

The Fight for the Reformed Faith

The Decline of Reformation Calvinism in 19th Century Scotland

PART THREE REARGUARD

FAITHFUL WATCHMEN ON THE WALLS OF ZION

In the fifty years from 1843 to 1893, the Free Church of Scotland turned somersault. The denomination that had formed in 1843 to uphold the doctrinal standards of the Westminster Confession and the eternal verities of the Holy Scriptures, finished in 1893 by denying both.

In the early and glorious days following the 1843 Disruption it seemed to most observers that the new Free Kirk was surely the “true heir to the Church of Knox, Melville, Henderson and Rutherford.....”⁵⁰. Led by eminently godly men like Cunningham, Duncan, Smeaton, and Bannerman, with adherence to such pure doctrinal standards, who could but draw glowing prognostications for the future of such a stalwart Kirk which had already, through the year of the Disruption, willingly endured widespread privations and even suffering for the sake of Christ?

There were some, however, gifted with a deeper discernment, who voiced warnings. The eloquent French Reformed evangelist Dr. Caesar Malan was, during the Disruption period, circulating extensively amongst Scots Presbyterians, and sounded an alarm concerning what he saw as an incipient Arminian undertow. Such warnings were taken up and reiterated by one of the “most spiritually-minded of the professors in the Free Church”, Dr. John “Rabbi” Duncan.⁵¹ As early as 1844, we find Duncan admonishing the Free Kirk General Assembly concerning the tendencies that lurked around them. Whilst not willing to believe that Arminianism was actually present in the new Free Kirk, he nevertheless expressed certain doubts.....enough to give the distinct impression that he had some deep cause for suspicion. For amongst their very own ranks prior to the Disruption he noted how he had detected the presence of an Arminian trend, and he could not but fear that

⁵⁰ Cf. *100 Years of Witness* p.12 (Publ. Free Presbyterian Publications, Glasgow 1993)

⁵¹ *Ibid.* p.13

many of these people might have come over with the Disruption from the established Church of Scotland.⁵² All around, he noted, there was in Scotland an evangelism which had become more fashionable, and in becoming more fashionable it had:

“.....become more indefinite and diluted; and if this did not amount to Arminianism, it was a rubbing off of the rough corners for the sake of refining of that which was called Calvinism.....it was a rubbing off and a smoothing down of the salient points of Calvinistic doctrine into something which, if it was not Arminianism, *was a kind of doctrine with which all who are called Calvinistic evangelicals and Arminian evangelicals would agree.* Now this was just the beginning of this evil - it was the letting in of water - the dilution of the Gospel - the dilution of the Gospel would very soon slide into the perversion of the Gospel.”⁵³ (Emph. Ed.)

It is notable that such a warning had to be issued so early in the history of the Free Kirk. Did Duncan know about Chalmers, we wonder? For what he described in that warning to the Assembly was virtually a duplicate of the very sentiments one can find in Chalmer's sermons and printed works. In short, Amyraldianism.

But more was to follow, and soon. In Glasgow, the faithful and stalwart ministry of Jonathan Ranken Anderson at Free John Knox Church was soon to sound loud and clear warnings that carried the length and breadth of the nation. A man of deep spiritual discernment and piety, an able expositor and evangelist, Anderson was equally equipped with courage. He too had noted what “Rabbi” Duncan had

⁵² Was Duncan looking over his shoulder at Chalmers, we wonder?

⁵³ Extract from *Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh 1844, page 89. Cited in **100 Years of Witness**, page 13. The reader should note carefully the sentence highlighted in bold italics. For this is the very kind of Evangelicalism that Calvinists have been arguing for in subsequent times. The Hodge's at Princeton also, in the 19th Cent., argued that Calvinism and Arminianism were both correct, and complemented one another. The same characteristic is blatantly evident in much of modern-day Calvinism, which leans over backward to accommodate Wesleyan Evangelical Arminianism, which latter is viewed as decidedly different to original Arminianism. One finds this tendency put forward by Spurgeon, and his later devotees. It is most noticeable in **Iain Murray's** book, *"Spurgeon versus Hyper-calvinism"*. It is the catch-all buzzword "Evangelical" which is the key concept in this matter. Effectively it grew out of "revivalism" and "experientialism" and acted as a kind of fundamental "spiritual glue" which was used to try and fuse Calvinism and Arminianism together. Allied with all this is, of course, the unjust, and theologically inaccurate usage of the denomination "hyper-calvinist" to describe those true, and Scripturally Confessional Calvinists who will have none of this abortive doctrinal blending. By modern-day standards, "Rabbi" Duncan would have been vilified by today's Calvinists as being a "hyper-Calvinist". Taking the same stand as Duncan, his noted contemporary Dr. John Kennedy of Dingwall was vilified as a "hyper", even a "hyper-hyper Calvinist" by the "evangelical Calvinist Horatius Bonar. (See *British Reformed Journal* No.22 pages 7 and 8). If all this evidence says anything, it shouts from the rooftops this indictment: "Modern Evangelical Calvinism is not Calvinism, it is a watered-down Arminianised imposter". Against such Duncan was, in the very words quoted here, bearing salient witness.

warned about....

“He felt the danger to be very great, *and so lifted up his voice as a trumpet against what he called evangelicalism.* His faithful witness caused a great deal of resentment.”⁵⁴ (Emph. Ed.)

In 1851 Anderson preached a powerful sermon on II Thessalonians 2 : 11-12 at Hope Street Gaelic Church in Glasgow. It was a direct warning on the state of affairs in the Free Kirk, only a mere eight years after the Disruption. The sermon caused great offence in the Free Kirk and Anderson was harshly, indeed “*too harshly* dealt with by the *majority* of his brethren in the Presbytery of Glasgow, *and in other courts* of the Free Church.”⁵⁵ (Emph. Ed.) The upshot of all this was that Anderson, with his congregation, left the Free Kirk in 1852.⁵⁶

The truth is, that large numbers of Free Kirk clergy could not stand Anderson because his stand for the truth exposed their own drift away from the Westminster Standards. And all this was happening in the first decade of the Free Kirk’s existence. Anderson, it would appear, had spotted a strong undercurrent amongst Free Kirk clergy that was working for union with the Amyraldian United Presbyterian Church, and other “evangelical churches” around. In order to effectuate such a union they were prepared to trim down their Calvinism, and trim it down pretty severely and *gladly*. A discerning observer would have smelled a rat as early as the First General Assembly of the Free Kirk in May 1843. Present at that assembly were representatives of a large number of “evangelical churches”, who apparently made vociferous and unusually glowing commendations of the infant Free Kirk. Such flattery was all too well received, Free Kirk officers were thereon falling over

⁵⁴ Cf. **100 Years of Witness**, page 14. Note again the highlighted italics. Here again is another firm adherent of the Westminster Standards turning his guns against "Evangelicalism" !

⁵⁵ Cf. N. Cameron, *Extracts from the Diary of Johaathan Ranken Anderson*, Glasgow . Introduction page 7. Cited in **100 Years of Witness**. p.14. Note the highlighted italics in this quotation. This tells the tale of how widespread was the anti-orthodox trend already as early as 1851 !

⁵⁶ Cf. **100 Years of Witness**. p.15. Some 200 communicants plus adherents attached to Anderson, and by 1855 this congregation built a new church, wherein he ministered till his death in 1859. Not only was his ministry greatly blessed of God in Glasgow, but, as a result of his courageous stand for the truth, there were godly folk all over Scotland and right down into the South of England who looked to him as a champion of their cause. He was constantly called to itinerate across the length and breadth of the realm, ministering to gatherings thousands strong right down to Plymouth. His Scottish adherents were apparently those across the realm whose descendents were to become the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, inaugurated in 1893. To this new secession from the Free Kirk Anderson's Glasgow congregation adhered in 1896. Three small volumes of Anderson's sermons have been reprinted recently by Old Paths Gospel Publications, P.O. Box 318, Choteau, MT 59422 in the USA. We understand that there is a move afoot to reprint his diaries. Anderson was without doubt one of Scotland's greatest preachers of that era, but the "authorities" in Scots Calvinism and Presbyterianism of that era seem to have thoroughly "killed him off", and as a result he is not listed in the Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology (DSCOT) (Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1993) whilst other, lesser figures do receive attention therein. One remembers how William Garden Blaikie in his "The Preachers of Scotland" could pass by Kennedy and Begg as if they never existed. (Cf. British Reformed Journal No. 10).

themselves to reach out to these "evangelicals" with views to "consultation", "correspondence", and "co-operation". And to put it in Chalmers' own words, voiced at the bi-centenary celebrations of the Westminster Assembly in the July of that year, it was made plain that as to the:

".....oft repeated aphorism of *co-operation without incorporation*. I would substitute for these words *co-operation now*, and this with the *view, as soon as may be, to incorporation afterwards*."⁵⁷

From the very beginning of the Free Kirk, its Amyraldian leader Thomas Chalmers was at work paving the way for its destruction. Right from the beginning, he became known as "the great Apostle of Union", and was so to such a degree that his biographer could note how he valued union more than he valued Presbyterianism or any other style of Church government. In fact, Chalmers would have settled for Union on "an essential unity of faith", even if it meant becoming Episcopalian!⁵⁸

Against such dangerous and blatant idiosyncracies Anderson witnessed, and suffered in the courts of Zion because of his faithfulness to Christ. After all, what he was exposing was none other than sentiments held near and dear by the great, and unimpeachable (sic) Thomas Chalmers! But Anderson's voice was that of the prophet. He saw that this movement for union was founded on a desire to mitigate the true Biblical standards of Westminster, and to unite with others of similar mitigating ilk. That he was a true prophet is underlined by how his words came to pass.....the accelerating decline in the Free Kirk, borne along by evangelicals such as Horatius Bonar, (of whose doctrine Anderson was very critical)⁵⁹ and the ultimate rise of modernistic theology within the Kirk bearing out his words only too well.

Regretably, one can only conclude from these facts that the idea held by many today that the Free Kirk was from the beginning a solid bastion of Reformed

⁵⁷ *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers*, by his son-in law, Dr. Hanna. (Publ. Edinburgh 1852) Vol. 4, p.379. Cited in **100 Years of Witness**, p.16

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* Vol. 4 pp.378 & 379 cited in **100 Years of Witness** p.16. Chalmers was himself undoubtedly Amyraldian, and his drive for "union" undoubtedly had in it an eye for the recently "Amyraldianised" United Secession Church, the descendent body from the "Marrow-men", as efforts to unite with the UPC were emergent from very early on amongst those charmed by Chalmers.

⁵⁹ Cf. **100 Years of Witness**, p.15. Anderson died in 1859, some 14 years before Bonar went hook, line, and sinker after Moody and Sankey. This is important, because it indicates how Bonar's views must have been pronouncedly enough Arminianistic at a very early stage to have attracted Anderson's notice and criticism before the latter's death. The reader should note how well the propaganda has worked over the last 150 years. Today, Bonar is accepted as an orthodox "calvinist", and Chalmers is revered as a "giant" in Scots Kirk history, such that none cares to expose him. Meanwhile, Anderson has been virtually consigned to non-existence. Similarly Kennedy and Begg have been "swept under the carpet". Such are the "Orwellian" trends that have characterised the status-quo "calvinism" and "evangelicalism" of the last century and more.

Orthodoxy is something of a myth. A comprehensive view across its ecclesiastical panorama reveals it to be a conglomeration of doctrinal drifters at a very early stage, amongst which the true orthodox people of God existed as a remnant, ever persecuted, more and more marginalised, and subject to harsh treatment by the very Kirk they loved and gave so much for. Anderson was their first major, public casualty. He was a true minister of the Lord Jesus. In but 25 years in the ministry, he suffered, and worked himself to an early grave in his labours for Christ's precious flock. The Lord alone knows how many others in the Free Kirk suffered too, at this time, but whose trials were never chronicled for later generations to see.

After Anderson's secession in 1852, the Amyraldianizing juggernaut rumbled on through the subterranean channels of the Free Kirk fraternity. Union with the Amyraldianised United Presbyterian Church (hereinafter UPC) was a top priority in high ecclesiastical circles and a running battle was beginning to emerge in those years between the "generous evangelicals", and the orthodox party.

With Anderson "disciplined" and out of the way, the growing phalanx of Free Kirk "generous evangelicals" began to "flex their muscles", so to speak, more overtly. But for the stubborn rallying of the orthodox they would have eclipsed the Free Kirk within a decade, simply by rail-roading it into union with the UPC. Such a union would have brought a flood-tide of Amyraldian ministers into Free Kirk ranks, and the fact is, that the orthodox were already outnumbered. As it was, the sound of faithful watchmen on Zion's walls did not cease with Anderson's departure. His trumpet warnings had alerted the faithful right across the realm, and through the late 1850's and the 1860's they organised to stem the tide of Arminianising apostasy that was gathering apace all around them. Their stalwart endeavours no doubt were the very means, under God, of delaying the final day of reckoning for another thirty years or more, during which time only the Great Day will declare the numbers of God's lost and wandering sheep who were brought home by faithful shepherds running the gauntlet of the "evangelical" pandemonium bursting out all around them.

Foremost amongst the faithful in those days were of course the "Great Senatus" of New College, Edinburgh: Cunningham, Bannerman, Duncan, Smeaton, and James Buchanan. Principal Cunningham had passed from this earthly realm by 1861, and his place was taken by the less-than-consistent R.S.Candlish, under whose leadership not only the "amyraldianised evangelicalism" but also modernism began to surreptitiously intrude into the College. By 1863 "Rabbi" Duncan had retired, and handed over the Hebrew department to the covertly modernist A.B. Davidson. In 1868 James Bannerman passed on, soon to be followed by Duncan in 1870, and James Buchanan in the next year. The ten years 1861 - 1871 took a heavy toll, and stripped the Free Kirk of its leading orthodox giants. Compounding the loss was the fact that many of the men who replaced them in New College were

of much lesser calibre, and included overt compromisers. One stalwart however was appointed in 1868 to replace the retiring James Buchanan in the chair of Systematic Theology. He was James MacGregor, 1830 - 1894, who was to remain there until his emigration to New Zealand in 1881 on account of his health. Meanwhile, the stalwart George Smeaton hung on at New College, maintaining his conservative Calvinistic orthodoxy right to his death in 1889.

Outside of New College circles, in the vanguard of orthodox leadership could be found such notables as Dr. James Begg, 1808 - 1883, Dr. John Kennedy of Dingwall, 1819 - 1884, Dr. Hugh Martin, 1822 - 1885, Dr. Julius Wood, and at the Free Kirk's Glasgow Seminary was to be found Professor James Gibson, 1799 - 1871, in the Chair of Systematic Theology and Church History from 1856 onwards.⁶⁰

It is important to observe here, that these orthodox stalwarts were leaders of a distinctly minority group in the Free Kirk. It appears that right from the beginning the "generous evangelicals" out-numbered the orthodox by some large proportion.⁶¹ But their high-level champion, Thomas Chalmers, had departed this life in 1847, and the next-down men of stature in the denomination were those of Edinburgh's "Great Senatus" listed above. "Generous evangelicals" therefore found themselves at a disadvantage for a time, the sheer force and stature of the Orthodox leaders now in control was evidently awesome enough to bottle up the evangelical drifters into the realms of subordination and surreptitious activity behind the scenes. Their drive for union with the UPC was effectively the vehicle through which they expressed their tendencies under the camouflage of something desirable, and evidently by which they increased and solidified their grass-roots support. In this interim period through the 1850's and 60's, they consolidated their forces, and began to engineer a stronger grip on the leadership of the denomination.

As the orthodox rearguard rallied their forces of these years, we might note here

⁶⁰ Many of these above listed notables engaged in a voluminous written ministry. Whilst the Banner of Truth has published some of this material, it has to be said that a great deal has remained unprinted, the catalogues of which include not only some vitally interesting titles, but much material seminal to the fight for the truth in the Free Kirk of those days. The reader who is interested should look up the names listed above in DSCOT, where summaries are given of their literary activities. MacGregor, for instance, appears according to DSCOT to have been a superb man, who published an important work on Apologetics. But he is today completely unknown. Gibson was another superb man and Christian scholar, to his name DSCOT lists seven important theological treatises on matters of importance at that time and relevant even now. DSCOT characterises Gibson as being "one of the foremost spokesmen of the conservative wing of the Free Church"....a "staunch.....Calvinistic Theologian." Today he is a forgotten man.

⁶¹ Cf. Hamilton "*The Erosion of Calvinist Orthodoxy*" (Rutherford House 1990), page 91, where he points out that between 1863 and 1873 in Assembly debates questioning the orthodoxy of the UPC on the Atonement, the challengers of the UPC rarely rose above 100 in number, out of an Assembly of over 600. A six to one ratio in favour of "generous evangelicals" over the "orthodox" evident as early as 1863 suggests that the evangelicals had wasted no time since the disruption, and must have had a majority platform from which to work right at the start.

the theological fiasco they were looking into. Their published materials yield the profile of the enemy they were shooting at. They saw, (it must have been with grave apprehension) the growing strength of the evangelicals, and the threat of union with the UPC hung over their heads like the Sword of Damocles. To look into the realms of the UPC, as they did, was to look into a cauldron of Amyraldian mischief. As the Free Kirk was emerging into being, and Chalmers still alive and propagandizing for union, the orthodox would have looked across into that UPC cauldron as it then was in the shape of the United Secession Church, (USC) and they would have observed the blitzing of an orthodox minority in that church. Dr. Marshall was arraigned against two USC professors before their Synod, and had himself put up a stalwart fight for an orthodox view of the Atonement. His protagonists, Balmer and Brown, brought forth the "generous evangelical" or Amyraldian view, but in such a way as to undermine Dr. Marshall's sturdy defence of the truth.⁶² In a two-pronged attack, the two professors effectively undermined the status and validity of the Westminster Standards for the USC, and with a Synod packed with their supporters they were exonerated from teaching any heresy, and Dr. Marshall was consequently marginalized.⁶³ A friend of the Amyraldian Professor John Brown,⁶⁴ the doctrinally liberal quasi-Calvinist John Cairns, 1818 - 1892, summed up the results of this controversy by noting that the Synod's decision in favour of Brown provided a measure of relief to many minds that were "hampered by an apparent inconsistency between the universal offer and limited atonement on which to rest it."⁶⁵ The upshot of all this was that by 1847, the USC united with the Relief Church, to form the United Presbyterian Church (UPC) on a Basis of Union that effectively elasticated the requirements of subscription to the Westminster Standards.⁶⁶ "It is undeniable," says Hamilton, "that the chief result of the Controversy (concerning Marshall,

⁶² Dr. Andrew Marshall, 1779 - 1854, was, despite being a minister in a "marrowised" denomination, nevertheless a stout advocate of Westminster Orthodoxy, and a stern opponent of Amyraldianism. He was minister of Kirkintilloch.

⁶³ A useful summary of the main points of this acrimonious dispute can be found in **Hamilton: Op. Cit.** and Ch. 2. Dr. Marshall and a few others eventually left the USC/UPC. **Hamilton** compares the two Professors with Dr. Marshall, and says (**op. cit.** p. 72) "Contrary to Brown and Balmer, Marshall was a logician, who saw theology in terms of black and white. For truth to be truth it had, for Marshall, to be logical and coherent. In this he differed from the senior professors who were willing to hold seeming irreconcilables in tension." Sounds familiar.....very, very familiar.

⁶⁴ Brown, was of course the famous Dr. John Brown (Tertius), 1784 - 1858, the third in a line from Grandfather to Grandson to bear the name "John Brown", and to be an eminent Presbyterian minister within the "Marrow" churches. He gained a name for himself as one who developed the principles of grammatico-historical exegesis, such that even William Cunningham held him in respect. **DSCOT** lists Brown as being a teacher of "universal atonement" and an Amyraldian. But because Brown had made a name for himself as a scholar, he tended to carry favour in all circles. He published voluminously, and notably the Banner of Truth Trust has over the last forty years made available his "*Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*" and his "*Exposition of the Discourses and Sayings of our Lord.*" In contrast to this modern apparent endorsement and approbation of Brown as an expositor is that of the Free Kirk orthodox wing of the 1850's and 60's amongst whom Brown was seen as something of a "troubler in Israel". (Cf. **Hamilton Op. cit.** p.93.)

⁶⁵ Cf. **Hamilton: Op. cit.** p.71.

⁶⁶ **Ibid.** pp.22 ff. for details.

Balmer, and Brown) was to make a significant breach in the Westminster doctrine of Particular or Limited Atonement as it was understood, and held to, by many. The emphasis placed throughout the Controversy on *the love of God to all men* acted as something of a harbinger for **the revolution** in Scottish theology in the 1860's and 1870's, when the love of God to *all* became the trademark of those dissatisfied with what they considered the narrow exclusivism of the Westminster Standards.⁶⁷ (emph. Ed.)

Viewing this gathering revolution, with its threatened importation into their own denomination, the Free Kirk orthodox prepared for the long fight ahead. Initially, some of the orthodox, such as James Begg, were in principle in favour of union with the UPC. But none, including Begg were willing for any union that would compromise on doctrinal matters. It was Begg's strategy to work off a platform sympathetic to union, using it to probe deeply and expose publicly the doctrinal idiosyncrasies of the UPC. As soon as he had achieved this position, he made no secret of his aversion to union with such a body.

It was in 1863 that the two churches undertook mutual overtures with a view to establishing union. Ten years of often acrimonious debate within the Free Kirk were to follow from this, culminating in the crisis of 1873 when the denomination almost split. During this harrowing period, it was, according to the extant records, the matter of the relationship between Church and State that dominated the debates.⁶⁸ The UPC was anti-establishment, and this factor was the chief sticking point in the minds of most of the Free Kirk evangelicals. The issue of the UPC's departure from the Westminster Standards on vital doctrines and concerning its elasticated subscription requirements to those standards was down-played to a secondary level by the vast majority of the Free Kirk at Synod and General Assembly level. Such matters were raised from time to time, but the orthodox were in such a minority that they could gain little support for considering the issues. Again this is evidence of the numerical weakness of the orthodox party in the Free Kirk.⁶⁹ Anyhow, 1863 marks the date when the Free Kirk set up with the UPC a joint committee to enquire into all these matters, and to report back to the General Assembly the following year. They first reported in 1864, then in 1865 they presented at Assembly level what was a complete whitewash of the UPC vis a vis the doctrinal matters, carrying a false claim that the Joint Committee were in "entire harmony" on discussions relating to the Confession's teaching concerning the atonement, and stating that :

"(the) Joint Committee found, with lively satisfaction, that holding, as all the Churches in the Joint Committee do, the Westminster

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* p.74.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* p.90

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* p.91 gives a succinct adumbration of this situation.

Confession of Faith as their common standard, they were in entire harmony as to the views which that Confession gives of the teachings of the Word of God, on the following fundamental truths....." 70

The "fundamental truths" listed were, "man's fallen estate, the nature, sufficiency, and extent of the atonement, and its application."71

Bluntly, this was all a pack of lies. Delivery of this report on to the floor of the Assembly precipitated a stern reaction from the orthodox Dr. Julius Wood, himself a member of the Joint Committee. Characterising the report as "altogether inadequate" (a gentlemanly understatement if ever there was one) he launched into a peroration during the debate concerning the UPC's departures from the Westminster straight and narrow. He was well armed, quoting from original source material concerning the case of Marshall v. Balmer and Brown, and pointed up especially the defection of the UPC into Amyraldianism and Arminianism.72

But the Free Kirk Assembly would have none of it. Dr. Wood proposed a motion aimed at clarifying the Free Kirk's view on the issues of the Atonement, at the vote he received only 16 votes, with 184 voting against him. The ratio of 11.5 to one against the orthodox was staggering, and it made the 1865 Assembly "something of a watershed in the union debates as it crystallized the opposition of those not in favour of a comprehensive Church union."73 From here on, the gloves were off, and as Hamilton says, henceforth "the debates.....became more acrimonious."74 But it is a sign of the shiftiness of the evangelical side that right up to and including the Assembly of 1866 they ducked away from answering to the strictures of the orthodox concerning the UPC and Westminster orthodoxy. The orthodox were bringing out the truth right into the open, the evangelicals were just deftly by-passing it.75

The fight was certainly hotting up from here on. The Fight for the Reformed Faith.

To be contin....(DV).

70 **Ibid.** p. 92 citing "Proceedings of the Free Church Assembly for 1865 " p.4.

71 **Ibid.** p.92 citing Op. Cit. note 70 above and p.4.

72 Wood's speech with the rest of the debate is given in the "*Proceedings*" of the 1865 Assembly pages 86 to 133. **Cited in Hamilton: Op Cit.** pp.92 - 93.

73 **Hamilton: Op.Cit.** pp. 92 -93 for the above details and quotations.

74 **Ibid.** p.93.

75 **Ibid.** p. 94. Hamilton points out here that "What is remarkable about the debates over the question of union in the years up to 1866, is that none of the leading pro-unionists in any way commented upon the misgivings of the anti-unionists over the relation between the UPC and the Westminster Standards".