INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Members of the Canadian Society of Church History have frequently expressed the wish that papers delivered at its annual meeting should be made available in more permanent form. Many members who support us financially year after year find it impossible to attend meetings regularly. Those who do attend are frustrated by the experience of hearing an illuminating presentation and then being prevented from making full use of it in their own research by failure of memory or inaccessibility of documentation. Publication is one of the most important services normally rendered by learned societies, and the best that we have been able to offer hitherto has been encouragement to seek publication elsewhere.

The Executive of the Society, meeting on November 28, 1967, accordingly directed the Secretary to collect as many of the papers given at our annual meeting of 1967 as possible and to distribute them in mimeographed form to the members. Copies are also being made available to others for a small sum.

We recognize that distribution on such a small scale in no substitute for publication. This is essentially a private mailing, without prejudice to eventual publication. Copyright remains with the authors, and any requests for the right to quote from the papers should be made to them.

John W. Grant

President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A SIXTEENTH CENTURY LUTHERAN DEFENCE OF THE STATE CHURCH: J.M. Estes 1

LIBERAL CATHOLIC JOURNALISM: THE SATURDAY REVIEW, 1855-1865: John Kenyon 15

RESPONSE TO DISRUPTION: PRESBYTERIANISM IN EASTERN ONTARIO, 1844: Burkhard Kiesekamp 30

A SIXTEENTH CENTURY LUTHERAN DEFENCE OF THE STATE CHURCH

by

J.M. Estes, Victoria College,
University of Toronto

For several years now I have been studying the career of the German reformer, Johannes Brenz (1499-1570), a figure not well known outside Germany. Brenz's career falls roughly into two periods: in the first (1522-1548) he was town preacher in the free imperial city of Schwäbisch Hall and chief theological adviser of the city council; in the second (1550-1570) he was provost of the Stuttgart Collegiate Church and chief theological adviser of Duke Christopher of Württemberg. Brenz's contribution to the Reformation was twofold. He first attracted public attention as the champion, in south-western Germany, of Luther's doctrine of the Real Presence against the views of the Zwinglians, and his subsequent writings, widely read in the 16th century, established him as an eloquent and influential spokesman of Luther's theology in general. At the same time, Brenz also became one of the most gifted and effective organizers of the 16th-century Lutheran territorial state church, his reorganization of the church in Württemberg after the ravages of the Interim being the culmination of his life's work in that field. It is Brenz's career as an organizer of the state church that I am interested in.

Whereas Luther, faithful to the implications of his doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, would tolerate governmental regulation of ecclesiastical affairs only as a temporary expedient, Brenz viewed governmental control of church order as the normal and desirable state of affairs. This fact immediately raises two questions. First of all, why did Brenz, who was otherwise such a faithful and articulate spokesman of Luther's point of view, become the proponent and organizer of an institution which violated the basic principles of the Reformation as Luther understood them? In an article

scheduled for publication in the Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte I have tried to answer that question. Briefly summarized, this is what I said:

Pointing to the well known fact that the development of state control of the church was already far advanced before the Reformation, I argued that two factors made Brenz view this development with approval and to seek to utilize it in behalf of the Reformation. The first factor was Brenz's background as a Christian humanist, which predisposed him to view the moral and religious education of the people as the chief means by which a "Christian magistrate" provides for the "common weal," the peace and order of his territory. It was to this Erasmian-humanist conception of the Christian magistracy, foreign to Luther's thought, that Brenz invariably appealed when assigning to the secular authorities responsibility for church order. This responsibility was not viewed, as with Luther, as one to be exercised only in emergencies but as an integral component of the ruler's office. The Peasants' Revolt and the threatened Turkish invasion of the Empire were to Brenz vivid examples of the sort of punishment God inflicts upon a country whose rulers fail to provide for the preaching of "pure doctrine" and who tolerate "idolatrous worship" (i,e. the Roman Catholic mass).

The second factor was the fact that it was the accumulated powers of the secular government in ecclesiastical affairs that provided the legal pretext for governmental action in behalf of the Reformation. For example, the rights of lay patronage which rulers had been eagerly concentrating in their hands before the Reformation enabled Protestant rulers to appoint Protestant clergymen, like Brenz, regardless of the objections of the Catholic bishops. Furthermore, that part of their territorial sovereignity, defined in imperial law, which obligated rulers to promote the "true faith," was sufficiently vague to enable them to defend actions in support of Lutheranism against the objections of the Emperor. Before the issuance of

the Speyer Recess of 1526, which gave the principle cuius regio eius religio its first tentative recognition in imperial law, Brenz had already utilized these traditional conceptions of territorial sovereignty to defend the principle of territorialism in religion.

In the same article I also pointed out that while Brenz's understanding of the office of Christian magistrate made him an advocate of governmental authority in ecclesiastical affairs, a characteristic fear of disorder, fed by his distrust both of the average clergyman and the average layman, made him a consistent centralist, an opponent of any scheme, such as synods, whereby the congregations and their pastors might have exercised at least some modest influence on the exercise of that authority. Thus Luther's hope, based on his doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, for active congregational participation in the government of the church, had no place in Brenz's thought or in the church orders which he established. For example in the Württemberg church, as reorganized by Brenz, all initiative and decision-making power were narrowly concentrated in the hands of the "ecclesiastical council," a subdivision of the prince's chancery. Thus ecclesiastical affairs, just like secular affairs, were subjected to the fatherly tutelage and bureaucratic control of the increasingly absolutist territorial rulers.

The second question raised by Brenz's championship of the state church--the question I want to deal with today--is this: How did Brenz reconcile the practice of governmental control of ecclesiastical affairs with the so-called "doctrine of the two kingdoms"? Did not the territorial state church, as both Catholic and Radical Protestant critics (for quite different reasons) charged, violate the divine world order by confounding secular authority and spiritual authority (or, in more modern terminology: by confounding the distinction between church and state)? If Luther's understanding of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers be the standard of judgment, the answer is clearly yes. However, the fact that Brenz enunciated the doct-

rine of the two kingdoms in his commentary on the Peasants' Twelve Articles, in which same work he also argued the case for the state church, indicates that his answer was no. It would therefore be most instructive to be able to reconstruct from his works a coherent statement of that understanding of the relationship between church and state which held that church government is the responsibility of the secular authorities.

At this point, however, we run into a bit of trouble. To the best of my knowledge, Brenz wrote no work dealing systematically with this subject. There are, of course, a great many passages in his works which deal with various aspects of the problem either directly or indirectly. It has been my experience however, that one can get the most out of these sources--i.e. a satisfactory, coherent account of the general position implicit in them,--only if one makes use of the device of extrapolation, that is, by supplementing Brenz's statements with interpolations from relevant contemporary evidence. Fortunately, there is preserved among Brenz's own papers some material which greatly facilitate this task.

In volume three of the Brentiana collection in the Schwäbisch Hall municipal archive there is a letter, dated 26 March 1530, from Lazarus Spengler, the secretary of the Nürnberg city council, to Brenz. In the letter Spengler requests Brenz's written opinion of a memorandum written in the course of a controversy in Nürnberg over the treatment of Anabaptists by a person whom Spengler describes as a close friend but whom he does not name. The memorandum, enclosed with the letter, raises the question of whether the secular authorities have the right to punish dissent from the established church order. The author argues very ably that it does not. Following this, the collection contains three other memoranda, at least two of which, and perhaps all three, are rebuttals of the memorandum mentioned above. None of them is signed or dated, and all are written in chancery script. Brenz's 19th-century biographers uncritically assumed that all three were by Brenz, simply because they were preserved

in a collection of Brentiana. They did not even raise the question of why Brenz would have replied two or three times to the same request. Recent work by Martin Brecht of the University of Tübingen, not yet completed and not yet published, has already overturned this assumption. According to Brecht, who has kindly communicated his findings to me, external evidence--the testimony of the 18th-century historian who owned the original manuscript --has established Brenz as the author of the first memorandum. Internal evidence--citations from a letter of Luther to the author--has established Wenceslaus Linck, one of the Nürnberg reformers, as the author of the second memorandum. So far it has not been possible to identify the author of the third, the longest of the three. It could be Andreas Osiander, another Nürnberg reformer, or Linck (the argument and the phraseology are very similar to that used in the second memorandum), or Spengler, or someone else altogether. Somehow or other Brenz came into possession of these two documents, and his copies appear to be the only ones that have survived.

For the purposes of this paper, Brenz's own memorandum is not very useful. While it throws a great deal of light on his relatively humane views on the treatment of religious non-conformists, it throws little light on the larger issue of church-state relationships in the state church. It is the third memorandum, the one of unknown authorship, which is most useful. Whereas Brenz and Linck, particularly Brenz, concentrate rather narrowly on the issue of the treatment of Anabaptists, the author of the third memorandum offers us a general analysis of the relationship between secular and spiritual authority in an attempt to define the limits of secular authority in ecclesiastical matters. Indeed, to judge from its contents (the argumentation being specifically anti-Catholic rather than anti-Anabaptist), the memorandum was not written as a reply to the anonymous memorandum rebutted by Brenz and Linck, and probably did not even originate as part of the controversy which produced the other documents. That, however, is beside the point. What is to the point is this. Whoever he was, the author of the third memorandum was almost certainly one of the Nürmberg reformers, a group whose

views on theology and ecclesiastical polity were very close to Brenz's own. Brenz was soon to work closely with them in the preparation of the Brandenburg-Nürmberg church order of 1533. Moreover, the views expressed in the memorandum dovetail almost perfectly with those to be found in Brenz's works. (This assertion, easily demonstrated by means of footnotes in a written article, cannot conveniently be demonstrated in an oral presentation. I assume that you would rather take my word for it than listen to a tedious recitation of passages in early new high German). What I have done, therefore, is to extract the basic argument found both in the third memorandum and (in somewhat abbreviated form) in that of Linck, and use it as the framework for drawing together all the relevant passages from Brenz's correspondence, memoranda, church orders, and biblical commentaries. The result, I hope, is a reasonably accurate statement of the arguments Brenz and a great many other 16th-century Lutheran reformers would have used to defend the state church against the charge that it confounded the distinction between church and state.

The working assumptions underlie the position argued in the memorandum. The first of these is the assumption that the secular ruler in question is a Christian. All ecclesiastical matters, even those whose regulation is the prerogative of the secular government, must be conducted in a Christian manner, that is, in harmony with God's word and in the spirit of love, Christian service, and the fear of God. Therefore, church order is the prerogative, not of secular authority per se but of secular authority exercised by a Christian, who desires not to seek his own gain but to serve his fellow Christians by using his office for the "premotion and administration" of spiritual matters.

The second assumption is the definition of the relationship between spiritual and secular authority which Luther had set forth in his pamphlet On Secular Authority (1523). God has instituted spiritual authority to govern the spiritual realm, that is, the realm of men's souls. This is the realm in which consciences are instructed and shown the way to salvation. Its citizens are God's

elect, those who respond to the word in true faith. It is thus something entirely internal, neither bound nor characterized by time, place, or external circumstance. In St. Paul's words, it is "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." In this spiritual realm God has reserved all authority to himself and governs through his word alone. No human authority may command in the spiritual realm of the conscience. Hence, although God employs officials, such as pastors and bishops, in his realm, he has given them no power to command human consciences but only to serve the community by proclaiming the word through which he himself rules.

To govern the secular realm God has instituted the secular authority. The secular realm is the kingdom of this world, of all things which men can perceive, understand, and judge. Within this realm the secular authority's power is supreme and has divine sanction. Whatever regulations it makes to preserve peace and order and to promote the common good, so long as they are not contrary to the gospel, are to be regarded not as human but as divine ordinances. But the secular government, declares the memorandum in a close paraphrase of Luther, has no power whatever in the spiritual realm: "That which is on earth and belongs to the temporal, earthly realm, God has placed under the power of the secular government. But that which is divine and belongs to the eternal kingdom is solely under the power of the heavenly lord." Thus no one owes obedience to a ruler who interferes in matters of conscience, for in such matters one must obey God rather than man.

What the author of the memorandum had to demonstrate, then, was that the state church did not violate this fundamental distinction. The demonstration consists of two closely related arguments: (1) an analysis of ecclesiastical affairs which comes to the conclusion that the external ordering of the church properly is a matter of secular jurisdiction; and (2) an analysis of the origin and purpose of secular power which comes to the conclusion that God established it primarily for the purpose of upholding and furthering the spiritual realm.

The first argument can be summarized as follows. As Brenz pointed out in one of his earliest writings, "church" is an ambiguous

term which is not necessarily the equivalent of "spiritual realm". In so far as "church" refers to the invisible fellowship of the elect, the two terms are synonymous. But "church" is also used to refer to visible, earthly institutions whose membership includes not only the elect but also hypocrites, and which are characterized by external ceremonies and practices which, though useful and necessary, are not in themselves a part of the spiritual realm. It is this conviction that the visible church is an institution lying partly outside the spiritual realm which underlies the rule according to which the memorandum assigns the affairs of the visible church either to the ministry of the word or to the authority of the secular government:

> Although things which pertain directly and of necessity to the spiritual realm should be dealt with in a spiritual manner and entrusted to the clergy, who have the ministry of the word: nevertheless, to the extent that such things are external or temporal and can be separated from the spiritual realm, a Christian magistrate may and should deal with them in the defense and promotion of the truth.

According to this principle certain matters belong "indisputably" in the one realm or the other. On the one hand, the secular government has full responsibility for the administration of church property and income. These things were not established by God in his kingdom. Rather, all church property originated as gifts from lay persons while church taxes are enactments of human law. There can thus be no question that these are temporal and external matters which have nothing to do with salvation and thus belong under the jurisdiction of the secular government. However, as Brenz occasionally had to remind the secular authorities, ecclesiastical property and income must not be expropriated for purely secular uses but, in conformity with the original intention of the donors, devoted exclusively to appropriate ecclesiastical and charitable uses, such as the upkeep of church buildings, payment of the clergy, education of the young and the care of the sick and needy. As for the conduct of the ministry of the word (i.e. preaching, administration of the sacraments, ecclesiastical discipline, judgment in matters of doctrine), it is equally indisputable that this is the

duty of the regularly called and ordained clergy. For the secular ruler to presume to pronounce on matters of doctrine or otherwise to arrogate to himself the prerogatives of the clergy in the cure of souls would be to ignore the office to which he has been called and to interfere in an office to which he has not been called and for which he probably has not been trained.

At this point the problem gets a bit stickier. While preaching and the administration of the sacraments are spiritual matters in that they have been instituted by Christ and pertain of necessity to the spiritual realm, they are also external matters in that they are performed at particular times and places according to certain ceremonies. These external aspects of the ministry of the word, it is argued, fall by definition under the jurisdiction of the secular government. Thus it is the government's task to provide for such things as suitable times and places for public worship, for suitable orders of worship for various occasions, for means of training and selecting qualified clergymen, as well as for means of enforcing the regulations thus established. For the government to do so is by no means an interference in the spiritual realm, for it is one thing to say, for example, that preaching is most effective in the morning because at that time people are more alert than they will be after dinner, and quite another thing to say that preaching in the morning is necessary to salvation or that preaching in the afternoon is a sin. The regulation of such external matters is simply a legitimate exercise of the government's duty to provide for the peace, order, and general welfare of its realm. This is a point repeatedly emphasized in Brenz's church orders.

The view that the externals of church order are in themselves neither holy nor binding on the conscience is, of course, a basic principle of Luther's thought. But it does not lead with any logical necessity to the conclusion that the regulation of such matters is therefore the prerogative of the secular magistrate. Luther was far more consistent when, true to the doctrine of the universal priesthood, he denied the right of the government to interfere except in emergencies. The conclusion drawn by Brenz

and by the author of the memorandum was dictated by an a priori commitment to a view of the Christian state which would not admit, as Luther's view implied, that any major area of public activity, ecclesiastical affairs least of all, could possibly lie outside the normal jurisdiction of the secular government. The view of the state in question is, of course, the one which had developed in the one hundred years or so before the Reformation, the one which had been idealized in the thought of the Christian humanists, and the one which Brenz had made his own. As a good Lutheran, Brenz naturally believed and taught the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers and often made effective use of it in combatting the claims of the Catholic hierarchy. Invariably, however, and often in the same breath, he reserved the exercise of the responsibilities involved to the secular government, the guardian of the public weal.

The second argument advanced in the memorandum appears to be an extension of that view of the origin of secular power elaborated in Luther's On Secular Authority and found also in Brenz's commentary on the Peasants' Twelve Articles. If all the people in the world were true Christians, that is, if they were really governed by the word of God, they would keep perfect peace and harmony among themselves. There would be no murdering, cheating, revenge-seeking, suing in court, and the like. Thus the preaching of the gospel alone would be sufficient to govern the world and external force would be superfluous. In reality, however, true Christians are very rare, nor can they all be brought together in one place in order that they may be ruled by the gospel alone. They are a minority of sheep among a majority of wolves, and the evil majority would, unless forcibly restrained, devour the few that are good as wolves devour scattered sheep. In these circumstances the word could not even for long be preached, let alone make any headway in the world. To prevent this, God has established the secular government and given it coercive power, the power of the sword, to be used in the maintenance of peace and order.

For Luther this meant, first of all, that the office of government is a high calling because its rule makes possible the survival of the church, and, second, that when in an emergency the prince

uses his secular authority to reestablish good order in the church he thereby acts to uphold the natural order of the world established by God. However, in a system of ideas uninhibited by the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, a much more far-reaching conclusion was possible. Thus both the author of the memorandum and Brenz in a number of his church orders and related documents, assert that secular authority was created primarily for the purpose of "serving God's kingdom." This is why St. Paul refers to the secular authorities as God's servants for the benefit of the good and the punishment of the wicked. To be sure, the secular rulers have authority only in the secular realm, but God has commanded them to exercise their rule in such a way as to serve his kingdom and has threatened them with his wrath if they do not (Ps. 2:10-12). Specifically, this means that the secular ruler's first duty is the ordering of the church according to God's word, and that the maintenance of secular peace and order is subsidiary to this and indeed dependent upon it.

While Luther's conclusion is the one more consistent with the implications of the priesthood of all believers, Brenz's is the more consistent with the reality of the inclusive state church. If all the members of the church were true Christians they would conduct the affairs of the church decently and in order simply because Christ has commanded them to do so. However, particularly in a church whose membership is taken to be identical with the population of the state, it is obvious that not all church members are true Christians. On the contrary, many are tares among the wheat, in Christ's kingdom, so to speak, but not of it. Thus the coercive power of the secular ruler is essential to the maintenance of church order for the same reason that it is essential to the maintenance of secular peace and order. Just as the true Christians would be destroyed in a war of all against all if the secular sword did not coerce the non-Christians to keep peace and order, so the ministry of the word would not long survive the assaults of faction, heresy, or just misinformed good intentions, if the secular government did not enforce, by means of devices such as regular visitations, the observance of decent and proper church order on

those of its subjects and fellow church members who do not make such observance freely, in obedience to Christ's command.

Implicit in the argument summarized in the last few paragraphs is the assertion that the welfare of the spiritual realm depends on the proper functioning of the secular authority. This assertion, along with its obverse, that the welfare of the secular realm depends upon the proper functioning of the spiritual authority, is implicit in some of Brenz's earliest writings on church order. In the memorandum, both assertions are made explicit in the attempt to demonstrate that although the two realms are distinct,each governed by its proper authority, they are nevertheless inextricably bound together like law and gospel or body and soul, each performing its appointed task not merely for its own sake but also for the welfare of the other. Through the ministry of the word the spiritual authority seeks not only to bring consciences to the saving faith but also to cause men to conduct themselves unimpeachably in all civic affairs and in general to render Caesar his due. On the other hand, the secular government uses its authority not simply to promote civic peace and welfare but also to facilitate and to maintain the preaching of Christian doctrine. In doing so each authority remains in its own realm where it belongs, Moses stands by Aaron and all is in order.

With respect to religious non-conformity, the authors of all three of the memoranda in the Schwäbisch Hall collection argue that it is the duty of the Christian magistrate to take action against false preaching and worship in those cases in which true preaching by itself does not eliminate them. To be sure, the secular government does not have authority to destroy unbelief by force. Indeed, it cannot, for, like faith, heresy is a spiritual thing which no iron can hew, no fire burn, no earthly power destroy. Only "divine power and the spiritual armor of God's word" can combat it. Nevertheless, if the secular ruler, "enlightened by the spirit of the true faith," finds that false preaching or worship threatens the welfare of the spiritual realm, the love of God and of his neighbor compels him to follow the example of the pious kings of ancient Israel by using his secular authority to end

the abuse and reestablish good order. Nor should he be intimidated by the spurious claims of the Catholic or sectarian clergy that such action is an infringement upon their spiritual jurisdiction or a violation of conscience. For just as every Christian is obligated to test all spirits and doctrines, receiving that which is profitable and rejecting that which is harmful, so the Christian magistrate, "as guardian of his subjects," should use his power to assure that true, saving doctrine is preached and false doctrine eliminated. While personal belief is a matter of individual conscience and thus of no concern to the secular authorities, public preaching of false doctrine is an external deed--indeed, an evil deed--which is the proper concern of the secular government. Furthermore, since the preachers of false doctrine are themselves "completely carnal, material, and brutish, without the spirit of God and understanding nothing of that spirit," they can claim no exemption from temporal jurisdiction. So when a secular ruler acts to abolish false preaching or worship, he does not invade God's kingdom or violate individual consciences. On the contrary, he acts within his own sphere in conformity with the purpose for which God created secular authority: the furtherance of God's kingdom.

However, as Brenz and the other authors emphasize at great length and with considerable vigor, the ruler must not act hastily in such matters but "thoroughly examine the matter" (i.e., consult the theologians) beforehand in order to make absolutely sure that it is error and not truth which he is combatting. He must not be guilty of condemning Jesus and freeing Barrabas. For he has power not to encourage or forbid this or that doctrine as suits his individual pleasure but only to serve God's kingdom by defending the truth, that is, the Christian gospel as the Lutheran reformers understood it.

In its sixteenth-century context Brenz's view of the office of Christian magistrate, despite the logical and theological flaws which can easily be found in it, was a persuasive statement of what the princes and pastors of the emerging state churches wanted to believe so that they could go about their tasks with a good Lutheran

conscience. With the benefit of hindsight we can see that Brenz contributed to that process which eventually made of the Lutheran Church the servile handmaiden of the absolutism and particularism of the German princes. But Brenz himself neither foresaw nor desired that development. Not only was he anything but servile in his attitude toward his own princely employers, he saw his defence of the state church as an attempt to get the secular authorities to accept the role of humble custodians of a heavy burden of responsibility toward their subjects and toward the church. Rulers, like Duke Christopher of Württemberg, who exercised their responsibilities in this spirit, made a vital contribution to the Protestant cause by making possible the growth of a church both "pure" in doctrine and at the same time able to survive in a hostile world. In the process, of course, the implications for church government of Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of all believers were cancelled out. The average Christian was viewed not as an active agent in the life of the church but as a passive subject of the secular government in ecclesiastical and secular affairs alike. Jesus Christ, wrote Brenz in 1535, has earnestly commanded everyone to serve the building of his church: the government by supervision of the clergy and church order, the pastors by preaching and administration of the sacraments, and the common people by saying their prayers.

Liberal Catholic Journalism: the Saturday Review, 1855-1865

by John Kenyon

Scarborough College

University of Toronto

The Saturday Review has always been recognised as one of the major exponents of mid-Victorian opinion. It might indeed appear that, after the most exhaustive analysis of the contribu--tions to the Review during this first decade of its existence made by M.M. Bevington, [1] there is little more to be said on this particular subject. Nevertheless it seems to me that there is one aspect that will bear further examination. For it was the stated purpose of the Review's founder, A. J. Beresford-Hope, that it should play a part in the attempt that was then being made to reconcile Catholic principles with the dominant Liberal ethos of the day - a matter that was of far more than merely local significance, being part of the intellectual develop--ment of Europe as a whole.[2] It is my hope, therefore, to provide a contribution, albeit a negative one, to the understanding of that most elusive of concepts, Liberal Catholicism.

Beresford-Hope was himself a most interesting character, being one of those extravagantly eccentric personalities of which nineteenth century English landed society was so prolific. He had received the customary education of that class, having attended Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge. His family background, however, was not in fact one of country landowners but of inter--national merchant bankers, as firmly established in Holland as in England. Beresford-Hope always maintained that it was this inherited 'foreignism of temperament' that enabled him to approach religious controversies free from the limitations that restricted the thinking of so many of his contemporaries.[3]

He was in particular convinced that the Church of England must be regarded as part of the Universal Catholic Church. As such, however, he believed that it suffered from two grave disabilities, both of which were the results of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. In the first place, it had then become an isolated national Church, cut off from the rest of Christendom, although,

as Beresford-Hope pointed out, it was in fact rapidly losing this quality of isolation as the English people spread themselves widely through the world. Secondly, during the fifteen-thirties, because of political and dynastic necessities, it had been forced to adopt much from the Lutheran religion of the German Protestant states, which it had never succeeded in completely discarding. As a result, Beresford-Hope saw the essential need of the time as the protection and reassertion of the Catholic element in the Church of England.[4]

Beresford-Hope's Catholic sympathies were strengthened by the fact that, like so many undergraduates of his day, he had fallen under the spell of Newman. He never made any secret of his admiration for the leaders and the principles of the Oxford Movement, and in consequence became identified with that Movement. It is of interest to note that it was at his wedding with Lady Mildred Cecil in 1842 that Lord Robert Cecil, the future Prime Minister, then a precocious boy of 12, first heard the term 'Puseyite' used in denigration of his new brother-in-law.[5]

Despite his hero-worship for Newman, Beresford-Hope was still not prepared to follow his example and secede to Rome. Although he was ready to acknowledge that the Roman Catholic Church possessed far more of the qualities of a truly Universal Church than did the Anglican Church, he nevertheless disapproved strongly of what he maintained were the popular superstitions and corruption that had been introduced into that Church by the Papacy. He believed that it would be first necessary to eliminate these before there could be a reunion between the two Churches, in his view the best possible solution for the present difficulties. Until this was achieved, it was vital to prevent the victory of the ultra-Protestant faction within the Church of England. He set out, therefore, with the declared intention of 'summoning the High Church party for the crucial battle for Anglo-Catholicism now arraying'.[6]

Beresford-Hope was a man of strong political ambitions as well as pronounced religious views, and he believed that he would further these by becoming a recognised leader of the High Church party.[7] He had stood for Maidstone during the general election of 1847 as an independent Conservative, free from any party ties, mainly because he had disapproved of the method by which Sir Robert Peel had carried

the repeal of the Corn Laws through Parliament. In the following years, however, he gradually established the habit of voting with the so-called Peelites, the group of Conservatives who remained loyal to Peel after the break-up of his Party in 1846, and which included men like Gladstone and Sidney Herbert who shared his religious views. It was not surprising when in 1850 he was invited to contribute to the Morning Chronicle, the mouth-piece of that group of politicians, and which had won for itself the reputation of being "the only daily paper which has not flown against Christianity".[8] Between 1850 and 1853 he was to contribute under the pseudonym of D.C.L. a series of Letters on Church Matters, which made that paper into a platform for his strong Anglo-Catholic views, and which did much to identify in the public mind the Peelites with the Puseyites.[9]

Beresford-Hope's alliance with the leaders of the Peelites was consolidated during the most important religious controversy over the Papal Aggression crisis which took place in 1850-1851. This was the result of the attempt by Pius IX to restore the Catholic hierarchy into England. In response the Whig Government then in office, apparently abandoning its traditional policy of toleration, proposed to impose harsh penalties through its Ecclesiastical Titles Act against anyone attempting to implement this measure. On the other hand, the Peelites, almost alone amongst the politicians, argued that the Roman Catholic Church like any other religious body had the right to deal with its spiritual organization in any way it wished. They saw the Ecclesiastical Titles Act as a clear warning of the great danger implicit in the erastian control claimed by the State over religious matters. As a result they argued that all Churches, including the Church of England, should be granted their freedom.

This was the point that Beresford-Hope constantly urged on the readers of the Morning Chronicle. In particular he stressed that the Church of England should now be released from the burdens of its establishment. What he was now demanding for it was, to use his own words,

> that only true, consistent and rational religious liberty which allows to all denominations liberty of self-develop-ment within the bounds of order and morality - to Dissenters and not only to Dissenters, but to the Church of England - a liberty neither abated in the one instance from a hyper-critical regard to the 'interests' of 'the Establishment', nor arrogantly refused on the ground of freedom and the status of 'the Establishment' not being compatible.[10]

It was in this way that Beresfore-Hope approached the conception of 'religious liberty', the belief in'a free Church within a free State', which was so important a part of the Liberalism of the nineteenth century.

Beresfore-Hope, however, was to find that his opposition to the Ecclesiastical Titles Act was to prove, temporarily at least, politically disastrous for him. The spirit of 'No Popery' was now too strong amongst the electorate for his arguments to be effective. As a result he failed to secure his re-election to Parliament in the general election of 1852. The following year he stopped contributing his Letters on Church Matters to the Morning Chronicle, which had done much to keep him in the public eye, and he retired to his family estate, where he had the care of his step-father, Viscount Beresford, of Peninsular War fame.[11] On the death of the Viscount two years later, Beresford-Hope was to resume his active interest in contemporary affairs. It was now that he decided to establish a new journal which he hoped would prove to be

> a paper not bound to any party, but written by a combina--tion of Peelite Conservatives and moderate Liberals, and to be mouthpiece of the middle moderate opinions of thought--ful and educated supporters.[12]

This paper was to be the Saturday Review.

Beresford-Hope chose as his first editor John Douglas Cook. Cook had been the editor of the Morning Chronicle, with which, as we have seen, Beresford-Hope had been closely associated. He must, therefore accept some responsibility for the financial collapse of that paper which occurred in 1854. He was now to prove that he was a journalist of genius. There is no doubt that it was his work that made the Review the finest and most successful periodical of its day. He was particularly skilful in his choice of contributors, bringing into its service men of the greatest literary talent, such as H.S. Maine, Goldwin Smith, Fitzjames Stephens and, for a time, Lord Robert Cecil.[13]

At the same time it cannot be denied that Beresford-Hope's belief that the pages of the Saturday Review could serve as a common platform for both High Church and Liberal principles were by no means fulfilled. It was once said that Cook, who, like the majority of his contributors, was strongly Liberal in his views, could only manage to preserve his

partnership with his proprietor "by keeping the paper as much as possible out of theological controversies", the last thing that Beresford-Hope wanted.[14] In the end, therefore, the history of the Review during its first ten years is one of failure to achieve the hoped-for reconciliation between Anglo-Catholicism and Liberalism. To understand why this happened it will be necessary to examine in what ways the Review's conception of Liberalism affected its attitude towards religious matters, especially towards the Church of England.

The Saturday Review took it for granted that national opinion in England was essentially Liberal in tendency.[15] It nevertheless acknowledged that it had considerable difficulty in defining exactly the meaning of this term. When it attempted to do so early in its history, it was first forced to eliminate all the popular slogans whose continued use now seriously distorted the understanding of its contemporary significance. To talk in 1855 about 'free trade' in this connection, for example, had no more relevance than references to 'the Glorious Revolution'. 'Electoral and social reform' were also now principles over which there was no longer any unanimity amongst those who called themselves Liberals.[16] When the Review sought a more positive definition, however, it could only suggest that Liberalism was primarily an attitude of mind, the readiness to test all intellectual matters by the use of reason rather than by reliance on authority, whether this be secular or ecclesiastical, [17] "the judgement of the common sense of the educated part of the World."[18] For this reason, the Review believed that the best way of identifying a Liberal in the eighteen-fifties was by his support of a foreign policy aimed at the promotion of that sort of constitutional government abroad which alone could create the sort of conditions under which such freedom of thought was possible.[19] It saw as its great enemies both the authoritarian states of Europe and also the new Democracy, whose success it believed would result in the worst tyranny of all, that of an illiterate majority over an educated minority.[20] The Saturday Review believed Liberalism, therefore, as the creed of what we have learned today to describe as 'open' societies, in contrast to those 'closed' ones which prohibited any manifestation of freedom either physical or intellectual.

It followed as a necessary deduction from this belief that for the Review the best social institutions were those which allowed their

members complete freedom to apply their own judgement to the ever changing circumstances in which they lived. It was for this reason that it had the greatest respect for the Established Church of England of all religious communities. For

> in the interests of Liberalism, of progress, of intellect and sense (to put religious considerations aside).... the Church of England ... admits of infinite variety of practice and tolerates great difference of opinion ... it is as comprehensive and liberal a religion as the world has ever seen.[21]

The Review believed that this was the result of the generally high standard of its clergy, who were in the main "the fairest, best educated and most elastic of the religious profession." [22] Above all, they did not form a caste with its own values and principles, set aside from the rest of the community. The English clergy were in the main educated in the same institutions as their social equals, they did not suffer from the considerable disadvantages resulting from an imposed celibacy, the majority of them received a decent living from their benefices and they had a close link with the neighbouring gentry through the wide-spread system of lay patronage.[23] There was consequently little dislike for the parson in English society, and certainly no incentive for the clergy to seek to improve their status by imposing their authority over the laity in matters of opinion. It was this that convinced the Review that the Church of England was essentially different in nature from other religious communities with more authoritarian natures.

The Review believed, nevertheless, that there was one great danger threatening the Anglican Church. This was the possibility that it might by its intellectual failure alienate the educated class of the country. It was this fear that forged the strongest link between the typical contributor to the Review and the Anglo-Catholic party within the Church, for it had little doubt that the great propor--tion of Anglican learning was concentrated within this latter group. On the other hand, the Review saw the Evangelical party within the Church as being formed from "the semi-informed, semi-educated, semi-religious portion of the population".[24] The Review was especially dismayed by the intellectual quality of the men appointed by Palmerston on the advice of his son-in-law, Lord Shaftesbury, from members of that school to senior positions in the Church during the early stage

of his long premiership after 1855. It characterised these as "sectarian, bigoted and persecuting", "with no taste, little self-denial and hardly more learning than is required for speaking grammatical English".[25] In its opinion, these new Evangelical bishops

> did not have the largeness of sympathy and comprehensive--ness of mind necessary in an age when revived religion had broken forth in various and sometimes eccentric forms. They are not on the level of the age in part of knowledge.[26]

The Review had no doubt indeed that these ill-conceived appointments had resulted in serious political consequences, and that in making them Palmerston had misjudged the opinions of the middle-class electorate. It believed in particular that Palmerston's surprising loss of popularity in 1858, leading to his parliamentary defeat was caused by the revulsion felt for them:

> there are very few thoughtful persons who did not feel that the late Premier's administration of ecclesiastical patronage was a proof of his personal unfitness for the highest office. Drs. Bickersteth and Villiers really cost Lord Palmerston his premiership.[27]

The Review was convinced that if by some mischance such men won a dominating influence within the Anglican Church, and especially if this meant the expulsion or withdrawal of the Anglo-Catholics, then that Church could no longer expect the confidence and support of the educated layman.

It was this belief of the Saturday Review that the presence of the Anglo-Catholics within the Church of England provided the best guarantee that it would remain the Church of the intellect and intelligence of the country that did much to promote the alliance between that school of religious thought and the Liberalism which it represented. The developments of the eighteen-sixties, however, were to emphasize that this alliance depended on the admiration of the Review for the personal calibre of the Anglo-Catholics and not on its approval of the principles which they represented. This was made clear in two of the major religious controversies of these years: in the first place, by the revival of an extreme Liberal theology as shown in the publication of Essays and Reviews, and secondly, over the all--important issue of church establishment.

The appearance of Essays and Reviews in 1860, with the consequent long series of cases through the various church courts, brought into

the open the wide difference which separated Liberals and High Churchmen over the permissable extent of toleration of opinion in the Church. The Saturday Review was forced to recognise that many Anglo-Catholics would in the last resort prove as intolerant in their attitude to some of the intellectual developments of the age as any other orthodox Churchmen. For Essays and Reviews made it necessary for Anglo-Catholics to make clear the limits to the freedom of thought that they were prepared to allow members of the Church of England. It placed the Review in an especially difficult position because it had always eulogised their toleration in such matters. It is easy to trace in its pages the dilemma faced by those of its contributors who, on the one hand, wished to maintain their own very well-publicised principles, but who on the other, knew that its proprietor, Beresford-Hope, had instructed the editorial staff not to express any support for the Essayists. This dilemma was, indeed, to bring about the resignation of some of its most brilliant authors between 1861 and 1863, at the cost of its high standard of literary excellence.[28]

It was not until March 2nd, 1861, that the Review saw fit to make its first comment on the issue, and then, as it admitted itself, with the greatest hesitation. It would have much preferred to leave the whole matter to "the good sense and honest feeling of the English people".[29] While it recognised that the publication of Essays and Reviews was bound to give offence to orthodox Churchmen, it was nevertheless concerned how much the controversy proved that

> the clergy of the Church of England require to be much more thoroughly educated and placed more on a level with the progress of theological discussions and opinions in an active minded age ... it showed their deep ignorance of what had been going on in the last half-century.[30]

As High Churchmen began to take a more extreme position against the Essayists, the Review was itself forced to modify its denigration of the capabilities of the English clergy in order that it might get more into accord with the well-known prejudices of Beresford-Hope. In May 1861 it was congratulating its readers that "the Church of England is, as all Churches must be, a little behind the age in a good many things. We rather like to fall across something behind the age".[31] It was nevertheless clearly far from happy about the need to compromise over its own principles in this matter, and its satisfaction was obvious

when the issue was finally resolved in 1864. It could maintain then that it had never in fact been more than a storm in a teacup, which however had done the Church considerable harm. With the treatment of Jowett in particular in its mind, it could express its hope that

> we have nearly arrived at the conclusion of that period of small persecutions... during which the Church has probably lost much ground in the affections and the beliefs of the more educated classes.[32]

The controversy over church establishment was the second issue that was in the eighteen sixties to bring the principles of the Saturday Review in conflict with those of the Anglo-Catholics. As we have seen, the Churchmen had clearly lost by this time their confidence in the close link between Church and State. They no longer believed in the vital necessity of the Established Church acting as the conscience of the community. They were much more aware of the danger to the spiritual nature of that Church from the erastian control of the secular State. As a result, they were now demanding that full religious liberty should be given to all ecclesiastical bodies, including the Church of England.

On the other hand the Saturday Review was to show strangely little sympathy with those who doubted the value of church establish-ment. It was certainly true that it had no hesitation in proclaiming its enthusiastic support for religious toleration of the non-Anglican institutions. It was ready, for example, to describe the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 as "the most generous and most politic of laws enacted in the statute book".[33] Again, it did not disguise its scorn for that type of uneducated mentality which became so easily the victim of 'No-Popery' scares, because of its purely emotional fear of Roman Catholicism. Even in 1860, it could still recall with satisfaction the ignominious downfall of Lord John Russell in 1852 due to his attempt to make capital out of this fear by his Ecclesiastical Titles Act.[34] It reserved its most bitter contempt, however, for the recurring attempts to abolish the Roman Catholic training college at Maynooth in Ireland. This was "an annual craze," "a playing at Parliament", "a real insult to the intelligence of the country". It was one of its main charges against Disraeli as a party leader, that while he had too much sense to believe in such nonsense, he was not above taking advantage of it for political reasons, and that he had too little straightforwardness

to vote according to his convictions.[35] It was for this reason that the Review could never accept the sincerity behind Disraeli's sustained campaign between 1861 and 1864 to restore the Conservative Party under his leadership as the traditional defender of the Church of England. It was convinced that he was merely using the Church as a ladder to Downing Street, and went on to comment that

> when the defence of the Church of England reposes in the hands of the author of Tancred it would be a very stiff man who would not laugh and a very silly man who would do more than laugh.[36]

The Saturday Review thus had no sympathy with those who wished to restore the Established Church to the privileged position it had held before the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and Catholic Emancipation. On the other hand, it had no intention to support any measure that would strengthen the power of the non-Anglican bodies, in particular by ending the establishment of the Anglican Church. It refused to do so on the grounds that the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand, the Dissenting sects on the other, were so alien in nature to the English mind that their success would do much to turn the educated classes against all religion. It found especially distaste--ful the spiritual intolerance of Roman Catholicism and the intellectual inadequacy of Protestant Dissent. This last, it argued, owed its origin to nothing more than the accidental quarrels of the seventeenth century, and it only remained in existence in the nineteenth century because of local social jealousies and enmities, particularly that felt for the parson by the lower classes in the country districts. If these were ended, then English Dissent would soon vanish as 'the light of argument' was brought to bear on its tenets. It was obvious that this could never be the religion of an educated man.[37]

It was for these reasons that Saturday Review completely rejected the conception of 'religious liberty' as being inapplicable to English conditions, even though many of the leading Anglo-Catholics were strongly endorsing it. It could see no justification for what it described as 'free trade in religion',[38] the inevitable result of which it believed would be the disestablishment of the Anglican Church and the triumph of 'the Conventical as well as the Pope', which it had no doubt would prove disastrous for civilized life in England.[39]

The issue of church establishment was also to do much to shape the attitude of the Saturday Review towards Gladstone.

This was a matter of especial significance since Gladstone was the essential middle term, so to speak, between Anglo-Catholicism and political Liberalism. On the one hand, he was a leading member of the Peelites, the political group which had won the support of High Churchmen like Beresford-Hope. He had in particular made it very clear during the controversy over Papal Aggression in 1851 how strongly he now believed in the principle of 'religious liberty' for the Church of England as well as for the other religious bodies in the community. In doing so, he had also shown how fundamentally he had changed his views from those he had held during the eighteen thirties, when his equally powerful defence of the traditional principles of 'the Con--stitition in Church and State' had made him 'the last hope of the stern, unbending Tories'. But on the other hand, during the eighteen fifties, Gladstone's political ambition made it necessary that he should rejoin as soon as possible one or other of the two major parties. For a number of reasons he was to find it impossible to become a member of the revived Conservative Party under Lord Derby. His political future lay therefore with the Liberals. And it was in his tortuous advance to the leadership of that Party in the years before 1868, that in order to retain the support of High Churchmen, he had to prove to their satisfaction that Liberalism and Catholic principles were in no way incompatible. This was all the more essential after he had become Member of Parliament for Oxford University in 1847, the most clerically dominated constituency in England. He was constantly forced to justify himself to a most knowledgeable and highly critical electorate. The whole controversy came to a head in 1865 when Gladstone made it known that under certain circumstances he would be prepared to recognize the need to disestablish the Church of England in Ireland. It was this above all which ensured his defeat at Oxford in that year.

The Saturday Review was to find itself in a difficult position with regard to Gladstone during this period. Like most of its contem--poraries, it had immense respect for his intellectual stature and political ability. It believed that it was the combination of these two qualities that alone had made possible the Oxford University Reform Act of 1854. This it considered the greatest triumph of the High Church Liberalism of the eighteen fifties, because it had done much

The issue of church establishment had brought into prominence the conflict between the principle of 'religious liberty' and the belief in the Established Church as an instrument of that social order and authority which alone made a Liberal way of life possible. The Review was also convinced that the activity of politicians like Gladstone was the result of political expediency rather than of religious principles. Not even the great admiration that it felt for the Anglo-Catholics personally could bridge the gap which now existed between them.

Lord Robert Cecil, indeed, argues that any attempt to do so would in fact be a sign of divine madness. As he told the readers of the Quarterly Review in 1865:

> just as in ruder times, insanity was looked upon as the mark of the protection of heaven, so in these days the simultaneous belief in two or three inconsistent sets of opinion is held by many to be the sure sign of a peculiar conscientiousness...
> An alliance between the Church and Liberalism can never be permanently the dream of more than a few very eccentric minds.[44]

It was certainly true that the Liberal Catholicism of the latter part of the nineteenth century was very different from that which was born as the result of the disintegration of the Conservative Party in 1846. It is indeed hard to tell whether representatives of this older generation were more shocked and dismayed by the theological principles of Lux Mundi or the social radicalism of the Christian Socialist Union, both of which were to appear in the same year 1889.

1. M.M. Bevington, The Saturday Review, 1855-1865: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England. New York, 1941

2. H.W. & I. Law, The Book of the Beresford-Hopes. London 1930. P. 214

3. Ibid. PP. 130-132, 143

4. [A.J. Beresford-Hope], Letters on Church Matters by D.C.L. 11 pts. in 4 vols. London, 1851-1854. II, pp. 211-213

5. Lady G. Cecil, Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury. 4 vols. London, 1924-1932. I, p. 24

6. Law, Book of the Beresford-Hopes Pp. 147-148

7. Ibid. P. 213

8. Ibid. Pp 147-148

9. Bevington, The Saturday Review. Pp. 10-15

10. [Beresford-Hope], Letters on Church Matters. I. p. 149

11. Law, Book of the Beresford-Hopes. Pp. 148, 223

12. Ibid. P. 214

13. Bevington, The Saturday Review, PP. 16-20

14. Ibid. P. 35

15. Saturday Review. XII (1861), p. 83

16. Ibid. I (1855), p. 156

17. Ibid. XVII (1864), p. 527

18. Ibid. XIX (1865), p. 162

19. Ibid. I (1855), p. 157

20. Ibid. XI (1861), p. 326

21. Ibid. IX (1860), p. 399

22. Ibid. P. 305

23. Ibid. XVII (1864), p. 527

24. Ibid. II (1856), p. 713

25. Ibid. X (1860), P. 659: II (1856), p. 713
26. Ibid. XI (1861), p. 286
27. Ibid. V (1858), p. 366
28. Bevington, The Saturday Review, Pp. 32-33
29. Saturday Review. XI (1861), p. 221
30. Ibid. P. 446
31. Ibid. P. 286
32. Ibid. XIX (1865), p. 218
33. Ibid. IX (1860), p. 69
34. Ibid. P. 109
35. Ibid. I. (1855), p. 485
36. Ibid. XVII (1864), p. 129
37. Ibid. XIV (1862), p. 672
38. Ibid. IX (1860), p. 569
39. Ibid. P. 305
40. Ibid. XX (1865), pp. 33-34
41. Ibid. P. 35
42. Ibid. P. 96
43. Ibid. P. 95
44. Quarterly Review, CXVIII (1865), pp. 212-213

RESPONSE TO DISRUPTION: PRESBYTERIANISM IN EASTERN ONTARIO, 1844.

Burkhard Kiesekamp
University of Toronto

The pattern of the Disruption of 1844 in Upper Canada[1] poses an interesting problem that merits further investigation. If the Bay of Quinte be taken as the boundary between eastern and western Upper Canada, then only twelve percent of the Church of Scotland ministers in the eastern as opposed to forty-eight percent in the western part joined the Free Church in 1844. Expressed as a percentage of the total number of ministers who joined the Free Church in Upper Canada, the contrast becomes even more striking. Only thirteen percent of the Free Church ministers in 1844 served congregations in the eastern districts[2]. This divergence in the response to the Free Church movement in Upper Canada, and particularly the lack of support for it in the eastern areas of the province, demands further explanation.

The settlement of Upper Canada confirms what the above pattern of disruption already suggests, that an emerging regionalism was responsible for these differences in the success of the Free Church movement. The attractions of a fertile soil and a moving frontier in western Upper Canada were largely to blame for this regional diversity. These advantages, which eastern Upper Canada could not offer, drew the immigrants into the western part of the province. Among them were those ministers and settlers who were responsible for importing the disruption to Canada. Having left Scotland after 1830, when church-state relations had become contentious there, these people continued to seek an outlet in Canada for their commitment to the non-intrusionist principles they acquired in Scotland[3]. The most radical of these non-intrusionists who advocated total separation from the Church of Scotland, were the twenty-odd ministers sent to Upper Canada by the Glasgow Colonial Society after it was founded in 1826. Only five out of the sixteen society appointees, who still resided in Upper Canada, retained their connection with the Church of Scotland after 1844. And significantly enough, four out of five were stationed in the eastern districts[4].

None of the conditions --- whether state intrusion in church affairs, patronage, or jurisdictional conflict--- which gave rise to the Disruption of 1843 in Scotland existed in Canada. Though the Imperial government had supported the United Synod and the Synod of Canada financially and had conceded one-third of the income from Clergy Reserves sales to the Kirk in 1840, it never, at any time, interfered in the internal affairs of the two Presbyterian bodies. Patronage was not a part of the constititional framework of either Synod. From the very beginning, local congregations of the Presbyterian churches in the Canadas had been free to call the minister of their own choice. Indeed, in view of its own trouble-free relations with the state, there was no reason why the Synod of Canada should not attempt to bolster as it did the sagging fortunes of the Free Church party in Scotland by conveying the resolutions of sympathy and support of the years 1841 to 1843[5].

Considering the emotional commitment of its members to non-intrusionist principles it was only a matter of time before the Free Church party would find alternative justification for severing all connections with the Church of Scotland. In the absence of any clear-cut violations of church-state principles in Canada, the constitutional connection between the Synod of Canada and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland turned out to be a heaven-sent opportunity for the Free Church party in Canada to make the most capital out of what, from the beginning, was a questionable enterprise. The founding members of the Synod of Canada in 1831 had left to the General Assembly the right to determine the connection which the newly-formed Synod was to have with the Church of Scotland. Two factors, however, were responsible for making this connection a mere legal formality. First the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was reluctant to accept the offered jurisdiction over the Synod of Canada, because it was unwilling to take on the attendant responsibilities which such jurisdiction implied[6]. Secondly, in failing to throw the full weight of its influence behind the Synod of Canada's campaign for an equal share with the Church of England in the Clergy Reserves, the General Assembly forfeited what little direct authority it had left with the Synod of Canada.

The Synod of Canada in 1843, therefore, was in a position to dismiss the issues which had led to the disruption in Scotland on the well-founded grounds that they were totally irrelevant to the Canadian situation. For, in the opinion of Synod, not only had its spiritual jurisdiction never been infringed upon by the state, but its connection with the Kirk "neither implied a spiritual jurisdiction on the part of the Church of Scotland over the Synod of Canada, nor involved the latter in responsibility for any actingsof the former."[7]

Confronted with mounting evidence which indicated that total separation from the Church of Scotland would not get the unanimous support of the Synod of Canada, the Free Church party planned to sever their connection with the Synod of Canada instead. Maintaining the constitutional connection with the Church of Scotland - no matter how tenuous it turned out to be - in their opinion contradicted their profession of and their adherence to the cause of non-intrusion. The taint which this left on their own moral self-esteem, the supporters of the Free Church sought to remove at all cost.

Resorting to such a drastic course of action, however, made the task of justification that much more difficult. Not only was the need for it greater since schism was not to be taken lightly at any time, but the weakness of its case for total separation from the Church of Scotland overseas had already been fully exposed. Under these circumstances, the rationale for the planned schism was made to rest solely on guilt by association and on possible future dangers to the independence of the Canadian Church that such a constitutional connec--tion with the Church of Scotland was thought to entail. Retaining the phrase "in connection with the Church of Scotland as part of the legal designation of the Synod of Canada was, in the opinion of the non-intrusionists, tantamount to condoning the principles which the residuary party in Scotland stood for. Furthermore, the fact that local congregations of the Kirk in Canada could legally call ministers from the established Church of Scotland might, so they argued, lead to a watering-down of non-intrusionist principles in the future.[8]

Few of these Scottish immigrants who were willing to sacrifice church unity for doctrinal purity, chose to remain in the eastern parts of Upper Canada at all. Those who decided to stay nevertheless did so for two reasons. They preferred to take up previously occupied

land in the townships north of Perth to the demanding task of clearing virgin lands in the western districts of the province.[9] Or they settled in areas situated near the main communication routes such as Bytown, Prescott, Brockville, Gananoque, Kingston,and Napanee where vocations other than farming could be more easily pursued and where travelling did not present any major difficulties. Thus the success of the Free Church movement in eastern Upper Canada was largely limited to areas whose proximity to the main transportation routes tended to alter more rapidly the composition of their resident population.

In contrast to that of the western region, the features that were to distinguish Presbyterianism in eastern Upper Canada for the next thirty years had clearly emerged by 1830. It resembled the established Church of Scotland in practically every detail of faith and practice. The Scottish Highlanders and Scots-Irish who settled in the eastern region during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, were mainly responsible for the virtual transplantation of the Old Kirk into the frontier environment of their newly-adopted country. They appeared in eastern Upper Canada in two groups. One included the United Empire Loyalists and the Highlanders from Scotland who settled in the eastern districts in the wake of the Revolution during the last years of the eighteenth and the first decade of the nineteenth centuries. The discharged military personnel from the War of 1812 and those immigrants of Scottish and Scots-Irish stock, who, with the encouragement of the British government, established themselves in eastern Upper Canada subsequent to the War of 1812, constituted the second group.

Important as the numerical contribution of the United Empire Loyalists and the veterans of the War f 1812 was to the growth of the Presbyterian churches in the eastern districts, their greater influence was qualitative. They carried a weight in the Presbyterian councils of Upper Canada that was far out of proportion to their numerical strength. The standing which this group, as Loyalist refugees and war veterans of 1812, had in the community and with the British Government accounts for their ascendancy not only in Presbyterian courts but also in the political and social life of eastern Upper Canada. Fortunes made in banking, in lumber and flour milling, in canal building and, for the greatest part, in the carrying trade further added to their social, political and ecclesiastical prominence. Represented within their

ranks were the most prosperous merchants from virtually all the more important urban and agricultural settlements of the eastern districts.

William Morris is the most outstanding representative of this group. Like Archdeacon Strachan, the Boultons and other members of the Family Compact, Morris, who with his father's family had emigrated from Scotland to Elizabethtown, Upper Canada in 1801, was not of United Empire Loyalist stock. Like them also, Morris' active involvement in the War of 1812, in his case as a militia officer, confirmed and strengthened already firmly-held Tory and anti-American prejudices. Before the war, he had helped his father, Alexander Morris, to establish a mercantile business in Elizabethtown, later known as Brockville. In 1816, he left the then flourishing family business to his elder brother and established himself as a merchant in the newly-founded military settlement of Perth where he soon became known as "the richest man in the settlement."[10] In addition to his own mercantile venture, he held a part-interest in his father's business and owned extensive tracts of land in Lanark county and in western Upper Canada.[11]

In the early 1820's, largely because the Kirk was not represented locally, Morris joined the Rev. William Bell's Secessionist Presbyterian Church in Perth. His influence and that of other prominent Scottish merchants in Perth was instrumental in the founding of St. Andrew's Presbyterian church and in the calling of the Rev. T.C. Wilson, a Church of Scotland minister in 1830. While Morris and his other fellow merchants had always been predisposed to the Kirk, a falling-out with Bell, who had openly criticized this merchant clique for their sharp business practises, for their intemperance, and for other picadillos of a more embarrassing nature, accounts for their rather sudden partiality to the Church of Scotland at the time. As a member of the Church of Scotland, Morris had an active career as trustee of St. Andrew's, as frequent representative to Synod, as envoy of the Church of Scotland to the Imperial government in 1837 and as first chairman of the Board of Trustees of Queen's University.

Other factors, however, besides Loyalist descent, active service in the War of 1812 and business success, determined that the mantle of leadership in both political and Presbyterian church affairs should fall on the shoulders of Morris and others like him. Most important of these was the Church of Scotland's need of political means for the realization of its most cherished claims and objectives in Upper Canada. The lack

of a politically influential voice to represent the interests of the Church of Scotland thus served to confirm a natural tendency among this group to seek political office. Moreover, the great number of Presbyterian and generally conservatively-minded settlers in the eastern region afforded enough assurance of political success at the outset to make them want to realize their ambitions of leadership --- ambitions which the inexperience of their more recently arrived brethren also fostered in a lesser way.

To use Morris' career as an example once more, he owed his start in politics and his continued election as M.L.A. for Lanark county from 1820 to 1836 to the loyal support of Scottish Presbyterians. His growing political influence with the Family Compact which was signified in his appointment as member of the Legislative Council of Upper Canada in 1836 led to his emergence as chief-spokesman for the Church of Scotland in the controversy over the disposition of the Clergy Reserves. Moreover, it was Morris' influence which contributed considerably to make the negotiations for the charter of Queen's College a success[12] This general pattern of Loyalist or War of 1812 background followed by business success, social prominence and growing influence in political and ecclesiastical affairs more or less repeats itself in the life of such other prominent Presbyterians as the McMartins of Martintown and later Renfrew, the Dicksons of Pakenham, the McKays of Bytown, the Mcleans of Cornwall, and the Mowats of Kingston.

Common background accounts for the relative uniformity in political and ecclesiastical concern that existed between the greater part of the Church of Scotland's congregations and its lay leadership. In any case, the influence which the lay-elite was able to exercise over the Kirk's courts, fortified as it was by the services they rendered to the church, usually proved too powerful to overcome for the occasional opposition that happened to develop. Thus the face of the Church of Scotland in eastern Ontario largely took on the distinctive political and ecclesiastical features of its lay elite.

That the lay elite and most of the ministers in eastern Upper Canada refused to countenance the Free Church movement was, in the first place, due to the fact that they had left Scotland before 1830.

The Church of Scotland under whose religious supervision they had grown up was relatively free of such divisive issues as patronage and state intrusion. Lacking the emotional commitment to the Free Church cause that some of their more recently arrived brethren displayed, the Presbyterians of the eastern districts were better able to consider the issues in perspective. Acknowledgement and support of the Free Church party in Scotland, in their opinion, did not justify the splitting of the Synod of Canada whose affairs had always been conducted according to the most orthodox church-state principles. The residuary party with good reason therefore likened the dissenters' withdrawal from the Synod of Canada to the action of a person who instead of making "every effort to extinguish the flames when a neighbour's house is on fire", kindles his "own in order to show how much" sympathy he "feels for his own neighbour."

While the residuaries considered such sympathy to be "as novel as it was irrational" and generally could see little wisdom in the action of the dissenters in Canada, they regarded the disruption of 1843 in Scotland as equally unjustifiable. To be sure, in as much as the case of the Free Church party in Scotland was based on genuine grievances, it was according to residuaries in Canada worthy of support and encouragement. Yet dangerous as the leading apologists for the Kirk considered state intrusion to be to the independence and spiritual integrity of the church, it did not in their opinion warrant schism. On Christian grounds, therefore, reform from within the church was to be preferred over schism.[13]

A second feature of Presbyterianism in eastern Ontario which was responsible for the failure of the Free Church movement was its Tory outlook. In its political ramifications this penchant for Toryism was based on strong traditions of loyalty to the British crown and on a firm conviction of the incomparable worth of British institutions and laws. In as much as such political views were an expression of the Scottish nationalism of the lay-elite and members of the Kirk in the eastern districts, a strong desire for Scottish institutions --- with the established Church of Scotland foremost on their list --- constituted an additional component of their Toryism. The establishment of the Church of Scotland and the achievement of equal status with the Church of England in Upper Canada was thus important for religious reasons to be sure, but equally, if not more so, for reasons of national heritage

and constitutional right. John Mowat's letter of exhortation to William Morris, calling for renewed agitation in defence of the Church of Scotland's rights, points this out.

> The honour of our country and the moral and religious interests of our countrymen will, I think, plead my excuse with you for the trouble I am to give you in the perusal of this letter. A birthright has been transmitted to us which we must endeavour to leave to our descendants unimpaired.[14]

That the moral and religious interests of Scottish settlers in Upper Canada be satisfied was, in the opinion of most Presbyterians in the eastern districts in the interest of the government. In a memorial to the Earl of Bathurst, the request for an increase in government subsidies is justified by the additional Presbyterian settlers which it would enable the Kirk to bring under its religious supervision. The lack of Church of Scotland institutions, according to the memorialists, was "fraught with danger" both from a moral and political point of view. Not only would it undermine the moral fibre of society but in the opinion of the memorialists, the "great majority of the Protestant population in the British Provinces of Presbyterian persuasion", being "wholly destitute of religious instructions and ordinances", would of necessity "become attached to the various sectaries who resort among them from all parts of the United States." The dissemination of "political disaffection with religious fanaticism" would be "the necessary effect" should the British government be so short-sighted as to refuse to increase the financial subsidy granted annually to the Church of Scotland in the Canadas.[15]

The church-state doctrine expressed in the memorial reflects a conviction basic to the brand of Toryism prevalent in British North America during the first half of the 19th century---that church and state are mutually dependent on each other. Hence its exploitation by the lay elite of the Kirk in the interest of promoting the Synod of Canada's claim for equal status with the Church of England in Upper Canada. Briefly summarized, the Tory conception of the relation--ship between church and state was based on the scriptural teaching that the state was divinely ordained to safeguard society from the grossest contrivance of sin, namely anarchy. Thrown on its own resources, however, the state, according to traditional Tory doctrine, could not of itself survive. Besides the protection which the state affords, additional inducements were needed to ensure the practice of

good citizenship. And these, in the Tory scheme of things, could only be supplied by the Christian religion. In the Christian teaching of the individual's accountability to God and his need to be obedient to the state lay the justification for the principle of church establishment. At this point the church-state principle of the Presbyterians in the Canada's begin to take on a distinctly Scottish flavour. Mutual dependence--- of the church on state support and of the state on the church's teaching---must not be allowed to encroach on the jurisdiction intrinsic to each other's existence. According to the Presbyterians, the person who paid the piper in this case would not be allowed to call the tune.

As far as their religious outlook was concerned, the standards of faith and practice which the Presbyterians of eastern Upper Canada desired to measure up to were generally those suggested by a widely-held notion of respectability. Its meaning more often than not was defined in a negative sense by way of criticizing the sectarian religious manifestations which Upper Canada shared with all frontier societies. Professional status for ministers, authoritarian church government, and adherence to confessions and set doctrinal standards were criteria essential to their notion of respectability. This fact can easily be substantiated by the Church of Scotland's frequent denunciations of "ignorant vagrants" not only because they had "assumed the ministerial office" on "their own authority" but also for their "attempt to deceive the people and inculcate their own peculiar political and religious dogmas as the doctrine of the blessed gospel.[16]

Furthermore, and this only serves to indicate how accomodating their Christianity had become to the status quo, the standards of respectability subscribed to by the Presbyterians in the eastern districts also included the ethnic, constitutional and political prepossessions of Toryism discussed above. The fact that such "vagrants" came from the United States was as objectionable to the Presbyterians as their lack of education and principles. Their United States origin by implication made them automatically suspect in the eyes of their critics of transgressing most, if not all, of the values which such set standards of respectability demanded.

Finally, the inclination towards elitism, more or less implicit in the Tory outlook described above, was incorporated into the require--ment for respectability. It was a practice widely adhered to by

Presbyterians in eastern Ontario, that, where possible, only those persons should be appointed to fill the office of minister, who by birth and education were qualified for it. Consequently, to put the Kirk's clergy 'on a more respectable footing", as people like William Morris were constantly aiming to do,[17] they found it necessary for the Church of Scotland to achieve co-establishment with the Church of England in Upper Canada. Barring the achievement of establishment, a substantial increase in the financial support given annually by the government to the Church of Scotland in the Canadas was the minimum which a "respectable ministry" was thought to require. Whatever the government finally decided to do in the way of support, it was needed, in the opinion of the leading Presbyterians, to sustain a living standard for ministers that their social background, their ability and educational qualifications and the importance of their office demanded, to provide an adequate return on the high financial investment in and to offset the high cost of a theological education.[18]

Thus circumscribed by a Tory outlook, the Church of Scotland in eastern Ontario was guilty of a parochialism of the worst kind, a parochialism that was particularly insidious because it appeared in the guise of Christianity. Like a cancerous growth on the body ecclesiastic, it robbed the Church of Scotland in eastern Upper Canada, and in the whole province for that matter, of the strength and vitality necessary for the discharge of its religious task.

The achievement of formal union between the Church of Scotland and the Secessionist United Synod, the only other Presbyterian body in eastern Ontario, was one such task which the Kirk's narrow and ingrown outlook delayed for eight years, until it was finally consummated in 1840. There was little reason for such a delay. Accord on basic issues such as church-state relations and standards of faith and practise had never been lacking between the two bodies.[19] The prospect of church association with Dutch and especially with American members of the United Synod, however, was particularly repulsive to the lay elite committed as it was to Scottish values and Tory principles. Moreover, the stigma of disloyalty, republicanism and sectarianism which was attached to American Presbyterianism, repugnant enough in itself, tended in addition to counteract the efforts of the Kirk's lay leaders to ingratiate themselves with Imperial Government on whom the Church of Scotland's prospects for improved status in the Canadas

depended.[20]

The aim of the clerical and lay leadership of the Church of Scotland in eastern Upper Canada was to make society conform to a pattern which ostensibly a Christian ethic demanded, but which was largely inspired by the social and political conservatism prevalent in England during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The kingdom of God thus envisaged was one that stood revealed in their social and political preconceptions. Its establishment involved trading the Gospel in exchange for a voice and a place in the trans--actions of society's power structure --- in this case with the obvious intent of conserving Scottish and Tory values and institutions within it, and of preserving the social inequalities which made its existence possible in the first place. Blurring the antithesis in this manner between the kingdom of God and its earthly counterpart and between the aims and methods characteristic of each, took the edge off the Gospel they preached and reduced their commitment to it.

Nowhere was this lack of commitment more clearly revealed than in the tendency of the Kirk in eastern Upper Canada to rely on means not normally associated with the church for the discharge of its Christian responsibilities. For its financial resources the Church of Scotland in the eastern districts became increasingly dependent on the political influence of its lay elite and on government support towards the procurement of which the former was largely directed. The conviction of the leaders of the Synod of Canada in the eastern regions of the province, that the contribution which the church made to society merited government support, constitutes the basis of their reliance on outside financial assistance. To sustain the Kirk's activities and even to escape from the painful sacrifices which a frontier church demands from its adherents, the Presbyterians in eastern Upper Canada were not above reminding the Imperial government of the sacrifices that a good number of them had made as Loyalists by coming to Canada in the first place.[21]

The effect of such dependent status was that the leaders of the Synod of Canada were open to occasional suggestions from the Imperial government, not always at a spiritual sacrifice to their church. The organic union achieved between the Synod of Canada and the United Synod of Upper Canada in 1840 is a good case in point. Where the union negotiations that had been carried on intermittently during the 1820's

between the two Synods failed, Sir George Murray's dispatch of August 1, 1830 was eventually successful. Addressed to Sir John Colbourne, then Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, it promised to increase and regularize the Imperial government's grants to the Presbyterians in Upper Canada on the condition that they unite into one body. The lay elite of eastern Upper Canada, who never lacked Christian zeal or virtue when it was a matter of financial profit, took the hint.[22]

The ever-present need for additional financial resources, which their conception of the church's role demanded, moreover, kept the leaders of the Church of Scotland from supporting the Free Church proposal of 1844 to sever all connections between the Synod of Canada and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Indigenization of the Canadian church would, in the opinion of the residuaries, jeopardize its claim to its temporal possessions and to a share of the Clergy Reserves which the Synod of Canada could only legally exercize "in connection with the Church of Scotland." This loss the residuaries were by no means willing to risk. They sought to retain their connection with the Church of Scotland overseas by defining it as one of "ministerial and church communion in the fullest sense."[23]

The leadership of the Church of Scotland in eastern Upper Canada once again played a leading role in thus sustaining the connection between the Synod of Canada and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. As early as 1843, the Presbytery of Bathurst declared its firm attachment to the residuaries in Scotland.[24] Their preference for things Scottish was too strong to permit the severing of relations with the Church of Scotland overseas. Then too, the Presbyterians in eastern Upper Canada had more at stake in the way of temporal possess--ions than the more recently established Free Church party. But decisive as their unwillingness to risk the loss of the temporalities and their claim to the Clergy Reserves was in persuading the Kirk's lay leaders to maintain "ministerial and church communion" with the General Assembly, the fact that the Church of Scotland in eastern Upper Canada could not afford such a loss was the consideration which carried most weight with them.

Given the lack of financial support for which their want of commitment was to blame, and the straightened financial circumstances in which the Synod of Canada in eastern Upper Canada found itself by

reason of its environment, there was no way left for the lay elite to support the Free Church proposal of total separation from the parent Church of Scotland. The ability of the Kirk to satisfy the religious needs of its own members not to speak of those of different background residing in the eastern region, largely depended on the Clergy Reserve income and on assistance that the Church of Scotland might contribute to its colonial offspring. The thin settlement in many areas of Carleton, Lanark, and Frontenac counties --- an unfortu--nate consequence of the poor soil in those areas --- simply could not, without outside financial assistance, support the religious institutions which their inflexible high church outlook demanded. The upshot of deteriorating commitment and lack of financial resources was the failure of the Synod of Canada to satisfy the demand for Presbyterian institutions which existed at Carleton Place and in the townships like Mountain, Oxford and McNab. The people in these areas were forced to look to the Free Church to supply their want.[25]

The dangers inherent in compromising the Church's position as a religious institution, in the case of the Kirk in eastern Ontario, emerged in its slow rate of growth. Not only did the ghetto-outlook of the leading Presbyterians in the area cause a decline in the kind of Christian commitment it takes to gain new adherents, but it also acted as a barrier excluding those people who subscribed to a different set of values from their own. The leading representatives of the Synod of Canada in the eastern districts, in the opinion of the dissenters of 1844, restricted the outreach of the church because they sought to impose a political and ecclesiastical value system on its adherents with which the Free Church supporters not only had no sympathy, but which they believed made the Gospel of little or no effect. The fact that the "character" of the Kirk in eastern Upper Canada was "national and exclusive" made it the "garden nursery of a lifeless moderatism" from which the Free Church party found it necessary to disassociate themselves.[26] The Disruption of 1844, seen in this context, was an attempt by the Free Church party to put the essence of the Gospel --- Christ's judgement of the individual and society --- back into the Presbyterianism of Upper Canada. The problem that they found insurmountable was how to accomplish this short of schism.

Compared to the outlook of the residuaries, that of the Free Church movement in Canada was less dominated by values which tend to compromise the spiritual function of the church. The secular ideals that it did hold proved less harmful to them because they reflected values which if not currently popular, were certainly moving in that direction. Politically, the Free Church movement was associated with the liberalism that inspired the 1832 Reform Bill in England.[27] For instance John Macdonald, the most prominent member of the Church of Scotland in Gananoque, which became the centre of the Free Church move-ment in eastern Upper Canada, was a member of the Reform party.[28] Just as it helped to bring the question of patronage and of the right to appoint ministers to a head in Scotland, the liberalism of the Free Church party speeded up the process of disruption in Canada. Under the banner of democratic liberalism, the Free Church advocates were able to challenge effectively the control that the conservatively minded leaders of the Kirk in eastern Ontario exercized over the Synod of Canada. Tied in their loyalties to institutions whose representative character they considered to be of least significance to the preservation of order and stability in society, the Kirk's leaders feared that the democratic character of liberalism would undermine the stability of the Kirk in the first place --- "the most sacred, time-honoured and valuable institution of the Empire"--- and of the political institutions of Canada in the second place.[29]

The leaders of the Church of Scotland in the eastern districts had every reason to be apprehensive about the growing strength of liberalism. An examination of the controversy over the legal disposition of the Synod of Canada's temporalities, which divided the church for the first time on a pattern similar to the one eventually taken by the disruption, indicates this on the ecclesiastical side. On the political side, the influence of the Reform party had been increasingly felt in the elections of the 1830's and 1840's. This was the case not only in the western but also in the eastern part of the province, the traditional stronghold of conservatism in Upper Canada. To make matters worse, the Reform party had inundated the ranks of the Church of Scotland in eastern Ontario in the person of Malcolm Cameron, member and occasional elder of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in Perth and editor-owner of the Perth Courier. The growing support for the Reform party due to the turn-over of

settlers in townships adjacent to Perth, made possible his election as M.L.A. for Lanark county along with William Morris in 1836,[30] Most Presbyterians in the eastern part of the province and particularly the leaders among them were, therefore, inclined to share the concern expressed by the Rev. T.C. Wilson, Minister of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in Perth, that the Free Church party would foster "the fearful tendency" in both church and state "towards democracy".[31]

The concern of the Free Church for the spiritual welfare was more universal than that of the residuaries for the simple reason that their political orientation proved to be less exclusive than that of the Synod of Canada after 1844. Their Christian commitment and zeal, however, also had a religious basis. Within their Christian outlook, the more sectarian manifestations of Christianity occupied a central place. The congregations in eastern Upper Canada who tended to emphasize the subjective rather than the objective manifestations of Christianity without exception joined the Free Church in 1844 or after. Of these, the congregations at Brockville and Prescott, the first ones to break away from the Synod of Canada, had been connected with the United Synod of Upper Canada prior to 1840.

The ethnic origins of the supporters of the Free Church in eastern Ontario is of even greater significance to an understanding of the disruption than the secessionist background of some of the dissenters. Of the five congregations in eastern Ontario, that unanimously decided to join the Free Church in 1844, four of them were made up of pre-dominantly Ulster-Irish rather than Scottish members and all four included a significantly larger number of Englishmen and Americans than the residuary congregations. The history of Presbyterianism in eastern Ontario accordingly corroborates the findings of Loetscher's study of Presbyterianism in the United States, namely, that Irish, English and American brands of Presbyterianism have traditionally constituted a low-church party within the pale of Reformed Christianity.[32]

The devotion of the Free Church movement in the eastern districts to the low-church ideals of spontaneity, vital impulse, and adaptability is substantiated by the history of the Brockville and Prescott congregations. Both congregations did not let the inferior educational and professional qualifications of the Revs. William Smart and Robert Boyd stand in the way of supplying a need of long standing for someone

to administer the means of grace to them. Smart, who came to Brockville in 1811, had been brought up as a Secessionist Presbyterian. He received his theological education at the Congregationalist Seminary of Gosport in Hampshire, England. Boyd, a native of Antrim, Ireland, who came to Prescott in 1820, had never attended a seminary but was licensed by the Presbytery of Ballymena after studying at Glasgow College in Ireland.[33]

Perhaps it was their lack of professional training which enabled both Smart and Boyd to adapt themselves more easily to the frontier conditions of Upper Canada than the ministers of the Church of Scotland. They early worked out a schedule for the periodic visitation of congregations unable to support a minister, a practice which the Church of Scotland did not institute until 1837.[34] Smart on his own adopted some of the successful methods of American revivalist practitioners such as the protracted meetings he held in his church during the month of December in 1832.[35] Both Smart and Boyd were convinced that the success of Presbyterianism solely depended on the individual Presbyterians, on how they adapted to their new environment and not on outside assistance. They played an active role, therefore, in establish-ing the United Presbytery of Upper Canada, which was later reconstituted as the United Synod of Upper Canada, as an indegenous and autonomous Canadian Church free from the restrictive influences of overseas connections.[36]

Their preference for Christian values of a more sectarian type also emerged in their relationship with the Synod of Canada. Union negotiations between the United Synod and the Synod of Canada were prolonged by their demands, eventually granted, that congregations should continue to be free to call Secessionist ministers after the achievement of union. Soon after union had been consummated, they began to lose patience with their fellow Church of Scotland ministers who, despite the shortage of ministers, kept insisting that incoming clergymen meet professional standards to the letter.[37] In the final analysis both Smart and Boyd and the congregations they represented joined the Free Church because they expected to find a communion of evangelical interest there. The fact that it was possible for them to continue to receive their government allowance independent of the Synod of Canada no doubt facilitated their decision to sever their connections with the Kirk.[38]

In as much as the geographical pattern of disruption in Ontario represented the divergent set of values described above, it also had a distinct social dimension. The rigidly narrow outlook of the Church of Scotland in Upper Canada, which was dedicated to the preservation of the status quo, had a definite relationship with the upper-class status of the lay elite which, to a large extent, controlled its affairs. This was especially the case in eastern Upper Canada. Commenting on the disruption, the Methodist-oriented Kingston Herald of July, 1844, observed that 'the more wealthy here, as elsewhere, generally sided with the Residuaries."[39] Conversely, its flexibility and the more universal appeal of its Christian values, its championing of new ideas and of reform within the Church of Scotland in the Canadas indicates a mobility within the Free Church party which is generally associated with middle class status. In Bytown for instance, the Free Church movement was led by Thomas Wardrope, who came to Upper Canada as a teacher in 1833 and by such small-time merchants as J. Durie and J. Forgie as well as by Alexander Gray a local watchmaker.[40] The census of 1848 moreover indicates that the membership of the Free Church congregations of Prescott, Brockville and Gananoque were predominantly middle class background.[41]

Being largely a middle-class movement, the Free Church adherents were concentrated in the urban areas of eastern Ontario, or at least in places which were subject to the urbanizing process. In the rural communities of the interior, where the Church of Scotland had a large following, people were not inclined to resent the influence of prominent members of the community under whose leadership they had immigrated and settled in their new surroundings, on whom they often depended economically and whose political and ecclesiastical views they shared.

The divergent set of values between the residuaries and the dissenters, the social basis and the place of influence and power which the lay elite of eastern Upper Canada occupied in the Kirk's affairs for the first time emerged simultaneously in the controversy over the Temporalities Act of 1843. The primary purpose of the Act was to give the higher courts of the Church of Scotland greater control over its temporal possessions and to make their administration uniform throughout the Province of Canada. Seven members were empowered by the Act to

manage the local temporalities. Of these, three each were to be elected by the pew-holders and the elders respectively, while the local minister was the seventh member.[42]

That the need for a uniform administration of the Kirk's temporalities should occasion controversy is largely the fault of the system by which the local temporalities were administered in the Canadas. It placed the control of the temporal possessions solely in the hands of the trustees. Since wealth and status in the local community, rather than church membership, which would have placed the temporalities under the spiritual supervision of the church, was the prerequisite for trusteeship, the trustees had the means at their disposal to control the decision-making process at the congregational level if they chose to use them. That the controversy should originate in eastern Ontario, as it did, is another consequence of the existing arrangement for the disposition of the temporalities. The concentra--tion of the Kirk's lay elite in eastern Ontario, and their tendency to control the affairs of their local congregation by means of the office of trustee, was bound to lead to conflict. Their tendency to impose their narrow views on the Church of Scotland enhanced this likelihood considerably. The major incidents of Perth in 1835 and of Ramsay in 1842 were the two examples of such conflicts. In both cases the trustees successfully imposed their will on the majority of the congregation including the minister.

In the Perth case, trustees representing the wealthiest members of St. Andrew's under the leadership of William Morris and Dr. Wilson tried to remove the local minister, Rev. T.C. Wilson who had the confidence of the congregation. Wilson had condemned in his sermons the crass materialism of the prominent church members and the traffick--ing in alcohol which some of them as local merchants were involved in. He had also interfered in the management of pews, a matter that thel trustees considered to be solely within their jurisdiction. Finally, in an attempt to reduce the influence of the prominent church members, which they commanded in virtue of their trusteeship, Wilson had tried to persuade the congregation of St. Andrew's to make church membership a necessary condition for trusteeship. The Ramsay dispute of 1842 was similar in nature to the one in Perth. The wealthy trustees led by William Wylie, formerly a merchant of Perth, rejected the Rev. T. McKidd, who had been called to serve as the local minister by a

majority of the congregation.[43] Both cases are evidence of the latent hostility in the Presbyterian congregations of eastern Ontario towards the lay elite and the desire of the local ministers to curb the power of the prominent church members.

The conflicting interests and objectives of three distinct groups concerning the temporal possessions of the Church of Scotland constitu--ted the fuel which fed the Temporalities controversy. The first group, the lay leadership of the Church of Scotland was headed by the brother-combination of William and James Morris and their business associate and confidante, F.A. Harper of Kingston.[44] They tried to quash the act because it threatened to terminate the control which they exercized over the temporalities. To defeat the Act they willingly joined forces with the Free Church party despite the differences in political and ecclesiastical viewpoint which existed between them.

The congregations in which supporters of the second interest group predominated either joined the Free Church in 1844 like those in Pres Prescott, Brockville and in Gananoque, or they gave rise to a Free Church movement after 1845 as in Perth, in Beckwith, in Ramsay, in South Gower, in Oxford and in Mountain.[45] That the adherents of this second group tended to sympathize and to identify with the Free Church movement is also indicated by the reasons which they gave for opposing the Temporalities Act. Like the lay leaders of the Kirk in eastern Upper Canada they condemned the Act because it placed the control of the temporalities in the hands of the clergy. Their opposition was further motivated by convictions which were not shared by the Kirk's prominent lay leaders but which the Temporalities Act nevertheless had violated. In the opinion of the Rev. Henry Gordon of Gananoque, the Act had not eliminated those very "secular tendencies" introduced into the church by these prominent lay members, "who from national feelings and associations, were using their influence and means to promote the extension of the Church of Scotland in the Province."[46] The Act's stipulation that British citizenship be made a requirement for membership and office-holding in the Church of Scotland only served to confirm the above conviction. The Kirk's clergy in eastern Ontario, because they dreaded "spiritual democracy as the worst system of tyranny", were equally guilty, according to the supporters of the Free Church, of turning the Church of Scotland "to a beautiful variety of purposes, political or otherwise."[47] They hoped to deprive the clerical and lay

leadership of the Kirk of much of its power and thereby rid the Synod of Canada of its exclusive parochialism.

The best means of accomplishing this, in the opinion of the non-intrusionists, was to entrust the temporalities to ordained deacons who had to be communicant members of the church and be elected by a majority of the congregation to qualify for the office. Not only would such an arrangement do away with minority rule of a select few, but, in the opinion of the Free church adherents, it would subject the actions of the persons in charge of the temporalities to the scrutiny of the church courts.[48] The relationship between the liberalism and non-intrusionism of the Free Church movement, which sought both to subject the Church courts to the will of the people and to maintain Christ's spiritual headship over the church, including its temporal possessions, thus was one of mutual support.

There were yet other reasons for the Free Church opposition to the Temporalities Act. The attempt to regulate the property of the Church of Scotland by an act of the legislature was open to the charge of Erastianism. Further, the Act proposed to make permanent what, in the opinion of the Free Church party, was an undesirable connection with the residuary party in Scotland. Finally, they questioned the legality of the Act because it had not been ratified by the congrega--tions of the Church of Scotland in Canada.[49]

The Presbyterian clergy of eastern Upper Canada, who wished to reduce the influence of the prominent lay leaders without endorsing the democratic principles of the Free Church party, constituted the third group in the controversy. They tried to steer a middle course between the two sides without sacrificing their own convictions as to who was legally entitled to control the temporal and spiritual affairs of the church. Persuaded as they were that ministers have been commissioned "from on high, and not by the will of the people" to exercize full authority over all aspects of the church, these clergy--men mainly from eastern Upper Canada, who dominated the Committee of Synod which drew up the terms of the Act, placed the temporalities under clergy control.[50]

The compromise solution which they attempted to achieve fooled no one, least of all the lay elite and the Free Church party, because it left the temporalities under their control. The combined opposition of the latter, which forced Synod to abandon the Act, constituted a

major defeat for the likes of Rev. T.C. Wilson and Rev. P. Campbell, who had sought to extricate their fellow-ministers from the horns of a dilemma --- how to curtail the excessive influence of the lay elite without descending to the degrading depth of "spiritual democracy".

In conclusion, the settlement pattern of Ontario must be held responsible for the lack of success which the Free Church movement enjoyed in the eastern districts of the province, Scottish nationals and other settlers imposed the conservative values in politics and religion on the Synod of Canada that had been tried by fire and the sword in the American Revolutionary War, the Napoleonic Wars and the War of 1812, and had not been found wanting. Tied to the conservative values of a passing age, the Kirk in Upper Canada was not equipped to meet the challenges of a changing society. In eastern Ontario, few challenges had to be met because society there changed very little after 1830. Life and the constant adjustment which it requires by-passed the Church of Scotland in the eastern areas simply because it by-passed eastern Upper Canada.

Those Scottish immigrants who brought with them to western Upper Canada their middle class values --- their Liberal orientation in politics and their evangelical outlook --- were responsible for injecting new vitality, flexibility and aggressiveness into the Synod of Canada. Challenging the political and ecclesiastical dominance of the upper class lay elite on the basis of wealth acquired by exploit--ing the new economic possibliities of a moving frontier, they saw the need for broadening the appeal of the Synod of Canada and for giving its lay membership a greater voice in the affairs of Synod.

The centre of gravity for this rising middle-class was Toronto, which was rapidly establishing itself as the dominant metropolitan centre in Upper Canada. The leading Free Church advocates like Peter Brown, the father of George Brown, and editor of the Banner, which was the self-appointed organ of the Free Church party, demanded a westward shift of power, to bring its focus nearer to the newer, richer settle--ments of western Ontario where the new staple wheat provided an economic basis for a changing society. The increasing frequency with which ministers from western Canada were chosen as moderators of the Church of Scotland and the marked tendency of the Church of Scotland during the 1830's to hold its synodical gatherings in or near Toronto indicates the growing influence of western Upper Canada and particularly of Toronto in

the affairs of the Synod of Canada. It is thus more than a mere coincidence that the Disruption occurred in 1844, the same year the seat of government was moved from Kingston to Montreal despite the efforts of the prominent lay Presbyterians to prevent the move. The Disruption of 1844 thus marked the declining importance of Kingston as a centre of Presbyterianism. It corresponds to Kingston's diminishing role in the economic and political life of the province which received its final confirmation in the loss of the seat of government.

Notes

1. For the sake of convenience and to avoid confusion "Upper Canada" is used to denote Canada West after the union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1841.

2. Three out of a total of twenty-five ministers in eastern Upper Canada joined the Free Church, while twenty out of a total of forty-two ministers in western Upper Canada joined the Free Church in 1844. Thus out of a total of twenty-three ministers who joined the Free Church, only three came from eastern while twenty came from western Upper Canada. See Minutes of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland. September 18-24, 1844

3. Ian S. Rennie, "The Free Church and the Relations of Church and State in Canada, 1844-1854" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Dept. of History, University of Toronto), pp. 38-9.

4. The Glasgow Colonial Society appointees who remained loyal to the Church of Scotland during and after the Disruption of 1844 were George Romanes of Smith Falls, P.C. Campbell formerly of Brockville and Professor of Classics at Queens University, John Smith of Beckwith township, Lanark County, John McLaurin of Lochiel township, Glengarry County, and Robert McGill of Niagara.

5. Minutes of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland for the years 1841 to 1845.

6. The newly-formed Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland in 1831 expressed their desire "to submit to you the determination of the precise relation which the Synod shall have to your Venerable Body" in a Memorial addressed to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Minutes, June 8-13, 1831. Also see the Declaratory Enactment of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Minutes, August 1-8, 1833.

7. Minutes, 1843.

8. Robert McGill, "Report of the Synod's Committee to negotiate on the Subject of Reunion with the Seceding Brethren", unpublished manuscript, Synod Papers, 1843-1845.

9. Jessie Buchanan Campbell, The Pioneer Pastor. Some Reminiscences of the Life and Labors of the Rev. George Buchanan. (2nd edit. Franklin Pa. Derrick Press, 1905), p. 44

10. William Bell, "History of the Presbyterian Church in Perth" (unpublished manuscript) see Synod Papers, 1818-1835.

11. Alexander Morris Papers.

12. The biographical sketch of William Morris has been compiled from the William Morris Papers, Rev. William Bell's Diaries, the Synod Papers, 1818-1845, and from the following secondary sources: Edward Marion Chadwick, Ontarian Families: Genealogies of United Empire Loyalists and Other Pioneer Families of Upper Canada (Toronto: Rolph,

Smith and Co., 1894), II, 468, Henry Morgan, Sketches of Celebrated Canadians (Quebec: Hunter, Rose and Co., 1862), pp. 429-432.

13. The best exposition of the views of the residuaries is found in the Minutes of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland for 1844, and in the Draft of an Answer to the Dissent and Protest of Certain Ministers and Elders Who Have Seceded from the Synod of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland (Kingston: Chronicle & Gazette Office, 1844), p. 13 from which the quotations are taken.

14. Letter from John Mowat to William Morris, Kingston, Upper Canada, September 27, 1837.

15. Synod Papers, 1818-1835.

16. Synod Papers. 1818-1835, see "Memorial to His Majesty on the subject of the Clergy Reserves" which was drawn up by a Committee of Synod at Williamstown in September, 1935.

17. Letter from William Morris, Perth, Upper Canada, March 20, 1826.

18. Synod Papers, loc. cit.

19. The Presbytery of the Canadas, constituted on January 8, 1818, the predecessor of the United Presbytery of Upper Canada and the United Synod of Upper Canada, adopted the following motion: "That the doctrines, discipline and worship of the Church of Scotland would be recognized by us." The Rev. William Bell, who had come to Perth in 1817 as an ordained minister of the Secession Presbytery in Edinburgh and who was the originator of the above motion, always defended his right, and that of his fellow ministers "to be considered as belonging to the Church of Scotland in as much as they only dissent from the errors, innovations and abuses that had crept in" to the Church of Scotland. Further the Rev. Henry Leith, sometime minister of the Kirk's congregations at Cornwall and Osnabruck testified before the Select Committee of the British House of Commons in 1827 that there existed no differences between the Secession Church and the Church of Scotland in Upper Canada which would prevent their being united into one church. See Isabel Skelton, A Man Austere: William Bell, Parson and Pioneer (Toronto. Ryerson Press, 1947), p. 188, Presbytery of the Canadas, Correspondence, 1819-1856, Letter from Rev. William Bell to Rev. Archibald Henderson, Perth, Upper Canada, November 13, 1823 William Gregg, History of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada (Toronto. Presbyterian Printing and Publishing Co., 1885), p. 386-7.

20. Letter from William Morris to Rev. Henry Esson, Perth, Upper Canada, December 18, 1827. I have always insisted on the settlement of our clergy, not as a boon or favour, but as a Constitutional and National claim of right, take American Presbyterians into your connexion now and the Ministers will no longer be binding."

21. The Synod of Canada used the following opening statement to preface their demand for an increase in the annual financial subsidy of the British government: "That your Memorialists have observed with peculiar satisfaction, that the loyalty and respect for the institution of the Empire, which have eminently distinguished Your Majesty's Subjects, members of the Church of Scotland in their native land, have suffered no diminution in this the land of their adoption, and that amidst many attempts by seditious and designing men to contaminate their principles they have remained faithful to their King and true to their country." Synod Papers, loc. cit.

22. Synod Papers, 1818-1835, 1835-1842

23. This is how the Temporalities Act of 1843 defined the Synod of Canada's connection with the Church of Scotland overseas. Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland, Minutes, September 18-24, 1844.

24. Presbytery of Bathurst, Minutes, September 22, 1843.

25. Ibid., February 13, 1832; January 9, 1833; May 10, 1843.

26. Kingston Herald, August 27, 1844.

27. Rennie, op. cit., p. 11.

28. T.W.H. Leavitt, History of Leeds and Grenville Counties, 1749-1879 (Brockville: Recorder Press, 1879), pp. 126-7.

29. British Colonist, August 12, 1843, letter from Rev. P.C. Campbell, Kingston, Canada West.

30. Synod Papers, 1842-1845 W.S. Wallace, The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography (Toronto: Macmillan, 1946) p. 106.

31. The Banner, November 24, 1843.

32. Lefferts A. Loetscher, The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church since 1869 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1957), p. 1.

33. Gregg, op. cit., p. 191-2, 362.

34. William Smart, "Biography of Rev. William Smart, Minister of the Presbyterian Church of Brockville, 1811-1849", unpublished manuscript, United Church Archives; ---------, Diary of the Minister of Brockville, 1822-1848, unpublished manuscript, United Church Archives, Synod-Papers, 1835-1842.

35. Christian Guardian, January 11, 1832.

36. Skelton, op. cit., p. 184.

37. Presbytery of Bathurst, Minutes, January 12, 1843.

38. Synod Papers, 1839-1842, see terms of union.

39. Kingston Herald, July 30, 1844.

40. Memorial Volume of Jubilee Celebrations of the Fiftieth Anniversary of Knox Church, Ottawa, (Ottawa: Thorburn & Co., 1894), p. 11.

41. Census of Canada 1848.

42. Synod Papers, 1843-1845, copy of the Temporalities Act.

43. Synod Papers, op. cit., 1818-1835, 1843-1845, see Minutes of the Meeting of the Standing Commission held at Perth by appointment of Synod on October 21, 1835, and Presbytery of Bathurst Extracts concerning the Ramsay Case, December 11, 1842 and January 11, 1843.

44. Letters from William Morris to F.A. Harper, Perth, Upper Canada, December 27, 1839 and February 12, 1841.

45. Synod Papers, 1839-1842, letter from Rev. Henry Gordon to Professor P.C. Campbell, Kingston, Canada West, March 9, 1842.

46. Ibid.

47. Kingston Chronicle and Gazette, February 14, 1844.

48. Synod Papers, 1839-1842, 1843-1845, letter from Rev. Henry Gordon to Professor P.C. Campbell, Kingston, Canada West, March 9, 1842, and letter of resignation from the Synod of Canada from Rev. Robert Boyd, October 30, 1843.

49. Ibid.

50. Kingston Chronicle and Gazette, February 14, 1844.