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This paper, and the thesis from which the material is drawn, was largely inspired by James Obelkevich’s assertion that every aspect of religion has a “social resonance,” and that religious institutions develop according to their specific social context. It was also influenced by the increased attention to themes of class, ethnicity and gender in English Canadian religious historiography of the last decade.

St. Mary’s and St. Thomas’s, the churches at the heart of this study, were both made independent parishes of the Anglican diocese of Newfoundland in 1877: St. Mary’s in the west end of St. John’s and St. Thomas’s in the east end. Although of a common denomination, diocese and city, these parishes had different populations and were located in very different neighbourhoods. St. Mary’s was located in the industrial, working-class district of St. John’s, and St. Thomas’s in the wealthy, middle and upper-class one. St. Thomas’s parish population had a high number of working-class families and individuals (many of them unskilled), but its congregation was dominated by members of the city’s commercial and political elite. St. Mary’s congregation, like its parish population, was mainly families and individuals of a middling status: skilled workers (many of them self-employed) and members of the proprietary lower middle-class. In contrast to the latter, the lower middle-class element at St. Thomas’s was mainly white-collar, commercial
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employees and their families. Occupational and family analysis also showed that members of the middle-class proper at St. Thomas’s were generally professionals, whereas at St. Mary’s they were likely to be business owners with roots in industrial or artisanal activities. It is within this context that I will discuss some of the sexually-specific, church-sponsored associations that were active at St. Mary’s and St. Thomas’s in the late Victorian and Edwardian era. In doing so I will illustrate how social status, which affected individual experience and shaped the character of a community, also influenced the development of organized religious institutions within that community and the experiences of those people who chose to partake in church life.

**Men’s Associations**

Established in June 1891, the St. Mary’s Association’s aim was “deepening the interest of the members of St. Mary’s Congregation in the affairs of their church.” The Association was open to any male over fifteen years of age who could pay the monthly subscription of 10¢. While there were no attendance rolls, officer lists indicate that Association leaders were mainly of the lower middle-class, followed by the skilled working-class. This distribution of power was reflective of parish demographics although it suggested that at St. Mary’s lower middle-class men were somewhat more likely to head associations than their working-class counterparts. This finding is not surprising given the well-documented lower middle-class interest in church life and leadership. It is also not surprising that the activities and mandate of the Association suggested an interest in respectability and upward mobility. It was, in essence, a literary and debating society. A description in the *Diocesan Magazine* stated that “the tone of the Association is high . . . it aims at the improvement of the mind by debate and conversation, and presents to its members the means of innocent and rational amusement.” At St. Thomas’s, a similar society was not established until the Llewellyn Club was founded in 1915.

At the same time, the St. Mary’s Parochial Association’s name suggests its deep roots in the west end Anglican community giving it a local flavour typical of artisanal organizations. The way in which the Association rotated its officers from year to year also suggested that the organization had a co-operative ideal. This contrasted with the idea of earned advancement to long-term positions of authority associated with the
military structure of the Church Lads Brigade, an association popular in the east end. In addition, the St. Mary’s Parochial Association was fraternal in nature. Mary Ann Clawson has shown that fraternalism mainly attracted skilled workers and proprietors, and was closely tied to artisanal identity and its male-centred culture. While English Canadian historians Gregory S. Kealey and Bryan Palmer have identified class ties within fraternal organizations and examined the way membership encouraged class consciousness, Clawson described how, despite shared socio-economic status, members of fraternities defended masculinity more than they promoted class identity.\textsuperscript{12} She explained how members of fraternities rejected the middle-class Victorian view of women as the moral and spiritual guides of men – a cornerstone of True Womanhood ideology – and promoted male autonomy.\textsuperscript{13} Such an analysis can explain why a motion on whether or not to admit women to the Association proposed at its second meeting was defeated.\textsuperscript{14} St. Mary’s Parochial Association represented an amalgamation of lower middle-class and skilled working-class cultural elements, a mixture that reflected the social setting in which its leaders and members lived. The Association especially illustrates the way working-class ties remained with the more upwardly mobile members of the west end population.

When Camplin Cogan, formerly curate at St. Thomas’s, became rector of St. Mary’s in 1902, he instituted several new male organizations in the parish. One of these, the Young Men’s Club, was a classic example of the Anglican church-sponsored “working-lad’s” institute designed by Victorian middle-class sponsors to offer a place of “respectable” leisure to lower-class adolescents.\textsuperscript{15} Cogan’s institution of this type of club in the largely working-class west end, given his class background and experience in the east end, was not surprizing.\textsuperscript{16} Established from above by a newcomer to the parish, the St. Mary’s Young Men’s Club was reforming and prescriptive by nature, in contrast to the fraternalism and self-help of the men’s association organized by members of the congregation itself.

Cogan also introduced the Men’s Bible Class to St. Mary’s. At St. Thomas’s, assuredly because of that parish’s theological connection to the Low Church, there were strong Men’s and Women’s Bible Classes during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. These bible classes were educational usually consisting of discussions and lectures about scripture or more specific matters of church doctrine. The place of sexual divisions in the organization of these classes was clear: the rector’s wife (or another
prominent, religiously devoted woman from the congregation) taught the female class, while the rector or curate had charge of the males. There was a clear sense of gender difference in the interpretation and understanding of scripture. As well, during the 1880s the Men’s Bible Class met Sunday mornings at 10:00, while the women’s class met at 2:30 on Sunday afternoons. The latter time slot was chosen, perhaps, to coincide with Sunday school, under the assumption that women would be the ones bringing children to the sessions. By the early-twentieth century, however, the Men’s Bible Class at St. Thomas’s had taken on a more prominent social and associational face, and began sponsoring entertainments and teas. While a bible class was held on Friday evenings at St. Mary’s during the late 1880s, it was Cogan who introduced the associational, and sexually specific, version of the bible class. The immediate acceptance of this association in the west end was perhaps due to the tradition of fraternal organizations in the parish as this organization had an educational and social, rather than prescriptive, mandate.

In contrast, the most popular men’s associations in the east end were more prescriptive than fraternal. Just as they promoted “True Womanhood,” the Victorian bourgeoisie painted a picture of the “Christian Gentleman” whose life was a balance of business achievement, social sensitivity and dedication to church and family. Involvement in secular or church-sponsored self-improvement societies was part of this role. The “Christian Gentleman” ideal was promoted by Victorian churches as part of “muscular Christianity,” and the Church of England in Newfoundland was no exception to this general trend. The clergy at St. Thomas’s were major promoters. Rector Arthur Wood wrote in 1889:

How many appear to think that the work of Religion and the Gospel should be left chiefly to Clergymen, aided it may be by a few women! How few seem to realize that the great work of the Church of Christ is a work to be done by men! . . . Religion among us must not be an effeminate sort of thing: we must not be content with milk instead of solid meat, well enough perhaps for those who like it, but not enough to satisfy the wants of men.

While not misogynistic, Wood portrayed women as second-rate parishioners and church workers. He believed that the “strength of a church or congregation reside[d] largely in the young men,” and that males should
be at the forefront of all parish work.  

Thus inspired, the clergy at St. Thomas’s encouraged the establishment of several men’s associations, and their upper and middle-class constituents answered the call. Throughout the 1890s the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, an American organization designed as a mission of men to men, operated in the parish. It is worth noting that while former St. Mary’s curate John Rouse (who accepted the rectorship of a Chicago, Illinois parish in 1891) sent the earliest description of this association to Newfoundland, the St. Thomas’s branch of the Brotherhood, which was the first in the diocese, was established only after Arthur Wood toured the United States and Canada in 1893. Several years earlier, Wood had expressed his concern about the “good deal of beer drinking . . . among the older lads” of St. John’s, and saw the Brotherhood as a means for “young tradesmen” to socialize apart from saloons and “bad company.” It is clear that the Brotherhood carried a prescriptive mandate: its outreach programs encouraged church involvement and "respectable" behaviour among members of the working class and poor. One of the major activities of the St. Thomas’s Brotherhood, for example, was visiting outport vessels moored at the St. John’s docks to distribute reading material and to encourage crews to attend church services. By 1903 interest in the Brotherhood had declined, officially because of political rivalry among members. This may seem strange to one unfamiliar with nineteenth-century Newfoundland politics where outport communities were part of districts often represented in the House of Assembly by St. John’s men many of whom worshipped at St. Thomas’s. For the politically ambitious, shipboard visitation under the auspices of the Brotherhood was an excellent opportunity to campaign for outport votes. Despite this collapse, the association was revived by new rector Edgar Jones in 1916. A St. Mary’s branch was not established until 1927.

Another successful, but more long-lived, association was the Church Lads Brigade, or CLB. British in origin, and organized along para-military lines, its stated purpose was “the advancement of Christ’s Kingdom among lads of all classes, the promotion of reverence, discipline, and self-respect, all that tends towards true Christian manliness.” While also part of “muscular Christianity,” the CLB was more openly prescriptive than the Brotherhood: it specifically aimed for physical, mental and moral improvement. In addition, its military structure meant that the mostly upper-class and middle-class leadership could hold clear positions of
authority over the rank-and-file in contrast to the revolving leadership preferred by the St. Mary’s Parochial Association. The large crowds that attended annual CLB services after its establishment in 1892 attested to its popularity at St. Thomas’s. In contrast, the St. Mary’s Company, established by Rector Edward Botwood in 1896 and administered by the Cathedral Company, had disbanded by 1902. While some boys from St. Mary’s remained involved in the CLB, it was several decades later before a strong west end company was formed.

Women’s Associations

While much of the literature on women’s religious experience has focused on the middle-class, McLeod’s work has shown that the idea of nineteenth-century women being more active in religious organizations than men was just as, if not even more, true for the working-class. At the same time, Marks has analysed the class composition of women’s religious organizations and discovered that while working-class women were often Sunday School teachers and rank-and-file members of voluntary organizations, leadership positions were dominated by the middle-class. In fact, in the towns Marks studied only 25% of Anglican women’s organization officers were from the working-class. A comparison of St. Thomas’s and St. Mary’s therefore provides an excellent opportunity to see if these ideas about women’s class-based experience in church-sponsored associations were equally true in neighbourhoods with very different class profiles as well as to see if the type of organization preferred by women was tied to their social status.

According to their mandates and activities, church-sponsored women’s organizations have been classified into two basic types: the ladies’ aid (or auxiliary) and the women’s missionary association. In contrast with the primary women’s organization at St. Mary’s, which was of the missionary type, the St. Thomas’s Women’s Association fit the ladies’ auxiliary type of organization. Organized in 1879, its members were concerned with raising money for poor relief, local schools, and parish building and improvement. They were also motivated by a need for fellowship, and developed a feeling of identity and belonging in the parish structure. The social function of the St. Thomas’s Women’s Association can been seen in a report written by president Hale Wood in 1894. She stated that the “opportunities given to members of the parish, who
otherwise would seldom or never see each other, to meet in friendly intercourse have been most valuable” and encouraged parish women of “whatever social grade” to join the group. While officially classless, the Association, like the male fraternities described by Claws, may not have been so functionally. Marks’s assessment of female voluntary associations rings true for St. Thomas’s: while working-class women may have joined the Association, positions of power and influence were held by a middle-class and upper-class leadership. This can be seen in officer lists for the years 1890 to 1904, which showed that upper-class, middle-class proper and lower middle-class women together held 90% of Association offices. By the turn of the century, half of these offices were going to the members of the lower middle-class, while the number of upper-class officers had declined to 20%. This latter trend was perhaps due to interest in secular feminist activities, which were largely centred in St. John’s East.

A favourite form of indirect poor relief administered by female voluntary associations in late-nineteenth-century St. John’s was based on the clothing, boot, or coal club model, sometimes referred to as thrift societies. Mainly co-ordinated by middle-class women who believed that such clubs encouraged saving, careful spending and industriousness among the poor, they functioned by imposing middle-class values and an idealized middle-class way of life on the working classes and unemployed. These clubs operated through members’ collection of money from the poor on an instalment basis, their solicitation of a donation from a middle-class or upper-class sponsor to supplement these deposits, and their returning of the grand total to the depositor as a “gift certificate” redeemable for predetermined items in a store selected by the organizers.

While a St. Mary’s Clothing Club was organized with the encouragement of rector Edward Botwood in 1879, it attracted few members and remained a relatively small organization. In 1888 the club operated on a budget of around $35, compared with the Cathedral club’s budget of over $575. At St. Thomas’s, the thrift club was organized as a branch of the Women’s Association, and the distribution of indirect poor relief in this way became a major parish enterprise.

The St. Thomas’s Women’s Association’s mandate and activities showed that its members not only embraced middle-class ideas of morally reforming the poor to be thrifty and self-reliant, but also accepted the middle-class Victorian gender ideal of women being the “moral guardians” of their families within the home. For example, the system of visitation
used by the Association to decide which poor families deserved financial assistance focused on the domestic abilities of their lower-class “sisters.” This can be seen in Hallie Wood’s 1889 reflections on households the Association had visited:

> When one considers all the varied work that the wife of the ordinary working man has to get through in the course of a week, one wonders how it can be accomplished. And consider that one moderately-sized room does duty for parlour, kitchen, wash-house, nursery, and all. It is pleasant to think how general is the case that this parlour-kitchen is quite presentable, fit to receive anybody who may come into it.\(^{41}\)

Using such a measure as a woman’s housekeeping ability to determine whether or not a family was “deserving” suggests that the leaders of the Association considered a woman’s maintenance of the domestic sphere as an indicator of the respectability of an entire family. Women in the home working as moralizing agents was a key component of nineteenth-century separate spheres ideology, and the Association’s approach to helping the poor showed that the middle-class Victorian women of St. Thomas’s parish thoroughly embraced the domestic ideals inherent in the concept.\(^{42}\)

The St. Thomas’s Women’s Association also carried out a major program of fund raising for parish improvements and class-based experience is apparent in the special projects they supported. Ritualism, which affected Anglican worship in the late-nineteenth century, involved increased use of music, candles, flowers and stained glass to enhance the experience of worship.\(^{43}\) It has been considered reflective of a change in late-Victorian secular aesthetics, especially the growth of an increasingly consumption-minded middle-class.\(^{44}\) The congregation at St. Thomas’s was one of the first in St. John’s to cultivate sacred parish music as performance, and the Women’s Association raised most of the money needed to buy new organs for the church in 1881 and 1909.\(^{45}\) In addition, the congregation extensively renovated their church in 1874, 1882 and 1903, each time adding ritualistic features (such as a centre aisle) to a building that was originally constructed as a Low Church preaching house.\(^{46}\) The Women’s Association and Young Ladies’ Guild (which was made in its senior counterpart’s image) raised money in support of these projects generally, and also specifically financed the purchase of chancel furniture such as an imported pulpit and choir stalls.\(^{47}\) Marks’s observation
that the Victorian middle and upper-classes built increasing elegant homes in an effort to display their taste and status, and that this impulse was also directed towards constructing large and impressive churches in which they could worship, holds true for St. Thomas’s.\textsuperscript{48} The support for these church-improvement activities by the parish’s female organizations shows the influence of this class experience.

Finally, the St. Thomas’s Women’s Association presented an interesting opportunity to examine if the social class of members affected the Association’s standing and power within the church. In 1892 members of the St. Thomas’s Women’s Association decided on their own initiative to raise money for construction of a new parish hall rather than continuing to direct most of their profits to the church wardens to pay pre-existing debts. Some members of the congregation disagreed with this change and Arthur Wood, who had written three years earlier that the Association’s help in paying off the church debt was “a plain proof, if one were wanted, of the practical benefit of such organizations,” felt compelled to defend the women’s actions in diplomatic and practical terms:

Volunteer workers must be permitted, to a large extent, to choose their own object, provided it does not conflict with the welfare of the parish generally . . . [when the rooms open] the ladies who are now aiming to provide the cost . . . will probably be commended by the Parish, not only for their zeal, industry, and perseverance, but also for their prudential foresight, in securing beforehand the cost of the building; contrary to the usual custom of entering upon expenditure first, and meeting the expense as best we can afterwards.\textsuperscript{49}

When the new parish building was opened in 1899 St. Thomas’s congregation and clergy generally recognized the Association’s role in initiating and financing this project. New rector Henry Dunfield even asked the women’s permission to name the hall in memory of Arthur Wood, who had died in 1897.\textsuperscript{50} In contrast, at a major fund-raising event in 1897 Bishop Llewellyn Jones announced that “whatever comfort and efficiency may be lent to the future working of the parish [by this hall] will be largely owing to [Reverend Wood’s] fostering care and foresight.” While that speech may have been influenced by grief over Wood’s recent death, at the building’s opening Bishop Jones recognized the Association’s fund-raising efforts but again did not credit the member’s initiative and perseverance in the face
of congregational protest. If the members of St. Thomas’s Women’s Association were empowered in any way by their financial role in the parish, it did not strengthen their place in the diocesan church, especially when one remembers the simultaneous promotion of “muscular Christianity.” Being female, it seems, outweighed being a member of a wealthy and powerful family.

In the west end, the situation was somewhat different. Edward Botwood was one of the first Anglican clergy in Newfoundland to publicize the need for members of the church in St. John’s to support financially home missions in the outports and Labrador. To this end he organized the Women’s Home Missionary Association (WHMA) in 1879, a group that in its first year enrolled 400 members. The local press recognized St. Mary’s women as the most active supporters of this project, but credited this to Botwood’s influence. An independent St. Mary’s WHMA and auxiliary Sewing Circle were organized in 1880, with the stated object of raising money for home missions through the sale of work by Sewing Circle members, holding socials and soliciting collections from parishioners. Besides being of St. Mary’s congregation, members were required to pay 5 shillings in annual dues. The popularity of the home mission cause at St. Mary’s can be seen in the fact that between 1880 and 1890, St. Mary’s WHMA gave nearly $2500 to the Diocesan Synod for home missions, compared to $2200 from St. Thomas’s and $2800 from the much larger Cathedral parish. St. Thomas’s, especially, seemed to have little interest in home missions. The rector encouraged more concern for this cause, and in the early 1900s he asked that a donation for home missions be included in the St. Thomas’s Women’s Association’s budget. They agreed, and east end interest in home missions began to increase.

Between 1880 and 1899, close to 85% of women who attended St. Mary’s WHMA meetings were from either the lower-middle, independent producing or skilled working-classes. Consistass culture alignment: The era for skilled working-class women, who made up an average of 37 per cent of attendees. The number of lower middle-class women who attended modestly increased from 27.5 per cent in 1880-84 to 31 per cent by 1895-99. At the same time, between 1880 and 1885 WHMA offices were nearly evenly distributed among the middle-class proper, the lower middle-class and the skilled working-class. However, after 1885 members of the lower middle-class increasingly began to hold the highest number of leadership positions (from 24% in 1880-84 to 44% in 1900-04), followed
by a growing independent-producer presence. The number of middle-class proper officers declined to 13% in 1890-94, but had recovered to 18% by the turn of the century. It is striking that the number of skilled working-class officers declined from 24% in 1880-84 to 12.5% by 1900-04, figures consistent with Marks’s findings for small-town Ontario. As was seen with the men’s organization, however, the influence of working-class culture in the association’s activities remained strong. While this may be tied to the leader’s social origins, the numbers provided above show that despite changes in leadership many of the most active and dedicated members of the St. Mary’s WMHA were from families headed by artisans.

Unlike ladies’ aids, the money raised by missionary associations was directed to the mission field rather than spent in the parish, and was usually handed over to a higher ecclesiastical authority. While they had control of the fund-raising process, the women in missionary associations did not have control of spending, and the literature suggests that this limited their sense of power.57 The women of St. Mary’s congregation, however, appeared to have just as strong a sense of independence as those of St. Thomas’s. It is true that St. Mary’s women did not have the same financial presence in the parish as was seen in the east end; neither did they determine their own fund-raising mandates. Members of St. Mary’s WHMA demonstrated a different type of independence, especially after the mid-1880s. In contrast to St. Thomas’s, the president or some other officer, rather than the rector, chaired annual meetings of the Association. Likewise, the women served as auditors of their own accounts.58

This pattern changed somewhat after Camplin Cogan began his term as rector in 1902. He began to chair Association meetings, and insisted that all officers meet with him quarterly to discuss Association business. Early in his career Cogan had been missionary in White Bay, and in 1906 he called a special meeting of the Association to tell the women of his special interest in that mission and to ask if all money they raised could be directed exclusively to that part of the island instead of the mission at Random Sound, Trinity Bay, which the WHMA had supported since 1880. The women, seemingly unquestionably, agreed to this change. He also began auditing the Association’s books, something members had been doing themselves for almost 30 years.59 The acceptance of male authority over their organization may have provoked resentment among some of the women at St. Mary’s especially because it came (perhaps not coincidentally) during a time when feminist ideas were starting to circulate in St.
John’s, especially among the elite women of the East End where Cogan served as curate. Nevertheless, the skilled working-class and lower middle-class women of the St. Mary’s WHMA appeared less willing to challenge parish clergy’s efforts to control their association than their upper-class and middle-class counterparts at St. Thomas’s.

Marks has recognized that lesser amounts of leisure time could limit working-class participation in parochial associations, and this factor appeared to affect the WHMA’s activities. The Association had no strong social element, and in the 1880s and 1890s members often held sales of goods in their own homes rather than dedicating much time and effort to organizing large-scale fancy fairs as was seen at St. Thomas’s. Such neighbourhood sales may have also shown a community-oriented approach to fund raising, in contrast with the St. Thomas’s Women’s Association sales, which were often advertised city-wide. After the turn of the century, perhaps because of the growing lower middle-class presence in the association’s leadership (or Cogan’s influence), the St. Mary’s WHMA held more large-scale sales.

Conclusion

In summary, the secular class status of members – and of parishioners generally – influenced what parochial voluntary associations were accepted. Class experience also influenced associational activities and mandates. At St. Thomas’s, a middle and upper-class-dominated parish resulted in a network of prescriptive men’s and women’s associations that favoured, among other things, the promotion of idealized gender roles. At St. Mary’s, a parish heavily influenced by skilled working-class culture led to more fraternalistic and community-centred parochial organizations. At St. Thomas’s, the middle-class and upper-class women who were active in voluntary associations achieved some measure of power and influence in their parish (perhaps influenced by the growing St. John’s feminist movement as well their own financial strength) but this did not translate into a wider diocesan recognition of their efforts and the church continued to promote “muscular Christianity.” The skilled working-class and lower middle-class women at St. Mary’s asserted a different kind of independence, but were also more willing to accept the imposition of male authority over their association. In addition, this study shows how nebulous lower middle-class experience could be, and that it cannot be understood without
considering the social circumstances in which members of that class lived. At St. Mary’s, members of the lower middle-class were closely tied to the skilled working-class and achieved considerable community influence. At St. Thomas’s, this group was overshadowed to a large extent by the same upper-class and middle-class proper parishioners they wished to emulate. Finally, one must reflect on a sub-theme running throughout this entire discussion: the extent to which the unskilled working-class, although a presence in both parishes, was alienated from church-based associational activities.

Endnotes

1. James Obelkevich, Religion and Rural Society: South Lindsey 1825-1875 (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), viii, ix-x; Laura B. Morgan, “Class and Congregation: Social Relations in two St. John’s, Newfoundland, Anglican Parishes, 1877-1909,” M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1996. The research on voluntary associations presented in this paper is only one part of a broader analysis that also compared developments in parish administration and financing, liturgy, architecture and interior design, and poor relief.


4. For a detailed explanation of the class structure developed for Victorian St. John’s and the statistical breakdown for each parish see “Class and Congregation,” chapters 3 and 4. In brief, I developed a six-part social hierarchy and placed families based on the occupation of the head of household and family connections. The upper-class was mainly merchants, leading professionals, and high-ranking government officials. The middle-class proper was manufacturers, lesser professionals, management and families in joint craft/commercial enterprises. Inclusion of the latter group was based on the discussion of artisan-to-merchant mobility in Sean Cadigan, “Artisans in a Merchant Town: St. John’s, Newfoundland, 1775-1816,” Journal of the Canadian Historical Association (1993): 95-119. The lower middle-class included the classic petty bourgeoisie of shopkeepers and other proprietors, white-collar salaried workers, sea captains and master mariners. For the latter see Eric Sager, Seafaring Labour: the Merchant Marine of Atlantic Canada, 1820-1914 (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1989), 105-110. The independent-producing class owned their means of production, and achieved competency by combining it with their own labour. It included farming and fishing families, and self-employed artisans. The skilled working class was made up of artisans and seamen (again based on Sager); the unskilled working class of labourers, teamsters, and service workers. A further methodological note: doing social history for 19th-century Newfoundland is complicated by the fact that there is limited nominal census data available to the researcher. In addition, Anglicans do not keep the kind of membership lists available for other Protestant denominations. My approach to solving these problems was to rely on personal and occupational information provided in church registers and city directories for assigning class status.

To get some sense of parish demographics I took an approach to compiling population statistics that presumed three levels of church participation: parishioners, congregation, and leadership. To find the names of “parishioners” – city residents who had at least a rudimentary connection to either St. Thomas’s or St. Mary’s – I used baptismal registers for the years 1880-1905 in combination with district statistics compiled by other historians of St. John’s. The “congregation” were those who had a stronger connection with the churches, and I used diocesan lists of subscribers to the General Church Fund (which were arranged parochially) as my source. Finally, the leadership database was compiled from lists of voluntary
association and parish officers that were available in minute books, local newspapers, and, after 1889, the Diocesan Magazine.

5. I do not discuss more centrally controlled voluntary associations that formed in the early-twentieth century such as the Church of England Women’s Association (CEWA, later Anglican Church Women or ACW) and the Church of England Men’s Society (CEMS).

6. Entry recorded 8 May 1891, Vestry Minute Book, 1886-1946, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives; “St. Mary’s Association,” Diocesan Magazine (October 1891); “St. Mary’s, St. John’s” and “St. Mary’s Parochial Association,” Diocesan Magazine (August 1893); “St. Mary’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (August 1894).


8. Diocesan Magazine (August 1893).


15. Church of St. Mary the Virgin, St. John’s, Newfoundland, 1859-1984: 125 Years of Service (St. John’s: the Church, 1985), 85; Cox, English Churches, 82.
16. St. Thomas’s was planning a young men’s club of this sort by 1897, and it was in place while Cogan was curate. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (June 1897) and (February 1900).

17. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (November 1899), (November 1902), (November 1903) and (December 1905).

18. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (January 1889).

19. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (February 1905) and (April 1906).


23. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s: Our Young Men,” Diocesan Magazine (February 1896).


25. “Our American Letter,” Diocesan Magazine (January 1892); “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (January 1890), (May 1893) and (December 1893); and P.B. Rendell and E.E. Knight, History of St. Thomas’s Church, 1836-1961 (St. John’s: s.n., 1961), 48.

26. Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes, 42-43.

27. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (June 1898) and (July 1901).

28. “Cohesion,” Diocesan Magazine (July 1903); and Rendell and Knight, History of St. Thomas’s, 48.

29. Church of St. Mary the Virgin, 97.

31. See, for example, “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (December 1907), (November 1908), (October 1912). St. Thomas’s, known as the “Old Garrison Church,” has a long history of connections with the military. This heritage may have contributed to the popularity of the CLB.

32. “St. Mary’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (November 1907); *Church of St. Mary the Virgin*, 97; and Helen Porter, *Below the Bridge: Memories of the South Side of St. John’s* (St. John’s: Breakwater, 1979), 1.


36. “St. Thomas’s Women’s Association,” *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1894).


39. “St. Mary’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1889) and (September 1889).


41. “St. Thomas’s Women’s Association,” *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1889).


45. *Evening Mercury*, 8 February 1882; *Organ Fund, 1909*, Parish of St. Thomas Archives. By way of comparison, the organ purchased for St. Thomas’s in 1909 cost almost $6700 while the new organ for St. Mary’s 30 years later only cost $2600, see “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1907) and (May 1909); and *Church of St. Mary the Virgin, 1859-1894*, 110.

46. *Times (St. John’s)*, 2 January 1875; LeMessurier, *Church of St. Thomas*, 16; Rendell and Knight, *History of St. Thomas’s Church*, 23; “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1904), (February 1904), (July 1904); and Frederick Jones, “Edward Wix,” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography IX*.

47. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (April 1912), (October 1912), (February 1913), (August 1913).

49. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1889) and (January 1892).

50. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (November 1897).

51. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (December 1897), (April 1898), (April 1899), (June 1899), (October 1899).


55. “St. Thomas’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1898), (March 1900), (December 1900), (January 1902), (March 1904), (March 1905), (April 1906), (March 1907), (May 1908), and (April 1910).

56. Statistics compiled from *St. Mary’s Women’s Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives.


59. Minutes recorded 27 January 1903, 2 February [1904], 10 July 1906, *Women’s Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives; “St. Mary’s, St. John’s,” *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1889) and (May 1911).


61. Minutes recorded 23 April 1884, 29 April 1890, 24 April 1894, 27 January 1899, *Women’s Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives; and *Times (St. John’s)*, 2 February
1884.

62. “St. Mary’s, St. John’s,” Diocesan Magazine (March 1902) and (August 1909).