

TAKING AWAY JOSS

CHINESE RELIGION AND THE WESLEYAN MISSION IN CASTLEMAINE,
1868

BENJAMIN PENNY

On October 1, 1868 three Chinese men appeared before His Honour, Judge Forbes at the Castlemaine County Court in Victoria.¹ One Goon Cheum was the plaintiff in 'an action to recover the value of Chinese Temple taken down by the defendants', namely Hoa Ah Pang and Laong Oun Hung. Goon claimed seventeen pounds, ten shillings and sixpence. *The Mount Alexander Mail*, the local newspaper, reported the next day that Goon had claimed in court, 'On September 29 of last year I purchased from Hoa Ah Pang a temple and all its contents for £5'.² According to him, and several witnesses, Hoa had sold the temple fair and square, intending, as one witness said, to go to New Zealand. Subsequently, it was claimed that Hoa and others had pulled the temple down and taken it elsewhere.

The defence case rested, said their barrister Mr Leech, on credibility. Hoa, when called to the stand, said that he had not sold the temple but rather had let it for six months, for which he had been paid five pounds. The witnesses he produced were his co-defendant Laong Oun Hong, a Wesleyan minister, and The Rev. Mr Dubourg, and they corroborated his stance. *The Mount Alexander Mail* reported

that, 'His Honour ... give the verdict to the defendants, with £3 7s costs'.³

This is a minor case by any account but *The Mount Alexander Mail* does not tell the full story. The case gains greater significance because Hoa Ah Pang, the former temple keeper, had recently been converted to Christianity, Laong Oun Hung (who rendered his own name as Leong On Tong, as I will refer to him hereafter) was the Wesleyan catechist who had won his soul, and The Rev. Mr Dubourg was a Wesleyan minister in the mission to the Chinese of Castlemaine and other parts of Victoria. An examination of records from the Uniting Church archives enables us to place this strange little case in a wider context, that of the meeting of Chinese popular religion (by which I mean the religion of the masses of the Chinese people as opposed to orthodox Buddhism or Daoism) and Protestant Christianity on the goldfields, and in turn to relate it to the *locus classicus* of that encounter, China itself. What I will present takes the form of microhistory, but perhaps cases such as this enable us to ground our conclusions about cross-cultural encounters in the minutiae of quotidian experience and historical specificity.

THE WESLEYAN BACKGROUND

In *The Wesleyan Chronicle* for 20 October 1868 (three weeks after the case), a letter appeared from The Rev. Ed. King under the title 'Chinese Mission in Castle-maine – a Joss House Transformed into a House of Christian Worship'.⁴ King supervised the mission to the Chinese. His letter gives the following account of the same case from a rather different point of view:

Some few months since, Ah Pang, the keeper of a joss-house, was converted through the instrumentality of Leong-on-Tong. For about ten years he had kept a joss-house, but about nine months previous to his conversion he let his temple to an old man named Goon Chin, and became a gold-digger. Having embraced Christianity, he felt that he could not consistently continue the proprietorship of the temple, and resolved to present it to Leong-on-Tong, that it might be converted into a house of prayer.

He goes on:

Having given due notice to the tenant of his intention to resume possession of the building, on Monday July 20, a number of the Chinese Christians met in the house of their teacher, and from thence they proceeded to Five Flags, Campbell's Creek, where stood the idol house.

Hoa, as we shall see below, had established his temple around 1857. King then passes over the account to Leong On Tong. Leong continues:

About three months since, my countryman, Ah Pang, was converted to Christianity. Eleven years since he built a joss-house, but, on his conversion, he resolved to remove the idol temple to Moonlight Flat, for the use of the Christian Chinamen. Monday July 20, was the day appointed for its removal, and I, accompanied by nine of my countrymen, went, with two horses and drays, to Five Flags, and, as I expected great opposition from the Pagans living in that neighbourhood, I asked the Revs. E. King and C. Dubourg to be present on the occasion. We also secured the presence of a policeman. During the time the house was being taken down there were great excitement and angry threats, but the presence of the ministers and the policemen happily prevented a breach of the peace. The rain came down very fast; and Mr Dubourg for about two hours held joss under his arm. My county men expected every moment to see him fall down dead, or some judgement to come upon him.

The word 'joss' is a corruption of the Portuguese word 'deos', god, thus 'joss-house', the building in which the sacred images of Chinese religion are housed and worshipped.⁵ When Mr Dubourg is said to hold joss under his arm, he would appear to have been holding the sacred images from the temple. King continues:

As might be expected, the Pagans were much incensed at the dishonour done to their idol, and an incid-

ent which occurred a few days after will show the prevailing temper of their mind.

Leong-on-Tong was pursuing his labours amongst his countrymen, and had entered into a tent where nine or ten Chinese were gathered. Suddenly a man entered, and said, 'I have come to curse you for taking away joss. You preach Christian doctrine very good, but why you take away joss?' He was willing to tolerate Christianity, but demanded similar tolerance for Paganism.

These comments are both important and revealing, and in some ways also perplexing. Revealing as they demonstrate the attitudes of at least some of the Chinese men to the actions of Hoa and his new comrades. They were clearly not pleased at the removal of their house of worship and the desecration of their sacred images. More than this, King understood the offence given. The comments are important as they show the Chinese reacting to that offence in a serious and meaningful way rather than simply accepting the actions of what must clearly have appeared as the representatives of the colonial powers. If we can trust King's reportage this anonymous man had come to the place Leong was proselytising specifically to curse him.

Finally King's response to the statement, 'You preach Christian doctrine very good, but why you take away joss?' namely, 'He was willing to tolerate Christianity, but demanded similar tolerance for Paganism', is, I suggest, both remarkable and perplexing. It is remarkable as it acknowledges the open-minded attitudes of the Chinese man who distinguishes

between the evangelism of the missionaries *per se*, whom he appears to compliment if only for their mastery of technique, and their actions towards his own religion. It also sums up very neatly a position of mutual tolerance that has echoes of modern ecumenism and indeed multiculturalism. However, the question arises as to whether King endorses such a position or regards it as intrinsically ridiculous. Given that his very next sentence begins, 'At length Pagan anger and malevolence found vent in a legal prosecution ...' I suspect King was not a man before his time.

Once the temple was moved, emptied of its religious articles, and Goon Chin (as his name is rendered here) was evicted from both his workplace and his home, it reopened as a 'house of prayer'. King reported:

It was opened for Divine worship, Sunday, August 2. I first preached to the Europeans who were present, from Isa. xlv. 1, 4, and was followed by Leong-on-Tong, who spoke warmly to his assembled countrymen from Acts xvii, 30, 31.

These two texts both address the ancient transgression of idolatry, thus, King and Leong were echoing the cries of protestant missionaries in every mission field in the last half of the nineteenth century.⁶ The potency of idolatry as an accusation is clear especially in the mission to China.

THE CHINESE IN CASTLEMAINE

After the discovery of gold at Mount Alexander was made public in 1851, the population of Castlemaine and surrounding districts rose quickly. Among those

flooding to the diggings were Chinese men arriving in Melbourne, and then Robe in South Australia after the imposition of the entry tax in 1855. By 1858 the Chinese population of Victoria had peaked at some 40,000. According to the Annual Mineral Statistics submitted by Secretary of Mines in his Quarterly Reports of Mining Surveyors and Registers, the population of Chinese in the Castlemaine district in that year attained 9727 and dropped steadily after 1865. By 1868 when our case was heard in the Castlemaine county court there were 3080 Chinese living there.⁷

These population data should not, however, be viewed as absolutely reliable. In 1868 The Rev. William Young submitted his 'Report on the Conditions of the Chinese Population in Victoria' to the Victorian parliament. Figures in that report on the major Chinese settlements in Victoria were obtained from different local informants. In the case of Castlemaine, 'Statistics of Chinese Population, and particulars of their Employments, [were] furnished by the Chinese Interpreter James Ah Coy'.⁸ Ah Coy's report is most informative. At the level of absolute numbers he reports 'over 80' Chinese in the township itself, 50 at Mopoke, and 'over 300 Chinese miners near Mopoke gully', 150 miners at Barker's Creek, 150 miners at Golden Point, 170 miners at Diamond Gully, and 'In the vicinity of the township all around', there were 100 miners, 20 who worked in gardens, 30 market gardeners, 300 who were married with wives in China, seven married to European women, 20 Chinese children, five Chinese naturalised, 25 in hospital, five lepers, and 400 Chinese prisoners in Castlemaine gaol. Ignoring Ah Coy's endearingly idiosyncratic taxonomy (did any of those married have

an occupation?), these numbers are still more than 1000 short of the 3080 souls. Nonetheless, the picture given here is of a community that had passed beyond the first flush of gold fever with the beginnings of a commercial economy. Ah Coy reports that in Castlemaine there were:

- 1 Chinese street in the township,
- 5 Chinese stores,
- 1 butcher's shop,
- 1 eating-house,
- 5 opium shops,
- 5 gambling-houses,
- 2 barber's shops,
- 4 fishmongers and
- 3 druggists' shops.

In Ah Coy's report there is no 'joss-house' in Castlemaine itself or any of the local villages or camps.

Could this really have been the case?

CHINESE RELIGION IN CASTLEMAINE

Information garnered from rates records in the Borough of Castlemaine and United Shire of Mount Alexander tells a different story. These records refer to three temples in 1860, three in 1861, one in 1865, two in 1866, and four in 1868. They also refer to one in Campbell's Creek in 1875.⁹

However, we are not limited to rates records in this matter. The *Mount Alexander Mail* also noticed Chinese temples and related activities throughout the period. Between 1858 and 1876 there are references to temples 'on the left hand of the

Forest Creek Rd, a few hundred yards out of town' (31.5.58), 'on the side of the road, just beyond Somerville's Store [Campbell's Creek]' (10.11.58), at Clinker's Hill (16.5.59), in the township (11.2.67), Clinker's Hill (again, 22.5.71), Ten Foot Hill (26.4.72), and Duke St (24.1.76).

Now, by any account this points to a religiously active community. In addition, it should be noted that the *Mount Alexander Mail's* coverage of Chinese temples undergoes a marked, but perfectly understandable, change after 1859. The early reports clearly regard the simple existence of a Chinese temple, even temporary structures, as news in themselves. As the years go by, and presumably their readership becomes more used to seeing such things, the *Mail* only notes more serious events such as the opening of new and imposing structures, or else as sites for events not necessarily related to the temple itself – 'a hut near the Chinese joss-house by some means took fire, and in a few minutes was destroyed with its contents' (11.2.1867). Thus, we may safely conclude that the references to Chinese temples in and around Castlemaine referred to here are an underestimation of the true situation.

When the *Mail* reported on temples or on activities related to them, it adopted a notably neutral tone, concentrating on the fabric of the building and its ornaments as an object of curiosity—often in elegant description—rather than in what the temple meant. An 1858 article under the title 'Chinese worship' is a good example.¹⁰ In a rich description of the temple structure and decoration there is very little by way of judgement. While certain mildly negative words and phrases may be noted—the display objects are

'tawdry', mirrors are of 'Brummagem' pattern (that is of inferior, Birmingham style, possibly fake), the lamp burns 'feebly', the man in the temple 'mutters to himself',—there are, equally, references to the undoubted sacredness of the place—it is a 'shrine', he is a 'worshipper' who has 'devotions' and is presumed to be 'devout'. That is, the author is not dismissive of this building and these practices in the way that The Rev. King and Leong On Tong are in their use of terms such as 'pagan' and 'idol house', let alone in their actions. Nonetheless the article concludes, 'We cannot say what all this may mean, but however devout the individual worshipper may be, his countrymen in the contiguous tent are not affected thereby, but chatter on as loud and shrill as usual'. Here, I suspect, the author is drawing a distinction between the Chinese observances which could take place at any time an individual preferred and collective Christian worship on a Sunday when the Christian Sabbath was observed with decorum, at least ideally in the minds of the protestants.

This tone is consistent in the material from the *Mount Alexander Mail*, even as the content of the articles changes. Indeed, there is a kind of admiration in some of their reports, such as the series of seven articles over eighteen months related to the subscription for, and construction, opening and consecration of the temple at Ten Foot Hill in the early 1870s.¹¹ As far as the *Mail* is concerned, by this time the Chinese are a notable part of the Castlemaine community whose religious buildings and observances are objects of interest for the whole community and no longer simply worth reporting for novelty value.

This is not to say that the stance of the *Mail* was shared with their entire readership. A letter from 'Iconoclast' from 6 June 1859 spells out a different set of attitudes to Chinese religions. He says that he has gathered information from a 'respectable Chinese',—later he tells us this man is a Christian—that the Chinese in Bendigo and Castlemaine both intend to seek subscriptions for 'a joss-house of much larger size than the one now built'. His informant apparently 'regret[s] the increase of heathen temples in this country. He wonders why they are not prohibited by law, fearing that his countrymen will be encouraged in their idolatrous practices by a toleration, which will be construed to mean an indifference to every form of religion'. 'Toleration' is clearly a threatening and problematic idea, for 'Iconoclast' as much as it was for King, for whom 'indifference to every form of religion, 'probably implied a threatening latitude for Catholicism. 'Iconoclast' then bemoans the lack of success of the missions to the Chinese and concludes, 'So far, indeed, from the doctrines of Christ having successfully combated the dogmas of Kung-foo-tze [Confucius], it would almost seem as if the philosophy of the heathen sage were assuming the aggressive'.

Iconoclast goes on to bemoan the standard of the interpreters between the Chinese and the authorities and 'the necessity of obtaining honest and competent Anglo-Chinese linguists'. His criticisms focus in on James Ah Coy:

I am assured on good authority, that Ah Coy, the Castlemaine Interpreter is sometimes performing the ko-tow before the picture of Kwan-ti on Clunker's Hill, and yet this official calls himself Christian,

and swears on the Bible. He has a right to be an idolator if he likes, but at least let him avow the fact.

However, not 10 days after this letter the first of a series from J. M'Culloch Henley, Anglo-Chinese Linguist, appeared in the *Mail* explaining various aspects of Chinese popular religions and Buddhism in a comparatively learned way.¹² It is, of course entirely possible that 'Iconoclast' and J. M'Culloch Henley were one and the same, his first letter making the case for employment of someone just like the author of the latter sequence. Such a conclusion is buttressed by the ending of his first letter, on the Chinese God of War Guandi (Kwanti in his rendering), which echoes Iconoclast's sentiments very closely:

It is to be hoped that some steps will be taken to evangelise these heathens and teach them that the knowledge of the God of benevolence was superior to that of the sanguinary god Kwanti. If some steps in that direction do not be taken soon, we will have the horror of beholding the Chinese erecting temples to the gods of their native hills, more numerous to those erected to the "Unknown God".

Here we have an interesting religious variation on the general fear of being flooded by the yellow hordes from the north—that churches will be overrun by joss-houses.

WHO WAS HOA AH PANG?

It would be entirely predictable that our sources would be silent on Hoa Ah Pang before his encounter with the Wes-

leyans. Surprisingly this is not so—however, the only snippet of information we have about him is tantalising in its brevity. The *Mail* tells us in its 3 September 1862 issue that the day before in the Castlemaine Police Court, ‘Ah Leung sued Hu Ah Pang for 30s, which amount he had kindly lent defendant. The debt having been proved, a verdict was given for the amount’.¹³ Who Ah Leung was, why Hoa borrowed the money, if he made a habit of borrowing money and then not paying it back and any number of other questions are raised by this gnostic reference but cannot be answered.

Some other aspects of Hoa’s life can be elucidated from the statement read out at his baptism in the Wesleyan church, Castlemaine and preserved in *The Wesleyan Chronicle* for January 20, 1869 and the *Mission Notices* for that year.¹⁴ Hoa, whose baptismal name was Enoch, came from Foo Tow village in Lunning district, Canton province. His family were too poor to send him to school, and he says that when he came to Victoria he ‘brought idols with me, hoping they would take care of me, and keep me in health, and aid me to become more rich’. He, ‘came here to make money. I got a little and went home.’ He later returned with another idol ‘in whom I trusted for greater prosperity’. This new god proved popular with other miners who came to Hoa’s tent to worship him. Not letting the opportunity slip away, Hoa says that he, ‘first thought of building a temple, in order to make money’. Over eleven years, he ‘removed it to six different places, and made £2000 by the speculation’. I might pause to note here that for Hoa, as for most temple keepers, religion was a business. This makes it even more surprising that Ah Coy did not include

joss-houses in his list of Chinese businesses active in Castlemaine. So, obeying the proper narrative rules for this kind of document, Hoa then speaks of his progressive degradation, smoking opium and gambling all his money away. He then tells of his meeting Leong On Tong on the road, and his gradual acceptance of Christian doctrine. At his moment of true conversion, he describes his realisation in terms that are, by now familiar:

The Holy Spirit shined into my heart, and I understood that to worship images was to offend God, and to be the owner of a joss-house was a great sin.

It is clear that the conversion of Hoa Ah Pang was regarded by the mission as a great coup, demonstrating God’s great strength and power. He is singled out in this article for special mention from three other Chinese recipients of baptism by both its author, presumably King, and by Leong in his address reprinted from the ceremony.

I have not been able to find out anything more of Hoa Ah Pang, including whether he remained in Australia or returned to China, whether he remained a Christian or became a ‘backslider’, and what he did for a living after he had turned to the straight and narrow and given away his means of sustenance.

The situation is different for Leong On Tong.

LEONG ON TONG AND HIS VIEWS OF CHINESE RELIGION

Leong On Tong assumed the position of catechist for the Wesleyan mission in 1866. He had been converted himself while

in Australia, in Vaughan, by his predecessor but one as catechist, Leong Ah Toe (no family relationship is ever mentioned between the two). He was regarded as very successful and stayed in the position for thirteen years. In 1879 he was ordained and then was placed in charge of the Little Bourke Street chapel in Melbourne where he stayed until 1885. He then returned to China.

Fortunately, parts of Leong On Tong's journal survive. Unfortunately, that part of his journal dealing with July to October 1868 is lost, or perhaps better put, has not yet been found. It is a fascinating document, describing his daily work on the goldfields and the occasional translated and transcribed conversation, sometimes with temple keepers—undoubtedly tidied up—and the arguments he puts to them strongly echo the statements of Hoa Ah Pang in his baptismal statement: worshipping images is a sin against God, setting up a temple to allow others to worship images is thus a greater sin, images are nothing but paper and wood and therefore cannot protect you, buying incense and candles to worship the images is a waste of money, and so on.

Leong's views on idolatry were absolutely mainstream in protestant missions of the time across the world. One favourite biblical text on idolatry comes from Psalm 805, 15 and 16:

The idols of the nations are silver and gold, the work of men's hands. They have mouths but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not; they have ears but they hear not; neither is there any breath in their mouths.

On this logic the worship of idols is simple absurdity, with no possible rational justification. Missionaries in China and elsewhere, who belonged to the London Missionary Society, in fact encouraged their converts to hand over their sacred images as a sign of true conversion. The missionaries often sent these to the museum of the LMS in London. The 'Advertisement' on the first page of its catalogues speaks of 'the most valuable and impressive objects in this Collection are the numerous, and (in some instances) *horrible*, IDOLS, which having been imported from the South Sea Islands, from India, China, Africa; and among these especially which were actually given up by their former worshippers, from a full conviction of the folly and sin of idolatry - a conviction derived from the ministry of the Gospel by the Missionaries'.¹⁵

Idolatry, specifically in China, aroused deep emotion in a notable witness to its religion in this period. The Right Rev. Bishop C.R. Alford, Anglican Bishop of Victoria in Hong Kong from 1867 to 1872 published a pamphlet for the Church Missionary Society called *Idols: Idolatry: Idolators* in 1887. In it he writes from his own observations doing the rounds of Anglican missions from Hong Kong to Beijing, 1000 miles west up the Yangtze, and east to Yokohama:

I can tell you what I myself saw of the idolatry of China when, as Bishop of Victoria, it was my duty to visit the Missions ... I can testify that, though their language differed in every important Mission that I visited, as also their physical appearance and even their mental temperament, their social manners and customs also

to some extent, -everywhere the people were given to idolatry ... In fact, everywhere in heathen lands, and in everything purely native, as a rule, idolatry overshadows the people, like some pestilential cloud enveloping and defiling more or less the great mass of the population ... But I have said enough to show you that, notwithstanding all that can be written about the philosophy of the ancient religions of the East, idolatry, whatever name it may assume, holds the heathen nations fast bound in chains of sin, and wretchedness, and death, -a piteous sight that brought the Son of God from heaven to destroy these works of the devil, and that ought to stir to the bottom of his soul every soldier of the Cross to go forth in his Master's name and overcome the Evil One by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony.¹⁶

CONCLUSIONS

Two conclusions follow from what I have described: First, religion existed in the Chinese community in Castlemaine and it was an important part of the lives of many if not most of the Chinese who lived there. To make such a conclusion leads us to ponder why it was so completely written out of official documents—including documents based on information collected by Chinese people. Secondly, the events that led up to our minor case in Castlemaine County Court were part of a much larger encounter between Protestant mis-

sionaries and the followers of Chinese religions in China and also in the Chinese diaspora. Doubtless, little dramas like the one I have described were taking place across the Chinese world and in all likelihood the dynamic everywhere was much the same. On the one side were usually relatively poorly educated Chinese people whose religious observances were based profoundly on the primacy of efficacy—did worshipping this god produce results in the here and now?—and on the other were generally well educated Europeans who tried to convince them that the way they sought results was not only not efficacious but sinful—a notion entirely novel to Chinese religious traditions.

As we have seen, as far as we can tell from our sources, the Chinese were far from antagonistic to the missionaries—their religious world was plural. Religions based on efficacy are welcoming of efficacious novelties and the history of Chinese religions is one—to a large extent—of borrowings, absorption and acceptance. On the other hand, the religions of the book tend to be exclusivist and uncompromising so it comes as no surprise that the protestant missionaries on the goldfields were not tolerant of the religious practices of the Chinese.

What I think is perhaps more surprising is that this intolerance seems not to be more widespread. The *Mount Alexander Mail*, for instance, did not attack the Chinese for being pagans or heathens—but rather seems to have adopted the attitude that if they did not understand what was going on, they would refrain from criticism.

This is not to say that the Chinese in Castlemaine were not subject to bigoted criticism beyond the mission. They were

subject to all the usual accusations of immorality, profligacy and besottedness that the Chinese across Australia experienced. Indeed, one of the most striking pieces of anti-Chinese bigotry that survives in published form in this period comes from Castlemaine: the infamous 'Sketches of Chinese Character, Illustrative of their Moral and Physical Effect on the Rising Generation of Victoria', by 'Humanity' published in Castlemaine in 1878. In this short piece, it is the Chinese debauching young European women that most inflames our author:

Could I but write – and by Gods help I'll try – the scenes of that awful red, blood-red alley or lane off Forest-street, and publish it in England, it would never be believed that our Saxon and Norman girls could have sunk so low in crime as to consort with such a herd of Gorilla Devils, devilish and leprous in feature, and devilish they are in nature also.¹⁷

Taking a step back from the material discussed in this paper, the overriding impression of the encounter between the Chinese and Europeans on the goldfields is one of two communities largely living separate lives, in different languages, eating different food, in distinct places of residence, worshipping different gods in different ways. The missionary encounter was one of the very few sites where one community actively reached out to the other. While the missionaries I have discussed held opinions of Chinese religion (and by extension the non-Christian Chinese themselves) that are at best deeply prejudiced, nonetheless they are also one of the few groups that also reckon them

worthy of attention and effort. They also, almost uniquely, preserve the voices of members of this community—'you preach Christian doctrine very good but why you take away joss?'—even when those voices disagree with them.

To most Europeans, the Chinese were completely and irrevocably alien and I suspect that their hatred of the Chinese was based on those features of their lives the Europeans understood precisely because they were paralleled in their own lives: their mining practices, their use of prostitutes, their use of intoxicants, and the threat that they would take their land by sheer force of numbers. Religion was not such a focus of general bigotry towards the Chinese as it was simply beyond their understanding.

ENDNOTES

¹ The case is recorded in the Castlemaine County Court Register for Thursday, October 1, 1868, held in the Public Record Office of Victoria, VPRS 733/5. The spelling of the names of the Chinese participants in this narrative vary according to who transcribed them. However, as it is clear in all sources used which person is referred to, I have rendered the names as they appear in each source. A general survey of the missions to the Chinese in the Victorian goldfields has recently appeared the *Victorian Historical Journal*: Walter Phillips, 'Seeking souls in the diggings: Christian missions to the Chinese on the Victorian goldfields', (72, 1&2, September 2001, pp. 86–104). I would like to acknowledge Ian Welch who first brought my attention to this case.

² All references to the case are from *The Mount Alexander Mail* (hereafter, MAM), 2.10.1868.

³ The costs, according to the Court Register, were made up of defendant's costs of three pounds three shillings and sixpence, a two shilling government fee and a two shilling subpoena fee.

⁴ *The Wesleyan Chronicle* (hereafter, WC), 20.10.1868, p. 149.

⁵ It should be noted that Chinese religious images may also be painted on paper, and in discussions of Chinese religion in Australia from this period 'joss' are sometimes said to be stuck to walls or doors.

⁶ The King James version of the Isaiah text reads, 'Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth, their idols upon the breasts, and upon the cattle; your carriages were heavy laden; they are a burden to the weary beast', and 'And even to your old age I am he; and even to hoar hairs will I carry you: I have made, and I will bear; even I will carry , and will deliver you.' The Acts text reads, 'And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; Because he hath appointed a day, in which the righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead'.

⁷ Figures from K. Cronin, *Colonial Casualties: Chinese in Early Victoria*, Melbourne, University of Melbourne Press, 1982, Table 5, p. 141.

⁸ I. McLaren, *The Chinese in Victoria: Official Reports and Documents*, Melbourne, Red Rooster Press, 1985, pp. 38–9.

⁹ I am indebted to the Castlemaine Historical Society Inc. for this information.

¹⁰ MAM 31.5.1858, p. 3.

¹¹ MAM 12.10.71, 24.4.72, 26.4.72, 7.6.73, 14.5.73, 15.5.73, 16.5.73.

¹² MAM 15.6.1859, 22.6.1859, 24.6.1859, 1.7.59, 8.7.1859.

¹³ MAM 3.9.1863, p. 2.

¹⁴ *The Wesleyan Chronicle* 20.1.1869, p. 11; *Mission Notices* 1867–71, pp. 143–4 (National Library of Australia, Ferguson Collection).

¹⁵ *Catalogue of the Missionary Museum, Austen Friars; including specimens of natural history, various idols of heathen nations, dresses, manufactures, domestic utensils, instruments of war, &c. &c. &c.*, London, W. Phillips, 1826, p. iii.

¹⁶ C. R. Alford, *Idols: Idolatry: Idolators*, London, Church Missionary Society, 1887, pp. 5–6.

¹⁷ 'Humanity', *Sketches of Chinese Character, Illustrative of their Moral and Physical Effect on the Rising Generation of Victoria*, Castlemaine, F. Y. Benham, Printer and Bookbinder, 1878, p. 3.