In December 1845 Bishop Michael Russell of Glasgow and Galloway wrote to a keen young Episcopalian layman, Alexander James Donald D’Orsey, a teacher at the High School in Glasgow, suggesting ordination. Conscious of the growing numbers of immigrant Episcopalians in the western suburbs of Glasgow, the bishop’s intention was to stimulate a new congregation for ‘the wants of the poorer class there’. Evidently D’Orsey was already known to the bishop for he mentions him as pleading ‘with your usual eloquence’ the cause of the Episcopal Church Society, which would raise part of the £80 stipend. Russell envisaged that D’Orsey would work in this new congregation for a year or two until something more worthy of the young man’s talents came up. D’Orsey wrote stating that the proposal was attractive, not least because it was a congregation which would primarily be comprised of the ‘humbler classes’. He would continue in his present work and undertake the congregational duties part-time. His present income made it preferable to refuse the stipend, suggesting that it should go to augment the livings of poorer clergy. As a new priest D’Orsey went on to create the congregation that eventually became St John’s, Anderston, and to become embroiled with Russell’s successor, Bishop Walter Trower, over ritualism in the parish. The deposit of D’Orsey’s correspondence with these two bishops in the National Library of Scotland provides the opportunity for a localised insight into the emergence of Episcopalian ministry to the poor in nineteenth-century Scotland’s most industrialised city, and to the connection of such ministry with ritualism.

NLS = National Library of Scotland; SEJ = Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal; SMCR = Scottish Magazine and Churchman’s Review
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D’Orsey’s work among the labouring poor of Anderston during the 1840s further undermines the traditional historiography of Scottish Episcopalanism which interprets it as largely a Church of the upper social orders which was lacking in evangelistic zeal. This interpretation has proved remarkably persistent, even among some of the leading historians of nineteenth-century Scottish religion. Alan MacLaren, writing of Episcopalanism in its heartland of Aberdeenshire, believed that by the 1850s Episcopalanism had retreated from any mission beyond its traditional adherents. Andrew Drummond and James Bulloch portrayed Scottish Episcopalanism as having little allegiance among the working classes of nineteenth-century Scotland except for the traditional north-east, and regarded initiatives by clergy such as David Aitchison and Bishop Alexander Forbes as exceptionally rare. The problem with the prevailing interpretation of an inward-looking upper-class Episcopalanism is that the exceptions to it are growing more numerous.

Callum Brown has acknowledged that there was a reversal of declining church membership in Scotland during the 1840s, largely connected with increasing church extension by competing denominations, particularly the Free and Established Churches. He also points to the Episcopal Church as experiencing the greatest growth of all, in relation to its size, although he believes this was most marked among the middle classes who were attracted to that Church for aspects not available in Presbyterianism, presumably liturgical and aesthetic ones. He dates the major Episcopal expansion to the period after 1877. However, when D’Orsey in Anderston is coupled with Aitchison at Bridgeton during the 1830s, Forbes in Dundee in the late 1840s, John Alexander at St Columba’s, Edinburgh, in the same period, not to mention the possibility of working-class evangelism by some already established congregations, then it would appear that Episcopal expansion among the lower social orders began to be a significant aspect of that Church’s revival as early as the 1830s. This article will investigate two aspects of this recovery in respect to the High-Church slum ministry at Anderston. The evidence draws attention to working-class adherence to Episcopalanism in the later 1840s and
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early 1850s, and also to the emergence of ritualism as a factor in the promotion of that working-class Episcopalian mission.

Allan MacLaren and Hugh McLeod have drawn attention to the influence of the bourgeoisie in imposing patterns for working-class urban religion in the later nineteenth century. The emergence of the new congregation of Episcopalians in Anderston bears out this middle-class dominance as a major factor earlier in the same century. A number of scholars have also highlighted a qualitative difference between the ‘official’ religion of the clergy and leading laity, and the more amorphous, but genuine, religiousness of the urban lower classes. This same distinction in religious outlook is found in the Anderston congregation. However, in recent Scottish religious history this debate has been confined to the larger Presbyterian denominations, predominantly in the work of Callum Brown. Brown has drawn attention to the way in which working-class religion was a response to changing economic and social factors in nineteenth-century cities. While this is undoubtedly true, there is some evidence that points to belief being important to working-class individuals in its own right and not merely as a reductionist response to a changing society.

The connection of slum ministries with Anglo-Catholicism is well-known in England. But, in D’Orsey’s case, there was no personal connection with Tractarianism prior to his ordination and to the emergence of his moderate ritualism. His surname indicates a possible Huguenot extraction, but he himself was apparently of Scottish birth. He attended Glasgow University where, he informed Russell, he did not intend to be ordained and therefore felt he had inadequate theology. The bishop directed his reading to Gilbert Burnet on the Thirty-Nine Articles, and Pearson on the Creed. He also provided him with one of his own sermons On the historical evidences for the apostolical institution of episcopacy, and advised him to procure a copy of the canons of the
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Scottish Episcopal Church. A month later, responding to D’Orsey’s continuing anxieties about his theological competence, Russell further suggested he read Paley on evidences for Christianity; Hooker, Potter and Lloyd on the constitution of the Church; Brett, Bingham and Wheatley on liturgy. Russell’s recommendations meant that D’Orsey’s reading moulded him into the same sort of High Churchman, as distinct from a Tractarian, as Russell was himself. There is nothing in this list that would have drawn D’Orsey’s attention away from the Orthodox or High Church tradition that had predominated in the Scottish Episcopal Church and, intermittently, the Church of England, throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries up to that point. D’Orsey’s theological formation occurred in the context of reading the classics of High Church and non-juring divinity. Consciously or otherwise, Russell excluded him from any contact with the English Tractarians such as John Keble or John Henry Newman whose Tracts for the times had been making such an increasingly controversial splash in the Church of England since 1833. So D’Orsey’s theological formation was not from the Tractarian stable which initiated the Anglo-Catholic slum ministries which began in the late 1840s and 1850s. D’Orsey’s was a slum ministry in Glasgow which grew entirely out of the classic High Church theology prevalent in Scottish Episcopalianism since its ejection from the Church of Scotland in 1689.

Consciousness of the need for such a mission was brought about by the changing nature of Glasgow itself, a change that particularly impacted on Anderston. Glasgow had undergone a transition from a merchant city whose economy depended largely on the import of tobacco, to the leading industrialised city in Britain by the mid nineteenth century. This had dramatically changed the urban landscape from the genteel streets of the eighteenth century to one that was regarded by experts such as Edwin Chadwick as the most degraded, unhealthy, urban environment in Britain. Industrialised Glasgow was largely the consequence of the
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deepening of the river Clyde which allowed navigation to reach the city itself. The river had also attracted the building of factories, especially textile mills, whose steam power required large quantities of water. New industries needed a greatly expanded labour force and proved a magnet for the labouring classes who were drawn not just from the agricultural hinterland but also from the impoverished Highlands, Ireland and England. As a consequence Glasgow experienced a population growth unprecedented in Scotland. In 1801 the city had some 77,000 people; by 1841 this had risen to 274,000. In the 1820s there was a growth of some 40 per cent, and in the next decade just a little less than 35 per cent. No early Victorian city could have coped adequately with such a population explosion. The result in Glasgow was massive overcrowding in the industrial areas which turned them into horrible slums. The crowded unsanitary conditions led inevitably to infectious diseases which occurred periodically after 1818. Most people feared cholera, but typhus killed more. The death rate in Glasgow by 1841 was 31.5 per thousand, compared to the other Scottish textile city, Dundee, where it was 22.1. These were the conditions in which the new industrial labour force lived, particularly in Anderston. In 1802 Anderston had been a large village on the periphery of Glasgow, with a population of about 4,000, mainly hand-loom weavers. By 1831 it had become an industrialised suburb, a burgh of the Barony, with a population of 11,600 and a growth-rate faster than that of the city itself. A quarter of its inhabitants were Irish. There were many hand-loom weavers threatened with obsolescence, factory workers and large numbers of casual labourers. Leading employers in the district soaking up this unskilled and semi-skilled labour included Houldsworth's cotton mill, potteries, bottle, glass and chemical works, foundry and engineering firms.

Into Anderston came large numbers of Irish and English immigrants, many of whom were former members of the Church of England or the Church of Ireland, in other words Anglicans nominally in communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church. It was these that Bishop Russell had become anxious about by 1845. ‘Nothing was more desirable’, according to the bishop, ‘than that we should bring within the fold of the Church, the thousands of Episcopalians in Glasgow who ought to belong to us.’ At the appeal for a new church launched in London in 1849 it was made more explicit who these thousands of unchurched Episcopalians were. D’Orsey told the meeting that in Anderston, Finniston and the western suburbs there were some 12,000 living ‘irreligious lives, some not even nominal Christians…most of whom are either natives of England and

27 Ibid. 406. 28 Ibid. 410. 29 Ibid. 404. 30 Derek Dow and Michael Ross, Glasgow's gain: the Anderston story, Carnforth, Lancs 1986, 22. 31 Ibid. 44. 32 Ibid. 67. 33 Ibid. 72. 34 Russell to unknown correspondent, Leith, 3 July 1846, NLS, ms 19325, fo. 28.
Ireland, or the children of English and Irish parents, and members of the Established Church in those countries.\textsuperscript{35} Apparently some of these former Anglicans had petitioned the diocesan synod in May 1845 for a regular service.\textsuperscript{36} The answer the bishop came up with was to look to D’Orsey as the right person to initiate an Episcopal congregation.

Before accepting the charge D’Orsey had to overcome an anxiety additional to his lack of theological readiness. He was also concerned about whether an Episcopal clergyman would be accepted as a member of staff at the High School. Formerly the historic grammar school of the city, the school was a part of the Presbyterian establishment of Glasgow. It was controlled by the town council, with support from the clergy of the Established Church and the professors of the university.\textsuperscript{37} D’Orsey was particularly worried that his ordination would result in the established clergy objecting to his continued employment.\textsuperscript{38} No such objection was evidently made, or sustained if it was, for D’Orsey was subsequently ordained in 1846,\textsuperscript{39} presumably by September when Russell talks of sending him a ‘Licence’ to read after the liturgy.\textsuperscript{40}

Almost immediately, if he had not already acquired it, D’Orsey showed signs of a liturgical interest. In July 1846 he had seemingly asked the bishop about the lawfulness of wearing the surplice for Russell replied that it was ‘allowed among us in all ranks & orders of the clergy’.\textsuperscript{41} Russell did not seem at all perturbed by the request. He acknowledged its canonicity at a time when surplices were causing unrest in London parishes,\textsuperscript{42} and when the black geneva gown was still customary usage in the Episcopal Church apart from in advanced churches which by the late 1820s had adopted the surplice for Mattins and Evensong.\textsuperscript{43} It was an early sign of D’Orsey’s liturgical innovations which would cause increasing episcopal concern. Russell began to be anxious about his new priest in December the next year, when D’Orsey consulted the bishop about an invitation to ‘celebrate Vespers’ with the Revd James Gordon at St Andrews in the city.\textsuperscript{44} The use of the non-Anglican term for the service made Russell wary not just about exactly what ‘Vespers’ might involve, but also about the ‘Teachings’ advertised to precede it. ‘Evensong’, he believed, would have been sufficient to provoke derision among the local Presbyterian or
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unchurched population, but ‘Vespers’ had no sanction in ‘Protestant usage’. Russell commented caustically that though Gordon was a former pupil of himself and Bishop Terrot of Edinburgh ‘assuredly he got none of his nonsense from us, as we rather labour to keep down the spirit of high churchism than to raise it, in the minds of our youth’. It would appear that Gordon had caught ‘high churchism’, that is, the Tractarian bug, and was endeavouring to educate D’Orsey in the delights of such avant garde religion. Gordon’s Anglo-Catholicism would become more well-known in Glasgow, as would his work for slum clearance in the neighbourhood of St Andrews. Endeavouring to nip such dangerous views in the bud, the bishop was cautioning D’Orsey to stay within the orthodox bounds of traditional High Church religion.

The following year, however, D’Orsey’s liturgical infection surfaced yet again, this time over a more thoroughly Episcopalian matter than any concocted Vespers service. Much to Russell’s displeasure D’Orsey was showing an interest in using the Scottish Communion Office for the eucharistic service at Anderston. This liturgy was the unique eucharistic rite that had developed in the Episcopal Church during the non-juring eighteenth century. It was disliked by many of the bishops, by prominent laity, and by some clergy because it drew attention to differences with the Church of England. On the other hand many Tractarians were particularly fond of it because it apparently conveyed a clearer theology of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist than did the liturgy of Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer. Such a body of partisans for the Scottish Office only made it even more unattractive to the High Church Scottish bishops. Russell deplored the idea of its further introduction into his diocese where it could become a source of division:

As to the Scottish Communion Office I wish there were no such thing in existence. But it is recognized; and many of the northern clergy prefer it to the other. It ought to be a sufficient argument for peace that nobody is asked to use it in these parts. There is only one small chapel in Edinh. diocese; and only one small chapel in the Glasgow diocese where it is used – that is, in all Scotland southwards of the Forth. The Bishops are divided, according to their local stations; and we do not agree respecting the question of using or not using, further than to allow the northerns to do as they chuse[sic], & the Southerns to do as they chuse[sic], without any interference. Nobody in Glasgow is offended by the presence of the Scot. Com. Office and therefore every body in Glasgow ought to be quiet, & cultivate the charity which thinketh no evil.

The issue may have surfaced in connection to baptisms, for it is in a letter replying to D’Orsey’s uneasiness about requests for home baptisms that Russell first mentions it. It may therefore have been requested by some
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parents, perhaps northern Episcopalians who immigrated into the area and were accustomed to the Scottish Office.

Meanwhile D’Orsey continued to set about the task of establishing a viable congregation in Anderston, in his spare time after work at the High School. Wherever he looked he saw opportunities, and when he broached the subject of the colliers at the Clyde ironworks for possible evangelism the bishop had to remind him not to overtax himself. By November 1846 D’Orsey had a regular Sunday congregation and was planning a further Wednesday meeting. Regarding this additional meeting, the bishop, perhaps mindful of its mixed gender or the temptations of the local public-house, insisted it meet somewhere which permitted the congregation to be ‘assembled decently & in order’. D’Orsey was also encountering Highland Episcopalians because in February 1847 Russell was able to advise him of a previous abortive attempt to minister to them in Glasgow. A house had been bought and a priest brought in, resourced by Gaelic prayerbooks. The result was negligible. Before making another attempt to episcopalianise these Highlanders Russell wanted to know how many there were and whether they genuinely desired the ministry of their traditional allegiance. He also revealed the common exasperation of the Lowlanders with their Highland compatriots: ‘The Celt has never been accustomed to do much for himself. He is content to bring up the rear of social improvement everywhere – in Scotland, Ireland, & Wales. I have not forgotten that you have “Donald” in your name; but you are not a Celt any more than I am of the archangelical order.’

In 1849 supporters of D’Orsey launched an appeal for a church in London which gave the priest an opportunity to report his progress since 1846. At the London meeting he claimed that his congregation consisted ‘almost entirely of the humbler classes’. However, in a presentation which was designed to tap the pockets of the wealthy English, D’Orsey’s information needs to be treated a little cautiously. One of Russell’s early letters mentions that the potential adherents included some ‘very respectable persons’, and there were sufficient middle-class members to take up pew-rents and to make up the parish leadership. Both churchwardens in 1851, for example, were bankers. Yet despite such
undoubted middle-class leavening the congregation did largely reflect the working-class nature of Anderston. In connection with the appeal a circular was printed to attract potential donors which provides further opportunity for assessing the social make-up of the congregation. According to this there were some ten or twelve families with an income over £200 a year but ‘far more than one-half of the congregation are strictly working people, many are almost paupers, and some actually so’. In the whole of Glasgow, D’Orsey estimated, there were some 30,000 inhabitants who had been baptised in either the Church of England or Ireland, and to minister to them there were just six clergy with three churches and one licensed schoolroom. Anderston, it was proposed, would have a church with accommodation for 600, plus a school. In the year of the appeal D’Orsey claimed to have a congregation of 400 which he believed could be trebled but for the lack of church accommodation. This supports what Callum Brown has said about the necessity of church extension for churchgoing. Communicants for the previous three years were respectively 64, 120 and 154, with a monthly average of forty-two and at the previous Easter 108 attended, though how many of these were communicants is not said which suggests it may have been a significantly smaller number. Of the four services held every Sunday the 8 a.m. service was reserved for the ‘ragged poor’. The more respectable poor attended at all services through the provision of free seating. In fact the amplitude of such seating meant that seat-rents did not cover the normal running expenses so that there was a debt in that current year of nearly £42. Unsatisfied applications for rented seats may indicate that pressure from those able to afford the rental, presumably the middle and upper classes, was increasing.

D’Orsey had to fend off some anxiety about ritual from at least one questioner at the London meeting. He was at pains to emphasise the liturgical conformity of Anderston with the Church of England through the exclusive use of the English Book of Common Prayer. So his previous thoughts about the Scottish Communion Office had presumably gone no further. The reason for this may be found in his expressed concern that the Office gave a handle to evangelical Anglicans in Scotland who formed schismatic congregations of so-called ‘English Episcopalians’. These, he claimed, attempted to ‘prejudice English and Irish settlers against the Church’. Such groups generally felt the Scottish Office was objectionable because they believed it enshrined a popish theology and because it was a departure from the Book of Common Prayer.

Until 1848 D’Orsey had experienced the close personal support of Bishop Russell who had been a sort of ecclesiastical paterfamilias to a new priest ordained later in life and still feeling his way into clerical culture. He had been fortunate that in dealing with the new problems of Anderston he had had the advice of the moderate theological liberalism of Russell. Clearly, Russell was not fazed by some of the slightly intemperate enthusiasms of his young protégé. This cordial eirenicism ceased when Russell died in April 1848 and an Englishman, Walter Trower, was elected in his place. In December 1850 D’Orsey found himself the subject of complaints to his new bishop and he wrote vigorously to defend himself against his local detractors. It is not clear what the petitioners were complaining of but it stung D’Orsey to retort that most of them were unsatisfactory members of the congregation:

I have sacrificed time, labour, domestic comfort, money, health, & almost life for these people – I say for these people, for all my efforts were directed to the poor – the few of the other classes that attend our Church having required but little of my case…. What have the petitioners done & suffered for the Church…. Yet we had 153 Communicants last Easter, many of them receiving from 10/- to 30/- a week. Most of them, I am sure, have not contributed the price of a single nail to the building.²²

From the weekly income figures cited by D’Orsey, these were people earning annually between £48 and £65, so it would appear that his opponents were those in the skilled working-class income bracket. This is made more likely by the fact of their having petitioned the bishop, not a likely move for the labouring poor of the congregation, many of whom may have been illiterate.

In this defensive letter to Trower D’Orsey points to his unwearied exertions on behalf of the neighbourhood poor. But how true was his personal picture? Fortunately in the correspondence there exists a letter written in D’Orsey’s support by a physician who had been surgeon to the Anderston Dispensary since 1847 and then parochial surgeon to the same part of the city.²³ The letter had been sought by D’Orsey in his defence to the bishop and therefore comes from a supporter, who was also an Episcopalian. But it is unlikely that a professional man asked to give a testimonial to an authority in his own Church would have seriously distorted the picture of D’Orsey’s pastoral work when it could have been easily verified by the bishop from other local sources. The physician states that he had particularly made enquiries regarding the religious beliefs of those he visited and his conclusion was that pastoral visiting ‘was much neglected in Glasgow’. Some Presbyterian ministers did visit portions of
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their congregations but there was no organised general visiting in the area. Indeed, during periods of infectious diseases ‘many Presbyterian ministers’ refused to visit the infected members of their congregations. For the poor, he lamented, this amounted to ‘their public guardians neglecting their duties in the selfish pleas of caring for themselves and their families’. In contrast he had not long been in practice in the neighbourhood before he not only heard of the reputation of D’Orsey, visiting his own congregation and lapsed Episcopalians, but also encountered him when visiting the sick. ‘During the Epidemics of Fever in 47 & 8 & of Cholera in 48–9 – when ministers of other sects shrank from their duty I know that your attendance on the sick was instant & unreserved.’ Apparently D’Orsey’s habit was to visit each night in the evenings until as late as 10 p.m., going from house to house to enquire for Episcopalians. Having made special enquiries the physician was confident enough to claim that he knew of ‘no clergyman in Glasgow who has so amply fulfilled his duties in this respect’.

Alongside his commitment to widespread pastoral visiting D’Orsey was also prepared to challenge both his congregation’s customs and the predilections of his bishop. As he had learned from Bishop Russell it had long been Episcopalian custom to baptise privately in homes. However, D’Orsey conscientiously objected to this, and here he had Trower’s support. Both were convinced that in so doing they were demanding that people live up to the rule of the Church for public baptism as expressed in the Prayer Book. However, in other liturgical matters the two were not so united. The first hint of trouble came in November 1849 when Trower objected to some of D’Orsey’s acquisitions for the church, specifically drawing attention to surplices for the boys, presumably in the choir. The introduction of a (surpliced) choir nevertheless went ahead, but not without some congregational objections, which were addressed in a printed circular in May 1850. Evidently some saw a choir as a threat to congregational participation in the service for the circular justified the choir as a group to lead the rest and not to ‘perform the Service instead of the people’. Its role would be to lead the congregational chanting of antiphonal psalmody. This was obviously an attempt by D’Orsey to raise the standards of public worship for the circular expressed the hope that ‘the practice of whispering or muttering the responses, and remaining silent during the singing of God’s praise, is really as objectionable as if the Minister were to omit large portions, or to read them in an inaudible voice’. But to Trower the choir was a presage of dreaded ritualism. ‘I have much doubt’, he told D’Orsey, ‘whether any great degree of choral service is suitable to the circumstances of this Church; and I think that our ritual
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and ceremonial should be as simple as is consistent with a decent reverence.\textsuperscript{67} He wished to discourage any ritualistic goings-on in his diocese and found D’Orsey further at fault for not having consulted him beforehand. Trower claimed that had he known what D’Orsey intended he would not have subscribed ‘for a Church for the poor in Anderston’.\textsuperscript{68} This was a bishop even more restricted in his liturgical tolerance than Russell had been. Compared with Russell’s previous leniency over the surplice Trower would not allow it if it represented a theological principle, in which case he ‘would not yield an inch. I think it one of those points on which the (weak) conscience of our Brethren, trained in another system, shd. be considered’.\textsuperscript{69} In other words, Trower thought that if he was not careful D’Orsey’s very mild ritualistic innovations would raise the hackles of the anti-popery of his English and Irish congregants; not, of course, to mention his own.

What lay behind Trower’s anti-ritualism was his personal contact with Tractarianism at Oxford University. A tutor at Oriel College between 1828 and 1830, he became friendly with Newman.\textsuperscript{70} Trower had even been one of those whose views Newman sought as to what was to be done as a consequence of John Keble’s Assize sermon, traditionally the initiating event for the Oxford Movement.\textsuperscript{71} In September 1834 Newman visited Trower at his home at Milland, where he was enchanted by the house, had lunch with him, and gave him a packet of Tracts.\textsuperscript{72} An intimation of their future disagreement came when Newman told Hurrell Froude on 2 September 1833 that he had received from Trower a ‘wretched letter – he calls me an ultra and you an enthusiast’.\textsuperscript{73} Trower had written the previous month that the established nature of the Church of England made it difficult to ‘fix the limit of the state’s interference in Church Government…. I will not for a moment conceal that I look upon you as very extreme in your opinions’.\textsuperscript{74} The assertion of such high and dry erastianism would not have pleased Newman at all and was precisely what he would controvert in \textit{Tract 1} published around the same time in September 1833. Though the correspondence and contact continued between the two, even up to 1837 when Newman breakfasted with the Trowers in Oxford, their previous association gradually developed into theological antagonism. Trower was a High Churchman, famously referred to by the Tractarians as the inadequately zealous ‘Z’s’. By 1840 Newman admitted that his Tractarian principles prevented him from re-establishing his old friendship with Trower.\textsuperscript{75} By the time he became
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bishop of Glasgow and Galloway Trower was a doubly convinced High Churchman, more old-fashioned in his opposition to moderate ritualism than the younger High Church D’Orsey. It is a reminder of the nuances within the various ecclesiastical groupings of the period. Trower was reaffirmed in his traditional opinions by the dangerously Rome-ward extremism of the Tractarians and their ritualistic followers which he believed were a source of division the Church could ill-afford.

Trower’s fears proved realistic when he was sent a petition by some members of St John’s in 1850. They called Trower’s attention to ‘these alarming times of the encroachments of popery in the land’ and particularly to recent ‘sweeping innovations or rather “novelties”’ introduced into our Church Service’. These innovations caused division and led to some members leaving St John’s, so the petitioners wanted a return to the status quo ante as they asserted the changes were both obsolete and popish. The petitioners also desired a resident full-time clergyman who would be paid by the congregation. In this way these objecting laity would have greater control over their priest than they currently exercised over D’Orsey, whose income did not depend on them. The petition carried sixty-four signatures. There exists an analysis of the signatories, presumably by D’Orsey, which records that 145 had previously withdrawn their names. These had signed, believing the petition to be against popery, but when D’Orsey made them aware it was against himself they withdrew their names. How many of these were the lower-class victims of the pressure of their priestly social superior, and how many genuine supporters of D’Orsey, it is now impossible to say. Of the sixty-one remaining twenty-one were not seat holders and six were not communicants. By thus redefining membership to marginalise those who were not at least seat holders and preferably communicants D’Orsey was able to represent, at least to himself, that the opposition was confined to a satisfactorily small number of dissidents. In a later letter he claimed that the majority of the petitioners were only occasional attenders, coming regularly only when D’Orsey confronted them in his regular visiting or when he had sufficient funds to help them out. ‘It is notorious’, he told Trower, ‘that some of the poor are ready to attend any Church where money & clothes can be had in return, no matter what the Creed may be.’

Defending himself to the bishop he also questioned the quality and knowledgeability of the petitioners’ religious adherence:

The truth is nine-tenths of these people dont know what is in their Prayer-book, & the less they know, the more ready they are to find fault. A very few of them are passably educated for their station, but even they brand as ‘Popish’ that [which] does not perfectly coincide with their opinion & with the lax & irregular
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practices they have seen elsewhere. But most are totally incompetent to judge in such questions, in proof [of] which I may mention that at last Confirmation I had eighty-eight candidates many of whom, grown up men & women, could not say the Lord’s prayer & the Creed; & after months of teaching only three fourths of them passed. (I see some their names in the memorial). I have been repeatedly asked to perform the public services of the Church (marrying, Baptising, Burying, Churching) in private houses; & people have been offended & left the Church because I refused; & not for the reasons now dishonestly put forth. To one man I lent money which he has never repaid; but he soon afterwards left the Congregation, assigning his dislikes to ‘Puseyism’ as his reason.78

D’Orsey’s complaints about the poor state of his confirmees’ religious knowledge may in fact have had more to do with the gap between his professional and clericalised standards and the more diffused religion of his confirmation candidates. While objecting to their lack of the Lord’s Prayer and the Creed, and passing only three-quarters of his class as ready for Confirmation, he seems to have overlooked the fact that he had eighty-eight adults who, apparently, persisted in trying to meet his expectations. When this persistence is coupled with lay demands for sacramental rites at home, as mentioned above, it would appear that D’Orsey was not encountering irreligion as, from his professional viewpoint, he supposed, but rather a different form of Christianity. This lower-order religion may have placed more store on getting things done and less on doing them in the approved manner. At this popular level of religion it may have been genuinely important to make connections with the Church at significant moments of life – birth, adolescence, marriage, death – but to make them as family concerns in which the home was the proper context for the rite, rather than the more impersonal church building. D’Orsey, regarding the fellowship of the Church as the principal social bond, reversed this domestic priority and placed the church building at the centre of his ministrations. It was a gap in Victorian religion between the more amorphous but genuine religion of the masses and the more defined ecclesiastical culture of the clerics and the more advanced laity. Jeffrey Cox has already drawn attention to this ‘diffused Christianity’ in his research on late Victorian Lambeth.79 The persistence of semi-churched Episcopalian laity in requesting baptism and in attending catechetical classes, despite their standards being held as unsatisfactory by the priest, may point to its existence in Glasgow in the 1840s. A similar breach of understanding and practice was beginning to open up between the priest and his bishop, focused now on intoning the liturgy rather than the earlier issue of the surplice. As well as believing that this more elaborate ceremonial was inappropriate to the place of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, Trower also held that it was an attempt ‘to give the
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character of Cathedral services to simple, parochial or congregational worship. By this Trower may have meant that such ceremonial produced an inappropriately exhibitionist worship for a Church representing only a tiny fraction of the Scottish population. However, he recognised that D’Orsey had not done anything which deserved an official reprimand. D’Orsey attempted a general defence to this episcopal disapproval which revealed that his inspiration was High Church rather than Tractarian. He had done nothing which was ‘unauthorised by the best writers on ritual recommended to me, when preparing for ordination, by your Lordship’s predecessor. I [am] as much opposed to those who would add to our Services by poor imitations of Romish rites, as I am to such who would strip our ritual of all those ceremonies which “do serve to a decent order & godly discipline”’. Nor did he find Trower’s services at neighbouring St Mary’s a model for emulation: Trower’s parishioners were also divided over them. In a cunning thrust at the bishop’s constant theme of authority D’Orsey drew attention to his ordination promise in the 25th Canon to ‘strictly’ observe the rubrics. He thereby foreshadowed the defence later characteristic of recalcitrant ritualist priests in the Church of England when faced with their bishop’s disapproval. In any case, he maintained, prayers were intoned only at the evening service ‘to meet the views of many who desire it’. Those who did not so desire could find an intonation-free zone at the morning services. Yet the intoned choral evening service was the best attended, both by rich and poor, and even by visitors from the other Episcopal churches, Trower’s included.

Trower nevertheless continued adamant in his opposition to intoning the prayers, particularly insisting that it ran contrary to the ecclesiastical culture of the poor, especially the Irish poor, for whom the church was built.

Here Trower had a point, for anti-popery was a prominent part of the ecclesiastical culture of both the Church of Ireland and the Church of England. It had been one of the major ways in which the Protestantism of these two official Churches had influenced English society and that of the Protestant Ascendancy of Ireland. As in England, Scottish anti-popery could be fanned into mob violence, as it was in 1778 when Protestant civic leaders militantly opposed extending to Scotland the Catholic Relief Act. The official Protestant culture of all three countries
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was based to a large extent on anti-Catholicism. Anti-popery in England and Scotland was also part of the popular culture due to the overwhelming success of Protestantism there compared with Ireland, though it had weakened at the start of the nineteenth century. In Glasgow, Anglican immigrants from England and Ulster brought with them an active cultural fear of the pope and his foreign legions of idolators. It was a fear which, for the English anyway, had little to do with actual experience of Catholicism. In both England and Scotland Roman Catholic numbers prior to nineteenth-century Irish immigration were tiny. Anti-popery was the cultural inheritance of centuries of successful Protestantism on the British mainland where it was stimulated back into robust life by the arrival of large numbers of Irish Catholics. In Anderston anti-Catholic prejudice was probably exacerbated because it was one of the centres of Catholic settlement in Glasgow. By the early 1850s, for example, a branch of the Glasgow Protestant Laymen’s Association dedicated to ‘opposing and exposing Romanism’ was established in the district.

Active suspicion of popery in Irish and English Anglicanism was borne out in the particular congregational accusations that D’Orsey reported to the bishop in order to demonstrate their absurdity. He believed the opposition was a beat-up by three laymen who had largely succeeded in getting the support they had by banging the anti-popery drum. It engendered accusations which seem to have reflected a general suspicion of the Episcopal Church on the part of these new immigrants as well as specific complaints against D’Orsey himself. The mistake of one clergyman in reading Queen Adelaide’s name in the prayerbook after her death was sufficient to result in an accusation of praying for the dead. The clergy were believed to worship the cross in the church, to worship saints, and, presumably, bowing at the altar was taken to be idolatrously bowing to the sacred monogram, an ‘IHS’, on the altar cloth. D’Orsey was thought to give each communicant a cross or crucifix; the finials over the prayerdesks were crosses in disguise; the font was a holy water basin; D’Orsey taught baptism and salvation were the same thing; he insisted on private auricular confession; he feigned illness to go officiating at Roman chapels; he was a friend of Father Ignatius; and the previous week he had read his public recantation of the Episcopal Church at St Andrew’s Catholic church. D’Orsey had heard such things from his curates, or from

88 Dow and Ross, *Glasgow’s gain*, 61.
89 D’Orsey to Trower, 27 Dec. 1850 [copy], NLS, ms 19325, fos 132–45.
90 ‘Father Ignatius’ was the Revd Joseph Leycester Lyne (1837–1908), an eccentric Anglican deacon intent on re-establishing the Benedictine order in the Church of England. He dressed in an odd Benedictine habit, but had a powerful evangelistic ability that led to a number of successful missions in England.
parishioners whom he trusted, and some in letters to him containing charges of ‘Puseyism’, ‘Popery’, or ‘holding forms essential to salvation’.91

These expressions of anti-popery were merely dismissed by D’Orsey as ignorant, but they do provide some genuine insight into the piety of his congregation. They reveal that religion continued to be important to the members of a predominantly working-class congregation, sufficiently interesting to be a topic of conversation, gossip, and for individuals to publicly oppose their priest. While some comments demonstrate an unfamiliarity with the new forms and furniture introduced into St John’s, others reveal a degree of religious knowledge sufficient to draw theological distinctions between baptism and salvation. Even the gross misrepresentations, such as idolatrously worshipping the altar, were expressed in religious language that derived from traditional Protestant anti-Catholic theology. This suggests that centuries of Protestantism in Scotland, England and Ireland had indeed permeated the lowest social orders, if only with antagonistic aspects of its world-view. However, it may be that the focus on these hostile aspects of Protestantism reflected the anxieties of Anderston Episcopalians about the economic or social consequences of Irish Catholic immigration into the area. The possible loss of livelihood to cheaper Irish labour, in an area with a significant population of unskilled labourers, was unlikely to make these Anglican immigrants more disposed towards their traditional religious foes. In addition, the willingness of some of his working-class adherents to disagree with their priest over an issue obviously significant to their religious leader is important. D’Orsey had already drawn attention to the readiness of some in this class to take advantage of the poor relief resources he controlled. The fact that individuals at this economic level were willing to oppose the official holder of ecclesiastical and economic power in the congregation suggests that their beliefs mattered to them. It was entirely possible that such disagreement could result in their own social, religious or economic disadvantage or deprivation if the priest elected to become personally vindictive to his opponents.

The propensity of both working-class and middle-class members at St John’s to come and go from the parish according to their attitude to his innovations prompted D’Orsey to reflect on the need for the laity to be educated to acknowledge a more binding connection between the congregation and their priest. This raised for him the model of mission he was operating from. It was naturally one in which sacerdotal authority, characteristic of both High Churchmen and Tractarians, was paramount. D’Orsey believed the laity should essentially be passively receptive towards his leadership, and this was compounded by the fact that
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John’s had been largely built through his own initiatives and unpaid hard work.

If then, the Church was built without their aid, & if we give our services without remuneration, what right have they to dictate or complain of any style of architecture or ritual than I may have deemed it my duty to adopt, so long as it does not violate the principles of our religion, or the practices of our Church? Had they built the Church, & engaged me as their Clergymen & had I then ‘introduced’ changes into a service already established, there might have been some ground for the present proceedings. But it is all the reverse. My late Bishop sent me to them, to collect the ‘scattered sheep’. It was not from them, but from him I derived my mission. It is for them to accept the donation or reject it, as they deem right, but surely not to murmur against the matter of the gift, the manner of the giving, or the motives of the giver.  

This hierarchical and paternalistic understanding of his slum ministry was also accompanied by an acknowledgement that much was expected from those to whom much had been given in the way of ecclesiastical authority. Not only did this result in his own exertions, but he also wanted the Episcopal Church to take its mission among the labouring urban poor seriously. His colleague, J. F. S. Gordon, in 1859, wrote that D’Orsey wanted to see a mission chapel staffed in every street in the poorer areas, floating chapels on the Clyde, and services whose nature made the poor feel comfortable attending in their working clothes.  

In part the struggle between the priest and the bishop boiled down to two issues. One concerned authority and the extent to which Trower could compel his priest’s conformity against the cleric’s insistence on rubrical exactness. Then there was a paternalistic issue over who best knew the needs and wishes of the poor, the priest or the bishop. The validity of each position is difficult to determine because the extant correspondence is almost completely Trower’s rather than D’Orsey’s. But it is noticeable that colouring Trower’s opposition to liturgical change was a propensity to see in all such innovations the dark hand of a Tractarianism that he regarded as anti-episcopal. He alluded to this suspicion when, at the start of 1851, he drew attention to D’Orsey’s intransigence in persisting with his reforms:

I can assure you that this disposition which is shown by a powerful party in Scotland (from which you have been markedly different) to set at naught the counsel of those whom God has at this time called to the chief ministry in this Church, is such as to require from all its true members every support to its Bishops which can be afforded by a loyal & trustful spirit of deference & co-operation.  

Trower was pushing the characteristic Episcopalian exaltation of the divine origin of episcopal authority. To argue with the bishop was
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dangerously close to arguing with God, at least from a Scottish bishop's point of view.

Meanwhile the whole disagreement had become more public through a review in the *Scottish Magazine* of Trower’s ten-page pamphlet written as a letter to ‘an Incumbent in Glasgow’. Trower complained that the pamphlet was improperly obtained by the magazine, but its printed form meant that it was obviously intended for wider distribution than a mere private letter to D’Orsey. Perhaps it was meant as a general admonition to any of his clergy contemplating emulating the incumbent of St John’s. The reviewer regarded D’Orsey as a bastion of the ‘nationality’ of the Scottish Episcopal Church against those ‘who are leaving no stone unturned to Anglicise her’, clearly having in mind the English Trower. The rituals D’Orsey introduced into the new church would be regarded by ‘Churchmen’ as ‘improvements’. These consisted primarily of the evening service on Sunday having intoned prayers, plus chant (presumably Gregorian) for the canticles and psalms in place of the customary metrical psalmody. There was also chanting of psalms at all services, the chanting or intoning of the Ten Commandments, turning eastwards for the Creed, and omitting the usual collects before and after the sermon. The anonymous author disputed Trower’s charge of alienating the poor through Romish ritual:

Conduct the services in a catholic and reverential manner, and no doubt at first they will be displeased, while some may even cease their attendance. Experience, however, has proved, that the poor are quite capable of appreciating and profiting by services properly conducted, and that little more is necessary to overcome their *prima facie* prejudices than gentleness combined with perseverance, and a word or two of kindly remonstrance and explanation from any third party to whom they may be supposed to look up.

In other words, those who would not succumb to such pastoral blandishments, properly supported by episcopal authority, could be regarded as ingrate Dissenters and not true churchmen at all. The author went on refute Trower’s charge that D’Orsey’s reforms gave the appearance of being ‘a badge of a party’ (i.e. Tractarianism) by claiming they were merely ‘rubrical exactness’. It was, therefore, Trower, rather than D’Orsey who was at fault in opposing his priest’s intention to live up to the standards of the prayerbook. Trower’s attitude only provided ammunition for the ‘unthinking and semi-Dissenting portion of the laity’ who were overly keen on levelling charges of Romanism. The bishop’s purported Dissenting sympathies were revealed, claimed the writer, in that his previous parish, Wiston in Sussex, was ‘as Meeting-house like as
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it was possible for them to be.\textsuperscript{101} Finally, he dismissed Trower’s objection that rubrical observance was impossible as many rubrics were obsolete and even offensive to contemporary congregations. This, the article asserted, was merely an encouragement to clergy to sit lightly to their solemn oaths at ordination that would positively encourage the Romish error Trower deplored. Strict observance of the Prayer Book was the remedy for turning out congregations of real churchmen, albeit they would be smaller ones.\textsuperscript{102}

Trower’s pamphlet, or the now public nature of the disagreement, or some other factor, made D’Orsey prepared to concede something to the bishop. The bishop promptly commended him for the ‘proof which you have given (I grieve to say in these days too rare) that your belief in the Divine appointment of Episcopal Rule is more than an empty profession’.\textsuperscript{103} However, the intended reconciliation fell by the wayside when D’Orsey announced in a printed letter to his congregation that he was resuming most of the discontinued ritual, an action which Trower regarded as direct disobedience.\textsuperscript{104} This led to episcopal threats of a formal trial before the diocesan synod and prompted in Trower’s mind the need for a General Synod to reform the canons and settle the contention over rubrics and the extent of the bishop’s authority. It appears that D’Orsey had been faced with a revolt by his churchwardens, who had threatened to resign if he submitted to the bishop. One of them, a Mr Dewar, a bank official, wrote to his fellow warden, James Chadwick, setting out their position as he saw it.\textsuperscript{105} He was very much opposed to canvassing the congregation’s view over the matter. As far as he was concerned they were the congregation’s representatives and as such had recommended to D’Orsey that the discontinued services be resumed. They were necessary to raise the church’s income to its former level. The proper course for any congregational opposition was to elect new wardens at the next annual general meeting. Any congregational vote would simply divide the congregation.\textsuperscript{106} The warden’s decision was prompted purely by a need to reverse the slide in revenue. This suggests that the sung service was indeed popular, but among the monied middle classes financially able to contribute.

This clerical \textit{volte face} had implications for the future of the school at St John’s. Trower decided to remove it to his own St Mary’s and abandoned his earlier plan of it being a joint school for both congregations. For the bishop it was not just an issue of clerical disobedience; he also saw
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D’Orsey as a Tractarian tool, although he acknowledged that D’Orsey himself was not of that persuasion.

This is but one of the many inevitable results of the line you have taken. You are fighting the battle (with sorry weapons as appears to me) of those with whose views & principles you have little sympathy, & are doing what you can to embarrass those Bishops (including your own) whom you would wish to be found supporting if things come to a crisis which your own recent course is likely to precipitate.\(^\text{107}\)

The school was known as ‘Bishop’s School’ so perhaps lay ultimately in Trower’s control rather than St John’s. A little more light is shed on the issue in a letter from ‘A Scottish Churchman’ in the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* in May 1851.\(^\text{108}\) The correspondent, a supporter of the congregation, claimed that the poor who attended the school followed it when it moved to St Mary’s, and this had a deleterious effect on St John’s attempts to initiate a school in Anderston. Being a poor congregation they were not able to afford a school without the assistance of the wealthy St Mary’s, which was not now likely to be forthcoming.

Research into a local revival of Episcopalianism needs more investigation on a national scale before confident generalisations from the particular can be made regarding Episcopalianism in nineteenth-century Scotland.\(^\text{109}\) Why was it, for example, that the Scottish Episcopal Church failed to benefit from working-class evangelism to the degree that other Scottish Churches did?\(^\text{110}\) Brown has suggested that this was because the Catholic ethos of the Church alienated large numbers of Irish Anglican immigrants, or because its identification with the culture of the landed classes alienated prospective working-class members.\(^\text{111}\) But the ministries of Aitchison and D’Orsey, and that of Forbes in Dundee,\(^\text{112}\) indicate that the Irish were not as ‘almost uniformly neglected’ as Brown claims, though undoubtedly some found Scottish Episcopalianism uncongenial.\(^\text{113}\) Among the reasons for a lack of greater evangelistic success may well have been the perennial lack of clergy, a long-term consequence of the Church’s eighteenth-century decline and impoverishment. This would greatly hinder Episcopalian church extension, a major factor in the mid century missionary success of other Scottish Churches.\(^\text{114}\) Certainly the middle-class assumptions of the priest and the leading laity who controlled the vestry were, at times, at odds with the desires of lower-class members of the congregation. Middle-class males definitely controlled the congregation. But this would also have been true of other Scottish Protestant.

\(^{107}\) Trower to D’Orsey, C[laralmart] T[errace], 17 Feb. [1851], ibid. fos 184–6.

\(^{108}\) Letter to the editor from ‘A Scottish churchman’, *SEJ* (May 1851), 114.

\(^{109}\) See n. 8.


\(^{111}\) Ibid. 33–6.


\(^{114}\) See n. 5.
Churches which, nevertheless, experienced greater growth among the lower orders than did the Episcopal Church. The Anderston case study indicates that the Episcopal Church had an inherent structural difficulty when responding to the rapidly changing urban society of the mid nineteenth century. While there were evangelistic clergy they did not always meet with understanding, flexibility and support for their endeavours from the leadership, that is, from the bishops. The leadership had an anxiety about threatening powerful Presbyterian interests in Scotland by being viewed as a proselytising Church. Until the late nineteenth century the Episcopalian leadership felt vulnerable, fearing that to upset the Established Church of Scotland especially would prevent an accommodation with the equally Established Church of England. So David Aitchison could complain of a perennial Episcopalian insecurity:

I do most heartily agree...that there has been too much reserve in communicating to the people of Scotland a knowledge of that faith [once delivered to the saints].... Money is wanted, and most especially men of tact and experience.... Add to these hindrances the still lingering, yet gradually falling away tradition of other years, that the Episcopal (so-called) Church of Scotland is a non-aggressive communion, a quiet, orderly, aristocratic society, exclusive and conservative in principle, very punctilious, and esteeming ministrations to non-Episcopilians as a sort of breach of etiquette.¹¹⁵

This distinct lack of unqualified support was serious for the Episcopal Church because of the virtually unlimited power of the bishops. Until the inauguration of the Representative Church Council in 1877, formal power in the Scottish Episcopal Church resided in diocesan synods (still fitfully called by a number of bishops), and the Episcopal Synod, which was comprised of the bishops alone. This meant the bishops, either as diocesans or as a college, were virtually unchallengeable by clergy, subject only to the power of the purses of upper middle class and landed laity. Consequently, episcopal caution about urban mission, not to say lack of sympathy, in the mid Victorian period, coupled with limited economic resources, had an exaggerated impact in constraining the evangelistic initiatives of a number of clergy, including D’Orsey and his friend, J. F. S. Gordon. Ecclesiastical structures, and the normative Episcopalian theology of divine-right episcopacy which upheld the bishops’ power, could, and did, work against the professed mission aims of the Episcopal Church. By the late 1870s, when the Church had widened its formal power-base to automatically include the clergy and laity, working-class ecclesiastical alienation had begun in Britain.¹¹⁶ Episcopalian failure to experience a significant enlargement of the social class of its membership may also have derived from its deliberate repudiation of Evangelicalism
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when Scottish religion and society was permeated by an Evangelical religious and social consensus.\footnote{Brown, \textit{Religion and society}, 188.}

But the evidence of this local study does indicate that the nineteenth-century Episcopalian revival was not merely a product of the infusion of Anglo-Catholic extremism and vitality,\footnote{William Perry, \textit{The Oxford Movement in Scotland}, Cambridge 1933, 84–6.} but that the younger generation of traditional Episcopalian High Churchmen could also respond to a changing Scottish society with evangelistic zeal. This would correspond to the same generational shift of attitudes found in the contemporary Church of England with the likes of Walter Farquhar Hook at Leeds. Neither, in this Glaswegian example, was Episcopalian moderate ritualism a result of Tractarianism but of a missionary initiative by a High Churchman. It was caused by the experience of the religious and social deprivations of the labouring classes in industrialising Glasgow. The evangelistic initiative this prompted in Scottish High Churchmen indicates that this tradition was not as moribund as the Tractarians asserted in the 1830s. The proactive missionary response was carried out by younger clergy on the spot, but could also be shared by informed ecclesiastical superiors such as Bishop Russell. But in the case of Anderston High Church zeal did cause a division among High Churchmen, between the younger D’Orsey and the more restricted theology of older High Churchmen such Walter Trower. When allied with an exalted and defensive position regarding episcopal authority, as it did in Trower, this older outlook could be unnecessarily confining of Episcopalian expansion. Yet the older attitude was more realistic about the anti-Catholic attitudes of much of the laity. The laity too was divided. As well as its opponents High Church ritualism also had its lay supporters, from both the middle and lower classes. However, lay support for ritualism was not always due to ritualist zeal. The churchwardens, for example, accepted it merely because they acknowledged that it was supported by members of the congregation and that this had consequent financial advantages. However, ritualism as a means of invigorating the Episcopal Church did run up against traditional Protestant no-popery, particularly vociferous from immigrant Anglicans from England and Ireland. While such anti-popery was directed not against a Tractarian but, in D’Orsey, against a normal High Church Episcopalian, it still resulted in accusations of Puseyism and Romanism. This suggests that in the Episcopalian lay mind ritualism, not the theology it represented, was the focus of attention. Nice theological distinctions between High Church and Tractarian as identified by Peter Nockles simply passed most laity by,\footnote{Peter B. Nockles, \textit{The Oxford Movement in context: Anglican High Churchmanship 1760–1857}, Cambridge 1994, particularly ch. vi.} though they were of concern to the official religious caste, the clergy. The differences
in liturgical and theological outlook among the clergy in this Anderston dispute were important enough for D'Orsey and Trower to initiate a confrontation. Though both were High Churchmen, their argument is a necessary reminder that theological differences and party positions mattered, often intensely, to the clergy. However it was the outward ceremonial of ritualism that the laity lined up for, and against, not necessarily its underlying theology. In other words lay religion also had its variations, but not between doctrinal possibilities such as High Church and Tractarian. Lay religion varied as a faith practised somewhere on a scale between the home and the church. The conflict between D'Orsey and his congregation over administering the sacraments at home or at church suggests more work needs to be done to identify the characteristics of lay religion in mid Victorian Scotland. There are indications that the clergy had difficulty recognising as Christian the religion of the laity when it was disconnected from the church building. For D'Orsey the church was the correct place for the Christian community to focus its life. Laity who asked for his ministry and the liturgy of the Prayer Book, but in a domestic setting, were judged to be dubiously or inadequately Episcopalian. They may simply have been going about their religion differently.