

The Historical Identity of the Denison Family of Toronto 1792-1860

David Gagan

Volume 6, Number 1, 1971

St. John 1971

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030461ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/030461ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (print)

1712-9109 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Gagan, D. (1971). The Historical Identity of the Denison Family of Toronto 1792-1860. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, 6(1), 124–137.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/030461ar>

All rights reserved © The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada, 1971

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

THE HISTORICAL IDENTITY OF THE DENISON FAMILY OF TORONTO

1792-1860

DAVID GAGAN

McMaster University

I*

In a recent article on the problems of American family history, Edward Saveth described the present state of family history in England and the United States of America in terms of a comparison between a state of mitigated, and one of almost unmitigated ignorance. He arrived at this conclusion in spite of an impressive body of literature representing nearly four decades of serious research related to the history of specific families, to the role of the family in the history of society, to the dynamics of family life, culture and structure and to the historical experience of families. John Owen's *The Rise of the Pelham's*, Lawrence Stone's *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, G. F. Mingay's *English Landed Society in the Eighteen Century*, Peter Laslett's *The World We Have Lost*, Edmond Morgan's *The Puritan Family*, and most recently Philip Greven's and John Demos' demographic analyses of families and social change in colonial New England come to mind as some representative examples of family history at its best.

By these standards, in Canada the state of family history, particularly in Anglophonic Canadian historiography, can only be described as uncharted country. Part of the problem, one suspects, is that even where it has enjoyed greater acceptance, family history has yet to evolve the commonly acceptable theory and practice that might produce a conceptually and methodologically distinct field of historical research with a legitimate claim to be recognized as such. At present the term denotes a range of family related studies that run the gamut from sheer anti-quarianism through Namierist collective biography and historical demography to the kinship and reference group studies of the sociologists.

Nevertheless, out of this diverse and frankly confusing approach to family history and family life there has emerged a reasonably clear and I think readily acceptable perception of the importance of family history. Families, like individuals, as Bernard Bailyn once observed, constitute the most primitive elements, and the ultimate building blocks of history. The more we come to understand the historical experience,

the culture, the structure and the historical identity of families and the dynamics of family life, the closer we come to recreating the social, economic, cultural, ideological, political and perhaps even the psychic characteristics of whole societies, like our own, in which families are the foundation of the social structure. Whether we choose to study the family demographically, genealogically or, as Eric Erickson did for Luther's family, psychoanalytically, whether we study the experience of individual families or the collective experience of many families, the end result can only be an *important addition to our knowledge of Canadian society*, knowledge all the more valuable because it is derived from one of the lowest common denominators of historical experience.

II

As one of the basic units of society and therefore as a primary agent of social assimilation, the family must loom large among those conditioning factors that determine the historical identity of individuals.¹ Historical biography implicitly acknowledges this assumption by introducing "family background" into the explanation of individual experience; but the "life and times" format rarely lends itself to an examination of family background broader in scope than the isolated experience of the individual within his immediate family unit. Yet, ". . . any given family in which an individual grows up is a unit in a family series disappearing backward in time."² Each new family unit and each new individual in this series is first of all an historical extension of that series. They are at once products of social, economic, demographic, cultural and ideological change and continuity within the series over time, and potential agents of permanence or discontinuity in the future, depending upon the desire and the ability of the family's scions to subscribe to the established characteristics of the family's historical identity, and upon the impact of the family's historical experience, its culture and its structure, on them.³

The historical experience of each generation invariably alters the family's identity as values, attitudes, modes of behaviour, life styles and traditional areas of individual achievement wax and wane with changing social and economic circumstances and the "flux of births and deaths and passing careers."⁴ But just as invariably, some of the characteristics acquired in the course of the family's historical experience survive and are transferred down through the series of family units and individuals. They constitute what Bernard Bailyn has described as the

symbols of the family's "inner continuity," the hallmarks of a "permanent identity"⁵ that transcends the passing of time and altered circumstances. It is this permanent identity which lends meaning to the very concept of family, and in so doing helps to inform individual experience which in turn can often be explained, at the most basic level of explanation available to the biographer, in terms of the historical identity of the serially defined family. At the very least, examining the relationship between individual and familial identities can be useful if only because it adds a new dimension to individual experience by placing it within the context of a continuing historical process that transcends the birth, life and death cycle of one individual's existence.

III

Among Victorian Canadians, including a veritable army of Denisons, George Taylor Denison 3rd (1839-1925) stands apart as one of our more visible links with the nineteenth century. From his books, articles, pamphlets, speeches and voluminous correspondence with public figures on both sides of the Atlantic emerges the portrait of a man painted in the light shed by the ideologies he espoused: imperialism, nationalism and loyalism, anti-Americanism, conservatism and militarism. Add to these his dominant personality traits among which singleness of purpose and mind, the habit of authority, inexhaustible energy and a healthy dose of self-esteem stand out, and the portrait is complete.⁶ The causes he championed and the ideologies he defended in his eccentric but effective style as a founder of the militantly nationalistic Canada First movement, as an apologist for the imperial connection and as a life-long antagonist of continentalism and republicanism reflect in a unique way the values, attitudes, problems and concerns of Victorian Canadian society. Consequently, George Denison has become one of that select group of historically significant individuals whose historical experience has been adopted as a barometer of the experience of his contemporaries.⁷ It is a role to which George Denison aspired, indeed assiduously cultivated, during his lifetime. From the standpoint of the historical identity of the Denison family of Toronto, it is a role for which he was remarkably well prepared, for out of the collective historical experience of the Denison family there had emerged, by the time George Denison was growing up, an interpretation of the family's historical experience and a clearly perceived sense of identity that fore-ordained not only his role in the "struggle for imperial unity," but the form, the content and the intensity of his involvement.

The family in which George Denison 3rd grew up between 1839 and 1860 represents the culmination of patterns of development that began when John Denison, a miller, brewer, farmer and captain of militia from Sussex, arrived at Kingston, U.C. with his wife and three sons in 1792. Their only assets were John Denison's skills, a few hundred pounds in cash, which they lost immediately in an ill-considered business venture, and the patronage of Inspector-General Peter Russell. Russell moved the family to York in 1796, gave John Denison a job and land, and extended to the family the "indulgences allowed to Loyalists" though they had no historical claim to those benefits.⁸

The Denisons soon became Loyalists in their own right, however, when John Denison's eldest son George married Esther Borden Lippincott, only child of Captain Richard Lippincott, a half-pay officer who had served with the New Jersey Volunteers during the American Revolutionary War. Lippincott, one of the most vicious of New Jersey's Tory partisans, spent part of the war in protective custody after he had summarily and brutally executed three rebel prisoners, an act which prompted George Washington to threaten to execute one of Lord Cornwallis' field officers if Lippincott went unpunished.⁹ George Denison 1st inherited not only the three thousand acres of land at Richmond Hill which Lippincott had claimed as a reward for his loyalty, but also Lippincott's "U.E." and the bitterly partisan ideology of hate that characterized his particular brand of loyalism.¹⁰

That ideology was reinforced by the Denisons' experience during the War of 1812 and again during the Upper Canadian rebellion of 1837. On both these occasions they played a prominent role in the struggle against republicanism, first in Isaac Brock's ultra-loyal flank companies of militia who unsuccessfully defended York in 1813, and again as part of Sir Allan MacNab's force that pursued Mackenzie's rebels across Western Ontario in the winter of 'thirty-eight.¹¹ By then, the Denisons' loyalism had become institutionalized in the form of the Queen's Light Dragoons, a cavalry troop created by George Denison I in 1822 as the family's contribution to the maintenance of the prevalent Tory ideals of peace, order and stability. When the disbanding of the Active Force in 1839 threatened the survival of the Dragoons by depriving them of British Army equipment, George Denison's sons, Robert, Richard and George, bought all the necessary arms, gear and apparel out of their own pockets, renamed the troop "Denison's Horse," and for the next decade maintained it privately as, in effect, a troop of household cavalry.¹²

The Denisons' military proclivities were only one manifestation of their newly acquired place in the substructure of provincial Toryism. George Denison 1st was also a Magistrate of the Court of Quarter Sessions for the Home District, York's governing body before incorporation. Afterward, he became alderman for St. Patrick's Ward, a seat which he, his sons and his grandsons controlled continuously until 1887 for the conservative faction until 1887.¹³ But the volunteer militia remained the effective symbol of the Denisons' political commitment and the vehicle of the political ambitions of George Denison and his sons who aspired to, and were given, command of their military district in unbroken succession from 1839 until 1885.

Meanwhile, the colonial family had blossomed into four "populous colonies" of Denisons numbering more than fifty individuals by mid-century. But it was sheer accident that George Denison I's family swiftly eclipsed all the other branches. Through an error in John Denison's will, the substance of his estate had been left to George Denison as heir-in-law after the death of his two brothers whose heirs and assigns were mistakenly omitted from the bequest.¹⁴ The omission created an irreparable breach in the family, but it gave George Denison of Bellevue exclusive possession of some of the most promising real estate in Toronto, perhaps half the land now encompassed by Queen and College Streets, Spadina Avenue and Bathurst Street. Building on this base, George Denison and his sons, Richard and George, soon added virtually all of the area now circumscribed by Queen, College, Ossington and Dufferin and tenant farms in several surrounding townships. Capital derived from the exploitation of these lands through agriculture, renting, speculation and urban development was reinvested in a variety of commercial and financial enterprises, ultimately producing for both father and sons fortunes and a life style that would be considered grand even by modern standards.¹⁵ Once impoverished colonists, the Denisons, through marriage, "connexion," accident, native ability and diligence, had become landed capitalists, gentry in fact, in a society dominated by men of property.

Clearly the Denison family had undergone a significant transition. No longer a disenchanting family of immigrant yeoman farmers, in two generations they had acquired, in kind if not in degree, the social, economic political and cultural characteristics of Upper Canada's patrician class. They were men of business whose interests ranged from farming and urban development through the Royal Canadian Bank, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Beaver Fire Insurance Company. They were

the senior officers and moving spirits behind the volunteering tradition in the local militia. They were devoted benefactors of the Established Church, defending it against the "unchristian" forces who would weaken its authority and in so doing rend the fabric of Upper Canadian society.¹⁶ And above all they were Tories and Loyalists who perceived themselves and discharged their obligation to society, as a praetorian guard defending *Simcoe's perfect model of a British colony* against real, potential and imaginary aggression. These were the hallmarks of the family's identity after half a century of colonial experience.

IV

The Denisons' new identity emerges clearly in the family unit in which George Denison 3rd grew up between 1839 and 1860, the family of George Denison 2nd of Rusholme. The elder Denison had begun his career in 1839 as a lawyer, but after fifteen years he abandoned his practice to devote all his energy to his various commercial enterprises. By 1850, his estate occupied the area bounded by Queen, College, Ossington and Dovercourt and was worked, under his supervision, by tenant farmers whose rents were partially commuted to labour services. Advancing urbanization eventually prompted him to develop most of the land as fashionable residential "park lots" worth ten times their original value, and the profits provided him with capital which he astutely re-invested in residential housing developments on land leased perpetually from the city, and in railways and bank stocks. In 1860, he estimated his liquid assets at nearly \$150,000 excluding his share of the invested capital from his father's estate which had been valued, by the probate court, at £200,000.¹⁷

Wealth and family tradition necessarily involved public responsibilities. From 1843 until he resigned in anger over Mayor Bowe's complicity in the Northern Railway scandal, the infamous "£10,000 job," George Denison 2nd was the representative of St. Patrick's Ward on City Council. By then he had become alarmed at the drift of political affairs in the province particularly with the emergence of the Clear Grit faction. He concluded that continued progress and stability could be guaranteed only by a federal union of the Canadas dominated by "a coalition . . . of those . . . who formerly cried out for Responsible Government . . . the Orangemen & the church unions and the loyal French . . ."¹⁸ His enthusiasm for the idea was also fired by his concern for the mounting insecurity of the province in view of Britain's gradually waning presence, rumblings of aggressive intent from south of

the border and the unwillingness of successive ministries to provide adequately for local defense, especially troops of volunteer cavalry, in the Militia Acts of 1846 and 1855.¹⁹

Denison's primary public responsibility, as he defined it, was therefore to the volunteer militia, the province's first line of defense and a nursery of popular patriotism for the men who would serve in it. In 1848, he reorganized "Denison's Horse" as the First Toronto Independent Troop of Cavalry, later the York Light Dragoons, and personally assumed the expense of maintaining it at full strength, in spite of ministerial and official opposition.²⁰ Seven years later he organized the Toronto Field Battery, and in 1860 the 2nd Battalion, "Queen's Own," Rifles. If the province would not create an army, the senior volunteer officer would — horse, foot and artillery.²¹

George Denison's commitment to volunteering and the values that military training and service instilled in the individual carried over into the education of his seven sons. Their formal education was merely a cipher in his account book, £22.10.10½ for his namesake; and he had no time for the pretensions of schoolmasters. A "punch-up" with an Upper Canada College master settled one argument over the right to discipline Denison children, and a public war of words with Bishop Strachan and the administration of Trinity College settled another.²² This habit of resorting to physical and verbal violence to settle differences great and small was a lesson clearly not lost on George Denison 3rd who regarded the sword and pen as interchangeable weapons for advancing his own opinions.

But if George Denison of Rusholme was indifferent to academic regimentation and if his sons were indifferent scholars, their informal education was quite another matter. In the Denison family, the priorities of elementary education were defined in terms of the military skills and arts required of officers commissioned in the volunteers. Denison demanded of his sons standards of discipline and achievement equal to the development of these skills by their fifteenth birthdays. They had two masters, Denison and his father-in-law, Jeremiah Dewson of Bond Head, a veteran of Waterloo and a Colonel in the Simcoe County Militia. Between them, they taught their boys horsemanship, the use of the sword, lance, carbine and pistol, military history and tactics, and cavalry drill. All but one graduated with commissions in the militia; three went on to become professional soldiers. Even the leisure activity of male members of the family, through the Turf Club and

the Upper Canada Rifle Association of which George Denison was both a founder and an officer, revolved around the skills of citizen-soldiers.²³

Quite apart from building character, preparing youths for manhood and careers as professional soldiers, this family-centred military education was directed toward a set of objectives at once selfish and altruistic. The York Dragoons symbolized the Denisons' symbiotic relationship with the society that had raised them up and to which they, in return, offered the protection of their arms. Fulfilling their commitment was more than a contractual obligation to the Denisons; it was a point of family honour and pride. Therefore, maintaining the troop was a perpetual family enterprise verging on a full-time occupation. Its commanding officer was invariably a Denison until the twentieth century.²⁴ On the other hand, the prerogatives historically associated with the Denisons' collective military function included not only the right to fill the commissioned ranks in the troop but also to use the Dragoons as a stepping stone to the provincial chain of command, to demand patronage from the Crown and to claim precedence over all other cavalry troops and officers in the province. For George Denison 2nd and his sons the eighteen-fifties and 'sixties, dark days for the militia in any case, were doubly trying. They made themselves thoroughly unpopular by openly criticizing government defence policy at every turn, while continuing to demand the perquisites traditionally due to them.²⁵

Adjutants-General, Ministers of Militia, Prime Ministers, even Queen Victoria, were the recipients of a steady flow of petitions from the Denison family requesting personal favours, military honours, appointments, special treatment for the Dragoons or the redress of some real or imagined affront to themselves or their troop. In every case, the petitions rehearsed in detail the unselfish loyalty of the family, Lippincotts, Dewsons and Denisons, who had defended King and country during the American Revolution, the Lord Gordon Riots, at Waterloo, at York in 1813, Niagara in 1839, and during the annexation crisis of 1849.²⁶ Each new skirmish merely extended the catechism and reinforced the family's interpretation of its historical experience and its place in the scheme of things as the armed defenders of the gods of the hearth. In fact, it seems evident that at this stage in the Denisons' development their past, their present and their future became inseparable, a sort of Burkean compact between dead, living and yet unborn generations of Denisons to preserve the family's special status. The Denisons' historical experience becomes an almost tautological argument in defence of place, precedence, tradition and a way of life in a

political atmosphere changing too rapidly to accommodate the family's perception of its own historical identity. The burden of that experience seems to have fallen principally on young George Denison 3rd who, for example, felt compelled to make periodical pilgrimages to New Jersey to meditate under the alleged tree on which his great-grandfather lynched the Yankee rebels.²⁷

The results of the family's petitions were sometimes fruitful, winning John Denison a midshipman's place in the Royal Navy where he subsequently attained the rank of admiral and became captain of Queen Victoria's yacht.²⁸ But just as often this special pleading fell on deaf ears: when Sir John A. Macdonald refused to appoint George Denison (3rd) Assistant-Adjutant General of Cavalry for Ontario on the basis of these claims in 1868, he resigned his commission and stormed off to launch the anti-party Canada First movement, arguing that Macdonald had ". . . kick[ed] [his] family out of the [Conservative] party . . ." after seventy-five years of unswerving loyalty.²⁹ Nevertheless, the Denison family name continued to command special consideration. George Denison 3rd's subsequent appointments as Ontario's immigration commissioner in England in 1872-73, where he made the first of his many contacts with British imperialists, and as Toronto's senior Police Magistrate, his occupation from 1877 until 1921, were both patronage appointments.³⁰

This pursuit of place, though not historically uncharacteristic of the Denison family, seems to have become endemic to the third generation, none of whom emulated the personal entrepreneurial success of their father and grandfather. One explanation may be that urbanization, fecundity and longevity conspired to deprive George Denison 2nd's sons of the family's traditional source of financial and social security, their land. By 1860, most of it had been either liquidated or subdivided into homesteads for the Denisons' numerous children, while the residue and the capital remained in the hands of George Denison 2nd and then his wife, who lived until her sons were middle aged. Nevertheless, the desire and the necessity of emulating their father's success had clearly been instilled in his sons. However the historian attempts to account for Colonel George Taylor Denison 3rd's high historical visibility, ultimately he must deal with a forty year old man, on the eve of his greatest public crusade, his "struggle for imperial unity," privately measuring his so far unspectacular material, military, political and intellectual achievements against standards of success laid down for him by his father twenty years before.³¹

In an earlier era, the name "Colonel George Taylor Denison of Heydon Villa" might have described a Denison with a landed estate, professional standing and income, extensive military responsibilities, and place and precedence in the political and social pecking order. But by the time George Denison 3rd reached maturity many of the traditional vehicles of the family's ascendancy, land for example, were beyond his grasp. Others, like the family troop, now the Governor-General's Body Guard, had ceased to be practically meaningful. Still others, political office, a military career or a career as a successful lawyer failed to materialize as the result of changing political, social and economic circumstances in Toronto, the province and the new nation. It is true that certain aspects of George Denison's life are strikingly parallel to the careers of his father and grandfather. As Toronto's senior magistrate from 1877 until 1921, as councilman for St. Patrick's Ward from 1864 until 1866, and as commanding officer of the Body Guard from 1876 until 1898, George Denison discharged civic, military and social functions traditionally associated with the family's record of public service. But within the context of the family's perception of its "permanent identity", Colonel George Taylor Denison of Heyden Villa possessed few of the hallmarks of that identity midway through his life, and it was a source of regret to him.³² Though he had acquired a minor reputation as an iconoclastic military historian, he was a landless urbanite, a Sunday soldier, a failure as a lawyer and as an aspirant to national political office. He was neither more nor less than a public servant whose security was dependant on the pleasure of politicians, and who enjoyed only the prestige of the family's name, when the Commercial Union and Imperial Federation movements conspired to thrust him forward as the popular champion of an idea of a Canadian nationality premised on values, attitudes and ideologies whose roots were firmly entrenched, in the first instance, in the historical experience of the Denison family: the imperial connection, loyalism, anti-Americanism and militarism.

Reaching back into the family's colonial experience he brought forward not only an explanation of the nature and significance of the new Canadian nationality, but also a definition of his own role in this latest repetition of British North America's, and his family's continuing struggle for survival within the context of a political and cultural nationality that would fulfill the "dream of the United Empire Loyalists."³³ Well might Goldwin Smith dread, as he said, being sabred in the street figuratively or literally by an ancestor-worshipping Loyalist whose great-grandfather had lynched Yankee rebels and whose grandfather had

offered on one occasion to deal definitively with William Lyon Mackenzie by “[giving] him a slap in the chops.”³⁴

For George Denison 3rd, the Denison family’s historical obligation to their adopted society — their collective function as a palace guard defending traditional values, institutions and ideological assumptions — became a symbol of his own obligation to the destiny of British N.A. *and* to his family, as well as an historical model for the particular brand of ideological warfare that propelled him into public prominence. The record of his subsequent struggle for imperial unity is the record of one historically significant individual’s experience. But like the cenotaph in the family’s private cemetery on the Humber, it stands as a monument to a collective experience, a family experience, and as a symbol of the most enduring feature of that continuing experience.

It is important to stress the point that George Denison 3rd not only represents elements of change and continuity in the historical experience of the Denison family, he also represents an experience characteristic of only one branch of the Denison family tree. Circumstances, time and memory have carefully pruned that tree of all those family units and individuals who did not sway with the winds of family tradition. The result of this pruning, as Edward Saveth has pointed out, “is not the totality of family experience, but only a sharpening of certain aspects of it . . .”³⁵ What is left helps to explain much that is central to the historical identity of George Taylor Denison 3rd, the only part of the tree still visible, and even then only from the viewpoint of Canadian political, intellectual and to a lesser degree military history. What has been lost, the historical experience of that undifferentiated host of Denisons among whom only the family name and certain occupational biases alone remain as indices of their collective identity, can only be a matter of regret to the social historian.

V

All family experience must eventually be related to the experience of individuals. But neither families nor individuals can or do exist in social isolation, and to study them in isolation is to ignore the fact that they function within the context of society and are subject to those periodical readjustments which shape and alter society and determine the course of its development.³⁶ We need to ask how many other families underwent an experience similar to the Denisons? Were this family’s patterns of social, economic, cultural and ideological development

unique, or were they typical of a colonial caste, status group or class whose existence has yet to be documented? And if they were typical, how many of George Denison's contemporaries shared his attitudes because they were products of a similar experience? On the other hand, if the Denison experience was unique, how accurate is our barometer? Finally, if the family is subject to social forces that produce change, is it not also possible that the family is itself a social force, that change and permanence in family culture and family structures are subsequently reflected in the changing patterns of social development of communities, regions, classes and interest groups? The history of the Denison family can only be informative in comparison with the structure and culture of other colonial Canadian families, but the *prima facie* evidence suggests that family history, as the basic unit of analysis for demographic studies and for collective biography or prosopography, will yield a rich harvest of Canadian social history.³⁷ We have only to begin to reconstruct the past by reconstructing the basic units of the social structure among which the family may be the most important. But even that is a sweeping and unsubstantiated assumption. It suggests that much remains to be done.

NOTES

* Section I, which contains my remarks in introducing the session on family history, is included here as a general summary of the state of family history in historical writing.

¹ Thomas C. Cochran, "The Social Sciences and the Problem of Historical Synthesis," in *The Social Sciences in Historical Study, Bulletin No. 64* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1964), pp. 163-165; Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960) p. 15.

² John Dollard, "Needed Viewpoints in Family Research," *Social Forces*, XIV (Oct., 1935), 110.

³ *Ibid.*, 111; Edward Saveth, "The Problem of American Family History," *American Quarterly*, XXI (Summer Supplement, 1969), 326.

⁴ Bernard Bailyn, "The Beekman's of New York: Trade, Politics and Families," *William and Mary Quarterly*, XIV (Oct., 1957), 606.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ This synthesis and my subsequent interpretation of both the family's historical experience and George Denison 3rd's identity draws heavily on my unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, "The Queen's Champion, The Life of George Taylor Denison 3rd . . ." (Duke University, 1969) and on the manuscript of "Warriors, Citizens and Patriots: The Denison Family of Toronto, 1792-1925," now in preparation for publication in the Canadian Biographical Series (University of Toronto Press). See also my articles, "The Relevance of 'Canada First,'" *Journal of Canadian Studies*, V (Nov. 1970), 36-43 and "A Prophet Without Honour: George Denison, Cavalry Historian," *Military Affairs*, XXXIV (Spring, 1970), 56-60.

⁷ Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), especially Chapter I.

⁸ Ontario Archives (OA), Russell Papers, Russell to Jarvis, 10 March, 1792; Denison to Russell, 23 June, 1793 and 26 May, 1795.

⁹ Public Record Office (PRO), America and West Indies Papers, 145, pp. 31-46 [Transcript in Public Archives of Canada (PAC), Denison Papers, 15]; North Callahan, *Royal Raiders* (New York: Bobbs' Merrill, 1963), pp. 244-246.

¹⁰ Egerton Ryerson, *The Loyalists of America and Their Times . . .*, Vol. II (2 vols., Toronto: William Briggs, 1880), p. 193.

¹¹ George T. Denison, *Soldiering in Canada* (Toronto: G. N. Morang, 1900), pp. 20-21; Ernest J. Chambers, *The Governor General's Body Guard* (Toronto: E. L. Ruddy, 1902), p. 29.

¹² Chambers, 29-33; Frederick C. Denison, *Historical Record of The Governor-General's Body Guard . . .* (Toronto: Hunter, Rose and Co., 1876), pp. 12-13.

¹³ F. M. Chadwick, *Ontarion Families* (Toronto: Rolph, Smith & Co., 1894), pp. 103-104; PAC, General Index of Commissions, Vol. I (to 1841).

¹⁴ OA, A. T. Galt Papers, Sophia Denison to George Taylor, 15 March, 1826. The will is reproduced in R. L. Denison, *The Canadian Pioneer Denison Family . . . Vol. II* (4 vols., Toronto: Privately Printed, 1951-53), pp. 42-43.

¹⁵ PAC, Denison Papers, 23 [Diary], 31 Oct., 1853, 31 Dec., 1853; R. L. Denison, II, pp. 66-70; J. G. Fleming, "The Fighting Denisons," *Maclean's Magazine*, XXVII (Dec. 1913), 9.

¹⁶ PAC, Denison Papers, 23 [Diary], 29 July, 1851, records George Denison 2nd's displeasure over the secularization of the clergy reserves.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 31 Dec., 1853.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1 July, 1851; Toronto Public Library (TPL), Denison Papers, G. T. Denison to Clerk of the Council, 31 Oct., 1853 [Copy].

¹⁹ OA, Percy Band Collection, George Talbot to G. T. Denison 2nd, 27 Jan., 1846; J. W. Gamble to G. T. Denison 2nd, 22 March, 1855; PAC, RG9, IC (1), Vol. 291, G. T. Denison 2nd to A. N. MacNab, 9 March, 1855.

²⁰ Frederick Denison, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

²¹ Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

²² PAC, Denison Papers, 23 [Diary], 15 Feb., 1855; TPL, Denison Papers, G. T. Denison 2nd Legal Account Book, 1861; George T. Denison 2nd, *Trinity College Conducted as a Mere Boys School . . .* (Toronto, 1858), n.p.

²³ PAC, Denison Papers, 23 [Diary], 17 April, 1854 and 27 June, 1860. Memorandum on the life of Jeremiah Dewson prepared by Mrs. A. W. Langmuir, Toronto in PAC, Denison Papers.

²⁴ Chambers, *op. cit.*

²⁵ In *A Review of the Militia Policy of the Present Administration*. By Junius, Jr., [G. T. Denison, 3rd] (Hamilton, 1863), p. 3., George Denison 3rd described the Prime Minister, John Sandfield Macdonald, as having all the military foresight of a "Chaldean astrologist."

²⁶ PAC, RG 9, IC (1), Vol. 291, G. T. Denison 2nd to Sir E. P. Tache, 4 April, 1864; C.O. 42, Vol. 678, pp. 240-45, No. 161, Sir John Young to Lord Granville, 20 Dec., 1869 enc. *Petition of Colonel Geo. Taylor Denison* (II) to Queen Victoria; PAC, Denison Papers, I, G. T. Denison 3rd to Lord Monck, 18 April, 1866.

²⁷ PAC, Denison Papers, 23 [Diary], 24 July, 1867.

²⁸ TPL, Denison Papers, G. T. Denison 2nd to Governor-General's Military Secretary, 24 July, 1866 [Copy]; *Toronto Globe and Mail*, 10 March, 1939.

²⁹ PAC, Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, Denison to Macdonald, 9 May, 30 June, 13 August, 1867.

³⁰ PAC, Denison Papers, I, Archibald McKellar to Denison, 2 Dec., 1872 and 20 Nov., 1873; *Ibid.*, 2, Smith to Denison, 16 June, 1877; Queen's University, Charles Mair Papers, Denison to Mair, 11 Jan., 1879.

³¹ PAC, Denison Papers, 27 [Diary], 31 August, 1879.

³² *Ibid.*,

³³ G. T. Denison, "The United Empire Loyalists and Their Influence Upon the History of This Continent," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Second Series, X (June, 1904), XXV-XXXIX.

³⁴ Goldwin Smith, *Loyalty, Aristocracy and Jingoism* (Toronto: Hunter, Rose and Co., 1896), pp. 10-33; OA, O'Brien Journal, 29, 24 June, 1830.

³⁵ Saveth, *op. cit.*, 326.

³⁶ Frederick Elkin, *The Family in Canada . . .* (Ottawa: Canadian Conference on the Family, 1964), p. 7.

³⁷ Philip Greven, "Historical Demography and Colonial America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, XXIV (July, 1967), 438-454; and Lawrence Stone, "Prosopography," *Daedalus*, 100 (Winter, 1971), pp. 46-79. These surveys of the relevant literature, together with the article by Saveth cited earlier, constitute what appear to be the most up to date assessment of the problems and potential of family history as an area of historical research.