In a sermon preached July 1, 1864, in St. George’s Church, Lennoxville, before Convocation of the University of Bishop’s College, J.H. Thompson, formerly Harold Professor of Divinity and Hebrew, sounded a warning note about “the intellectual dangers” to which students were “at the present time most exposed.”1 Entitled “Revelation and Science,” his address juxtaposed a defense of the “harmony between the natural and spiritual worlds” and “the peculiar inspiration of scripture” with an attack on “Rationalism,” which he characterized as “a new and subtle infidelity” in which “Christianity is denied or explained away, [and] the light of Human Reason ... is exalted as a judge over all that God has declared or revealed.”2

The timing, content and audience for Thompson’s sermon are telling. It was delivered at almost the mid-point of what Professor George Kitson Clark has described as “the crisis of the nineteenth-century attack on religion.”3 A series of books published from 1859 to 1871 represented the most serious attack upon orthodox Christian belief that had ever appeared in so brief a period. Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* was published in 1859. There followed the liberal Anglican *Essays and Reviews* (1860), the first part of Bishop Colenso’s *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined* (1862), the English translation of Joseph Ernest Renan’s *La Vie de Jésus* (1863), J.R. Seeley’s *Ecce Homo* (1865), and Darwin’s *Descent of Man* in 1871. “Orthodox religion received,” argues Kitson Clark, “a series of body blows, which seemed to be aimed at its existence.”4 These works, while originating in Britain, France and South Africa, were available throughout the Anglo-American world.5 Of late, however, Canadian historians have emphasized the evangelical Methodist and Presbyterian responses to these intellectual crosscurrents, while
largely ignoring the Anglican. The note of urgency in Thompson’s sermon serves as a reminder of High Church Anglican reaction. Moreover, his declaration that “the Church also looks to this place for instruction and guidance in the impending conflict between Faith and Scepticism” indicates that he saw Bishop’s College as having a place in this debate.

Three years after Thompson’s call to arms, the first of two short-lived Anglican literary and theological magazines issued from the University of Bishop’s College appeared. The first was *The Students’ Monthly*, which began publication in January 1867. Described by D.C. Masters as “austere and ably-written,” it was intended to serve as a general literary review. It was published for a year under its original name, but in January 1868 it was reincarnated as *The Lennoxville Magazine*. Only eleven issues of the latter appeared; it ceased publication in November 1868 — “probably too much of a strain on the resources of an overworked faculty.” It has all but been ignored, even by historians of the University. This is unfortunate, as the magazine provides an important window on the High Church Anglican culture of Bishop’s faculty in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Not until the appearance of *The Mitre* in June 1893 did the University have another publication.

Both magazine and college were defined by an Atlantic, Anglo-American culture that encompassed the local world of Quebec’s Eastern Townships and the High Church tradition within Anglicanism. Though situated on the frontiers of empire, members of the United Church of England and Ireland in British North America in a sense saw themselves as part of a cultural entity best described as the Atlantic world. Thus J.D. Bollen’s observations about “English Christianity and the Australian Colonies,” that “the English Churches not only perpetuated themselves abroad, they reinforced the cultural ties of mother country and colonies” and that colonial missions “were part of the phenomenon of empire,” was as true in British North America as it was in New South Wales.

Yet writing within a framework which stresses the importance of the Atlantic world and the imperial connection has seldom found a receptive audience among Canadian historians. In his 1993 Presidential address to the Canadian Historical Association entitled “Whatever happened to the British Empire?”, Philip Buckner mounts a trenchant critique of the insularity and whiggishness of Canadian historians. He argues that they “have locked themselves into a teleological framework which is obsessed with the evolution of Canadian autonomy” and, in so doing, have severed the Cana-
dian experience from that of the larger Atlantic world. As Buckner and others have argued, it was precisely this Atlantic and imperial context which gave shape and direction to events in British North America. The Atlantic was not an impenetrable barrier to communication; indeed, it was a conduit for people, news, ideas, and money travelling back and forth between Britain and British North America. Emigration was not a terminal point in this process; it was but one link in a chain of ongoing cultural diffusion and communication. People in the Atlantic world, moreover, used a common political and religious discourse and operated within a shared framework of ideas. When in 1849, for example, Armine Mountain, son of the third Bishop of Quebec, wrote to his sister Harriet, wife of Principal Nicolls of Bishop’s College, “I am afraid Nicolls will not escape the charge of Puseyism if he has permitted chanting the service,” he was writing in the language of a common religious discourse and controversy which made as much sense in Lennoxville as it did in Oxford.

A whole series of networks operated in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries enabling people, money, trade goods, news, gossip, political and religious ideas to circulate within this Atlantic world. The eighteenth century consumer revolution bound Britain and its colonies together in what T.H. Breen has called an “empire of goods.” There also existed, from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, a series of transatlantic religious networks linking, in various degrees, England, Scotland, Ireland, the Thirteen Colonies, and British North America. Historians of Puritan New England and of the First Great Awakening in the Thirteen Colonies have delineated the epistolary and publishing networks which linked Britain and her Atlantic colonies. Moreover, Andrew Porter has recently argued that British Evangelicals “had a powerful sense of belonging to a community that was universal or international, one which included like-minded Christians in continental Europe and North America as well as those in Yorkshire or Norfolk.”

This shared sense of community was not, of course, limited to Evangelicals. High Church Anglicans had their own sense of shared identity and their own set of networks which provided substantial linkages between centre and periphery. One of the most important of these was the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG), whose money and influence were conspicuously present in the Diocese of Quebec, as in many other parts of the Empire.

Until the laying of the first transatlantic cable in 1858, linking Trinity Bay, Newfoundland, with Valencia, Ireland, this was a
communications network dependent on wind, currents, sails, and, eventually, steam. While the material basis of communication may have changed from the mid-nineteenth century onwards, the matrix within which it operated did not. One of the most important vehicles for communication within this Atlantic empire was literary — magazines, pamphlets, books and, above all, the weekly and eventually daily newspaper. Well into the last half of the nineteenth century, Canadian dailies carried a large proportion of British, Continental and American news.

In addition to the burgeoning newspaper press of the mid-nineteenth century, an increasing number of literary magazines were appearing by the second half of the century. Some were clearly orientated towards a popular mass market, as witness the rise of the illustrated magazine. Alongside these popular magazines, there arose magazines devoted to specialized interests, whether politics, history, religion or science. It has been argued that “such diversification clarified (and narrowed) the role of the literary periodical, leaving it to concentrate on the cultivation of polite letters and the dissemination of informed opinion on social, political and cultural issues.”

The Lennoxville Magazine, while conforming in some respects to this trend towards specialized literary magazines, also had roots traceable to the earlier part of the century. Journals such as the Christian Sentinel and Anglo-Canadian Churchman’s Magazine of the late 1820s and early 1830s and the Colonial Church Chronicle and Missionary Record of the 1840s were clearly theological and religious in orientation and devoted to strengthening, informing and educating the Anglican constituency.

The Lennoxville Magazine was more eclectic, though its orientations towards a literate, Anglican, and British culture were evident. The debut issue, for example, contained the first two chapters of a rather tedious novel entitled “A Lord of the Creation”; a poem by C. Pelham Mulvany — “Don Almansor’s Baptism”; the first part of a history of “The Church in Britain to the Time of Augustin”; a short-story “A Terrible Night” by Benedict de Revoil, in translation from the French; another poem, this one by “O.M.,” “On the Receipt of Tennyson’s ‘In Memoriam’”; an essay on the neglected art of reading aloud; a poem by F.B. Crofton “Sub Noctem Susurri” (in English despite its Latin title); and the account of a trip to the Gaspé by “Viator.” Three regular features closed the first number. The first was a column entitled “The Church,” in which the writer commented on events in the United Church of England and Ireland; the second
was a section of “Essays in Translation” which was accompanied by the comment, “Under the above head we purpose to give each month a small space to poetical translations from various languages, — especially from the Latin and Greek. We would respectfully invite the attention of Canadian scholars to this feature of our Magazine.”

Last, the magazine contained advertisements for Lennoxville businesses. Subsequent issues of the magazine continued to reflect this eclectic tone: serialized forms of novels, poetry, history, travel-logs (of the Hudson’s Bay region), essays and poems in translation, biographical sketches (Talleyrand, Thomas D’Arcy McGee), obituaries (Rev. S.S. Wood of Three Rivers), and essays on such diverse topics as “Martyrs of the Seventeenth Century” and “Alcohol: Its Use and Abuse.” Its parochial advertising is in marked contrast with the rest of the magazine’s national and international focus. Apart from the occasional article on “Education and Lennoxville School” or the “Public Schools of the Eastern Townships,” The Lennoxville Magazine had a worldview which encompassed province, nation and empire. Nowhere is this more evident than in the column entitled “The Church,” which brought a colonial High Church perspective to imperial religious issues. The issues addressed in the column over the course of The Lennoxville Magazine’s eleven numbers are the focus of this article.

While much about the origins, conduct and demise of the magazine remains obscure, some light can be shed on its readership through the examination of two published subscription lists. Other information can be inferred from its contents. Certainly not all of the subscribers can be traced and therefore any collective profile must remain incomplete. Nevertheless a few observations are warranted. The first concerns transatlantic and international connections. Of the eighty-two people listed as subscribers, sixty-six were located in Canada, eleven in England and five in the United States. A number of subscribers, including five of the eleven from England, were women. Not surprisingly, the subscribers included thirteen clergymen: all except one were connected to the Diocese of Quebec; most were based in the Eastern Townships. Thus Beaulieu’s and Hamelin’s observation that “ce périodique littéraire s’adressait non plus aux étudiants et aux professeurs de Bishop, mais au public lettré des Cantons de l’Est” is accurate but incomplete. It also seems clear that the magazine would have been limited in its appeal. Unlike contemporary newspapers, it contained nothing specifically aimed at children, nor did it address women or women’s issues (as the Victorians might have defined them), despite having
a number of women subscribers. The inclusion of a column enti-
tled “The Church,” exclusively devoted to issues related to Angli-
canism, may not have represented astute marketing strategies, but it
did reflect a High Church Anglican view of the Church of England’s
claims to legitimacy and exclusivity.  
24

Most of the articles were unsigned. We therefore have little con-
firmed information about contributors. However, the identity of the
editor is known. In the November issue, under the heading “Ordi-
nation,” there is a notice that “John F. Carr, B.A., editor of the
‘Lennoxville,’” was ordained deacon by the Lord Bishop of Quebec
and that Mr. Carr was being appointed to the charge of Durham. We
also know from D.C. Masters’ work on the early history of Bishop’s
that Carr received his B.A. in 1867 and his M.A. in 1870.  
25 After grad-
uation in 1867 Carr must have remained in Lennoxville, perhaps
beginning the work towards his M.A. while awaiting ordination.
This is fairly clear evidence that the magazine that had been The Stu-
dents’ Monthly in a previous incarnation had remained under student
editorship.

Few clues exist regarding involvement in the magazine by the
principal and faculty, but I should like to argue, based on the range
of topics discussed and the sophistication they were handled with,
that “The Church” was written either by Principal Nicolls himself or
by a member of the faculty, more probably the latter. Given his posi-
tion in the college and his obvious literary abilities, Nicolls would
seem a natural candidate to comment on the state of the imperial
church. In 1868, however, he was struggling under the heavy weight
of administration in addition to teaching almost the entire arts and
divinity curriculum, and it was only through the assistance of
interim faculty like Henry Roe and A.C. Scarth that he managed
the period 1866–68.  
26 Moreover, Nicolls had been coming under
increasing attack from Evangelicals in Montreal during this time. It
was well known that he had been at Oriel College, Oxford, in the
eyearly days of the Oxford Movement and had even voted in Oxford
Convocation against censuring the views of W.G. Ward, a fairly
advanced Tractarian.  
27 Nicolls’ associations would thus quite natu-
rally have brought him under Evangelical scrutiny. As well, the col-
lege’s financial problems, its low enrollment, and questions about
Nicolls’ leadership raised in Corporation meant that between 1868
and 1871 he laboured under increasingly difficult circumstances.  
28
Nicolls was probably far too busy and under too much strain to write
“The Church.”

Who then? A strong candidate is Henry Roe.  
29 Roe had been a
student under Nicolls at Bishop’s in the mid 1840s, had been ordained priest by Bishop George Mountain in 1853 and had served two charges in the diocese: New Ireland from 1852–55 and St. Matthew’s, Quebec City, from 1855–68. In 1868 he was in Lennoxville to help Nicolls teach divinity and in 1873 he was appointed to the chair of divinity at Bishop’s. Roe was a High Churchman with a “penchant for controversy.” His tenure at St. Matthew’s had seen him embroiled in controversy with Quebec City area Evangelicals over the twin issues of his alleged Tractarianism and the nature of the diocese’s new synodical constitution. Roe also had considerable journalistic experience and established international connections. He had served as correspondent for both the New York Church Journal and the London Guardian.

Roe would have brought to “The Church” an awareness of imperial religious issues as viewed through the lens of colonial High Church Anglicanism. Indeed, the range of issues discussed is rather narrow: ritualism; the first Lambeth Conference; the case of John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal in the Province of South Africa; Irish Church disestablishment; and the secularization of the University of Oxford. Each of these was relevant to the experience of the Anglican church in Canada. Questions of doctrine, biblical authority, ritual, liturgy, and secularization are not limited by geography; they were lively issues in all parts of the British Empire.

In the first issue, “The Church” took up the subject of the recently completed first Lambeth Conference. Interestingly enough, the initiative for these conferences had come from bishops in the British North American church. At the third meeting of the Provincial Synod for Canada, held in 1865, John Travers Lewis, Bishop of Ontario, concerned by the inroads being made into the various branches of the Anglican communion by “ritualism and rationalism,” put forth the idea of “a world-conference of Anglican bishops” that led to the meeting by seventy-six bishops in London in September 1867. “The Church” was warmly supportive of this pan-Anglican initiative, seeing it as further evidence that the Church of Christ was progressing in its fight against “the Spirit of the world, and the power of the Ruler of this world.” Whatever its shortcomings, the first Lambeth Conference succeeded by the mere fact of its meeting. “Herein lies the great step forward that has been made, that the bishops of the English, Scotch, Canadian, American, African, and New Zealand Churches have met and proclaimed to the world, that they, and the churches they represent, are in real visible communion one with another.”
Perhaps the thorniest issue addressed at Lambeth was the case of John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal. Colenso (1814–1883) had been embroiled in controversy almost since the beginning of his appointment as first Bishop of Natal. A native of Cornwall, he had been educated at St. John’s College, Cambridge, and had served as vicar of Fornbett St. Mary’s in Norfolk for seven years prior to his appointment to Natal. He had offended many of his contemporary missionaries by suggesting that Kaffir polygamists need not divorce their wives on being baptised, arguing that this caused unnecessary pain and suffering to both wives and children. He quarrelled with the Dean of Pietermaritzburg over their respective Eucharistic theologies. He had alienated most of his diocesan clergy over the constitution of a proposed diocesan synod. In 1861 he ventured into the field of biblical criticism by publishing a commentary — *St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans: Newly Translated, and Explained from a Missionary Point of View*. As his modern biographer Peter Hinchliff has put it, “[I]t was an attempt to set out the essentials of the gospel he preached, and to show how he interpreted St. Paul to the heathen who had never heard the gospel before.”

In Colenso’s view, the atonement was “an entirely objective event. Christ’s saving work needed no personal application to the individual. Both conversion and baptism were in the last resort meaningless. The work of the missionary in preaching the gospel is to show the heathen the pattern of Christ, the example of his love, and to assure him that he is already redeemed.” Such universalistic views, which rejected the High Church/Tractarian emphasis on the efficacy of the sacraments as means of grace, and the Evangelical emphasis on conversion, were bound to provoke the wrath of his contemporaries. Colenso’s commentary on Romans was followed by the publication of the first part of his *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined* in 1862. Influenced by his reading of *Essays and Reviews* and by study of contemporary German biblical critics, Colenso contended that parts of the Pentateuch were not historical, that Moses could not have been its author, that Christ was ignorant of its real authorship, that the Bible was not God’s self-revelation, and that contemporary views of its inspired nature were unfounded.

Whatever the long-term significance of Colenso’s views for biblical criticism, they had immediate constitutional and theological implications. Upset by Colenso’s views as expressed in both the Romans commentary and *The Pentateuch*, Robert Gray, Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of the Province of South Africa, and theoretically “a moderate Tractarian,” convened a Synod of South
African bishops in November 1863 to consider Colenso’s position. Of the nine charges brought against Colenso, eight could have been subscribed to by Evangelicals, High Churchmen and Tractarians alike.\(^42\) He was charged with, among other things, holding heterodox views on the atonement, justification, future punishment, and the inspiration, historical trustworthiness and authority of Holy Scripture.\(^43\) In December, Gray deposed Colenso as Bishop of Natal pending his full retraction, and declared that he could no longer serve as a Church of England clergyman in the province of South Africa. As well, fearing Erastian interference by the English courts, the Church in South Africa declared itself independent of English jurisdiction. Colenso, espousing heterodox theological views, and seeing himself as a defender of individual against corporate rights, appealed against the Metropolitan court’s decision to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London, sitting in its civil, not its ecclesiastical capacity.\(^44\) On March 20, 1865, the Privy Council rendered judgment, declaring the proceedings of Gray’s court to be null and void but also calling into question the validity of Gray’s letters patent (which had “made” him Bishop of Cape Town and then Metropolitan of South Africa) and the jurisdiction of his synodical and metropolitan courts. This was merely the beginning of a long and tortuous legal battle, both civil and ecclesiastical, over Colenso’s claim to still be Bishop of Natal, over the obligations of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund to continue to pay his stipend, and over the right to the church property in Natal.\(^45\)

*The Lennoxville Magazine* first approached the Colenso case in the context of the convening of the first Lambeth Conference. “The Church” expressed clear concern about Colenso’s theological position, referring to it at once as “pernicious heresy.” The writer continued to keep abreast of the legal and constitutional questions occasioned as the various cases were tried in both the ecclesiastical and civil courts of South Africa and Great Britain. Throughout these proceedings, “The Church” consistently supported Bishop Gray.\(^46\) Moreover, the writer expressed dismay at Colenso’s support by the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London, and he linked these issues with a further exodus from the Anglican communion to the Church of Rome.

...[T]hose who thus turn their backs in the hour of danger, show that they have no power of endurance in the cause of religion, when they leave the city that is most hardly beset; in our Church the battle of Christianity and the world is being fought, and in our Church, by God’s aid, the battle shall be won.
We have treasured the Bible as the Word of God even in our darkest days, and we will not let it go now, that the clouds gather round us, and the storm threatens. But it certainly is a keen blow that this attack upon the Bible springs from England; where the Book has been printed most extensively, criticised most reverently, and circulated most freely, that thence should spring this deadly attack upon it; that Bishops of our communion should, the one openly deny the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, and the Inspiration of those Scriptures to which He set his seal, and the other proclaim to the world that he upholds the heretical bishop, because he is not deposed by the Civil Courts.47

These remarks should remind us that High Church Anglicans were just as disturbed by the new cross-currents in science, theology and historical criticism as their Evangelical colleagues.48 This refrain of the Church and Christianity in danger was a recurrent one in the pages of The Lennoxville Magazine. A passage in “The Church” of May 1868 warned, “[M]en, who have nothing else in common, are calmly plotting to overthrow that faith in a Divine Ruler of the universe, in whom, from primeval times we have believed, and the working of whose Hand we have been accustomed to trace in all the social, political, and moral changes that the world has yet seen.”49 The proposals to secularize the University of Oxford were read in the same light: “The revolutionary spirit of this century purposes now to hand over the revenues and the entire government of the university to men who may be Christians or infidels, members of the Church of England or the Church of Rome, Presbyterians or Dissenters.” To permit such secularization would have grave effects on the rising generation of students:

No one who really knows the universities, and has had any experience in the characters and dispositions of the young men who commonly pass through an university career, could do otherwise than oppose the secularization of university education. Men at the age at which they come to an university are just beginning to exult in the conscious possession of intellectual powers, and many are thereby inclined towards philosophical speculations .... It is almost impossible to overrate the influence which the existence of non-Christian fellows, tutors, and professors would have over men at this stage of their intellectual development.... The main existing fault in our two great universities is, not that they exercise too much, but too little moral and religious control over the undergraduates....50
These remarks were echoes of what Owen Chadwick has described as “two ideals of a university struggling for the mastery.”51 The older ideal viewed the university as an institution devoted to educating and nurturing students in an atmosphere of piety and virtue. The newer ideal saw it as a research institution, with intellectual achievement being the highest priority. As Chadwick put it, “[F]or the new men the rules of celibacy and religious profession merely hampered Oxford and Cambridge in their proper endeavour to encourage the advancement of knowledge.”52 This debate, which in some ways had been ongoing since the 1850s, when the universities’ commission issued its report recommending changes to both ancient English universities, resounded throughout the Anglo-American world in the second half of the nineteenth century. In the United States, educational reformers like Andrew Dickinson White of Cornell and Charles Eliot of Harvard were undertaking a restructuring of the American university to reflect the new research values, and in so doing were leaving behind the more explicitly Christian values which had animated higher education since the seventeenth century.53 In many respects, the ideals on which Bishop’s had been founded mirrored the older vision of piety and virtue which had sustained higher education in Britain and America down to the 1870s. Now much of this vision was under attack, and The Lennoxville Magazine reflected the urgency of the issue. Amidst all the darkness and gloom, however, the writer of “The Church” saw “a noble act of faith” shining through — the foundation of Keble College, Oxford. This foundation he regarded as “a proof that the conflict is not yet lost, or rather is a good augury that it shall be ultimately won.”54 To his mind, Keble College would stand as a bulwark of truth against unbelief and against those forces which threatened to undermine all that was good and virtuous and Christian about English institutions. It would ultimately serve as good leaven, influencing the entire University of Oxford.

Another critical issue broached in “The Church” was the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, what it called “one of the most important questions of the day, as regards the interests of the Church Catholic.”55 It will be remembered that it was the issue of the reform of the Church of Ireland which had prompted John Keble to issue his call to arms of “the church in danger” in his Oxford assize sermon of 1833, which some have seen as the beginning of the Oxford Movement. Those proposals to reform the Church of Ireland “seemed the start of a general despoiling of the establishment at the hands of a secular parliament that had ceased officially to be either
Anglican or even Protestant.” By the 1860s there were discussions in earnest about proceeding to the entire disestablishment of the Anglican church in Ireland, and it was left to the Liberal administration of William Ewart Gladstone to propose and ultimately carry legislation to that effect in 1869–71.

*The Lennoxville Magazine* took up the issue in the year preceding the main parliamentary debate. The writer of “The Church” approached the Irish Church question from the perspective of one who had been nurtured and educated in the High Church and Tractarian traditions, but also one who had spent most of his adult life ministering in a colonial church which didn’t enjoy all the perquisites of establishment. He argued that the proposals concerning the Irish Church “confuse the question of establishment and the power of holding property.” Thus, “unless a voluntary body has power in its corporate capacity to hold property, we can have no societies, colleges, churches at all. The question of establishment or non-establishment, though a grave one, yet involves no wide principle, extending beyond itself; whereas the question of the claim of the Government of a country to confiscate all property, which they may choose to consider to be badly administered, involves a fundamental principle of social and national life.” To the writer of “The Church,” this was a question of political philosophy which went beyond “the utility and value of the Irish Church, or...her vitality: the disendowment of an endowed body is neither more nor less than the transference of property from the hands of one person to those of another.” Having stated, though, that the principal question was independent of the issue of the state of the Irish Church, the writer was not prepared to grant that that church was in fact moribund: “her disendowment will remove from Ireland thousands of her best inhabitants, both clerical and lay; it will alter the state of religion in Ireland in an abrupt way, which may reasonably, on mere social grounds, cause alarm, depriving seven hundred thousand members of our communion of those means of grace, which at present, the Irish Church affords them.” Disendowment, moreover, meant that these Irish Anglicans would be thrown into the arms of the Roman Catholic Church. “We must, at least, believe that members of Parliament are prepared to assert deliberately, that the Roman communion offers higher means of grace to the population of that island, and therefore, that there is nothing unreasonable in handing over to them so large a number of souls.”

*The Lennoxville Magazine* had first broached the Irish Church question in May 1868. In July of that year, almost the whole of “The
Church” was devoted to this issue. The writer once again took up the theme that the Irish Church question was not well understood by members of the House of Commons, who continued to confuse establishment with endowment and the true and spiritual nature of the Church with its political and economic benefits. He wrote:

The Irish Church, continuous in history and succession from the earliest days of the Church, and in full spiritual communion with the Established Church of England, will not cease to exist, however ruthlessly its temporal rights be torn away from it. It may be feeble in organization, deficient in zeal, earnestness and faith, yet, no Act of Parliament can make a Church other than its Divine Founder made it.

Such principles, he asserted, had been ignored in the quest for power by members of Parliament. They were also an ominous portent, prefiguring the disendowment of the Church of England. But the argument did not end there. Raising the whole issue of the connection of church and state, he cited a work entitled Letters on the Church, which had apparently influenced John Henry Newman’s thinking on these issues. Letters on the Church, he wrote,

claims for the Church of England a distinct corporate character, a spiritual sovereignty independent of the State, whose golden chains have been too closely fastened about the Church in England. Very strongly does the writer protest against what he terms the double usurpation, viz., the interference of the State in spirituals, and of the Church in temporals. On the one hand this state of things involves the Ministers of the Church in duties and offices which do not properly pertain to them; and on the other hand it prevents the Church from exercising that discipline within its own body, which, in the early ages of Christianity, it always did exercise, and with so beneficial an effect.61

Indeed, the writer went so far as to suggest that the disestablishment of the Church, if this did not involve its disendowment, might be the best thing for its spiritual health. Tellingly, he asserted that “the Church of Christ, the cause of truth, has ever suffered less from persecution that from prosperity; the favour of princes and states was more fatal to it than their animosity.”62 Finally, the fiery trials which the churches in Britain were undergoing gave him occasion to reflect on the contrasting circumstances of the colonial Church. The colonial churches offered proof of

that which appears so very hard to realize to the minds of
many at home: the possibility of having a church without an establishment; Bishops, without the imposing externals, which surround them at home, clergy poorer than they are at home, and pastoral work without distinct parochial limits. The inherent vitality and indestructibility of the Church, which so many seem unable to believe, is attested by the living testimony of actual fact.63

The last major issue confronted by The Lennoxville Magazine in “The Church” was that of ritualism. Again, this was an issue which went back to the Oxford Movement of the 1830s and 1840s. The precise relationship of liturgical and architectural to theological change is a contentious issue. Some historians, like Desmond Bowen, have seen significant differences between the early Oxford reformers and the later Anglo-Catholic ritualists. Others, like Nigel Yates, have argued vigorously against dividing the theology of the early Tractarians from the later practices of the ritualists, asserting that “liturgical experiment, however advanced, was the logical outcome of Tractarian teaching.”64 Liturgical change was introduced over time. The first changes involved chanting the service, using lighted altar candles and preaching in the surplice. By the 1860s, however, there were six recognizable parts to “advanced Anglo-Catholic practice.” According to Nigel Yates they consisted of “taking the eastward position at the Eucharist; wearing the full eucharistic vestment; mixing water with wine in the chalice; using lighted candles on the altar; using unleavened or wafer bread in the Eucharist; and using incense during the service.”65 Tractarian teaching and ritualistic practice resulted in a series of prosecutions from the 1850s down to the 1880s (four of the six practices being ruled illegal), the establishment of a Royal Commission on Ritual (quite critical of ritualism), and ultimately various attempts to regulate liturgical practice through legislation in the British Parliament, culminating in the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874.66 Ritualists had founded the Society of the Holy Cross in 1855 and the English Church Union in 1859–60 to defend ritualism and ritualists. The Evangelicals had responded in 1865 with the establishment of the Church Association, to defend against romanizing trends in the Church of England.

Much of the public Evangelical opposition both to Tractarianism and Ritualism was led by Anthony Ashley-Cooper, seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. Shaftesbury, a great social reformer who is representative of what James Bentley has called “the conscience of Victorian England,” was implacably hostile to both Tractarian teaching and ritualistic practice, seeing them, like most Evangelicals, as an attempt
to return the Church of England to the Roman fold, in belief and practice if not in name. From 1865 to 1872, Shaftesbury took the lead in introducing anti-ritualist bills into the House of Lords. In this context of litigation, Royal Commissions, legislation and armed camps of ritualists and anti-ritualists that The Lennoxville Magazine entered the fray. The Lennoxville Magazine took up the issue with reference to the first recommendations of the Royal Commission, Shaftesbury’s Vestment Bill and a memorial to the commission by a meeting of High Churchmen. The views expressed at this meeting were characterized by “moderation and charity.”

The plea made by the writer of “The Church” was that “the comprehensiveness of the Church of England be not destroyed by hasty legislation.” “There seems, indeed,” he wrote, “no sufficient ground for attempting to exclude from that communion its High Church members, who form well nigh half the whole body.” To do so would be to irreparably weaken it, making it unable to withstand the threats from Roman Catholicism. Thus he went on to say that “Lord Shaftesbury might live to regret that he had destroyed the only organization, which he has openly declared that he believes to be the only one capable of resisting Papal encroachments.” In April 1868, “The Church” returned to this issue of ritualism, this time criticizing a resolution by the Bishops in the Upper House of Convocation as having settled none of the issues, but also saying, “[N]or can any good be effected by a rule, which, while it limits ritual observances on the side of excess, does nothing to touch the case of clergy who are too indolent to do their proper work, and, while living upon the temporalities of a parish, allow the parishioners to starve spiritually.” Moreover, to let parliament decide such issues was very dangerous indeed: “The attempt to effect this might effect too much, and Parliament, acting as mediator to the two Church parties, might destroy both instead of repressing one.”

In June 1868, “The Church” again broached the subject of ritualism, this time with a glance at the judgment made by Sir R. Phillimore in the Court of Arches (the highest ecclesiastical court in the Province of Canterbury). The writer had hoped for a decision which would set the matter of ritualism to rest, at least for a while, and so “permit members of that Church to unite in meeting the terrible attacks which are being made against her, both from within and without.” His primary concern was that this interminable strife and litigation over matters of ritual was dissipating the Church of England’s energies to such an extent that “the day may be past when the English Church has strength to resist the attacks made upon her
doctrine by the inroads of heresy, and upon her position by the
attacks of secularists.”71 While he did not identify the heretics, he
was probably referring to the contributors to Essays and Reviews
and Bishop Colenso. Given his repeated calls for unity, and know-
ing that much of the anti-ritualist litigation originated in the Evan-
gelical camp, it was unlikely that he was referring to the Evangeli-
cals as heretics.

Describing The Lennoxville Magazine’s precise position on mat-
ters of ritual is more problematic. Commenting on a paper on “Pub-
lic Worship” delivered at the biennial visitation of the Lord Bishop
of Quebec (James Williams) to Bishop’s College, the writer of “The
Church” remarked that “nothing could be more cheering than the
unanimous, hearty assent of the Clergy to the obligation of daily
Common Prayer, the weekly celebration of the Holy Communion,
and to the distinctive position of this blessed Sacrament as the
Church’s perpetual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. We were not
less pleased with the generous tone of the Clergy with what is pop-
ularly known as Ritualism.”72 In September 1868, “The Church”
returned once again to the subject of ritualism, this time in reference
to perhaps the most notorious of the extreme ritualists in England,
Alexander Heriot Mackonochie.73 “The Church” characterized Mack-
onochie as an extreme Evangelical who had become an extreme
ritualist, and his actions at St. Alban’s, Holborn, in London’s East
End, as having outrun the intentions of its founder and patron,
Mr. Hubbard.74 Mackonochie was criticized for “imprudence and
indiscretion” and “breech of obligation in carrying on the services
in a manner which has caused difficulties, not only in the Church
at large, but with his own friends and supporters.” The writer of “The
Church” sided with Hubbard in his efforts “to restrain such usages
and practices as seemed, not only to himself, but also to many sin-
cere friends of the Church, incompatible both with the law of the
English Church and the spirit of our Liturgy.”75

In 1868, the Upper House (that is, the Bishops) of the Provincial
Synod passed a series of resolutions upholding the recent decision
of the Court of Arches in England in its condemnation of ritualistic
practice, namely the elevation of the elements in celebrating Holy
Communion; the use of incense during services; the mixing of water
with wine; and the use of wafer bread. The matters still sub judice in
England, the use of altar lights and vestments, were disapproved of,
pending final legal decisions. The resolutions of the Upper House
were conveyed to the Lower House, and after considerable discus-
sion, which was “unfortunately made to hinge upon party faction,”
they were adopted there. The writer of “The Church” congratulated the Provincial Synod for steering a “moderate” course through dangerous waters: “No members of the Canadian Church uses extreme ritual; nor can its sincerest friend, or those who heartily join in the prayer that the kingdom of Christ should be extended in this realm, seek its introduction.”

While the author of the “The Church” remained anonymous, one article concerning church affairs whose authorship is known was published in September 1868 under the title “How Church Work May be Done” and signed by “C.P.M.” C.P.M. was undoubtedly C. Pelham Mulvaney, who had been serving as senior assistant master at Bishop’s College School. The tone of this article stands in stark contrast with that of “The Church.” It is a triumphalist panegyric to the principles of the Oxford Movement, the Gothic revivalists and the Cambridge Camdenians, and includes occasional explicit condemnation of Evangelical Anglicans and Presbyterians. In particular, it defends the architectural and liturgical changes introduced at Holy Trinity, Toronto, against suggestions allegedly made by Evangelicals that it was “a kind of halfway house to Rome.”

Retrospect

In his 1864 Convocation sermon, Thompson said that the Church looked to the University of Bishop’s College “for instruction and guidance in the impending conflict between Faith and Scepticism — if not for the actual solution of difficulties, at all events for the spirit in which they are to be met.” The sense of threat and urgency which characterized Thompson’s address resonated in The Lennoxville Magazine and in particular the contents of the column “The Church.” The cry of the Church in danger had been a recurrent one in the history of Anglicanism since the early days of Queen Anne’s reign (1702–14). Echoes had been heard more recently in John Keble’s 1833 sermon on “National Apostasy” — considered by many to have launched the Oxford Movement. Then the threats were from Erastian governments which had failed to preserve and protect the national church, now they came from a rogue bishop in South Africa, liberal churchmen in the University of Oxford, and over-zealous Evangelicals bent on eradicating ritualism and what they perceived as the Trojan horse of Tractarianism. As active participants in these debates, The Lennoxville Magazine and the University of Bishop’s College continued to sustain a vision of Church and University which was rooted in an Anglican High Church tradition and borne by an Anglo-American Atlantic culture.
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