'.6 And it was this that was the

---

3Argus, 7 July 1900; see also Rev. S.G. McLaren in Age, 1 December 1898.
41 September 1898.
5Church of England Messenger, 1 August 1898.
6Australasian Schoolmaster, June 1900 (emphasis mine).
gravamen of the charge against him, in respect to the religious opinions he had expressed. It was not their unorthodoxy as such, which rendered him unfit to be a university professor, but the 'translucent scorn and hostility' of the tone in which they were couched.

The distinction between reverent and irreverent unbelief pervaded Hebraic definitions of the limits of permissible heterodoxy, and was a key structurally conducive element of the outbreak of the collective action under investigation. 'People,' declared the Argus, condemning Richard Strauss's Salome, 'demand gravity from those who attack no less than from those who defend orthodox views'. The Dean of Ballarat believed that the real danger faced by the Church was that 'much of the scepticism of the day is not of a reverent character'. And the Australian Christian insisted that Christian principles 'even when not agreed with, are worthy of being treated with consideration'.

The disquiet occasioned by the higher criticism resulted, to a large extent, from the alleged failure of its exponents to conform in this respect. Hebraism, typically, saw 'nothing to object to', in the Biblical investigations,

---

7 Age, 15 August 1898; see also e.g. Advocate, 15 August 1898.
8 9 March 1907.
10 30 November 1899.
'provided the spirit of the inquirer is right'. They became obnoxious, not when 'the method ... is at fault, but the temper of the critic' - that is to say, when the latter began to exhibit an 'unwise arrogance', in place of a 'reverent ... spirit', dissecting 'with rough coarse hands the sacred books', holding 'up to scorn their apparent inconsistencies and assumed contradictions', and rejoicing 'at any new victory over old belief'. This, too, was a conspicuous component of the degraded present - a time when the 'sentiment of reverence, once the basis of order, is now derided as a weakness, and truths the most sacred are travestied without eliciting rebuke'.

It is not surprising, then, that it was the offensiveness of his tone that aroused the ire of Marshall-Hall's critics more than the religious views he had expressed. He was accused of having 'shamelessly flaunted unbelief', of

---

11 Southern Baptist, 3 May 1900.
12 Southern Baptist, 15 March 1900; see also e.g. Southern Baptist, 12 April 1900.
13 Southern Cross, 4 January 1901.
14 Church of England Messenger, 1 January 1899; see also Rev. Lyndon Parker in Argus, 25 November 1898.
15 Church of England Messenger, 1 January 1899; see also e.g. Australian Christian World, 20 January 1899.
17 Pastoral Letter of Second Plenary Council of Australian Archbishops and Bishops, 1895, quoted in O'Farrell, op.cit., 1905.
18 Rev. C.H. Barnes in Argus, 8 August 1898; see also Advocate, 13 August 1898.
having 'gloried in publicly trampling underfoot the most sacred sentiments of religion',\textsuperscript{19} in the course of a 'wild and insulting speech',\textsuperscript{20} full of 'wretched ribaldry',\textsuperscript{21} 'irreverent jokes, ... scornful caricature',\textsuperscript{22} and 'a ... clumsy, acrid hatred of religion'.\textsuperscript{23} He was not just an unbeliever, but 'a bigoted and aggressive infidel',\textsuperscript{24} who 'could unblushingly trample upon all that is held sacred, and publicly hold up to ridicule the most cherished convictions of the pious'.\textsuperscript{25} Others, it was pointed out, had 'held these views and hold them, and advocate them in perfect good faith, and are well within their rights in so doing, provided, of course, that they write with a decent reverence'\textsuperscript{26} and 'a respectful tolerance of the Christian religion'.\textsuperscript{27} But a line had to 'be drawn at mere vulgar and blasphemous infidelity'.\textsuperscript{28} Marshall-Hall's 'diatribes', unlike the criticism of religion that had been voiced by Huxley and Tyndall\textsuperscript{29} and, in Melbourne, by Judges Higinbotham

\textsuperscript{19}Australian Christian, 5 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{20}Southern Cross, 19 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{21}Age, 15 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{22}Advocate, 16 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{23}Southern Cross, 12 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{24}Argus, 13 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{25}Australian Christian, 1 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{26}Argus, 15 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{27}Australian Christian, 8 June 1899.

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{29}Argus, 30 November 1898.
and Hartley Williams, were said to have been delivered, not 'in the exercise of a free opinion', but 'launched in the same spirit that actuates the lerrkin who hurls a piece of blue metal at a stained glass window'. For sheer, 'coarse, vulgar, gutter-bred blasphemy and profanity, [they] would be hard to match ... outside of a street "push" or a chain-gang of convicts.' In 'controversies of this kind,' as the Age observed,

the spirit in which they are conducted is everything .... If Mr. Marshall-Hall had discussed the place of God in the scheme of things in the reverent spirit that the subject invited, he would probably have been let off by his critics as easily as Mr. Higinbotham and Sir Hartley Williams.

And the Age pointed out that Huxley, in his 1893 Sheldonian oration, had, like Marshall-Hall, argued that benevolence, altruism and peace were opposed to nature. But, in doing so, he had exhibited 'that fine cultured reticence which forebore to do outrage to the cherished feelings of his

---

30 George Higinbotham (1826-1892): editor of the Argus from 1856 to 1859; Victorian Attorney-General in the McCulloch ministry of 1863-1868, during which time he chaired an important royal commission on education; he became chief justice of Victoria in 1886; in 1883 he gave a lecture in Scots' Church Melbourne entitled 'Science and Religion', which, due to its attacks on ecclesiastical imperviousness to modern biblical and scientific scholarship, gave rise to a storm of protest. (See Gwyneth M. Dow, 'George Higinbotham' in B. Nairn, G. Serle and R. Ward (eds), Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol.4, Melbourne, 1972, pp.391-7.) Sir Hartley Williams: Australian-born Oxford educated lawyer; succeeded Redmond Barry on the Supreme Court bench in 1880; published Religion without superstition in 1885, attracting strong criticism from Anglican Bishop Moorhouse (see Robert Miller, 'Sir Hartley Williams', ibid., vol.6, 1976, pp.403-4).

31 Austral Light, September 1898.

32 19 August 1892; see also Argus, 18 June 1900.
auditory'. He had, that is, 'avoided the vulgarity of simply labelling as "foolish and futile" the doctrine of the Christian Founder that "Blessed are the peace-makers"'.

The decisiveness of this factor in arousing strong hostility towards Marshall-Hall's anti-religious utterances is illustrated by an exchange that took place in the University Senate late in 1899. Under discussion was the alleged inadequacy of the Council's powers to deal with errant staff, which had forced it, on 24 October 1899, to allow Marshall-Hall to serve out his current five-year term.

A motion was put by the Presbyterian Rev. S.G. McLaren (seconded by Dr. Leeper) to permit action to be taken, in future, against any professor, who had 'been guilty of any misconduct, whether in office or otherwise, which had been adjudged by an absolute majority of the Council to render him not a fit and proper person to hold ... office'.

Professor E.E. Morris, Professor of modern languages and literature at the University, clearly concerned to protect academic freedom, moved an addendum, to provide 'that no expression of views on religious, political, philosophical, or scientific matters shall be adjudged conduct which renders a professor not a fit and proper person to hold his office'.

---

33 *Age*, 6 August 1898; see also e.g. *Argus*, 5 August 1898; *George Bell in Argus*, 29 October 1898; *Presbyterian Monthly*, September 1898; *Argus*, 5 July 1898; MUCMB, 24 October 1899.

34 *Melbourne University Senate Minute Book*, 10 October 1899, MUCR.

This was then successfully amended, on the motion of Andrew Harper, one of Marshall-Hall's most determined enemies, to read,

Provided that the fact that views expressed by a professor are opposed to or in favour of any religious, political, philosophical or scientific doctrine shall not be deemed to justify a finding that a professor expressing such views is not fit or proper person to hold his office.\footnote{Ibid.}

There is no record of the debate, but Harper's motives are clear enough. Morris's addendum, by excluding an 'expression of views' from the ambit of the Council's proposed new powers, could be interpreted to refer not only to the views themselves, but also to the manner of their expression. Harper narrowed the excluded area to encompass only the 'views expressed by a professor', leaving it open to the governing body to discipline an employee for the tone of his utterances.

It is true that Marshall-Hall denied having written or spoken in a 'flippant spirit of mockery'. But by this he simply meant that he sincerely held the views he had expressed - which, if anything, aggravated the offence. 'The motive,' he maintained, '... is the chief factor in determining whether what I have written is insulting or the reverse'. Criticism, he argued, was an affront only when it 'is insincere, and therefore ready to vent itself in everything, good or bad'. And as his own utterances had been 'the result of sincere philosophical conviction',...
and not of 'a mere foolish spirit of mockery'\textsuperscript{37}, they clearly
did not, he assured his detractors, fall into this category.

To his enemies, however, offensiveness consisted in
holding up to scorn and derision what others held sacred,
and was not incompatible with sincerity. And by this
definition there can be no doubt that Marshall-Hall's
utterances merit the label. He had, after all, referred
to the Christian Trinity as 'Hideous scarecrows that flap
in the wind'\textsuperscript{38} and to the Bible as 'quaint old tomes forlorn
whose sense is blurred'\textsuperscript{39} and whose exegesis is contained in
'the mystical jargon of dull-witted priests'\textsuperscript{40}. He had
spoken of God laying the world like an egg\textsuperscript{41}, and 'yawning
in his heavenly arm chair'\textsuperscript{42}. King David, he had said,
who 'became father of his nation/By dint of prayer and
fornication', was a 'man after God's own heart'\textsuperscript{43}. And
the Immaculate Conception was 'that all-wondrous hour/When
slain by love's irremittable power/The God grew faint
within [Mary's] wild embrace'\textsuperscript{44}. He had attacked the

\textsuperscript{37}\textit{Age}, 13 August 1898; Marshall-Hall to University Council,
11 August 1898, in MUCME, 12 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{38}'Ancient and Modern' in \textit{Hymns Ancient and Modern},
\textit{op.cit.}, P.47.

\textsuperscript{39}'To Mrs. Fischer-Sobell' in \textit{ibid.}, P.18.

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Age}, 15 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{41}'To Franz Dierich' in \textit{Hymns Ancient and Modern},
\textit{op.cit.}, P.44.

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{43}'King David' in \textit{ibid.}, P.48.

\textsuperscript{44}J. Redford Corr, \textit{Extracts...}, \textit{op.cit.}. 

saints for 'their lewd ideas', had said that the resurrection of Lazarus was procured by 'witches' wit, and that a popular concert is 'as depressing to a man of vigorous mind and body as a visit to an idiot asylum, or a hospital, or a church. It did not help his case that he tried to prove his sincerity by protesting that in his criticism 'only those things are ridiculed or exposed, which to anyone holding my views must appear maleficent', and that he had never attacked 'any worthy and righteous principle', but only 'what I regard as worthless ideas'.

The very title of his book, Hymns Ancient and Modern, was held to exemplify the sneering, disdainful complexion of its contents. It had, complained his critics, been 'insultingly appropriated', for a 'flippant or offensive purpose', from 'one of the most revered collections of Christian hymns of devotion and worship'. It was seen as a deliberate 'violation of the best and holiest
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45 'A Supplication' in Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit., p.47.
46 To Mrs. Fischer-Sobell in ibid., p.18.
47 Argus, 2 August 1898.
48 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898 in MUChB, 12 August 1898.
49 Ibid.
50 PPGM, November 1898, Appendix p.lxxxiv.
51 Argus, 15 August 1898.
52 PPGM, November 1898, Appendix p.lxxxiv; see also Argus, 6 August 1898; 'Largo' in Herald, 20 June 1900; Argus, 14 July 1900.
feeling\textsuperscript{53}, which increased the sting of every offensive line\textsuperscript{54} (although the Herald went too far in asserting that it was this title that 'caused the greater part of the Marshall-Hall trouble'\textsuperscript{55}).

Even the professor's supporters called him an 'aggressive type of atheist', who had 'elected wilfully to tread on the corns of other people'\textsuperscript{56}. His had been no mere expression of quiet scepticism, but 'an outrage upon [the] feelings and earnest convictions'\textsuperscript{57} of the religious. He had set out 'with a perverse and unreasoning zeal to scoff at beliefs and sentiments which are dear to the heart of the majority and which are revered even by those who do not agree with them'\textsuperscript{58}. Alma Mater could 'not refrain from blaming a man of such marked ability and such wide influence ... for ridiculing what has been for centuries held sacred by the purest souls'\textsuperscript{59}. And the Leader objected to 'his desecration of sacred themes by the medium of vulgar, and, in some instances, filthy abuse'\textsuperscript{60}. But they did not seem the offence to be serious enough to warrant his removal

\textsuperscript{53}PPGM, November 1898, Appendix p.lxxxiv.
\textsuperscript{54}Argus, 5 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{55}8 December 1900.
\textsuperscript{56}Leader, 15 December 1900.
\textsuperscript{57}Rev. L.D. Bevan in Argus, 9 August 1898; see also Table Talk, 5 September 1898.
\textsuperscript{58}Leader, 13 August 1898.
\textsuperscript{59}September 1898.
\textsuperscript{60}13 August 1898.
form office. To Marshall-Hall's defenders, it had simply been 'an error in good taste'\(^\text{61}\), or 'propriety',\(^\text{62}\) an 'official indiscretion not to be repeated'.\(^\text{63}\) The greater leniency of their strictures reflected their lack of a strong Hebraic sense of the threat posed to the sacred by the profane.

2. Temperament

It is clearly important, then, in view of the crucial role it played in raising the clamour against him, to discover why he elected to speak so scornfully in public against an outlook with which he disagreed. Some of his contemporaries, with the deterministic tolerance so characteristic of the Hellenic cast of mind, denied that there had been any real element of choice. He had spoken impulsively, they argued, on the spur of the moment, and without due reflection, in response to a strong emotional urge over which he had little or no control. Thus, I.N. Raamsdonk attributed his outbursts to the supposed fact that he was 'a man whose passionate heart would often conquer the strength of his mind'.\(^\text{64}\) And \textit{Table Talk} said that he belonged 'to a class of men who get intoxicated when facing an audience, and, losing their presence of mind, give vent to extraordinary views in order to cover up their bashfulness'.\(^\text{65}\)


\(^{62}\) J. Buckley Casties in \textit{Herald}, 23 August 1898; see \textit{O.G. Leader}, 20 August 1898; \textit{Bulletin}, 27 August 1898.

\(^{63}\) \textit{Bulletin}, 20 August 1898.

\(^{64}\) \textit{Australian Musical News}, 2 August 1915.

\(^{65}\) 18 April 1901.
And there is ample support for the view that he was indeed a man of ebullient, boisterous and extroverted personality. Those who knew him commonly spoke of his 'flamboyant ... restless energy', his 'magnificent vitality' and the 'burning fire of revolution' that 'surged through his veins'. They marvelled at 'the exuberance of his strong and enthusiastic nature', which was so 'virile, so energetic, that one seemed to be caught in the maelstrom and hurried along with it'. They said he always talked loudly, often flew into violent tempers, strode down Collins Street, loudly humming excerpts from Puccini, shook hands 'as though he were gripping a pump handle', and laughed with such force that 'the whole bally room shakes ... and the blanky roof nearly

66 Sun (Sydney), 19 July 1915; see also e.g. Music, October 1900; Triad, 10 March 1913.
67 Weekly Times, 24 July 1915.
68 Theatre Magazine, 1 September 1915.
69 P.S. Delmer in Herald, 12 August 1898; see also e.g. Argus, 19 July 1915; Table Talk, 22 July 1915; J.P. Runciman in Saturday Review, 5 November 1898; Brian Wibberley in Beacon, July 1900; J.S. Crow to Ivy Brookes, 19 October 1945 WMA, Group 1 l/2.
70 Unidentified cutting (perhaps Leader), context 1917 in Fritz Hart papers, scrap book labelled 'Sharps and Flats' in Latrobe Library.
comes off. 74. At concerts he 'thundered' his approval of the performance with 'mighty hand claps and resonant bravos'. 75. And when conducting, he exacted silence from the audience by glaring ferociously at them and rapping loud and long on the stand with his baton like 'a Maxim gun in operation'. 76. In class, he subjected his students to a 'running fire of caustic criticism' in which the 'metaphors are strong and vigorous, and the candour brutal, his wit pungent, his ridicule biting'. 77. And the margins of the books he read were peppered with explosive ejaculations of disgust such as 'B---- Ass', 'monstrous ignorance and blockheadism', 'Amateur Nonsense', 'O superfine Assiduity', and 'The dryest, emptiest, most pitiable collection of inconsequent rubbish that ever yet man was impertinent enough to ask five bob for'. 78.

74 Streeton to Tom Roberts, 1 June 1892, in R.H. Croll, Tom Roberts Father of Australian Landscape Painting, Melbourne, 1935, p. 190; see also e.g. Argus, 19 July 1915; All About Australians, Vol. 4, No. 47, 1 March 1905.

75 Table Talk, 13 October 1899; see also e.g. Argus, 19 July 1915; Australian Musical News, October 1911; Theatre Magazine, 2 August 1913; Punch, 27 July 1899.

76 Bulletin, 26 August 1899; see also e.g. Argus, 29 July 1893; Bulletin, 12 May 1900; Alma Mater, March 1902; Table Talk, 10 May 1900, 29 September 1899; Champion, 10 August 1895; Argus, 1 September 1905.

77 Bulletin, 4 May 1901.

78 Ernest Scott, cp. cit., p. 145; Len Fox, cp. cit., p. 46; the book referred to by Scott was John F. Rundiman's Old Scores and New Readings; Fox draws his examples from two books, one on the Pianoforte Sonata, and the other criticising the 'bad taste' of parts of Schiller's Ode.
Moreover, the famed 'volcanic eruptiveness of his detestations'\textsuperscript{79} was not reserved exclusively for Hebraic Christianity. In similar vein, it anathematised the 'frivolous incapable buffooneries'\textsuperscript{80} of the 'incompetent, critical canaille',\textsuperscript{81} whose 'ignorance and viciousness is [sic] only equalled by their musical stupidity',\textsuperscript{82} and who, having 'neither feelings deep enough for expression, nor wit to deepen such as they have',\textsuperscript{83} inflicted the 'vicious emanations'\textsuperscript{84} of their 'sterile, unproductive mediocrity'\textsuperscript{85} on a long-suffering newspaper readership. And the average musician did not fare much better, being 'generally a man of slight education, paralytically contracted mind, [and] feeble intellect, who pours forth sickly sentimental ballads, or superficial, nauseating, feeble settings of the church service',\textsuperscript{86} and performs Bach's 'finest thoughts ... as though they were so much ape-chatter'.\textsuperscript{87}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{79}Scott, op.cit., p.145.  
\textsuperscript{80}Australian Musical News, December 1911.  
\textsuperscript{81}Punch, 11 August 1898.  
\textsuperscript{83}Table Talk, 12 May 1893.  
\textsuperscript{84}Ibid., see also e.g. School, September 1899; June 1899.  
\textsuperscript{85}Argus, 24 March 1894.  
\textsuperscript{86}School, January 1899.  
\textsuperscript{87}Monthly Musical Record, 1 September 1889.}
The abrasive tactlessness of his temperament was well illustrated by the concluding observation of a lecture he once delivered in a country town with the assistance of a local pianist: 'This music is so fine,' he informed his startled audience, 'that even here, even you, even with this rattle trap of a piano, played as it has been, have been able to make something out of it!'\(^{88}\). In the light of all this, Sir William Robinson's warning to the University Council in 1890, that there was 'a certain outspoken roughness in his manner'\(^{89}\) savours of understatement.

But, to leave it at that - to attribute his behaviour on a particular occasion to a temperamental disposition so to act, and to look no further - comes dangerously close to Molière's famous explanation of the power of opium to put people to sleep, in terms of its dormitive qualities. The two cases are not identical, since the latter accounts for a tendency purely in terms of itself, whereas the former subsumes an individual occurrence under a general tendency. But as an explanation it operates at a relatively low level, adding little to what was already known. Its value lies in its heuristic potential, since it directs attention to the need to seek out the origins of the volatility of temperament thus invoked.

\(^{88}\) A.S. Weigall, My Little World, Sydney, 1934, P.170.  
\(^{89}\) Sir William Robinson to University Council, 19 June 1890, MUCFOF, 1890/30.
3. The Professional Stereotype

In this context, it will be profitable to consider the possibility that the latter stemmed, at least in some degree, from Marshall-Hall's membership of a profession, one of whose most conspicuous characteristics was believed to be emotional instability. Musicians were widely described as 'a cross-grained and irritable race'\textsuperscript{90}, whose 'overwrought temperaments'\textsuperscript{91} and 'highly strung nerves'\textsuperscript{92}, not to speak of their 'vain, conceited and violent temper'\textsuperscript{93}, made them 'notoriously the most quarrelsome people on earth'\textsuperscript{94}.

In the absence of an acceptable means of verifying these propositions, they cannot be employed as even the loosest covering law explanation of Marshall-Hall's behaviour. They do perhaps derive some very tenuous support from the economic difficulties facing musicians at a time of general depression, which, for example, resulted in the annual fees, earned by the highest paid music master at the Presbyterian Ladies' College, falling from £100 in 1891 to £21 in 1893\textsuperscript{95}. That the profession was still in

\textsuperscript{90}Musical World, 25 June 1898.
\textsuperscript{91}Monthly Musical Record, 1 February 1906.
\textsuperscript{92}Argus, 26 August 1894; see also Alma Mater, September 1898.
\textsuperscript{93}Music, May 1906.
\textsuperscript{94}Argus, 29 May 1895.
trouble at the end of the decade, is exemplified by, inter alia, a remark made at a meeting of the Musicians' Union in February 1899 to the effect that 'ninety per cent of the Musicians of Sydney and Melbourne supplemented their earnings by working at various trades'. Two years later the Tribune reinforced this impression with a report that private music teaching was being invaded by 'the ever-increasing numbers of shallow humbugs', who, to supplement their main earnings, 'charge a nominal fee ... and deprive honest people of their just reward'.

It seems reasonable to suppose that in such a climate musicians would evince a degree of irritability, somewhat higher than that of the citizen whose livelihood was not similarly threatened. But it hardly applies to Marshall-Hall, who was one of the lucky ones, whose material fortunes had been little affected by the depression, and who, although he had, as we have seen, suffered some hardship during the previous decade, was now in a well paid job, which, prior to his fateful utterances of 1898, could reasonably have been expected to continue indefinitely.

96 Minute Book of the Professional Musicians' Union of Australia, New South Wales Branch, 27 February 1899, in Musicians' Union Papers in Australian National University Archives, Canberra.

97 Tribune, 22 June 1901; see also e.g. Tribune, 13 July 1901; address to the members of the Musical Association of Victoria, entitled The Present State of Music in Victoria, Melbourne, 1902, by George Oscar King, in Music Pamphlets, Vol.V, 1902; Argus, Victorian State Library; Table Talk, 29 September 1894; Argus, 1 February 1894; London Musical Courier, 30 September 1897.

98 Having had, at one stage, to sell or pawn 'every stick of furniture' he possessed; see Ella Winter to Herbert Bokes, 9 January 1921, MHMA, loc.cit.
Yet, the stereotype could have been important in a different way. It may have acted like a self-fulfilling prophecy, causing him unconsciously, to adopt the role that he believed was expected of him qua musician. He, too, believed musicians to be 'exceptionally pugnacious in character', a phenomenon which he characteristically attributed to 'their excess of power which must find itself an outlet'. The artist's feelings, he declared, when 'denied their proper vent', will sometimes 'cause him to plunge momentarily into excesses'. It seems likely that he was referring to his own offensive outburst of some two years earlier, when he informed an audience in June 1900, that in 'every artistic nature outward events have the power of arousing a sudden rich flood of emotion' which leads the artist 'at times to the most embarrassing situations' and occasionally startles him 'into incoherencies, which are . . . the cause of great annoyance and distress to himself, and wonderment to others'. It is not implausible that the 'incoherencies' of which he had lately been guilty, represented, in part at least, an unconscious act of conformity to this conventional, stylised image of the artist.

I. The Father's Influence

Additional motives for this temperamental ebullience that was so conspicuous a part of Marshall-Hall's behaviour

---

99 Argus, 2 August 1898.

100 Musical Standard, 20 June 1891.

101 Alma Mater, June 1900.
can be sought in his childhood - although identifying them is a highly speculative exercise. Not a great deal is known of Marshall-Hall's early life, which means that the choice of a theoretical framework is necessarily governed more by what is known (and can be surmised) than by a comparative evaluation, on the basis of independent evidence, of the various conflicting models offering. It also means that there is a distinct danger of circularity in the formulation of the argument - of postulating, that is, the operation of certain youthful influences, the only evidence for which is the adult behaviour they are believed to have caused - thus representing history, as Richard Elman wryly put it, not as 'an influence upon the individual', but 'a kind of Greek chorus confirming what is already assumed to be there'.

But as the alternative is entirely to exclude the subconscious dimension of motivation from consideration, the risk, provided it is acknowledged, seems to me to be worth taking. It can be minimised by focussing on persistent themes rather than individual incidents, in the subject's

early life, since the greater duration of the former makes them more accessible to the investigator. We are far more likely to know of the major influences that continued or recurred for some years in someone's childhood, than of the crucial traumatic event that lasted, perhaps, a few minutes. Thus, Sartre's account of Baudelaire's conduct in terms of the poet's mother's repeated rejection of him as a child is, prima facie, more plausible than his explanation of Genet's adult behaviour in terms of his having been detected in a youthful act of stealing\textsuperscript{103}.

It is reasonable to assume that the Ormond Professor's outlook was to some extent coloured by his early relations with his father, a man of strong personality, great energy, wide interests, and a voracious appetite for life. He was a qualified barrister (who, however, due to a hearing disability, never practised\textsuperscript{104}), an army officer with the rank of captain when he retired in 1873 from the Royal East Middlesex Militia\textsuperscript{105}, a one-time light weight boxer\textsuperscript{106}, a chamois hunter\textsuperscript{107}, an amateur botanist, glaciologist\textsuperscript{108},

\textsuperscript{103} Elman, op.cit., pp.6-8.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{106} J.E. Marshall-Hall to William Moore n.d. loc.cit.
\textsuperscript{107} Geological Magazine, 1896, p.573.
mineralist\textsuperscript{109}, and zoologist\textsuperscript{110}, a competent and enthusiastic mountain climber\textsuperscript{111}, who in 1849 made what he claimed to have been the first crossing of the New Zeisstorr from Zermatt to Macugnaëe\textsuperscript{112}, and an adept ocean-going yachtsman with a 65 ton iron vessel of his own\textsuperscript{113}, in which he explored Norwegian fjords\textsuperscript{114} and grappled for broken telegraph cable in the Atlantic\textsuperscript{115}.

And he was more than a little vain about his competence, intrepidity and achievements. He confessed to 'a feeling of pride at the prowess of my little craft showing her heels to so many big ones',\textsuperscript{116} and bragged of how he had often 'with all proper caution kept to sea when yachts of double my tonnage have either run for a port or had

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{109} Marshall Hall (senior) to Professor Heddle, 2 October 1879 in ibid., Vol.III, No.15, December 1879; Marshall Hall to J.H. Collins, 3 September 1875 in Archives of the Royal Mineralogical Society, London.
\item \textsuperscript{110} Field Quarterly, August 1871, p.170.
\item \textsuperscript{111} See e.g. Geological Magazine, 1869, p.573; Munn, op.cit., p.178; Mineralogical Magazine, Vol.I, No.3, February 1877, p.51.
\item \textsuperscript{112} Munn, op.cit., p.175. The claim was subsequently challenged by R. Donald and George P. Grey, who claimed to have beaten him to it by one month – see Munn, op.cit., p.154; H. Dübël, Guide des Alpes Valaisannes (trans. from German by E. Steinmann), Geneva 1919, Vol.1, p.154.
\item \textsuperscript{113} See e.g. Munn, op.cit., p.178; Field Quarterly, August 1871, p.171.
\item \textsuperscript{114} Geological Magazine, 1869, p.528; see also Marshall Hall's translation of Professor Kjeralf's 'The Terraces of Norway' in Scientific Opinion, February, March 1870; Munn, op.cit., p.178.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Munn, op.cit., p.178.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Field Quarterly, August 1871, p.178.
\end{itemize}
everything swept off their decks.\textsuperscript{117} On one such occasion, he boasted, his vessel had been caught in a gale in passage to Norway, in which we rode harmless over a fierce and cross-grained sea whilst another fine yacht of nearly four times our tonnage lost her boats, sprang her forecastle and made things generally uncomfortable.\textsuperscript{118}

It is likely that the young George was present on these voyages, since his father declared himself to be a 'family yachtsman who likes to see his youngsters' skin tanned and who is not aghast at freckles on his daughters' faces.'\textsuperscript{119} In fact, he kept his yacht

in great measure to give my family fresh air, the opportunity of seeing foreign ports, of leading a healthy life such as cannot be led on shore, and last, not least, to prevent my children from disgracing their Viking tradition by growing up to be what no Englishman should ever be - wide English history passim - land lubbers.\textsuperscript{120}

He wanted them to be able 'to face a breeze or a squall, to learn what salt water is, to handle a rope, pull a boat and laugh at hardship.'\textsuperscript{121} His contempt for those who did not measure up to his standards, in this regard, was indicated in the concluding words of some advice that he offered to budding yachtsmen: 'your passion for yachting will, if you are half a man, increase year by year, and your disgust with the great bulk of yachts' sailors will

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid. p.171.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., p.170.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., p.171.
\end{flushleft}
most keep pace with your increased pleasure in the life you lead afloat.'

Nothing could have been more natural than for his son to have internalised both the high value that the father quite evidently placed on zestful, energetic and dangerous living, and his disdain for those who had not the proficiency, the endurance, the virile forcefulness to triumph over adversity. This internalisation (together, perhaps, with a genetically inherited personality component) then expressed itself in the Liedertafel tirade against the 'feebleness of the meek and lowly', the 'humble ones of the earth, the incompetent, the useless, the knock-kneed', and, especially, the 'modern, puling pseudo-religiousness', which celebrated that 'foolish and futile' saying of the founder of Christianity, 'Blessed are the Peacemakers'.

At the same time, it is possible that he did not always face hardship and danger, as a small boy, with quite the degree of cheerful fortitude expected by his father. He could not have been the first youngster thus to have disgraced his viking heritage. And, there is a likelihood, upon the temperament displayed in the oft-quoted passages, that the elder Marshall Hall did not entirely conceal his displeasure. The boy's consequent feeling of inadequacy may well have been reinforced by a temporary (perhaps

\[122\text{Ibid., p.179.}\]

\[123\text{Argue, 2 August 1898.}\]
(hereditary) deafness he suffered at Blackheath\textsuperscript{124} – and which presumably explains his lengthy absences from school in 1876\textsuperscript{125}.

The role played by this conjectured early conflict with his father in shaping his adult behaviour patterns could then have been reinforced by the latter's apparent antagonism to his choice of vocation – itself perhaps an unconscious effort to compensate for the early bouts of deafness\textsuperscript{126}. I have found no evidence for Radic's claim that his 'parents, objecting to music as a career, forced the young Marshall-Hall into a secret study of harmony and counterpoint.'\textsuperscript{127} Nor can W.A. Laver's report, that he had originally been intended for the church\textsuperscript{128}, be substantiated. No objection seems to have been raised against his taking music lessons when the family lived in Blackheath, or to the choral society which he formed in Montreux, Switzerland, and which met to practise in the family dining room\textsuperscript{129}.

\textsuperscript{124} Typescript by J.E. or A.S. Marshall-Hall in Marshall-Hall papers, University Archives, \textit{loc.cit.}

\textsuperscript{125} See \textit{Annual School Report} and Blackheath Proprietary School Register of Shares, 1876, in Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.

\textsuperscript{126} Adler argues that children with a physical defect often endeavour to excel in the faculty which is defective. See A. Adler, \textit{What Life Should Mean to You}, London, 1933, p. 33; also Ansbacher and Ansbacher, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 111.

\textsuperscript{127} Radic, \textit{Meanjin}, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 196.

\textsuperscript{128} Typescript headed 'Professor Marshall-Hall A few formal notes' by W.A. Laver in possession of Professor Hailey.

\textsuperscript{129} J.E. or A.S. Marshall-Hall typescript, University archives, \textit{loc.cit.}
Nevertheless, Marshall-Hall, himself, was later to relate that his father had said that 'he wouldn't want any damn fiddler in his family',¹³⁰, and that, on being thwarted, he had cut his erring son off without a shilling.¹³¹ This, if true, referred, presumably, not to the father's will — in which no distinction was made among his various children, the whole estate being left to his wife, Mary Eliza Hall 'for her own absolute use and benefit'¹³² — but to his failure to help the young musician in the eighties, when economic exigencies forced him on occasions to sleep in the snow in Trafalgar Square and button his jacket up to the neck, in order to conceal his lack of a shirt collar and waist coat.¹³³

His brother, John Edward, confirmed this picture of paternal opposition.¹³⁴ And George's employment record during the eighties is consistent with the notion that some sort of vocational tug-of-war was taking place, in which the father's views still carried considerable weight. For a short period, probably directly after his return from Europe in 1879 or 1880, George studied under a tutor with

¹³⁰ Ella Winter to Herbert Brookes, 9 January 1921, in MMHA Group 1/5.
¹³¹ Ibid.
¹³³ Ella Winter to Herbert Brookes, 9 January 1921, ibid.
the apparent view of joining the civil service. Then he taught at the Oxford Military College, Crowley, of whose board of management his father was a member.

While there, he became an unattached student at Oxford University, although what he studied is not known. The University did not offer tuition in music, and perhaps it was there that he gained his claimed knowledge of botany or architecture. At some point during this decade, he also briefly enrolled to study Chemistry at King's College, London. The fact that he stayed at the Royal College of Music for only one term in 1883 perhaps also reveals an ongoing conflict between father and son. According to a friend he left after becoming 'impatient with the College's slow ways and slower Professors'. But his approaching marriage to May Hunt (which took place on 5 April 1884) may also have made it imperative, in the absence of a paternal subsidy, for him to find paid employment - although he identified himself on the marriage certificate as a musician.

135 Typescript by J.E. or A.S. Marshall-Hall in MHMA, loc.cit.
136 Tecklenborough, op.cit., p.28, 42.
137 Tecklenborough, op.cit., p.42; Oxford University Calendar 1883, p.246; i.e. he was not attached to a college.
138 Marshall-Hall's application for the Ormond chair, January 1889, MUCLB 3,294 in MDCR.
139 Marshall-Hall in Argus, 25 July 1908; the College, however, has no record of his enrolment (Letter written to me in my possession, by E.C.W. West-Watson, Assistant Master, University of London, King's College, November 1975).
140 John Punciman in Magazine of Music, June 1892.
141 Copy of Entry of Marriage Mx41128, General Register Office, London.
Be that as it may, his conduct as an adult fits the model provided by Alfred Adler, according to whom 'the absolute inferiority of the child' in a world of physically larger, stronger and more adept adults 'gives rise to a feeling of inferiority',\textsuperscript{142} which is 'always preceded by a matching, a comparing of himself with others, at first with his father'.\textsuperscript{143} As 'no human being', Adler argues, 'can bear a feeling of inferiority for long, he will be thrown into a tension which necessitates some kind of action'\textsuperscript{144} in the form of 'a compensatory movement towards a feeling of superiority'.\textsuperscript{145} This, then becomes 'for him a permanent impelling force for the development of his psyche'.\textsuperscript{146}

The 'stronger the inferiority feeling', the 'more forcibly' the need for compensation 'asserts itself'.\textsuperscript{147} And if, as may well have been the case with Marshall-Hall, the child was made to feel particularly wanting in certain 'masculine' characteristics - courage, assertiveness, endurance, etc - he may grow to doubt 'his maleness'.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{143}Ibid., p.119.
\textsuperscript{144}Ibid., p.52.
\textsuperscript{145}Ibid., p.52.
\textsuperscript{147}Ansbacher and Ansbacher, \textit{op.cit.}, p.111.
\textsuperscript{148}Ibid., p.313.
to equate his 'underlying feeling of inferiority ... with femininity', and to seek to conceal it beneath 'hyper-rophied masculine wishes and efforts'.

This is the 'masculine protest' - when the individual overvalues 'the importance of being masculine', but dubious whether [he is] strong enough to achieve it, tries 'to hypnotise himself, or autointoxicate himself into feeling superior'. The symptoms, according to Adler, include 'an attitude of aggression', expressing itself in 'disdain ... arrogance, exuberant emotion ... a tendency to depreciate, inordinate hero worship ... habitually loud laughter ... fantasies and wishes of the role of a hero, warrior, robber'. Typically, such a person 'is one whose striving for power is so intense that he must always make large movements and wants to produce feats of energy and overrun everything in a straight-line, aggressive manner'. These were all characteristics that were conspicuously exhibited, at different times, by Marshall-Hall.

That he was, himself, at least dimly aware of thus suppressing part of his personality, by means of the

---

149 Ibid., p.250.
150 Ibid., p.48.
151 Adler, op.cit., p.192.
152 Ibid., p.52.
153 Ansbacher and Ansbacher, op.cit., p.313.
154 Ibid., p.53.
155 Ibid., p.170.
accentuation of another part, is suggested by his remark that, in the fierce struggle for existence, a man 'is forced but too often to cultivate the one side of his character at the expense of the other', and that this, in an individual in whom the gentler attributes naturally predominate, often creates an intense yearning for the neglected part of his being.\footnote{156}{Alma Mater, September 1899.}

The fact that he responded to his early experiences by lawing out art critics, music teachers and Hebraic Christians, rather than by stouthing toffs in Spadger's Lane, is, no doubt, accounted for by other, less threatening influences in his childhood - his mother, perhaps, of whom his dominant memory was a 'peaceful, happy one'.\footnote{157}{See Marshall-Hall to Mrs. F.S. Delmer, 2 July 1906.} These led him to alleviate his feelings of inferiority by means of the more co-operative strategy, which Adler calls 'social interest',\footnote{158}{Adler, op.cit., p.8.} contributing to the well-being of others by seeking to gain 'victory over ... difficult enterprises'.\footnote{159}{Quoted in Ansbacher and Ansbacher, op.cit., p.95.} Thus, instead of resting content with his duties as Ormond Professor, he helped found the University Conservatorium, of which he was the first Director\footnote{160}{See discussion, pp.411-428.}, an appointment that
vastly increased his workload, with little or no extra material reward. He conducted an annual series of orchestral concerts, without remuneration - until the loss of his university chair forced him to be less generous of his time. And from 1897 he acted as honorary conductor of the Melbourne Liedertafel, requesting its Committee to donate his salary to the orchestra.

Before leaving the question of subconscious motivation, it may be profitable to consider the relevance of a study by F. Wyatt and W.B. Willcox of the behaviour of Sir Henry Clinton, Commander-in-Chief of the British army in America from 1778 to 1822. Clinton, too, was noted for his offensive tactlessness and his proneness to being drawn into controversy, although not in the public arena. He, too, the authors surmise, had experienced 'more than commonly ambivalent' childhood feelings towards his father, feelings that had been 'charged with hostility and awe, and consequently with anxiety and guilt'. Citing 'a considerable volume of clinical experience', concerning conflicts 'over authority originating in childhood', the authors argue

162 HLLB, 10 June 1898.
164 ibid., p.18.
165 ibid., p.7.
that the awe in which Clinton stood of the disapproval of a strong-minded father had left him 'both eager and extremely reluctant to assume the paternal role of authority and power.'\textsuperscript{166} He 'craved power', believing 'that he ought to have it because he knew better than anyone else how to use it.'\textsuperscript{167} But, at the same time, because 'at bottom he doubted himself too much to be sure that he was right',\textsuperscript{168} he had an unconscious conviction that he ought not to have it \textsuperscript{169} and, therefore, when giving advice, 'did his best to present it in a way that would ensure rejection.'\textsuperscript{170} Applying this to Marshall-Hall's case, it is possible that, in addition to over-compensating for a deep sense of inferiority bequeathed to him by his father, he was unconsciously trying to secure his own dismissal from the paternal/professorial role he played at the University, for which he, perhaps, half believed he had not the requisite competence. But this, of course, is mere speculation.

5. The Case for Calculated Premeditation

However, to conclude that the effervescent vivacity with which he confronted the world in general, and the vituperative shrillness of his two outbursts of 1898 were simply an outcome of the powerful and irrational stimulus of the moment, whatever its source, is to ignore three significantly

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., p.18.
\textsuperscript{167} Ibid., p.17.
\textsuperscript{168} Ibid., p.20.
\textsuperscript{169} Ibid., p.17.
\textsuperscript{170} Ibid., p.26.
relevant circumstances. One is that the publication of a book of verse (he was his own publisher) is an elaborate undertaking, which cannot be accomplished in the course of a sudden, spontaneous impulse. That he did give some thought to the likely effect of his verses on the Hebraic world is indicated by his decision not to publish the most offensive stanza of his poem, 'On Michelagnolo's Mask of Mary' (see below, p. 377). By the same token (and secondly,) the Liedertafel speech was not delivered extempore, but read from a previously prepared speech.\(^{171}\)

Finally, a reconstruction of the musician's *Weltanschauung* clearly reveals that he was not merely acting in accordance with the blind impetuosity of one unconsciously striving to compensate for past paternal disparagement, but that (no doubt, in addition to the latter) he was pursuing two systematic, consciously articulated, and closely related policies. The first, already explored in some detail above\(^{172}\), was his belief in intense energy expenditure as a means of extinguishing, at least temporarily, the persistent contrapuntal voice of malignant Destiny and the associated anguish of living in a world without meaning. That this was, indeed, part of the function of his vitriolic invective is corroborated by his self-confessed predilection for 'the smell of literary powder, as a cure for mental sniffles,'\(^{173}\).

---

\(^{171}\) *Argus*, 2 August 1898, 8 August 1898.

\(^{172}\) See pp. 198-204.

\(^{173}\) *Alma Mater*, June 1900.
Secondly, despite his claim that it 'never has been an object with me to cater for, or educate or force myself and my ideas in any way on the general public', the cutting edge of the conflict under consideration was his passionate conviction that he had a (literally religious) vocation to convert an erring world to his views concerning the nature of authentic experience - achieved through the maximum multi-directional expenditure of energy.

This is doubly paradoxical in view of his (typically Hellenic) determinist view of human behaviour. Like Schopenhauer, his identification of noumenal reality with energy (Will) led him to deny that there was any essential difference between the organic and the inorganic, both of which were objectifications of energy. The 'falling stone,' he explained,

> if it had consciousness and could speak, would express its desire to rest on solid earth; the flower to bathe itself in the light to which it turns, and our desires, our will, are nothing but an adaptation of the principle which, when applied to unconscious matter, we call gravitation, the nature of which is more readily known by us when we ourselves act under its compulsion and it presents itself to our consciousness as will and desire.

We may believe that we are masters of our destiny, but in fact, 'a thousand magnets of varying power attract us this

---

174 Toosin, 8 June 1900; see also e.g. Argus, 30 August 1892, 8 September 1892.

175 See Parker, O.P.Cit., p.327.

176 Gleam, 20 November 1900.

177 Gleam, October 1900 (emphasis mine).
way and that according to the quality and quantity of energy objectified in us, we obey the mandate, and the subtle action and counteraction of magnetic forces presents itself to consciousness as a series of powerful or infinitesimal desires and repulsions, while the final result we term choice\textsuperscript{178}. Our conduct, then, is subject to 'the automatic action of the will, by which all our actions and thoughts were directed in spite of the illusion of free will\textsuperscript{179}.

This, together with his identification of the 'natural' with the virtuous, entailed the conclusion - clearly structurally conducive to conflict - that Hebraism's efforts to eradicate sin were at best unnecessary, and at worst doomed to failure. That is to say, since 'all true virtue is as strong as Nature, and as durable', there was no foundation for the 'profound instinctive pessimism' of those 'effusive Mrs. Grundies-in-breeches', who 'hold that the virtue of themselves and their disciples is so skin-deep, so frail, so liable to crumble to nothing at the least touch, that it must be kept in a glass case, and labelled "this side up with care"\textsuperscript{180}. Real virtue was 'an indestructible force' which 'needs not to be propagated in a hot-house, nor to be artifically nourished. It can look upon all thing untended and without shame; automatically

\textsuperscript{178} Gleam, 20 November 1900.
\textsuperscript{179} Argus, 27 September 1892.
\textsuperscript{180} Gleam, October 1900.
it assimilates what is akin, and rejects what is averse.\textsuperscript{181} Therefore, he concluded, the best efforts of the moral reformers were futile. At most they could

... turn [man's] current up the hill
A moment only, then 't resumes its course,
And each must die none else than he was born,
Fulfilling all the instincts of his nature.\textsuperscript{182}

This was especially true of heroic individuals, in whom these instincts were unusually strong, and to condemn whose behaviour was, therefore, to endow them with a freedom of will they did not possess\textsuperscript{183}. It was, insisted Marshall-Hall, 'as reasonable to fulminate against a Swiss avalanche as immoral and perverted and utterly reprobate for falling from its heights and destroying whole forests and villages as, for instance, against Napoleon whose ambition smothered nations', since the latter was simply 'a humanised form of the same energy', the 'same essential character belongs to both and displays itself in each according to its kind and degree'.\textsuperscript{184}

But the same stricture applied, albeit in different degree, to humbler sinners, whose emotions were 'unhealthy' - a view, whose logical consequence was implicit in his epigram, 'Teetotallism', which was bound to raise Hebraic hackles:

\textsuperscript{181} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{182} 'Words' in Hymns Ancient and Modern, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 42.
\textsuperscript{183} \textit{Alma Mater}, July 1899.
\textsuperscript{184} \textit{Gleam}, October 1900.
D'ye think that I'll go fast a pray
For you, you drunken swine?
No! You be dammed in your own way
And I'll be dammed in mine."

Nevertheless, and paradoxically, his repeated public
exhortations to his fellows to change their ways leave one in
no doubt that, at the same time, he had a profound (and
typically Existentialist) commitment to the notion of free
will, which owed little, if anything, to Schopenhauer, or,
indeed, to Hellenism. His was not the mechanistic
paradigm beloved of 19th century positivism, which
absolutised matter and subsumed all phenomena under the
governance of blind impersonal law, capable of precise
mathematical formulation. It was a 'soft' determinism,
ordained by the individual's own inner constitution. We
are the energy which dictates our behaviour, but which is
not, itself, determined - an antinomy which is in no
essential different from Sartre's well-known aphorism, that
we are not free not to be free.\footnote{186}

Moreover, to Marshall-Hall, as to Existentialism
generally, there were degrees of freedom, the highest being
found in the greatest expenditure of energy, in the employ-
ment of one's own will as distinct from involuntary (because
automatic, in the sense of, unintentional) conformity to
that of Das Mann\footnote{187}. It was, he said, 'only when each

\footnote{185}Hymns Ancient and Modern, \textit{op.cit.}, p.39.


\footnote{187}Heidegger's scornful epithet for the herd - usually
translated as 'the they'. See R.G. Olsen, \textit{op.cit.}, p.137.
individual shall find happiness in the exercise of his utmost capabilities', that humanity 'will ... become truly free'. This finds an echo in Colin Wilson's assertion that 'freedom is not simply being allowed to do what you like; it is intensity of will'.

Although this commitment to freedom of will reveals itself nowhere more clearly than in Marshall-Hall's efforts to convert his contemporaries to his own religious outlook, his principal object in so exerting himself was the pursuit of his own authenticity. However, success in this (latter) quest was, he believed, jeopardised for every individual by the 'enormous pressure of inner barbarism' (my emphasis), which reduced receptivity to joyous, energy-demanding influences. It was 'ever striving for mastery' and when it did become dominant, the

... heart is laden -
For air doth gasp,
And feels less the moonlight and lovely earth
Than the idle jest and hollow mirth.

This, in Nietzschean language, was the dwarf of mediocrity stubbornly clinging to Zarathustra's back.

Now, to 'combat vulgarity in others,' Marshall-Hall believed, 'is [in itself] a wasteful expenditure of energy'.
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192 School, November 1889.
193 See Barrett, op.cit., p.172.
while to 'extinguish it in oneself is the highest life task'. Since, however, the 'former attempt is ... necessary for the latter it becomes both reasonable and advisable'.

When considered in the context of his philosophy as a whole, as I have reconstructed it, this assertion is seen to be underpinned by the following reasoning: The most powerful instrument for the achievement of authenticity was, of course, art, which, as we have seen, 'affords an opportunity to become intimately acquainted with the inner effect of that form of energy which obtains in heroic characters'. But art is inseparable from the larger context in which it exists. The 'field of art,' he argued, 'is co-extensive with the field of life.'

One incidental corollary of this was his contention, hardly calculated to find favour in Hebraic circles, that there was 'nothing in existence but is [art's] fit and proper material,' and, therefore, 'there is nought good or bad but what has an interest' for the artist. From this it followed that in art the public must be permitted

194 *Alma Mater*, June 1900.
196 *Alma Mater*, July 1899.
197 *Ibid*.
198 *Glean*, October 1900.
199 *Magazine of Music*, October 1891.
to 'study the real nature of existence, as it is, for good or bad, unbowedderised', without 'any pious editing, any manipulation, any suppression'.

However, of more concern to the present argument was the fact that this postulated relationship between art and life was an ecologically dependent one - such that the artist can do no more than 'reflect his age in the mirror of self'. His work 'necessarily reflects the conditions of [its] time'. It gives 'form and expression' to 'the tendencies, the ideals of an age'. Therefore, the quality of art varied 'with the varying peculiarities of different times, their greater or less simplicity or complexity, their emotional depth or shallowness, splendour or poverty, gravity or folly, strength or feebleness'. And only 'highly civilised, masculine, vigorous, expansive nations produce in their prime art which is forceful, splendid and sublime'.

here and there, once or twice in thousands of years when favorable conditions have brought about an abnormal state of vitality and activity, does it happen that a few superlative men uprise and represent in glowing works of art, their age, which, owing to
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its intensity, lends itself to a vivid and decisive personification of ever-recurring existence - perhaps a reference to Nietzsche's notion of the eternal recurrence.

That even the greatest masters operate under this constraint was revealed, he contended, by an examination of such 'great quasi-dramatic' works as the chromatic Fantasia, the minor Fantasia for organ, the E-flat minor Prelude for clavier [of J.S. Bach], which 'shows that his actual success was only partial'. But this was not owing to any shortcomings in capacity on the part of the divine master, but rather, as in Shakespeare's case, to the extraneous limitations and restrictions imposed upon his super-human fertility by the times, his immediate environment, the conditions, shackles, which to a certain extent bound his Promethean genius to the desert-rock of Church ritual.

Similarly, a climate of Hebraic moral fervour, he believed, had

Damn'd up Milton's splendid glowing soul
And sprang from Dante's mouth —
— a ghoul.
Wordsworth grew maudlin over its fell ban;
Johnson dyspeptic; Pope felt qualms
And straight to Bedlam Coleridge ran —

So, what Marshall-Hall meant when he said it was not 'possible for any man to realise his own individuality so
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long as the artificial conditions of life are of such a nature as to prohibit his fellow man doing the like', was that artistic creativity, and, by consequence, authenticity are inhibited in proportion to the level of vulgarity that subsists in a community. That is to say, the unrestricted exercise of the individual's 'higher nature' was 'prohibited by the nature of the rest of mankind' - which could be improved only 'by implanting in all mankind the desire for change'.

The realisation, that is, of 'the utmost possibilities of [one's own] nature ... is an impossibility until the same desire has entered the breasts of all mankind.'

When the artist, then, sought 'to encourage and stimulate in those around him the qualities which go to make a nation of sterling worth', he was, in fact, 'working his own salvation', by creating conditions 'in which [his] innate joy hunger may more completely and unrestrictedly satiate itself'. And that was precisely what Marshall-Hall was up to when he addressed the Liedertafel audience on 1 August 1898, and published his books of didactic verse.

The rancorous tone in which his remarks were couched on these occasions and which gave so much offence, was, in

---

211. *Weekly Times*, 30 December 1899.
part, the outcome of two incongruously Hebraic strands of his thought, both components of his situational interpretation (see Martin's condition 1). One was his perception of vulgarity, not as a passive condition, but an actively hostile, 'all-permeating influence' with dangerously hegemonic propensities.\footnote{213} The other was a conviction that, in this regard, he, too, was living in a profoundly degraded present - an age in which a 'small body of artists' worked 'in the midst of forces which are in the main indifferent to our aspirations and efforts, when not absolutely hostile to them.'\footnote{214} And foremost among these 'forces' was Hebraic Christianity. While 'the gods of the Greeks' had been 'Emblems of nature in beauteous form ... and the joy of mankind', the 'Jew gods' of his day were 'Hideous scarecrows that flap in the wind ... to frighten the weak and the blind.'\footnote{215}

In particular, he identified three components of Hebraism as ingredients of this modern malaise. The first was a prevailing hostility to happiness, which he felt to be 'typical of modern belief.'\footnote{216} The 'angel with the flaming sword,' he declared, had driven humanity from the

\footnote{213} \textit{Musical Standard}, 5 December 1891.  
\footnote{214} \textit{Weekly Times}, 30 December 1899.  
\footnote{215} \textit{Argus}, 5 August 1898.  
\footnote{216} Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898 in MUCL, 12 August 1898.
garden of Eden. As a result, the 'god of Joy' had been 'banished by man',\textsuperscript{217}, and 'the beautiful careless life' of the 'English folk song spirit ... has been well nigh lost to us',\textsuperscript{218}. Once, gladness and merriment had reigned supreme. But now,

No more as of old, high heroical paeons resound
To the mighty immutable goddess of laughter and love;
Her temples are shut, within them other gods crowned, -
Weaker, gloomier gods which never mirththrove,
Nor in their sad sanctuaries ever the hallowing wings
Of health-giving laughter gave echo, but sad sounds of sorrowful things.\textsuperscript{219}

Secondly there was the alleged tendency of the age to deprecate the ethical function of instinct. The 'Pythagorean' moral ideal, he claimed, was reached 'by training 'the instincts' to climb', while the 'modern conception of virtue' was 'a thing which is attained by crushing and trampling on the passions ... by doing violence to their nature',\textsuperscript{220}. Thus, 'our apish modern society' 'prohibited the fine unfettered play of man's finer nature',\textsuperscript{221}.

Finally, and as a result of the last, he was convinced that the masculine warrior virtues of a higher culture had

\textsuperscript{217}Minutes of the 36th meeting of the Boobook Society, February 1906, in Harrison Moore papers, Melbourne University Archives.

\textsuperscript{218}British Australasian, 2 July 1914.

\textsuperscript{219}Hymn to Sydney, op.cit., p.17.

\textsuperscript{220}Glean, October 1900.

\textsuperscript{221}Musical Standard, 15 December 1891.
given way to a 'milk and water' morality, characterised
by 'emasculating resignation' and 'slave-like submission'.
Due to 'the corrupt and effeminate influences that surround
us', the 'type of energy which the more robust and
actively vital civilisations termed "heroic"' had been
replaced by 'our somewhat pulingly sentimental modern idea
of heroism', by 'the modern pseudo-virtues, the modern
unselfishness', and the 'modern sickly effeminate hyper-
sympathy, philanthropy, charity', which prized 'weak
pathos over strong passion; languorous sentiment over force'
exaggerated sensibility over dignified feeling.

Not that Marshall-Hall despised unselfishness, sympathy,
philanthropy or charity, as such. His various denunciations
of these qualities stemmed rather from the belief that his
contemporaries prized them too highly, to the detriment of
the more forceful, sturdy virtues.

If I lay especial stress upon the
masculine, robust traits of character
[he explained], it is as an antidote
to what is nowadays dinned into our
ears from every side, for it seems to
me the modern tendency is to be too
soft and tender, too considerate, too
pliant.

---

222 Argus, 13 August 1898.
223 Herald, 28 February 1901.
224 Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.
225 Alma Mater, July 1899.
226 Alma Mater, April 1899.
227 Argus, 9 March 1907.
228 Alma Mater, July 1899.
And it was this loss of contact, in all three ways outlined above, with 'the glorious fires of former rich days in this country's history' that, he believed, accounted for 'the paltry sensualities and hysterical pity of latter-day art', by means of which the joyousness of Merrie England had died out 'amid the degrading imbecilities of the Victorian Royalty Ballad'. And the world had been deluged with 'sickly unreal sentiment as it exists ... in the modern drawing room music which fills the shop windows of London'. This, then, together with the active contaminating tendency of vulgarity, explains why he held it to be of the utmost importance for the artist, not only to be an evangelist of authenticity among his fellows, but to 'force his way through the midst' (emphasis mine).

And the 'force' he employed was verbal acrimony.

6. The Domestic Connection

Another clue to the bitterly anti-Hebraic tone of his 1898 utterances can be found in an already quoted remark of June 1900, which was almost certainly offered in extenuation of his behaviour - namely, that artists, by their very nature, often find themselves startled 'into incoherencies' by 'outward events', which arouse in them

---

229 Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.
230 Marshall-Hall Orchestral Concert Programme, 21 July 1906, in MMCA.
231 British Australasian, 2 July 1914.
232 Magazine of Music, September 1892.
233 Weekly Times, 30 December 1899.
a sudden rich flood of emotion.\textsuperscript{234} An examination of
the background to his outbursts reveals several such
'outward events', which could well have had this effect.
One was the reaction (in some quarters anyway) to his
domestic situation. He had arrived in Melbourne in 1891
with his first wife, May Hunt, to whom a daughter, Elsa,
was born in the following year.\textsuperscript{235} The marriage, however,
broke up, and wife and daughter returned to England early in
1893.\textsuperscript{236} At about the same time, he formed an extra-
marital relationship with Catherine (Kate) Hoare,\textsuperscript{237} whom
he eventually married after his wife's death in 1902,\textsuperscript{238}
having previously had two sons by her.\textsuperscript{239} She, presumably,
was the subject of the following lines in his Book of
Canticles:

\textsuperscript{234}See above, p.336.

\textsuperscript{235}Magazine of Music, February 1893.

\textsuperscript{236}Marshall-Hall to F.S. Delmer, 10 January 1893,
Delmar papers, \textit{loc.cit.}

\textsuperscript{237}This is the spelling of the name on the birth
certificate of her child born in December 1898 (Certificate
of Births in the District of Hotham East No.926a, 1899,
Office of Government Statist, Queen Street, Melbourne), and
on his death certificate (Certificate of Deaths in the
District of Bourke N.3841, Office of Government Statist,
Queen Street, Melbourne). The birth certificate gives her
first name as 'Cathrine', the death certificate as 'Catherine'.
I have assumed the latter, more common spelling to be
probably correct. Elsa Inman, Marshall-Hall's daughter (by
his first wife), told me the correct spelling of the surname
was 'Hoare'.

\textsuperscript{238}Marshall-Hall to F.S. Delmer, 9 April 1902, in
Delmar papers, \textit{loc.cit.}

\textsuperscript{239}Marshall-Hall to F.S. Delmer, 5 March 1900, and
9 April 1902 in \textit{ibid.}
As night stole by me to meet the day,  
Sweet Katie met me o'er the way.  
Heigh-ho! my heart was blithe and gay.\textsuperscript{240}

The social reprobation which their relationship  
attracted evidently greatly distressed Kate, who, according  
to Herbert Brookes, a close family friend, was 'well aware  
with what class so many pupils were disposed to place her'.  
She, therefore, 'shrank from sociable [illegible - contact?]  
with others and became with this a silent recluse'\textsuperscript{241}.  
The depth of her anguish at this time is demonstrated by  
the fact that it continued long after her position  
had been regularised by marriage. After her husband's  
death she fiercely opposed Herbert Brookes' (never  
accomplished) intention to publish a biography. 'She is  
obviously dotty on this matter', J.E. Mackey, one-time  
legal adviser to Marshall-Hall, informed Brookes in March  
1922, after having discussed it with her. 'She grew  
quite hysterical as she talked of it ... she says she  
"has forbidden you" or anyone else to publish any life  
of her husband'\textsuperscript{242}. And her reason, according to a friend,  
Ella Winter, was the 'fear of having her early part in  
his life exposed.'\textsuperscript{243}.

\textsuperscript{240}As night stole by', \textit{op.cit.}, p.51.

\textsuperscript{241}Note by Brookes, headed 'Marshall-Hall' in MHMA  
Group 1 1/2.

\textsuperscript{242}J.E. Mackey to Herbert Brookes, 16 March 1922  
in MHMA Group 3.

\textsuperscript{243}Ella Winter to Herbert Brookes n.d., context early  
1920s, in \textit{ibid.}, Group 1 1/5.
That she had had, at one time at least, good reason to shrink from censure, is indicated by an 'advertisement' for the 'Harshall-Mall concerts', appearing in the Trinity College students' paper, the Crab Catcher, in June 1892, and allegedly inserted by their 'manager', one 'Hereward the Rake'. It contained the following verse:

Ta-ra-ra Boom-de-ay
Haul me back again
Clementine
Do-re-me-fa-744
Hoary Anna.

If the last line was, indeed, a reference to Kate, it suggests that the relationship had already begun before his wife's departure. Long afterwards, in the 1920s, Herbert Brookes received an anonymous letter urging him not to go ahead with his planned memoir of the musician, and reminding him that Marshall-Hall 'drove his English wife back to her relatives and took up with a smutty barmaid of Frazer's Cafe'. Whether the latter was Kate is not clear, but the note indicates the depth of feeling his adultery excited in some circles.

Kate's discomfiture in this regard may well have been aggravated in the late nineties by a perception of Marshall-Hall's estranged wife and daughter as constituting a continuing threat to her place in his household and affection. Communication between husband and wife continued after the latter's departure for England in 1893, and was apparently

244 Crab Catcher, 26 June 1892 (in Trinity College Archives).

245 NHMA, Group I/3.
quite cordial. An undated letter from Marshall-Hall to Tom Roberts, written in that year, tells of the musician having recently received 'a cheery letter from my wife, who is enjoying her voyage thoroughly.'\(^{246}\) He presumably saw her on his visit home in 1894 - not, as Radic would have it, in order to study European Conversatoriums\(^{247}\) but 'on account of urgent business requiring my immediate presence in England.'\(^{248}\) And there is reason to believe that he sadly missed his daughter, Elsa, who, presumably, was the subject of the following lines in the Book of Canticles entitled 'To a Child':

\[
\begin{align*}
O \text{ Thou sweet innocent! Thou stands't within my life,} \\
\text{Serene and Beautiful as night's prophetic star;} \\
\text{Like the first gentle breeze of Spring} \\
\text{Thou cam'est on my bleak and fitful world} \\
\text{With odorous blooms its bareness garlanding.} \\
\text{Now thou art far,} \\
\text{And I bereft,} \\
\text{And nothing but thy blast remembrance left.} \\
\text{O mayst thou never know} \\
\text{So keen a woe.}\end{align*}
\]

\(^{249}\)

That the relationship was far from defunct in 1898 is suggested by May Marshall-Hall's brief return to Melbourne with her daughter in the following year - departing Plymouth

\(^{246}\)Smike to Bulldog, op.cit., p.61.


\(^{248}\)Record of meeting of Committee on Practical Instruction in Music on 4 July 1894 in MUCRF 1894/7; see also Marshall-Hall to Council, 4 July 1894 in ibid., 1894/41; MUCMB 16 July 1894.

on the Orient steamer, Oraya, on 15 April\textsuperscript{250}, and returning by the same ship from Melbourne on 13 June\textsuperscript{251}. The precise purpose and significance of this visit are not known. But it probably reflected some possibility, in the mind of one of them at least, of a reconciliation. And it would be strange, indeed, had it not heightened Kate's feeling of insecurity, as well as her resentment of those who did not conceal their moral disapproval of her place in the Ormond Professor's life.

That Marshall-Hall was not unaffected by her chagrin is evidenced in the \textit{Hymn to Sydney}, when the poet appeals to his mistress to

\begin{quote}
Think not of the world, gentle heart,
nor its usages trite; -
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
What if our sweet joy with opprobrious names it decry,
Its soul is the soul of a hog, and it takes the whole earth as its sty.\textsuperscript{252}
\end{quote}

And the same sentiment is found in the \textit{Book of Canticles}, when he exhorts her to

\begin{quote}
... Let the rank world wherein we live
Say its foul say, - We can forget, forgive.\textsuperscript{253}
\end{quote}

Her suffering, according to Herbert Brookes, 'caused him to fulminate against the upholders of [illegible - morality?] (chiefly the Churches' representatives)', until

\textsuperscript{250}British Australasian, 6 April 1899.

\textsuperscript{251}Table Talk, 16 June 1899; British Australasian, 27 July 1899.

\textsuperscript{252}Op.cit., p.17.

\textsuperscript{253}'Honi Soit Qui Mal y pense', op.cit., p.45.
'it became an obsession'. It seems reasonable then, to conclude that the Liedertafel speech and _Hymns Ancient and Modern_ constituted, in part, an attempt to revenge himself on these same 'representatives' for the pain they had inflicted on her. Their disapproval and, therefore, his anger (as well as her feeling of insecurity) were, no doubt, reinforced by the fact that in early August she was (almost certainly noticeably) pregnant.²⁵⁵

Whether the adultery played a significant role in giving rise to the outcry against him is not clear. I have found no single reference to it during the dispute in question.

²⁵⁴ Note by Brookes in MHMA Group 1 1/2.

²⁵⁵ Her son (named Alick on the birth certificate, Ulrick (sic) on the death certificate, and Herrick on his tombstone in Brighton cemetery) was born on 1 December, which means that conception probably occurred at the beginning of March — when Marshall-Hall was convalescent and writing _Hymns Ancient and Modern_ (see footnote 261). The birth certificate gives some slight support for the view that she felt insecure about the relationship at the time, as the boy was born at number 25 Queensberry Street, North Melbourne, in the absence of witnesses (not even an accoucheur), and in premises that apparently had no other 'occupier' (see birth certificate, loc.cit.). Marshall-Hall never, to my knowledge, lived in North Melbourne. So at this stage he and Kate may have been temporarily estranged, a circumstance that was, no doubt, connected with his wife's impending return to Melbourne. By the time the latter arrived (in August 1899) the child may have already been seriously ill (he died in February), and this could explain (in part at least) why no marital reconciliation occurred, and why he and Kate came together again. The fact that he was about to lose his professorial salary, and, with it, his capacity to keep two households, may also have been a factor. While all this is, admittedly, highly speculative, it is difficult to think of a more plausible explanation of her giving birth in an otherwise unoccupied house. Presumably, the discrepancy in names was due to errors made by registering officers, and the correct name was Herrick, a poet much admired by Marshall-Hall.
although it is hard to believe that it was not common knowledge in a small community like Melbourne, where university professors in general, and Marshall-Hall in particular, were very much in the public eye. The practice of the period seems to have been to ignore such peccadillos by public figures, unless they were unavoidably drawn to the attention of the populace. Thus, in Britain, no action was taken against Charles Stewart Parnell until his liaison with Mrs. O'Shea was dragged before the community in a sensational divorce case. Similarly, in Melbourne, Sir Redmond Barry, senior puisne judge of the Supreme Court, Chancellor of the University and Chairman of the trustees of the Public Library, got away with a 34 year relationship with Mrs. Louisa Barrow, who bore him four children without apparently damaging his career or social prospects. Probably the moral advantage to be won by punishing such people was outweighed in Hebraic eyes by the increased tolerance of immoral conduct that could result from a widespread realisation of its prevalence among the respectable. Nevertheless, the motivation of the individuals who attacked Marshall-Hall for what he had publicly said and written is likely to have been reinforced by their knowledge of his private behaviour.

7. Marshall-Hall's Illness; Bismarck's Death

Then there was the diphtheria, which he contracted in August 1897, and which rendered him too 'seriously ill'.

---

257 E. Moffitt to E.F. a'Beckett, 2 August 1897, MUCRCF 1897/6.
to continue discharging his teaching and other commitments, until the beginning of the following academic year. This long period of sickness, by keeping him at home with Kate, presumably sharpened his awareness of her torment.

One enterprising medico attributed the character of the verse he then published, in July 1898, to the anti-toxin treatment that had been prescribed for his ailment.

And it is true that at least one of the poems - 'Sapphics' - which the Argus declared to be too indecent to print, was written, or rather dictated to an amanuensis, during the early stages of convalescence, when, in 'extreme weakness', and 'unable to hold a pencil', he had been carried out on to the verandah of his sea-side home, where he found poetic inspiration in 'the delight of once more feeling the open air playing upon me, of feeling the green grass, and the ti-trees, and beyond, the immense ocean.' But, as Punch pointed out, this does not explain the contents of Marshall-Hall's earlier books of verse, which were written in the same vein. Moreover, the tone in which this particular correspondence was carried on suggests that the physician

---

258 Dr. Eccles to E.F. a'Beckett, 14 September 1897, in ibid.; W.A. Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 31 October 1897 in ibid.; Herald, 2 May 1898; Punch, 5 May 1898.

259 Dr. J.R. Wolfe M.D. in Age, 15 August 1898.

260 5 August 1898.

261 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898, in MUCNE, 12 August 1898.

262 25 August 1898.

263 See Dr. J.V. Eccles in Age, 16 August 1898, 17 August 1898; Dr. J.R. Wolfe in Age, 17 August 1898, 19 August 1898, 5 November 1898.
in question was actuated at least as much by the desire to grind a medical axe as by a genuine belief in the relation between the serum in question and the composition of 'indecent' poetry.

Be that as it may, there undoubtedly was a connection of a different kind between his diphtheria and the Liedertafel speech. Because of the former, his place as conductor of the Liedertafel had, from August 1897, been temporarily filled by Auguste Siede\textsuperscript{264}. And it was as a mark of appreciation for this service that Marshall-Hall, when he took up the baton again, on 1 August 1898, was charged with saying a few words of thanks to Siede and making a presentation.

By chance, this happened also to be the day on which Melbourne received news of the death of Bismarck, whose virile, ruthless character thus became the explicit inspiration for Marshall-Hall's attack on Christian meekness and humility\textsuperscript{265}.

Not that Bebbington is correct in asserting that he 'offended wide sections of the community with his speech in honour of Prince Bismark [sic] when the papers were full of anti-German sentiment over the war in Pretoria'\textsuperscript{266}.

\textsuperscript{264}30th annual report of the Melbourne Liedertafel, ML papers in PG; see also MLMB, 18 August 1897.

\textsuperscript{265}Argus, 2 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{266}M.Mus., p.135.
The Boer War (which, presumably, is what is meant) did not break out till more than a year later - on 11 October 1899. It is true that Germany's relations with Kruger - the Kaiser's congratulatory telegram of January 1896 on the failure of the Jameson raid, and the engineers, military instructors and artillery he subsequently sent to help fortify Pretoria - were not calculated to endear that country to Victorian Anglophiles. But by August 1898 Anglo-German relations had improved, when the two countries agreed on the partition of Angola and Mozambique. And a survey of the Melbourne press at this time, in fact, reveals very little anti-German feeling.

Certainly the Ormond Professor's praise of Bismarck evoked some criticism. The Advocate, commenting on his speech, drew attention to the blood-letting for which the German leader had been responsible. The Mitre complained that Marshall-Hall had elevated 'this cynical


271 Not enough to warrant Turnbull's contention that 'Current feelings against the commercial and military aggressiveness of Germany made Marshall-Hall's sentiments particularly out of season', op.cit., p.27.

272 6 August 1898.
brutal man ... above the Christ as an ethical teacher.\textsuperscript{273} And the \textit{Spectator} expressed the view that a 'more unscrupulous or more ruthless man never lived.'\textsuperscript{274} But such comments were rare and were in no case accompanied by any reference to German involvement in South African affairs. Moreover, Bismarck's repute was far from being uniformly low among exponents of Hebraism. The \textit{Southern Cross} actually extolled his hatred of gambling\textsuperscript{275}. And the \textit{Argus}, on the morning of the day the Liedertafel address was given, declared that he had

\begin{quote}
made his country great and kept it great, and that alone is a noble epitaph to write upon the tomb of any statesman ... nothing which is set down will diminish the giant stature of the man who has just passed away or his rugged heroism.
\end{quote}

Yet it is clearly possible that the course of Melbourne's history and of Marshall-Hall's fortunes would have been significantly different, had he not fallen victim to the diphtheria infection, or had the iron chancellor's doctors been able to keep him alive a few days longer. It is true, given the various psychological and situational determinants, discussed above, that, in that case, sooner or later some other pretext, or none at all, would probably have served equally well. He was not, after all, short of platforms from which to speak, the conductor's lectern being available

\textsuperscript{273}1 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{274}30 September 1898.
\textsuperscript{275}14 January 1898.
to him on numerous occasions each year. And it was not the first time he had used it for this purpose.

In fact, some two years earlier, he had already come very close to evoking what would surely have been a similar fracas. When he first submitted his poem 'On Michelagnolo's Mask of Mary' to the Bulletin more than a year before the publication of Hymns Ancient and Modern, it had contained the following stanza:

Thou liest wretched priest - Again I say
Thou liest - it is thy trade ever to lie;
The healthful master that this shapeless clay
Gave beauty, life, Yea! immortality,
For your uncleanly lusts had ne'er a thought. -
Your "virgin" God-papa, your mother - "maid"
Nor all the loathed abortions priest-begot,
Who, sexless, fain would all life else castrate.
Think you those lips were made to pout in prayer?
The Holy Ghost, sure! differed from you there:
He put the matter to the test at least,
And whether one be God, or man or beast,
It seems to come at end to the same thing,-
And Joseph turns up at the Christening.

After some delay the Bulletin accepted the poem, but, at that stage, Marshall-Hall, under the impression that 'the matter ... had fallen through', had already arranged for a truncated version to be published in his forthcoming book, and, therefore, returned the guinea A.G. Stephens had sent him in payment. The version that was then published omitted the above-quoted lines, presumably because the author had decided that the mixture of sex, anti-

276 See e.g. the Ibsen speech, Argus, 24 July 1893.
277 Mitchell Library manuscript, Ah 102.
278 Holograph letter in ibid., Ah 82, Marshall-Hall to A.G. Stephens (c.), 12 July 1897.
clericalism and blasphemy was too strong for the Hebraic Zeitgeist. It seems likely, then, that on this occasion he narrowly escaped the storm of protest that was eventually to break out in 1898 - which strengthens the view that a man of his temperament, opinions and perceptions was bound sooner or later to excite such a tempest. This is not, however, to say that the outcome would have been the same, had it occurred at a different time.  

279

8. Self-Advertisement

Finally it seems likely that the splenetic tone in which he couched his utterances was (in part) intended to attract some free publicity for his orchestral concerts. Musical performances, as he pointed out, 'for financial reasons must always clearly depend upon the support of a large mass of people whose interest has to be constantly stimulated'.  

The newspaper critics had, he believed, singularly failed in their duty in this respect. So, he quite consciously took the task upon himself. His friend, Herbert Brockes, claimed that he habitually employed 'shock tactics' in the hope that his philistine contemporaries would, thereby, be 'stung ... into life'.  

An interview which he gave to the Herald in the early nineties, and in which he poured vitriolic scorn on the competence of local musicians and

279 See discussion below, p.641.


281 Cutting from Age, 30 April, in MHMA, Additional Papers.
critics had, he informed W.A. Laver, been intended 'to create public interest' in his concerts. 'He said,' reminisced Laver, 'that being a press man, himself, in England, he knew that an attack upon Press critics, musicians and existing performances would provide the best propaganda'. And that this had, indeed, at least occasionally, been his policy was obliquely borne out in a letter to his friend, linguist F.S. Delmer, lamenting the failure of English managements to take an interest in his two operas, Stella and Romeo and Juliet, in 1914. 'I am not cut out,' he wrote, 'for the sort of hat-in-hand cut-throat methods by which one has to get on, and eccentric advertisement seems rather a poor ideal to adopt as one's life-aim'. The fact that his illness had kept him out of the public eye for so long in 1897 and 1898 may well have caused him to decide that such 'eccentric advertisement' was needed to draw attention once more to his artistic ventures.

To sum up, the irascible tone in which many of Marshall-Hall's utterances were delivered was a crucial determinant in raising the outcry against him. It derived from temperamental factors which may have owed something to an unconscious imitation of the behaviour of the supposedly typical musician. In addition, it may have represented an effort, also unconscious, to compensate for early feelings of inadequacy.

282 Typescript by W.A. Laver, headed 'Professor Marshall-Hall', in possession of Prof. G. Blainey.

283 Marshall-Hall to F.S. Delmer, 26 July 1914, in Delmer Papers, loc.cit.
engendered by failure to live up to his father's exacting
standards. But, at the same time, it was part of a
conscious policy of expending energy, as an anodyne against
the painful awareness of the ultimate hopelessness of the
human condition. And it reflected a belief that authentic
experience is impossible for the individual living in a
society enslaved to inauthenticity. To achieve it the
individual has first to implant the same desire forcibly
in his fellows.

The timing of the utterances of 1898 (and also to an
extent their tone) probably stemmed from irritation at
community attitudes (real or imagined) to his relationship
with Kate Hore, aggravated perhaps by certain strains in that
relationship. It was also probably an outcome of the
fortuitous death of Bismarck, as well as of the musician's
recovery at that time from a long period of illness and
musical inactivity.
CHAPTER 5

ULTERIOR MOTIVES

But a number of commentators have asserted or implied that the utterances of 1898 were an occasion, rather than a cause, of the outcry that was raised against him. His religious and moral heterodoxy, they have suggested, was merely a convenient pretext under cover of which to settle old scores. The purpose of this chapter will be to consider the accuracy of these allegations. The possibility that his critics were punishing him for his elitist views will be investigated, as will the charge that many of them were musicians seeking revenge for aspersions he had cast on their professional competence, and for the damage allegedly done by competition from his conservatorium to their teaching connections. Particular consideration will be given to the motives and actions of the three University Conservatorium teachers who did not leave the University with Marshall-Hall. Finally, attention will be paid to the claim that Dr. Alexander Leeper and the Argus newspaper, arguably Marshall-Hall's most determined and persistent enemies, were acting from motives other than genuine moral outrage.
1. Anti-Elitism

Radic claims that the dispute was basic at least, a 'confrontation between the enl and the ... anti-elitist establishment'\(^1\). Apparently, is that the professor's adversaries motivated by the opportunity he had given themselves on him for his elitist posturin

Some support for this view can be found levelled against him from all sides of pos\[\text{priest of music}\]\(^2\), the 'great panjandrum c in Melbourne'\(^3\). He was, it was complained a 'musical faction in this city'\(^4\), whose selves as 'the elect'\(^5\), the 'High apostles: 'chosen few who know everything about the and who were 'characterised by an inflated selves' and 'a supercilious attitude towar the world'\(^8\). Having, allegedly, a 'most belief in his own merits and opinions as a

\(^1\)Radic PhD, p.49.
\(^2\)Arena, 23 March 1901.
\(^3\)Table Talk, 18 April 1901; see also the 29 September 1892, 21 March 1901; Argus, 'Fair Play' in Table Talk, 25 May 1901.
\(^4\)Argus, 29 July 1893.
\(^5\)Outpost, 28 April 1900.
\(^6\)Argus, 4 July 1891.
\(^7\)Bohemian, 29 October 1891.
\(^8\)Outpost, 28 April 1900.
and lacking any 'sympathy with the poor, ignorant world that has never studied the construction of harmonies', he believed, according to his critics, 'that ... he expounds ... the only gospel which could be held by sane intellects' (ironically, a distinctly Hebraic trait).

And there was undoubtedly some justification in these charges of elitism. Radic is wrong in referring to his 'frequently published views that the wealthy were unfeeling parasites and that music was the property of the common man'. In fact this was a view he rarely published. I have found only two examples, both of which appeared in mid-1889. In the first, he affirmed that

Art and especially music is the property of the workers. From among their number all the great artists, the geniuses, the nobles of nature have sprung, by their sufferings, labours, and joys the greatest masterpieces have been inspired; it is emphatically to them and not to the animated clothes pegs, who lounge into their cushioned stalls half an hour after the performance has begun, that the artist appeals ... Beethoven and Wagner [had] the utmost respect for a well-clayed suit of corduroys, and a like disdain for ... those

INSIGNIA OF PUPPYDOM — the collar of huge dimensions, hat of smoothness, oily in proportion to the

---

10 Bulletin, 9 September 1899; see also e.g. Bulletin, 1 July 1899; Argus, 31 October 1891, 9 April 1892; 'M' in Argus, 4 July 1891; Musical Times, 1 February 1893.

11 Tocsin, 8 June 1899; see also e.g. Bulletin, 15 July 1899; Argus, 1 September 1905, 27 June 1903, 4 July 1891, 29 July 1899; Australasian Critic, 1 April 1899; Musical Standard, 2 January 1892, 9 June 1892; Punch, 21 March 1901; F.A. Keating in Argus, 12 April 1892; 'Cockney' in Bulletin, 6 October 1900; Musical Times, 1 February 1893; Table Talk, 16 December 1892; Outpost, 28 April 1900.

gentility of the wearer, and gloves guilt-
less, as their wearer's own hands, of stain
from connection with any profane thing.\(^\text{13}\)

Another article in the following month declared that 'genius
flowers the fairest amid poverty and distress' where it is
'directly in contact with realities of existence.\(^\text{14}\)

More often he insisted that 'Art as a whole, is for the
few ... of special mental powers'\(^\text{15}\), who 'are born with a
highly developed beauty-sense'\(^\text{16}\). The majority 'are
coarse and are suited to a coarse life'.\(^\text{17}\). Art was for
the 'select set' of 'highly cultivated' people. The
'general mass are unleavened dough',\(^\text{18}\). And it is for the
former that the artist works, not 'by the direction and for
the pleasure of the mob'.\(^\text{19}\).

Although this does not necessarily exclude members of
the working class from the elite minority, it clearly

\(^{13}\text{Star, 1 June 1899.}\)

\(^{14}\text{Musical World, 13 July 1889.}\)

\(^{15}\text{Alma Mater, July 1899; see also e.g. Table Talk,}
2 August 1892; British Australasian, 2 July 1914; Weekly
Times, 30 December 1899; Alma Mater, April 1900, June 1899;
Australia Today, 1 November 1910; Gleam, October 1900;
Marshall-Hall to President of the Professorial Board,
29 October 1895 in MUCMB, 4 November 1895; Herald, 28 February
1901; Table Talk, 16 January 1891, 12 May 1893.\)

\(^{16}\text{Address to be delivered to the Brown Society on}
30 July 1915, in MHMA, Group 2.}\)

\(^{17}\text{Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898,}
in MUCMB, 12 August 1898.}\)

\(^{18}\text{Sydney Morning Herald cutting in G.M. Thompson's}
scrap book, context November 1911, loc.cit.}\)

\(^{19}\text{Alma Mater, August 1895.}\)
represents, at the very least, a change of emphasis. The reason probably lay in his altered circumstances. In 1889, as we have seen\textsuperscript{20}, he was endeavouring to make a living as a professional musician in London. It was probably in this period that he underwent the hardships subsequently related to Ella Winter\textsuperscript{21}, which are likely to have made him more sympathetic to the poor, than when he became the recipient of a handsome professorial salary in Melbourne in the nineties. Moreover, as a university teacher it was hardly in his interests to repeat his assertion, made in the first of the articles quoted above, that the worker 'learns by the

DIRECT METHOD OF NATURE

in a short time what years of university lectures and book lore without end are unable to teach the more favoured classes'.

However, while his elitism undoubtedly offended against the democratic temper of the period, and may have reinforced the hostility of some who attacked him for his religious and moral utterances, it is implausible that many of his enemies were primarily motivated by it. There is no significant correlation between those who criticised him on this score and those who sought his removal from the chair of music. The former included such champions of his cause as \textit{Arena}, \textit{Table Talk}, \textit{Outpost}, \textit{Punch} and the

\textsuperscript{20}p. 345.

\textsuperscript{21}See above, p.337, fn.98.
Bulletin. It also included Tocsin - leading organ of 'the anti-elitist establishment'. This journal denounced the hapless professor for allegedly preaching that 'all individuals not artistically endowed are only fit to be, and should be, slaves', and for sneering at those 'who cannot and do not hope to be anything more than "hewers of wood and drawers of water"'. But it fought for his reappointment on the ground that he was, musically, 'a Godsend to Melbourne', whose 'capacity is by no means to be judged by his cackling'.

2. Musical Jealousies

Nor was Tocsin correct in contending that 'the "back bone" of the cabal against Marshall-Hall is the jealousy of alleged music teachers'. It is true he gave offence by denigrating local musicians. He was accused of having asserted that, before his advent, local music teaching had been 'at a very low ebb indeed', and 'that musical taste [did] not exist in Melbourne' until 'he arrived to teach it'.

And there was some justice in these charges against him. Without indicating whom exactly he had in mind, he had

*As, of course, was the Bulletin.

22 June 1900.

23 22 September 1898.

24 S.G. McLaren in Argus, 18 December 1896; see also e.g. Argus, 22 January 1898.

25 Argus, 26 November 1892.

26 Argus, 14 July 1900; see also e.g. Southern Cross, 28 October 1898; Argus, 15 December 1896; J. Summers in Magazine of Music, March 1893.
stigmatised local teaching as 'frightfully bad',\textsuperscript{27} and 'conducted on wrong and even rotten principles',\textsuperscript{28} in a 'perfectly unscientific and ignorant manner'.\textsuperscript{29} As a result, he had averred, musical 'charlatanism is rampant',\textsuperscript{30} performances 'almost without exception', were 'execrable',\textsuperscript{31} a 'number of incompetent musicians had been able to retain a hold on certain peculiarly desirable positions',\textsuperscript{32} and 'the people here ... as a whole have as yet no taste, no judgement, and are profoundly ignorant of what music is and what an artistic performance really means'.\textsuperscript{33} Any improvement that had occurred since his advent he attributed largely to his own efforts,\textsuperscript{34} a view that was frequently echoed by his supporters.\textsuperscript{35}

It is hardly surprising that such pronouncements met with a hostile reception from some music teachers.

\textsuperscript{27}Herald, 10 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{28}Champion, 27 June 1896.

\textsuperscript{29}Alma Mater, July 1899; see also e.g. Marshall-Hall to President of the Professorial Board, 29 October 1895, loc. cit.; Table Talk, 22 March 1895; Argus, 6 January 1896.

\textsuperscript{30}Argus, 15 November 1892.

\textsuperscript{31}Sydney Morning Herald, 26 November 1892.

\textsuperscript{32}Table Talk, 2 August 1895; see also Table Talk, 22 March 1895.

\textsuperscript{33}Argus, 15 November 1892.

\textsuperscript{34}Unidentified cutting in E.H. Sugden scrapbook, Vol.1, p.235, context 1893; Table Talk, 2 August 1895; Argus, 6 September 1898; Herald, 10 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{35}See e.g. Answers, June 1894; Saturday Review, 5 November 1901; Somervell to Stanford, 1 October 1900 in Argus, 22 December 1900; Champion, 22 August 1896; A. Siede in Argus, 19 June 1900; E. Wiedermann in Herald, 20 June 1900; Arena, 19 January 1901; Magazine of Music, June 1894.
G.W. Russell declared them to be 'insulting to professional musicians ... and absolutely false'. And he fiercely denied 'any insinuation that we ever needed or felt the influence of the Ormond Professor or the Conservatorium as a stimulus required to arouse our enthusiasm or direct our efforts or bring us out of a state of musical barbarism'.

Jealousy was discernible also in the resentment evinced by some members of the profession against what was perceived as unfair competition on the part of the University chair of music and the Conservatorium. While, originally, it was maintained, the objective had been 'to benefit an over manned profession by raising it to the dignity of a faculty, with a chair at the University', the outcome was the establishment of 'a private adventure school' - run for 'business purposes and pecuniary profit'. The Conservatorium, as such, was said to be competing 'most unfairly with outside teachers and musicians', doing them 'serious injury' by undercutting their fees. Not only that, but its teachers were also accused of -

---

36 *Argus*, 29 November 1900; see also *Argus*, 24 December 1900; *Musical News*, 13 April 1901; *Punch*, 25 October 1900.

37 'Dominant Seventh' in *Argus*, 25 March 1896.

38 Joseph Summers in *Argus*, 2 March 1896.

39 Ibid.

40 Joseph Summers in *Argus*, 6 March 1896.

41 'Dominant Seventh' in *Argus*, 2 March 1896; see also T. Ibsen in *London Musical Courier*, 16 July 1896.

42 'Lover of Music' in *Herald*, 12 October 1896.
utilising their position to displace others from the visiting staffs of suburban schools, the principals of which establishments are naturally not proof against the double attraction of a music master who is connected with the University Conservatorium and who is willing to work for a lower fee. 43

On 30 March 1896 a petition was forwarded to the University Council 'from the Teachers and Musicians of Melbourne' registering their complaint against the Chair of Music and the University Conservatorium of Music, in competing on most unequal terms with us, as teachers when local musicians can hardly earn enough by concert engagements to pay cab fares. 44

How far the plight of local teachers was really due to the Conservatorium is impossible to say.

But W.A. Laver, Chief Study Piano teacher at the Conservatorium, was wrong in designating his 'several attacks on resident musicians soon after his arrival in Melbourne' as one of the 'chief causes of Professor Marshall-Hall's downfall'. 45 And the evidence contradicts Radic's assertion that the Conservatorium 'raised the ire ... of the teaching body as a whole', and that 'professional jealousy by this time [i.e. mid-1898] had gathered enough momentum to destroy its object'. 46

43 Leader, 9 March 1895.
44 MUCRFC 1895/6.
45 Typed statement by W.A. Laver in possession of G. Blainey, op.cit.
The petition of March 1896 seems to have been widely circulated. It is known that a copy was left for signature at Sutton Bros. music shop in Bourke Street - only to be immediately removed by the proprietors who declared that they were 'not in sympathy with its contents', being, on the contrary, 'of opinion that the establishment of a Conservatorium of music in practical touch with the University cannot be else than conducive to the best interests of musical education'. And another was apparently sent to the Musical Society of Victoria, the President of which, on 28 March 1896, 'reported receipt of a letter from Mr. Russell re the Ormond Professor and Conservatorium'. But here, too, it was resolved (on the motion of George Peake) 'That Mr. Russell be informed that the Society do not intend to take active steps in the matter at present'. It is likely, then, that other major musical organisations and other music retailers were similarly canvassed. Yet there were only eight signatories, of whom only one, C.W. Russell, later became active in the campaign for Marshall-Hall's removal.

\[47\] *Argus*, 17 March 1896.

\[48\] Minute Book of Musical Society of Victoria, 28 March 1896, in MSV Archives, 27 Inglesby Road, Camberwell.

\[49\] To wit, those of organists David Lee and J.R. Edeson, tenor George Heron, violinist and financially unsuccessful opera impresario Martin Simonsen, Dr. Joseph Summers, C.W. Russell, James Ure and Julius Herz - see MUCRF 1895/6; see also MUCMB, 13 April 1896; *Argus*, 30 March 1896. Simonsen committed suicide in 1899, perhaps because of his financial difficulties. But the latter probably derived more from his unsuccessful operatic ventures than from the loss of students to the University Conservatorium - see Leader, 2 December 1899; *Australasian Stage Annual 1900* (ed) William Crawley), p.56. David Lee was organist to the
This was in marked contrast to the meeting called in September 1908 by the Musical Society, chaired by George Peake, and attended by 60 music teachers, to protest against Marshall-Hall's successor, Franklin Peterson, for the same alleged offence. The greater strength of the opposition on the latter occasion no doubt reflected the fact that, by this time, Peterson had offended Melbourne musicians far more deeply than Marshall-Hall ever did —by his administration of the new Australian Music Examinations Board.

What evidence there is favours the view that most musicians desired Marshall-Hall's reappointment. A letter of support, sent to the University Council in June 1900,

Corporation of Melbourne (Weekly Times, 15 May 1897). Ure, who came to Melbourne in 1854, was a school teacher and was connected to the Philharmonic Society (Weekly Times, 27 February 1909). Russell joined the University Conservatorium as teacher on Marshall-Hall's departure (Leader, 23 March 1901). Edeson was organist at Scot's Church, Melbourne (Table Talk, 11 January 1900). Summers had been music inspector for the government, and conductor of the Philharmonic Society. He had composed oratorios and other music (Weekly Times, 5 April 1890). Herz had founded the Metropolitan Liedertafel in 1870 (then called the South Yarra Liedertafel). In 1889 he was one of the founders and became secretary of the Society of Musicians of Australasia (Illustrated Australian News and Musical Times, 1 August 1889).

50 Argus, 7 September 1908.

51 See e.g. University Conservatorium Examination Board Minute Book, 22 July 1903; Miss J. Henderson to Professor Baldwin Spencer, 4 November 1905 in MUCRF, 1905/37; Charles Manby to W.E. Cornwell, 6 August 1907 in ibid., 1907/21; Charles Manby to F. Peterson, 16 May 1907 in ibid., 1907/9; M.S.V. Minute Book, 16 November 1901, 26 February 1902, 13 March 1902, loc. cit.; James Ure to Louis Lavater in Lavater papers, Victorian State Library 527/4(c) MS8273; James Ure in Australasian Musical Monthly, 1 June 1906.
was signed by 69 members of the profession. In the same month the audience at a concert which, according to Punch, was 'crowded with hairy musicians and loyal pupils and friends', expressed its support for the professor with a 'demonstration ... such as the people gave during the patriotic fervour in honour of Lord Roberts or Baden Powell'. They 'cheered and cheered' him for 'about ten minutes' before the programme commenced, repeated the exercise after each item, and, when the concert was over, 'remained in the hall to go through the cheering business all over again'. Among the floral tributes that 'were handed up in such numbers that the conductor hardly had any room to move', were some from the members of the orchestra, the Turn Verein Liedertafel, the committee of the Risvegliato and the Quartette Verein Arion.

Moreover, Table Talk was radically mistaken in its claim that 'most opposition to Marshall-Hall came from his own subordinates' at the University Conservatorium, with only 'a few faithful supporters standing loyally beside him'. In fact, at a meeting in June 1900 the Conservatorium teachers

---

52 MUCRCF, 1900/40.
53 21 June 1900.
54 Herald, 16 June 1900. The first and last were affiliates of the Melbourne Deutscher Turn Verein (founded 1 May 1860), an organisation dedicated to the promotion of physical culture, literature, music and social entertainments. The Quartette was a male chorus specialising in German Lieder (Argus, 2 May 1910; Australian Musical and Dramatic News, Vol.3, No.4, 1 October 1913, p.107); I have not been able to get any information about the Risvegliato. Presumably, it catered for the cultural interests of the Italian community in Melbourne.
55 9 August 1900.
resolved to 'urge upon the Council that the Professor ... should be reappointed', and selected three of their number - Herr Walter, Auguste Siede, and Elise Wiedermann - to take part in a deputation for that purpose. Although it is not known how many were present, or how many, if any, voted against the resolution, the fact that when Marshall-Hall lost his post, all the University teachers but three voluntarily followed him into exile, suggests that it had overwhelming support.

This is not to say that there was no opposition to his reappointment from musicians, but it was neither general nor organised. Nor was it necessarily the product of jealousy, rivalry, or professional pique. C.W. Russell's role has already been noted. In addition, J. Alfred Johnstone, organist of St. Paul's Anglican Church, Geelong, was 'shocked and scandalised' by the professor's 'disgraceful language and writings' and thanked the Argus for using its 'influence ... to put away such shame from amongst us'. There are, however, no grounds for supposing him to have been impelled, in this regard, by any but perfectly orthodox Hebraic motives.

---

56 Argus, 19 June 1900.
57 E. Wiedermann to University Council, 15 June 1900, MUCRCF, 1960/40.
58 See below, pp.334-431.
59 Argus, 9 August 1898.
The same is, admittedly, not true of Henry John King, organist of St. Mark's church, Fitzroy\textsuperscript{60}, who, on 15 August 1898, attacked the Liedertafel speech before an audience some 800 strong in the large hall of the Athenaeum, which he had hired for the purpose\textsuperscript{61}. King had been Marshall-Hall's immediate predecessor as conductor of the Liedertafel\textsuperscript{62}. In August 1897 he was dismissed from the post for a number of offences, including unauthorised withdrawal of a piece from performance, publicly 'ridiculing the actions of the Musical Committee', and private rudeness to its members when they refused to allow one of his pupils to sing at a concert\textsuperscript{63}. He denied the charge that his 'severance from the office of conductor of the Liedertafel, and Mr. Hall's succession to it, had something to do with my resolve to reply ... to his speech'\textsuperscript{64}. But there may have been some truth in it. He may well have been, at least unconsciously, influenced by his personal grievance. Neither he nor Johnstone, however, had signed the petition of March 1896.

Nor, of course, had any of the three Conservatorium teachers, who stayed with the University after Marshall-Hall's

\textsuperscript{60} Table Talk, 19 June 1891.

\textsuperscript{61} Herald, 15 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{62} Bohemia, 13 August 1891; MLMB, 12 March 1891; 24th annual report of Melbourne Liedertafel 1891-2 in PG.

\textsuperscript{63} 30th annual report of the Melbourne Liedertafel, 1897-8, p.9 in ML papers in PG; MLMB, 23 July 1897.

\textsuperscript{64} Age, August 1898, i.e. the Liedertafel speech.
departure - namely, Ernest Wood, William Adolphus Laver and David John Coutts. Wood's motives are uncertain. It is not even clear that he opposed the professor's reappointment. If he did, the fact that he was organist of St. Paul's Cathedral, Warden and musical director of the Australasian Guild of Church Musicians, and a Fellow of the London Guild of Church Musicians (honoris causa), suggests that he may have been actuated by religious and/or prudential considerations.

In the cases of Laver and Coutts, more evidence is available, although its precise import is open to question. On 4 May 1899 Marguerite Henderson, a singing teacher in, and ex-student of, the Conservatorium, made a statutory declaration to the effect that,

During the difference between Professor Marshall-Hall and the University Council, Mr. W.A. Laver and Mr. Coutts called at my house [in Coburg] one evening about nine o'clock. Mr. Laver ... talked of Professor Marshall-Hall's difficulty. He said that if one student would come forward and say that the Professor had made any improper remarks in class, his dismissal would be certain, and Mr. Laver asked me if I could remember any such remarks; I said I could not. Mr. Laver said this was a very important matter for me as I had not been appointed a Teacher in the conservatorium by the University Council, but only by Professor Marshall-Hall.

---

65 Church of England Messenger, 1 November 1896; Southern Cross, 4 November 1898.

66 Argus, 30 May 1896; Church of England Messenger, 1 September 1909.

67 Argus, 13 January 1897.
who had no power to appoint me; but that if I came forward against the professor my position would be made secure, as he (Mr. Laver) had strong support in the University Council. I said this would make no difference to me, and after an interview which lasted nearly 88 hours, Mr. Laver and Mr. Coutts left.

For some reason, this document was not made public until July 1900. Perhaps it had been considered better, on tactical grounds, to wait until the question of reappointment was formally reopened in the Council. Perhaps Henderson, herself, wishing to escape distasteful publicity, had delayed its publication in the hope that it would not be necessary.

Laver and Coutts denied the allegation. It is possible that Henderson was lying, or that she had misunderstood her two visitors. If so, it is puzzling that, although Laver threatened, first to sue for libel, then to issue a counter-affidavit, he did neither, despite being taunted by the Outpost for the omission.

Perhaps he was persuaded that, in the absence of disinterested witnesses to the event, a court action would not succeed. And perhaps he had reason to fear that a

---

68 Table Talk, 19 July 1900.
69 Table Talk, 12 July 1900.
70 Ibid.
71 Outpost, 28 July 1900, 25 August 1900, 5 January 1901.
72 5 January 1901.
counter-affidavit would prompt Henderson to serve him with a libel writ. This may explain an entry in Alexander Leeper's diary for 12 October 1899, concerning a meeting Leeper had with Laver and Coutts on that day, when they 'told me de libel act\(^n\) v Mackey,\(^73\). This is consistent with Table Talk's claim that they first learned of Henderson's affidavit in October \(^74\), and it was presumably a reference to J.E. Mackey, one of Marshall-Hall's legal counsellors, who was also adviser to Henderson in this affair\(^75\). The 'act\(^n\)' alluded to could have been one that Mackey had threatened in response to the proposed counter-affidavit. Or, of course, it could have been the one Laver, himself, was thinking of initiating. In either case, the latter's reluctance to go to court probably stemmed from the difficulty he and Coutts would have had explaining why they did visit Henderson's home on the night in question. They never denied the visit, to which Henderson's mother, who was present when they arrived, but not during the subsequent interview\(^76\), would, presumably, have testified. These circumstances, then - the failure to take any legal action, and to provide an alternative explanation of their visit - make Henderson's story somewhat more plausible than Laver's denial.

\(^73\) Leeper Diary, loc.cit., 12 October 1899.

\(^74\) 19 July 1900.

\(^75\) Table Talk, 19 July 1900; Outpost, 14 July 1900.

\(^76\) Table Talk, 19 July 1900.
As for their motives, neither of the two men ever gave any sign of Hebraic tendencies, or of having been offended by the Liedertafel speech or the poems. But both had other reasons for wishing to be rid of Marshall-Hall. Laver, Victorian born (on 20 August 1866\(^77\)), and musically educated at Frankfurt\(^78\), had been an original applicant, with Marshall-Hall, for the Ormond Professorship, although well below the stipulated minimum age\(^79\). He had returned to Melbourne in 1889, on the advice of the Victorian Agent-General, Graham Berry, 'in order to have the age restriction removed', but failed\(^80\). (Radic, however, provides no evidence for her assertion that this was why he was not appointed\(^81\). And, in view of the failure of the selection committee in 1900\(^82\) even to include him among the short-listed applicants, it is surely at least as likely that, on the earlier occasion, he was simply not regarded as having the necessary musical qualifications and competence.)

He met Marshall-Hall soon after the latter's arrival in Melbourne, and initially relations between the two seem to

\(^77\) Laver's account of his application for the chair of music, in Hince papers, NLA 2691/3611; see also Laver's application for the position of Director of the projected Sydney Conservatorium, 16 May 1914, in MUCRF 1915/194.

\(^78\) Laver's application for Sydney Conservatorium, loc.cit.

\(^79\) MUCMB, 29 October 1898.

\(^80\) Ibid.

\(^81\) Radic, PhD, 233.

\(^82\) See below, p. 596.
have been cordial. Laver was honorary pianist at the Marshall-Hall concert of 22 July 1893\textsuperscript{83} and, again, on the following 28 October\textsuperscript{84}. In 1894, when Marshall-Hall visited England briefly, he requested that Laver be appointed acting professor\textsuperscript{85} and conduct one of the Marshall-Hall concerts\textsuperscript{86} in his absence. In 1895, again on Marshall-Hall's recommendation, Laver was appointed first study piano teacher in the newly opened Conservatorium. In October he played at a Marshall-Hall chamber music concert\textsuperscript{87}, and in November joined Marshall-Hall, at the professor's instance, as examiner in Matriculation Music\textsuperscript{88}. In all, he recorded that 1895 had been 'a happy year' for all those working together in the new Conservatorium\textsuperscript{89}.

Trouble seems to have begun with Eduard Scharf's appearance on the scene. Scharf, a pianist, and quondam Director of the Prague Conservatorium\textsuperscript{90}, had come to Australia with the Musin company and decided to stay, partly on Marshall-Hall's

\textsuperscript{83}Table Talk, 28 July 1893.

\textsuperscript{84}Table Talk, 3 November 1893.

\textsuperscript{85}Report of Committee on Practical Music, 4 July 1894, to University Council, in MUCRCF 1894/7; see also MUCMB, 16 July 1894.

\textsuperscript{86}Table Talk, 3 November 1894.

\textsuperscript{87}Argus, 25 October 1895.

\textsuperscript{88}MUCMB, 4 November 1895.

\textsuperscript{89}Hand written note by Laver in Hince papers, NLA, 2691/3611.

\textsuperscript{90}Ernest Moffitt to University Council n.d. MUCRCF 1897/6.
urging. In September 1897, when bed-ridden with diphtheria, the Professor requested the University Council to put Scharf in charge of his interpretation and orchestral classes, and the appointment was duly made.

That Laver felt threatened by this is suggested by a letter in the Argus on 4 December, from the secretary of the Conservatorium, Ernest Moffitt, correcting a previous correspondent's assertion that Scharf was acting as locum tenens for Marshall-Hall. 'Mr. W.A. Laver, our chief pianoforte teacher,' wrote Moffitt, 'occupies the position of acting director during the Professor's illness; in justice to Mr. Laver merely, is this correction made.'

Then, in March 1898, Marshall-Hall offered Scharf a job as chief study piano teacher, which would have placed him on a level with Laver, hitherto the only occupant of that position. The latter, who, reportedly, saw the appointment as 'a piece of petty animosity towards himself', countered by asking the Council to make him (Laver) Vice-Director of the Conservatorium, in return for a reduction in pay.

---

91 Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 12 August 1898, in ibid., 1898/5.
93 Argus, 21 January 1897.
94 4 December 1897.
95 Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 4 November 1898, in MURCF 1898/5.
96 Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 12 August 1898 in ibid.
Marshall-Hall opposed the request 'on the grounds that this would give him undue advantage in Status over other Teachers, and would prevent first class musicians joining us,' as 'the professional status of such would suffer by their accepting a subordinate position to Mr. Laver.' He was thinking particularly of Scharf who, he informed the Council's Committee on Practical Tuition in Music (henceforth referred to as the Conservatorium Committee), 'would not and could not accept an inferior position.'

Laver's request was rejected, but a final decision on Scharf's appointment was deferred, due, purportedly, to 'financial difficulties' that had arisen 'with regard to teachers' salaries.' In August Marshall-Hall again sought approval for the proposed engagement, explaining that 'I thoroughly appreciate Mr. Laver's excellence up to a certain point, but it is necessary for us to acquire an artist of greater experience in concert technique, and general finish, if the pianoforte school is to be a model for the rest of Victoria.' On 28 September the Conservatorium Committee, presumably in the interests of peace,

97 Ibid.; see also Marshall-Hall to University Chancellor, 1 March 1899, in MUCRCF 1899/9.


99 Ibid.

100 Ibid.; see also Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 2 December 1898, in MUCRCF, 1898/5.

101 Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Bekcett, 12 August 1898, in ibid.; see also Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 4 November 1898, in ibid.
instructed him to discuss the matter with Laver before a
decision was taken\textsuperscript{102}. According to his own account,
Marshall-Hall tried to arrange a meeting, but Laver 'without
sending me any notification, failed to keep the appointment,
although he was in town that afternoon', and 'absented him-
self during the next two days from all his classes'.\textsuperscript{103}

At this stage, Marshall-Hall believed that Laver was busy
lobbying Councillors, representing the proposed Scharf
appointment to them as a political tactic, perhaps an attempt
to strengthen the professor's power base at the University
in readiness for the looming battle over his reappointment
in 1900. During his two-day period of absence from the
Conservatorium, declared Marshall-Hall, he was taking
advantage of 'my somewhat difficult position' - arising from
the Council's having recently taken 'exception to certain
opinions I held as to matters which had nothing to do with
my work' - in order 'to misrepresent this other, previous
matter [i.e. the Scharf affair]'.\textsuperscript{104} That this was, indeed,
what he was doing is indicated by Marshall-Hall's subsequent
report that members of the Conservatorium Committee then
'informed me that they do not question the advantage which
would be derived by the Conservatorium from the addition of
Mr Scharf, and if they do not recommend it, it is because

\textsuperscript{102}Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 4 November 1898, in \textit{ibid}.
\textsuperscript{103}\textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{104}Marshall-Hall to University Council, 1 March 1899, in \textit{ibid}., 1899/9.
they suspect motives other than the interests of the Conservatorium. 105

In December 1898 Marshall-Hall claimed to have heard that the Conservatorium Committee was 'about to recommend that the management of this branch of the Conservatorium [i.e. the piano teaching] be taken out of the hands of the Director and entrusted to the present pianoforte teacher.' 106 a step which, he warned, 'would destroy the discipline of the Conservatorium, be an intolerable slight on the Director, and constitute a breach of contract with him.' 107 However, there is no independent record of such a recommendation having been made or even contemplated.

Meanwhile, early in October, Marshall-Hall gave Scharf one class 'so as at all events to keep faith with him.' 108 In doing so without consulting the Council, he was certainly acting within his rights, inasmuch as the regulations empowered the Director 'to engage Teachers to assist temporarily in the conservatorium', provided that the 'name of any teacher so engaged shall immediately be reported by the Director to the Council and the Council shall determine at its first meeting thereafter whether such engagement

105 Ibid.
106 MUCMB, 6 December 1898.
107 Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 2 December 1898, in MUCRCF, 1898/5.
shall be then terminated or continued for any further period.\textsuperscript{109}

To this new class he assigned, according to his own account, two of Laver's students, 'whose progress had been very unsatisfactory during the year.'\textsuperscript{110} Laver, however, claimed that Marshall-Hall had instructed three of his best pupils to transfer themselves to Scharf, that all three had protested, and that when one, Harold Elvins, insisted on seeing Laver, the professor had replied, 'I am director here and if you don't do as I direct you, you must leave the institution' - or words to that effect. Another of the students, Alice Maurice, had said, 'I'd rather leave the institution.'\textsuperscript{111}

Marshall-Hall did not dispute this last part of Laver's account. It was confirmed by Alice's father in a letter saying that his daughter had 'no desire to change her teacher and would leave the Conservatorium if forced to do so.'\textsuperscript{112} And the discrepancy between Marshall-Hall's account and Laver's, as to the number of students involved, presumably reflects the Ormond Professor's resolve not to persist with

\textsuperscript{109}Rules of the Conservatorium in ibid.

\textsuperscript{110}Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 4 November 1898, in ibid.

\textsuperscript{111}Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 15 October 1898, in ibid.

\textsuperscript{112}Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 16 October 1898, in ibid.
his plan, in respect to Alice Maurice. The third proposed
transferee was Lucy Gray, of whose views on the matter
nothing further is known, her mother having insisted that
she be spared any publicity\textsuperscript{113}.

The only substantive and unequivocal difference between
the two versions was in regard to Harold Elvins. According
to Laver, Elvins' father had reported his son to be very
upset about the proposed change\textsuperscript{114}; while Marshall-Hall said
that both 'Mr. Elvins and his father told me that, grateful
as they were to Mr. Laver, they felt that Elvins had come to
a standstill, and that he would greatly benefit by the
transfer'.\textsuperscript{115} It is difficult, in the absence of further
evidence, to determine which version is correct, or whether
one of them was a deliberate lie. It is possible that the
Elvins, themselves, had not been consistent in their
responses, genuinely wishing, perhaps, to change teacher,
while finding it difficult to say so to Laver, in view of
their feeling of obligation to him for his past services.
The latter hypothesis acquires some degree of confirmation
from Marshall-Hall's subsequent assertion that 'It seems to
me absurd and improper that a teacher, by dint of urging
claims to the gratitude of students for past work, should
endeavour to persuade them to act against their own interests
and my advice'.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{113}Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 16 October 1898, in \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{114}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{115}Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 4 November 1894,
in \textit{ibid.}, 1898/5.
\textsuperscript{116}\textit{Ibid.}
This particular battle was won, at least in the short term, by Laver. At its meeting of 17 October the Council resolved

that Professor Marshall-Hall be informed that as Mr. Scharf has not been appointed by the Council he cannot be recognised as a University teacher of music and that pupils attending the class of Mr. Laver, the recognised University teacher of the pianoforte, cannot be required to attend in the class of Mr. Scharf who is not recognised.\textsuperscript{117}

However, Marshall-Hall did not give up. On 4 November he was again urging the appointment of Scharf as Chief Study Teacher\textsuperscript{118}. Laver again objected, contending that the real motive was to 'indirectly ruin me by taking nearly all, if not all, my students and especially promising students away from me'.\textsuperscript{119} And the Council, acting on the advice of the Conservatorium Committee\textsuperscript{120}, again rejected the proposal\textsuperscript{121}.

Then, on 15 May 1899, it reversed its decision\textsuperscript{122}. The clue to this abrupt change lies, apparently, in the letter Marshall-Hall had written to the Chancellor in March saying that he had

\textsuperscript{117}MUCMB, 17 October 1898.
\textsuperscript{118}Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 4 November 1898, in MUCRCF 1898/5; MUCMB, 7 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{119}Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 26 November 1898 in MUCRCF, 1898/5.
\textsuperscript{120}MUCRCF, 1898/5.
\textsuperscript{121}MUCMB, 5 December 1898.
\textsuperscript{122}MUCRCF, 1899/9; MUCMB, 15 May 1899; Punch, 25 May 1899.
reason to believe that the correspondence relating to the recommendation by me of Mr. Scharf to the position of First Study pianoforte teacher in addition to Mr. Laver has never been submitted in its entirety to the Council, nor considered by them. I beg to request that you will see this omission is rectified ... as I learn from the [Conservatorium] Committee that a grave misunderstanding has arisen as my motives in making this recommendation.\footnote{Marshall-Hall to Chancellor, 1 March 1898, in MUCRCF, 1899/9.}

Now, there is little doubt that the main consideration, preventing the Council from endorsing the appointment, had been Laver's claim that it was to be used as a means of getting rid of him (together, probably, with the belief — probably fostered by Laver — that this would strengthen Marshall-Hall in the impending struggle over his reappointment). Marshall-Hall claimed that Dr. J.H. MacFarland, a member of the Conservatorium Committee, had informed him in the previous December 'that he considers that it is an absurdity that the Director should not have the power to advise students (on such rare occasions when advice is necessary) as to the teacher most suitable to their temperament and requirements' and that the only reason for the Committee's reluctance to agree with his plans in this instance 'is that Mr. Laver is afraid that the Director will unfairly deprive him of pupils'.\footnote{Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 2 December 1898, in ibid., 1898/5.} As this statement, which was laid before the Council, of which MacFarland was a member, was never denied by MacFarland, it is presumably true.
It is likely, then, that the correspondence not previously submitted to the Council, and which, when tabled, was responsible for that body's volte face, included an assurance of 12 August 1898, guaranteeing Laver against loss of students.

If I should at any time think it advisable to recommend any of Mr. Laver's pupils to continue under Mr. Scharf [it said] I will see that their place is filled by others, so that there will be no financial loss, with this exception, all pupils on joining will have their choice of master.125

Another letter which may have been kept back, was one written in the following December, affirming that students who join the Conservatorium will have the choice of teacher, with which choice I should not interfere unless asked for my advice expressly. Then, since I am not constitutionally dishonest, it will be given in accordance with my real judgement.126

If one or both of these passages was, as seems probable, withheld, it was presumably at the behest of the chairman of the Council - the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Henry Wrixon - who controlled the agenda. That Sir Henry was in collusion with Laver at this time, is further (albeit only weakly) supported by the fact that, when the latter countered in July by once more requesting the Council, in view, this time,

125 Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 12 August 1898 in ibid.

126 Marshall-Hall to E.F. a'Beckett, 2 December 1898, in ibid.; this represented a change of policy since 1891, when, in his annual report to the Council, he had said that if a conservatorium was to be established, the 'Professor ... should have the power to place a student under such tuition as he thinks most likely to develop individuality' - see Argus, 1 December 1891.
of the Scharf appointment 'Having apparently placed that
gentleman on an equal footing with me in the institituion[.] ...

... to officially establish my position by appointing me
Vice-Director',\textsuperscript{127} it was Wrixon who moved, unsuccessfully,
that the request be granted and the statute amended
accordingly\textsuperscript{128}. In the event, it was not until 1901,
after Marshall-Hall's departure, that Laver got his coveted
Vice-Directorship\textsuperscript{129}, perhaps as a reward for remaining
loyal to the University, by not joining the general exodus
of teachers that occurred that year.

A further reason for the Council's original reluctance
and subsequent willingness to confirm Scharf's appointment
was anxiety about the financial future of the Conservatorium.
That there was some concern is clear from the decision of
5 December 1898 provisionally to reduce the Chief Study
piano teacher's fees for the forthcoming year from 15s. to
13s.6d. an hour, and the Chief Study singing teacher's fees
from 21s. to 19s. an hour, provided that the reduction was
to be made good at the end of the year, if finances
permitted\textsuperscript{130}.

This disquiet derived from two circumstances. One was
the fear, discussed above\textsuperscript{131}, that Marshall-Hall's offensive

\textsuperscript{127} Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 29 July 1899 in MUCRCF 1899/9.

\textsuperscript{128} MUCMB, 5 December 1898.

\textsuperscript{129} See Laver's application for directorship of Sydney
Conservatorium in MUCRCF 1915/94.

\textsuperscript{130} MUCMB, 5 December 1898.

\textsuperscript{131} See pp. 312-314.
utterances would deter many parents from allowing their children to attend the University Conservatorium. The other was the announcement in November 1898 of the forthcoming opening of a Victorian College of Music, in a building opposite the Public Library. The idea of founding such a rival school was not inspired by a prospect of benefitting from the anticipated student exodus from the University Conservatorium. Preliminary discussions on its establishment had already begun in February 1898, long before the Marshall-Hall controversy. But it must then have occurred to Councillors that the existence of such an institution could materially increase the expected outflow.

Marshall-Hall, too, saw the danger, and tried to use it to his own advantage, pointing out that Scharf, when appointed, would 'introduce private pupils of his own to the [University] Conservatorium', thus extending its influence, an end 'which is much to be desired, just now, seeing that a society of musicians are about to establish a rival Conservatorium in Melbourne'. That he viewed the venture with some anxiety is further suggested by his unsuccessful request to the Council in May 1899 for the engagement of a 'matron'135, the new school having announced that it would employ a 'lady

---

132 Argus, 12 November 1898.
133 Minute Book of the Musical Society of Victoria, loc.cit., 11 June 1898.
135 MUCMB, 15 May 1899.
superintendent ... [in] charge of the house arrangements.\textsuperscript{136} The Council's ultimate endorsement of the Scharf appointment, then, no doubt, owed something to the significant increase in enrolments that occurred in 1899.\textsuperscript{137}

By this time, a second issue had emerged, exacerbating the ill-feeling between Marshall-Hall and Laver, and, no doubt, strengthening the latter's opposition to the proposed reappointment. In September 1898 Marshall-Hall, in a letter of self-defence, reminded the Council that 'the conservatorium owes it origination entirely to myself,'\textsuperscript{138} and that he 'personally guaranteed ... all financial liabilities.'\textsuperscript{139}

Laver took exception to this, insisting that the credit, on both counts, rightly belonged to him. Already in November 1889, he pointed out, he, together with the artist, W.T. Woodward, had convened a public meeting in the Town Hall to consider a proposal 'for the formation of a national academy of music and art.'\textsuperscript{140} After discussing the scheme with a number of prominent citizens, including Minister of Education Charles Pearson, and the visiting musician, Charles Halle, he had submitted it, either in that year or early in the next, to the Chancellor of the University, Sir

\textsuperscript{136}Argus, 12 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{137}See above, p. 315.
\textsuperscript{138}MUCMB, 5 September 1898; see also 3 October 1898.
\textsuperscript{139}Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 21 October 1898 in MUCRCF, 1896/5; see also Argus, 27 December 1900.
\textsuperscript{140}Ibid.
Anthony Brownless, who, according to Laver, 'highly recommended it.'\(^{141}\).

Then, in September 1894, during Marshall-Hall's absence abroad, Laver claimed to have 'attended a meeting of the Council of the University', where he 'strongly urged the Council to agree to the scheme.'\(^{142}\). Marshall-Hall's contention that he 'personally' guaranteed the institution financially, 'though literally true', was, Laver said, 'discounted by his [Laver's] offer to the Council at that meeting 'to give my services to the Conservatorium without fee for twelve months if the Conservatorium was not a financial success', and by the 'financial sacrifice' he made in causing his private 'pupils to enrol themselves as students of the Conservatorium', and, there, 'to pay fees to the conservatorium instead of to myself.'\(^{143}\). It was, Laver insisted, because 'I had offered ... to forego my fees for the first year if it was not self-supporting, and also to induce many of my private students to enrol - although at great loss to myself', that 'the Council ... eventually accepted Marshall-Hall's recommendation to establish a conservatorium of music.'\(^{144}\).

\(^{141}\)Ibid.

\(^{142}\)Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 21 September 1898, in MUCRCF, 1896/5; Argus, 27 December 1900.

\(^{143}\)Ibid.

\(^{144}\)Hand written statement by Laver in Hince papers, loc.cit., 2961/3611.
That Laver had waited until September 1898 to lodge his claim, despite the fact that, since late 1894, public report had been unanimous in assigning credit to Marshall-Hall\textsuperscript{145}, suggests that he was actuated by pique, arising from the proposed Scharf appointment. This is further borne out by the inclusion in his letter, challenging Marshall-Hall's title to priority, of an otherwise totally irrelevant paragraph, saying 'That during the drawing up of the said scheme Professor M. Hall promised to give me sole charge of the pianoforte classes'\textsuperscript{146}. That, however, the issue then became important to him in its own right - independently, that is, of other circumstances - is shown by his reassertion of his claim in 1911\textsuperscript{147}, and again in 1935\textsuperscript{148}, and by his family's determination to continue the fight after his death\textsuperscript{149}.

Where credit rightly belongs is not easy to determine. It is true that Laver was active in 1889 in drumming up

\textsuperscript{145} See e.g. Argus, 25 December 1894, 9 June 1894; London Musical Courier, 30 September 1897, 27 March 1895; Musical Times, 1 April 1895; Table Talk, 17 August 1894, 20 March 1896.

\textsuperscript{146} Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 21 September 1898, in MUCRCF 1896/5; Argus, 27 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{147} Age, 7 September 1911.

\textsuperscript{148} Conservatorium Financial Committee Minute Book, 20 June 1935; Laver to J.P. Bainbridge, 28 March 1935, in University Central Registry; see also Laver to J.W. Barrett, 28 March 1935, in Ivy Brookes papers NLA, MS 2000, Box 5 File marked 'Lady Northcote Permanent Orchestra Trust Fund'.

\textsuperscript{149} Mitchell Library document No.3187.
support for the idea\textsuperscript{150}. But he was far from being the first. Nine years earlier Dr. Torrance, first Warden of Trinity, in an address to the Social Science Congress, had advocated the establishment of a school of music in Melbourne on the plan of the Royal Academy of Music, London\textsuperscript{151}. In 1884 Dr. Joseph Summers suggested a Federal Australian College of Music, to be financed by 500 subscribers, each contributing £50\textsuperscript{152}. A few weeks later, Oscar Commendant submitted to the Minister of Education 'un rapport très détaillé sur l'enseignement musical à établir dans une grande école nationale de musique', which would be 'foncé[e] et subventionné[e] par l'État', and would take 'pour modèle le conservatoire de Paris'\textsuperscript{153}. Pearson, in reply, expressed the hope that Francis Ormond's proposed benefaction would be used to found such a Conservatorium, rather than a university chair of music\textsuperscript{154}. In this he was supported by a meeting of professional musicians, chaired by solicitor and M.L.A. for Emerald Hill, David Gaunson, in March 1886\textsuperscript{155}.

\textsuperscript{150} Circular, dated 25 November 1889, for meeting called by Laver and Woodward in Melbourne Town Hall to discuss the foundation of a conservatorium, in MURCF, 1896/5.


\textsuperscript{152} C.S. Ross, Francis Ormond, op.cit., p.124.

\textsuperscript{153} O. Commendant, Au Pays des Kangarous et des Mines d'or Paris, 1890, p.191.

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{155} Table Talk, 5 August 1898.
In October 1887 two further meetings of professional musicians were held to consider the possibility of establishing 'a National School of Music in Melbourne'.

A committee was appointed 'to draw up a circular embodying the objects and the probable cost of the institution', and in the following January it published the results of its labours, in the form of a plan, including a proposed course outline, scale of fees and funding strategy, for the establishment of a National College along the lines of the Royal College of Music in London. Financial assistance was to be sought from the government.

Francis Ormond's own original preference, long before Laver came on the scene, had been for a conservatorium, towards the establishment of which he had been prepared to donate £20,000 'if the public contributed a like amount'. But his offer was not matched. And, as he believed that £40,000 is the lowest possible sum on which we could commence such a scheme as a college of music', and 'as the public showed no disposition to contribute', he concluded that there was 'no alternative' to the foundation of a chair.

Yet, as late as April 1887, he was still willing to change

---

156 *Table Talk*, 14 October 1887.
157 *Illustrated Australian News*, 12 November 1887.
158 *Table Talk*, 27 January 1888.
159 *Argus*, 18 December 1884.
160 Quoted in Radic, PhD, p.167. By July 1888 this estimate had mysteriously increased to £100,000 - see unidentified newspaper cutting in Mrs. Ormond's scrapbook, p.13, in Ormond College Archives.
his decision if 'it can be shown that a college of music is practicable with the money in hand'.

Nor was Laver the first to suggest that a conservatorium could be set up as part of the University. Table Talk had ventilated the idea as early as February 1886. And in July 1888 Francis Ormond had voiced the hope that 'the natural outcome of the chair would be a college of music.'

Moreover, Laver was far from the only one who tried to persuade Melbourne University to move in that direction after his return from Europe. Sir Charles Halle proposed it in a letter to the Chancellor in June 1890, as well as in a subsequent communication, in which he said that as the money set aside by the late Mr. Francis Ormond has to be devoted to the establishment of a chair of music, the best thing, which can be done is to appoint a professor of music who would ... act as Principal of such a school of music, in which practice of music in its leading branches would be taught.

This advice was echoed by the Melbourne University Review, Table Talk, the Undergrad (which, however, suggested

161 Argus, 21 April 1887.
162 1 February 1886.
164 Halle to University Chancellor, 16 June 1890, in MUCMB, 23 June 1890.
165 Undated statement by Laver in Hince papers, National Library, Canberra, 2691/3611.
166 October 1891.
167 20 March 1891.
delay\textsuperscript{168}, the \textit{Argus}\textsuperscript{169} and University librarian, E.H. Bromby\textsuperscript{170}.

It is true that Laver claimed to have put the idea into Halle's mind in the first place. But it is difficult to believe that the latter had needed much, or, indeed, any prompting when the University approached him for advice. He had, after all, been active in a similar movement in Manchester in 1882\textsuperscript{171}. And although, in the event, the Melbourne institution became the first of its type to be established within a university in the British Empire, the notion had already received serious consideration elsewhere. Halle and, indeed, Australian musicians generally, must have been aware of the well-publicised discussion taking place in 1891 over the proposed establishment of a conservatorium in connection with the chair of music at Edinburgh University\textsuperscript{172}. In fact, if Laver had any influence on Halle at this time its tendency was probably counter-productive, judging by a note written by the latter to the Chancellor in July 1890, urging that the question of the Conservatorium be shelved until the professor was appointed\textsuperscript{173}. His reason, no doubt, was the same as that of the University

\textsuperscript{168}20 June 1890.
\textsuperscript{169}18 February 1891.
\textsuperscript{170}Argus, 19 March 1892.
\textsuperscript{171}Musical News, 7 August 1891.
\textsuperscript{172}Musical News, 24 April 1891.
\textsuperscript{173}Halle to Chancellor, 28 August 1890 in -WUCRCF, 1890/30.
Council for declining to consider Laver's proposal at that point (indeed, Halle's letter could have influenced the Council's decision), namely that its members were 'afraid of it appearing to give him [Laver] a sort of pre-emptive right' to the chair.\textsuperscript{174}

Marshall-Hall, himself, broached the matter within a few weeks of his arrival, informing the University Senate that he hoped his proposed Diploma of Music would 'at some future day' form the basis of 'an Australian School of Music'.\textsuperscript{175} He referred to it again in his inaugural lecture, delivered in the following month.\textsuperscript{176} And his first annual report to the Council declared 'the greatest hindrance to steady advance in musical culture on the part of students in the University' to be 'the looseness of the tie between their theoretical and practical work, the latter being outside the control of the Professor of Music'.\textsuperscript{177}

Admittedly, this may have reflected, in part at least, the influence of Laver who claimed to have become acquainted

\textsuperscript{174} Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 21 October 1898, in \textit{ibid.}, 1896/5; see also \textit{Argus}, 27 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{175} \textit{Argus}, 20 February 1891.

\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Argus}, 12 March 1891.

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{Argus}, 1 December 1891; the Diploma was intended for students who were more interested in performance than composition, and who, prior to the establishment of the Conservatorium, apparently obtained their practical tuition from private teachers outside the University - see Doreen Bridges 'Some Historical Backgrounds to Australian Music Education (I) Foundations' in \textit{The Australian Journal of Music Education}, No.10, April 1972, p.23.
with the new professor 'soon after his arrival', when Marshall-Hall 'rented a house in Grey Street near our home in (Powlett) [sic] street'. At that time, according to Laver, they 'met almost daily', and discussed 'the scheme for a Conservatorium which I had drawn up'. This was in 1891, and was never denied (or confirmed) by Marshall-Hall. (J.W. Barrett's subsequent assertion of 1935, repeated by Doreen Bridges, that Laver had returned from Europe in 1893 and given Marshall-Hall a report on the organisation of Continental conservatories, is, however, quite incorrect.) Perhaps conversations of the type mentioned did take place. But in his inaugural lecture of 1891, the Ormond Professor said that he had had discussions on the subject with a number of musicians, including Halle, most of whom, he assured the Council, had been of the opinion that 'the public mind is ripe for such a move'. There is no reason to suppose that Laver's influence on him at this time was stronger than that of any of the others. Radic says that 'Once Marshall-Hall realised he had an ally in Laver, he asked the Council to appoint a Committee to meet him in order to obtain approval for a scheme of Practical Tuition in Music'. This, however,

---

178 Handwritten statement by Laver in Hince papers, National Library, Canberra, 2691/3611.
179 The Role of the Universities in the Development of Music Education in Australia 1885-1970', loc.cit., p.18.
181 Argus, 1 December 1891.
182 Radic, PhD, p.240.
is contradicted by the records, which show that the professor did not approach the Council on this matter until January 1893, two years after Laver first declared his 'alliance'.

Moreover, the pianist, himself, conceded that Marshall-Hall had been initially motivated by concern at the low enrolment in his degree and diploma classes\(^\text{183}\). During the first year of the chair's operation, 12 students entered for the full course and 16 for single subjects\(^\text{184}\), while 60 enrolled in the orchestral class\(^\text{185}\). This was a clear indication of demand for practical, rather than theoretical tuition. Marshall-Hall's own predilection for the practical in art as against the purely theoretical is amply documented\(^\text{186}\), as is his low opinion of Melbourne's music teachers (see pp.386-387). All this was surely sufficient to start him thinking about a conservatorium without prompting from Laver.

However, the latter's belief in the decisive importance of his own role also rested on the claim that it was he alone who drew up the detailed scheme which was put into effect with the opening of the institution in 1895.

\(^{183}\) Handwritten statement by Laver in Hince papers, NLA, 1691/3611.

\(^{184}\) Radic, PhD, 1,229.

\(^{185}\) 'U of M Roll Book' in MMCA.

\(^{186}\) Magazine of Music, June 1888; Marshall-Hall to Mrs. May Weatherly in MHPG, uncatalogued; Table Talk, 2 August 1895; Musical Standard, 15 December 1891.
Marshall-Hall, he said, had 'admitted that he knew nothing about the working of a conservatorium and would have to rely upon me to see it carried through if the University was to establish one in connection with the chair'. As a result, the 'general system of teaching (details of subjects, of practice &c) was prepared by me alone. Professor Marshall-Hall simply adopted the course of studies prepared by me'. This, Laver informed the Council, could be confirmed by 'a comparison of the University conservatorium and the scheme previously drawn up by me'. Unfortunately, as he did not provide a copy of his scheme, and, as none seems to have survived, such a comparison is no longer possible.

But, given the strength of Marshall-Hall's views on music education, it is not plausible that he entrusted the devising of the venture entirely to someone else. Moreover, as he informed the Conservatorium Committee in April 1894, the course of study proposed was the same as that which he had prepared for the Diploma of Music Associate - on the

187 Handwritten statement by Laver, Hince papers, loc.cit.
188 Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 21 September 1898, in MUCRCF, 1896/5.
189 See e.g. his attacks on local music teachers, Australian Schoolmaster, March 1895; Alma Mater, July 1899; also his comments on the importance of emotion and meaning in music teaching, Monthly Musical Record, 1 September 1889, 1 October 1889; School, September 1888; Magazine of Music, July 1888; Alma Mater, July 1899.
190 Report of the Committee appointed to confer with Professor Marshall-Hall upon his proposition to form a Practical School or Conservatoire, in connection with the Ormond Chair of Music' in MUCMB, 7 May 1894; this was duly reflected in Section 4 of the University Statute (No.xxviii) enacted for the purpose: 'The course of study to be pursued in the Conservatorium,' it said, 'shall be that prescribed ... for the Diploma of Music Associate' - see Melbourne University Calendar, 1895, Melbourne, 1894, p.327.
designing of which Laver never claimed to have had the slightest influence. Laver's former guardian, Otto Jung, to whom he appeal for corroboration, did not explicitly support his claim to have designed the teaching curriculum of the new body. What he did say, in a letter to his ward, was that he had been present during their discussions, when Marshall-Hall had admitted 'that he had no knowledge of the working of a conservatorium, nor a liking for business matters, and would have to leave it chiefly to you. You not only provided him with a full scheme for the establishment of a conservatorium, but also with an approximate estimate of all expenses in connection with it'.

This, together with the other evidence above, suggests that it was the plan for the administrative organisation and business management of the proposed institution which Laver had been responsible for.

Yet, when Marshall-Hall did first approach the University Council in January 1893, he made no reference to already having such a scheme. He simply requested that, as the 'institution would necessarily depend on having a firm business basis ... an able and intelligent business man, of resource and energy', should be appointed 'to confer with me on this matter, prior to submitting a scheme to the necessary authorities'. This surely suggests that he had not been quite as impressed with Laver's ideas, as that gentleman believed.

---

191 Argus, 7 December 1900.
192 Marshall-Hall to President of the Professorial Board, 21 January 1893, in MUCRCF, 1893/21.
Besides, the plan that was finally adopted — whereby the sessional payment of teachers and all other expenses, apart from the Director's salary, were to be met from students' fees — was far from original. It was, moreover, so simple that, Columbus and his egg notwithstanding, and, given the great amount of contemporary interest in the project, and the economic depression, which ruled out any financially risky initiative, it is hard to believe that someone else, in Laver's absence, would not soon have suggested it. The payment of teachers from students' fees had been proposed already in 1887 by the committee appointed to look into the matter by the musicians' meeting in October of that year. Halle, repeating it in his July 1890 letter to the Chancellor, pointed out that the London music schools and most of those in Germany supported themselves in this fashion. And when the Conservatorium Committee recommended its adoption in March 1894, it, too, drew attention to the operation of similar schemes in France and Germany.

In reply to Marshall-Hall's letter of January 1893, the Chancellor, A.C. Brownless, stated that he could do

---

193 MUCMB, 7 May 1894.
194 Report of Committee appointed to confer with ..., in ibid.
195 Illustrated Australian News, 12 November 1887; see also Table Talk, 27 January 1898.
196 Halle to University Council, 28 July 1890, in MUCRCF, 1890/30.
197 MUCMB, 5 March 1894.
nothing further until he had had 'an opportunity of consulting some gentlemen who will not be in town until February'. Whether these included Laver is not clear, but, if so, he was patently not the only one whose advice was thus sought. It seems likely that Laver overstated the enthusiasm with which the Chancellor had hitherto greeted his submission, as in June 1890 Brownless wrote to Charles Halle asking him to draft a scheme.

Nor is it possible to accept Laver's claim that the decision was made during Marshall-Hall's absence abroad and as a direct result of his urging. He, himself, contradicted this assertion in 1914, when, in an application for the directorship of the projected Sydney conservatorium, he said the proposal had been 'finally accepted by the University Council immediately after the return of the Ormond Professor of Music from England'.

There is no official record of the meeting he claimed to have attended in September 'to induce the University Council to pass the statute establishing the University conservatorium'. Nor is it conceivable that any such meeting took place, since, when Marshall-Hall left on 23 July,

---

198 Brownless to Marshall-Hall, 26 January 1893, MUCLB 4,76.
200 Laver's 1914 application, loc.cit.
201 Laver to E.F. a'Beckett, 21 January 1898 in MUCRCP, 1896/5; see also Argus, 27 December 1900.
202 Argus, 24 July 1894.
the Conservatorium was already a fait accompli, the relevant statute having been passed by the Council on 4 June\textsuperscript{203}, and by the Senate on the 21st\textsuperscript{204}.

Radic is mistaken in her assertion that 'During Marshall-Hall's absence ... it was Laver's duty to put his own approved scheme into operation.'\textsuperscript{205} On 4 July, at a meeting of the Conservatorium Committee at which Marshall-Hall was present, it was decided that, in view of the professor's projected absence, no steps should be taken in this direction before 3 December, and teachers should not be appointed until the 17th\textsuperscript{206}. These decisions probably reflect a determination to prevent Laver taking any independent initiatives.

What, then, of the latter's contention that the decisive factor in obtaining official consent for the scheme had been his readiness to persuade his students to enrol in the new institution and, himself, to forego any payment during the first year, should it prove unsuccessful? If this offer was indeed, made either to the Council or to its Conservatorium Committee, it was not considered important enough to be recorded in the minutes, or anywhere else in the official records. It is surely unlikely that the governing

\textsuperscript{203}MUCMB, 4 June 1894.

\textsuperscript{204}Senate Minute Book, 21 June 1898, in MUCR.

\textsuperscript{205}Radic, PhD, p.236.

\textsuperscript{206}Record of Conservatorium Committee meeting, 4 July 1894, in MUCRCF, 1894/7.
body of the University would have permitted itself to be
swayed by a commitment which, since it was apparently never
given in written form, or made public at the time, was
probably not enforceable.

Certainly, Laver's assertion that his guardian, Otto
Jung, had advanced the first term's rent for the conserva-
torium building - the unfinished Queen's Coffee Palace
on the corner of Rathdowne and Victoria Streets - is
confirmed by a letter to Jung from the General Manager of
the Colonial Bank, which owned the premises in question\textsuperscript{207}. But, since, in the event, it was the professor's salary, not
the fees of the chief study piano teacher, that guaranteed
the solvency of the institution (see below, pp.623-624), it was
from the former and not the latter that the advance would
have been repaid, had the venture failed.

In the absence of information about the fees he had
previously charged, it is impossible conclusively to evaluate
Laver's claim to have suffered a 'great loss' when his private
students\textsuperscript{208} (many of whom, he ingenuously admitted, had been
recommended to come to him by Marshall-Hall in the first
place\textsuperscript{209}) enrolled at the new University Conservatorium.

\textsuperscript{207} Saxton to Otto Jung, 13 December 1894, in MUCRCF
1894/7.

\textsuperscript{208} Presumably, those attending the Oberwyle Conservatorium
in St. Kilda of which he was director, and which he had
founded in January 1893 - see Argus, 27 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{209} Handwritten statement by Laver in Hince papers,
loc.cit.
But he was far from impoverished by the change. In 1895 he was receiving fifteen shillings an hour, the highest rate paid to any University music teacher, with a promised increase to seventeen and sixpence when the new institution 'shall have been successfully established'. In 1900 he was paid a total of £703.2.6, the second highest income earned - after that of the first study singing teacher, Elise Wiedermann.

Moreover, he also stood to make considerable gains as a result both of his enhanced status as first study piano teacher at the University, which would have increased his attractiveness to private students, and of the opportunity it gave him to pursue his own evident academic ambitions. He had, we have seen, been an applicant for the professorship of music when it was first advertised in the eighties. During the Scharf imbroglio he had twice tried to formalise his position as heir apparent by seeking the title of Vice-Director (see pp.400, 409). In 1896, within days of the Lieder- tafel speech he called on the University Registrar in order to express his anxiety about the future of the chair, offering to perform the duties himself, free of charge, until a new appointment could be made. In 1900 he again applied for

---

210 Argus, 18 December 1894.
211 Ibid.
212 MUCMB, 2 April 1900.
213 Minute Book of University Finance Committee, 2 August 1898, in MUCR.
the position\textsuperscript{214}. But it was to be another fifteen years before his ambition was achieved.

It seems clear then, that the perceived situation which (in the context of Martin's first condition) prompted Laver to oppose reappointment, was not the professor's violation of Hebraic moral or religious norms, but the threat he posed to the pianist's own professional and career prospects. The same is true of the third member of the Conservatorium staff, who failed to follow Marshall-Hall into exile, and who, like Laver, gave no indication, either of harbouring Hebraic beliefs, or of having been offended by the Ormond Professor's speech or his verse. This was David John Coutts. Also Victorian born, and three years older than Laver, Coutts had been among the first group of students to enrol in the Melbourne University music degree course, graduating in 1895. In the same year he was appointed Second Study piano teacher, and teacher of harmony at the Conservatorium\textsuperscript{215}, where he soon came into conflict with the Director. In December 1898 he complained that in the previous year six of his pupils had been transferred to another teacher, Nellie Billings, and that, since then, 'Nearly all, if not all, new pupils were placed under Miss Billings'. As a result, he said, 'practically speaking my

\textsuperscript{214}See list of applicants in MUCMB, 10 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{215}Marshall-Hall's report on the University Conservatorium, 3 July 1895, in MUCRF, 1895/7; 1895 annual commencement programme, in Latham papers, series 12, 1899/12/1-35 \textit{loc.cit.}; 'U of M Roll Book' in MMCA.
time was unoccupied, and I am deprived of my livelihood', although no 'fault has been found with my work'. (The last statement was not, strictly, true, as Marshall-Hall declared him to be 'lethargic' and reported having received complaints about him from students.)

This turn of events added to Coutts's already considerable financial problems. It also increased his dependence on the patronage of Dr. Alexander Leeper, Warden of Trinity College, and perhaps Marshall-Hall's most determined adversary. Since 1892, Coutts had been a resident at Trinity, holding a Warden's scholarship (worth £50 a year), and taking an active part in the College's musical activities.

In August 1892, on Leeper's recommendation, the College Council agreed to pay him the third instalment of his scholarship, despite his failure to fulfil one of its conditions — to obtain, that is, first or second class honours. In the following year, Leeper again bailed him out of trouble.

---

216 Coutts to E.F. a'Beckett, 12 December 1898, in MUCRCF, 1898/5.
218 Coutts to Trinity College Council, 10 August 1892, in Trinity College Archives, Council papers 40 1892; see also Alma Mater, August 1901; Trinity College Calendar, 1897, p.194.
219 See e.g. Quadrangle, June 1892; Leeper diary, 14 February 1894, loc.cit.; Trinity College Calendar, 1897, p.201; Crab Catcher, 26 June 1892, Vol.1, No.3; Trinity College Council Minute Book, 17 December 1897.
220 Trinity College Council Minute Book, 26 August 1892.
by permitting him to remain in residence during vacation at a reduced fee. And in 1894, when even this was not enough, the Warden offered him an additional honorarium of £10 to act as college librarian\(^\text{221}\). (Nevertheless, he was forced to move out for a few months\(^\text{222}\).)

The record is then silent until the end of August 1898, when Leeper and Coutts had a 'long talk' about 'music here'\(^\text{223}\), the significance of which is revealed in the College report published in the same year, which noted that an 'attempt is being made to establish a school of music at the College under the direction of D.J. Coutts, Mus Bac ... to supplement the work of the university in music'\(^\text{224}\). Then, in 1899, presumably because his University income had fallen, he asked Leeper to help him get a position at the Training College\(^\text{226}\). And, in the same year, he had a discussion with the Warden about an 'organship'\(^\text{227}\) - perhaps the one at Scots' Church, which Coutts actually obtained in 1901\(^\text{228}\), and which would hardly have been offered to a Marshall-Hall supporter.

\(^\text{221}\) Leeper diary, 8 March 1894, 14 February 1894.
\(^\text{222}\) _Ibid._, 4 August 1894.
\(^\text{223}\) _Ibid._, 30 August 1898.
\(^\text{224}\) Trinity College Report for 1898 to the Melbourne and Ballarat Church Assemblies in Trinity College Archives.
\(^\text{225}\) He earned £80.14.10 from that source in 1900 - 2 April 1900.
\(^\text{226}\) Leeper Diary, 15 December 1899.
\(^\text{227}\) _Ibid._, 4 October 1899.
\(^\text{228}\) _Alma Mater_, August 1901.
In 1898 he had discussed the Marshall-Hall case with Leeper a number of times, on at least one of which Laver was also present. He had sought the Warden's opinion, on another occasion, about whether or not to sign a memorial supporting the music professor - 'I advised not,' says the terse note in Leeper's diary. Coutts, then, was clearly aware of an alternative course of action open to him (condition 2 of R'). The evidence indicates that, like Laver, he failed to avail himself of it, because he felt it would perpetuate a situation (condition 1) that was unpropitious for his material prospects.

3. The Motives of Alexander Leeper

His patron, Alexander Leeper, has also been accused of acting from considerations other than genuine moral and religious outrage - notably from 'personal spleen' and a desire 'to be revenged for a personal humiliation.' At the time, both the Bulletin and Outpost claimed, and, more recently, Radic has reiterated the charge that Leeper's hostility to the musician 'originated in a production of the Alcestis of Euripides which Leeper directed ... and for which Marshall-Hall composed an elaborate score.'

---

229 Leeper diary, 14 October 1898.
230 24 September 1898.
231 Outpost, 29 December 1900.
232 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 6 June 1900, in MCRCF 1900/40; see also MUCMB, 25 June 1900.
233 27 August 1898.
234 23 June 1900.
The production in question took place in the Town Hall on 22 June 1898, under the auspices, not, as Radic believes, of the University, but of Trinity College. This was, Radic to the contrary again, notwithstanding its one and only Melbourne performance. It was to have been repeated; but this, according to Leeper, was prevented by 'circumstances over which we have no control', one of which, no doubt, was the financial failure of the enterprise - leaving a deficit of some £200 for which Leeper was personally liable. Another, presumably, was the fact that, within two months of the first performance, the producer was trying to secure the musical director's dismissal from his University chair. The Liedertafel concert of 1 August was not a performance of Alcestis, but of music from it, together with other pieces, such as the overture to Mozart's Don Giovanni, the nocturne from Mendelsohn's 'Midsummer Night's Dream' music, the Prisoners' Chorus from Fidelio and Brahms's Rhapsody for contralto, choir and orchestra. Leeper had nothing to do with this concert, except as a member of the audience.

236 Church of England Messenger, 1 July 1898.
237 Radic, PhD., p.392.
238 Trinity Council Minute Book, 18 March 1898, loc.cit.
239 'A Man out of Season...', p.204; Bebbington claims that it was twice repeated in that year - 'Marshall-Hall's forgotten operas', op.cit., p.5.
240 Argus, 27 October 1898.
241 Trinity College Council Minute Book, 16 September 1898, loc.cit.
242 Argus, 2 August 1898.
Given the temperaments of the two men, it was perhaps inevitable that tensions should have arisen. Leeper was a man possessed by an inordinate craving for recognition and esteem, and an anguished conviction that he lacked both. He was acutely aware of his own 'vanity and self-consciousness',\textsuperscript{244} And his diary contains ample supporting testimony. One entry of this period reveals his child-like pleasure when Canon Potter and the Bishop of Ballarat made complimentary remarks about him at a public function\textsuperscript{245}. But, more frequently, he recorded his vexation with his 'unpop.\textsuperscript{V} in soc.\textsuperscript{V} generally'\textsuperscript{246}. He felt 'v sad @ nt being more pop.\textsuperscript{c} stu-dnts,\textsuperscript{247} He experienced ' a mean jealousy' when a book published by E.H. Sugden, Master of Queen's, was critically acclaimed\textsuperscript{248}, and when a farewell dinner was given in honour of MacFarland of Ormond\textsuperscript{249}. And he became 'Deprest' when Alma Mater omitted his name from a report\textsuperscript{250}, when the Age 'suppress any nice all\textsuperscript{2} me',\textsuperscript{251} and when, at a function, his students did not cheer him as heartily as he had wished\textsuperscript{252}.  

\textsuperscript{244}Leeper diary, 29 September 1897, \textit{loc.cit.}  
\textsuperscript{245}14 April 1893.  
\textsuperscript{246}Leeper diary, 19 September 1893.  
\textsuperscript{247}\textit{Ibid.}, 22 March 1897.  
\textsuperscript{248}\textit{Ibid.}, 5 August 1893.  
\textsuperscript{249}\textit{Ibid.}, 13 March 1897.  
\textsuperscript{250}\textit{Ibid.}, 5 June 1897.  
\textsuperscript{251}\textit{Ibid.}, 3 July 1897.  
\textsuperscript{252}\textit{Ibid.}, 26 May 1896.
It is little wonder, then, that he was nettled when Marshall-Hall received more public recognition than he (or, for that matter, Euripides) for the *Alcestis* performance. *Alma Mater* did not mention the Warden's contribution. Both *Table Talk* and the English Musical *Herald* announced the 'forthcoming performance of Professor Marshall-Hall's *Alcestis* by the students of Trinity College', the former paper also reporting that a bicycle accident suffered by the leading lady, Florence Towl, had 'upset the whole arrangement for Professor Marshall-Hall's production of *Alcestis*'. And the *Outpost* rubbed salt into the wound by averring that it had been 'clear at a very early stage that the Professor's music was exciting far more interest than the Doctor's stage management, a circumstance very galling to one who had only fished for fame and caught chagrin'. The same journal put the following lines into the mouth of the 'Good Fairy Leeperi' in a satirical skit dealing with the affair:

... it is not due to gall
Why I hate this bold musician,
Greek play writing Marshall-Hall.
And my reason this the best is
(But don't tell him I said it),
In the Matter of Alkestis
He got all the blessed credit.

253 August 1898.
254 17 July 1898.
255 1 July 1898.
256 17 June 1898.
257 14 July 1900.
258 29 June 1900.
That Leeper did experience some mortification on this score is suggested by a diary entry of January 1898 which simply said 'Cut re Alcest f M Hall',\textsuperscript{259} and another in August of the same year deploiring 'the careful ommiss\textsuperscript{N} of all complm\textsuperscript{V} allus\textsuperscript{N} 2 me in Alcestis accounts'.\textsuperscript{260} This, however, hardly amounts to proof of Lionel Lindsay's contention that Leeper 'had never forgiven him [Marshall-Hall] the success of Alcestis'.\textsuperscript{261} Nor does it demonstrate that wounded pride rather than religious and moral motives was the cause of his subsequent agitation against the professor.

Then there is the claim that, while the play was in preparation\textsuperscript{262} Marshall-Hall had 'several differences of opinion with Dr. Leeper that were frequently humiliating to that gentlemen', and from which he 'was not always able to withdraw with dignity'.\textsuperscript{263} According to the Outpost, there had been 'the very devil to pay as soon as these two came to the discussion of what was and what was not the proper method of rendering a Greek play'.\textsuperscript{264}

\textsuperscript{259}Leeper diary, 28 January 1898.

\textsuperscript{260}Ibid., 10 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{261}Lionel Lindsay, \textit{Comedy of Life}, op.cit., p.120.

\textsuperscript{262}Precisely when work was begun is not clear. The earliest reference I have found was dated July 1897 - see Leeper diary, 14 July 1897.

\textsuperscript{263}Outpost, 14 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{264}Ibid.
But, although Leeper's diary contains allusions to many conversations with Marshall-Hall in connection with the production,²⁶⁵ there is no reference to any disagreement on matters of classical authenticity, with the possible exception only of an entry for Sunday, 13 October 1897. On that day, instead of going to church, Leeper apparently went o'er de 12.15 T.G.T. de Marshall-Hall's lett re Alcest.²⁶⁶ T.G.T. was Thomas George Tucker, Professor of Classics at Melbourne University. He was a good friend of the Warden's, and the obvious person for the latter to consult over a matter of Greek scholarship. Leeper's (unsuccessful) attempt to see Marshall-Hall the next morning²⁶⁷ presumably had to do with this visit to Tucker.

However, even if a disagreement on classical questions did occur (and it is far from certain that this was the case—the letter in question might simply have dealt with Marshall-Hall's illness and, perhaps, with the consequent need to postpone the performance), there are no grounds for believing the outcome to have been humiliating for Leeper. The diary gives no hint that this was so, although its author was not reluctant to record personal mortifications endured on other occasions. Thus, in relation to some

²⁶⁵ e.g. 14 March 1897, 9 January 1898, 11 June 1898, 19 February 1898, 26 February 1898, 22 March 1898, 6 April 1898, 14 April 1898, 7 April 1898, 27 April 1898, 30 May 1898, 4 June 1898, 12 June 1898, 17 June 1898.

²⁶⁶ 13 October 1897.

²⁶⁷ Leeper diary, 14 October 1897.
incident in 1896, he felt 'wretched' at the 'thought of having made a fool of myself over having appeared weak and timid, vain, self-conscious and priggish, and having talked twaddle', instead of behaving in a 'more manly and straight manner'. And, three years later, he became very 'remorseful and miserable because of my foolish want of dignity 1st night'.

The diary contains only two references to conflict in connection with the Alcestis production. One does not seem to have involved Marshall-Hall at all, being a record of the 'quite friendly' discussion Leeper had had over lunch in April 1898 with Ernest Moffitt, the advertising and business manager, during which they 'settled his idea of being "boss"'. Presumably this refers to the resolution of a power struggle between Leeper and Moffitt. The other simply said 'Frict. M Hall and Miss Billings'. But again, there is no suggestion that Leeper suffered any hurt to his amour propre on this occasion. Moreover, it occurred on 21 June 1898, one day before the performance.

---

268 8 June 1896.
269 29 October 1899.
270 Church of England Messenger, 1 July 1898.
271 Leeper diary, 23 April 1898.
272 It is possible that the dispute with Moffitt related, in part at least, to advertisements that had appeared in the press over the latter's name, announcing the forthcoming performance as having 'ORIGINAL MUSIC BY PROFESSOR MARSHALL-HALL', but without any reference to Leeper at all – see e.g. Argus, 11 June 1898.
273 21 June 1898. Nellie Billings acted as accompanist during rehearsals.
Had there been any serious differences about the mise en scene, they would surely have surfaced long before this.

The only other, even remotely relevant circumstance is the rather cheap triumph enjoyed by Lionel Lindsay who, when painting scenery for the Town Hall production of 22 June, and, 'tiring of filling the metopes with genuine groups from the frieze of the Parthenon', apparently decided it was 'easier, and scenically just as effective, to improvise them'. Leeper, 'who was always poking his classical nose into our work', apparently queried Lindsay's inventions and demanded their source. "Why Professor," I said, "you must have forgotten them. I got them from those Sicilian coins discovered last year in Syracuse". "To be sure," said the poor quid nunc, "I remember quite well." How Marshall-Hall laughed when I told him. 274 But there is no reason to believe that Leeper ever discovered that he had been duped in this incident, much less that he felt humiliated by it, or attributed such humiliation, in any way, to Marshall-Hall.

So, if the Warden was pursuing a personal vendetta, there are no adequate grounds for supposing its origin to have been in the Alcestis production. There is, however, evidence of an earlier contretemps. According to his diary, on the evening of 10 June 1896, Leeper went to a concert, given in the University's Wilson Hall by the Conservatorium students under Marshall-Hall's baton. On arriving, he 'was

274 L. Lindsay, op.cit., p.120.
much hurt & being refused admittance. Reserved seats. 275.
In fact, he was so enraged that the next day he penned a letter of protest to the Chancellor, Sir Anthony Brownless.

This communication has not, itself, survived. But the reply gives some idea of its tone. It expressed Brownless's 'deep regret' for 'the want of courtesy shown you' when 'you did not receive the respect and high consideration due to your official position as Warden of Trinity College within the University of Melbourne'. It gave an assurance 'that on any future occasion of the same kind, I shall insist upon your receiving the respect and courtesy which your high position entitles you to'. But it added that, in this instance, the writer had 'had nothing to do with the arrangements, beyond having granted the use of Wilson Hall to Professor Marshall-Hall for what I considered a legitimate purpose', and that it was the 'professor as Director of the University Conservatorium [who] issued the invitations and made the arrangements. 276.

It would be too facile, however, to conclude that this incident was the real reason for Leeper's opposition to Marshall-Hall more than two years later. A possible motive is not the same as an actual motive, and the Warden's behaviour, in general, suggests that, while he was a frequent

275 Leeper diary, 10 June 1896, loc.cit.
276 Brownless to Leeper, 12 June 1896, in MUCLB 4, 294.
and determined controversialist, he was not by nature vindictive. He did not long harbour grudges against those who crossed him.

In August 1890, when four students were expelled for their part in hooting and burning him in effigy, in the College grounds 277, he recommended their reinstatement - even after receiving a highly offensive apology, that said 'We regret exceedingly that we have been compelled by force of circumstances [i.e. Leeper's alleged deficiencies] to participate in an act which in itself we are unable to defend' 278.

In the following month a meeting of Trinity students protested against the 'arbitrary and capricious manner in which the maintenance in the college is conducted' 279. When the chairmen, L. Atkinson and S.S. Argyle, were expelled by the College Council, 34 of the 48 resident students moved out

277 Trinity College Council Minute Book, 7 August 1890; unidentified newspaper cutting, context August 1890, in Sugden scrapbook 2,28, loc.cit. The immediate occasion for the demonstration was the Warden's decision to expel a student (S.P. Thompson) without announcing the reason (although Thompson, himself, may have been told). In the subsequent lengthy controversy it became clear that there were additional underlying causes in the form of student allegations about the arbitrary and capricious character of the discipline exercised in the College, the poor quality of meals and the unjust way in which rooms were allotted (James Grant, Perspective of a Century, Melbourne, 1972, pp.19-22).

278 Trinity College Council Minute Book, 9 August 1890; unidentified newspaper cutting, context August 1890, in Sugden scrapbook loc.cit., 1,67.

279 Trinity College Council Minute Book, 19 September 1890, loc.cit.; cutting from Daily Telegraph, context September 1890, in Sugden scrapbook 1,2, loc.cit.
in protest\textsuperscript{280}. Although, in the heat of the moment, Leeper told a Herald reporter that this was 'the best thing that could have happened to the College', and that the thirty-four had acted 'in a very cowardly and dishonourable manner',\textsuperscript{281} two days later he publicly apologised for these 'hastily uttered' remarks\textsuperscript{282}. And in November 1894 he successfully moved in the College Council for the reinstatement of Atkinson and Argyle\textsuperscript{283}. Similarly, in March 1902, after initially remonstrating with the editor of Alma Mater for having published in January a poem entitled, 'Hymn to Tattersall', which mocked the role played by Leeper at an anti-gambling meeting, he wrote to the journal saying he was satisfied no discourtesy had been intended\textsuperscript{284}.

It is true, as Tocsin, was quick to point out, that in the annual report for 1898 of Trinity College to the Melbourne and Ballarat Church Assemblies, the section on the Alcestis production did 'not mention the name of Marshall-Hall whose music made the performance so signal a success'.\textsuperscript{285} But this document was the work of the College Council, not the Warden\textsuperscript{286}. And it is hardly surprising

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{280} Unidentified cutting, context late 1890, in Sugden Scrapbook 1.73 loc.cit.
\item \textsuperscript{281} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{282} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{283} Trinity College Council Minute Book, 9 November 1894.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Alma Mater, March 1902.
\item \textsuperscript{285} 20 October 1898.
\item \textsuperscript{286} Report of Trinity College Council for 1898 in Trinity College Archives.
\end{itemize}
that it failed to draw attention to that body's erstwhile association with a reputedly immoral man. Leeper, himself, had drawn attention in 1898 to 'the excellent music which had been composed by Professor Marshall-Hall for the tragedy and which would be welcome as a rich musical treat', and had acknowledged 'how largely Professor Marshall-Hall's music contributed towards the success achieved'.\textsuperscript{287}

If he was lying when he claimed to be seeking the professor's replacement on purely religious and moral grounds, and denied having any personal motives\textsuperscript{288}, it is strange that no hint of this appears in his diary, whose pages are crammed with expressions of regret for various deceitful acts and improper attacks on other individuals, the details of which, however, have been largely lost to history. In September 1893 he was 'ashamed to have to write t[he]r told Simpson falsehood de OrelliTac [?]. Soon p he'd gone wrote him a lett confessing. Thank God who helped me write'.\textsuperscript{289} In January 1896 he felt 'very uneasy de lett 2 Argus. One sentence I did not quote quite accurately'.\textsuperscript{290} And next day he had 'grave misgivings de unconfest falsehood c[ould]nt screw up courage to confess'.\textsuperscript{291} In the same month he

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{287}Argus, 27 October 1898.
\item \textsuperscript{288}Leeper to University Council, 25 June 1900, in MUCRCF 1900/40.
\item \textsuperscript{289}I am unable to identify the people or event referred to.
\item \textsuperscript{290}4 January 1896.
\item \textsuperscript{291}5 January 1896.
\end{itemize}
'told a falsehood ... such a trifle too - O God pardon me
I pray thee and help me 2 set a watch on the door of my
lips;"292.

Similarly, in August 1893 he 'saw Mrs. T.G.T., and spoke
I am ashamed 2 say in a disparagingly [sic] way of Mrs.
C.H.R.,'293. In March 1895 he felt 'shame speaking of
"McCartneyites" 2 Moule. O God pardon me for making litt
Thy true servants';294. In June he felt 'ashamed that I
disparaged E.E.M. [i.e. Professor E.E. Morris]';295. In
October he grieved 'to say I let myself disparage Bp Goe,'296.
Again, in January 1896 he 'Broke my good resol[n] alas by
spkg ill of C.H.R.'297. And later in the same year he
'very foolishly allow[d] self 2 talk disparagingly o the Orm
play dresses';298. Yet there is not one word of remorse at
his role in the Marshall-Hall affair.

In the absence of any clear evidence of ulterior motives,
a more plausible account of Leeper's behaviour is furnished

2921 January 1896.

29312 August 1893: Mrs. C.H.R. was presumably the wife or
mother of C.H. Rendall, Classics tutor and founder (in 1885)
of the Trinity College Musical Society, whom Leeper dismissed
in the early 1890s - see Grant, op.cit., p.21, 155.

29412 March 1895: 'McCartneyites' may have been the
followers of Hussey Burgh Macartney, Anglican Dean of Melbourne,
who, however, had died two years previously - see A. de Q.
Robin in A.D.E., Vol.5, pp.1225-6; Moule was, perhaps,
P.G. Moule of Brighton, Leeper's father-in-law.

2956 June 1895.

2962 October 1895.

2971 January 1896.

29820 April 1896.
by his generally, although not invariably, Hebraic outlook\textsuperscript{299}, and by the commercial character of his relationship with God, for which there is evidence. He was a chronic hypochondriac and valetudinarian, whose diary fairly bristles with references to the physical symptoms which filled his life with foreboding. There were pains in the bladder\textsuperscript{300}, the chest\textsuperscript{301}, the abdomen\textsuperscript{302}, the head\textsuperscript{303}, the throat\textsuperscript{304}, the side, the back\textsuperscript{305}, the colon\textsuperscript{306}, the kidneys\textsuperscript{307}, the limbs\textsuperscript{308}, the shoulders\textsuperscript{309}, in one or other testicle\textsuperscript{310}, above the penis\textsuperscript{311}, and in various other, unspecified regions\textsuperscript{312}. In addition, there was insomnia\textsuperscript{313}.

\textsuperscript{299}Documented above - see pp. 65, 441 and below, p. 449.
\textsuperscript{300}16 May 1895, 14 September 1896.
\textsuperscript{301}1 April 1892, 23 May 1896.
\textsuperscript{302}3 October 1893, 13 December 1898.
\textsuperscript{303}16 March 1893.
\textsuperscript{304}1 November 1894, 26 November 1894, 23 May 1896, 26 December 1894.
\textsuperscript{305}3 January 1895.
\textsuperscript{306}11 March 1896.
\textsuperscript{307}10 September 1896.
\textsuperscript{308}1 December 1896, 25 July 1897, 2 February 1897.
\textsuperscript{309}24 October 1898.
\textsuperscript{310}2 January 1896, 22 January 1896, 21 January 1896, 20 January 1896.
\textsuperscript{311}26 January 1896, 25 January 1896.
\textsuperscript{312}25 January 1896, 30 April 1893, 30 December 1894, 20 December 1894, 19 August 1894, 15 December 1894, 31 October 1894, 15 December 1894.
\textsuperscript{313}8 August 1893.
constipation\textsuperscript{314}, hoarseness\textsuperscript{315}, coughing (with and without blood)\textsuperscript{316}, giddiness\textsuperscript{317}, high temperatures\textsuperscript{318}, diarrhoea\textsuperscript{319}, heart flutterings\textsuperscript{320}, loss of appetite\textsuperscript{321}, and general seediness\textsuperscript{322}. He was forever finding suspicious lumps on his palate\textsuperscript{323}, his cheek\textsuperscript{324}, his groin\textsuperscript{325}, his nose\textsuperscript{326}, his tongue\textsuperscript{327}, and his testicles\textsuperscript{328}. And the symptoms were frequently interpreted as terminal, or, at least, very serious. A white spot on his tongue\textsuperscript{329}.

\textsuperscript{314} 26 December 1894.
\textsuperscript{315} 1 November 1894, 16 December 1896, 3 October 1896, 23 September 1896.
\textsuperscript{316} 17 November 1894, 21 May 1896, 22 August 1899, 5 August 1899, 23 May 1896.
\textsuperscript{317} 10 March 1894.
\textsuperscript{318} 28 November 1895, 29 December 1895.
\textsuperscript{319} 24 November 1898, 3 December 1899, 11 January 1896.
\textsuperscript{320} 3 December 1899.
\textsuperscript{321} 29 January 1897.
\textsuperscript{322} 8 August 1893, 8 March 1893, 16 March 1893, 5 March 1893, 19 September 1896, 14 September 1896, 19 June 1897, 19 May 1899, 22 November 1898.
\textsuperscript{323} 20 September 1896, 19 September 1896, 15 August 1896.
\textsuperscript{324} 9 November 1899.
\textsuperscript{325} 15 December 1896.
\textsuperscript{326} 26 September 1897.
\textsuperscript{327} 10 October 1898.
\textsuperscript{328} 22 January 1896, 21 January 1896, 20 January 1896.
\textsuperscript{329} 11 October 1898.
a 'throbbing o'er pubes', a lump on his palate, an abdominal discomfort, and a pain in the right testicle all made him fearful of cancer. A back pain suggested pneumonia. A 'right pain above penis' and pains in the chest and throat, accompanied by spitting of blood aroused apprehension of tuberculosis; while stomach ache induced a dread of appendicitis.

On top of this, he was obsessed with the physical signs of senescence. He was, he believed, 'aging v fast', and the 'symptoms [were] daily becoming more apparent'. His hair was 'getting grey'. His hands were 'rapidly

---

330 March 1894 - presumably the pubic region.
331 10 September 1896.
332 16 December 1894.
334 25 February 1897.
335 26 January 1896.
336 23 May 1896.
337 19 December 1894.

338 26 December 1894, 1 November 1894, 9 October 1894, 25 August 1894, 10 September 1898, 29 April 1897, 7 September 1895, 12 April 1895, 19 October 1896, 12 October 1896, 27 September 1896, 28 September 1896, 19 September 1896, 3 August 1896, 9 May 1896, 26 July 1896 - born on 3 June 1846 (Grant, op.cit., p.14); L o e p e r was in his early fifties during the Marshall-Hall controversy.


340 25 August 1894, 5 November 1895, 9 April 1895, 1 February 1896.
wringling,\textsuperscript{341} and 'shrinking v fast',\textsuperscript{342} and the 'fingers [were] fast atrophying',\textsuperscript{343} His 'neck [was] shrivelling',\textsuperscript{344} as was his face\textsuperscript{345}. His 'strength [was] fast failing', his 'memory cert\textsuperscript{2} impaired', his 'sight weakening', and his 'other powers failing'.\textsuperscript{346} He was growing 'v short-winded',\textsuperscript{347} and had begun to notice a 'cold numb feeling'.\textsuperscript{348} And all this indicated to him that the 'night cometh',\textsuperscript{349} that 'God is warning me to prepare',\textsuperscript{350} and that 'I am soon to die'.\textsuperscript{351}

His life was dedicated to the postponement of this latter eventuality, as is shown by his frequent visits to, and from doctors\textsuperscript{352}, his repeated self-administration of

\textsuperscript{341} 5 November 1895, 9 April 1895.
\textsuperscript{342} 31 October 1896, 1 September 1896, 19 June 1896, 17 June 1896, 1 February 1896, 30 January 1896.
\textsuperscript{343} 13 September 1895, 20 September 1895, 2 September 1895, 20 August 1895, 17 August 1895, 16 December 1896, 19 September 1894.
\textsuperscript{344} 5 November 1895, 17 August 1895, 19 June 1896.
\textsuperscript{345} 9 April 1895, 1 September 1896, 19 June 1896, 1 February 1896.
\textsuperscript{346} 25 August 1894.
\textsuperscript{347} 16 November 1894, 23 October 1895, 16 May 1895, 11 February 1895, 2 February 1895, 19 June 1896.
\textsuperscript{348} 1 July 1896.
\textsuperscript{349} 12 April 1895, 2 February 1895.
\textsuperscript{350} 11 February 1895, 3 August 1896.
\textsuperscript{351} 20 September 1896.
\textsuperscript{352} e.g. 2 February 1894, 31 July 1894, 15 August 1899, 9 November 1899, 10 October 1898, 13 February 1899, 24 January 1896, 20 December 1896, 4 November 1898, 2 December 1896, 2 October 1896.
enemas\textsuperscript{353}, cocaine\textsuperscript{354}, chloroform\textsuperscript{355}, morphia\textsuperscript{356}, opium\textsuperscript{357}, laudanum\textsuperscript{358} and arsenic\textsuperscript{359}, the insertion in his diary of various newspaper cuttings on the relation between food, exercise and longevity\textsuperscript{360}, and, above all, in his perpetual prayers to the Almighty that the decay may be retarded\textsuperscript{361} or the symptoms prove benign\textsuperscript{362}. Failing that, he prayed to be reunited with his mother and first wife in heaven\textsuperscript{363} implying the possibility of a less agreeable outcome.

That is to say, Leeper's was an interventionist God who could, and would if so minded, help or harm him. A hoarseness he developed in 1895 was interpreted, with dread, as 'God ... revealing his judgement to me and in me'\textsuperscript{364}.

\textsuperscript{353} e.g. 26 December 1894, 28 October 1894 (twice), 16 December 1894.
\textsuperscript{354} 8 August 1893.
\textsuperscript{355} 30 November 1894, 13 November 1894, 9 September 1894.
\textsuperscript{356} 30 November 1894, 13 November 1894, 9 September 1894.
\textsuperscript{357} 20 August 1894, 18 July 1894, 19 April 1894, 19 September 1896, 10 February 1900, 19 May 1899.
\textsuperscript{358} 25 May 1894, 16 March 1894, 15 March 1894.
\textsuperscript{359} 12 November 1896, 9 March 1897.
\textsuperscript{360} Including one, headed 'The Art of Prolonging Life' loose in the 1898 diary.
\textsuperscript{361} 19 June 1896, 27 September 1896.
\textsuperscript{362} 10 January 1896, 20 January 1896.
\textsuperscript{363} 30 April 1899, 16 April 1895, 5 February 1895, 16 April 1893, 8 September 1896; he had married Adeline Marian Allen in December 1879; she died in 1893; four years later he married Mary Moule (Grant, op.cit., p.14, 27).
\textsuperscript{364} 20 June 1895.
But with typically Hebraic emphasis on humanity's power to influence its own destiny, he filled his diary with pleas illustrating a governing conviction that favorable divine mediation could be procured in return for an expressed (and fulfilled) determination to avoid sin. The point is well exemplified (as is Leeper's Hebraism) in an early episode of 1878, when he apparently wrote a letter whose contents he then deeply regretted, to his future parents-in-law, Sir Wigram and Lady Allen (Parents of his first wife, Adeline).

Oh what wretchedness I am in about that letter, [he wrote] God grant that I may be spared the shame and disgrace of its being known to Sir W. and Lady A. ... O, if only this last chance be granted, if only God will spare me the love of this family ... if He will really spare me this, my life henceforth is His. I swear it. I will never taste tobacco again and I will be a teetotaller until I am quite sure the temptation has lost power of any kind over me. 365

(It is not impossible that Leeper was an alcoholic, and, possibly even a drug addict.)

Two decades later he was still trying to strike bargains with the Almighty. In December 1894, fearing he had cancer, he was 'full of good resolutions amending my life and living 2 God's glory if he will spare me' 366. In particular, he 'Made 2 vows if God will spare my health - (1) give up Melb Club (2) Prayer a Gk Test Lect' 367. Two years later, in great 'dread and anxiety' about the condition of

365 Oct 1878.
366 Dec 1894.
367 22 Dec 1894; see also 17 Nov 1895.
his epiglottis, he wrote that if 'God will grant me this reprieve I give my life to him henceforth. Never again will I touch tobacco: Never will fail in the daily reading of SS'.  

And when a white spot appeared on his tongue in 1898, he declared himself 'not fit to die', and promised 'God, if thou wilt spare me still for a few years, I will consecrate my life to Thee - ', and, in the following February, in connection with yet another symptom, he solemnly vowed consecrat to God if spared.'  

In Hebraic vein, he was much preoccupied with 'remorse and repent for past life'. The grudges he bore were against himself, not others. His diary is crammed with self-reproach and entreaties of 'pardon ... for my grievous sins'. The latter ranged from a joke he told at the Beefsteak Club, the 'undignified way' in which he spoke to a certain Miss Ward, and his failure to intervene in a fight between two footballers in Royal Park, to his envy.

---

368 October 1896.
369 10 October 1898.
370 13 February 1899.
371 16 December 1894, 12 December 1894, 31 December 1895, 23 August 1897, 15 February 1895, 12 August 1893, 18 January 1896, 3 September 1896, 13 January 1896.
372 30 December 1895, 23 August 1896, 31 October 1896, 31 December 1897, 13 January 1896, 14 June 1896, 1 September 1894, 8 January 1897, 6 July 1893.
373 1 August 1896.
374 17 November 1896.
375 13 August 1893.
for the success of others, his various falsehoods and slanders (see above, pp. 442-443), and his repeated violation of the pledges he offered in return for divine favours - on one occasion he even asked God to 'help me to keep this vow if I recover.'

Prominent among the forms of conduct which he believed would win God's favour was the public assertion of religious commitment, whose performance, however, he did not find easy. This is clear from a diary entry of June 1895, which said, 'Prayed again and again 2 day ... for courage to confess my Lord and Master before the world,' and another in the following year, referring to an evangelical meeting in Wyselaskie Hall, where he was 'glad that I'd strength to appear on the side of X in public.'

But at the Liedertafel concert of 1 August 1898, when Marshall-Hall delivered his sacrilegious address, Leeper's courage failed him. When he got home that night he wrote in his diary, 'Let pass M Hall's saying de the "foolish and futile saying Blest be peacemaker" Felt I had been false to my Lord. May he pardon me.'

---

376 13 March 1897.
377 17 November 1895
378 28 June 1895.
379 7 June 1896.
380 1 August 1898.
The sedulousness with which he subsequently hounded the hapless musician becomes intelligible when viewed against this background. Having lacked the temerity to denounce him that evening, with the blasphemy still hot on his lips, he sought to make up for it, and avoid divine retribution by throwing himself with tireless zeal into the more socially acceptable activity of organising and directing the hue and cry that followed.

The same motive very probably helped to activate all or most of Marshall-Hall’s Hebraic foes — although the evidence is scantier. They, too, were much preoccupied with sin and guilt (see above, p. 92). They put a high value on the public confession of faith. And they rejected with scorn the deistic ‘notion ... that God has emigrated from the physical universe,’ insisting that he was ‘not a tendency but a person, not a sluggish king, but active everywhere, pursuing the selfish, who had no thought for the welfare of others, or the kingdom of God, with relentless patience.’

Thus, he was said to have punished the French, a hundred years earlier, for omitting his name from their revolutionary

---

381 Rev. S.G. McLaren in Australasian Intercollegian, 1 June 1899.
constitution\textsuperscript{384}. And now the long Victorian drought was believed to be his 'retributive punishment for the national sins of dishonesty and folly committed during the land boom'\textsuperscript{385}, and for the ascendancy that the 'accursed forces of whisky, gambling, lust and covetousness' had acquired over the community\textsuperscript{386}. Moreover, he was ready to intervene again whenever his creatures 'pray for modifications in His arrangements'\textsuperscript{387} - which accounts for the repeated appointment, during the nineties, of days of humiliation and prayer for rain\textsuperscript{388}.

It seems reasonable to conclude from this that many of the Ormond Professor's enemies (how many is impossible to say) were also partly motivated, in their chastisement of him, by the hope of, thereby, warding off divine retribution for sins of their own. Their faith in man's power, thus to control his own destiny was not, significantly, shared by the pro-Marshall-Hall, Rev. E.H. Sugden, who could 'not find any promise in the Scriptures which authorises me to

\textsuperscript{384}Sentinel, fourth quarter, 1897.

\textsuperscript{385}Rev. Dr. Marshall in Argus, 3 May 1897; see also e.g. A. Harper, Australia Without God. An Appeal to the Churches of Australia to Secure an Acknowledgement of God in the Australian Constitution, Melbourne, 1897, p.9.

\textsuperscript{386}Searchlight, June 1896.

\textsuperscript{387}Rev. Canon Tucker in Argus, 9 September 1895; see also e.g. Rev. Alexander Marshall D.D. in Argus, 16 September 1895; Rev. J.L. Rentoul in Argus, 5 September 1895.

\textsuperscript{388}See e.g. Southern Cross, 18 February 1898; Council of Churches in Argus, 24 April 1897; Bishop Goe in Argus, 3 May 1897; Canon Taylor in Argus, 20 September 1895.
think I can by my prayers alter the will of God', and, therefore, did not believe ... that our prayers can alter God's laws, plans and purposes.\textsuperscript{389}.

It is interesting that, if my argument is correct, then Leeper's conduct (and, perhaps, that of his Hebraic supporters) in this matter was basically impelled by the same governing principle as was Marshall-Hall's — namely, a pressing need to overcome death. The crucial difference between them was that the Warden operated within a guiding conceptual framework that was instinct with whole meanings — in which, that is to say, notions of the individual's ultimate destiny were, in effect, extrapolated from the rules devised by humanity for the orderly regulation of its temporal affairs — in this case, the rules of bargaining in the marketplace. Marshall-Hall's metaphysic, on the other hand, contained no such comforting image, which bound the relative to the absolute with the same familiar links that (supposedly) secured the harmony of human society. He was, therefore, in the absence of a plausible cure for his pain, compelled to turn to an anodyne which temporarily obliterated it in a flood of strong feeling aroused by prolific expenditure of energy.

4. The Motives of the Argus

Another leading opponent of Marshall-Hall, that was accused of acting from dishonorable motives, was the Argus\textsuperscript{389} \textit{Liberator}, 13 October 1898.
newspaper. Its real objective, reportedly, was not to defend religion and morality, but to 'avengage Majuba' \textsuperscript{390}, to 'wipe out a lot of old scores' \textsuperscript{391} from considerations of 'personal spite' \textsuperscript{392}. Marshall-Hall, himself, charged it with having 'carefully hatched and fostered' the opposition 'for private ends of its own', and 'merely for the sake of paying old personal grudges' \textsuperscript{393}. Even the anti-Marshall-Hall Mitre saw no need to disguise the fact that we have witnessed also a victory for the "Argus". It was a lawful occasion for an attack, but also a not unwelcome one. A newspaper ... has strong likes and stronger dislikes, and it has a long memory. \textsuperscript{394}

It is true that the Ormond Professor had already, several times, crossed swords with the Argus before the dispute that began in August 1898. We have seen (p.334) that he made no bones about his contempt for music critics in general. And those who exercised the calling in Melbourne did not escape his censure. They 'certainly endeavoured, as far as they dared,' he lamented, 'to hinder any genuine advance to higher artistic ideals'.\textsuperscript{395} W.A. Laver believed this

\textsuperscript{390} Bulletin, 23 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{391} Outpost, 28 April 1900.

\textsuperscript{392} J.B. Atley in Heralde, 27 August 1898; see also Outpost, 14 June 1900, 16 June 1899; Triad, 10 March 1913; Tocsin, 11 August 1898; Saturday Review, 5 November 1898.

\textsuperscript{393} Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898 in MUCMB, 12 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{394} 1 September 1898.

\textsuperscript{395} Table Talk, 26 July 1895.
'attitude adopted by him towards press criticism' to have been one of the 'chief causes of Professor Marshall-Hall's downfall'.

One critic, whom he had singled out for special attention, was Thomas Harbottle Guenett of the Argus. In July 1895, during a lecture given at Queen's College, entitled, 'The Artist, the Art Larrikin and the Public', Marshall-Hall had excited 'Loud Laughter' by informing the audience of the mirth of the artists assembled in the green room at Mr. [Clifford] Halle's recent concert, when, Madame Wiedermann, having responded to an "encore" by singing the same song a second time, the Argus critic stepped in to inquire "what the song might be that Madame sang in response to the recall".

This 'most insignificant incident', according to the Outpost, 'was never forgotten and never forgiven', and was the main reason why, 'as soon as an opportunity occurred [sic] all the vials of the Argus anger were poured forth upon the Professor's head'.

Guenett's understandable resentment at this unfriendly disclosure may have been compounded by envy of the financial success of Marshall-Hall's orchestral ventures, in comparison with the failure of his own chamber performances in the eighties. This view gains some confirmation from the

396 Laver typescript in possession of G. Blainey, op.cit.
397 Table Talk, 2 August 1895.
398 30 June 1900.
399 See e.g. Melbourne University Review, 24 December 1884; Table Talk, 23 July 1886.
latter's waspish observation in July 1893 that it 'must be remembered that Professor Marshall-Hall has had far better opportunities of rehearsing with his orchestra than any of his predecessors here - with one exception.'

Yet there is no evidence to show that the critic even tried to enlist his employer's editorial assistance in a personal vendetta or that, if he did, his motives were not of a perfectly respectable, Hebraic character. He was, after all, the son of a Lancashire Congregational minister and had recently been organist at the Presbyterian church in Toorak. Nor, as far as I have been able to ascertain, did he, or any other local music critic, play an active public role in the anti-Marshall-Hall movement at the end of the nineties.

But the Ormond Professor had also crossed swords with more exalted members of the *Argus* staff. On 22 July 1893 he had startled a concert audience in the Town Hall with a blistering verbal assault on the 'scurrilous newspaper hack' responsible for a 'shameless and ignorant attack on Henrik Ibsen,' which had appeared in the newspaper's editorial columns that morning. The *Argus* responded with ridicule, referring to its assailant as a would-be 'press censor-in-chief of this city', who was bent upon muzzling 'a hireling

---

400 Presumably Frederic Cowen; see *Argus*, 24 July 1893.
401 Table Talk*, 25 October 1889.
402 *Argus*, 24 July 1893.
press' for its failure to recognise his idol 'as the fin de siecle Messiah'.

However, again, there are no positive grounds for linking this incident with the paper's subsequent efforts to prevent a reappointment. And, if there were, the connection would not necessarily bespeak dishonorable motives. The two offences (the 1898 publications and the 1893 Ibsen lecture) could easily have been perceived as being essentially the same in kind, inasmuch as Ibsen was regarded in Hebraic circles as an immoral writer. The Argus, itself, referred to the 'putrid ... mass of ... sensuality' that constituted his plays, which, it claimed, depicted 'certain offensive elements only', for the purpose of 'inculcating a wild moral or social chaos', and which, therefore, appealed mainly to 'the moral anarchist and the libertine, the free thinker of the strive-and-cry-species'.

Moreover, the allegation that the Argus was actuated by an ignoble desire for revenge is not consistent with its general treatment of the musician. Certainly, it attacked him on various occasions for such misdemeanours as denigrating Trinity College of Music (London) and uttering a 'curious mixture of phrases which he has learnt without understanding,

403 Argus, 29 July 1893.
404 See e.g. Daily Telegraph, 14 March 1891.
405 Argus, 22 July 1893.
406 4 April 1896.
from the foolish Sturm und Drang period in German litera-
ture. It deplored (not without reason) his 'monotonous'
preoccupation with the deficiencies of music critics.
And it sometimes reviewed his work unfavorably. In 1895,
for example, a chamber recital given under his direction was
declared to be characterised by 'faulty intonation' and
many 'inaccuracies and misreadings ... as well as weak and
scratchy violin tone'.

At the same time, however, and not infrequently, it also
treated him in a very friendly manner. His forthcoming
concerts were often announced in a way that could only have
been intended to increase their popularity. 'The full
programme for the orchestral concert to take place in the
Town Hall next Saturday afternoon under the conductorship
of Professor Marshall-Hall,' went a typical comment, 'is an
excellent one', which 'merits patronage in these dull
times'.

Moreover, reviews were generally far from unfavorable.
The 'Ibsen' concert of 22 July 1893 was described as 'very
enjoyable' and 'most laudable', the greater part of its
items deserving to 'be spoken of in terms of almost unstinted

407 4 July 1891.
408 24 March 1894.
409 27 September 1895.
410 21 June 1893; see also e.g. 20 July 1893, 12 June 1896,
26 June 1896, 28 May 1895, 9 May 1903, 5 August 1903.
praise. In August 1895 we learn that an 'efficient orchestra by Professor Marshall-Hall gave a laudable rendering of Mozart's "Don Juan" overture. A week later, the Beethoven 'Egmont' Overture was 'well played by the small but efficient orchestra under the direction of Professor Marshall-Hall. The performance of a work by Hamish McCunn at 'a thoroughly enjoyable concert' on 30 April 1898, although in 'one or two instances' leaving 'scope for still more attention to the marks of expression', was declared to be 'a laudable one, redounding greatly to the credit of the orchestra and its conductor.

The Alcestis music was represented as 'a distinct artistic triumph', containing 'impressive and original' passages of 'vividly suggestive orchestral writing', that displayed a 'graphic power of no mean order', and were 'throughout ... in perfect keeping with the sentiments finding expression upon the stage. Its performance under the composer's baton on 22 June was said to have shown 'the generally satisfactory results of careful assiduous rehearsing, that redounded greatly to the credit of all concerned, including, of course, the conductor and composer.

411 24 July 1893; see also 29 July 1893.
412 12 August 1895.
413 19 August 1895.
414 2 May 1898.
415 23 June 1898.
416 Ibid.
And a 'further acquaintance' with the music, at the fateful Liedertafel concert of 1 August 1898 actually 'added to the favorable impression previously formed concerning its artistic value'. At another concert later in the same month, the critic reported that the 'orchestra ... conducted by Professor Marshall-Hall, gave its attention with most gratifying result, to the interpretation of Wagnerian masterpieces', and 'it became evident that very great care had been bestowed upon the necessary rehearsals ... the concluding performance being certainly amongst the best heard in Melbourne'. Presumably most of these (unsigned) reviews were written by Guenett. They differ little, overall, from those appearing in the Age and Herald.

It is true that in December 1898 the Argus drew attention to a 'startling similarity' between the second chorus of Brahms's 'Requiem' and one of the choruses in Alcestis, adding next day that the resemblance by no means ended with the particular phrase we reproduced. The theme is not only substantially the same in both pieces, but the use made of it right through the chorus by Professor Marshall-Hall follows in large measure the earlier work of Brahms.

However, no plagiarism was alleged. The writer even conceded

4172 August 1898.
41818 August 1898.
4197 December 1898.
4208 December 1898.
that 'Coincidences in literary and musical works are by no means uncommon'.

Nevertheless, it does, perhaps, as George Oscar King drily remarked at the time, seem 'very strange that a leading newspaper should see fit to devote a rectangular space, the sides of it being three and a half inches in width and length, to so trifling a matter'. And it may well have been that the motive was malicious.

But this occurred after the Liedertafel speech. When the same music was first reviewed before that address, the paper had simply noted in passing a likeness between the opening bars of Marshall-Hall's Funeral March and those of Beethoven's 'Eroica' Symphony, without, however, considering the matter to be worthy of further comment. If the subsequent Brahms' allegation was, indeed, a none too subtle attempt to secure revenge for an earlier offence, then the likelihood surely is that this was the Liedertafel speech and Hymns Ancient and Modern, rather than some prior outrage that the paper or its music critic had suffered at the hands of the musician.

---

421 Argus, 7 December 1898; as, indeed, they are not. See e.g. George Oscar King, The Present State of Music in Victoria, Melbourne, 1902, p.9; Table Talk, 9 December 1898; Arena, 1 December 1900; Bulletin, 2 July 1898; British Handsman and Cornet Field, 30 March 1912.

422 G.O. King, op.cit., p.9.

423 23 June 1898.
A more plausible account of the stand taken by the Argus is found in its general Hebraic orientation. It was certainly not as extreme and unrelenting, in this respect, as the religious press. In the early nineties, it even exhibited distinct Hellenic proclivities. In June 1891 it attacked the anti-theatre party. In May of the following year it protested against attempts 'to elect a parliament that will legislate in accordance with the resolutions passed by reverend assemblies in regard to the sale of drink, or the observance of Sunday, or the reading of the Bible in the schools.' In January 1893 it yearned nostalgically for a time 'when England was "merrie", long ere the Puritan had soured the English Sabbath from a day of rest and gladness into a day of yawns and dreariness', and 'long ere to be virtuous meant to rob your fellow creature of cakes and ale.' In March it again complained of the clerical tendency to 'appeal constantly to the secular arm to enforce their ideas of morality.' And in April 1894 it favoured the introduction of the totalisator machine on to race courses.

But, towards the end of the decade, such assertions of Hellenism became rare. The change coincided with the

---

424 20 June 1891.
425 19 May 1892.
426 28 January 1893.
427 20 March 1893.
428 24 April 1894.
replacement, in March 1898, of editor since 1967 and erstwhile friend of Marcus Clarke, Frederick William Haddon, with Howard Willoughby\textsuperscript{429}, first editor of the Melbourne Daily Telegraph\textsuperscript{430}, and with the return from London in December 1897 or early in 1898 of assistant news editor Edward Sheldon Cunningham\textsuperscript{431}, whose brother-in-law had once complained to Alexander Leeper that Cunningham had done him an injury because he was an agnostic\textsuperscript{432}.

These changes in personnel were of crucial importance in the Marshall-Hall affair. It is true that the paper continued to oppose prohibition\textsuperscript{433}, to deny that bicycling on Sunday was tantamount to a renunciation of God\textsuperscript{434}, and to publish racing results\textsuperscript{435}.

But this was accompanied by a perceptible change in temper. Now editorial policy was cautiously supporting Alfred Deakin's call for non-denominational religious instruction in State schools\textsuperscript{436}. It was applauding the

\textsuperscript{429}Bulletin, 12 March 1898; it is significant that when Alexander Leeper wrote an anti-Marshall-Hall letter to the Argus in September 1898, he delivered it personally to Willoughby - see Leeper diary, 25 September 1898, loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{430}ADB, 4 314 4; 6 409.

\textsuperscript{431}Punch, 11 June 1914 - from 1936, Sir Edward.

\textsuperscript{432}Leeper diary, 4 September 1893.

\textsuperscript{433}20 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{434}27 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{435}See e.g. 9 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{436}8 October 1898, 21 August 1900.
A.N.A. decision to abandon 'so unworthy an auxiliary to the metropolitan celebration' as its annual lottery.\textsuperscript{437} It was complaining that the 'objectionable practice of betting [had] made its appearance at the last University sports',\textsuperscript{438} that smoking was on the increase among young boys,\textsuperscript{439} and that the examiner of stage plays in the Lord Chamberlain's department in London was not sometimes 'a little more exacting in his ... standards'.\textsuperscript{440} It was deploring the 'ignoble selfishness' of contraceptive practices,\textsuperscript{441} and contending that Commonwealth divorce law should not go beyond the grounds sanctioned by scripture,\textsuperscript{442} and, especially, that the 'fact that the bond irks' should not be considered 'good and sufficient reason for demanding its release'.\textsuperscript{443}

And it was calling for the suppression of 'unwholesome' literature which 'paints vice and ugliness and moral deformity for its own sake',\textsuperscript{444} and in which 'the sympathy of the audience is commonly enlisted in favour of the vicious, and

\textsuperscript{437} 16 March 1900, 25 January 1900, 11 March 1900.
\textsuperscript{438} 29 May 1900.
\textsuperscript{439} 7 March 1901.
\textsuperscript{440} 5 August 1903, 5 September 1903.
\textsuperscript{441} 11 January 1901.
\textsuperscript{442} 19 April 1900.
\textsuperscript{443} 10 September 1900.
\textsuperscript{444} 5 July 1902.
unhappy heroine'. More particularly, it was denouncing Marie Corelli for her 'shocking travesty of the crucifixion', H.G. Wells for his account of the 'supposed visit to earth of an angel, who is shot in the wing and "bagged" by a clumsy country figure', Coulson (?) Kernahan for using 'the Almighty as the subject of a fiction sketch', and Leo Tolstoy for writing 'upon sexual questions with such savage directness and nakedness of style as to paralyse the hand of his would-be translators'.

In the light of all this, and in the absence of stronger evidence than has been advanced to the contrary, the most plausible conclusion is surely that the attacks on Marshall-Hall were simply a further manifestation of the Hebraic turn taken by Argus editorial policy with the accession of Willoughby and Cunningham.

In fact, there is little ground for supposing the great majority of Marshall-Hall's enemies to have been significantly actuated by ulterior desires to punish the professor for conduct other than his utterances of July and August 1898. His Nietzschean elitism irritated his friends as much as his enemies. Both Leeper and the Argus were impelled by run-of-the-mill Hebraic considerations, the former being particularly anxious to secure reciprocal favours from the

445 31 January 1903.
446 7 May 1898.
447 10 October 1898.
Almighty. Most music teachers seem to have favoured reappointment and most of those who might have had professional or personal grudges against the professor did not publicly oppose it.

The exceptions were Laver and Coutts, who, the evidence suggests, endeavoured to strengthen the case against him by suborning a witness. Neither exhibited any Hebraic characteristics or any sign of having been offended by anything that Marshall-Hall had said in public. And both had clear motives for wanting to be rid of him. Laver feared his own status at the Conservatorium (and thus, no doubt, his chances of one day succeeding to the chair) was threatened by the Scharf appointment. And Coutts saw his earnings as a Conservatorium teacher dwindling as Marshall-Hall favoured Nellie Billings in the allocation of second-study pianoforte students. It is also likely that Coutts feared losing the patronage of Alexander Leeper if he supported those seeking reappointment.
CHAPTER 6

PRECIPITATION - INDECENCY AND IRRELIGION

Having dealt with the first two of Smelser's value-added determinants (structural conduciveness and strain) it is now time to discuss the third - that which precipitated the collective behaviour under consideration - which, of course, was Marshall-Hall's utterances of July and August 1898. But what precisely it was about these utterances that prompted so much indignation is open to question. Probably the most frequently proclaimed objection was to their alleged indecency. He was variously accused of having published 'lecherous ... poems', 'immodest verses', and 'grossly indecent', and 'lewd writings', that were full of 'offensive animalism', and contained licentious and immoral passages calculated to place a blush of shame upon the cheek of every virtuous woman.  

1Victorian Independent, July 1900.
2Argus, 5 August 1898.
3Advocate, 16 June 1900.
4Australian Christian, 5 July 1900.
5Age, 15 August 1898.
6Bishop Goe to University Council, 5 August 1898, in XUCRCP, 1898/5; see also e.g. Musical News, 15 September 1900; Age, 25 November 1898, 29 October 1898; Argus, 5 August 1898, 15 August 1898, 29 October 1898, 5 June 1900; Australian Christian, 5 July 1900, 1 September 1898; Spectator, 13 September 1900; Robert Potter in Argus, 7 July 1900.
University Council, itself, gave the 'libidinous' character of his writings as a ground for its resolution not to re-employ him\(^7\).

Yet it has been contended that the writings in question were not really indecent by the standards of the time – that is to say, that indecency, in terms of the first condition of Martin's R', was not a part of his enemies' situational interpretation. Thus, Radic says that the 'so-called "lewd" poems today, as then, appear trite and harmless'\(^8\). Both the Bulletin\(^9\) and the London Sketch\(^10\) agreed, claiming that the charge of indecency had been trumped up, because of a perceived need, in the prevailing liberal-secular climate, to disguise, behind a cloak of fictitious obscenity, what was actually the persecution of a man for his expression of religious opinions.

1. Initial Responses

This view is supported by the fact that, although it was published nearly a month before (on 5 July), Hymns Ancient and Modern attracted relatively little attention until after the Liedertafel speech, which contained nothing deemed to be indecent, but much that was irreligious\(^11\). I have found

\(^7\) MUCMB, 24 October 1898.

\(^8\) 'A Man out of Season ...', op.cit., p.203; my emphasis.

\(^9\) 2 November 1898; see also Herald, 20 June 1900.

\(^10\) 19 October 1898.

\(^11\) This point was made by Ernest Moffitt in a letter to the Herald, 15 August 1898.
only two earlier references to it. One appeared in the
*Presbyterian Monthly* on the day of the Liedertafel address
and argued that the book 'ought ... before now to have
been examined by the Council of the University', as it
assailed 'the foundations on which existing society rests'.\textsuperscript{12}
The other, in *Punch* on 21 July, merely said that Marshall-
Hall had 'published a new book of poems ... in the exaggerated
style of former effusions'.\textsuperscript{13}

Radic, therefore, is guilty of serious distortion when,
referring to the response to this work, she says, 'One
controversy would have been enough but on 1 August 1898
Marshall-Hall added fuel to the fire in an extraordinary
speech delivered at a Melbourne Liedertafel concert in the
Town Hall'.\textsuperscript{14} The early responses to the book of verse
did not amount to a 'controversy', and certainly not one
that was 'enough' to secure his departure from the chair of
music, or in any other way to seriously incommode him.

But, while it is true that little was said about the
indecent verse before the impious address, it is also the
case that reports of the latter, appearing before the Argus

\textsuperscript{12}1 August 1898. It is possible, but unlikely, that
the Liedertafel address was a direct response to this
comment - unlikely because Marshall-Hall was presumably not
a regular reader of the *Presbyterian Monthly*; nor, as far as
I can ascertain, did he have any friends who were likely to
have been subscribers; so, although someone may have drawn
the article to his attention, this is unlikely to have occurred
on the day it appeared. There was nothing in the speech which
could be interpreted as an explicit reference to this article.

\textsuperscript{13}21 July 1898.

\textsuperscript{14}Radic, PhD, p.254.
drew attention to the former, on 5 August, were of a relatively mild and tolerant nature. The Advocate later doubted 'whether that remarkable speech delivered before the Melbourne Liedertafel would have called for any public notice whatever, had it not been for the publication immediately afterwards [sic] of "Hymns Ancient and Modern".'

And early comments on the speech bear this out. The Spectator, for example, testily regretted that Marshall-Hall had 'broken out again' after a welcome 'interval of abstinence from intemperate utterances', but added tolerantly that the community was used to his going 'on the rampage', and took no more notice of him than Shakespeare's Beatrice, when she said, 'I wonder that you will still be talking, Signior Benedick, nobody marks you'. The Southern Cross said that 'No one, of course, takes Professor Marshall-Hall seriously .... As for Professor Marshall-Hall's speeches, they are taken humorously. Everybody expects something of the nonsensical and high falutin order from him'. The Advocate grieved that after 'a long spell of quietude, Professor Marshall-Hall has "got 'em" again', but went on to say that 'one cannot help thinking that the Professor is in the habit of talking with his tongue in his cheek', which probably accounted 'for its colossal size.'

---

13 August 1898.
15 August 1898.
17 August 1898.
18 August 1898.
Even the *Argus* confined itself to good natured ridicule, expressing doubt as to 'whether so much inappropriate nonsense has ever before been compressed into so little space', but exhorting a 'perplexed world ... to contemplate Professor Marshall-Hall's excursions into realms of oratory with friendly sympathy', since, like 'the throes of seasickness, they represent the effort of nature to get rid of disturbing elements in the general system', and, like the latter, were best treated by soothingly informing the sufferer that 'It will soon be all over, and you will be all the better for it afterwards'\(^{19}\). So Turnbull is probably correct when he says that, but 'for subsequent events the speech would probably have been quietly forgotten'\(^{20}\).

The early tone of mildly admonitory, but good-humoured banter changed radically, however, when, on 5 August, under the heading of 'Indecent and Impious' and 'A Public Scandal', the same paper launched a blistering attack on *Hymns Ancient and Modern*\(^ {21}\). The most likely reason for the long hiatus between the publication of the book and the main reaction to it was that, as only 38 copies had been previously sold\(^ {22}\),

\(^{19}\) 3 August 1898.


\(^{21}\) The *Outpost* identified the writer as W.H. Fitchett (2 June 1900), an attribution accepted by Turnbull (*op.cit.*, p.28), but there is no reason for supposing it to have been any more than an intelligent guess.

\(^{22}\) Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898, in MUCMB, 12 August 1898.
it had simply not come to the notice of the daily press any earlier.

2. Readership

But that does not warrant the conclusion that the number of people who professed to be shocked by the verses was substantially greater than the number who had read them, and that, therefore, the indecency charge must have been insincere\textsuperscript{23}. In fact, Marshall-Hall had ordered five hundred copies to be printed, all of which were ready on 5 July. Three days later 'the complete order was out of the printer's hands, the author having taken possession of them'\textsuperscript{24}. He, presumably, distributed them to the book shops, which, during the next month, sold only thirty eight. Whether review copies were sent to the press is not known.

But the Argus attack undoubtedly increased demand. On the morning of 5 August an unnamed book seller asked the printer, E. Newlands of Atlas Press, for more copies, which Newlands was able to supply, on account of fifty having been lately returned to him by Messrs. Melville, Mullen and Slade\textsuperscript{25}. By the 18th Tocsin was reporting that 'they seem to have been all snapped up in Melbourne'\textsuperscript{26}.

\textsuperscript{23}Expressed, for example, by Sketch, 19 October 1898; Outpost, 14 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{24}Letter from E. Newlands, the printer, Argus, 8 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{26}Tocsin, 18 August 1898; see also George Eastgate in Herald, 10 August 1898.
The book is short and quickly read, and was probably much borrowed. And many more people had access to what Tocsin called 'the Heineish extracts in the "Argus" of the 5th inst., which issue, by the way, was in such demand ... that copies could hardly be got for love or money. Nevertheless, those who missed out could peruse at their leisure examples quoted in other papers, including the Age and the Bulletin, which also printed passages deemed by the Argus to be too salacious for publication.

Then, in July 1900, J. Redford Corr sought support for the anti-Marshall-Hall cause among members of the University Senate by sending each a printed circular, containing a 'selection from the writings on which the Council based its decision'. The recipients were asked to treat the document as confidential. But one non-Senator, who had seen it, claimed to have had 'ample testimony' that the request was not regarded as binding. Now, no doubt it is

27 Alexander Leeper, for example, obtained a copy on loan from Alexander Morrison on 11 August 1898 - see Leeper diary, 11 August 1898, loc.cit.
28 18 August 1898.
29 6 August 1898.
30 20 August 1898.
31 Ibid.; see Argus, 5 August 1898.
32 Extracts from the Published Works of Professor Marshall-Hall, Latrobe Library, op.cit.
33 Ibid.
34 Outpost, 28 July 1900.
grotesquely unfair to judge the moral tenor of a work from extracts selected with such a partisan purpose. But the fact remains that it is unlikely that there were many among Marshall-Hall's enemies who, like George Bell, based their hostility, not on an acquaintance with the verse, but simply 'on the resolution of the University Council and nothing more'.

3. Censorial Inconsistency

It is true, as Marshall-Hall's friends never tired of pointing out, that the musician's traducers were far from consistent in their condemnation of what they regarded as indecency in literature. Bebbington goes too far in contending that some of the poems deal with 'human passion ... with a licence and freedom unknown at the time save in Oscar Wilde'. And 'W' was undoubtedly correct in characterising them as 'not more shocking to the modesty ... of their readers than a large number of books that are admitted, without the slightest reserve, into the most refined and orthodox circles'.

---

35 i.e. the resolution of 24 October 1898 which, declared Bell, had 'distinctly stated that the books were of a libidinous character', see Age, 29 October 1898.

36 See e.g. Tacsin, 18 August 1898; Outpost, 28 June 1898, 23 June 1900; 14 June 1900, 30 June 1900; John White in Argus, 10 June 1900; 'W' in Age, 19 August 1898; Tacsin, 17 November 1898; Outpost, 16 June 1900; Liberator, 13 August 1898, 16 June 1900; Bulletin, 20 August 1898, 30 June 1900; 'Soap' in Herald, 14 June 1900; 'Jess' in Herald, 20 June 1900; George Eastgate in Herald, 10 August 1898.

37 M.Mus., p.112.

38 Age, 19 August 1898.
The latter, it was justly claimed, included the classics and the Bible as well as the works of highly respected writers ranging from Swinburne, Heine, Wilfred Blunt and Shelley, to Shakespeare, Chaucer, Marlowe, Grant Allen, Mona Caird and Keats. Isobel Armstrong has shown that sexual love was widely treated in 'respectable' Victorian literature. And in Melbourne in the nineties one need look no further for examples than the (somewhat less than respectable) published work of Lionel Lindsay, with his desire, inspired by 'the marble/Maids undraped' of Greek sculpture, 'that these airy ancient dresses were/Worn in this region', his yearning for

39 See e.g. Tocsin, 18 August 1898; Outpost, 28 June 1900, 23 June 1900, 14 June 1900, 30 June 1900; John White in Argus, 10 June 1900.

40 See e.g. 'W' in Age, 19 September 1898; Tocsin, 17 November 1898; Outpost, 16 June 1900; Liberator, 13 August 1898, 16 June 1900; Bulletin, 20 August 1898, 30 June 1900; 'Soap' in Herald, 19 June 1900.

41 'W' in Age, 19 August 1898; Bulletin, 20 August 1898.

42 Tocsin, 18 August 1898.

43 Tocsin, 3 November 1898.

44 Outpost, 23 June 1900; Liberator, 27 August 1898; Percy Frost in Herald, 14 June 1900; 'Jess' in Herald, 20 June 1900; Bulletin, 20 August 1898.

45 Liberator, 27 August 1898.

46 George Eastgate in Herald, 10 August 1898.

47 Tocsin, 16 August 1898.


49 Free Lance, 30 April 1896.
... the breasts, the ever beautiful breasts and eyes
Of all the girls that haunt my paradise.
O undulant breasts of women, insolent with round suggest;

and his smutty portrayal of a lovers' tiff:

"You love me not," she tossed her head,
You only love my clothes."
"Ah no," he made reply with zest,
"I care not what you don.
In truth, I swear I love you best
When you have no clothes on."51

Yet this did not result in an outcry against the author.

But inconsistency is the occupational stock in trade of the censor. In Victoria it was inconsistent of the customs authorities, as Table Talk remarked, to prevent the importation of the novels of Zola, while Tess of the d'Urbervilles, which was 'one long argument that a woman may be seduced and commit adultery, and yet be pure', was permitted to sit on the shelves of the Public Library.52 It was inconsistent of the police to prosecute George Robertson and Company in September 1901 for importing Balzac's Droll Stories and Paul de Kock's Monsieur Dupont, although both books had been on sale in the shop for the previous nineteen years.53 And the same could be said of the prosecution of a suburban book seller in June 1900 for selling Ovid's Art of Love, which had also long been

50 Outpost, 17 November 1900.
51 Free Lance, 9 July 1896.
52 22 November 1901.
53 Argus, 21 September 1901.
freely available at the Public Library. Even the Argus expressed some puzzlement at a moral code which tolerated 'the often coarse outspokenness of Fielding and Smollett', while 'shuddering at the modern novelist who asserts his right to handle ... the great realities of life'. As Oscar Commettant observed, 'la pudeur anglaise ne se dispute pas. Elle s'impose.'

Moreover, inconsistency can, with equal justice, be charged against Marshall-Hall's critics in connection with their complaints against his irreligious views, which, declared one anonymous correspondent (albeit, one presumes, with some measure of hyperbole in the subordinate clause), 'do not contain anything more flippant and offensive to the dominant religion than Shelley or Ingersoll, whose works may be bought at every railway bookstall.' J. Meiklejohn, calling for the Ormond Professor's dismissal, conceded that 'what [he] has written and spoken is not likely to do more

---

54 Outpost, 23 June 1900.

55 Argus, 5 July 1902. Similarly, the Bulletin remarked (16 June 1900) that the English police took action against Havelock Ellis who had 'written in the interests of science upon a subject of paramount importance ... while the gross versions of gross Latin and French and Persian authors were sold for the titillation of the baser sort under police noses'; J.F. Punciman expressed puzzlement at people who did not object to Don Giovanni or La Traviata, but who yelled 'immorality' when encountering Wagner's Valkyrie (Musical Standard, 13 July 1901); G.B. Shaw complained that 'you can perform any number of farcical comedies which from the beginning to end turn upon stage humours of adultery and prostitution; but you cannot perform Shelley's Cenci' (Star, 1st October 1899); see also Table Talk, 23 March 1894.


57 'W' in Age, 19 August 1898.
harm than some of the literature which is introduced into many Christian homes without murmur or dissent. The Argus thought nothing of discussing the prospects of a race horse called Rock of Ages. And in September 1898 Joseph Symes's Liberator published the following 'Hymn to God', which was at least as offensive as anything penned by Marshall-Hall:

Hymn to God

1. Holy Puzzle! Fun Divine!
Blest conundrum ...

2. O thou great transcendent Nought!

3. Thou our Father art, our Dad!
Yet no wife you ever had! - Re the mysteries of life,
Specially those about your wife.
You, O, Daddy in the sky
Frown when we begin to pray

4. Jesus was born of virgin maid,
And thy Ghost - a rakish blade.

Yet no comparable outcry ensued.

4. Indecency and Literary Merit

It is pertinent to the present inquiry that censorial inconsistency is explicable partly in terms of the acceptance by the Zeitgeist of literary merit as a mitigating factor in indecency cases. What musician and anti-Marshall-Hall campaigner, J. Alfred Johnstone, found obnoxious in Madame Butterfly was that its indecency is not enlivened, as in Congreve, by sallies of sparkling wit; some of it is sensual, but it is the unromantic passion

58 Southern Cross, 12 August 1898.
59 7 October 1898.
60 24 September 1892.
61 Although in 1886 the Victorian postal department had refused to carry the Liberator in the mail - Age, 21 September 1898.
of vulgar city life, devoid of any of the sensuous beauty of the poetry of Byron and Swinburne.

Material, he explained, which, in another context, 'might be sordid, might be mean ... is transmuted to beauty by passing through the purifying furnace of a noble imagination.' Alexander Leeper, perhaps the most prominent and insistent of Marshall-Hall's enemies, conceded, in the course of an address on Swift's _Tale of a Tub_, that 'Coarse it is certainly, indeed in places shockingly so; but it has a wonderful directness and energy in its language. It is the work of true creative power.' The _Argus_, which led the press assault on the hapless musician, objected to powers of censorship being vested in customs officers and policemen, who had no literary training. The _Southern Cross_ deemed the 'offensive phrases in Shakespeare' to be fully extenuated by the fact that he 'is the greatest man in English literature.' And in the George Robertson prosecution alluded to above, much of the argument turned on the literary merit of the works in question.

Now a few readers did claim to find aesthetic merit in Marshall-Hall's books. Walter Murdoch even included two

---

63 _Notes of Lecture on Swift, loc.cit._
64_7 July 1902.
65_10 February 1898.
66 _Argus_, 21 September 1901.
67 _Alma Mater_, September 1898; Dr. J. V. Eccles in _Age_, 16 August 1898; 'Amicius Curiae' in _Herald_, 29 August 1898; 'Epistolomon' in _Triad_, 10 March 1913.
of the poems in his 1918 edition of the *Oxford Book of Australian Verse*\(^{68}\). But such favorable assessments were rare. When in 1914 the *Herald* invited its readers to name Australia's twelve best poets in order of preference, only one respondent included Marshall-Hall, ranking him eleventh\(^{69}\).

The professor's enemies typically described the poems as 'absolute literary garbage'\(^{70}\), 'doleful rubbish'\(^{71}\), and 'as miserable from the artistic standpoint as they are unseemly from the religious'\(^{72}\). His supporters were no more complimentary, referring to his work as, inter alia, 'downright bad and clumsy'\(^{73}\), 'shockingly bad poetry'\(^{74}\), 'hardly distinguishable from rubbish in the literary sense'\(^{75}\), and 'verses which a silly poetaster would be ashamed to acknowledge'\(^{76}\).

\(^{68}\) Although they did not appear in the subsequent editions. They were 'To Giuse Carducci' (pp. 121-2) and 'On Reading Shakespeare's Sonnets' (pp. 122-3).

\(^{69}\) 21 July 1914.

\(^{70}\) *Austral Light*, September 1898.

\(^{71}\) *Australasian Review of Reviews*, November 1898.

\(^{72}\) *Argus*, 5 August 1898; see also e.g. *Presbyterian Monthly*, 1 September 1898; *Australasian Review of Reviews*, 15 August 1898; *Presbyterian Messenger*, 22 June 1900; *Victorian Independent*, September 1898, November 1898; *Austral Light*, September 1898.

\(^{73}\) J.F. Runciman in *Saturday Review*, 5 November 1898.

\(^{74}\) Percy Frost in *Herald*, 14 June 1900.

\(^{75}\) *Leader*, 13 February 1898.

\(^{76}\) *Table Talk*, 12 August 1898; see also e.g. *Outpost*, 4 July 1900, 6 June 1900; J. Buckley Castieau in *Herald*, 23 August 1898; *Punch*, 11 August 1898; *Bulletin*, 20 August 1898, 15 August 1898; *Tocsin*, 18 August 1898, 8 June 1899; John Robertson in *Herald*, 20 June 1900; Dr. J.R. Wolfe in *Age*, 17 August 1898; *Leader*, 20 August 1898; A.L.H. Dawson in *Argus*, 1 December 1898; Christopher Brennan, who took no part in the dispute, judged them to be 'really demoralising:
And it is clear that their moral defects would not have been considered so serious had their literary merit been greater. A 'line needs to be drawn,' insisted the British Australasian, 'at indecency and inanity combined. Swift's and Shelley's outpourings may be tolerated, but not such effusions as Professor Marshall-Hall's "Watch and Pray". The Spectator admitted that Byron's verses 'were not always clean, but they were always poetry', while Marshall-Hall's were 'in their literary form contemptible'. The London Musical Courier found them wanting in good taste, and in 'any literary quality which could atone for the lack of it'. The Australasian Review of Reviews admitted that their content was similar to those of the early Swinburne, but added that 'Mr. Marshall-Hall has not Swinburne's unapproached melody and style to atone for graver faults'. 'Mephistopheles' agreed that Shelley, too, had been offensive, but had possessed 'a great intellect', while Marshall-Hall had merely penned 'doggerel lines'. 'Onlooker' contrasted 'Professor Marshall-Hall's doggerel with Swinburne's verses (some of which, 'tis true, are very suggestive) [but which]


77 15 August 1898.
78 2 December 1898.
79 15 September 1898. English press reports of the affair were desultory and, in general, less well-informed than those appearing in Australia.
80 20 July 1897, 20 December 1896.
81 20 August 1898.
are couched in very beautiful language. And another correspondent denied that Marshall-Hall 'has a right to express himself perfervidly in bad verse because Swinburne has delivered himself with some warmth in sterling poetry and de Maupassant in virile prose.'

Here, it has to be conceded that Hebraism was departing from its usual policy of declining to permit the profane to atone for injury done to the sacred. One reason, presumably, was a pragmatic acceptance of the fact that the suppression, or drastic bowdlerisation, of a substantial portion of the acknowledged masterpieces of literature was beyond its powers. Another, no doubt, was a reluctance on the part of its adherents to deprive themselves of the opportunity to enjoy the material in question. In addition, moral disapproval may be, in part, an inverse function of the reader's capacity to maintain an appropriate psychic distance from the literary product - to free his/her mind, that is, of related practical considerations. And perhaps artistic merit facilitates this by shifting attention to other properties of the work.

Of course, there were people, especially among Marshall-Hall's supporters, who, like J. Buckley Castiego, co-editor

---

82 *Herald*, 1 September 1898.
83 *Critic*, 8 October 1898.
of the labour Tocsin, considered his verse to be 'pure and moral according to the accepted standards' of the day.\textsuperscript{85} Even some of the musician's enemies did not strongly disagree. Austral Light conceded that there was 'not much' indecency in Hymns Ancient and Modern, which, indeed, 'could scarcely be said to be immodest at all'.\textsuperscript{86} And the Mitre published an article, so cynically and candidly hypocritical, that one wonders if the writer was a covert Marshall-Hall supporter.

So far as the public at large have stirred in the matter, [it said] they have been aroused, not by the indecency, but by the profanity of the Professor's speech and verse. The charge of indecency is one that could scarcely have been pressed had it stood alone. We are unable to discover in these "poems" referred to sufficient ground for declaring their writer unworthy of his high post. But it is not the first time that the real charge against a man is not that for which he is condemned. Neither the "Argus" nor the University could proceed against the Professor for atheism. It is undesirable that they should.

Yet in all the oceans of ink spilled on the subject these are the only hostile passages that exonerated him from the charge of indecency, while a number of those

\textsuperscript{85}Herald, 25 August 1898; see also e.g. Tocsin, 18 August 1898, 25 August 1898; F.S. Delmar in Herald, 12 August 1898; L.D. Bevan in Argus, 29 October 1898; L.D. Bevan to H. Wrixon, 23 June 1898 in MCRCF, 1900/40; Percy Frost in Herald, 14 June 1900; 'A Christian' in Herald, 16 June 1900; Bulletin, 20 August 1898; 'Epistomen' in Triad, 10 March 1913; A.L.R. Dawson in Argus, 1 December 1898; Critic, 12 November 1898; Outpost, 16 June 1900, 14 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{86}September 1898.

\textsuperscript{87}1 September 1898.
favoring his re-engagement granted that it was not without substance. Thus, the Leader saw 'quite enough' of both indecency and impiety in Hymns Ancient and Modern to sustain both charges⁸⁸. Alma Mater declared that the book showed its author to be 'deficient in moral perception'⁹⁰. The Herald, like the Argus, declined to publish some of the poems and cautioned correspondents that 'their publication ... is not to be achieved by embodying passages from them in letters of comment'⁹⁰. And 'Pedagogue' agreed that there were 'half-a-dozen sentences' in the book that were calculated to 'offend the squeamish sensibilities of the prudes in our community'⁹¹.

5. Coarseness

Broadly speaking, three components of the contemporary notion of indecency can be discerned, namely, coarseness (or vulgarity), eroticism, and immorality. The first described material which was inherently unpleasant, but not necessarily of a sexual character, and which, when treated frankly - without resort to attenuating euphemism - was likely to induce emotional or physical revulsion.

Thus, the discussion of venereal disease in the Doll's House was held to be 'coarse', inasmuch as it would offend audiences 'as the sight of blood, itself a necessary concomitant of

⁸⁸ 20 August 1898.
⁹⁰ September 1898.
⁹¹ 11 August 1898.
⁹¹ Outpost, 30 June 1900.
existence, would offend, in the sense of disturbing and alarming, a sensitive woman.\textsuperscript{92}

Coarseness, while generally deprecated, was the least reprehensible category of the indecent. Thus, Alexander Leeper, as we have seen, was able to praise Jonathan Swift, despite the fact that 'much of his writing is defiled by a coarseness that makes the gorge rise', because 'there is nowhere a trace of sensuality such as stains the pages of Pope, Dryden, Byron and Burns'. Swift's coarseness, explained Leeper, 'is a sin against taste rather than morals.'\textsuperscript{93}

Similarly, although 'wanton coarseness'\textsuperscript{94} was a quality freely detected in Marshall-Hall's writings, it was not their most heinous crime, and would probably not, of itself, have led to a clamour for his dismissal. Indeed, his supporters often cited the coarseness of his work in its defence, declaring it to be 'mere coarse tommy-rot'\textsuperscript{95}, or 'merely coarse and vulgar'\textsuperscript{96}, its author having allegedly

\textsuperscript{92}Table Talk, 20 September 1899; referring presumably to the brief conversation between Nora and Dr. Rank in Act 2 - see Ibsen Plays, Harmondsworth, 1969, pp.191-2.

\textsuperscript{93}Notes for lecture on Swift, Leeper papers, loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{94}J.L. Rentoul in Age, 15 August 1898; see also e.g. Argus, 15 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{95}Bulletin, 1 September 1900.

\textsuperscript{96}'An Atheist', quoted in Austral Light, September 1898; see also e.g. 'Lover of Music' in Herald, 27 May 1898; Punch, 11 August 1898; Bulletin, 20 August 1898.
'mistaken coarseness for vigour'\textsuperscript{97}. Marshall-Hall, himself, admitted, and justified the offence. 'The subject is coarse', he declared, in a reference to his epigram 'Democracy', 'and I have endeavoured to reproduce the coarseness of the persons alluded to by the style of the verse'\textsuperscript{98}.

The perceived innocuousness of this quality reflected a belief that the strong feelings of revulsion it aroused were incompatible with sexual desire. According to banker and University Council member, John Grice (later Sir John), the Ormond Professor's 'coarseness was so great that it became harmless'\textsuperscript{99}. And A.L.H. Dawson, a member of the University Senate, said it was 'incapable of exciting erotic feeling', since it 'could only excite feelings of disgust'\textsuperscript{100}.

6. Eroticism

This second category of indecency, eroticism, was, however, a more serious matter, involving, as it did, allusions of an overtly sexual character, which were deemed likely to arouse, not disgust, but unwholesome desire. To say that Marshall-Hall's verses were not indecent, by the standards of the time, in this sense, is either to have misread

\textsuperscript{97} Leader, 20 August 1898; see also e.g. Leader, 13 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{98} Marshall-Hall to University Council, 11 August 1898 in MUCMB, 12 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{99} Southern Cross, 22 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{100} Argus, 1 December 1898.
the poems, or to have radically misapprehended the time-spirit.

Sexual appetite was held to be very easily awakened by literature, the temptation being 'stronger than any other',¹⁰¹ because it 'lies at the roots of our nature'.¹⁰² Moreover, once lit, it was extraordinarily difficult to extinguish the fire. 'A few minutes' with an indecent book, declared a White Cross League pamphlet, 'may defile your mind with impure images which will remain firmly fixed in your thoughts all your life'.¹⁰³ And the English moral reformer, A.S. Dyer, quoted a Congregational minister who had read an 'infamous book' for fifteen minutes in his youth, which 'has haunted me like an evil spirit ever since. I have asked God on my knees to obliterate that book from my mind'.¹⁰⁴

Evidence of the consequently extreme squeamishness of the Victorian code of sexual reticence is abundant. A brief glance through the British Lord Chamberlain's records of this period reveals that one play was licensed on

¹⁰¹ Australasian White Cross League pamphlet, Purity and Impurity, p.4, Purity Series No.2.


¹⁰³ Purity and Impurity, op.cit., pp.20-1; see also e.g. Southern Cross, 12 August 1898; Austral Light, July 1899.

condition that the words 'that you spent the night with Walter Beach in Betty Black's lodging', were excised. Another was required to delete the speech, which said, 'If you do not consent I will use force to disgrace you. After that perhaps you will be more willing to throw a cloak of decency over your lost honour by becoming my wife.' The tarnished heroine of a third was not allowed to ask 'Do you - do you imagine that I earn all - all my money on the stage?' Fanny Legrand could be performed only if a reference to 'a liaison with a passionate woman' was expunged. The promoters of the Prince of Rogues had to remove the line, 'Why shouldn't I enjoy the few moments we are alone together? a great revenge on Farrell! - to dishonour his wife' (seizing her round the waist &c). 'Yield then! Say Yes to my embraces - my love - and live! Make your choice - dishonour or death.' And the song, 'That Explains Everything', could be included in Old Man Darling only with the omission of the fourth verse, which went as follows,

Suppose you spend a week or two at a gay watering place.
You tell your wife that business has detained you with 'His Grace'.

---


106 Louis, 17 February 1901, ibid., p.52.

107 The Jansen Family, 20 April 1901, ibid., p.99.

108 7 May 1902, ibid., p.70.

109 28 October 1901, ibid., p.164.
She finds within your bag a garment trimmed with lace. Well, that explains everything!  

The same fastidious fiat ran in the antipodes, where Hebraism was forever objecting to the publication by the daily press of 'indecent evidence' given in divorce cases, although it never involved even the briefest description of sexual indulgence, but only a (generally veiled) statement of the fact that it had taken place. In 1895 there was a spirited debate in the correspondence columns of Champion over whether that (Hellenic) journal had been morally justified in using the expression 'enforced maternity' in a report. Journalist Randolph Bedford remembered being forbidden to use the word 'chemise' in the Age in this period. And novelist Ada Cambridge claimed to know of an Australian editor, 'who, if "darling" appears in a contributor's M.S. ... crossed it out as an improper word, unfit for the family circle.'

When, in 1889, A Doll's House was first performed in Melbourne, the discussion of hereditary venereal disease in

1109 March 1900, ibid., p.153.
111 Spectator, 17 December 1897.
112 Spectator, 3 December 1897.
113 e.g. Champion, 31 August 1895, 7 September 1895.
115 Thirty Years in Australia, London, 1903, p.302.
Act 2 was omitted\textsuperscript{116}. And twelve years later, a production of \textit{Tannhäuser} deleted 'all reference to the hero's physical relations with Venus'\textsuperscript{117} (which must have made the action all but incomprehensible to those not familiar with the opera).

The extreme caution exercised with regard to allusions of a sexual character in literature intended for the young is well illustrated in an incident reported in the \textit{Outpost} in June 1900. It concerned an English text book, prescribed for Matriculation study in Victorian schools, which contained the following sentence:

A friend of mind, taking notice that one of our female companions was big with child, affirmed that there were fourteen in the room and that instead of portending one of the company should die it plainly foretold that one of them should be born.

When this was drawn to the attention of the Professorial Board, that august body at once announced that candidates would not be examined on this section of the book\textsuperscript{118}.

It was not just that all direct reference to the physical act and its consequences had to be avoided, but, as Peter Cominos has pointed out, even the 'emotions associated with sexual love were found guilty by association'\textsuperscript{119}. In 1897.

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Table Talk}, 20 September 1889.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Table Talk}, 4 April 1901.
\textsuperscript{118} 30 June 1900.
the Argus, for example, attacked playwright H.J. Jones 'who aimed at elevating the stage by a nice dissection of the lawless passions of humanity'. And the Right Rev. Monsignor J.S. Vaughan was quoted approvingly in Austral Light of July 1899 as objecting to 'minute descriptions of the tender passions'.

When reference to sex-related matters was considered to be in the public interest, the most euphemistic circumlocution was resorted to. Abortionists were 'persons who, under various guises profess to bring about certain results by illegal means'. Sexually transmitted infections became 'certain diseases of an indecent nature'. And contraception was 'a very pressing matter which could not be specifically alluded to owing to its indelicate nature'.

The point (and its structural conduciveness to collective action of the kind under consideration) is aptly illustrated by an anti-Marshall-Hall letter of 1901 from J. Frederick Bridge to the London Musical News. To illustrate its point, it quoted the Ormond Professor's poem, 'King David' in full, except for the word 'fornication', which, the writer declared, 'your readers must imagine' - not a very

---

120 11 December 1897. This was a general attack on Jones, not referring to any specific play.

121 Herald, 7 July 1898.

122 Advocate, 23 February 1901.

123 Advocate, 23 November 1899.
difficult task, given that it rhymed with 'nation'.\textsuperscript{124}
In similar vein, Alma Mater, in a comic verse about the
clothing of the New Woman, omitted the word for that
article of female attire that rhymes with 'rumours'.\textsuperscript{125}

Another particularly apposite example of this immoderate
Victorian scrupulosity was contained in a complaint received
on 16 May 1901 by the governing committee of the Melbourne
Liedertafel from four members of the choir that was currently
preparing Marshall-Hall's music drama, Aristodemus, for
performance. That the committee shared the complainants'
cconcern is shown by the resolution it passed, saying, 'that
a representation be made to Professor Marshall-Hall that he
should withdraw the work from rehearsal'.

When Marshall-Hall refused, threatening to resign if the
matter was pressed\textsuperscript{126}, a compromise was reached, whereby
the following changes were to be made in the libretto:
Where it had said that Alcmene felt the might 'of his arms
about her' (p.5), the word 'about' was replaced by 'upon'.
In the passage that said she felt 'the fire of immortal
limbs, knew the stark joy of a god upon her and a god's
ambrosial breath', the word 'limbs' was changed to 'lips';

\textsuperscript{124} April 1901.
\textsuperscript{125} May 1901.
\textsuperscript{126} In the light of this, and in the absence of further
evidence, it is hard to accept Bebbington's contention
that Marshall-Hall, in publishing Aristodemus, 'was concerned
that the public would see him capable of moral and edifying
art', M.Mus., p.136.
'stark' was altered to 'blessed', and 'god upon her' to 'god's descending'. And elsewhere, the word 'womb' was altered to 'earth'. These changes were made at the unanimous behest, not of a group of Presbyterian clergymen, but of the same Liedertafel committee which, less than a year before, had pleaded with the University Council to retain Marshall-Hall's services.

It is little wonder, then, that his earlier writings had given offence. By these standards, they were undoubtedly erotic. Their descriptions of physical love-making, and of the related emotions, though lacking the brutal frankness of Henry Miller and Philip Roth (and, indeed, of the anonymous nineteenth century author of My Secret Life), were nevertheless unmistakably candid in a manner that was wholly at odds with contemporary norms. One poem referred to 'the exquisite thigh of a woman'. Another dealt with 'the passion of blood, Straining breasts and strong limbs interlaced'. A third told how the poet lies with his 'Mistress',

Here where thy white warm arms hold me close-prest Kissing the veined curves of thy rich breast

127 MLMB, 28 March 1904.
128 Ibid., 23 May 1901.
129 See Steven Marcus, op.cit.
130 Hymn to Sydney, op.cit., p.13.
131 'Of the Sorrow of Things' in Book of Canticles, op.cit., p.11.
132 'To my Mistress, not to put Love to question' in Ibid., p.19.
and another, how he falls

On thy quick-panting bosom scarce conscious -
with burning lips
Thy emulous hungering mouth sear, with strong
limbs enthral
Thy weak-yielding frame, that is shaken with
shuddering bliss,
As wildly thou catchest me to thee, and
suckest forth my soul in a kiss.

In yet another he promises to take her 'to some far mist-
hidden shore' where

... I'll lay thee on some sea-carved couch
And loosening thy harsh gaolers from their ward
Bury my eyes that brim with aching thought
In the warm whiteness of thy smooth soft neck,
And Gaze - ah me! and gaze my fill
Into the limped azure of thine eyes
Until intoxicate with great tenderness
I sink joy-faint upon thy rising breast.
And with wild lips seek thine, close clasping,
clasped.

Elsewhere, again, he beseeches her not to deny him

Thy bosom's veinèd ivory,
But let my cheek there cradled lie. 135

And in To Irene he recounted how he felt

... through her glowing vest, the short sharp
shocks of bliss
That maddened in her bosom ... 136

and how

Desire and utter longing on them crept
In strains that seemed to languish and to die.
And then again to live, and pant, and burn,

. . . . . . . . . . . . .
Expanding in exulting ecstasy
Into a frenzied, frenzying, tumultuous sea,

---

133 To Hymn to Sydney, op.cit., p.19.
134 'To my Mistress, to come forth' in Book of Canticles, op.cit., p.11.
135 'To my Mistress, not to Leave Me' in ibid., p.16.
136 To Irene, op.cit., p.4 (N.B. the pages of this book are unnumbered. Numbers given are mine, starting with the first page, as number 1.)
Wherein it seemed desire's uttermost
To plunge, to sink, to die, dissolve,
be lost,

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

With but one mouth, one body, being, soul,

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Thus their two hearts were as one trembling lyre
With passion of wild music all afire,
It was with them as when some island-tide
Feels against his the faint limbs of his bride,
And all his being quivering beneath
The timorous pant and pausing of her breath,
And the voluptuous-summer bosom's swell
Warm outlined on his own, and all the spell
Of beauty maddening in his passionate blood. 137

That the above lines, all of which were published before
Hymns Ancient and Modern, were not at first cited as reasons
for depriving the author of his university chair, will be
discussed below (pp.510-511).

7. Immorality

Finally, Marshall-Hall also offended against contemporary
canons of decency in respect of the third, prevailing
category, by preaching that sexual indulgence outside marriage
was not morally wrong. The difference between this and
eroticism was captured by the Argus when, in another context,
it distinguished between 'the mere literature of passion,
which made no pretence to morality', and the 'new literature
of the revolted woman', in which 'passion becomes a divine
law and puts on the airs of an even priggish morality'. 138
Similarly, the English Era differentiated between, on the
one hand, 'the open depiction or discussion of the sexual
act and its accompaniments and the sexual instinct and


138 20 April 1895.
organs - anything, in short, which leads the mind to dwell on these "tabooed subjects"139, and, on the other, 'anything which has a tendency to debase the moral coinage, to bring into contempt the "morality" or customary virtues of the country'.

Marshall-Hall was accused of having transgressed in both senses. He had, it was widely alleged, published an 'evangel of free love',140, which 'scoffs at the current ideas of sexual morality',141, taught 'that human society ought not to be based on marriage',142, and 'argue[d] for and justifie[d] the breach of the marriage tie and the rightfulness of lust'.143

The lines most frequently quoted to support of these charges were the following from the Hymn to Sydney:

\[
\text{Love is not lust, though it stinteth the parson his fee,}
\text{Nor lust, howe'er glaz'd by sanctified mummeries, love.144}
\]

It is true that he later claimed to have been 'utterly misunderstood and misinterpreted'.145 Far from advocating

---

13929 February 1908.
140Teacher of Thirty Years Standing' in Herald, 6 June 1900.
141IN MEDIO' in Argus, 13 July 1900.
142Robert Potter in Argus, 7 July 1900.
143PPCM reported in the Argus, 25 November 1898; see also 'Onlooker' in Herald, 3 September 1898.
144e.g. Southern Cross, 13 July 1900; J.L. Rentoul in EMS, 15 August 1898; 'Onlooker' in Herald, 3 September 1898.
145Marshall-Hall to University Council, 3 October 1898 in MS, 3 October 1898.
free love, he professed to regard 'the civil institution of marriage as the foundation of natural morality'. And he insisted that the couple to whose 'Love' the offending extract alluded, were 'newly wedded, united by the civil contract, and their own high conception of love'.

Moreover, the 'sanctified mummeries' referred, not to religious wedding services, in general, but only to 'the corrupt practice of certain clergy who are ready to bestow the blessings of God indifferently on anyone who will pay their fees, whether they are notorious evil-livers, drunkards, criminals or rascals of any description'. The lines, he claimed, merely meant that love 'can be neither sanctified nor befouled by such ceremonies, or lack of ceremonies'.

And, by way of example, he drew attention to a recent advertisement in the Argus in which a minister had announced his availability to perform weddings anywhere for one guinea, witnesses provided.

But there is nothing in the poem to bear this out - no reference to either civil marriage or to the notorious 'marriage shops', which, incidentally, were also the cause of considerable concern to the institutional Churches of the day. Marshall-Hall's defence, as the Rev. S.G. McLaren, Principal of the Presbyterian Ladies' College, tartly

---

146 Argus, 9 July 1900.

147 Ibid.

148 See e.g. report of the Presbyterian Assembly in Argus, 11 November 1897.
remarked, did not meet the basic requirements of such an explanation, namely, that it 'must be capable of being attached to the words to which it refers, without doing undue violence to their obvious meaning'. And McLaren was surely right in pronouncing the obvious meaning of the words in question to be, that true love may follow its natural impulses without seeking the sanction of the marriage tie and that it is not on that account to be stigmatised as "lust". On the other hand, love which may properly be described as lust does not change though sanctioned in its exercise by the marriage tie and a religious service.  

The lines preceding those that scorned the 'sanctified mummeries' are surely inconsistent with the claim that the couple were united by a civil marriage:

Think not of the world, gentle Heart, nor of its usages trite;
What if our sweet joy with opprobrious names it decry,
Its soul is the soul of a hog, and it takes the whole earth as its sty.

At the secular end of the nineteenth century love was not decried with 'opprobrious names' simply for having been solemnised by a civil, rather than a religious, ceremony.

Marshall-Hall's pretended attachment to civil marriages, moreover, was belied in the Book of Canticles, by the following passage, which also caused offence:

Then kiss me, Dear,-
And let me have my joy unshent,
We need no priest to shrive us here.

149 Argus, 10 July 1900.
150 Hymn to Sydney, op.cit., p.17.
8. Immortality

The immoral import of all this was heightened in the contemporary view by what J. Lawrence Rentoul referred to as 'the extreme form of materialism' contained in the preface of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, in the shape of a 'denial of the right to believe in any immortality for man'. When the 'lewdness' of the verse, declared the *Argus*, was read 'in conjunction with the theory set out in the preface ... the impression that something is amiss is deepened'. And equity and company law barrister The reverend Beckett Weigall argued that 'the author's preface to his recently published "Hymns Ancient and Modern"' was 'all important and conclusive' in respect to the weighing of 'the evidence on charges of blasphemy and of indecency on the poems which follow'.

What was implicit in these assertions was the common opinion that repudiation of an after-life weakened the

---

151. *To my Mistress, not to leave Me*, *Book of Canticles*, op. cit., pp.17-18. This was quoted by Canon Potter in July 1900 to support his view that Marshall-Hall was preaching against marriage - *Argus*, 14 July 1900.

152. *Argus*, 25 November 1898. Rentoul was referring to the opening sentence of the Preface, which said, 'It is the impertinent belief alike of the professional pietist, and of the most unconscionable rascal that his unspeakably insignificant ego is destined to exist forever'.

153. 5 August 1898.

fetters of moral imperatives generally, and of sexual
shibboleths in particular.

We know as a matter of fact [declared
the Australian Christian] how belief in
judgement to come makes many less careless
and how absence of this belief tends to
recklessness ... [I]f men come to believe
that this life is the whole of life, and
that there is no after life and no judgement
to come, then they would be sure to live
carelessly.  

And 'A Parent' argued that Marshall-Hall's preaching of the
finality of death amounted to an injunction to 'enjoy the
glorious present, and follow your animal instincts, since
there is no hereafter, and man is no better than the
brutes'.

That the Ormond Professor, himself, saw the force of the
point is clear from his protest 'against the hint that these
poems are to be interpreted by the preface', which, he
insisted, 'was intended as an answer to attacks made on a
former work of mine and has nothing to do with this book'.
The Argus, however, was correct in characterising this as
'a futile effort to escape the natural consequences of written
words', since 'There is no word in the preface referring to
any other book than the one it introduces'. Moreover,
it would not have helped him if there had been, as an

155 21 December 1900.
156  Herald, 1 September 1898.
157 Marshall-Hall to Council, 11 August 1898, in MUCMB,
12 August 1898. Presumably he was referring to the Hymn
Sydney — see pp. 510–511.
158 15 August 1898.
important part of the case against him was the alleged teachings of his former books.

This is not to say that Marshall-Hall was not speaking the truth, as he saw it, when he denounced as 'downright lies' the charges 'made against me by cowardly and unscrupulous antagonists', to the effect 'that I approve indiscriminate sexual intercourse'. But this denial rested on two assumptions, both of which were directly at odds with fundamental Hebraic values.

One was implicit in his claim to have been 'treating of love', in his poems, 'in the abstract, not in its social bearing' - independently, that is, of its practical implications in the form, for example, of illegitimacy and a weakened social fabric. This, however, is a defence which starts from the Hellenic assumption - anathema to Hebraism - that what makes an act sinful is its injurious consequences.

9. Love, Lust and the Psychic

Secondly, Marshall-Hall's conception of sexuality was crucially different from that of his enemies (and, indeed, many of his friends), and, therefore, he differed from them radically in his definition of acceptable sexual behaviour. Not that he failed to distinguish between love and lust, to honour the former, and despise the latter. The Duke

---

159 Argus, 25 October 1898.
160 Argus, 9 July 1900.
in his play Bianca Capello was clearly speaking for the author, when he said,

O Natures there are inapt for anything
O'er love's brute adjunct, blind and wolfish lust,
That recks not those honorable parts
Which are love's pride and ornament

And such are' beasts, dangerous, and unsociable. 161

Nor, as far as can be gathered from the records, is it the case that his detractors commonly considered copulation to be, in itself, inherently wicked. Few would have agreed with the Victorian Independent that it was 'something ... that Christianity aims at eliminating from our nature' 162. The general tenor of Hebraic argument was more in line with the Australasian White Cross League pamphlet which insisted that 'there is nothing sinful, or worthy of condemnation either in this sexual impulse, or in the relation between the sexes' 163. To have argued otherwise would have been to exacerbate an already intractable problem of theodicy.

But this apparent congruence of views conceals a crucial divergence. Peter Cominos is no doubt going too far in asserting that the psychic component of sexuality was non-existent for Victorians 164, (Marshall-Hall, himself, being

162 July 1899.
163 'Purity and Impurity', op.cit., pp.3-4; see also e.g. Richard Arthur 'The Needs and Methods of Purity Teaching', op.cit.
a notable exception). But they rarely acknowledged more than two motives for indulgence, namely, the satisfaction of physical appetite, and the desire to propagate.\textsuperscript{165}

Sexual intercourse, insisted M.D. O'Brien in 1893, had 'absolutely nothing to do with love. There undoubtedly is such a thing as desire, but there is no such thing as sexual love.'\textsuperscript{166} To those who held this view, 'lust' described the feelings of participants in any sexual act, in which there was no intention (or, at least, possibility) of procreation, since they believed that this left the indulgence of physical craving as the only object of the exercise. This notion was clearly implicit in Austral Light's warning that to promote contraception was 'to frustrate the principal purpose for which the Almighty constituted matrimony, and to bring down the marriage state to a condition little elevated above concubinage.'\textsuperscript{167}

Even Hellenism often concurred. Contraception, according to Tocsin,

strikes a foul blow at the sublime instincts of motherhood and purity, and propounds a doctrine which would make Vice usurp the place of Sexual Purity; would make Lust shoulder Love from the stage of Life; transform marriage literally into sanctified prostitution.\textsuperscript{168}

\textsuperscript{165}Ibid., part 2, p.229.

\textsuperscript{166}Quoted in ibid., p.24; see also Henry Varley, quoted in ibid., p.22.

\textsuperscript{167}January 1900.

\textsuperscript{168}14 December 1899; see also Tocsin, 23 November 1899.
the check in population were the only harm done it would not matter so much. Indeed, on economic grounds, abortive practices might be cold-bloodedly justified. But nothing could justify the immoral results. Husbands and wives who deliberately render themselves sterile, reduce themselves to the status of mere lustful, selfish debauchees, void of any higher feelings, than the low desire for sensual indulgence.  

And when this occurred it was held by Hebraism to be 'the most degrading and harmful of all sins'\(^{169}\), 'the national sin' which 'is eating out the heart and destroying the vitality of the Australian race'\(^{171}\), the 'master sin of the age', even 'worse than murder'.\(^{172}\) It is significant that the only religious journal to support Marshall-Hall, the Catholic Tribune, found 'something inexpressibly shocking' and 'distinctly unChristian' in the fact that 'the general public express ... far more indignation at the Professor's supposed laxity as to sexual morals than at his open blasphemy of Almighty God'.\(^{173}\) The same journal pointed out that in the Gospels:

Those who dishonoured God by buying and selling ... in His Father's house are driven out with knotted whips by His own hands ... Yet to the sinful woman taken in

\(^{169}\) 19 January 1901.

\(^{170}\) Untitled Australasian White Cross League Pamphlet in Leeper papers, \textit{loc.cit.}.

\(^{171}\) Bishop of Carpentaria, approvingly quoted by the Sydney Mothers' Union, in Neville Hicks \textit{This Sin and Scandal: Australia's Population Debate 1891-1911}, Canberra, 1978, p.57.

\(^{172}\) \textit{Christian Citizen}, 1 March 1902; see also e.g. Archbishop Carr in \textit{Southern Cross}, 25 February 1898.

\(^{173}\) 22 September 1900.
adultery, He only says, "Go and sin no more". The reason [declared the writer, with a tolerance bred of characteristically Hellenic determinism, was] that He knew our weakness, and allows for the frailty of the flesh in fallen humanity.

But Marshall-Hall, like Hardy, Havelock Ellis and others, went even further. He did not regard it as, necessarily, a frailty at all. And this was because of his identific-
ation of a third, legitimating component of the physical act, namely, the mutual love of the participants. He scorned to believe,

... as poets fain
In faith begot of amorous fantasy
That soul and body are not one but twain:
The one a throne superlative, where love
With nuptial dues and chaste solemnity
Sits coronate, all vicissitudes above;
The other but a vile and menial cell
Wherein she is perforce constrained to dwell.

For him, on the contrary, the dialectic between the spiritual and sensual elements was the very essence of permissive sexuality.

The body's joy is borne of the soul's fire;
Material fire, of spiritual thirst;
Each from the other doth new life acquire
And lend in everlasting interchange.
Thus, when by thy soul's influent flame traversed,
Mine trembles o'er with
Searchings sweet and strange,
Shall not my body, trembling too, divine
Some sudden - subtle quickening of thine?

What though high reason of deep policy rage?
If still his kingdom, body, have no ease?

174, 23 June 1900.
175, 'Corpus et Anima' manuscript poem in MHPG M-H 6/4.
More than this, the psycho-physical character of sexual relations also represented for him another dimension of periechontological authenticity. Indeed, 'of all forms, the form which wakens this supreme happiness most clearly, most powerfully, most ecstatically, most generally is the relation between man and woman - Love'.176. Like art, which depicts the elements of the preconscious mind, it acts as an 'emblem of the eternal principle of all life, all Beauty[,] ... a symbol of Death which shall make [humanity] eternally one with the entire Universe ... a beautiful and splendid allegory of the most sought after of all truths'. And that was because in 'the supremest moment of [sexual] passion (as in the corresponding mental state of pure contemplation) the ego is annihilated'.

For 'a single moment ... the phenomenon Man [is blended] with the phenomenon Woman'.177.

And by this means, too, whole meanings were, at least temporarily, restored.

We are momentarily relieved of our restless sense of incompleteness. The fragment is re-united with the whole. Life no longer appears as an endless meaningless circuit of detached units, but rather as the significant movement of a single vast organism, interdependent in every part, of which we ourselves ... are integral portions.178

Not only that, but sexual love, he (inconsistently) affirmed, was the 'sole whole thing/That may death and fate defy'.179.

176 Preface to Hymns Ancient and Modern, op.cit.
177 Ibid.
179 'Of the Sorrow of Things' in Book of Canticles, op.cit., p.11.
It is not surprising, then, that he was hostile to what he (privately) described as that 'dirty bit of juggling', that 'supreme insult ... to mankind and Life', namely, 'the disgusting fable of the Virgin Mary', involving, as it did, the 'conception of a "god", too "pure", too "chaste", too "spiritualised" (i.e. decadent) to beget a son in the manner of the gods of old'.\textsuperscript{180} However, the closest he got to a public declaration of this particular kind was the contrast revealed, in different poems, of Christianity's 'sexless saints ... /Psalm-wearied forever and aye',\textsuperscript{181} and 'the merry gods' of a more carnal (and, evidently, voyeuristic) age, who

\begin{quote}
Merry lovers love to spy
When they think that none be nigh.\textsuperscript{182}
\end{quote}

In this respect, too, Marshall-Hall's views were diametrically opposed to those of Schopenhauer and the Symbolists. The androgynous creatures of either sex, who inhabit the works of the latter, are too listless and indolent to evince even a hint of sexual energy. Their women, as Octave Mirbeau remarked, 'walk without legs and ... love without genitals'.\textsuperscript{183}

Schopenhauer manifested a positive hostility to the 'satisfaction of the reproductive impulse', which he

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{180}{Marshall-Hall to E.E. Morris n.d. context 1900 in Mitchell Library copy of Hymn to Sydney.}
\footnote{181}{A Canticle to the Gods' in Book of Canticles, op.cit., p.7.}
\footnote{182}{To my Sweetheart, to be Merry with Me', in ibid., p.6.}
\footnote{183}{Quoted in Phillipe Jullian, op.cit., p.252.}
\end{footnotes}
stigmatised as 'utterly and intrinsically reprehensible because it is the strongest affirmation of the lust for life'. As living was 'constant suffering', it followed for him that lovers were 'traitors who seek to perpetuate the whole want and drudgery, which would otherwise reach its end'.\textsuperscript{184} The 'first step,' he declared, 'in the denial of the will to live', is 'voluntary and complete chastity'.\textsuperscript{185}

It was the Existentialist, Nietzsche, who argued that the 'degree and nature of a man's sensuality extends to the highest altitude of his spirit',\textsuperscript{186} and that it 'is only Christianity with its resentment against life at the bottom, which caused sexuality to be regarded as something impure'.\textsuperscript{187} Marshall-Hall applauded this observation, declaring that it explained 'the feeling of partial impotence' in Wordsworth and Tennyson, who 'voluntarily castrated themselves and their poetry', and also in Milton, who employed 'the Christian obscenity-knife' to produce 'a castrated God the Father and God the Son'.\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{184}Quoted in Durant, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.256-7.
\textsuperscript{185}Quoted in Parker, \textit{op.cit.}, p.272.
\textsuperscript{187}Quoted in Hince 'The Case of the Dismissed Professor', \textit{op.cit.}, p.28.
\textsuperscript{188}Ibid.
The Religious Factor

But, although his verse clearly was indecent by the standards of the time, there can be little doubt that this alone was not sufficient to precipitate the outcry that occurred. Both the *Church of England Messenger*\(^ {189}\) and the *Southern Cross*\(^ {190}\) felt that he had offended less in this way than with his 'larrakin-like treatment of all ideas about God,'\(^ {191}\) and it is surely significant that his earlier publications — *Book of Canticles*, *Hymn to Sydney* and *To Irene* — whose anti-religious tone, so far as it existed at all, was much milder than that of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* and the Liedertafel address — only came under really fierce and sustained attack after the latter effusion.

Bebbington is wrong in saying that they had previously been ignored\(^ {192}\). Nor had they, as the *Leader* contended, been merely 'passed by with almost contemptuous indifference,'\(^ {193}\). On the contrary, *To Irene* was described by one commentator as an 'insidious dilation upon the languorous languishment of merely physical passion, which revealed 'an imagination as foul as Vulcan's stithy.'\(^ {194}\) Another had found it to be throbbing 'with a passion which

---

\(^{189}\) September 1898.

\(^{190}\) 12 August 1898.

\(^{191}\) *Southern Cross*, 12 August 1898.

\(^{192}\) *M.Mus.*, p.112.

\(^{193}\) 13 August 1898.

\(^{194}\) John Reid in *Table Talk*, 20 November 1896.
is very earthy and sensual, and not very manly,\textsuperscript{195} while a third said it mounted 'to a glowing altitude of passion which only the artistic temperament can climb with safety', but which a 'prosaic family journal' could not quote\textsuperscript{196}. Similarly, the \textit{Hymn to Sydney} had been called 'an outrage upon decent reticence'\textsuperscript{197}, a 'nasty production'\textsuperscript{198}, whose 'sensual note' 'offends the healthy mind'\textsuperscript{199} and a fit Australian companion for 'the unsavoury heap of pornographic literature beyond the seas'\textsuperscript{200}.

Yet, as there was no widespread demand at the time for the author's dismissal, it is reasonable to conclude that the storm of protest which broke out in 1898 owed much to the professor's attacks on religion. But not to these alone, since, alone (before the Argus discovered \textit{Hymns Ancient and Modern}), they invoked little more than good-humoured Hebraic irritation (see above, pp.469-470). It was the two together - the blasphemy and the indecency - which account for the clamour which occurred.

\textsuperscript{195}Australasian Review of Reviews, 20 December 1896.
\textsuperscript{196}Argus, 21 November 1895.
\textsuperscript{197}Unidentified Argus cutting, context 1897, in MMCA.
\textsuperscript{198}'Pueris Virginibus' in Argus, 8 June 1897.
\textsuperscript{199}Australasian Review of Reviews, 20 July 1897.
\textsuperscript{200}'Pueris Virginibus' in Argus, 8 June 1897.
CHAPTER 7

THE PROCESS

Attention will now turn to the question of why, given the various factors discussed above, the University Council decided not to reappoint Marshall-Hall when his second five-year contract expired in 1900. Since this will involve a closer focus on efficient cause, the exposition will be chronologically organised.

Understanding will be facilitated by a brief preliminary account of the relevant administrative structure. The University Act of 1890\textsuperscript{1} provided for a governing Council, to consist of 20 male members elected by (but not necessarily from) members of the University Senate - who, themselves, had to be male and to hold doctors' or masters' degrees obtained from Melbourne University\textsuperscript{2}. Council Members held office for five years, with the exception of those whose membership predated 7 June 1881 - who held office for life, or until they voluntarily relinquished it. The Council was chaired by the Chancellor or, in his absence, the Vice-Chancellor\textsuperscript{3}, both of whom were elected by and from its

\textsuperscript{1}No.MCLI - see Melbourne University Calendar 1900, Melbourne, 1899, pp.5-20.

\textsuperscript{2}But not necessarily originally. The University had the power to grant \textit{ad eundem} degrees which had the same status as those obtained in its own courses.

\textsuperscript{3}Or, in the absence of both, a member elected by those present.
membership. It alone could initiate legislation, which, however, had to be endorsed by the Senate. The latter body could reject it or amend and send it back to the Council for reconsideration.

As well as exploring the various efforts of the Council to find a way out of the Marshall-Hall imbroglio, attention will be given in this chapter to identifying and evaluating the tactics employed by both sides. Various extraneous issues which may have influenced the outcome will be discussed, with particular stress on their role in the two Council elections that occurred in the second half of 1900. In addition, the importance of Dr. Leeper, the Argus newspaper, and the selection committee and Victorian Agent-General in London will be investigated, as will the view that Marshall-Hall's role in the dispute was that of defender of liberty.

First to recapitulate - the two utterances that sparked off the outcry were Marshall-Hall's Liedertafel address, delivered on 1 August 1898, and his Hymns. Ancient and Modern, first published on 5 July, but exciting little interest until the Argus attack on it of 5 August. In the afternoon of the following Friday - the 12th, a special meeting of the University Council was held to consider these events. A letter from Marshall-Hall was tabled, urging that 'before any sort of a decision is arrived at on matters vitally

---

4 Clarke, 12 August 1898.
concerning my character and position, I shall have the fullest opportunity afforded me of defending myself. After more than an hour and a half of in-camera discussions, it was resolved to reconvene on the following Friday to 'hear Professor Marshall-Hall further in regard to the questions raised'.

1. Champion of Liberty

The latter's subsequent conduct belies Radic's contention that the Liedertafel speech 'was a fair warning to anyone who cared to challenge him that Marshall-Hall intended to stand and fight' and to 'refuse an easy submission'. Had this been the case, he would not then, instead of defending himself, as originally proposed, have asked for twelve months leave on full pay in the following year, during which time, he promised, 'I shall do nothing which may cause embarrassment to the Council in what they believe to be their duty', and at the end of which, he would 'place my resignation in the hands of the Council'.

Nor would he have explained his willingness so to relinquish his post by conceding

---

5 Marshall-Hall to Council, 11 August 1898, in MUCMB, 12 August 1898.

6 MUCMB, 12 August 1898.

7 Radic, PhD, p.257.

8 Not, as Bebbington and Len Fox claim, at the expiry of his current five year term. See Bebbington, M.Mus., p.136; Fox, op.cit., p.46.

9 MUCMB, 19 August 1898; Argus, 20 August 1898.
that I had unfortunately involved the
University in a very obnoxious dispute,
for which it was in no way responsible;
that a religious struggle must necessarily
be dangerous to the interests of the
University; that whatever my own opinions
were with respect to the freedom of the
professors outside their duties, the
interests of the University were entrusted
to the Council, and not to me; [and] that
as a loyal officer of the University I should
leave to the Council the entire responsibility
of this matter, and should relieve them of
their difficult position by offering to resign. 10

Nor, again, would he have subsequently expressed 'regret at
having caused the Council any embarrassment', or acknow-
ledged 'that it is against the interests of the University
that one of its professors should publicly attack any
particular religion, inasmuch as no partisanship should be
shown by those under whom persons of all denominations
might have to pass' - a sentiment in which is implicit
precisely the same narrow view of University religious
neutrality as was embodied in the attacks of his enemies (see
above, pp.310-312). Above all, he would not have averred
that, if the matter had been earlier represented to him
in this light, he 'should have been perfectly willing to
have adopted it as a general rule of action'.11

That he had, in fact, all along been anxious not to
offend Hebraic susceptibilities too severely is surely
demonstrated by his previous decision12 to excise eight

10MUChR, 3 October 1898.
11Argus, 25 October 1898.
12See above p.377,
highly offensive lines from his poem, 'On Michelagnolo's Mask of Mary', before including it in the Book of Canticles. Ironically, this decision, or A.G. Stephens' tardiness in accepting the poem for publication, may have cost the professor his job, inasmuch as the protests which would surely have followed its appearance at that time might have been sufficient to have had a chastening effect on the author, rendering him more cautious in future, without succeeding in prising him from his post, since the storm which did occur, was, as I have argued, an expression of the combined effect on his enemies of Hymns Ancient and Modern and the Liedertafel speech, which, together, contained a greater range of offensive material than the eight lines in question.

The truth of the matter, then, is that in 1898 he clearly miscalculated the tolerance of local Hebraism - no doubt failing to take into account the fact that it would be faced with two of his utterances published in close succession. He then regretted what he had done, and became positively conciliatory, indeed deferial in his efforts to make amends. His application for leave was submitted on the advice of J.E. Mackey and Professor W. Harrison Moore, perhaps in the belief that the only alternative was instant dismissal. But it hardly bespeaks a resolve to 'stand and fight'.

In fact, the main motive appears to have been financial. Initially, it seems that Harrison Moore, after discussions with 'some members of the Council', had brought the musician
'a proposal by which I was to receive £500 for compensation for sending in my instant resignation'\textsuperscript{13}. Marshall-Hall had baulked at this, not because it would involve a surrender of principle, but because the amount offered was too small. Instead, he insisted that he 'receive £1000 by way of compensation',\textsuperscript{14}. When Harrison Moore pointed out that the University would have difficulty, in the short term, laying hands on such a large sum, Marshall-Hall had agreed to the formula outlined in his letter\textsuperscript{15}.

2. The Leave Application Withdrawn

The next Council meeting, on 19 August, was also held in-camera\textsuperscript{16}. Discussion lasted for over an hour, during the course of which it was moved

That the Council accepts the proposals of Professor Marshall-Hall made in his letter of 18th August, and on his assurance that he will, during the current year abstain from anything that would cause embarrassment to the Council, and that he will resign at the close of 1899, grants him leave of absence for the year 1899 on full pay, on the understanding that during that year he recognises his obligation as professor to abstain from giving musical instruction in Victoria.

After Dr. T.F. Bride, perhaps sensing what was coming, had tried unsuccessfully to have 'the matter ... postponed

\textsuperscript{13}\textsuperscript{MUCMB}, 3 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{14}\textsuperscript{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{15}\textsuperscript{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{16}\textsuperscript{Argus}, 20 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{17}\textsuperscript{MUCMB}, 19 August 1898. The minute book, which on this occasion simply says that the motion was passed, sometimes records details of divisions, and sometimes fails to do so. We have not been able to detect any pattern that might explain the inconsistency.
until the whole of the terms of the arrangement which it
is proposed to make with Professor Marshall-Hall are before
the Council\textsuperscript{18}, the motion was passed with, according to the
*Argus*, only one or two dissenting votes\textsuperscript{19}.

But the matter was not to rest there. On Monday
8 September Councillors met to consider a letter from
Marshall-Hall which throws further light on his motives for
requesting leave\textsuperscript{20}. In it he expressed a desire 'to know
the exact limitations which would be imposed on me by the
condition of the Council "that during the year he recognises
his obligation as a professor to abstain from giving musical
instruction in Victoria"'.

He was, he explained,

extremely anxious that neither the artistic
principles I have worked for here, nor the
system of education and instruction I have
built up on carefully considered lines for
their support and propagation, should be
effaced or injured in any way by the present
turn of affairs.

And he reminded Councillors that

in addition to my voluntary work in organising
and directing the conservatorium, and in giving
finishing lessons to students; in taking them
through operatic works &c; in holding
ensemble, choral, and orchestral classes; and
in giving students' concerts, I have also,
quite outside of this work, held public
orchestral concerts, and am acting as conductor
of the Melbourne Liedertafel. All these extra

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{19}*Argus*, 20 August 1898.

\textsuperscript{20}MCCMB, 5 September 1898.
duties I have taken upon myself without fee or reward, and at some financial risk, and they all necessarily involved the giving of musical instruction.

What he wanted to know now was 'whether it is intended to prohibit me in the future from performing these voluntary duties which I have in the past discharged without let or hindrance.'

What was significant about this request was the (surely deliberate) linguistic sleight of hand it embodied. That is to say, the letter implied that, since he had voluntarily undertaken the work in the Conservatorium, with all it involved by way of taking instrumental and operatic classes, that institution was no more an integral part of the University than were the Liedertafel and the Marshall-Hall orchestra, with which his association was also voluntary.

Now, as this claim was of some importance in the conflict that followed, it warrants closer examination. It has been repeated, both at the time, and since, by people who ought to have known better. _Punch_ declared the Conservatorium to be 'Professor Marshall-Hall's own concern', there being 'no provision by the University for such an institution'.

Hebbington agrees, saying it 'was not University property, having been financed independently [sic] from its inception.' Radic is not so sure. At one point she

---

21 Ibid.
22 25 August 1898.
23 M. Mus., p. 142.
affirms that the institution Marshall-Hall directed from
1895 to 1900 had been 'financed privately', and that the
'University Conservatorium ... can be said to date only
from 1900', when the former 'was re-formed under Professor
Peterson' (in fact Peterson did not take up his position
until 1901). But then she states that 'the de facto
relationship between Melb. Uni., the first Ormond Professor,
G.H.L. Marshall-Hall and his support of a recognised
conservatorium used by the University could be taken to mean
1895 was the year of origin' 24.

There can, however, be no doubt that, from its official
foundation in 1894, the Conservatorium was unequivocally,
and de jure, part of the University - so defined by a
University Statute 25. The University Council appointed
its teachers 26 and determined their remuneration as well
as that of its secretary 27, and fixed students' fees.

24 Račić, PhD., p.177.

25 i.e. Statute XXVIII, passed on 19 July 1894, which
established the Conservatorium as part of the University,
whose 'Council shall from time to time with the advice and
assistance of the Director frame rules for the conduct and
management of the Conservatorium' (Section 3), which will
be carried on in such buildings ... as may be approved
by the Council after consulting with the Director'
(Section 7), Melbourne University Calendar 1895, Melbourne,
1894, pp.325-6.

26 Ibid.; Argus, 5 June 1894.

27 Ibid. When in December 1895 it was drawn to the
council's attention that, on Marshall-Hall's authority,
the secretary, Ernest Moffitt, had been receiving £2 a week -
twice the amount stipulated by the Council - that body
required Moffitt to repay the excess 'because it was paid to
in error and without authority' - see MUCMB, 1 December
1895.
Furthermore, Marshall-Hall was well aware of this, having been involved in the drafting of the statute in question. All he claimed - explicitly - at this time, was that he 'personally guaranteed, and continued to guarantee, all financial liabilities, so that even the building which the conservatorium occupies is taken in my name ... and all the risks are borne by me'.

Yet, even this was not strictly true. The agreement of 7 July 1897, whereby 'an artistic institution known as "the University Conservatorium of Music"' was given the use of part of the ground floor of the Victorian Artists' Society building in East Melbourne, was signed on behalf of that conservatorium by Marshall-Hall and Ernest Moffitt. But when, on 10 April 1899, V.A.S. secretary A. Colquhoun wanted to know whether the lease was to be renewed, he addressed the query, not to Marshall-Hall, but to 'A. Dickenson, secretary of Melbourne University'. And when it was proposed to take an additional room 'to be used as a Secretary's office by the conservatorium', the request was made to Colquhoun not by Marshall-Hall, but by F.T.J. Dickson.

---

28 pp.418-425.
29 MUCMB, 5 September 1898.
30 Victorian Artists' Society papers, Latrobe Library 7593, Box 586/2.
31 He meant, of course, F.T.J. Dickson, the University's accountant, and secretary to its Conservatorium Committee (Calendar 1895, p.19) - see A. Colquhoun to 'A. Dickenson', April 1899 in V.A.S. papers, loc.cit., letter book 97-1902, p.92.
Secretary of the University Council Conservatorium Committee. The question of the professor's financial liability is complicated and is more appropriately addressed at a later point in the argument. For the moment, it is sufficient to conclude that what Marshall-Hall probably had in mind, when applying for twelve months' leave in August 1898, was the detachment of the Conservatorium from the University. This, had it been successful, could have resulted in an injury to the chair of music, from which it would have taken many years to recover. The great majority of its students were attached to the Conservatorium, and were not pursuing either a degree or a diploma. By 1900 only three had acquired the former, and 23 the latter. So most of them would presumably have continued to study under Marshall-Hall who, therefore, would have been on leave in 1899 only in a very narrow technical sense of the term. He would have been able to consolidate his position so firmly during this period that his successor, who could not have commenced duties until the beginning of 1900, would have been faced with the almost insuperable task of starting a new school of music from scratch, in the face of very strong established competition. And the University would have been left with a very costly chair, attracting only a handful of students.

32 See A. Colquhoun to F. Dickson, 14 April 1899, in _Annals_, p. 95.  
33 See University Calendar 1902, _op. cit._, pp. 365-6; University Calendar 1901, _op. cit._, pp. 361-387.
In the event, the Council saw the trap. At its meeting of 19 August it had instructed its Finance Committee to inquire into and report on the financial condition of the Conservatorium and the Ormond Professor's responsibilities for it. Then, on 5 September, in reply to Marshall-Hall's request for further information, it firmly pointed out that according to Statute 28, the conservatorium is within the University of Melbourne, that the Ormond Professor is director ex officio, that all appointments in the Conservatorium have been made and salaries paid by the Council, and that the work has been carried on in buildings approved by the Council.

and, therefore, 'Professor Marshall-Hall while on leave of absence cannot lecture in the University or its conservatorium'. A 'member of the University', quoted in the Herald next day, was doubtless correct in saying that 'they are afraid to let him continue at the conservatorium during his leave of absence, because they are frightened lest he should take their pupils.'

One rather puzzling aspect of the episode was that, while insisting that 'it must be clearly understood that he is not during his year's absence on full pay, to teach either in the Conservatorium or elsewhere in Victoria', the Council added simply that this 'does not prevent Professor Hall from fulfilling his functions as conductor of the

---

34 MUCMB, 19 August 1898.
35 Ibid., 5 September 1898.
36 6 September 1898.
Melbourne Liedertafel. The implication of this seemed to be that he would not be permitted to continue conducting his orchestral concerts. It is difficult to see why such a distinction was made, since the orchestra did not, any more than the Liedertafel, operate under the aegis of the University. Its conductor was not paid. And the 'teaching' he did in this capacity was in no essential different from that done in connection with the Liedertafel. When the discrepancy was pointed out to Marshall-Hall, he wondered jocularly whether, in the event of a concert involving both the Liedertafel and the orchestra, a 'curtain might be put up to screen the orchestra from seeing my beat and some arrangement might be made for Mr. Siede seeing and repeating my beat to the orchestra'.

The most plausible explanation, perhaps, was that provided by T. Ibsen, Melbourne correspondent of the London Musical Courier, who wrote that the omission was 'so obviously an oversight on the Council's part, that I am surprised to notice it has been interpreted by Mr. Hall's friends to mean that he will not be permitted to organise such [orchestral] concerts'. But, if that was the case, one wonders why the oversight was not rectified when attention was drawn to it in the press. It is hard to believe that it was a

---

37 MUCMB, 5 September 1898.
38 Herald, 6 September 1898.
39 London Musical Courier, 13 August 1898.
40 e.g. Age, 6 September 1898; Herald, 6 September 1898; Sidel, 10 September 1898.
conspiracy hatched by the professor's enemies to induce him to withdraw his leave application in the hope that the Council would then sack him; as his friends on that body also made no attempt to remedy the omission. Perhaps Ibsen was right, and the error was not repaired because it was seen to be immaterial, the prohibition of Conservatorium teaching being clearly the principal stumbling block.

Nevertheless, Marshall-Hall's immediate response was cautious. At the next Council meeting, on 19 September, a letter from him was tabled, asking for time to consider the Council's reply which, he said, "fell short of a full acceptance of my proposal' and sought 'to impose upon me obligations of a new and unexpected character'\(^1\).

The requested was acceded to. But the implication that his proposal had not been accepted 'without variation' was, quite correctly, denied\(^2\). The embargo on teaching during his period of leave may have been 'unexpected', but it was certainly not 'new'. It was simply a reminder of a condition that had long applied to all the professors - to wit, the University's Statute 5, Section 4, prohibiting them from giving 'private instruction'\(^3\). There is no evidence for the Advocate's assertion that it was included

\(^1\)MUCMB, 19 August 1898.

\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Ibid.; University Calendar 1895, op.cit., p.36.
at the instance of the musical profession. Its function was simply to protect the University.

However, a fortnight later, Marshall-Hall withdrew his offer, still contending that the Council had 'virtually rejected' it, and had 'instead made a fresh proposal which it is impossible for me to accept'. His reason was not, of course, as Radic contends, that he would otherwise have been forced to leave the country in order to earn a living, since his leave was to have been on full pay for the whole year.

Nor was the Advocate correct in saying that 'the fighting spirit of the man caused him to withdraw' his leave application. It was simply that he did not relish the prospect of a year's idleness in Victoria, and feared that if he 'left ... under such circumstances it would be open to unscrupulous enemies to report, wherever I went that I had been obliged to fly the country on account of abominable charges brought against me'.

3. The 'Libidinous' Motion

Despite lengthy discussions on 3 October, and again on the 17th, the Council did not reach a solution until the

---

44 27 August 1898.
45 MUCMB, 3 October 1898.
46 Radic, PhD., p.261.
47 24 July 1915.
48 MUCMB, 3 October 1898.
49 Ibid., and 17 October 1898.
14th. At this meeting three motions were put. The first, moved by Dr. Alexander Morrison, was to 'dismiss Professor Marshall-Hall from his office as Ormond Professor of music in the Melbourne University'. It was defeated by twelve votes to four.

The second was moved by the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Henry Wrixon, and called on Marshall-Hall 'to show cause before the Council why he should not be dismissed for such alleged misconduct in his office'. It, too, was lost - by eight votes to seven.

The third, moved by H.B. Higgins, was carried, with twelve votes in favour and four against. It declared that, although Marshall-Hall's 'libidinous' utterances and his 'ostentatious' parade of religious unbelief had rendered him unfit to remain in his post, 'the limited powers conferred on the Council in such a case by the constitution of the University', together with the professor's recognition of 'the grave mistake which he had made', and his pledge 'to abstain from such conduct in future' had persuaded Councillors 'not ... to attempt any further action', apart from intimating 'to him that in the opinion of the Council, it will be impossible to reappoint him when his tenure of five years comes to an end in 1900'.

50 KUCME, 24 October 1898.
The discussion, lasting more than two hours, was held in camera\textsuperscript{51}, and the minute book gives no indication of how individuals voted, or why. But some inferences can be tentatively drawn from the surrounding evidence.

There seem to have been roughly three groups present. One, consisting of four people, who favoured dismissal, and, therefore, probably voted for all three motions. A second, the same size, was opposed to Marshall-Hall’s removal from the University, either then or later, and probably voted against all three. And a third wished to be rid of him, but doubted whether dismissal was within the University’s legal powers, and, therefore, probably voted against Morrison’s motion and in favour of Higgins’. This last group, consisting, if my assumptions are correct, of eight individuals, was divided over Wrixon’s motion, three believing that there was a possibility of framing charges which, when proven, would make dismissal a feasible option, four denying such a possibility, and one abstaining due to indecision. An additional two members abstained from each vote, there having been eighteen present.

There are, of course, evident weaknesses in this reconstruction. Some of the first group, unwilling to compromise, may have voted against one or both of the other two motions\textsuperscript{52}.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.; Argus, 25 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{52} It is unlikely that Morrison acted in this way, he having already previously shown his readiness to compromise by moving the motion to grant Marshall-Hall’s application for leave – see MUCMB, 19 August 1898.
Membership of the groups may have changed during discussion, as the perceptions and opinions of individuals were modified by argument. No one person, apart perhaps from the chairman, University Chancellor, Sir John Madden\(^5\), may have abstained on all three occasions. A number of those who wished to retain Marshall-Hall, and who, therefore, opposed the first two resolutions, may have voted for Higgins' motion, in order to obtain a respite during which passions against the professor might cool (especially if he kept his pledge not to transgress again), and his supporters could rally their forces.

Nevertheless, the voting figures, together with the fact that a fourth option, in the form of a resolution to refrain from any action, was apparently not tried, suggested that at this point a majority of Councillors did not favour reappointment. But those who did were, it seems, able, in conjunction with those who feared the legal cost, to outvote those who were willing to risk the consequences.

The composition of the groups cannot, of course, be determined with any certainty. But, in view of the uncompromising character of their subsequent opposition to

\(^5\)Turnbull incorrectly says that the Chancellor was a non-voting member of the Council, op.cit., p.64. In fact the University Act 1890 (No.MCLI) stated (Section 14) that 'all questions which shall come before the said Council ... shall be decided by the majority of members present', and that 'the Chairman of any such meeting' who was to be the Chancellor if he was present, 'shall have a vote and in the case of an equality of votes a casting vote' - see University Calendar 1900, op.cit., p.18. The last provision was to be of decisive significance in the Marshall-Hall case.
reappointment, the first could well have consisted of Alexander Morrison (mover of the motion), Andrew Harper, Bishop Goe and J.H. MacFarland.

The second probably included Professor Allen, since in June 1900 he expressed the view that Higgins' motion had been 'carried ... improperly'. In 1900 the Presbyterian Messenger said that, of the four opponents of the latter motion, one was no longer a Council member. As Andrew Harper was on the editorial staff of this journal, the report was probably reliable. If so, the individual in question was Dr. James Jackson, a Hobart born Collins Street specialist, who was replaced in January 1900 by Dr. David Grant. This being so, the remaining opponents of Higgins' motion were probably two of Dr. T.F. Bride, Dr. John Williams and R.L.J. Ellery, all three of whom consistently and strenuously supported Marshall-Hall in the battle that ensued.

---

54 Argus, 12 June 1900.
55 22 June 1900.
57 University Calendar 1901, op.cit., p.424. Grant, a graduate of Edinburgh University, had been lecturer in materia medica at the University in the 1880s. See E.F. Russell, The Melbourne Medical School 1862-1962, Melbourne, 1977, pp.72, 93.
58 Bride was librarian of the Melbourne Public Library from 1881 to 1895, when he became curator of deceased estates (A.D.B. 3, 229); Ellery was director of the observatory at Ballarat (moved to Melbourne 1863) from 1853 to 1895 (A.D.B. 4, 135); Edinburgh-born John Williams was, from 1879 to 1904, honorary doctor at the Melbourne Hospital - see Dr Richard Stawell, 'John Williams, Physician to In-Patients August 1879 to November 1904' in The Melbourne Hospital Clinical Reports, Vol.III, No.1, June 1932, pp.1-4.
Sir Henry Wrixon, T.T. a'Beckett and Higgins, being lawyers and subsequent opponents of Marshall-Hall, were probably among those who favoured dismissal but doubted the Council's legal powers. Already in 1896, Higgins had lamented the difficulty of getting rid of a professor for conduct that took place outside the lecture room\(^59\). John Grice almost certainly voted for Higgins' motion, since, when he opted for reappointment, in June 1900, he conceded that he had changed his mind\(^60\). And three—politician and businessman Robert Murray Smith, explorer and student of aboriginal culture A.W. Howitt, classicist and head of Hawthorn Grammar School M.H. Irving, and resident surgeon and Prahran medical officer Dr. Gerald Fetherston—probably also supported Higgins, the other abstaining. The abstention was most likely to have been Fetherston, since he was the only one of the four later to vote for the professor's reinstatement (see below, p.549).

The nature of the perceived legal difficulty was not officially disclosed. The *Presbyterian Monthly*\(^61\), and the *Church of England Messenger*\(^62\) said it was the belief that a professor could not be disciplined for an offence not committed in the actual course of his University duties. And these reports were probably correct, since the former

---

\(^59\) *Argus*, 7 October 1896.

\(^60\) *Argus*, 5 June 1900.

\(^61\) *November* 1898.

\(^62\) *November* 1898.
journal was edited by Andrew Harper, and the latter represented a denomination headed by Bishop Goe, both members of the University Council, who had been present at the meeting in question. Further confirmation is furnished by a motion moved by Higgins and passed by the Council in March 1899, as a direct result of the Marshall-Hall case. It requested the Registrar to draw up a regulation permitting the authorities

after full enquiry [to] suspend or dismiss any professor if in the opinion of an absolute majority of the members of the Council he has been guilty of misconduct, whether in the course, or not in the course of his duties, calculated to injure the University.

This led on 2 October to the passage of an amendment to Statute number five, Section ten, allowing the authorities to discipline a professor guilty of misconduct 'whether in office or otherwise'\(^6\)\(^4\) - which could not, however, affect the current Ormond Professor's position, since he had been appointed under the old regulations.

Perhaps the Mitre was correct in claiming that some anti-Marshall-Hall members also believed dismissal to be illegal, because it would infringe the twenty-third Section of the University Act\(^6\)\(^5\), which prohibited the University from placing any religious disability on any of its officers.

\(^6\)\(^3\) MUCMB, 6 November 1899.

\(^6\)\(^4\) MUCMB, 2 October 1899.

\(^6\)\(^5\) November 1898; see University Calendar 1898, op.cit., p. 19. Turnbull, incorrectly in my view, identifies this as the only reason, op.cit., pp. 36-7.
That no subsequent effort was made to amend this Section was no doubt due to the fact that, in the prevailing liberal-secular climate, it would almost certainly have failed, and could well have resulted in an erosion of support for the anti-Marshall-Hall party, by identifying the latter more closely with the anti-liberal forces of religious bigotry.

So, Marshall-Hall remained in office for another two years, on condition that during that time he would keep his offensive views to himself - or, as Tocsin put it, 'subject to the deprivation of those civil rights enjoyed by every adult in any free country, outside his working hours and in his private capacity'. This hardly supports Radic's description of him as a man determined to 'stand and fight'. The labour journal was a good deal closer to the truth, if somewhat lacking in forbearance for human frailty, when it accused him of having 'such a contempt for Liberty that he airily surrendered freedom of thought, speech and action at the bidding of a Pecksniffery, in order that he might retain his salary'.

4. A Tactical Blunder

So matters remained until 4 June 1900, when the third item on the University Council agenda required members to consider what steps shall be taken in view of the fact that

---

67 8 June 1899.
Hall has been appointed as Ormond Professor of Music will expire at the end of the year.\textsuperscript{68} Since the resolution of October 1898 had, in this regard, been merely an expression of opinion, a firm decision was yet to be made. Discussion began with R.L.J. Ellery moving 'that Professor Marshall-Hall be reappointed to the Ormond Chair of Music at the expiration of his present term of office'. Bishop Goe moved an amendment, seconded by Dr. Morrison, to the effect 'That the election of the Professor of Music be referred to a selection committee in London, and that ... the present holder of the position is not eligible for re-election'.\textsuperscript{69}

Five anti-Marshall-Hall members - Andrew Harper, Sir Henry Wrixon, A.W. Howitt, T.T. a'Beckett and Robert Murray Smith - were absent, presumably believing, in view of the overwhelming support given Higgins' motion in October 1898, that their votes would not be needed. If so, they were wrong. It soon became clear, as Higgins remarked, that 'some members who had voted some years ago against the reappointment [had] changed their minds without letting their fellow members know'.\textsuperscript{70} As a result, the amendment received only four votes - those of Goe, Morrison, MacFarland and Higgins. Opposed were Ellery, Bride, Grice (who had

\textsuperscript{68}\textit{Leader}, 9 June 1900; \textit{Argus}, 5 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{69}\textit{MUCMB}, 4 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{70}\textit{Argus}, 5 June 1900.
seconded Ellery's motion\textsuperscript{71}, William Thwaites, Dr. John Williams, Professor H.B. Allen and Dr. Grant. Dr. Fetherston was present but did not vote\textsuperscript{72}.

As those who voted against the amendment, all revealed themselves in the subsequent six months of wrangling to be firmly and unwaveringly in favour of reappointment, there can be no doubt that, had Ellery's motion then been put, it would have been carried. Once passed, it is not likely to have been rescinded at a later, better attended, meeting, since by then an offer would have been made to Marshall-Hall, and its withdrawal would have amounted to a breach of contract, avoidance of which was, as we have seen, an overriding motive (Martin's condition 6) with some of the professor's enemies.

But Dr. MacFarland argued that it should first be ascertained whether Marshall-Hall would 'accept the position at the reduced salary, if it is reduced, inasmuch as the [Ormond] endowment is not bringing in as much as at the time of the last appointment'. It would, he pointed out, be 'very awkward' if the professor was re-appointed and then refused to take a reduced remuneration. 'We should wait, concluded MacFarland, 'until we receive an application from him.'

Accepting this, Professor Allen moved 'That the question be referred to the Conservatorium Committee to report to

\textsuperscript{71} MUCMB, 4 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid.
the Council after conferring with Professor Marshall-Hall. This Committee, consisting of R.L.J. Ellery and J.H. MacFarland, was to make the financial conditions clear to him and to elicit from him (but not as a condition of reappointment) a renewal of his pledge not to embarrass the University with any further offensive utterances. The motion was passed unanimously - a serious tactical blunder on the part of Marshall-Hall's supporters.

It is difficult to say whether MacFarland, in raising the question at this point, was acting in good faith. Did he merely wish to ensure that Marshall-Hall understood and accepted the financial position, before an offer was made to him, so that the University did not unwittingly bind itself to paying him for the next five years at the old rate? Or, given the purely fortuitous character of the temporary majority enjoyed by the professor's friends, was he playing for time, so that a whip could be organised and community opinion mobilised?

---

73 Ibid.; Argus, 5 June 1900.

74 See e.g. Marshall-Hall to University Council, 16 June 1900, in MUCRCF, 1900/40.

75 Argus, 5 June 1900.

76 Ibid.; MUCMB, 4 June 1900.

77 Turnbull is incorrect in saying that Ellery's motion was not put on this occasion due to the Vice-Chancellor's ruling it out of order (op.cit., p.41). In fact the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Henry Wrixon, was not present at this meeting, which was chaired by Dr. Alexander Morrison (MUCMB, 4 June 1900).
He, of course, denied the latter allegation. But the force of this denial is weakened by the fact that no alteration in the professor's contractual conditions of employment was contemplated at this time.

It is true that the £20,000 Ormond benefaction had fallen a victim to the depression. On 4 August 1889 the sum had been lent at five per cent per annum interest for five years to a soft drinks manufacturer, Evan Rowlands, on the security of two city properties in King and Lonsdale Streets, valued at a total of £31,395.6.8. However, by 1893 Rowlands, like many others, was in trouble, and, after having his land revalued, the Council declined to extend the loan for another five years on the same terms. Instead, an agreement was reached whereby he would pay back £1000 at once and the remainder in yearly instalments of £1500, finishing in 1906.

By the end of 1899 (the only relevant year for which figures are available), when Rowlands' estate still owed £10,000, the other £10,000 had been reinvested by the Council in various amounts with the Bank of Victoria at 3, 4 and 4½ per cent; the Board of Works at 3½ and 5 per

---

78 Argus, 26 June 1900, 28 June 1900; Herald, 19 June 1900.
79 'Epitome of a Mortgage' in MUCRCF, 1890/9.
80 A.C. Brownless to Messrs. Bennett, Attenborough and Nun, 10 July 1888, in MUCLB, 3,235.
82 MUCRCF, 1893/11.
83 'Statement of Account of the Ormond Chair of Music from first January to 31st December 1899' in ibid., 1900/1.
cent; and the E.S. and A. Bank at 4 and 4½ per cent; and in government inscribed stock at 3 per cent. That is to say, earnings had manifestly fallen.

But the conditions under which the professor was employed had not changed. Nor was any change now proposed. The Conservatorium Committee informed him on 6 June that, if reappointed, his salary would continue to be the income earned by the investment 'less whatever sum may be required for the ordinary expenses of the chair', provided that, if any money from students' fees was left over 'after the payment of all necessary and incidental expenses in connection with the Conservatorium', the Council could use it to augment the Ormond interest paid to him, up to an annual maximum of £1000.

This is in no essential different from the offer he had accepted in August 1895, namely that 'the amount of his

---

24 The figures available are confusing. The total sum adds to £13,354 and was distributed as follows: £689 on deposit at the Bank of Victoria; £1000 in government inscribed stock; £2068 on fixed deposit at the Bank of Victoria at 4½ per cent; £4980 in Board of Works debentures at 3½ and 5 per cent; £2782 on fixed deposit with the Bank of Victoria at 3 per cent; £835 6.6 on Terminable Deposit in the E.S. and A. Bank; £1000 in Board of Works debentures at 3½ per cent, ibid. But it is not clear whether some sums appear twice, having perhaps been reinvested during the year. Also, the total might include money collected for the funding of scholarships, and some interest not yet expended.

25 Conservatorium Committee report in MUCRF. Miscellaneous Papers Box M.N. folder marked 'Music Ormond Professor 1887'; see also MUCMB, 25 June 1900.
salary would depend on the revenue derived from the endowment of £20,000'. On that occasion, it had been explicitly stated that, although he had to date always received £1000 a year, this 'sum could not be guaranteed for another term of five years, as the rate of interest is now much lower than it was five years ago'. The surviving records show that he was paid £900 in 1899 and £750 in 1900. It is difficult to see, in the light of this, what legitimate function MacFarland's motion could have served. Even if a substantive change in conditions had been contemplated, there was nothing to stop the Council from passing Ellery's motion of 4 June with that proviso – making the offer, that is, conditional on the acceptance of new terms.

Yet, none of this amounts to a conclusive case against MacFarland. The implications of his intercession on 4 June clearly did not occur to Marshall-Hall's friends at the meeting, although the point (that no significant change in conditions was envisaged) was made several times during the discussion – by Ellery (twice), Sir Henry Wrixon, and Dr. Bride. It is quite possible, therefore, that MacFarland, too, was quite oblivious at the time of the importance of his action.

---

86 Argus, 6 August 1895.
87 Statement of Account of Ormond Chair of Music ..., 1899’, loc.cit.
88 MUCME, 4 June 1900; Argus, 5 June 1900; Turnbull is wrong in saying that under the new conditions Marshall-Hall was asked by the Conservatorium Committee to accept a reduction of £50 (from £800 to £750) in his annual income - loc.cit., p.41.
89 MUCME, 4 June 1900; Argus, 5 June 1900.
5. The Meeting with the Conservatorium Committee

Be that as it may, opposition was soon mobilised. Two days after Marshall-Hall's meeting of the 6th with the Conservatorium Committee, a letter from Professor Andrew Harper, who had been unable to attend the Council meeting of the 4th, appeared in the Argus, strongly protesting at what had been decided.

Then, on Saturday the 9th, a meeting, called by Alexander Deepe, of heads and representatives of leading schools and colleges\(^90\), was held at the Assembly Hall, Collins Street, under the chairmanship of the Rev. T. Keogh, rector of St. Patrick's College (chosen, perhaps, to emphasise the non-sectarian nature of the movement). Those assembled recorded an 'emphatic protest against the proposed reappointment of Professor Marshall-Hall to the Ormond Chair of Music', and requested the University Council to 'delay taking further action towards that end in order that time may be allowed for an expression of public opinion'. The Council was further asked to 'fix a date for receiving a deputation representative of the schools and colleges in the colony'.\(^91\)

At the following Monday's Council meeting, Professor Allen and Dr. Bride, sensing danger, urged rejection of this last request. To 'ask the public which way we are to exercise our power and vote,' warned Bride, 'will be a great mistake'

\(^90\) Argus, 11 June 1900.

\(^91\) Argus, 11 June 1900.
and an ominous precedent. Thus, he introduced what was to be a recurring, and, on occasions, very important contra-
pointual theme in the controversy that followed - namely, the question of by whom the University was to be managed. In
the end, it was agreed, on Higgins' motion, to meet the deputation a week hence, John Grice giving notice of a counter-deputation that would interview the Council on the same day.

At this point, a protest was received from Marshall-Hall to the effect that the University authorities were breaking faith by giving heed to an attempt to persuade them 'to go back upon an honorable understanding' entered into at the meeting of 4 June and formalised by the Conservatorium Committee two days later. In part, at least the substance of his complaint was arrant nonsense. The Council meeting in question had not, as Marshall-Hall now claimed 'formally resolved not to advertise for applicants'. Nor, Goe's amendment having been lost, was 'Mr. Ellery's motion that I be reappointed the only other course logically possible'.

All that had happened was that an amendment, calling for the chair to be advertised and disqualifying the present

\[92\] Argus, 12 June 1900.

\[93\] MUCMB, 11 June 1900; Argus, 12 June 1900.

\[94\] Marshall-Hall to Council, 16 June 1900 in MUCRCF, 1900/40; see also MUCMB, 25 June 1900.

\[95\] Herald, 21 June 1900.

\[96\] Marshall-Hall to Council, 14 July 1900 in Melbourne University Pamphlets, Vol.1, No.25.
incumbent, had been defeated. This had left a number of options available. The position could have been advertised, for example, without any qualifying conditions. Or it could have been offered to somebody else without advertisement.

Nor is it likely that Marshall-Hall was accurately representing what had occurred when he claimed that, at its meeting with him on the 6th, the Conservatorium Committee had 'told me that the Council had instructed them to make me what practically amounted to an invitation to express my willingness to accept a renewal of office', and had given him to understand 'that the matter was settled, and that when the Council received a communication, they would, as of course, make the formal appointment.\(^{97}\)

Dr. MacFarland, one of the Committee members, strenuously denied this. Being 'aware of the fact that the committee had no power to come to an arrangement with the professor,' he informed an interviewer, 'I took special pains to let him understand that we were only placing the position before him, so that he might resolve what he should do'.\(^{98}\) MacFarland's version is borne out by the Committee's report, presented before Marshall-Hall's protest was lodged, and saying that the Committee had 'set forth in general terms to him the salary, tenure and duties of the Ormond Chair of

---

\(^{97}\) Marshall-Hall to Council, 16 June 1900, in MUCRF, M1900/40.

\(^{98}\) Herald, 19 June 1900; see also Argus, 7 August 1900.
Music and communicated to him the message from the Council "that before deciding with regard to his reappointment the Council desired a communication from him".\(^99\) (emphasis mine). That is to say, the Committee did not regard the decision as having already been made.

In compliance with this request, five days later Marshall-Hall wrote to the Council saying he had been 'requested ... to state ... whether, under the inevitably modified arrangements, I was desirous of continuing to occupy my present position. I beg to answer in the affirmative.'\(^100\) Once more, and contrary to the legend that has turned him into a fearless and determined champion of academic freedom, he expressed his readiness 'for the sake of my musical work here', to 'fall in' with the policy which deemed 'it inexpedient that Professors shall publicly give voice to their private opinions on matters outside of their special subjects when such opinions are likely to embarrass the Council'.\(^101\)

No doubt, it was true, as Marshall-Hall affirmed, that, during the meeting with the Committee, a 'long conversation' had taken place 'over the future of the Conservatorium, as

\(^99\) Conservatorium Committee report in MUCR Miscellaneous papers Box M.N. Folder marked 'Music Ormond Professor 1887'; see also Council Minute Book 25 June 1900; Ardua, 12 June 1900.

\(^100\) MUCMB, 25 June 1900.

\(^101\) Marshall-Hall to Council, 11 June 1900, in MUCRCF 340/40; see also MUCMB, 25 June 1900.
to how it would go on &c., and both members of the Committee warmly shook hands with me at parting, and the chairman [Ellery] heartily congratulated me. MacFarland conceded as much. Nor did he deny the Ormond Professor's claim that he (MacFarland) had done most of the talking at the meeting, and had dictated to the Committee's secretary, F. Dickson, part of a proposed letter of application, which he then 'handed ... to me and asked me to incorporate the substance of it in my letter to the Council.'

But shaking hands with a prospective applicant, helping him to write his letter of application, discussing with him the future of the institution that he wishes to head, even (under these circumstances) congratulating him, are not the same as offering to appoint him. Nor, surely, was such an interpretation confirmed, as Marshall-Hall claimed, by the opening paragraph of the Committee's report, written by MacFarland, and stating that the Committee had

---

102 Marshall-Hall to Council, 16 June 1900, in MUCRCF 1900/40.
104 Ibid.
105 Marshall-Hall to Council, 14 July 1900, in Melbourne University Pamphlets, Vol.1, No.25; see also MUCMB, 28 June 1900; actually Marshall-Hall gave two accounts of this episode. One had MacFarland writing part of the application 'with his own hand' (Argus, 19 June 1900). The other had him dictating it to Dickson (Argus, 7 August 1900). MacFarland confirmed the latter version (Argus, August 1900); the letter in question survives in the University records and though signed by Marshall-Hall, is in his handwriting, MUCMB, 25 June 1900.
set forth in general terms to him the salary, tenure, and duties of the Ormond Chair of music, and communicated to him a message from the Council that before deciding with regard to his re-appointment the Council desired a communication from him. 106

Marshall-Hall argued that had MacParland regarded the matter 'as still open to question' he would have alluded here, not to 'his re-appointment' but simply to 'an appointment'. 107 Now, it is perhaps true that the latter expression would have carried more unequivocally the implication that no particular appointee had been fixed upon. But it is absurd to assert that the same interpretation is precluded, or rendered implausible, by the words that were, in fact, used. The phrase, 'before deciding', had already made it clear that the issue was yet to be resolved.

Equally unconvincing was Marshall-Hall's characterisation of another part of the Committee's report as making sense only on the assumption that it was intended at the time to re-engage him. This was the passage that said,

for the sake of clearness, and to avoid any doubt or ambiguity as to the meaning or interpretation of the provisions of the Statutes concerning the Ormond Professor of Music, the Committee recommend that those provisions [i.e. conditions of employment] be removed from Statutes No V (The Professors), and form part of the Statutes No VI (The Ormond Professor of Music) ... If I am to be re-appointed [Marshall-Hall argued] it might be urged that there is a "doubt or ambiguity" as to whether I would

106,107 Herald, 21 June 1900.
be the first or second Ormond Professor, and therefore whether I would hold office for five years or life. But there is nothing to make "clear". There is no "doubt or ambiguity" if it is contemplated to appoint any other person. He would necessarily, by the statutes, hold office for life.

There is, however, nothing in the statutes, or anywhere else in the recorded deliberations of the Council, which foreshadows such a change. It is true that the Section to which the Committee was referring (Section 3 of Statute V) said that 'the tenure of the first Ormond Professor of Music shall be limited to five years'\textsuperscript{109} (emphasis mine). But it certainly did not follow that subsequent appointees would hold the post for life. Nor would transferring this Section from Statutes No V to Statutes No VI in any way make it clear whether Marshall-Hall, if reappointed, would be the first or second Ormond Professor. He, himself, had been reappointed for a further five years in 1895, as was his successor in 1900\textsuperscript{110}, 1905\textsuperscript{111}, and 1910\textsuperscript{112}. When R.L.J. Ellery was asked on 4 June whether the intention of his motion was to secure the professor's reappointment for a further five year period, the reply had been 'Of course yes'\textsuperscript{113}. The Conservatorium Committee report, two days

\textsuperscript{108}Herald, 21 June 1900; see also Marshall-Hall to Council, 25 June 1900, in MUCMB, 25 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{109}University Calendar 1899, \textit{op.cit.}, p.34.

\textsuperscript{110}University Calendar 1901, \textit{op.cit.}, p.41.

\textsuperscript{111}\textit{Ibid.}, 1905, p.12.

\textsuperscript{112}\textit{Ibid.}, 1910, p.17. The University had employed no other professors on limited contracts.

\textsuperscript{113}\textit{Ibid.}, 9 June 1900.
later, said it had been made clear to him that the tenure would be 'limited to five years.' And in July, when the Council made some routine changes in the regulations concerning the chair of music, the five year tenure was left undisturbed.

It is true that in 1900 a number of the professor's enemies claimed that, if he was re-engaged, it would not be for five years but for life. But there was no warrant for such a contention, which was advanced, presumably, to strengthen the anti-Marshall-Hall case by suggesting implicitly, as Andrew Harper did explicitly, that 'then he would have no motive for keeping quiet.'

It was, nevertheless, assumed on all sides after, and as a result of, the Council meeting of 4 June, that Marshall-Hall would be reappointed. The only Councillor subsequently to deny it was Alexander Morrison, who declared that,

---

114 MUCR, Miscellaneous Papers Box M.N. folder marked 'Music Ormond Professor 1887'; Argus, 25 June 1900.

115 MUNCH, 16 July 1900.

116 See e.g. report of schools and colleges meeting of 3 June 1900 in Argus, 11 June 1900; Andrew Harper in Argus, 26 June 1900; Sir Henry Wrixon in ibid.

117 Argus, 26 June 1900.

118 e.g. 'A Christian' in Herald, 16 June 1900; A. Leeper to E.F. a'Beckett, 16 June 1900, in MUCRF 1900/40; William Morris to University Council, 16 June 1900, in ibid.; Rev. Mother Icreto Abbey to E.F. a'Beckett, 13 June 1900, in ibid.; Outpost, 14 July 1900; Tocsin, 7 June 1900; Leader, 16 June 1900; Tribune, 9 June 1900; Punch, 7 June 1900; Expositor, 29 June 1900; Advocate, 9 June 1900; Presbyterian Messenger, 15 June 1900; Australian Christian Worker, 22 June 1900; Table Talk, 7 June 1900.
had he been of that opinion at the time, he would have filibustered in order to adjourn the meeting until more members could be present.\textsuperscript{119} When Goe's amendment was rejected, 'it was,' declared Dr. T.F. Bride, 'practically agreed to accept Professor Marshall-Hall if he would accept the tenure, if he should understand what the salary would be, and if he would give an undertaking not to embarrass the Council again.'\textsuperscript{120} Even MacFarland had 'assumed (wrongly as it turns out) that the majority of the Council were against us, and that Professor Marshall-Hall would be re-appointed.'\textsuperscript{121}

So, Marshall-Hall was probably reporting accurately when he said 'Not only in the way the [Conservatorium] committee approached me but in everything they said and did, they led me to conclude ... that it was understood that I should be re-appointed.'\textsuperscript{122} But they did not make him what amounted to an offer of re-employment.

This is clear from the professor's own failure subsequently to seek redress in the courts, having, no doubt, been discouraged therefrom by his legal advisers, Professor Harrison Moore and J.E. Mackey. Their view was clearly shared by two of the legally trained pro-Marshall-Hall

\textsuperscript{119}Argus, 7 August 1900.
\textsuperscript{120}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{121}Outpost, 14 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{122}Marshall-Hall to University Council, 14 July 1900, \textit{MSUCS}, 16 July 1900.
Councillors, Dr. T.P. Bride and Judge Hood, who agreed that neither the Council nor its Conservatorium Committee had bound the university to reappoint\textsuperscript{123}. What clinches the argument is that, when Marshall-Hall appealed to R.L.J. Ellery\textsuperscript{124} and F. Dickson\textsuperscript{125}, who had been present on the occasion, to corroborate his version of what had occurred, both remained conspicuously silent.

In the event, Ellery's motion was not put until 25 June, when the pro-Marshall-Hall party sustained its first serious setback. There were nine votes in favour and nine against, the former consisting of R.L.J. Ellery, Dr. Fetherston, Dr. T.P. Bride, John Grice, William Thwaites, Judge Hood, Dr. John Williams, Professor H.B. Allen and Dr. David Grant; and the latter of Sir Henry Wrixon, Dr. Alexander Morrison, Dr. J.H. MacFarland, Professor Andrew Harper, Judge T.T. a'Beckett, H.B. Higgins, Bishop F.F. Goe, Robert Murray Smith and A.W. Howitt\textsuperscript{126}. Then the Vice Chancellor, who had a casting, as well as a deliberative vote, gave it to the ayes, and declared the motion lost\textsuperscript{127}.

\textsuperscript{123}\textit{Argus}, 7 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{124}Marshall-Hall to University Council, 16 June 1900, in MUCRCF 1900/40.

\textsuperscript{125}\textit{Herald}, 21 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{126}MUCMB, 25 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{127}\textit{Ibid.}: Weekly Times, 30 June 1900; Section 14 of the University Act 1890 said that the chairman of any Council meeting 'shall have a vote and in case of an equality of votes a casting vote', see University Calendar 1898, op.cit., p.17 - it may be argued that, by convention, casting votes should uphold the status quo. Even then Wrixon cannot necessarily be said to have erred, since the status quo
In view of the closeness of the division, the motives of individual opponents of the motion are manifestly of great importance. Any one of them could have swung the decision in Marshall-Hall's favour simply by abstaining. Evidence has already been presented (see above pp.62-66) to show that six of them - Goe, Morrison, Harper, Murray Smith, MacFarland, and (with, however, significant reservations, yet to be considered) Wrixon - were of distinctly Hebraic temper. They would, therefore (with, again, some important qualifications in respect to the Vice-Chancellor), have been acting inconsistently with their beliefs had they supported him. What actuated a'Beckett is not clear, and is best left for discussion at a later point. Murray Smith also will require further consideration.

6. Some Puzzling Cases

What is known of Howitt does not illuminate the part he played. His parents, English Quakers, had moved in literary and artistic circles, numbering, inter alia, Wordsworth, Dickens, Millais and Holman Hunt among their acquaintances. He, himself, does not seem to have had any deep religious commitment. His childhood was spent in a family where, according to his biographer, 'unlike other Quaker households,'
no strict rules of living were imposed.\textsuperscript{129} As a young man in Melbourne during the 1850s he delighted in balls, and smoked and drank without qualms - recalling one occasion when he and some friends had 'made ourselves as jolly as sand boys with brandy, sherry and claret.\textsuperscript{130} And he seems to have been unrepentant at having 'scandalised' the 'righteous people' of St. Kilda, when they perceived him 'sitting on a sand hillock sketching while they were bound for church'.\textsuperscript{131} Although his chief friend in Beechworth in the 1870s had been a Presbyterian minister (R.K. Ewing)\textsuperscript{132}, and although he was subsequently to work fruitfully and harmoniously with anthropologist-clergyman Lorimer Fison, he felt uncomfortable with the 'black coated tribe', in general, declaring them to be 'not much in my line'.\textsuperscript{133} He found it difficult, he explained, to 'talk to members of the clergy without coming into contact with their prejudices'.\textsuperscript{134} Yet, while a member of the University Council, he consistently cast his vote against Marshall-Hall.

At least as puzzling was the part played throughout this conflict by H.B. Higgins, who never faltered in his opposition to reappointment, but left no record of his reasons.

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., p.17.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., p.70.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., pp.73-4.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., p.185.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., p.181.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., p.185.
Although the son of a Wesleyan minister135, who, according to Nettie Palmer, Higgins' niece, had brought him up in an 'atmosphere of high moral expectations', forbidding him any book on Sunday but the Bible136, and although he was a close friend of J.H. MacFarland137 and had married Alexander Morrison's niece138, he was no supporter of Habraism. He had long since discarded his early religious beliefs139, and was against any expansion of religious instruction in State schools140 and any effort to impose Sunday observance on the community141. In the late nineties he played a leading role in opposing the recognition of the deity in the preamble to the Federal constitution142, and fought hard to include a clause preventing State and Commonwealth alike from making 'any law prohibiting the free exercise of any Religion ... or imposing any religious test or observance'143.

135 Punch, 15 February 1900.
137 Ibid., p.82.
138 Table Talk, 13 May 1892; Palmer, op.cit., p.106.
139 Blainey, A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne, op.cit., p.47.
140 Tocsin, 26 July 1900; Spectator, 14 July 1899.
141 Ely, Unto God and Caesar, op.cit., p.50.
142 Alma Mater, May 1897.
143 Ely, Unto God and Caesar, op.cit., p.55; see also Southern Sentinel, April 1898.
Nor was he one to violate his principles from motives of personal expediency. He had appeared in Melbourne on a platform with the Redmond brothers\textsuperscript{144}, and had openly opposed both the Boer War and the Federal Constitution Bill - all actions which could, and some of which, in view of his defeat in the Legislative Assembly election of 1900\textsuperscript{145}, apparently did, injure his professional and/or political prospects. It is not surprising, then, that some bewilderment was expressed when it was found that, with respect to Marshall-Hall’s reappointment, ‘the liberal-minded Mr. H.B. Higgins’\textsuperscript{146} had aligned himself ‘on the side of morality-mongering Goe’\textsuperscript{147}.

Perhaps he was actuated (possibly unconsciously) by personal spite. But the evidence is flimsy, to say the least. There is no warrant for Radic’s claim that Marshall-Hall had ‘repeatedly held [Higgins] up to ridicule’\textsuperscript{148}. All we have is an unconfirmed story in the Outpost to the effect that the Ormond Professor had once interrupted a diatribe of Mr. Henry Bournes Higgins M.L.A. - when that honorable gentleman was mauldering to the University Council about the duties of the Ormond Professor of music - by telling the Vice-Chancellor that

\textsuperscript{144} Palmer, \textit{op.cit.}, p.90.
\textsuperscript{145} Advocate, 10 November 1900.
\textsuperscript{146} Outpost, 9 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{147} Tocsin, 7 June 1900.
"if that gentleman is going on talking all night like this I am going home".\textsuperscript{149} It may be, if this account is true, that Higgins' subsequent opposition to reappointment was in part an act of revenge, but the inference is clearly tenuous. It is not even known when the supposed incident took place.

Or perhaps, in spite of having cast off the greater part of his youthful Hebraic inheritance, he had retained an extreme sensitivity in regard to sexual matters, and was, accordingly, offended by Marshall-Hall's verse. In 1912 he was to support a movement in the Council to dismiss, or expel, the editor of \textit{Speculum}, the medical students' journal, for publishing a number of indecent items\textsuperscript{150}. But this material was of a far more explicitly crude, indeed, smutty character than anything that had appeared in Marshall-Hall's books.

John Rickard suggests that Higgins drew a distinction between 'sexuality ... expressed in the imagery of comradeschip', as it appeared in the work of Walt Whitman, one of his favorite poets, and the 'kind of explicit sensuality' which he found reflected in some of Shakespeare's sonnets, and 'with which he was not comfortable'. It was the latter kind, Rickard hazards, that disturbed him in Marshall-Hall's verse. The trouble with this is that Rickard has not shown that it was the bard's 'explicit sensuality' that worried Higgins, but only the homosexual overtones of some of the

\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Outpost}, 14 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{150} \textit{Speculum}, September 1912.
sonnets. Rickard is perhaps on safer ground when he says that Higgins may also have been actuated, in part, by a distaste for the frivolity of Marshall-Hall's verse and for 'the professor's romantic enthusiasm for war', as well as by a belief that his 'ostentatious parade' of religious apostasy endangered the University's neutrality. But it is hard to accept the additional implication that he was less inclined to favour reappointment because, being 'not greatly interested in music itself', the professor's 'achievements ... meant less for him than for others'. In fact, he was very conscious of the value of Marshall-Hall's contribution to the University's musical studies. This is clear (ironically, in the light of later events) from a remark he made, at a University Senate meeting in October 1894, when, arguing in favour of five year contracts for professors, he said that in 'the case of the Chair of music [the only such chair at the time] a man had been obtained for five years who would not have been bettered under a life appointment'.

Finally, Rickard could also be right in suggesting that this was a time when Higgins 'was increasingly preoccupied with his own position as a political rebel', he might well have felt ... unwilling to risk another breach

---

152 Ibid., p.158.
153 Ibid.
154 Argus, 3 October 1894.
with his establishment friends', especially with MacFarland and Morrison. But it is also possible that he was influenced by expediency, not on his own account, but on that of the University, whose material fortunes he may have seen as bound up with the outcome of the affair. As part of the general retrenchment prompted by the depression, the Government grant to that institution had been reduced between 1892 and 1895 by nearly thirty per cent - from £17,250 to £12,250, £1000 of which was restored in 1898.

The Marshall-Hall controversy coincided with determined efforts on the Council's part, to recover the rest. In 1899 an additional £1000 was secured (which, however, was substantially less than the £2313 that had been asked for). And in December 1900 a request for a further £3000, as well as a special capital grant of £10,000, was lodged with the Premier.

Marshall-Hall's enemies did not scruple to make threatening use of these circumstances to increase their pressure on the

---

156 *Alma Mater*, January 1901; *Argus*, 7 July 1896.
157 *Herald*, 14 August 1898.
158 *Age*, 7 February 1899; MUCMB, 19 November 1900.
159 MUCMB, 24 July 1899.
160 University Lecturers to Council, 31 August 1898, in MUCRCF 1898/22.
Council. 'The University exists by virtue of grants of public money,' one of them declared, 'It desires a heavy increase in the grant - a heavy increase which it ought to obtain - but there is an unwritten condition to all these grants that the body receiving them should earn the confidence of the public.' Another reminded its readers that the University had been established and is sustained by act of Parliament and the Public funds for the higher education of the people ... let those among the supporters of ... Mr. Marshall-Hall beware lest the public recognition be so violated, and its confidence in the University and its staff so shaken as to lead to serious loss to that institution.

Bishop Goe, referring to the 'long and somewhat bitter conflict' over the Ormond Chair, told Councillors that 'in view of the fact that the University was hopeful to receive certain financial assistance it would be well to leave as little cause for offence and dispute and bad feeling as they possibly could.' The Argus warned that legislators might be reluctant to increase the funding of 'a body rent by internal dissensions and disgraced by ignoble partisanship' over the Ormond Professor. 'The community at large,' the same paper reminded Councillors, 'is the paymaster of the University', which 'may forfeit public respect as a result of the controversy, and find itself in quarrel with

162 Argus, 10 December 1900.
163 Argus, 9 July 1900.
164 Age, 11 December 1900.
165 26 December 1900.
its natural allies. And in the same context, the spectator drew attention to the fact that

The University of Melbourne is not on the same footing as the ancient seats of learning in the old country. These have their endowments, and receive nothing from the public purse. But the income of the Melbourne University is derived from government grants, which are voted every year and can be increased or diminished, or entirely withheld, at the will of the Parliament which represents the people of Victoria.

The fact that there had already been talk of raising the matter in parliament (in August 1898) may have heightened Higgins' (and, indeed, other Councillors', including, perhaps, Howitt's) nervousness on this score.

In much the same way, he (and they) may have been influenced by the assertions that reappointment would amount to a subversion of Francis Ormond's intention in founding the chair, and, therefore, was not calculated to induce others to endow the University.

Such material considerations could also, at least partly, account for the strange behaviour of Sir Henry Wrixon.

166 29 June 1900; see also Southern Cross, 30 November 1900, 14 July 1900.

167 29 June 1900.

168 i.e. this was the declared intention of T. Smith M.L.A., see Argus, 10 August 1898; but although the House was in session at the time, and Smith was present, speaking, inter alia, on the Maffra Beet Sugar Company Bill on the 11th (V.P.D., Vol.88, p.840), the matter was not referred to.

169 R. Gillespie in Argus, 26 June 1900.

Wrixon's Hebraic credentials, although significant, were not impeccable. He had been President of the Victorian Education League, which sought to defend the secular character of the State schools. And during the debate on the Shiels divorce bill he had made the extraordinary suggestion that its provisions might be made available only to people who had been married by a registrar.

It is consistent with my general argument, then, that he was less than totally committed to getting rid of Marshall-Hall. At a Council meeting of 22 December 1900, he suddenly suggested that the musician should remain as director of the Conservatorium, but not as professor of music. This would not have achieved the end of protecting students from his supposedly maleficent influence, but Wrixon might have perceived it as a possible means of retaining Marshall-Hall's pedagogical services without endangering the University's funding. In which case, it was the latter consideration, rather than religious or moral inducements, which constituted the Vice-Chancellor's overriding motive — satisfying Martin's sixth condition.

Finally, the closeness of this vote also highlights the importance of two factors, already discussed in another context, namely, Marshall-Hall's diphtheria and the death of
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171 Australasian Schoolmaster and Literary Review, 1 October 1906.
172 Outpost, 9 February 1901.
173 Herald, 22 December 1900.
Bismarck. These, as previously argued (see pp.372-378), represent occasions rather than causes of the outbreak. Had they not occurred, it is still likely, given Marshall-Hall's temperament and beliefs, his personal situation and the nature of the community in which he lived, that sooner or later he would have made this speech or one like it. But, at another time, the composition of the Council may have been different and, while conflict would still have been intense, the outcome may not have been the same.

7. The Council Elections

Be that as it may, Radic is wrong in saying that, after the loss of Ellery's motion of 25 June, 'the fight was over'. On the contrary, Marshall-Hall's friends were far from ready to concede defeat. When, at the next Council meeting, on 2 July, MacFarland tried to move a motion, calling for applications for the chair, and ruling Marshall-Hall ineligible for appointment, Dr. Bride successfully objected that the mandatory seven days' notice had not been given. His motive seems clear enough. The resignation from the Council of A.W. Howitt, who had voted against the Ellery motion, was shortly to become effective. This meant that, at the next meeting, the Marshall-Hall party would be in a majority of one.

174 'A Man out of Season: G.W.L. Marshall-Hall'.
175 Argus, 3 July 1900; Leader, 7 July 1900.
176 c.f. Presbyterian Messenger, 6 July 1900.
Yet when members reassembled on the 16th, they passed MacFarland's motion after he had withdrawn the disqualifying clause. They did not take the opportunity provided by their accidental majority to defeat the motion outright, and put Ellery's motion again. And the most likely explanation is that they did not believe they would be successful.

The 'Marshall-Hall party' in the Council was not as cohesive as some commentators seemed to think. Dr. Fetherston had already abstained in the division over Goe's amendment on 4 June, and was soon to vote with the musician's enemies (see below, pp. 607-608). His support of the Ellery motion may have been due more to a perception that failure to re-engage the professor would be unjust in view of the impression given him by the Conservatorium Committee than to a conviction that the interests of the University would be best served by reappointment.

The revelation on 11 July that Marshall-Hall had recommended his students to read Tolstoy's Kreutzer Sonata (see above, p. 284) may have been enough to persuade him of the musician's unsuitability for the post. Accordingly, he might have signalled his intention to vote for MacFarland's motion once it had been divested of its contentious

---

177 Namely, 'that the Council had decided not to re-appoint the present occupant of the Chair' - MUCMB, 16 July 1900.

178 E.g. Presbyterian Messenger, 6 July 1900.
disqualifying clause. It was probably to him, then, that the Southern Cross was referring, when it said on this occasion, 'we believe at least one member. of that [i.e. the Marshall-Hall] party declined to maintain the fight'.

In addition, the impending election of a Councillor to replace Howitt is likely to have influenced Ellery's supporters against taking the risk of putting his motion again, since, if it were to be once more negatived, electors may have come to feel that the professor had had sufficient chances, and that their responsibility was now to close the case by voting for an anti-Marshall-Hall candidate.

In the event, there were two nominees for the vacancy, E.H. Sugden, Master of Queen's College, and Hickman Molesworth, a judge in the Insolvency Court. The outcome was a victory for the former by the narrow margin of 218 votes to 216. Radic is, however, incorrect in saying that this showed the majority of graduates were in favour of Marshall-Hall's reappointment. For a start, she is disregarding the fact that members of the University Senate, who comprised the constituency, had to have higher

179 20 July 1900.

180 MUCRCF, 1900/11.

181 Weekly Times, 15 September 1900.

182 MUCMB, 2 October 1900.

183 Radic PhD, p.271. The assertion is repeated in slightly weaker form by Turnbull, who says, 'Sugden's victory seemed to reflect a view among University graduates that the standing of the professor had gone far enough', CB.Cit., p.49.
degrees - masters or doctorates - and, moreover, had to be male. The University Calendar for 1901 lists a total of 963 graduates who were not members of the Senate - although it is not clear how many of these were still living.

It cannot even be said that a majority of Senators voted for the Marshall-Hall candidate, since 73 of the 507 who were eligible failed to vote at all. Perhaps, as Table Talk suggested, this was partly because the 'time between nomination and voting is so long', that many simply forgot all about it. Sugden had been nominated on 16 July, and Molesworth on the 27th. The election, however, did not take place until 14 September.

Nor does the result necessarily reveal voters' preference with respect to the Marshall-Hall conflict. The election, it is true, was widely canvassed as having as its sole, or central issue the reappointment of the Ormond Professor, with 'the alumni of this centre of learning [divided] into

184 University Calendar 1895, op.cit., p.15; Argus, 6 December 1898.
186 Argus, 3 March 1900; the 1901 Calendar lists 576 (op.cit., pp.344-360). The discrepancy may be accounted for by deaths.
187 20 September 1900.
188 Note in MUCRF, 1900/11.
189 Argus, 15 September 1900.
two parties, the one for the re-appointment and the other against'.

Furthermore, Molesworth was everywhere proclaimed as the anti-Marshall-Hall candidate. A meeting of Senators who supported him called for his election on the ground that 'the reappointment of Professor Marshall-Hall ... would exercise a disastrous influence upon the moral tone of the schools and colleges of the colony'.

And Sugden, although claiming to be neutral, was commonly represented as desiring the professor's reappointment, or, at least, as being 'the victim of unconscious and invincible bias in favour of Mr. Marshall-Hall'. He had, voters were reminded, 'already appeared as a public advocate of Professor Marshall-Hall', when 'his famous letter' absolving the musician of offensive behaviour in class (but not, as Turnbull asserts, arguing for reappointment).

Austalian Christian World, 13 September 1900; see also e.g. Argus, 2 July 1900; Southern Cross, 20 July 1900, 6 July 1900; Punch, 2 July 1900; Presbyterian Messenger, 6 July 1900; Table Talk, 5 July 1900; British Australasian 9 August 1900; Leader, 7 July 1900.

e.g. Argus, 5 July 1900; Outpost, 28 July 1900; Age, 7 July 1900, 3 July 1900.

Argus, 5 July 1900.

Argus, 4 July 1900; Southern Cross, 6 July 1900.

Southern Cross, 20 July 1900; see also e.g. Argus, 11 July 1900; Presbyterian Messenger, 24 April 1900.

Argus, 5 July 1900.

Southern Cross, 13 July 1900, 20 July 1900.

had appeared in the *Argus* on 18 June 1900. In addition, it was repeatedly pointed out that reappointment was desired and aimed at by the gentlemen who have induced Mr Sugden to come forward.\(^{198}\)

But to conclude that the result reflected majority support for Marshall-Hall is, among other things, to disregard the fact that, while the majority of Senators probably believed that Sugden was committed to the Marshall-Hall side, some did not. Some (and it need not have been many) did accept at face value his (as I shall argue, perfectly sincere) assurance that he had an open mind on the matter, and, if elected, would, 'after hearing the evidence and arguments on both sides, and considering the qualifications of any other candidates who may apply ... give my vote according to justice and in the best interests of the University and the Conservatorium of Music'.\(^{199}\) The inference, he added, that this vote, when given, 'would necessarily be in favour of Professor Marshall-Hall is my opponents' not mine'.\(^{200}\)

This is likely to have appealed to voters who were, themselves, undecided on the question. One such was Stephen

\(^{198}\) *Argus*, 5 October 1900; see also e.g. *Argus*, 10 July 1900, 13 July 1900, 14 July 1900, 7 July 1900; Southern Cross, 13 July 1900, 20 July 1900; Rev. S.G. McLaren in *Argus*, 10 July 1900.

\(^{199}\) Sugden to members of his election committee, 9 July 1900 in Hince papers, *loc.cit.*, 2691, Box 10, University Scrap Book; see also *Argus*, 4 July 1900.

\(^{200}\) *Argus*, 12 July 1900.
Thomas, who, having no strong views on the Marshall-Hall case, declared himself willing 'to delegate to a highly educated, broad-minded, and conscientious member of our body, the power of deciding for us on the facts, and considerations that may be made before him as a member of the Council.\textsuperscript{201} In similar vein, an anonymous correspondent (not, however, known to be a Senator) asked the pro-Molesworth \textit{Southern Cross}, 'Are you quite fair to Mr. Sugden? He says he will not pledge himself to vote either for or against Mr Marshall-Hall. What more could he do? He takes an impartial position as he ought to do.'\textsuperscript{202} Even the fiercely Hebraic \textit{Spectator} believed that 'Mr Sugden, if elected, will sit as a representative of Queen's College, and while he has, he ought to have, a free hand, he will doubtless give due weight to the views of his constituency.'\textsuperscript{203} (a reference to the anti-Marshall-Hall stand taken by the College Council\textsuperscript{204}).

There were, after all, people with mixed feelings about the Marshall-Hall affair, just as there were people who did not fit easily into either the Hebraic or the Hellenic categories. It is important, in this connection, that the claim commonly made by the professor's opponents - that all the facts had been before the Council in October 1898, when

\textsuperscript{201} \textit{Argus}, 9 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{202} \textit{Southern Cross}, 20 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{203} 6 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{204} Queen's College Council Minute Book, 14 August 1900, in Queen's College Archives; see also \textit{Argus}, 16 August 1900.
the 'libidinous' resolution was passed, and that there was no new evidence to consider, and, therefore, no justification for reserving judgment - was not universally accepted. Some, like A.R. Stephenson, while condemning 'the fury of Professor Marshall-Hall's attacks upon ministers of religion' argued that the subsequently published 'splendid ethical essays of his in the "Alma Mater"' should also be taken into consideration. Others, including perhaps Dr. Fetherston, felt that honour demanded a more thorough investigation of what had passed during Marshall-Hall's meeting with the Conservatorium Committee on 6 June 1900. Others again, as shown earlier (pp.109-111), believed that the fulfilment of his pledge not to repeat his offence during the remainder of his term of office was a relevant consideration.

What was involved here was an important matter of principle, namely, the precise status of the University Council in dealing with the case. This was logically distinct from the question of whether the professor should be reappointed. But it could materially have influenced voting in this election.

Marshall-Hall's opponents claimed that the Council was acting purely as an executive body, 'like the directorate of

\(^{205}\) e.g. Argus, 11 June 1900; Presbyterian Messenger, 29 June 1900.

\(^{206}\) Argus, 11 June 1900; i.e. the series entitled 'The Essential in Art'; see also Herald, 27 August 1898.

\(^{207}\) e.g. Alma Mater, July 1900.
a bank or like the Cabinet in the political sphere. Its function, that is, was to pass judgment on facts already before it. His supporters, on the other hand, agreed with Professor Harrison Moore, who saw the governing body as 'engaged in an administrative duty to be performed in a judicial way, and governed by similar, though perhaps not identical, rules as to justice and fair play as those which govern proceedings in courts of justice.'

The question had already arisen in June 1900, when Marshall-Hall expressed surprise to see that certain members of the Council, who are also my judges, have identified themselves with my accusers outside the Council, seeing that as members of the Council, it is their duty to decide as to the justice and relevancy of the very charges they themselves have helped to formulate.

In particular, he cited the extra-conciliary opposition of Professor Andrew Harper, Dr. Alexander Morrison,
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208 Andrew Harper in Argus, 2 July 1900.
209 See e.g. Argus, 11 July 1900; E.B. Hamilton in Argus, 6 July 1900; Presbyterian Messenger, 29 June 1900; A. Harper in Argus, 27 June 1900; S.G. McLaren in Argus, 28 June 1900; E.B. Hamilton in Argus, 29 June 1900.
210 Argus, 28 June 1900; this was not merely a matter of expediency with Harrison Moore - advanced because it suited his side of the Marshall-Hall case. Already in June 1898 he had published an article on 'Executive acts ... which consist in putting the law into operation and enforcing it', and in which the power 'is discretionary in character, to be exercised when it appears expedient in the public interest'. In it he had argued that, even when the act in question 'is to be exercised in the first instance, with regard to the public interest and only secondarily with regard to an interest of private concern ... the proceeding ceases to be wholly executive or administrative; it draws to it some of the character of the judicial. In other words, the administrative duty must be exercised in a judiciary way. If it is not, the proceeding itself will be voidable'. In such a case, he continued, the judging body 'must not be accuser and judge' (Summons, June 1898).
Dr. J.H. MacFarland and Bishop Coe. His concern was shared by (among others) the Outpost, which opined that, had their tremendous bias remained hidden in the minds of the judges, no protest could have been entered ... but when the biased judge, perceiving that his influence on the Bench will not suffice to ensure a conviction, stoops to take the role of prosecutor, he can hardly expect to disarm suspicion in a nation which is still shuddering at the memory of Jeffries and the Bloody Assize.

That is to say, the Council was not regarded as a court, in which even concealed bias on the part of the judges is objectionable - but as a body carrying out a similar function, and, therefore, to be governed by similar, not identical conventions.

It is true that this turned out to be a two-edged weapon, inasmuch as Marshall-Hall's friends on the Council had also acted as outside advocates for his cause. Professor Allen, particularly, it was pointed out, had signed a pro-Marshall-Hall manifesto, drawn up by his fellow professors.

This, however, does not affect the contention that some of the votes cast in the election may well have reflected, not support for Marshall-Hall's reappointment, but a belief
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211 Marshall-Hall to University Council, 16 June 1900, in MUCRCF, 1900/40.

212 Outpost, 7 July 1900; see also e.g. H.B. Allen in Argus, 3 July 1900; Alma Mater, August 1900; Outpost, 20 June 1900.

213 Presbyterian Messenger, 29 June 1900; see also e.g. A. Harper in Argus, 2 July 1900; E.B. Hamilton in Argus, 25 June 1900; W.E. McCutcheon in ibid.
that further evaluation of evidence and argument was required before a verdict could honorably be reached. Such a view is likely to have favoured Sugden, who had made a point of denying that he could honorably and justly take my seat in a Council which may have to try a man for his professional life, after giving a pledge to the prosecuting attorney to find him guilty no matter what evidence might be brought in his favour. 214

One voter who was clearly impressed by this argument was A.R. Stephenson. If the facts were found, declared the latter, to be 'as clearly against the Professor of music as those which induced the Council's past resolution, we need have no doubt of Mr. Sugden's decision'. But, while there remained some doubt, his 'claim to form judgement, after the fullest possible evidence, seems fair and necessary'. 215

Yet it does not follow, as contended by the Presbyterian Messenger, that, because some who voted for Sugden were undecided on the Marshall-Hall question, 'if the senate were polled for and against Mr Marshall-Hall's reappointment, it would decide against him by a very considerable majority'. 216 or, indeed, by any majority at all. For one thing, this ignores the possibility that some electors voted for the wrong candidate by mistake - that is to say, in terms of

214 Sugden to his election committee, 9 July 1900, in Hinch papers, loc.cit.
215 Argus, 11 July 1900.
216 21 September 1900; see also Southern Cross, 21 September 1900.
Martin's condition 7, they may not have known how to perform the action they believed would satisfy their situational motivation. In view of the closeness of the result, this could have been critical. Not all of them lived in Victoria, and not all will have followed developments with the same close interest and attention to detail as the leading participants.

Two circumstances probably caused some confusion: the fact that Sugden was a Methodist clergyman and head of a University College may have misled those who were aware that Marshall-Hall had offended the churches, but did not realise that the Master of Queen's was out of step with the majority of his denomination and calling. The likelihood of such an error was no doubt increased by the resolution passed by the Queen's College Council in June 1900, demanding Marshall-Hall's removal from the University.\footnote{217}

A similarity between the names of two of the prominent participants in the affair further muddied the waters. They were Mr. James MacFarlan, secretary of Sugden's election committee, and Dr. John MacFarland, Master of Ormond, and a staunch Molesworth supporter. The latter's name was occasionally given in the press as 'MacFarlane'.\footnote{218} And Table Talk did not help matters by reporting that a number of voters mistook 'J. MacFarlan M.A., L.L.B., who is the

\footnote{217}{Queen's College Council Minute Book, 15 June 1900, \textit{ibid.}}

\footnote{218}{e.g. Australian Christian World, 25 June 1900; \textit{British Australasian}, 9 August 1900; \textit{Herald}, 23 March 1900; \textit{Precocium}, April 1886.}
Rev. E.H. Sugden's secretary for the approaching election', for 'J. MacFarlan, M.A., L.L.D., Master of Ormond College, who had taken a prominent part in opposing the re-appointment of Professor Marshall-Hall'. The article went on to say that an elector is [sic] an adjacent college wrote by mistake to Dr. MacFarlan of Ormond promising his hearty support of Mr. Sugden, and giving vent pretty freely to his candid and unflattering opinion of those who opposed the Ormond Professor of Music. 219

Shortly afterwards the same journal compounded its original error by blandly informing its readers that 'Dr. MacFarland or Ormond was scrutineer for Principal Sugden' 220.

Then again, it is of the utmost importance to the present inquiry that the Marshall-Hall case was not the only issue in this election. Nor, for all electors was it the most important one. It is a dangerously procrustean exercise to endeavour to force this election to fit Martin's paradigm, by supposing that the overriding motive (condition 6) of all voters was the reappointment or removal of the Ormond Professor.

In fact, there was much lamentation that the matter had intruded itself at all, thus encouraging Senators to subordinate 'all other questions and interests of the University to a temporary dispute concerning an individual' 221.

219 9 June 1900.
220 27 September 1900.
221 T.G. Tucker in Argus, 2 July 1900.
Many of us [T.G. Tucker drily informed Argus readers] do not regard the University of Melbourne as consisting solely of the Ormond Professor Music and his "case" .... A member of Council is elected for five years, and not to serve a special occasion or in a special question.\(^{222}\)

In like vein, Alma Mater heartily wish[ed] that the Marshall-Hall case had been definitely settled before now, so that it should not have entered as a disturbing element into this election .... Our contention [continued the writer] is that a member should be returned to the Council on his general merits [and] it will be a matter of regret if in response to a passing clamour, an inferior candidate is elected .... The truth is that the Senate should choose a candidate who is likely to represent it most wisely during his whole term of office.\(^{223}\)

Table Talk reminded Senators that a 'Councillor ... holds his seat for five years', and objected to the 'fierce attempt' that was being made to decide the claims of these ... candidates to the high honours of a seat on the University Council by the single issue - How will each vote if the lamentable Marshall-Hall case came again for discussion to the Council.\(^{224}\)

James Barrett urged them to return a candidate who was 'best fitted by knowledge and training to deal dispassionately with the various questions which arise', rather than one who had merely pledged himself 'to a particular course of action with respect to some detail largely irrespective of other considerations'.\(^{225}\)

\(^{222}\) July 1900.
\(^{223}\) July 1900.
\(^{224}\) 30 August 1900.
\(^{225}\) Note in Hince papers, loc.cit., 2691.
Senators were even 'threatening to abstain from voting' because of the narrowness of the issue.\textsuperscript{226}

But those who did vote are likely, if they felt this way, to have favoured Sugden. The latter had protested against 'an election for a seat which is to be held for five years being decided entirely by reference to a candidate's pledge as to one particular question.'\textsuperscript{227} While Molesworth admitted that he had only been asked to contest the vacancy because of Sugden's pro-Marshall-Hall letter in the Argus of 18 June 1900.\textsuperscript{228} 'I have been assured,' said the Master of Queen's, 'that if I will pledge myself to oppose Mr. Marshall-Hall all opposition to my election will be at once withdrawn.'\textsuperscript{229}

Many of his supporters,\textsuperscript{230} as well as a number of his opponents,\textsuperscript{231} agreed that, apart from the Marshall-Hall case, he was eminently qualified for the position; while not one of those campaigning against him denied Charles Bage's assertion that 'Judge Hickman Molesworth's claims are based solely on his attitude with regard to the Marshall-Hall

\textsuperscript{226} Argus, 5 July 1900; see also e.g. Argus, 9 July 1900; Orme Masson in Argus, 3 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{227} Argus, 12 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{228} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{229} Argus, 4 July 1900.

\textsuperscript{230} e.g. Orme Masson in Argus, 6 July 1900; Charles Bage in Argus, 6 July 1900; Alma Mater, July 1900; Table Talk, 30 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{231} e.g. Australian Christian World, 13 July 1900; Robert Butler in Argus, 11 July 1900.
dispute. The Methodist Spectator declared that, in the absence of the Ormond Professor, Sugden's 'election would have been a matter of course and everybody would have been delighted by it. And that this was true of at least two influential Molesworth supporters, Andrew Harper and J. Lawrence Rentoul, is indicated by the backing both had given to Sugden when he had unsuccessfully stood for a previous vacancy in March 1892, for which Harper had nominated him.

This is not, however, to say that the Marshall-Hall affair was the only issue in the election. Any attempt to interpret the outcome must also take into account a number of important cross currents, not the least of which was an issue that had long been a source of strife in University politics, namely, that of whether professors and heads of University Colleges should be members of the Council. Sugden's own defeat at the hands of Dr. John Williams in 1892 had been hailed as 'a signal triumph for the progressive party opposed

\[232\] Argus, 6 July 1900.
\[233\] 6 July 1900.
\[234\] Nomination form, and printed paper dated 29 March 1892 from Senators recommending Sugden's election, in MUCRF 1892/8.
\[235\] See e.g. Argus, 16 March 1886, 3 March 1891, 17 March 1891, 23 March 1891, 20 January 1898, 17 March 1890, 4 May 1892, 4 March 1891, 20 March 1891, 7 December 1897, 13 February 1886; Melbourne University Review, 5 August 1887, 30 March 1889; Table Talk, 6 May 1892, 5 November 1886, 29 October 1886; Herald, 13 June 1900; Australasian Schoolmaster, September 1886; Melbourne University Senate Minute book, 10 July 1889, in MUCR; Arg, 19 March 1889.
to the nomination on the Council of such inevitably partisan representatives as professors and heads of colleges.\textsuperscript{236}

That the issue was still very much alive in 1900 is clear from the Leader's observation, in July of that year, that a large section of the Senate is strongly opposed to collegiate and professorial representatives on the University Senate [sic], and though many of these members are in sympathy with Mr. Marshall-Hall, they cannot support the candidature of the master of Queen's College without a sacrifice of their principles.\textsuperscript{237}

The Leader, itself, while favouring reappointment declared that a Molesworth victory 'may not be unsatisfactory if it strikes a blow at the vicious practice of inculcating in the Council of the University those who have interests of their own to serve'.\textsuperscript{238} Table Talk, too, believed that the election was 'being made a battle ground' to decide the question of College representation, and, although this journal also supported the Ormond Professor, it warned that if 'the college influence predominates, it will not be long before the undenominational character of the university will be lost if they are allowed to dominate the administration'.\textsuperscript{239}

Some, no doubt, voted for Sugden because he was a College Head. This is likely to have been particularly true of

\textsuperscript{236} Table Talk, 6 May 1892.
\textsuperscript{237} July 1900.
\textsuperscript{238} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{239} 20 July 1900.
Methodists and others with an attachment to Queen's. Such people, moreover, would have been influenced by the Spectator's argument that since the 'other two Colleges are represented on the Council, ... the third College also should have a representative there.' 240 Although the Warden of Trinity was not actually at this stage a member, his College was represented in the person of the Anglican Bishop of Melbourne; while Ormond was represented by three members of its governing body, namely, Dr. J.H. MacFarland, Dr. Alexander Morrison, and Professor Andrew Harper. 'Unless the Senate is prepared to say that an undreamed of power is to be placed in the hands of one College,' maintained Alma Mater, with reference to the last three, 'it cannot consistently object to Mr. Sugden's candidature.' 241

The fact that the retiring member, Howitt, was on the Council of Queen's College 242 would have reinforced this argument, even, to an extent, in the minds of voters who believed in principle that College connection should disqualify a candidate from University government. The latter group could have been further influenced in favour of Sugden on this occasion, by the Master's pledge, if elected, 'to resign my seat and submit myself for re-election solely on this issue', provided the current representatives of Ormond were prepared to do likewise 243.

240 6 July 1900.
241 July 1900.
242 See e.g. Queen's College Council Minute Book, 14 August 1900, loc.cit.
243 Sugden to his committee, 9 July 1900, loc.cit.
Further evidence of the importance of this issue emerged in the second Council election of 1900. This resulted from a vacancy caused by the retirement of M.H. Irving\(^{244}\), whose letter of resignation was actually written (in London) on 6 June. But Sir Henry Wrixon ruled that it had been wrongly addressed - to the Vice-Chancellor instead of the Chancellor - and, therefore, could not be accepted. An election, Wrixon decreed, could not be called until the seat had become vacant by effluxion of time, on 1 September\(^{245}\). Technically, the ruling may have been correct, since Section 8 of the University Act 1890 said a member's seat became vacant if (inter alia) he 'by writing under his hand directed to the Chancellor of the University resign'\(^{246}\). But, especially as the Chancellor, Sir John Madden, was on leave, it is difficult to believe that Wrixon would have invoked a legalistic quibble, had he not been tactically bent on delaying an event which, had it favoured a Marshall-Hall candidate, could have resulted in the Ormond Professor's re-instatement.

Two candidates nominated - Alexander Leeper\(^{247}\), Warden of Trinity, and Dr. James W. Barrett\(^{248}\). In July the latter received a note from Professor Orme Masson, expressing pleasure at his candidacy, and saying, 'you will have,
I think, [the votes of] all Sugden's men plus the Nanson-Bride contingent.\textsuperscript{249} This was clearly a reference to Dr. T.F. Bride and Professor E.J. Nanson, who, although champions of the Marshall-Hall cause, did not, apparently, together with their 'contingent', vote for Sugden. Both were known to oppose the seating of professors and College heads on the University Council. Accordingly, both had supported Dr. S.D. Bird in an electoral contest in 1889 with Professor Henry Laurie, President of the Professorial Board\textsuperscript{250}. Bride had been prominent among the Master of Queen's opponents when the latter was defeated by Dr. Williams in 1892\textsuperscript{251}. And Nanson had acted as chairman of William H. Irvine's electoral committee, when Irvine unsuccessfully contested a seat with Professor Allen in January 1898. On the latter occasion Nanson had warned that if Allen won, 'the way will have been paved for the return to that body of the head of Trinity College'\textsuperscript{252}. It is, no doubt, significant that neither of them appears in a list of Senators, now in the Kenneth Hince collection of the National Library, Canberra, who had

either enrolled themselves on Mr. Sugden's committee, or have requested that their names should be added to the requisition asking that gentleman to consent to be

\textsuperscript{249} Masson to Barrett, 10 September 1900, in Hince papers cutting book marked 'University', Box 10, loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{250} Voting list in Mrs. Ormond's scrap book, p.20, loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{251} Printed letter of support for Williams, 2 April 1892, in Sugden scrap book 1,131, loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{252} Argus, 8 January 1898; see also Argus, 18 January 1898, 10 January 1899, 22 January 1898.
nominated for the seat on the University Council rendered vacant by the retirement of Mr. Howitt.253

It seems likely, then, that they, and some who thought like them, either abstained altogether in this election, or voted for Molesworth - and then for Barrett, despite their feelings about Marshall-Hall.

Nevertheless, Nanson's prophecy was fulfilled in the second election, held on 2 November 1900, Leeper winning by the bigger margin of 246 votes to 217254. This might indicate, as the Presbyterian Messenger believed, that 'the longer the members of the Senate consider the matter the less they like the appointment of the egregious Professor.'255

It might even signify that the majority of voters had been of this view from the beginning. Although Barrett, like Sugden, declared himself to be 'neither for nor against Professor Marshall-Hall',256 and to be 'utterly incapable ... to state what action I should take ... until the matter comes before me and the evidence is forthcoming',257, his protestation carried less conviction than that of the Master of Queen's. The latter had never explicitly argued for reappointment, whereas Barrett, as J.H. MacFarland was quick

253 2691, Box 10, University scrap book, loc.cit.
254 Argus, 3 November 1900.
255 Argus, 9 November 1900.
256 Argus, 14 July 1900; see also statement by Barrett to Senate Members in Hince papers, loc.cit.
257 Argus, 16 July 1900.
to point out, had, on 6 June, signed a memorial to the University Council hoping that 'you will be able to find a modus vivendi by which the colony will be saved the loss of so distinguished a man.' Thus, in the absence of a plausible uncommitted candidate to attract voters without strong views on the matter, the second election result may constitute a more accurate measurement, than the first, of the real division of opinion over the Ormond Professor's future.

Or it, too, might represent a determination, on the part of many, to elect a long term representative rather than a mere delegate, whose value was confined to his opinion on this one, temporary issue. Leeper is likely to have been considered preferable to Barrett in this respect, having been closely associated with the University for nearly thirty years as a college head and erstwhile Council member. Even the pro-Marshall-Hall Arena conceded the Warden's superior qualifications as 'an educational expert', and admitted that, apart from his support for Marshall-Hall, Barrett was 'so obviously less qualified to fill the seat.'

On the other hand, the result may well indicate that the constituency, which in the eighties and early nineties had generally opposed College heads and professors sitting on

---

258 *Argus*, 14 July 1900.
259 *Church of England Messenger*, 1 November 1900.
260 13 October 1900.
the Council, had now altered its opinion. This is borne out by Professor Allen's overwhelming victory (by 219 votes, to his opponent, W.H. Irvine's 142) in January 1898.

Leeper, himself, had changed his mind on the matter, having previously supported the Nanson-Bride view. And there may have been a significant number of Senators who, like W.L. Bowditch, voted for Leeper and Sugden in 1900, because they wished 'to see on the Council of the University all the heads of the affiliated colleges and at least an equal number of professors.'

Moreover, Leeper's greater majority may also partly reflect a conviction on the part of some who, having expressed their opposition to the seating of College heads on Council by voting for Molesworth, now felt that it would be unfair to exclude the Warden of Trinity, when the other two Colleges were represented by their heads. Anglicans, especially, are likely to have been influenced by the argument of the Church of England Messenger that 'As Dr. MacFarland and Mr. Sugden, the masters of Ormond and Queen's Colleges ... have a seat on the Council, it is at least reasonable to expect that the Warden of the senior affiliated College should also have a seat.'

261 Vide defeat of Hearn in 1886 and Sugden's defeat in 1892.
262 Official election result in MUCRCF 1892/8; see also Argus, 22 January 1898.
263 Outpost, 21 July 1900.
264 Argus, 12 July 1900.
265 1 November 1900.
Some, whose paramount concern it was to advance the interests of the latter institution, may previously have been induced to vote for Sugden, by Orme Masson's reminder that his opponent had made 'persistent efforts in the Church of England Assembly a few years ago to wreck our Trinity College.'\textsuperscript{266} This presumably referred to a motion moved by the Judge in the former body in 1887 (and later withdrawn) to the effect that, in view of

the state of the church funds, and the many calls thereon, ... no payment out of church funds, either by way of gift, loan, or otherwise, shall be made to Trinity College after the 31st Dec, 1887, without the sanction of this assembly previously obtained.\textsuperscript{267}

Although it had received £21,594 from the Church, Molesworth subsequently asserted by way of explanation, the College had sent only ten men into the ministry in the previous sixteen years\textsuperscript{268}.

Here Martin's sixth condition - that the agent had no overriding motive - is of obvious importance. While some friends of Trinity probably accepted Canon Potter's view that, with respect to this election, 'primary Morality' was 'a matter of greater moment' than the survival of a University College\textsuperscript{269}, others of paler Hebraic hue may not have seen it that way, and may have voted for Sugden and then Leeper - which would help to account for the latter's bigger majority.

\textsuperscript{266} Argus, 3 July 1900; see also Argus, 6 July 1900.
\textsuperscript{267} Trinity College Calendar, 1897, p.64.
\textsuperscript{268} Unidentified newspaper cutting in E.H. Sugden scrap book, 1,74, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{269} Argus, 7 July 1900.
Professional rivalry could also have played a significant role. There had, for some time, been concern about the number of legal men, especially judges, on the Council. In 1891 the *Daily Telegraph* opposed Judge Hood's candidacy on the grounds that 'the legal profession is already quite adequately represented on the governing board of the University.' In 1896 *Champion* had wondered 'how a bench will be constituted in the event of an appeal', in view of the fact that 'so many Judges have been or are members of the University Council.' And in August 1900 *Table Talk* said that it had 'been urged, and fairly, that as nearly one third of the members of the Council are legal men, it would be desirable to introduce some new blood.'

At that time, there were five practising lawyers serving on the body - Sir John Madden, Sir Henry Wrixon, H.B. Higgins, T.T. a'Beckett and Joseph Henry Hood - three of whom were Judges. And this may well have cost Molesworth votes. At the same time, however, *Table Talk* also claimed that 'Quite a number of members of the University Senate ... object to the election of clerical persons to the governing body of a secular institution such as the university is meant to be' - which, if true, would not have helped Sugden.

---

270 *Argus*, 4 March 1891.
271 16 March 1891.
272 8 August 1896; see also 'C' in *Argus*, 7 July 1900.
273 30 August 1900.
274 5 July 1900.
Similarly, the fact that Barrett was a medico may have influenced voter behaviour. Dr. Williams' 1892 victory over Sugden was reportedly helped by strong support from 'the graduates on the medical side'.\(^{275}\) While, in January of the following year, the medical members of the Senate had held a meeting at which it was decided to nominate Dr. James Jackson for a Council vacancy.\(^{276}\) In 1900 Barrett may have attracted the votes of medical men chiefly on professional grounds. On the other hand, the pro-Marshall-Hall Arena argued that 'It will be a blow to the University if Dr. Barrett is elected, for medical men have far too much weight in the Council already'.\(^{277}\)

Another factor clearly requiring consideration was the conspicuous role played in the anti-Marshall-Hall movement by the colony's private schools. It was felt by some, at least, of the musician's enemies that, because the denominational schools 'contribute a large element to the University's strength and prestige'.\(^{278}\) the occupant of the chair of music should be 'one who has the confidence more particularly of those who have the education of our youth in their charge'.\(^{279}\)

\(^{275}\) Argus, 4 May 1892.

\(^{276}\) Argus, 30 January 1893.

\(^{277}\) 13 October 1900. There were, in fact, only four on the governing body at the time - Drs. Fetherston, Williams and Grant, and Professor Allen - all pro-Marshall-Hall men.

\(^{278}\) PPCM, November 1898, Appendix p. Ixxxii.

\(^{279}\) Southern Baptist, 28 June 1900.
When Bishop Goe's amendment, disqualifying Marshall-Hall from re-engagement, was defeated in the Council on 4 June 1900, a meeting of heads and representatives of leading schools and colleges was called on the 9th to protest. It passed a motion objecting to the proposed reappointment and, at a subsequent meeting, selected a deputation, consisting, not as Radic claims, of 'heads of schools and colleges', but chiefly of members of the governing bodies of these institutions - including a small minority of heads (in the ratio of 16:5) - which met the Council on the 18th.

In addition to claiming to represent the University Colleges, the 'public Schools, and nearly all the boys' private schools in Melbourne, it presented protests from the bigger schools

---

280 Argus, 11 June 1900.
281 Radic PhD, p. 264.
282 It consisted of James Aitken, a member of Scotch College Council; G.E. Blanch, head of Melbourne Church of England Grammar School; J. Redford Corr, head of Methodist Ladies' College; Dr. Crowther, head of Brighton Grammar; J. Gavan Duffy, representing St. Patrick's College; R. Gillespie, a member of Presbyterian Ladies' College Council; David Ham, member of Methodist Ladies' College Council; E. Harcourt, Treasurer of ibid.; T.C. Harwood, member of Geelong Church of England Grammar School Council; L.H. Linden, head of Geelong Church of England Grammar School; Rev. Alexander Marshall, chairman of Scotch College Council; A. Leeper, G.W. Rusden and Judge E.G. Hamilton, Warden and members of Trinity College Council; the Hon. William Anderson, Donald McKinnon and Charles Guthrie, members of Ormond College Council; Rev. William A. Quick, Walter B. McCutcheon and E. Wason Nye, members of Queen's College Council; and Rev. Canon Goodman, member of Geelong Church of England Grammar School Council - see Argus, 19 June 1900, 12 June 1900; Alexander Marshall to P.F. a'Beckett, 18 June 1900 in MUCRCF 1900/40.
283 MUCMB, 18 June 1900.
in Ballarat, and from eighty girls' schools and colleges in Melbourne and Geelong. Its secretary, Alexander Leeper, asserted that, of the large number of teachers who had communicated with him on the matter, only one had favoured Marshall-Hall. As well as this, separate protests were made by the Loreto Convent, the Councils of Melbourne and Geelong, the Church of England Grammar Schools, Wesley College, the Presbyterian and Methodist Ladies' Colleges, the Provisional Council of the Church of England Girls' Grammar School, and a meeting of the heads of eight private schools in Ballarat.

The importance of all this for the two Council elections of 1900 lies in the substantial pre-existing hostility of a

284 Ibid.
285 Argus, 19 June 1900. This may have been J. Henning Thompson of Kew High School who, in July, chaired a meeting of Sugden's supporters in the Senate - Argus, 4 July 1900.
286 MUCMB, 18 June 1900.
287 Argus, 13 June 1900.
288 Argus, 16 June 1900.
289 Argus, 14 June 1900.
290 Argus, 12 June 1900, bellying Kathleen Fitzpatrick's claim that the school 'has always been remarkably free from religious bigotry', op. cit., p. 22.
291 M.L.C. Executive Committee Minute Book, 14 June 1900, loc. cit.
292 William Morris to E.F. a'Beckett, 16 June 1900, in MUCRCF 1900/40.
293 Argus, 18 June 1900.
section of the community to these same private schools. They had already attracted considerable animosity in respect of their alleged pedagogical incompetence and sweating practices. In addition, they were seen as exerting too much control over University entrance requirements. And during the eighties and nineties, a number of attempts had been made to transfer jurisdiction over the Matriculation examination from the Council and Senate, where school administrations were relatively powerful, to the Professorial Board, where they were not.

Marshall-Hall, himself, had engaged in a public controversy with the Principal of the Presbyterian Ladies' College, the Rev. S.G. McLaren, in which the latter had attacked the professor for the high failure rate in Matriculation Music. This may even have played some part in producing the storm of scholastic opposition to him at the end of the nineties, although the denominational and Hebraic connections of the schools in question, and the evident desire of the denominations themselves to assume a low profile in the dispute, are probably explanation enough.

---

294 Orme Masson in Argus, 12 August 1897; Argus, 9 October 1896; Tribune, 23 June 1900; Outpost, 23 June 1900; 'Justice' in Herald, 4 July 1900; unsigned letter in Argus, 12 July 1900; T.G. Tucker in Argus, 2 January 1895; Alma Mater, July 1900.

295 Melbourne University Review, 26 May 1888, 3 December 1887, July 1891; Australasian Schoolmaster, June 1892; Argus, 6 May 1891.

296 Argus, 6 January 1896.

297 e.g. report of McLaren's speech at Senate meeting of December 1898 in Argus, 30 November 1898; Bishop Goe in Argus, 19 June 1900.
Ill-feeling towards these schools undoubtedly reinforced support for the Ormond Professor, whose champions often coupled their defence of him with more general denunciations of the educational institutions. Thus, 'MA' (presumably a member of the Senate) insisted that, until 'the control of the matriculation examination is handed over to the Professorial Board ... it will remain as it is today, an incubus on true education in Victoria', adding that for 'years the schoolmaster interest had dominated the University Council', and that 'the men who farm their schools and grind down their ill-paid teachers should be the last to speak evil of one who sets them so noble an example of duty as Professor Marshall-Hall'. The Outpost declared that the 'petty pedagogues of the private schools', who had 'been at such unnecessary pains ... to advertise their abhorrence of Professor Marshall-Hall', would 'have been much more worthily employed in devising some means of preventing the sweating of teachers prevalent in suburban Dotheboys-Halls and kindergarten crèches [sic]'. The Tribune alleged that Marshall-Hall's schoolmaster enemies were 'for the most part ... shamefully neglecting their duty to their pupils and paying utterly inadequate salaries to their assistant teachers'. They should, declared the writer, emulate the Ormond Professor's 'enthusiastic devotion to duty and utter unselfishness ... before they cast a stone at him'.

298 Alma Mater, July 1900.
299 16 June 1900; see also 23 June 1900.
300 23 June 1900.
compared 'the esteem in which the Professor is held by all
who benefit so much by his tuition' with that 'in which
principals of schools are held who offer their governesses
one shilling and sixpence a week to teach and set a moral
example to their pupils'.

These participants in the debate had, no doubt, noted
with satisfaction Marshall-Hall's own remark that it was a
good thing that

our schools are the last places in the world
to which our youth turn for light and under-
standing, otherwise they would grow up mentally
akin to those monstrosities which I remember
with a dim horror upon the tables of boarding-
houses and which go by the name of resurrection
pies.

All this, moreover, may well have swayed some Senators,
who had no strong opinions about the Professor's reappoint-
ment as such, to give their votes to Sugden and Barrett, as
opponents of the schoolmaster interest in this particular
instance. Others, for the same reason, will have voted
for Sugden in the first election and Leeper in the second,
since the Warden was known generally to favour a reduction
of schoolmaster influence in University government.

Among the latter group was W.L. Bowditch, who argued that
any 'real progress in secondary education in Victoria is
inextricably bound up with the handing over of the conduct

301 Herald, 4 July 1900.
302 Alma Mater, June 1900.
303 e.g. Senate debate in Bohemia, 14 August 1890.
of the matriculation examination to the Professorial Board',
the chief obstacle to which, he believed, was 'the University Council - which for long years past has allowed itself to
be dominated by the selfish schoolmaster interest'. He,
therefore, conceiving it to be 'a plain duty to record [his]
vote ... upon quite different issues than the Marshall-Hall
case', intended 'to give my votes to Dr. Leeper and
Mr. Sugden'.

Finally, interpretation of the results of these elections
is further complicated by the likelihood that there existed
a group of Senators who had (or believed they had) reason
to fear the practical consequences of publicly supporting
Marshall-Hall, or even of failing publicly to oppose him by
abstaining from voting. These probably included some
secondary school teachers and church organists, and perhaps
even a few clergymen, elders, and others whose living or
social position depended on their good standing with
Hebraism. Anglican clergymen, in particular, may have been
nervous about appearing to be less than totally committed to
the removal of the professor from his chair, given the
prominent part played by Bishop Goe in the affair. It was,
no doubt, in order to protect such people and maximise the
pro-Sugden vote, that, at a Senate meeting in July 1900,
Professor Nanson successfully moved two amendments to standing
orders. One stipulated that in future elections only votes
recorded on official ballot papers would be valid; and the

---
304 Argus, 12 July 1900.
other that 'Neither the Returning Officer nor any scrutineer shall in any way directly or indirectly divulge or disclose or aid in divulging or disclosing for what candidate or in what manner any person voted.'

Nanson made it clear that the changes were proposed in the light of 'one, or perhaps two vacancies' imminently expected on the Council. His intention, he explained, was to end the practices, quite common in the past, of members entrusting their votes to others by attaching their signatures to blank sheets of paper, which they then surrendered; and of canvassers producing voting papers already filled in for members to sign, giving them 'very little peace until they did so.' In addition, it is reasonable to conclude, he was seeking to create a situation in which pro-Marshall-Hall Senators with denominational connections could vote for Sugden without fear of retribution.

That the professor's opponents in the Senate interpreted the move in this way is clear from the fact that they objected to the proposals because of their timing rather than because of any disagreement with them in principle. Alexander Morrison declared them to be inopportune 'because of the peculiar and unfortunate circumstances connected with the forthcoming election'. Robert Morrison agreed, and sought delay by suggesting the creation of a select committee of

---

305 Senate Minute Book, 11 July 1900, loc.cit.
306 Argus, 27 July 1900.
inquiry into the matter. And S.G. McLaren moved (unsuccessfully) that the new regulations should come into force only on 1 January 1901.<ref>argus27</ref>

Then, when votes in the Sugden-Molesworth election were being counted, the Rev. Reginald Stephen, sub-warden of Trinity College, and scrutineer for Molesworth, apparently compiled a list of those who had voted, and immediately became involved in a dispute with the Registrar over his right to publish it.<ref>argus28</ref> Although the Warden of the Senate (T.P. McInerney) ultimately ruled in Stephen's favour,<ref>argus29</ref> the list was never actually made public. But the knowledge that it could be made to account for the larger turn out of voters in the second election - in which Stephen acted as Dr. Leeper's campaign secretary.<ref>argus30</ref> This is borne out by the fact that only the anti-Marshall-Hall candidate's votes increased significantly. Many may have heeded Table Talk's warning that, in consequence of Stephen's action, 'all clerical non-voters may look out for squalls from the heads of their respective denominations'.<ref>argus31</ref>

To sum up, then, what all this shows is that the elections were characterised by an extraordinary complexity of cross-
currents. This, together with the closeness of the first vote, makes it impossible to point confidently to any one factor as decisive, and certainly precludes the conclusion that the majority of graduates, Senators, or voters favoured the reappointment of Marshall-Hall. If anything, Leeper's comfortable victory seems to support the opposite view.

Perhaps all that can safely be said is that the results suggest a very roughly equal division of opinion among Senators who voted. This certainly reflected the division in the Council, and perhaps also in the community at large - although, in this regard, the evidence is scanty and far from conclusive. While two of the three daily papers opposed reappointment, an examination of the letters from readers published in their columns shows that 99 correspondents (of whom 18 were anonymous) were in favour, and only 59 (including 11 anonymous) were against it. This, however, is clearly susceptible to a range of interpretations, for example, that the professor's supporters, having little of the institutional backing that characterised the denominational and scholastic opposition to him, felt a stronger need for this sort of individual effort - and it would be extremely dangerous to draw any conclusions from it about the state of public opinion at large. All that can be asserted with any confidence is that the Southern Cross was incorrect in saying that the University Council,
if it re-engaged him, 'will find itself in quarrel with nearly the whole community.\textsuperscript{312}

Whether the outcome for the Ormond Professor was decisively influenced by the results will be considered at a later point.

8. The Case of the Mysterious Telegrams

Meanwhile, in accordance with MacFarland's amended motion, on 6 August the University Council approved a letter to be sent to Sir Andrew Clarke, Victorian Agent-General in London, instructing him to advertise the position, but making no reference to the present incumbent\textsuperscript{313}. Clarke was to assemble a selection committee of musical experts, consisting of Sir Hubert Parry, Professor of Music at Oxford; Dr. (later Sir) Charles Villiers Stanford, Professor of Music at Cambridge; Sir Frederick Bridge, organist at Westminster Abbey; Sir George Clement Martin, organist at St. Paul's Cathedral; Sir Alexander Mackenzie of the Royal Academy of Music; and composer, Sir John Stainer, whom Parry succeeded in the Oxford chair in 1900\textsuperscript{314}. After applications closed (on 20 October), this committee was to select three candidates and to send their names, ranked in order of

\textsuperscript{312}15 June 1900.

\textsuperscript{313}MUCMB, 6 August 1900; Argus, 7 August 1900.

\textsuperscript{314}Wrixon to Clarke, August 1900, in MUCR, Miscellaneous Papers Box M.N. folder marked 'Music Ormond Professor 1887'.
merit, to Melbourne by the mail leaving London on 3 November.\footnote{MUCMB, 6 August 1900.}

What followed is not completely clear. On 2 November Sir Andrew wrote to the Vice-Chancellor, as instructed, informing him that there had been 45 applicants, whose names had been sent to each committee member, after which a meeting had been held on 25 October. Present, in addition to Clarke, himself, were Parry, Stanford and Bridge.\footnote{Clarke to Wrixon, 2 November 1900, in MUCMB, 10 December 1900.} Stainer (presumably due to illness - he died in April 1901\footnote{Musical News, 13 April 1901.}) had dropped out. And Martin had sent a letter of apology, which recommended the appointment of Franklin Peterson. The committee, according to Clarke, unanimously agreed with this choice, declaring Peterson to be 'superior in every respect to the other candidates', and ranking Edward D. Rendall and George Langley second and third, respectively. Clarke's letter contained the names of all 45 candidates, one of whom was Marshall-Hall\footnote{Clarke to Wrixon, 2 November 1900, in MUCMB, 10 December 1900.} (who had applied after receiving a petition containing some 5700 signatures urging him to do so\footnote{Argus, 29 August 1900. I have been unable to see this document.}).
However, all was not as it seemed. Between the posting of this letter and its arrival in Melbourne, the University Council received a number of telegrams from London. One, from the Agent General, said, enigmatically, 'Committee elected three names. In consequence of later information from Melbourne Parry, Stanford suggest question Hall'.

Puzzled, Councillors asked for the message to be repeated, and the reply came as follows: 'Forwarded three names. In consequence of information since received from Melbourne Parry, Stanford suggest reappoint Hall'. This was then followed by an unsigned cable, also from London, dated 23 November, and saying simply 'Minority favour including Hall'.

When the Council met again on 3 December, notice of motion had already been given that the first of the three names (as yet still officially unknown) be accepted for appointment. John Grice unsuccessfully sought an adjournment, pending arrival of letters explaining and elaborating on the telegrams. Instead, it was resolved, on MacFarland's motion, to meet again in a week, by which time it was (correctly) expected the Council would be in possession of Sir Andrew's letter, containing the selection committee's three nominees.

---

320 *Herald*, 21 December 1900.
321 *Argus*, 23 November 1900.
322 *Argus*, 27 November 1900; *MUCMB*, 3 December 1900.
323 *Argus*, 27 November 1900.
324 *MUCMB*, 3 December 1900; *Argus*, 4 December 1900.
At this meeting, on the 10th, Alexander Morrison moved a motion, seconded by Bishop Goe, 'That Mr. Franklin Peterson be appointed to the Ormond Chair of Music in accordance with the select committee in England.' John Grice, still apparently hoping that clarification of the various telegrams would be to Marshall-Hall's advantage, countered with an amendment seeking to postpone 'the question of appointing a professor of music ... until Wednesday 19th inst.', by which time the next mail from England would have arrived.\(^{325}\)

Then came a surprise move from Robert Murray Smith who, while declaring that he had always been, and still was, opposed to Marshall-Hall's reappointment, added that 'as a matter of courtesy alone' they should wait for amplification of the telegrams which, in contradistinction to Clarke's letter, seemed to indicate that the recommendation of Peterson had not been unanimous. Accordingly, he moved 'That the matter be adjourned until the first meeting of the Council after the vacation'. A week's delay, he pointed out, would be insufficient, since some Council members were shortly leaving Melbourne, and it would be impossible to arrange another full meeting until the following March.\(^{326}\)

It is unlikely that Murray Smith was actuated in this by an ulterior desire to procure Marshall-Hall's reappointment.

\(^{325}\) *Argus*, 11 December 1900; *Presbyterian Messenger*, 14 December 1900.

\(^{326}\) *Argus*, 11 December 1900.
Certainly, Ernest Scott claims that at about this time he had changed his views on the question. And Table Talk said it was 'freely alleged' that, on a previous occasion (presumably the 25th of June), 'he had promised to vote for the Ormond Professor of Music', but had 'voted the wrong way' by mistake 'in the excitement of the moment'. Both contentions, however, are implausible, in view of the fact that, later at the same meeting (of 10 December, that is), he voted against Bride's motion for the reappointment of the present Ormond Professor.

The fact is that, apart from this case, he had played a smaller part, than most of Marshall-Hall's enemies, in Hebraic affairs. And, in this case, he had always been less uncompromising than the hard core of the musician's opponents on the Council (that is to say, than MacFarland, Harper, Goe, Morrison, Howitt, Higgins, and (latterly) Leeper). On 16 July he had opposed the Master of Ormond's motion to prohibit Marshall-Hall from re-applying for the chair. On 25 June, when Andrew Harper claimed that Marshall-Hall had not expressed regret for his utterances, Murray Smith protested that, 'He says he did not put that [immoral] signification on them'. And he even tentatively

328 28 July 1900.
329 MUCMB, 10 December 1900.
330 Ibid., 16 July 1900; Argus, 17 July 1900.
mentioned the possibility of reappointing the offender on condition that he pledged himself not so to embarrass the Council again. But he did not pursue the suggestion once Higgins had assured him that the University could not legally make such conditions\textsuperscript{331}.

Although his position on the executive of the Argus\textsuperscript{332} may have made it difficult for him to support the musician, the evidence is consistent with the view that, while genuinely opposed to the continued employment of a professor prone to outbursts of the type recently exhibited by Marshall-Hall, he was genuinely desirous to avoid any appearance of unfairness in the procedures adopted. And being, perhaps, of a more forgiving nature than others of his party, he would have liked to reach a modus vivendi, which guaranteed the University against further embarrassment, without depriving it of such a talented teacher. That is to say, his motive was not so much to get rid of Marshall-Hall, as to prevent a repetition of the musician's offences. Radic's assertion that after Peterson had accepted appointment Murray Smith said that, though he had voted for him, he now thought that a mistake had been made\textsuperscript{333}, is not supported by evidence.

When the delaying resolution was put, the voting was again equal, with Ellery, Bride, Grant, Sugden, Williams,

\textsuperscript{331}Argus, 26 June 1900.
\textsuperscript{332}Argus, 25 January 1912.
\textsuperscript{333}Radic PhD., p.271.
Grice, Allen and Murray Smith in favour, and Wrixon, Morrison, MacFarland, Fetherston, Higgins, Goe, Harper and Leeper against. Once more Wrixon exercised his casting vote, and the motion was lost.\textsuperscript{334}

9. Sugden, Leeper and the Argus

In this particular skirmish, Sugden's recent election to the Council made no difference at all, since Molesworth, had he won, would undoubtedly have been against delay, thus simply saving the Vice-Chancellor the trouble of voting twice. The reason given by the Master of Queen's for his vote was that, whilst he 'recognised the inconvenience of delay', there was 'a feeling amongst the friends of Professor Marshall-Hall that that gentleman had not had fair treatment at the hands of the Council', and he believed that 'the Council ought not to give the slightest handle for him or his friends to think that the matter had been rushed through'.\textsuperscript{335}  The fact that he then abstained from voting on Bride's subsequent reappointment motion\textsuperscript{336} indicates that when, during the Council election campaign, he had said that his mind was not yet made up on the Marshall-Hall case, he was merely speaking the simple truth.

Leeper's role in determining the final result, on the other hand, may have been crucial. I have already argued

\textsuperscript{334}MUCMB, 10 December 1900; Argus, 11 December 1900; Age, 11 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{335}Argus, 11 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{336}Ibid.
that Radic is wrong in declaring that 'the scandal ... had its origins not in the poems at all, but in a confrontation between Marshall-Hall and Dr. Alexander Leeper'.\textsuperscript{337} Nevertheless, it is undoubtedly true that the latter had done more to mobilize, co-ordinate and direct the opposition than any other single individual. His diary shows him to have been active behind the scenes, exciting feeling against the offending musician\textsuperscript{338}. In November 1898, together with J.H. MacFarland and J. Lawrence Rentoul, he organised a whip of Marshall-Hall's enemies for a University Senate meeting at which S.G. McLaren's motion, seconded by Leeper, increasing the Council's disciplinary power to deal with such cases, was to be discussed\textsuperscript{339}.

In June 1900, when it looked as if the professor might be reappointed, Leeper wrote to the Council requesting that further action be delayed 'in order that time may be allowed for an expression of public opinion in regard to a matter of such vital importance to the community and especially to the educational bodies of the colony'.\textsuperscript{340} Together with J.P. Wilson, headmaster of the Presbyterian Ladies' College, he organised a circular letter of protest which the heads of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{338} e.g. 17 October 1898, 20 October 1898, 12 October 1898, \textit{loc.cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{339} Leeper Diary, 29 November 1898, \textit{loc.cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{340} Leeper to University Council, 11 June 1900, in MUCMB, \textit{J. June 1900}.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
all Victorian girls' schools were invited to sign (but which was not as Radic claims, signed by the 'heads of the University Colleges'). Then in the same month he convened a protest meeting of representatives of boys' schools and colleges. As secretary of the meeting he sent the University Council copies of its resolutions. And on the 18th he introduced its deputation to that body.

It is plausible that this demonstration of scholastic feeling had an impact on less committed Councillors - Murray Smith, a'Beckett, Fetherston - who eventually voted against reappointment, although there is no hard evidence for such a view. Leeper's activities certainly aroused hostility on the other side. So much so, that in December 1900 he actually felt obliged to go into hiding to escape 'the clutches of M-H'.

This is not, however, to say that, without Leeper, the agitation would not have attained the magnitude or intensity which it did. There were, after all, plenty of active and enthusiastic participants, including those already mentioned.

341 Outpost, 14 July 1900.
343 Herald, 16 June 1900.
344 MUCMB, 18 June 1900; Leeper to University Council, June 1900 in MUCMB, 11 June 1900.
345 Argus, 19 June 1900; Presbyterian Messenger, 22 June 1900.
346 Mary Leeper to Alexander Leeper, 27 December [1900].
347 Leeper papers, loc.cit.
as assisting him - MacFarland, Rentoul, McLaren, Wilson -
as well as others, such as Andrew Harper, Alexander Morrison,
J. Redford Corr, and Bishop Goe, all of whom exhibited quite
sufficient zealous dedication to the cause to justify the
confident conclusion that any one of them could have assumed,
and would have been willing, in Leeper's absence, to assume
his role of leadership.

Moreover, the Argus newspaper played a more important role
than Leeper, certainly in precipitating, and probably also
in sustaining, the episode of collective action under consi-
deration. Marshall-Hall, himself347, as well as many among
both his supporters348 and his opponents349 considered the
paper's campaign to have been decisive.

We have seen350 that the Liedertafel speech, although
not greeted with applause, did not, by itself, give rise to
a concerted demand for the speaker's removal from his post.
That came only after the Argus attack, on 5 August, on
Hymns Ancient and Modern. And there is probably some truth
in Marshall-Hall's assertion that 'But for attention drawn by

347 Age, 13 August 1898; Marshall-Hall to Council,
11 August 1898, in MUCMB, 12 August 1898.

348 e.g. Saturday Review, 5 November 1898; John Robertson
in Herald, 20 August 1898; Outpost, 16 June 1900; Tocsin,
2 February 1899, 3 November 1898; Bulletin, 23 June 1900;
'Aricus Curiae' in Herald, 29 August 1898; Alma Mater, July 1900.

349 e.g. Rev. C.H. Barnes in Argus, 8 August 1898;
Presbyterian Monthly, 1 September 1898; 'A Parent' in Argus,
12 July 1900; Theyre a'Beckett Weigall in Argus, 8 August 1898.

350 pp.470-471.
the "Argus" to my book ... these things [i.e. the alleged indecency] would never have come before the ignorant public'.

In addition, the part played by the Argus endowed the outcry with an all-important measure of secular respectability. The temper of the time, while not intractably anti-clerical, was wary of anything that could be seen as an intrusion of ecclesiastical authority into temporal affairs. That Marshall-Hall's enemies were aware of this is shown by their insistence, both at the Assembly Hall protest meetings of 9 and 11 June 1900, and in the anti-Marshall-Hall deputation to the University Council of the 18th, that the opposition came not from the Churches, but from the secondary schools. All the speakers, emphasised the Australian Christian World, "were laymen, and clergymen, wisely perhaps, were conspicuous by their absence". Bishop Goe, on the same occasion, reported that he had received a large number of anti-Marshall-Hall letters 'not so much from persons who made any religious professions, but persons of good moral character'.

Neither of the other two secular dailies - the Herald and the Age - was a likely candidate to spearhead such an outcry. The former supported Marshall-Hall; while the latter,

---

351 Marshall-Hall to Council, 11 August 1898, in MUCMB, 2 August 1898, loc.cit.
352 22 June 1900.
353 Argus, 19 June 1900.
354 See e.g. Herald, 5 August 1898.
although it did not, as Manning Clark believes, simply receive Hymns Ancient and Modern with good-natured banter\textsuperscript{355}, declaring it, on the contrary, to be a 'filthy work'\textsuperscript{356}, was less vehement than the Argus, and slower to declare its hostility\textsuperscript{357}. Its stablemate, the Leader, supported the musician to the end. Whether this indicates a greater degree of editorial independence from proprietorial control in the latter journal, or whether it simply represents David Syme having two bob each way, is not clear.

Thus, Leeper's role in raising and sustaining the furore which ended in the removal of Marshall-Hall from his University post, while undoubtedly important, was not crucial. It was his victory in the Council election of 1900 which may have been of decisive consequence. Had he been defeated by Barrett in the contest for the seat vacated by M.H. Irving, Murray Smith's motion of 10 December would almost certainly have passed.

This would not, of course, necessarily have resulted in the reappointment of Marshall-Hall. But it is likely that

\textsuperscript{355} Op.cit., p.162.
\textsuperscript{356} 29 October 1898.

\textsuperscript{357} Early references (on 5 and 6 August 1898) were couched in a tone of sardonic but tolerant reproof. But by 12 June 1900 a subleader was declaring the proposed reappointment of a professor who 'has chosen deliberately to outrage public sentiment by the dissemination of peculiar views, offensively stated' to be 'nothing short of an outrage on public propriety' which the writer regarded with 'astonishment and consternation'. The University Council,' the article continued, 'will find that public opinion cannot be trifled with in that manner'.

Andrew Harper was right in saying that postponement 'would mean that the appointment would be made owing to force of time more than with due regard to the best man for the position.'\textsuperscript{358} And this would probably have favoured the current incumbent, especially in the light of the events of the succeeding weeks.

However (and before considering these events), if, given such an eventuality, the second Council election has to be regarded as decisive, it was not the only such factor. Neither Judge Hood nor William Thwaites, both consistent Marshall-Hall supporters, attended the meeting of the 10th\textsuperscript{359}. The former was absent without explanation, and the latter, 'owing to a peculiar regulation of the Council', which had rendered his seat temporarily vacant\textsuperscript{360}. Both would undoubtedly have favoured delay, and either, had he been present, would have tipped the balance.

10. Dr. Fetherston and Mr. Justice a'Beckett

Then, Dr. Fetherston, previously a tepid Marshall-Hall supporter - who had voted for Ellery's reappointment motion, but had abstained on Bishop Goe's amendment of 4 June - now voted against delay\textsuperscript{361}. His motives are unclear. It is

\textsuperscript{358} British Australasian, 3 January 1901; Southern Cross, 14 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{359} MUCMB, 10 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{360} Argus, 11 December 1900; I have not, however, despite a careful examination of the documents, been able to identify this regulation.

\textsuperscript{361} MUCMB, 10 December 1900.
unlikely that he was merely worried about the effect on the University's music teaching of beginning the Conservatorium year with the question of the directorship still unsettled, since he, too, voted against Bride's last-ditch effort to reappoint Marshall-Hall later at the same meeting\(^{362}\). What support he had previously given the professor may, as noted above (see p. 567), have derived from a feeling that the Council was morally obliged to honour the commitment reportedly made by its Conservatorium Committee at the meeting of 6 June. If so, the latter may no longer have appeared binding to him after the *Kreutzer Sonata* allegation, and after a selection committee of musical experts, with Marshall-Hall's name before it, had, apparently, judged his qualifications to be inferior to Peterson's.

Finally, Judge a'Beckett abstained from voting on Murray Smith's amendment\(^{363}\), explaining that he could not accept the Vice-Chancellor's view that Parry and Stanford had formed a judgment based on Marshall-Hall's moral and religious utterances, on which they were not competent to adjudicate. The 'fair interpretation of the cablegram,' he insisted, was that those two gentlemen regarded Professor Marshall-Hall's [musical] attainments as superior to those of the gentlemen recommended\(^{364}\).

\(^{362}\) *Ibid.*  
\(^{363}\) *Argus*, 11 December 1900.  
Now, a'Beckett had never cast a pro-Marshall-Hall vote, and, later in the same meeting, he voted against Bride's reappointment motion\textsuperscript{365}. But it is just possible that his opposition stemmed from expediency, rather than moral or religious conviction, and that, if he had been able to summon up just a little more courage on this occasion, things would have turned out very differently for the Ormond Professor. This is suggested by a note in Herbert Brookes' handwriting in the University's Marshall-Hall papers. Probably penned in the twenties, when Brookes was collecting material for a projected biography of the musician, it is headed, 'Interview with I.G. Mackey per. Marshall-Hall'. Beneath that are the following words: 'Judge a'Beckett "So glad you have come M.H. will have a majority. I have got to vote against".\textsuperscript{366} However, to whom a'Beckett addressed this remark (if he said it at all) - presumably not to Mackey, who was not a Council member - and what was the nature of the supposed pressure he was seemingly under, are unfortunately not known. Nor is it clear which occasion it referred to.

11. The Strange Behaviour of Sir Andrew Clarke

Be that as it may, ten days after the defeat of Murray Smith's motion an article appeared in the \textit{Herald}, proclaiming 'an extraordinary state of affairs', to wit, that on 12 December the Vice-Chancellor had received from Sir Andrew

\textsuperscript{365} \textit{MUCMB}, 10 December 1900.

\textsuperscript{366} \textit{MHMA}, Group 1 1/3.
Clarke a private letter in which the Agent-General confessed to having withdrawn Marshall-Hall's name from the list of eligible applicants considered by the London committee. It may be that Murray Smith had had some premonition of this. If so, he was not the only one, Professor Allen having argued, on the 10th, that the telegrams showed 'that the committee, in making its original selection, had been in some way impressed with the idea that they needn't take Professor Marshall-Hall's application into serious consideration'. Just how the Herald knew about the letter is not clear. But it now reported that 'certain pressure had been brought to bear' on Wrixon, as a result of which the text was to be 'supplied in confidence to members of the University Council' at a meeting on the 22nd.

What then emerged was Clarke's admission that, when the London selection committee met, 'there were a couple of the members in favour of Marshall-Hall'. But the Agent-General had taken it 'for granted that the reference to me to select new names for your guidance, put Marshall[-Hall]'s name outside the reference of this committee'. And he had, accordingly, withdrawn it.

Shortly after this, Clarke had received a letter from Charles Villiers Stanford, in which was enclosed yet another

---

367 Argus, 11 December 1900.

368 Clarke to Wrixon, 8 November 1900, in MUCMB, December 1900; see also Leader, 29 December 1900.
communication, to Stanford from his 'old friend', Arthur Somervell. The latter had been written in Australia, where Somervell was, at the time, visiting examiner for the Associated Board of the Royal Academy of Music and the Royal College of Music, London. And it was his letter that contained the 'later information from Melbourne', referred to in Clarke's telegram. Had it arrived in time, Stanford wrote,

I should have read it at the [selection committee] meeting the other day. We knew nothing of the big petition or of the unanimous support of Marshall-Hall by the University Professors ... I think the letter ... entirely upholds my plea on the occasion of the Meeting for hearing both sides of any question.

Somervell's letter, also tabled at the Council meeting of 22 December, was dated 1 October 1900. It said that Marshall-Hall had reapplied for the position in response to a petition got up in five days, and signed by 6000 people, including the whole of Melbourne's musical public, the most prominent men in the business world, all the professors, half the University Councillors, some members of parliament, 'and many of the most prominent men in the religious world'. No one, it continued, 'who knows him is taking part in the campaign against him', and 'it is hardly too much to say that almost every respectable man - with the exception of the clergy who are vehemently against him - was on M-H's side'. If he was not reappointed, Somervell added, he would

369 C.V. Stanford to Clarke, 6 November 1900, in MUCMB, 22 December 1900, loc.cit.
'take with him every pupil and all the staff but two'. And, as a result, his successor 'would need a private income as he has to make up conservatorium deficits', which would 'at once swallow the salary'.

When all this was laid before the Council, Marshall-Hall's supporters were in a majority. So Bishop Goe, unsuccessfully, sought a postponement until a fuller attendance could be mustered. Dr. Bride then moved 'That the Council take no action with regard to Dr. Somervell's letter' which he clearly (and correctly) perceived to be a dangerous red herring. Its manifest errors - especially the assertion that the whole of the new professor's salary would be consumed by Conservatorium expenses - could well have distracted attention from what Marshall-Hall's supporters saw as the main issues, namely the revealed preference of the Oxbridge professors, and Sir Andrew Clarke's unauthorised withdrawal of Marshall-Hall's candidacy. Both Alexander Morrison and J.H. MacFarland, although absent from this meeting, had written to the Registrar, impugning the accuracy of the letter.

Bride's motion was carried by five votes to two, his reading of the situation having, presumably, been endorsed

---

370 A. Somervell to C.V. Stanford, 1 October 1900, in ibid.
371 Argus, 24 December 1900.
372 MUMC, 22 October 1900; Herald, 22 December 1900.
373 Ibid.
by the remainder of the Ormond Professor's conciliatory supporters. Discussion then turned to the removal of Marshall-Hall's name from the list of applicants, an action that was condemned both in and outside the Council, by the professor's supporters and his enemies alike, although the latter were generally more restrained in their criticism, agreeing, on the whole, with the Southern Cross that the action had given Marshall-Hall 'not so much an injury as a grievance'. Only S.G. McLaren defended Clarke unreservedly, declaring that he had 'been unjustly blamed for withdrawing Marshall-Hall's name from the selection committee', when the real fault lay with the Council members for failing 'to define in their instructions the position of the present occupant of the chair'.

The immediate upshot was the unanimous passage of a motion disapproving of Clarke's action and asking him 'to favour the Council with the following information':

1. Did the Agent-General receive any communication from any member of the Council or from any person suggesting that the Committee was to select new candidates only? - if so from whom was such communication received?

2. Why, having regard to the Council's letter dated 7th August, 1900, the Agent-General

---
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withdrew Marshall-Hall's name from the list of candidates whose merits were to be considered by the committee?

3. For what reason, when Marshall-Hall's name had been so withdrawn, was his name forwarded by the Agent-General in the list of candidates together with the statement in reference to the candidate specially selected that the committee are of opinion that the first-named gentleman is the most complete and practical man available for the position, and that he is superior in every respect to the other candidates?°

Sir Andrew's reply had a distinctly disingenuous ring: 'I acted on my own initiative entirely,' he wrote, 'And for the reason that the Council, knowing the qualifications of [Marshall-Hall] for the position, would not require further advice on the point from the Committee of selection.' But it was that committee's function to assess the qualifications of applicants and to rank them accordingly, something which the Melbourne University Council, not being composed of musical experts, was not competent to do. Clarke had not, after all, withdrawn the application of W.A. Laver, whose qualifications were equally well known to the Council.

Moreover, this explanation is quite different from the one he had privately given Wrixon in his letter of 8 November, namely, that he believed 'that the reference to me to select new names' had 'put Marshall-Hall outside the reference of the Committee' (emphasis in the original).

°MUCMB, 22 December 1900.

Andrew Clarke to Premier, 8 February 1901, in MUCRCF 501/26; see also MUCMB, 1 April 1901.
There is, in fact, nothing in the official correspondence about 'new' names. It is conceivable that the Agent-General had misread his instructions, mistakenly construing them to contain, explicitly, what he took to be their spirit. Yet, if he was following the case in the Melbourne press, he would surely have been aware of the failure of both Goe's and MacFarland's attempts to disqualify the current incumbent from re-engagement.

Furthermore, such a mistake would not explain the inclusion, in his official letter of 2 November, of the names of all 45 applicants, including Marshall-Hall, together with the assertion that the committee had unanimously agreed that Peterson was superior to all of them. This, as a Beckett remarked, did the current Ormond Professor the additional injury of giving 'a false impression of the estimation in which [he] was held by the most competent judges of musical qualifications in London'. It was not until November, six days later, that Clarke had written, admitting to having tampered with the list, and then only in a private letter, whose contents might never have been divulged had not pressure been exerted on the Vice-Chancellor, and which presumably would not have been written but for the intervention of Somervell and Stanford.

This surely demonstrates a lack of candour on the Agent-General's part, at the very least. It indicates either

---

\(^{180}\) WUCMB, 22 December 1900.
that, when he withdrew Marshall-Hall's name, he was quite aware that he was acting contrary to his official instructions; or that, on being subsequently assailed by misgivings, he had tried to conceal his error.

It does not, however, in itself, prove that he was acting under instructions or suggestions from Melbourne. Nor does the fact that I have been unable to find any evidence of Hebraism in his outlook. It is true that, before the committee's recommendations arrived here, notice of motion had already been given in the Council (by whom is not known) in favour of accepting whichever name was ranked first. But this does not necessarily mean that someone already knew what that name was, since Clarke's telegram had already made it clear that Marshall-Hall's name was not among the first three. The foreshadowed motion may have simply been an attempt to

---

381 Clarke was a military engineer by profession, having risen to the rank of Lieutenant-General in the British Army. He had been born at Southsea on 27 July 1824. His father was briefly Governor of Western Australia in 1845-1847. He, himself, became military secretary to Sir William Denison, Governor of Van Diemen's Land. He fought in New Zealand in the 1848-9 war, after which he was appointed Victoria's first Surveyor-General. In 1853 he took up a nominee's seat in the colony's Legislative Council and two years later became Minister of Lands. He played a major part in setting up the machinery of local government in Victoria. In August 1858 he returned to England to command the Royal Engineers of the Eastern and Middle Districts. In 1864 after a short period of service on the west coast of Africa, he became Director of the Navy's Works and in 1873 a Governor of the Straits Settlements. After a spell as Minister of Public Works in India he acted as Australian delegate to the 1885 International Consultative Commission on the Suez Canal, of which body he was elected vice-president. In the early 1890s he became Inspector-General of Fortifications in Victoria. He acted as Victorian Agent-General in London on a number of occasions (Vander, 16 January 1897; Australasian, 5 April 1902; Argus, 15 May 1892; Table Talk, 10 April 1902).
put a clean end to the controversy before it further
damaged the University's good repute.

The Herald regarded Sir Andrew's first telegram, which
ended, mysteriously, 'Parry, Stanford suggest question Hall',
as evidence of collusion. There 'is no accounting for the
despatch by a business man,' argued that journal tartly,
'of such an incoherent cablegram, unless he assumed it would
be perfectly understood by some members at least of the
Council as referring to the withdrawal of Marshall-Hall's
name from the selection committee.' 382. But even business
men make mistakes. And it is difficult to see why the Agent-
General would deliberately send a cryptically worded official
message in order to convey his meaning in disguised form to
an accomplice, with whom he could equally have directly
communicated privately.

The Herald also spoke of 'a series of sensational rumours'
about the identity of the supposed accomplice 383. One of
them had apparently implicated M.H. Irving, since the latter
took the trouble to write to the Vice-Chancellor from
London, denying the charge 384. The Outpost claimed that
the culprit had given himself away 'by his miserable, pale
and trembling attitude' at the Council meeting of the 10th,
and 'his cowardly, terror-stricken absence' from that of the

382 21 December 1900.
383 20 December 1900.
384 Christian Citizen, 2 December 1901.
22nd\textsuperscript{385}. But as the demeanour of those present on the former occasion was not recorded, and as most of Marshall-Hall's opponents were absent from the latter, it is not possible to ascertain whom the writer was referring to, much less whether he/she was correct. On the principle of \textit{qui s'excuse, s'accuse}, it may be significant that Alexander Leeper then went to the trouble of writing to the Leader to \textquote{explain ... my absence from the University Council meeting} of the 22nd. He had, he said, \textquote{had a long standing engagement which I was bound to fulfil, at the risk of causing serious inconvenience and positive loss to others, which necessitated my absence from Melbourne the whole day from early morning}.\textsuperscript{386} But this is hardly adequate grounds for concluding that he had been in cahoots with the Agent-General.

A more plausible assumption, if there was an accomplice (and this has not been demonstrated), is that it was Sir Henry Wrixon who was present at both meetings. It was, significantly on this assumption, to Wrixon, that Clarke had privately confessed that he had interpreted the alleged \textquote{reference to me to supply new names for your guidance} as disqualifying Marshall-Hall. And if he did not act on his own initiative, it seems likely that he would have taken the step only at the instigation of the highest authority - that is of the Vice-Chancellor. (The Chancellor, Sir John Madden, \textsuperscript{385}January 1901. \textsuperscript{386}29 December 1900.)
was on leave at the time - while acting, in his capacity of Lieutenant Governor, as Administrator of the Colony.  

Moreover, there are independent indications that Wrixon was quite ready to work behind the scenes with whatever means were at hand to damage Marshall-Hall’s chances. We have seen (p.578) that, on the basis of a trivial technicality, and without discussing it with the Council, he had declined to accept M.H. Irving’s resignation. Later, it emerged that on receipt of Somervell’s letter, and again without consultation, he had sent Peterson an official telegram in which the appointee was assured ‘that he takes no financial liability with the Conservatorium’. When challenged by Sugden and Dr. Williams for failing first to seek Council approval for this communication, he avoided the issue by saying simply that it contained only the truth, since ‘Mr. Peterson may or may not run the Conservatorium’.  

The evidence, however, is admittedly very flimsy. Whether further light was thrown on the matter by a letter Marshall-Hall received from the Agent-General in January 1901 will probably never be known, as the communication does not seem to have survived. But the fact that it was not made public at the time suggests that it contained no new disclosures.

387 *University Calendar 1901*, op.cit., p.426.
388 *Leader*, 29 December 1900.
389 *Melbourne Conservatorium Diary, 16 January 1901*, in MMCA.
But did Sir Andrew's action make any real difference? Radic's claim that Marshall-Hall's name was 'not included' on the list considered by the committee\(^{390}\) is palpably false. And the same is true both of Bebbington's assertion that it 'was struck from the list secretly',\(^{391}\), and the Outpost's report that 'the London committee DID place Hall first, and that the AGENT-GENERAL THEN withdrew his name.'\(^{392}\).

This is clear from Clarke's letter to Wixon, saying the committee had considered Marshall-Hall's application before it was withdrawn. It is confirmed by the fact that Stanford, in his communication to the Agent-General, expressed no surprise at discovering that Marshall-Hall had been a candidate. And it is put beyond reasonable doubt by a letter of April 1901 from Sir Frederick Bridge, another member of the London Committee, to the Musical News, whose contents were never denied.

The majority [wrote Bridge] was in favour of Mr. Peterson (Sir George Martin sent his vote by letter), and after Mr. Marshall-Hall's name was withdrawn, the whole committee unanimously recommended three names, placing Mr. Peterson's name first. Mr Marshall-Hall's name was really before us.

But why, if only a minority favoured Marshall-Hall's appointment, did Clarke bother to withdraw his name? The answer is in Bridge's letter, which reveals that Sir Andrew

---

\(^{390}\) Radic Phd., p.270.

\(^{391}\) M.Mus., p.140.

\(^{392}\) 12 January 1901; see also L.H.S. Brodsky in Herald, 27 January 1900; Leader, 22 December 1900.

\(^{393}\) 6 April 1901.
had withheld another vital piece of information. When, at the London selection meeting, Marshall-Hall's candidature was raised

by a member of the Committee [recalled Bridge] I stated that I could not be a party to even the consideration of his name... and should withdraw if it was placed before us. It was then that the Agent-General... took upon himself to retire his name from consideration. ³⁹⁹

Had Bridge carried out his threat, it would have left a majority of those present in favour of Marshall-Hall - by two to one (i.e. Parry and Stanford to Sir Alexander Mackenzie). Martin's absentee vote could have been used to equalise the score. But then Clarke would have been compelled to send both names to the Council, ranked equal first.

Of course, this would not have ensured the incumbent's reappointment, that being a matter for determination by the University Council ³⁹⁵ which would have been perfectly within its rights to disregard even a unanimous recommendation from the London committee. Nevertheless, had the London vote been tied, some of the less staunch of Marshall-Hall's opponents on the Council (and, in the circumstances, only one such abstaining in a crucial division would have been enough) may have decided that the latter had the stronger claim because he had the support of the Oxbridge professors.

³⁹⁴ Ibid.

³⁹⁵ As Sir Henry Wrixon explicitly pointed out at the meeting of the 22nd - Leader, 29 December 1900.
and because one of Peterson's champions had not been present during the discussion - leaving open the possibility that had he been there, he might have been prevailed upon by argument to change his mind.

12. The Question of the Future of the Conservatorium

To return, now, to the Council meeting of 22 December: news of Clarke's action put new life into Marshall-Hall's supporters. If it did nothing else, it prolonged the struggle. No one suggested that the offer to Peterson should be withdrawn - a course which could have led to expensive litigation. Nor is there the slightest warrant for Radic's claim that at this (or, for that matter, any other) point, a 'majority of the Council now hoped that Peterson would not accept'\(^{396}\). Dr. Bride, while conceding that they were 'morally bound to him, and must carry out our contract', moved that 'a letter should be sent intimating to Mr. Peterson that he had been appointed under a misapprehension, but that notwithstanding the Council confirmed his appointment'\(^{397}\).

There followed a long and muddled discussion about the extent of the Director's financial liability for the Conservatorium, some agreeing with Ellery, who insisted that the 'statement that the salary would be affected by the

\(^{396}\) Rasic PhD., p.271.

\(^{397}\) MUCMB, 22 December 1900; see also Herald, 22 December 1900.
Conservatorium is ... all nonsense', others with Bride, who maintained that the 'university chest is not to contribute anything towards the Conservatorium', and that, therefore, 'if there is a loss the shortage must be made up out of the Professor's salary'. No one seemed to notice that the two statements are not necessarily at variance.

In view of the confusion that has reigned in this area ever since, it will be useful to look more closely at the arrangements that did govern the institution's financial operation. Radic is completely wrong when she says that 'the University refused to accept financial responsibility [for the Conservatorium], the costs falling entirely on Marshall-Hall', who 'paid for [it] out of his pocket'. In fact, the regulations permitted up to seventy per cent of students' fees to be used to pay teachers' salaries, the main cost item, which were to be reduced pro rata if this proved insufficient.

While this, in itself, could not affect the Director's income, Professor Allen was also incorrect when, on 22 December, he asserted that the 'teachers are paid so much an hour for the pupils to teach. If there are no pupils

---

398 *Herald*, 22 December 1900.


they don't get paid. That's the whole thing."401. There was - there had to be - more to it, since costs other than teachers' fees would still have to be defrayed. These included the rental of accommodation, lighting and heating, hire of instruments, and the secretary's and caretaker's salaries, which were to be met from the remaining 30 per cent402. If that proved insufficient, the shortfall could only be made up from the interest paid on the Ormond benefaction, the result of which could, of course, be to reduce the professor's income, which was paid from the same interest403. By the same token the professor also stood to gain by the arrangement, inasmuch as, if the Ormond interest was ever insufficient to provide him with an annual professorial income of £1000, it could be made up to that sum, at the Council's discretion, from students' fees404. Thus, Marshall-Hall's claim to have taken on the Directorship of the Conservatorium quite 'without fee or reward'405 was not, strictly, true.

Bride's assertion (above) was correct if the 'university chest' is construed so as to exclude the fees paid by music students, and the Ormond interest; while the accuracy of

401Herald, 22 December 1900.
403University Calendar 1895, op. cit., p.327.
404Conservatorium Committee report in MUCR Miscellaneous Papers Box M.N. folder marked 'Music Ormond Professor 1887'; see also MUCMB, 25 June 1900.
405MUCMB, 5 August 1898.
Ellery's prediction depended on enrolments. In the six years during which Marshall-Hall was director of the institution it had never once been necessary to cut into his earnings for this purpose. 406

Which is not to say that it could not have become necessary under a new, less popular director. But Somervell's claim that the whole of the salary could be consumed in this way was false. In 1900 the professor's income from the Ormond interest was £750 407, the lowest yet. Figures for expenditure in this year are not available. But those for 1899 (the highest to date) were as follows: rent was £125; the hiring and tuning of pianos cost £63.6.10; advertising, £67.3.0; printing £16.6.9; stationery, £4.19.6; gas and electricity, £36.16.2; concert expenses £93.17.7; furniture and fittings, £3.15.6; repairs to buildings, £7.5.6; telephone rent £10. The caretaker was paid £63.5.0; the librarian £2 and the secretary £50 plus 5 shillings per student per term. 408 This amounts to a total of £543.11.10 (excluding the capitation fee). And with no, or very few, students, these costs could have been considerably reduced. Fewer, if any pianos, would have been needed. There would have been no concert, or a very modest one, and little advertising, printing etc., etc. Of course, if the Ormond

406 Document concerning Ormond chair finances dated 7 August 1900 in MUCRCP 1901/36.
407 MUCMB, 4 June 1900.
408 University Calendar 1901, op.cit., p.464.
interest were to have fallen substantially, or some of the institutions with which the capital was invested were to have defaulted, that could have been a different matter.

The upshot of the discussion at the Council meeting of 22 December was the withdrawal of Bride's motion. Instead, it was resolved to cable the following message to the Agent-General: 'Inform Peterson that University cannot devote any University Funds to maintain Conservatorium. Establishment of Conservatorium dependent on Professor. Hitherto Conservatorium self-supporting but future doubtful. Marshall-Hall will probably continue Conservatorium on private basis\(^{409}\). Income from Ormond bequest assured to Peterson.\(^{410}\) This compromise left open the question of how the institution was to be funded if it proved not to be self-supporting, Councillors having apparently been unable to reach a consensus on this point. No doubt, some intended the omission to discourage the recipient from accepting the position.

This is certainly how their enemies saw it. It was, they argued, no more than 'a thinly veiled attempt to restore

\(^{409}\) In fact it appears that steps had been taken already on 12 July when Carl Pinschof, Austrian Consul in Melbourne, husband of the Conservatorium's chief study singing teacher, Elise Wiedermann, and staunch Marshall-Hall advocate, had sought (and was granted) a year's lease of the Albert Street premises, to begin when the University's lease ran out at the end of 1900 - see A. Colquhoun to C. Pinschof, 18 August 1900 in V.A.S. letter book 1897-1903, p.182, loc.cit.

\(^{410}\) Murdoch, 22 December 1900; see also Herald, 22 December 1900.
Mr. Marshall-Hall to office, and an outrageous wrong upon their own just-appointed officer, Professor Peterson, upon the University, and, indeed, upon the community at large. Even Table Talk described it as 'a threatening telegram [sent] to Professor Peterson as a Christmas Box'. And Alexander Leeper appealed to the public at large 'to suggest some course by which the apparently almost inevitable consequences of the unfortunate telegram to Professor Peterson may even yet be averted.

Moves were soon under way to counter its presumed effect. The Rev. S.G. McLaren suggested the creation of a guarantee fund and promised £10 to start it off. 'A Parent' claimed to know a number of people who would donate liberally to such a cause, as well as various musicians who would freely give their services to help the new professor against 'the Marshall-Hall clique'. And C.W. Russell offered the University the use of his teaching premises in Collins Street, complete with grand and upright pianos and music library, all free of charge for the first twelve months.

411 Argus, 26 December 1900.
412 Argus, 24 December 1900; see also Southern Cross, 28 December 1900.
413 3 January 1901.
414 Leader, 29 December 1900.
415 Argus, 26 December 1900.
416 Argus, 3 January 1901.
417 Argus, 27 December 1900.
The other side was also busy. On the 24th the University professors (all except Kernot and Gregory, who were overseas; Allen, who, as Masson later explained, being 'a member of the Council, was not consulted on the matter'; and, of course Marshall-Hall, himself) sent a telegram to Peterson, saying, 'We Professors think you, before accepting have right to know dissatisfaction felt here because Council appointed you in ignorance of fact, since learned, that Agent-General withdrew Marshall-Hall from London Committee's consideration. Council have ordered inquiry.'

Predictably, this produced another outcry. The Argus called it an 'unseemly interference ... in a matter resting with the governing body of the University alone.' The Victorian Churchman said it was 'an unjustifiable assumption of the functions of the Council, whose salaried servants they are.' Even Table Talk and the Leader, prizing the maintenance of authority in the University above the continued engagement of a music professor, called it a 'gross ... insult' to the Council and a 'flagrant act of disobedience and disloyalty on the part of the signatories,' while the

418 Orme Masson to Wrixon, 26 December 1900, in MUCR Miscellaneous papers Box M.N. folder marked 'Music Ormond Professor 1887'.
419 Ibid.; Argus, 2 January 1901.
420 2 January 1901.
421 11 January 1901.
422 Leader, 5 January 1901.
423 Table Talk, 17 January 1901.
Herald, Arena and the Liberator commended the action.

Then, on Boxing Day, a letter from Leeper appeared in the Argus, saying that he had been authorised to announce that a wealthy benefactor who wished, for the time being, to remain anonymous, had undertaken to guarantee the Conservatorium against financial loss 'for the first two years (or more if desired)'. A document to this effect had, apparently, been drawn up, and the same guarantor had paid for a cable to be sent to Peterson apprising him of the new turn of events.

The name of this philanthropic citizen was never officially revealed. But it is likely that the Outpost identified him correctly when it claimed to have been 'informed on good authority that the guaranteeing gentleman is W.A. Laver'. This is borne out by Leeper's otherwise quite mysterious reference in a previous communication (objecting to the pessimistic picture given of the Conservatorium's financial prospects in the Council's cable), to a 'letter which I addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, covering an important letter from a leading member of the Conservatorium staff', which,

---

424 2 January 1901.
425 5 January 1901.
426 4 January 1901.
427 Argus, 26 December 1900.
428 12 January 1901.
However, he regretted, may not have 'arrived in time for the meeting' of the 22nd.

The latter communication, which, unfortunately, does not seem to have survived, presumably came from the guarantor, who, on this assumption, was one of the three teachers, who did not follow Marshall-Hall into exile - the others being hardly likely to offer financial assistance to his successor. Of these three, David Coutts was in serious financial difficulties (see pp.429-430), and Ernest Wood had shown no inclination to play any active part in the affair at all. This left Laver, who seems to have had the money, having previously, according to his own account (see above p.412), offered to guarantee the solvency of the Conservatorium. And he had a motive. Peterson's failure to accept the offer would not have helped his ambitions, as he was not among the three selected and ranked by the London committee. It might, however, have been of assistance to Marshall-Hall who, if reappointed, could hardly have been expected to favour a man who had worked against him and who may have tried to suborn a witness in order to do him an injury (pp.395-397). Laver, it should be recalled, already believed that the professor was trying to replace him with Eduard Scharf.

Peterson's Acceptance

How far this offer influenced Peterson's acceptance of the chair - the last nail in Marshall-Hall's academic coffin -

429 Argus, 24 December 1900.
is difficult to determine. A decade later, when embroiled in a dispute about his salary, the new professor was to inform the Council that what had especially induced him to apply for the position was the promised income and the University regulation (Section 9, Statute V), which protected professors after ten years' service from being removed from office for incapacity brought about by age or other infirmity — although their remuneration could, in that case, be reduced, in inverse proportion to their years of service, by the vote of an absolute majority of Councillors. It is hard to evaluate such a claim, made long after, at a time when his health was failing and he was in pecuniary difficulties for which he held the University authorities partly responsible. But, if these considerations induced him to apply for the position, they were, no doubt, a factor in causing him to accept it.

But they were not alone responsible. On his arrival in March 1901, he explained that he had received many cable messages from Melbourne 'for and against occupying this appointment', and had been 'very uncertain as to what course to adopt until I got one message, simply reading "Kings vi 16". I looked up the text and found it read, "Fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them". That decided me.'

430 Peterson to Council, 2 November 1910 in MUCRCF 1910/47.

431 Report of the Director of the Conservatorium, December 1910 in MUCRCF 1910/20; Peterson to Council, 2 November 1910, M18, 1910/47.

432 Argus, 6 March 1910.
Whether or not this was literally true, it is likely that his decision was influenced by a general impression, gained from these communications, that the balance of community opinion was on his side. Leeper had complained that the Council cable of 22 December contained no 'promise [of] the Council's loyal and hearty support of Professor Peterson in any difficulties that he might have to face at the beginning'. Nor had it informed him that he 'might count upon the warm support of every school and college in Victoria, of the principal organs of public opinion, of the clergy of all denominations, and of the leading members of all professions, including even that of music'\textsuperscript{433}. No doubt, Leeper and others, including W.A. Laver, had made good these omissions in many of the cables that were sent to Peterson. The mere fact that someone in Laver's position was prepared to guarantee him against financial loss to this extent must have increased his confidence of having community support.

But the factor which was ultimately crucial in overcoming his indecision was the question of the directorship of the Conservatorium. The Council's cable of 22 December contained no presumably, unintended ambiguity. It used the word "Conservatorium" four times, without making it clear that the last usage, unlike the first three, referred, not to the University institution of that name, but to the one Marshall-Hand was expected to run in competition. This permitted the inference that the University Conservatorium was to be

\textsuperscript{433} The \textit{Leader}, 29 December 1900.
separated from the chair of music, and to remain under its original director. It is possible that Peterson had received word of Wrixon's suggestion of 22 December to just that effect (see above, p.559).

Anyway, it is clear that this had been the final sticking point. When Clarke received the Council's recommendation (on the 27th), and after he had shown it to Peterson, he cabled back as follows: 'Your telegram not understood. Is Peterson not to be director of the University Conservatorium?' 434. To this the Council replied, 'Peterson is to be Director Conservatorium' 435. And it was then that the new Professor signified his acceptance 436. The fight was over.

434 Argus, 21 February 1901.
435 Ibid.
436 Ibid.; see also Herald, 8 January 1901.
CONCLUSION

The defeat of the Marshall-Hall party was, given the closeness of the division in Council, and the less than total commitment of some anti-Marshall-Hall Councillors, undoubtedly due, in large part, at least, to the strength of the outcry that was mobilised against the Ormond Professor. And that, in turn, stemmed from a combination of circumstances which, together, satisfied both Smelser's model of collective action, and the seven antecedent conditions of Martin's paradigm of action explanation, as modified above (pp.43-44).

That is to say, firstly (and briefly), certain of Marshall-Hall's utterances (Smelser's precipitating events) were judged to be indecent and irreverent in tone, while lacking in any compensatory literary merit. This, together with the generally antinomian and atheistic convictions that were mistakenly attributed to him, and his official position as a representative of the State, and a (charismatic) teacher of the (principally female) young, was perceived as contributing to, and aggravating an already profoundly degraded present, in which Hebraic values were confronted by an unusually strong, determined and co-ordinated phalanx of hostile forces (Fisher's strain).
As a result, a disposition to act in some manner, calculated to counter the increased threat posed by the musician's offensive behaviour, arose among those members of the community who held certain (structurally conducive) beliefs. Notable among these was the view that man's primary occupation should be with overcoming sin, in its 'moral' as distinct from 'social' signification, defined by a body of external doctrine, in terms that were independent of its consequences. This presupposed a fundamental faith in the individual's ability to control his/her own destiny, albeit with divine help obtained in return for services rendered. The latter included strenuous participation in the struggle against evil as personified in various Manichean agents of Satan, among whom was Marshall-Hall. Seen in this way, the removal of the Ormond Professor from his University post fits into an ancient tradition of human sacrifice, offered to a mercenary and vindictive deity, as a means of purchasing the temporal welfare and ultimate salvation of his disciples.

Secondly, there was, and there was seen to be, a number of alternative courses of action to choose from. The Professor's opponents could have emulated the behaviour of the more ardent of his supporters, such as R.L.J. Ellery and Dr. T.F. Bride, and demanded his reappointment. Or, with the Rev. Charles Strong, they could have remained silent on the matter. Failing that, they could have sought to justify their situational motivation by striving, as did
Dr. Alexander Morrison and the three Councillors who supported his motion on 24 October 1898, for the professor's instant dismissal, leaving the University to suffer the legal consequences. Or they could have gone even further, and tried to prevent him from teaching anywhere in the colony. Alternatively, like the Rev. L.D. Bevan, they could have been satisfied — in the light of Marshall-Hall's adherence, between August 1898 and June 1900, to his pledge not to repeat his offence — with a severe reprimand and a renewal of this promise. Or they could have permitted the musician to resign at the end of 1899, after a year's paid leave, on his terms. Or, finally, they could have agreed to Sir Henry Kirxon's suggestion that Marshall-Hall remain Director of the Conservatorium, while relinquishing the chair.

Instead (condition 3), they decided not to oppose the completion of the remainder of his current five-year term of office, but to seek to prevent his reappointment thereafter. This end, they believed, could be achieved (condition 4) by bringing pressure to bear on the University Council in a number of ways — through letters to the press; to the Council; by passing motions in various denominational assemblies, school committees, and other bodies; by direct deputation to the Council; by endeavouring to fill two vacancies on that body with anti-Marshall-Hall candidates; and, no doubt, by much private lobbying.
With respect to condition 5, it is difficult to prove a negative, but it seems likely (if somewhat circular) that their failure to adopt any of those alternative actions, identified under condition 2, which, if successful, would have satisfied their situational motivation, stemmed, at least in part, from a belief that these options would not achieve their end as well as or better than the one chosen. Another alternative that might have been considered at the time - that of persuading Marshall-Hall to resign voluntarily - would presumably have been rejected when it became evident, after he withdrew his application for leave, that he was ready to go to considerable lengths to retain his post, even if it meant a humiliating apology and the voluntary limitation of his own freedom of speech.

Some of these alternatives were rejected, because their successful implementation would have satisfied the situational motivation of most of the anti-Marshall-Hall activists only at the expense of other, overriding considerations (condition 0). Amongst the latter was the University's material welfare, which would have been jeopardised by a possibly successful lawsuit for wrongful dismissal; or by the detachment of the Conservatorium from the chair, which could have occurred, had it been permitted to continue teaching in the former institution during his projected year of leave. The preservation of free speech was a further overriding motive, to the extent that it prevented the opposition from trying to stop the predecessor from teaching elsewhere in Victoria, but not to the
extent of persuading them that he should remain in a
publicly funded post. Similarly, the undoubted acknowledge-
ment by most of the professor's opponents of the valuable
musical contribution he had made during his decade of office,
did not override their determination to weaken his allegedly
pernicious moral and religious influence.

Finally (condition 7), they were clearly able, and knew
how, to take the action in question. This was due to a
variety of structurally conducive factors, including the
existence of channels through which their protests could be
expressed, notably the religious press, the correspondence
columns of daily papers, and the governing committees of
schools, churches and other organisations. Their access to
the University Council was facilitated by the close links
obtained between these bodies and leading anti-Marshall-
Hall Councillors, such as Dr. Alexander Morrison, Bishop Goe,
Dr. J.H. MacFarland and Professor Andrew Harper. And the
effective mobilisation of the campaign owed much to the energy
and political acumen of leading individuals like Alexander
Keeper, T. Palmer, J.R. Corr and S.G. McLaren, all of whom
also had direct lines of communication to the Council.

Marshall-Hall's conduct, which precipitated the whole
affair, is not easily assimilated into Martin's paradigm.
It is true that he, too, was responding to a perceived
situation in terms of certain structurally conducive beliefs.
In fact, that is, that the ever-present threat posed to
authenticity of experience, as he understood it, by the pervasive pressure of inner barbarism had been much fortified in his time both by the loss of whole meanings and a substantial accretion to the power and influence of Hebraism (which latter also jeopardised his domestic felicity). In addition, the structural conduciveness of the situation, thus created, to conflict was, of course, enhanced by his rejection of many of Hebraism's most cherished articles of faith, such as the importance of separating the sacred from the profane, and the concept of sin from the suffering it caused, the distrust of instinct as a guide to virtue, and the belief that the only possible motives for sexual indulgence were lust and propagation.

That Marshall-Hall was aware of possible alternative courses of action is shown by his own statement that, had he known how the Council would react to his utterances, he would have remained silent. And the fact that he had previously excised a highly offensive passage from his poem, 'On Michelagnolo's Mask of Mary', before including it in the Book of Canticles suggests that some consideration was given to alternatives. 

The end he had in view was, of course, authenticity, which, he believed, was possible only if the same ambition had been implanted in the hearts of his fellows. It was to bring this about that he took the actions that so offended the chemists in July and August 1898, actions which, demanding,
as they did, a large expenditure of evangelical energy, were, in themselves, calculated to augment his participation in authentic experience.

However, he did have an overriding motive which should have curbed his ebullience - namely, that of retaining his job. Or, to put it differently, it is misleading to identify his object, in behaving as he did, simply as the thirst for authenticity, which, in practice, he prized only insofar as its achievement was consistent with his continued occupation of the chair of music. This was made abundantly clear by his expression of regret, for the publications in question, and his pledge not to repeat the offence.

Now, although he was, no doubt, capable of accomplishing his overriding end - by holding his peace - he clearly did not know how to, having miscalculated the level of tolerance subsisting in the community and on the University's governing body. He failed (partly) because of the (to him) unexpected strength of the influence wielded by those whom he had offended (some, but not much of which stemmed from considerations of personal, material and professional interest, rather than religious or moral indignation). In addition, his downfall reflected the particular composition of the University Council and the London selection committee, which, between them, determined his fate, as well as the inept tactics employed by his supporters on the former body.
Had the Vice-Chancellor been an advocate of reappointment, or had just one of the opposition party been absent from, or otherwise abstained in, the crucial division of 25 June 1900, there is little doubt that Marshall-Hall would have begun a third five-year term in 1901. This might have occurred if the University had not at the same time been in such a parlous financial condition. Similarly, the timing of the offensive utterances may have been crucial, since, had they been delivered when the membership of Council was only slightly different, the decision could well have gone the other way.

Then, the absence of Judge Hood and William Thwaites from the Council meeting of 10 December, and Alexander Leeper's victory over James Barrett in the second Council election of that year, were all clearly important. Had any one of these factors been otherwise, Murray Smith's delaying motion would surely have succeeded on that day, and the professor might have retained his chair through force of circumstances. But what produced this election result cannot be asserted with any confidence, as the complexity of the issues makes it impossible to subsume voter behaviour under Martin's schema, by claiming that a decisive number of electors were principally actuated by their views on the Marshall-Hall affair.

The failure of Marshall-Hall's supporters to put Ellery's reappointment motion on 4 June 1900, when they enjoyed a year, albeit fortuitous majority on the Council, was
certainly crucial. And the same may be true of the fact that they did not take up and promote Sir Henry Wrixon's suggestion that the musician remain director of the Conservatorium, while vacating his chair. This would probably have induced Peterson to decline the appointment. It would then have been difficult to argue that a man, whose influence on a large number of practical students was deemed to be harmless, would corrupt a very small number of students of theory.

Finally, although nothing is known of Sir John Stainer's attitude to the affair, it is possible that, if his health had held out a little longer, he would have added his voice to those of Parry and Stanford in London. This would have left the selection committee evenly divided, and, while it would certainly not have guaranteed his reappointment, it would surely have improved the incumbent's chances.
Martin's grounds for declining to regard R' as an empirical (and, therefore, in principle, falsifiable) proposition are as follows: the failure of the consequent condition to be instantiated, given the seven antecedent conditions, could, he contends, occur in two distinct ways. The agent might do nothing at all. Booth, having determined that shooting the President is the best way of achieving his political goal, rises from his seat, takes out his pistol, cocks and aims it - and then does nothing. He does not, he it noted, deliberately forbear to act - which would, in itself constitute an action - nor is he incapacitated. He just does nothing.

Now, says Martin, 'We can view the consequent part of the formula, where it says, "he, the agent, does A", as specifying the doing of an action'. Therefore, if no action is performed, the formula cannot have been falsified\(^1\).

The argument, it seems to me, rests on two quite arbitrary, and, therefore, inadmissible assumptions, one explicit, the other implicit. The former is that the formula could only be falsified (if such were possible at all) by an action. Now, it is true that 'we can view the consequent part of the formula ... as specifying the doing of an action'.\(^2\) But I

\(^1\)Martin, op. cit., p. 188.

\(^2\)Emphasis mine.
no reason why we must or should do so. Martin concedes that even if nothing had been done by Booth, something would have 'happened' - he would have stood stock still, pistol in hand, pointing at Lincoln. And there are, surely, no grounds for supposing that anything more is required of a specification of the consequent term of the formula than an account of some relevant event - relevant, that is, in the sense that it either is the explanandum (bearing in mind Arthur Danto's stricture that the explanandum is never simply an event, but an event under some particular description) or replaces it. Viewed in this way, any event other than and in the absence of, Booth's assassination of the President, irrespective of whether it is an 'action', would falsify R.

In the second place (and a fortiori), I would challenge Martin's implicit assumption that if something is to qualify as an action, it must have been intended by the agent. He, himself, argues at an earlier point that the notion of intention does not include (logically include, that is) that of the action intended - otherwise we could not speak of intending an action, and then changing our minds and not performing it. But by the same token, acting does not, in ordinary language, necessarily imply an intention to act. One is always, if alive, doing something. (I am following Martin's practice of using the terms 'acting' and 'doing'.

3 Martin, op. cit., p.188.
interchangeably here.) There is nothing, for example, incongruous about answering the question, 'What is he doing?" with the information that 'he is sleeping', although to sleep (and, often, to fall asleep) is clearly involuntary. But to reply, 'he is dead', would be to insert a semantic discontinuity between question and answer. Being dead is not 'doing' anything; sleeping is.

This usage of the term is, of course, quite distinct from the hyperbolic, shorthand sense, according to which 'to do nothing' is to fail to do what is appropriate - as when one says, 'Although the house was on fire, he did nothing; he just sat there twiddling his thumbs'. Martin, I think, has confused the two. Booth, in the example considered above (it is Martin's example), can be said to have done nothing only in the second, non-literal, sense of the expression - he did not do what was appropriate, given the instantiation of the antecedent part of the formula. But to did do something, in the first sense - he stood motionless, gun in hand, etc.

But this is not, in itself, a sufficient refutation of Martin's basic contention, since he also believes that if the agent does perform some action other than A - eating an apple, say, or delivering an admonitory address, instead of shooting - the formula would still not have been falsified. Martin, himself, is not unaware of the difficulties that arise in this view. 'I am not sure,' he concedes, 'that
I can deal with this ... case in a wholly satisfactory way.6 And, indeed, he does not. R', he asserts, is not an empirical proposition, but a fundamental ingredient of our praxis - 'our modes of inquiry and of explanation'. That is to say, it is Martin's view that 'the relationship between the elements of the basic formula, between the "if ..." part and the "then ..." part is established by the way we think'.7 And this, he argues, is not grounded on any falsifiable beliefs, but on what Wittgenstein called 'a language game (Sprachspiel)'.8 It is 'simply a ... conceptual representation - of the foundations of one language game in particular, that of explaining actions, and it cannot be true or false because there is nothing it can be referred to to determine its truth value'.9

If I understand him correctly, what Martin is saying here is, in part, that R', in its relation to action explanation, is analogous to the axioms of an uninterpreted system of geometry. In defending the notion that no truth value can be asserted of it, he makes the obvious point that 'a particular inference has its proper grounds, but this business of citing grounds cannot go on forever! There is an end point which provides grounds but is not itself grounded'.10

6 ibid., p.191.
7 ibid., p.207.
8 ibid., p.203.
9 ibid., p.206.
10 ibid., p.204.
In the case of action explanation, he claims, this end point is 'an unfilled specification ... devoid of specific empirical content'.

But whether or not the empirical content is specific (in the sense of referring to particular individual phenomena) is surely beside the point. While it is true that any system of argument must be based on ungrounded premises, it does not follow that these premises have no truth value — unless, of course, the primitive terms are left uninterpreted. Whether the axioms of a geometrical system are true or false (or whether truth or falsity can be meaningfully asserted at all) depends, of course, on whether and how their primitive terms are interpreted. When they are uninterpreted there is no distinction in respect to truth value between the theorems of Euclid and those of, say, Lobatchevsky. Indeed, we are not permitted in these circumstances to speak of their truth value, but only of their internal consistency, and their deductive validity. But when the primitive terms are given their common interpretation, the Lobatchevskian system (or that part of it which relies on the negation of Euclid's parallel postulate) can be shown, by empirical means, to be false, its theorems being irreconcilable with, inter alia, the measured properties of actual triangles.

\[11^\text{Ibid.}, \text{p.184.}\]

\[12\text{For a fuller discussion see e.g. Stefan Kulażycki, Non-Euclidean Geometry (transl. Stanislaw Knapowski), Oxford, 1971; D.M.Y. Sommerville, The Elements of Non-Euclidean Geometry, New York, 1958.}\]
Martin concedes that \( R' \), too, has the characteristics of an empirical proposition when its conditions are factually instantiated. He admits that we employ the formula because of our belief that it is 'frequently useful, perhaps even invariably applicable with success in the explanation of actions', and that if this were not so we would make adjustments to it - a process he calls 'praxis verification' - in the light of counter-instances, or, if the number and gravity of the latter warrant it, abandon the formula completely in favour of a more serviceable explanatory paradigm and, therefore, a different praxis altogether\(^\text{13}\).

In stating that this would not falsify \( R' \), he seems to have confused the notion of empirical specification with that of the interpretation of primitive terms. It is true that the formula has no truth value if terms such as 'perceive', 'act', 'motivate', 'situation', 'end' and 'overriding', and their various derivatives, are left uninterpreted. But in practice they are not. In practice the formula (even when it has been neither instantiated not counterinstantiated) is a schema to whose primitive terms ordinary language interpretations are assigned. As a result, it refers to a wide range of empirical circumstances - to all those, in short, which could instantiate it, irrespective of whether any such instantiation actually occurs. The first condition refers to all of the motivating situations that people have ever been, are, or could ever in practice find themselves in;

\(^{13}\) Martin, op.cit., p.211.
the second, to all the actual choices of alternative conduct they are (again in the omnitemporal sense) faced with; the third to any real end that anyone could possibly wish to achieve to satisfy a real situational motivation; and so on. Without such an empirical content, what Martin calls praxis verification would be impossible, because the formula would contain no characteristics which are commensurable with, and therefore adjustable in the light of, counterinstances.

But the question at issue is, of course, not simply whether the conditions of the formula are individually empirical in character, but whether, in combination, they constitute an empirically falsifiable generalisation. The nub of Martin's reply to this question is, I think, his contention that 'with respect to R' it is not so much that the fulfilling of the antecedent conditions is a sufficient condition for the consequence, as that fulfilling the whole thing is a sufficient condition for asserting an explanatory connection between the agent's action and the other specified facts, from which it follows that 'R' is truly and properly employed in being applied to a particular set of behavioural circumstances, only when all its elements are fulfilled.

But the only ground given for concluding that this is a sufficient condition for its use is that it is part of our praxis, of our 'conception of how actions happen'. The

14 Ibid., p.198.
15 Ibid., p.197.
16 Ibid., p.198.
provisions of the formula, Martin declares, quoting Wittgenstein, constitute 'not an ungrounded pre-supposition [but] an ungrounded way of acting'; they are 'that which defines the game, that which gives it its point or character' and which 'sets the kind of moves one can make'. Thus, they 'are neither right nor wrong, true nor false; they just are'.

This surely involves a profound misconception of the nature of historical inquiry, whose purpose is to achieve a true understanding of the past. There may be as many definitions of the word 'true' as there are historians. It may be that 'objective' truth is unattainable by beings who are inescapably imprisoned within the walls of the Kantian categories, or whatever conceptual parameters may be preferred in these days when we are all relativists. And it may be that what we call 'truth' is no more than an expedient fiction, or what Nietzsche called 'the sort of error without which a particular class of living creatures could not otherwise live' - that history, in other words, along with other modes of inquiry, is a technology, and R', one of its tools. But historians, then, to be faithful to their craft, must surely justify their methodology in terms of its effectiveness in furthering this human end - in terms, that is, of a belief.

17 Ibid., p.207.
18 Ibid., p.204.
19 Ibid., p.207.
that it will, in some sense, work\textsuperscript{21} - rather than simply in terms of the fact that it reflects the way people happen to think (itself, incidentally, an empirical proposition). That is to say, R' is the basis of a belief game - an ungrounded pre-supposition - asserting what we believe to be 'true' (and, therefore, empirically corrigeable), not of a language game - an ungrounded way of acting - which describes how we, mentally, behave.

This is not to say that it is not also a part of our praxis, so deeply imbedded in our reflective habits that it has sunk below the level of conscious thought, and, therefore, generally, below the need for explicit assertion. Nor, indeed, is Martin wrong in saying that if the antecedent clauses were instantiated and action A did not ensue, a situation would have arisen which we would be unable to understand, because it would be incompatible with the way in which we perceive relations between the phenomena of behaviour - we cannot imagine it happening\textsuperscript{22}. This, no doubt, is why we use the formula with such confidence. But, as there is no reason to believe that the scope of the empirically possible falls within the limits of human understanding or imagination, this is not a ground for reducing the praxis in question to nothing more than a language game.

\textsuperscript{21} For example, that R' has a predictive power which licenses the investigator to expect that whenever the antecedent clauses are fulfilled the specified action will be performed.

\textsuperscript{22} Martin, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.201-2.
However, although \( R' \) is a transhistorical and (in principle) corrigible empirical proposition of the form \((x)(ax \rightarrow bx)^{23}\), it does not satisfy the strict deductive-nomological requirements of the covering law theorists\(^{24}\). It has not been established as true by controlled inductive procedures; much less has it been logically meshed into a larger network of empirical law and theory. Moreover, the rigorous deduction of a conclusion from a set of premises presupposes a nicety of definition of the non-logical terms involved, which is not only impossible but inappropriate in respect of this formula, whose explanatory power hinges, in part, on an assertion of the agent's subjective assessment of conative factors.

The crucial condition in this regard is the sixth. To say that an agent has no overriding motive, is to declare that he/she has not motive which (1) is stronger than the one specified in the first condition, and (2) the attempt to fulfill which would, in his/her opinion, conflict with the goal of satisfying the one specified. But the concept of motivational strength, if it is to be of any use, must remain an open textured one.

We are, of course, free to interpret it in terms of the behaviour it is believed to cause - to say that attributing

---

23 i.e. for any \( x \), if \( x \) is \( a \), then \( x \) is \( b \).

24 See e.g. A. Donagan, 'Historical explanation: the Popper-Hempel theory reconsidered' in History and Theory, Vol. 4, 1964, p.3.
a certain strength to a motive means asserting that the agent will, _ceteris paribus_ (provided, that is, that the other six conditions are correctly instantiated), perform the corresponding action in preference to other actions which arise from weaker motives, a corollary of which is that the strength of a motive can only be ascertained _ex post facto_. This, however, would confer a degree of analytic status on the formula, reducing it (in respect to this one condition) to semantic triviality. Our understanding of a situation can be advanced by condition 6 only if the concept of motivational strength is interpreted in such a manner as to make the non-occurrence of action A, given the fulfilment of the other antecedent conditions, logically possible – however unlikely it may be in practice.

By its very nature it is an affective phenomenon, comprehensible by virtue of the investigator's ability empathetically to project his/her own experience of volitions of varying intensity, subjectively differentiated. Any attempt to delimit it by the construction of a sharply defined verbal model would tend to exclude precisely that emotional element which is not susceptible of being comprehensively encapsulated in a form that states all the necessary and sufficient conditions of its occurrence. The greater degree of denotation thus achieved would be accompanied by a concomitant sacrifice of connotation.
Thus, R' is not even an explanation sketch in Hempel's sense of a rule positing the causal nexus between events in terms of the inductive probabilistic requirements of a weakened covering law thesis, and indicating the direction that future research should take in order to procure a 'gradually increasing precision of the formulations involved'. It is simply a common sense rule of what Dibble calls 'the armchair variety', deriving its justification from the casual, qualitative empiricism of everyday life, to which the ideographic historian (the efforts of Toynbee, Spengler and others to the contrary notwithstanding) is necessarily confined until such time as the nomothetic social scientist produces an acceptable body of law governing human behaviour.

---


26 Ibid., and Gardiner, Theories of History, op.cit., p.351.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY

1. Manuscrit Sources

Marshall-Hall papers, Melbourne University Archives.

Marshall-Hall papers, Percy Grainger Museum, University of Melbourne.


Holograph letter from Marshall-Hall to A.G. Stephens (c.) 12 July 1897, Mitchell Library A9 82.

Alberto Zelman papers MS 9607, Latrobe Library, Melbourne.

Alexander Leeper papers, in possession of Miss Valentine Leeper, South Yarra.

Alexander Leeper papers, Trinity College Archives.

Arthur Streeton papers, in possession of Oliver Streeton, Olinda, Victoria.

Baldwin Spencer papers, Box 2, Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford.

Charles Tait papers MS 3434, National Library of Australia, Canberra.


C.J. Coutts Correspondence, Council papers 4C 1893, Trinity College Archives.

Diaries of Melbourne Conservatorium of Music 1901-1915, Malta Memorial Conservatorium Archives, York Street, Richmond.

Deakin papers MS 1546, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

T.S. Delmer papers, in possession of Margaret M.S. Delmer, Woollahra, N.S.W.
Fritz Hart papers, Lachlan Library, Melbourne.

George Grove papers (Letters from George Grove to Edith Oldham), Department of Portraits, Royal College of Music, London.

Grice Family papers, Melbourne University Archives.

H.E. Higgins papers MS 1057, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

Harrison Moore papers, Melbourne University Archives.

Herbert Brookes papers MS 1924, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

Ivy Brookes papers, MS 2000, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

J.W. Barrett papers, Melbourne University Archives.

Kenneth Hince papers MS 2691, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

Kernot papers MS 8552, Box 977/3, Lachlan Library, Melbourne.

Letter File of the Musicians' Union of Australia, Correspondence from the Secretary 1914-16 (T. 7/8/1), Australian National University Archives.

Letters of Marshall Hall (senior), Archives of the Royal Mineralogical Society, London.

Melbourne University Council Letter Book 1888-1897, Melbourne University Central Registry.

Palmer papers MS 1174, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

Papers of the Melbourne Liedertafel, Percy Grainger Museum.

Papers of the Metropolitan Liedertafel, Percy Grainger Museum.

Rev. E.H. Sugden Letter files, Queen's College Archives, Melbourne.

S.W. Pring Personal papers MS 1367, Mitchell Library, Sydney.

Sir Ernest and Lady Scott papers, Series 5 MS 703, National Library of Australia, Canberra.
Sir John Lachlan papers MS 1117, National Library of Australia, Canberra.
Sydenham papers, Additional MS 151, 331, British Museum.
Tom Roberts papers, Mitchell Library, Sydney.
University of Melbourne Correspondence Files 1834-1915, Melbourne University Central Registry.
Victorian Artists' Society papers, Latrobe Library, Melbourne.
W.A. Layer 'Professor G.W.L. Marshall-Hall. A Few Personal Notes', in possession of Professor Geoffrey Blainey.

1. Official Records

Annual Reports of Melbourne Liedertafel 1891-1902, Percy Grainger Museum.

Annual School Reports and Blackheath Proprietary School Register of Shares 1874-93, Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.

Blackheath Proprietary School Register of Shares, Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.

Certificate of Birth ('Alick More') in the District of Hotham East No. 526A 1883, Office of Government Statist, Queen Street, Melbourne.

Certificate of Death in the District of Strake No. 295, Office of Government Statist, Queen Street, Melbourne ('Ulrick More').


Marshall-Hall Concert Programmes, 1896-1912 (incomplete), Melba Memorial Conservatorium Archives.

Melbourne Conservatorium of Music Calendars 1911-1912, Melba Memorial Conservatorium Archives.

Melbourne University Calendars 1890-1902.

Melbourne University Council Minute Books 1885-1916, Melbourne University Central Registry.

Melbourne University Senate Minute Books 1890-1901, Melbourne University Central Registry.

Metropolitan Liedertafel Minute Books 1893, 1897-1902, Percy Grainger Museum.

Minute Book of Melbourne University Conservatorium Examinations Board, 1903-6, Melbourne University Central Registry.

Minute Book of Queen's College Council, Melbourne, 1898-1901, Queen's College Archives.

Minute Book of the Council of Melbourne Grammar School, Melbourne, 1898-1900.

Minute Book of the Executive of Methodist Ladies' College, Melbourne, 1898-1900, Methodist Ladies' College Archives.

Minute books of the Musical Society of Victoria, MSV Archives, 27 Inglesby Road, Camberwell, Victoria.

Minute Book of the Professional Musicians' Union of Australia, New South Wales Branch, Australian National University Archives, Canberra.

Minute Books of Trinity College Council 1890-1901, in Trinity College Archives, Council Papers.

Minute Books of Melbourne University Finance Committee 1898, Melbourne University Registry.

Minute Books of Melbourne University Professorial Board 1889-1915, Melbourne University Central Registry.

Minute Books of the Victorian Council of Public Education, Spring Street, Melbourne.

Minutes of the Meetings of the Boobook Society 1906, Harrison Moore papers, Melbourne University Archives.

Old Blackheath Club School Register Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.
Oxford University Calendar 1883.

Presbyterian Ladies' College Reports, Prize Lists and Prospectuses, 1894-1904, P.L.C. Archives, Melbourne.

Principal's Register. New Boys, Blackheath Proprietary School, Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.

Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria 1892-1903.

Programmes of the Melbourne Symphony Orchestra 1906, 1908, Melba Memorial Conservatorium Archives.


Reports of Annual General Meetings of the Melbourne Liedertafel 1888-1904, Percy Grainger Museum.

Reports of Annual General Meetings of the Metropolitan Liedertafel 1888-1904, Percy Grainger Museum.

Reports of Trinity College Council to the Melbourne and Ballarat Church Assemblies 1898-1901, Trinity College Archives, Council papers.

Students' Register, Department of Portraits, Royal College of Music, London.

The Alpine Club Register 1864-1876 London: Edward Arnold, 1925.

Trinity College Calendars 1890-1901.

Trust Deed of Lady Northcote Permanent Orchestra Trust Fund, Hince papers 2691, National Library of Australia, Canberra.

'U of M Roll Book', Melbourne Memorial Conservatorium Archives.

Victorian Parliamentary Debates 1888,1898-1900.

Visitors' Book Blackheath Proprietary School, Archives and Local History Department, Manor House Library, Lewisham, U.K.

3. Newspapers and Periodicals

Advocate (Melbourne), 1896-1910.
Age (Melbourne), 1891-1903.
All about Australians (Sydney), 1905.
Alma Mater (Melbourne), 1897-1904.
Answers (London), 1894.
Arena (Melbourne), 1898-1901.
Argus (Melbourne), 1888-1915.
Austral Light (Melbourne), 1898-1902.
Australasian (Melbourne), 1892-1901.
Australasian Critic (Melbourne), 1890-1891.
Australasian Catholic Record (Sydney), 1895.
Australasian Intercollegian (Melbourne), 1895-1906.
Australasian Musical Monthly (Melbourne), 1906.
Australasian Review of Reviews (Melbourne), 1898-1902.
Australasian Schoolmaster (Melbourne), 1886-1906.
Australian Christian (Melbourne), 1898-1901.
Australian Christian Herald (Sydney), 1899.
Australian Christian World (Melbourne), 1898-1901.
Australian Herald (Melbourne), 1897-1903.
Australian Musical News (Melbourne), 1911, 1914, 1933.
Australia Today (Melbourne), 1910.
Australian Women's Sphere (Melbourne), 1900.
Ballarat Church Chronical (Ballarat), 1898-1900.
Bible Echo (Melbourne), 1898-1901.
Blackheathen (London), 1875-1878.
Bohemia (Melbourne), 1890-1892.
Book Lover (Melbourne), 1899-1900.
British Australasian (London), 1898-1915.
British Bandleman (London), 1887-1915.
British Musician (London), 1888-1902.
Bulletin (Sydney), 1891-1915.
Centennial Magazine (Melbourne), 1889.
Champion (Melbourne), 1896-1901.
Christian Citizen (Melbourne), 1899-1903.
Church Musician (London), 1891-1893.
Church of England Messenger (Melbourne), 1897-1902.
Crab Catcher (Melbourne), 1892.
Critic (London), 1898.
Daily Telegraph (Melbourne), 1891.
Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 1898.
Era (London), 1893-1908.
Field Quarterly (London), 1871.
Free Lance (Melbourne), 1896.
Gleam (Adelaide), 1898-1901.
Great Thoughts (London), 1898.
Herald (Melbourne), 1890-1901.
Illustrated Australian News (Melbourne), 1885-1904.
Leader (Melbourne), 1892-1902.
Liberator (Melbourne), 1890-1901.
Manchester Examiner (Manchester), 1889-1890.
Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser (Maryborough), 1903.
Melbourne University Magazine (Melbourne), 1908-1910.
Melbourne University Review (Melbourne), 1891.

Mineralogical Magazine and Journal of the Mineralogical Society of Great Britain and Ireland (London), 1876, 1879, 1882, 1887.

Nitre (Melbourne), 1896-1903.

Monthly Musical Record (London), 1889.

Music (London), 1897-1901.

Musical Age (London), 1898-1915.

Musical Herald (London), 1888-1902.


Musical Notes (London), 1893-1895.

Musical Opinion (London), 1897-1913.

Musical Risvegliato (Melbourne), 1903.


Musical Times (London), 1888-1915.


Newtonian (Newton Abbot), 1884.


Notes and Queries (London), 1899.

Orchestral Association Gazette (London), 1893-1900.

Orchestral Times (London), 1901.

Organist and Choirmaster (London), 1893-1907.

Outpost (Melbourne), 1890-1903.

Overture (London), 1891-1892.

Patchwork (Melbourne), 1888, 1891-1903, 1906, 1914.

Presbyterian Messenger (Melbourne), 1896-1905.

Presbyterian Monthly (Melbourne), 1897-1906.

Punch (Melbourne), 1896-1901.

Quadrangle (Melbourne), 1892.
Saturday Review (London), 1898, 1905.
School (London), 1888-1890.
Scotch Collegian (Melbourne), 1904.
Searchlight (Melbourne), 1896.
Sketch (London), 1898.
Southern Baptist (Melbourne), 1898-1901.
Southern Cross (Melbourne), 1892-1915.
Southern Sentinel and Herald of Liberty (known as Australian Herald and Spirit of Liberty before 1895) (Melbourne), 1894-1901.
Spectator (Melbourne), 1891-1902.
Speculum (Melbourne), 1886-1912.
Star (London), 1889.
Summons (Melbourne), 1892-1898.
Sun (Sydney), 1915.
Sydney Morning Herald (Sydney), 1892.
Table Talk (Melbourne), 1890-1915.
Theatre (Melbourne), 1905.
Theatre Magazine (Sydney and Melbourne), 1915.
Theatre of Australasia (Melbourne), 1890, 1899.
Tit-Bits (Melbourne), 1887, 1890, 1893.
Toisin (Melbourne), 1898-1904.
Triad (New Zealand), 1913.
Tribune (Melbourne), 1898-1901.
Truth (London), 1898-1900.
Truth (Sydney), 1898-1901.
Victorian Churchman (Melbourne), 1898-1902.
Victorian Independent (Melbourne), 1893-1902.
Victorian Standard (Melbourne), 1893-1900.
Violin Times (London), 1893-1907.

War Cry (Melbourne), 1898, 1900.

Wesley College Chronicle (Melbourne), 1898-1900, 1903.

Weekly Times (Melbourne), 1896-1904.

White Ribbon Signal (Melbourne), 1898-1900.

Woman (Sydney), 1900-1902.

Xaverian (Melbourne), 1900-1901.

4. Literary Works by G.W.L. Marshall-Hall

A Book of Canticles, Melbourne: the author, 1897.

'Against Ideals and Idealists', Australian Musical News, August 1911.


'Beethoven's Mass in D at the last Richter Concert', Magazine of Music, August 1888.


Hymn to Sydney, Melbourne: the author, 1897.

Hymns Ancient and Modern, Melbourne: the author, 1898.

'Genius', Musical World, 13 July 1889.


'Love's Spring' (poem), Musical World, 15 February 1890.

'Music a Development of Speech', Musical World, 22 November 1888.

'Music and Man', School, January 1889.

'Music as a Religious Force', Monthly Musical Record, 1 July 1889.


'Music: Some Faults in our Education System', Magazine of Music, July 1888.

'National Opera', Manchester Examiner, 31 August 1889.

'Notes on the Opera Season', Australian Musical News, December 1911.


'Press Criticism Versus Art', Table Talk, 12 May 1893.

'Songs of Thought and Feeling', School, September 1889.

'The Artist', Magazine of Music, October 1891.


'The Call of Genius' (poem), School, November 1889.


'The Voice: Its Use and Cultivation', Magazine of Music, September 1892.

'To Death' (poem), Musical World, 8 February 1890.

To Irene, Sydney: McLardy, 1896.

'What Progress Has England Made in Music During the Last Ten Years? Are the English Musical? What Particular School of Music had had the Greatest Influence?', School, September 1888.

3. Books and Pamphlets

Adams, F. Australian Essays, Melbourne: Inglis, 1886.


Brentnall, T. My Memories, Melbourne: Robertson and Mullens, 1938.


Cambridge, A. Thirty Years in Australia, London: Methuen, 1903.


Corry, J.A. (ed.) Extracts from the Published Works of Professor Marshall-Hall, pamphlet dated 17 July 1900, Latrobe Library.


Hopkins, E. _The Power of Womanhood or Mothers and Sons_, (Melbourne), Robertson & Co., 1901.


Jackson, Holbrook _The Eighteen Nineties_, London: Grant and Richards, 1913.

Jose, A.W. _The Romantic Nineties_, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1933.


Leeper, A. _Christian Education in the University_, Melbourne: Edgerton and Maers, n.d.

Lindsay, L. _A Consideration of the Art of Ernest Moffit_, Melbourne, 1899.

Lindsay, L. _Comedy of Life_, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1967.


Lindsay, N. _My Mask_, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1970.

Lucas, A.H.S. _His Own Story_, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1964.

McKay, C. *This is the Life*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1964.


Potter, R. *An Examination of Secularism*, Melbourne: George Robertson, 1883.


Tate, H. Australian Musical Possibilities, Melbourne, Vidler, 1924.

Taylor, G. Those Were the Days, Being Romances of Australian Artists and Writing..., Sydney: Tyrrell's, 1918.

Thompson, G. Marr, Scrapbooks of Newspaper cuttings, Mitchell Library, MFO 780 T.


6. Articles


Burt, A.J. 'The Endeavourers' Bible' Gleam, October 1900.


Marshall Hall (senior) Translation of Professor Kjeralf's 'The Terraces of Norway' Scientific Opinion, March 1870.


Moore, W. Harrison 'Bias and Suspicion of Bias, Summons, June 1898.

Noble, J.A. 'The Fiction of Sexuality' Contemporary Review, April 1895.

Rowbotham, J.F. 'The Wagner Bubble' Nineteenth Century, October 1888.

Smythe, Carlyle 'The Education of Australian Music', Life, 1 May 1913.


Sutherland, M. 'Young Days in Music' Overland, 40, December 1968.


Wibberley, B. 'Professor Marshall-Hall' Gleam, Vol.1, No.1, July 1900.

B. SECONDARY

1. Books


Cooper, J.B. The History of St. Kilda from its First Settlement to a City and After (Vol.2), Melbourne: Melbourne Printers, 1931.


Faquet, E. Politicians and Moralists in the 19th Century, London: Benn, 1953 (2 vols.).


Fox, L. E. Phillips Fox: Notes and Recollections, Potts Point, N.S.W., the author, 1969.


Hoff, C. Charles Conder His Australian Years, Landsdowne Australian Library, 1972.


Serie, G. The Rush to be Rich, Melbourne U.P.


2. Articles


Anderson, T.H. "Becoming Sane with Psycho-History" *Historian* 41, November 1898.


Brink, T.L. 'History and Depth Psychology: Some Reconsiderations' Historian 41, August 1979.

Buckley, V. 'Utopianism and Vitalism in Australian Literature' Quadrant 10, Autumn 1959.


Connolly, C.N. 'Class, Birthplace, Loyalty: Australian Attitudes to the Boer War' Historical Studies, Vol.18, No.71, October 1978.


Davis, A. 'Socialization and Adolescent Personality' in J.P. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education 1944.


Eakins, D. 'Suden of Queen's' Heritage, No.10, 1939.


Izbensky, G. 'Psychohistory and Intellectual History' History and Theory 14, 2 1975.


Harr, M. 'Dismissal of Chris Brennan from the University of Sydney' Australian Literary Studies, Vol.7, No.4, October 1976.


Shapiro, N. 'Psycho-historians' *Encounter* 52, March 1979.

Shore, M.F. 'Biography in the 1980s: A Psychoanalytic Perspective' *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 12, Summer 1981.


Strout, C. 'Historical Hero in a Psychological Age' *Yale Review* 70, Winter 1981.


3. Theses


French, B.L. 'Secondary Education in the Australian Social Order 1788-1898' Ph.D., Melbourne University, 1958.


Radic, M.T. 'Some Historical Aspects of Musical Associations in Melbourne 1885-1915' Ph.D., Melbourne University, 1977.


Spate, V. 'Tom Roberts and Australian Impressionism 1869-1903' M.A., Melbourne University, 1962.

Author/s: Rich, Joseph Wolfgang

Title: His thumb unto his nose: the removal of G.W.L. Marshall-Hall from the Ormond Chair Of Music

Date: 1986


Publication Status: Unpublished

Persistent Link: http://hdl.handle.net/11343/38869

File Description: His thumb unto his nose: the removal of G.W.L. Marshall-Hall from the Ormond Chair Of Music

Terms and Conditions: Copyright in works deposited in Minerva Access is retained by the copyright owner. The work may not be altered without permission from the copyright owner. Readers may only download, print and save electronic copies of whole works for their own personal non-commercial use. Any use that exceeds these limits requires permission from the copyright owner. Attribution is essential when quoting or paraphrasing from these works.