Reform at the Council of Constance

Joseph G. Ramisch

The Council of Constance assembled in the early fifteenth century at a time of supreme crisis in Western Christendom. The Great Schism had continued for almost forty years, and the one recent attempt to end the Schism, The Council of Pisa in 1409, had succeeded only in adding a third line of popes to the two existing ones at Rome and Avignon. Constance tackled and solved that problem, by judging and deposing two of the rival claimants and accepting the resignation of the third, then by electing a new pope, the first man in forty years to be recognized as pope by the whole church.

Today we have had several centuries to grow accustomed to a divided Christendom: many separate Christian churches, each claiming its own kind and degree of authenticity. It is therefore difficult for us to appreciate the extent to which the Schism was felt to be a tragedy. Certainly it was a great and universal scandal. All of Western Christendom was painfully aware of the division within the church and was willing to seek any effective and proper means to resolve the scandal. The details of this work of the Council need not concern us here, however, Constance has usually been studied to shed light on conciliarism, or the balance of power within the church, but in the light of later developments, the movement for reform at the Council and the problems it

encountered are at least equally worthy of attention.

Somewhat surprisingly, there has been relatively little attention to this topic of reform in the literature on Constance. The major work on it, that of B. Hübler,[1] was done more than one hundred years ago, well before the good critical work on Constance by Finke and others beginning around the end of the nineteenth century.[2] The only modern work to devote much attention to it is the volume by Delaruelle, Labande, and Ourliac in the Fliche-Martin series.[3] The Franzen and Muller anniversary volume on Constance from 1964 has no article in it dealing with reform as such.[4] The purpose of this paper is not to fill the gap but simply to survey the movement for reform at the Council and set out the chief problems it encountered.

Some preliminary comments are in order on what is meant by "reform" in the context of this paper.[5] There are probably as many different understandings of reform as there are persons interested in it, because each person seems to have his own notion of what Christianity is or should be. But for the purpose of this investigation, one need only examine the actual discussion of reform in the late Middle Ages. The reformers, or would-be reformers, were reasonably clear on what they meant by reform, and what they hoped to achieve.

Their chief complaint at this time was against an over-institutionalized church, one top-heavy with administration, encroaching on traditional local rights. The frequent calls for reform were calls to return to an earlier, simpler kind of church. The movement for reform included reforms on the personal level and certainly in the area of clerical morality, but it primarily focused on reforms of the system: the legal, the financial, especially the papal administrative and fiscal systems. To some extent, it

included biblical and liturgical reforms as well. But if personal salvation was seen as the ultimate end in life, thoroughgoing reform of the ecclesiastical system was seen as a necessary and prerequisite means to achieving that end, doubtlessly because the policies and practices in the church for which the papal courts were responsible were felt to be among the major frustrations on the path to salvation.

The Reform Movement at Constance

The Council of Constance, which met in the small imperial town on Lake Constance from 1414 to 1418, was assembled because practically everyone in Western Christendom, except possibly the three popes themselves, knew that it had to be. In a sense, it was an "all-or-nothing" attempt that simply had to be successful. Pisa had failed, and hopefully the leaders of the church had learned by their mistakes on that occasion, because Constance could not be allowed to fail. A whole generation of Christians had grown up in a Christianity that was disunited--a contradiction in terms.

The restoration of unity through restoration of the papacy was therefore the most urgent and the most important task facing the Council. But the very idea of calling a general council to settle the problems caused by the Schism had developed only slowly, meeting some reluctance at first. It was only when rival popes seemed destined to continue through their successors indefinitely, with apparently little or no intention of either reforming the Church or ending the Schism that the reform movement adopted conciliarism, the theory of ecclesiastical government which stressed the importance of the general council as a corrective to papal power or the abuse of it. And once the <u>via concilii</u> gained acceptance, around 1400 or shortly thereafter, it was no longer possible to imagine reform taking place

through any means other than a council. The reform movement no longer thought it was possible to have reform without a council; even Luther, 100 years later, thinks of them together. The problem was, as Constance shows, that it was possible to have a council without reform.

When the Council assembled, its purpose was seen as three-fold; three closely related goals: union, reform, and faith, i.e., the curtailment of heresy. The document from the Council of Paris in 1414 dealing with the appointment of the French duputies to the Council of Constance explicitly sees the purpose as union and reform, even though the purpose was not so stated in the bulls of convocation issued jointly by the Emperor Sigismund and Pope John XXIII. It needed no stating, for everyone who would be at the Council knew it.

So well accepted are these goals that they are explicitly stated in Haec sancta, one of the most important decrees of the Council of Constance, issued at the end of March, 1415 and promulgated on April 6:

> This holy synod of Constance, constituting a general council in order to uproot the schism and to unite and reform God's church in its head and members for the praise of almightly God and in the Holy Spirit, legitimately gathered together, and to achieve more securely and freely the union and reform of the church of God, orders, decides and declares as follows:
>
> First, it declares that being lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, constituting a general council and representing the catholic church militant, it has its power directly from Christ, and that all persons of whatever rank or dignity, even a pope, are bound to obey it in matters relating to faith and the end of the schism and the general reformation of the church of God in head and members....

This text, closely linking reform with the power of the council, shows who the chief spokesmen for reform were: essentially the same as the leading conciliarists. This linking of council and reform will prove to be one of the tragedies of this period.

In order to understand what happened to the reform movement at Constance, we have to look very briefly at the structure and operations of the council. What turned into the greatest assembly of the Middle Ages actually got off to a slow start. Some participants were simply delayed in arriving by the hazards of travel or other legitimate excuses, like Sigismund, being crowned, and typically in need of funds, but some were skeptical of the whole venture and waited to see if there really would be a council. Pope John XXIII had been one of the first to arrive at the end of October,1414 and solemnly opened the council on November 5. Sigismund arrived at Christmas, and in January 1415, the number grew rapidly. Along with all the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and leaders of religious orders and military orders that you would expect, there was strong lay representation, especially German princes and nobility, and strong representation from the universities in many professors of theology and canon law. At its largest, the Council included: 3 patriarchs, 29 cardinals, 33 archbishops, 150 bishops, more than 100 abbots, 300 to 400 lesser prelates and doctors of theology and law, all as active participants. Altogether, in the three and one-half years the Council met, thousands of persons gathered there, including so many of the influential leaders of the time.

In all there were 45 solemn sessions which were largely ceremonial and liturgical events for promulgating decrees and other decisions, and hundreds of general congregations and meeting of the nations and various committees.

From the spring of 1415, voting in the general sessions was by nations. At first there were four "nations": English, French, Germans, and Italians, then with the addition of the Spanish supporters of Benedict in 1416 and

1417 there were five. For some purposes the cardinals counted as another "nation". The nations did most of the discussing and debating ahead of time, and seemed to have the power to decide who could or could not vote in their own groups.

Much of the real work, however, was done in the many special committees established during the Council. Several committees were required to deal with Popes John and Benedict who had to be deposed. Other committees were set up to examine the cases of those accused of heresy, like Hus, and Jerome of Prague and others. Similarly, there were three committees to deal with reform.

The Reform Commissions

Much of the real discussion of reform took place in these committees or commissions, and of course the actual reform decrees of the Council were hammered out in these committees. It is probably fair to say that at one point or another in the course of the Council, practically all of the areas felt to be in need of reform and practically all the proposed solutions, even the more radical ones, were discussed. Why then, were not more positive results achieved? The answer to that question lies partly in how the committees worked--or didn't work. The first reform committee was set up at the end of July, 1415, following the request of the Emperor Sigismund and an offer by the cardinals to work with deputies from each of the nations, so as to continue their influence. Composed of eight members from each of the four nations and three cardinals, it met regularly for the next six months or so, but is hardly mentioned the following year.

Concern for reform was felt to be inappropriate in Sigismund's absence and only reappeared in 1417 after his return in January. Reform then played a central role in the great debate over priorities that summer, i.e., over the question of whether the Council should first

finish the work of reform, or, alternatively, elect a pope first, then handle the reform question. The cardinals, backed by most of the Italian, Spanish and many of the French nations, led the drive to have a pope elected first. The cardinals and the rest of the papalist party, ever in favor of a strong papacy, argued that it would be improper for anyone but the pope himself to carry out reform "of the head"--in capite, so a pope was necessary before reform could proceed.[6] Sigismund was pressing strongly for control of the papacy, and saw reform of the papacy before filling the vacancy[7] as one of the best ways to obtain that control. The German nation obviously supported this view, as did the English--at first.

The second reform committee, composed of five delegates from each of the five nations, with the cardinals excluded on the insistence of the Germans,was named shortly after the deposition of Benedict XIII on July 26, and worked until late September, when pressure for a papal election could no longer be resisted. Only a fragment of this committee's work has survived. The English nation, on explicit orders from King Henry, had just ceased supporting the Germans. They must have known their change of position would not only move the Council beyond its impasse, but would also effectively kill the reform movement at the Council,and it did. The motivation for the English action depended in all likelihood on political and military factors, but at the Council, in any case, the English shift to the majority position cleared the way for the election.[8]

According to a compromise agreement arrived at in September, the fruits of the second reform committee (and the first) were to be published by a conciliar decree and put into effect before the election coming up in November, 1417. This agreement covered all the reform decrees already approved by all the nations. These were published in the 39th Solemn

session on October 9, 1417. There were a total of five decrees on as many main points. One of them was the famous Frequens, calling for the frequent holding of a general council, at first after 5 years, then after 7, and thereafter every 10 years. In this decree the influence of the conciliarist theory as part of the reform movement is obvious:

> The frequent holding of general councils is the best method of cultivating the field of the Lord, for they root out the briars, thorns, and thistles of heresies, errors, and schisms, correct abuses, make crooked things straight, and prepare the Lord's vineyard for fruitfulness and rich fertility. Neglect of general councils sows the seeds of these evils and encourages their growth. This truth is borne in upon us as we recall times past and survey the present.
>
> Therefore by perpetual edict we affirm, enact, decree, and ordain that henceforth general councils be held as follows: the first within the five years immediately following the end of the present council, the second within seven years from the end of the council next after this, and subsequently every ten years forever, in places which the supreme pontiff a month before the close of the previous council, with the council's approval and consent, shall name or failing him, the council itself shall appoint and designate. Thus there will be a certain continuity. Either a council will be in session or one will be expected at the end of a fixed period. This period the supreme pontiff, on the advice of his brethern, the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, may shorten in case of emergency but on no account prolong. Nor may he change the place set for the meeting of the approaching council, except for reasons of obvious necessity....

The other decrees dealt with: precautions against future occurrence of Schism; the making of a profession of faith by newly elected pope; non-transferability of higher clergy; and the suppression of spolia and procurations and reservations.[9]

The compromise agreement also attempted to bind the coming pope to carry out reform of "the head and members" before the council closed. In the next session, the 40th on October 30, 1417, a solemn decree covered this reform of papacy and curia by listing 18 areas needing reform.[10] At the same session, the decree on election procedure was published.

The third and final reform committee was appointed in November after the election of the pope, Martin V, and there is unfortunately no written record of its deliberations. It was made up of six representatives of each of the five nations, plus six cardinals, and reported a month before the Council closed, in March 1418. The work of the third committee was obviously different since it had the pope to deal with as well. In conformity to the obligation imposed on him, the new pope cooperated with the committee and individual nations. In January,1418, e.g., he suggested several reform proposals which were sent to the Council from the committee. The pressure was on this committee to produce, but there were fantastic internal pressures and strains too. The biggest difficulty apparently was conflicting national interests. Martin V effectively hindered the committee by insisting on unanimity in its report. Finally, the reform articles which met with general acceptance were promulgated by the Council in the Pope's name in one of the last general sessions, the 43rd on March 21, 1418. Those decrees covered seven areas: exemptions; unions and incorporations; revenues; simony; dispensations; tithes and other taxes; and the life and dignity of the clergy (on dress and haircuts).[11]

In addition, reform measures that had not been agreed on among the nations, but which individual nations favored, were concluded separately, as concordats, between the Pope and that nation. All the concordats, except the one with the English, were for a period of 5 years,i.e., until the next council, which would continue the reform. The English concordat was to be permanent.

While not all the hopes for reform were realized in these few decrees and concordats, still the Council of Constance did some good work; it was simply not enough. And very much, or perhaps everything, would depend on the attitude and actions of the new Pope.

Martin V

What kind of man was the new Pope? He was a Colonna. The Colonnas were one of Italy's strongest families; they had been for centuries and would be down to modern times. They had produced many cardinals, including two of Martin's relatives quite recently, yet he was the first (and only) one ever to become pope.

Born in 1368, he had been a cardinal since 1405, of the Roman obedience, so he had worked with three popes until Constance. Very familiar with political and ecclesiastical life in all its current confusion, he had nevertheless avoided entanglements, although he had worked very hard to make the Council of Pisa successful. He had friendly contacts with both Gregory XII and John XXIII, whom he accompanied to Constance. He was at the Council, busy on many committees, not widely known, and had no enemies, and was therefore a genuine compromise candidate. Cardinal Zabarella might have been another good choice, if he were still alive.

Once elected, what were his priorities? Not the same as the Council, and not the same as reform movement. His chief task was to strengthen the position of the papacy, obviously enough. To reestablish the papacy solidly, he needed to return to Rome, or the Papal States, because he needed money and his territories provided him with his most secure revenue especially since the few reforms actually passed at Constance had the effect of cutting down somewhat on papal revenues. He also needed a certain independence in political and ecclesiastical matters.

He began right after his election by constructing a Curia who would carry out his work. He had enough talent from the three reunited obediences, and drew most heavily from the Avignon group, since they had

the most experience. In compliance with the reform decree, he reduced the number of officials. By some very skillfuly maneuvering on the reform issues, and with introduction of concordats which diffused the reform movement, Martin V preserved some of his traditional rights and revenues, but still needed more money. He left Constance in May, 1418, a month after the Council closed, but because of the political and military situation in Italy, it took him until September, 1420, more than two years, to reach Rome. There he began reorganizing the Papal States and his financial situation. He was quite successful at that task, but he gained his success by no small effort. A fair amount of his time and energy went to reestablishing the papacy in Italy in this way.[12]

In the meantime, he showed a great knack for diplomacy. He carried out an extensive correspondence with all European sovereigns. He sent many embassies on peace missions, especially to England and France. He paid special attention to the campaign against the Hussites in Bohemia. He was in constant touch with the Eastern Church in Constantinople, with prospects of reunion and a council there.

How he did on reform is best seen in terms of his following Council of Constance decrees. He did reasonably well in the Council-ordered reform of the Curia. Especially significant is that he followed Frequens to the letter and called two more councils: Pavia-Siena, 1423, and Basle, 1431 (Ferrara-Florence). When the five year concordats lapsed, he returned as much as possible to the old system of revenues and appointments, but did so legally, since the concordats were not renewed.

Both Pavia and Basle were failures as reform councils, and Pavia dismally. But if Martin V did nothing to make that council a success, neither is he responsible for its failure. He did not prevent its assembly, nor did he flatly oppose the Council, but he did work hard through his

legates to control it. Political problems, like the war between Milan and Florence, presented more immediate obstacles to frustrate the hopes of the reformers.[13]

Overall, there has to be a kind of grudging admiration for Martin V, who was quite a talented politician. The misfortune lay not in what he failed to do so much as in the very fact of his returning to Italy and restoring the Papal States where the Renaiscence would soon catch up his successors. His strong point, then--his successful rebuilding of the Papal States--is also the aspect of his work with such unfortunate results. That task had to have a high priority for him, because without the strong base of his territory he would never have been strong enough to carry through any reforms; but it had so high a priority for him that it displaced any concern for reform he might earlier have felt.

It should, however, be noted that Martin's apparent opposition to reform was really an opposition to conciliarism which he clearly saw as a threat to a strong papacy. Unfortunately, for him as for almost everyone else, reform and conciliarism were inseparable, so in trying to crush conciliarism he also crushed any hope of reform.

Conclusion

The question of why the reform movement failed at Constance, after so much discussion and so much apparent interest, should now be considered. Those who put most of the blame on politics and rising national interests are surely correct. This has been the commonest explanation advanced, and it is certain that no other area of the Council's activity suffered as much from the general political situation. For example, Sigismund's strong call for the "reform of the head" could easily be seen as only the latest chapter in the long struggle between Empire and Church. It was easy to

call for reforms which were aimed at others, but when their proposals began to strike close to home, it was only natural to want to subject such proposals to very long and careful scrutiny. Yet, this explanation is not completely satisfactory. France and England had protected themselves pretty well from papal encroachment and crippling taxation, but why should they object to other people's doing the same? Furthermore, despite the organization of the Council by nations, the delegates were primarily churchmen, not politicians; they were prelates, canonists and theologians.

There may be two additional reasons why the reform movement failed. The first reason goes back to the close link between conciliarism and reform mentioned earlier. The clearest aim of conciliarism was to reunite Christendom and end the Schism. Once that was done, there was no clear statement of purpose to carry it coherently through the work of reform. The phrase "reform in head and members" was, after all, fairly vague, and as a slogan lacked the content and force of later ones like "Scriptura sola" or "faith, not works". Furthermore, because of the link between conciliarism and reform, the papalists automatically opposed reform in opposing conciliarism.

Another reason for the failure of the reform movement which may be valid had to do with the conciliarist ideology, and its notion of the source of power in the church. In using the council to depose the two popes, the conciliarists stressed the authority of the whole church over that of the pope alone, i.e., the greater power of the universitas fidelium. Was there not possibly some risk therein of idealizing or almost glorifying the community of the faithful in opposition to the holders of the papal office? If there were some of that process at work, then they would naturally tend to stress more the need for reform in the head, rather than

the members. Popular religion, its sacramental system and its contact with the Scriptures, would then be of secondary importance in the reform program.

Finally, what are the implications of the failure of reform for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries? The Council of Constance or its failure certainly prepared the way for the Reformation in some indirect but very real ways, and perhaps made it inevitable (if it was not already) and even determined to some extent its shape.

In a sense, the Council of Constance caused the kind of Reformation that took place in the sixteenth century by preventing the very strong reform movement from working any kind of effective reform on the papacy. In April, 1415, in Haec Sancta, the majority of participants in the Council approved the phrase reformatio in capite et membris, but by September, 1417, only Sigismund and the Germans still wanted to do it. The failure of will is not hard to understand in such a long Council, but when Constance rejected any limitation of papal power in the normal governing of the Church, it ruled out the likeliest of the two possible peaceful ways of reforming the Church: i.e., through a council over the pope, or externally. The other way, even less likely and less hopeful, was through a reforming pope, and they were rare. Constance was really a last medieval attempt to maintain the influence of the papacy, through imposing a strong pope, and the outcome of that at this time could only be the Renascence papacy. Ironically, the strong point of Constance was also its weak point.

Footnotes

1. B. Hübler, Die Constancer Reformation und die Concordate von 1418 (Leipzig: 1867).

2. Especially his critical edition: Heinrich Finke, et al., eds., Acta Concilii Constanciensis (4 vols.; Münster: 1896-1928).

3. E. Delaruelle, E.-R. Labande, and Paul Ourliac, L'Église au temps du Grand Schisme et de la crise conciliare 1378-1449, Vol. XIV of Histoire de l'église, ed. by A. Fliche, V. Martin, J.-B. Duroselle, and E. Jarry (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1962).

4. August Franzen and Wolfgang Müller, eds., Das Konzil von Konstanz: Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte und Theologie (Freiburg: Herder, 1964). Another good survey of the theological issues with a helpful bibliography is August Franzen, "The Council of Constance: Present State of the Problem", in Historical Problems of Church Renewal, Concilium, Vol. VII (Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965), pp. 29-68.

5. One obvious background study on this question is the work by Gerhart B. Ladner, The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers (New York: Harper and Row, 1967). It is an extremely useful work, but does not really extend beyond the very early Middle Ages, and thus has little immediate relevance to our topic. Another work which makes a very worthwhile attempt to bring the question of reform through the late Middle Ages is John P. Dolan, History of the Reformation (New York: Desclee, 1965), especially chapters, 2,3, and 4.

6. This argument was present from the beginning and explains why four of the cardinals absented themselves from the session on April 6, 1415 when Haec sancta was promulgated. It also supports the common interpretion of the Council as basically conservative and of an ad hoc nature.

7. All three rival popes had either resigned (Gregory) or been deposed (John, Benedict) by July, 1417.

8. I am indebted to C.M.D. Crowder for an explanation of the English position at the Council and this critical change that took place. Cf.his "Henry V, Sigismund, and the Council of Constance, a Re-examination," Historical Studies, Vol. IV (Pagers Read before the Fifth Irish Conference of Historians), ed. by G.A. Hayes-McCoy (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1963), pp. 93-110.

9. These are given in Louise R. Loomis, trans., The Council of Constance, ed. by J.H. Mundy and K.M. Woody (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), pp. 407 ff.

10. Ibid., p. 417.

11. Ibid., pp. 438 ff.

12. Martin V had first had to defeat the dangerous condottiere Braccio di Montone, and he did it successfully, although not quickly or easily. Then he had to defeat the attempt of King Alfonso V of Aragon to take Naples, and then in 1429 he had to use force to put down a revolt in Bologna. These examples show what some of the Pope's concerns and financial drains were like in this period.

13. For a good recent discussion of this Council, see Walter Brandmüller, Das Konzil von Pavia-Siena, 1423-1424, I: Darstellung (Munster: Aschendorff, 1968).

JOHN KNOX AFTER FOUR HUNDRED YEARS

by W. Stanford Reid

The year 1972 is the year in which we commemorate the death of John Knox, the Scottish Reformer. For this reason it is probably a good thing to look back over the intervening centuries to gain perspective on his work. In estimating his achievements and attempting to understand them, we may well learn something, not only of him but also of ourselves. Indeed, we may even gain some knowledge that will help us in our own endeavours in the latter part of the twentieth century.

Interpretations of Knox since 1572

Ever since Knox's own day many different interpretations of him and his work have been made. Some have been strongly in his favor, apparently with the view that he could do nothing wrong. Others have been just as far in the opposite direction, with the attitude that he could do nothing right. A few have attempted to occupy a middle ground, but they have not been entirely successful in convincing either his foes or his friends, for Knox, as during his life time, has evoked strong emotions that incline to be extreme rather than moderate. In the case of the reformer, neutrality has been almost unknown.

Those who were against him in his own day adopted this stance sometimes because of his very brusqueness, even violence of language and policy. As Sir Thomas Randolph reported to Sir William Cecil in 1562 when it was rumored that Queen Mary would become an Anglican:

> I have not conferred with Mr. Knox in these matters, as shortly I must, who, upon Sunday last, gave the Cross and Candle such a wipe that as wise and learned as himself wished him to have held his peace. 1

Also his statements in this day of Women's Lib. to and about Mary Tudor, Elizabeth and Mary Stewart all won him enemies, even among some who claimed to be Protestants. But probably the thing that brought him the most opposition was his strong Calvinism with which many disagreed, even Calvin at times having to restrain his zealous disciple.[2] Theological differences were undoubtedly the principle causes of anti-Knoxian thought and action.

These attitudes have continued down to the present day. We still find the same anti-Knoxian arguments appearing in post 16th century writings. Archbishop Spottiswood recorded a good many of them and they still crop up in the most recent references to him. One only has to look at the views expressed by Knox's successor in St. Giles, Dr. Charles Warr, revealed in the recent biography by Jasper Ridley, and Professor Hugh in Trevor-Roper's review of that work, or in current accounts of Mary, Queen of Scots, such as that written by Antonia Fraser, to realize how strongly many dislike Knox, and to encounter the arguments with which they support their attitude.[3]

On the other hand, in his own day he had many admirers and supporters. Some saw him primarily as an anti-French and pro-English, but nationalist, leader who favored Scottish independence, both political and ecclesiastical. Some also regarded him as the opponent of despotism both episcopal and royal. To them he represented freedom from religious persecution and political oppression. But probably most important of all, his followers looked to him as the man who succeeded in leading Scotland back to a true knowledge and appreciation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Repeatedly we find statements to this effect in the writings of men such as James Melville, Richard Bannatyne and others.[4] He was to them the apostle of Scotland.

From the days of Andrew Melville who was really his successor down to

the present time, many have held the same opinion. Not until Dr. Thomas M'Crie at the beginning of the nineteenth century and David Laing in the 1860s, worked intensively on Knox's life and writings, however, was much attention devoted to him by those who agreed basically with him. From the time of the publication of his works by Laing in 1864 down to the present time a considerable number of biographies as well as histories of the Scottish Reformation have appeared which have had a favorable attitude to the one whom Geddes MacGregor has termed "The Thundering Scot." Usually those who are prepared to support Knox have been those who have agreed with him theologically and/or politically, and not infrequently, despite all that Knox had to say on the subject of his own shortcomings, have tended to think of him as without blemish or fault.[5]

What is needed, therefore, is a balanced approach to the subject, since Knox rouses such strong feelings in both thos who favor and those who dislike him. While objectivity is never entirely possible, we should try to obtain as unbiassed an appreciation as possible. This we can best do, I believe, by looking first at the balance of forces in the Scotland of his day, and then by attempting to see what he accomplished.

The Balance of Forces in Knox's Scotland

In seeking to understand Knox's situation and to evaluate his achievements, we must first look rather carefully at the situation in which he found himself, and at the forces which both opposed and favored his attempt to reform the whole of Scottish life. Moreover, since Knox, himself, as well as the Scottish Reformation as a whole, was closely connected with the European movement, we must also take into consideration the European context and conflicts which influenced his thought and action.

The 1540's saw Scotland in a state of near political disintegration. Since the early fifteenth century the country had been constantly plagued with repeated eruptions of feudal lawlessness which brought the kingdom to the brink of civil war. From 1542, the year in which the English defeated a large Scottish invading force, indirectly bringing about the death of James V, down to 1560 the year in which the Reformation officially took place, Scotland's political state was even worse. Although the French interest succeeded in dominating the country, the English were constantly interfering and from 1545 to 1551 were actually occupying parts of the kingdom. The resultant effect was at times one approaching total anarchy.

When we keep in mind that the French party was also the Roman Catholic party, while the pro-English group represented, at least during the reign of Edward VI, the Protestant interest, we can see that more than politics entered the picture. French and English were in conflict in Scotland for both political and religious reasons. Yet although the French element dominated the scene generally, they were not able to destory the English-Protestant group, partially because of the government's weakness and partially because of English support of the Protestant group, even to the seizure of such strongholds as Broughty Craf, Haddington and Eyemouth.[6]

Yet the Protestants by themselves were able to give little support to the English or to maintain their independence by their own strength. For one thing, they lacked strong leadership. Throughout the 1540's the leader of the pro-English party was in fact a Roman Catholic, the Earl of Angus, although most of his supporters seem to have been Protestant. Even later when the Lords of the Congregation set themselves up in 1557 they appear to have been able to accomplish little until Knox arrived from France to give some sense of purpose and coherence. Thus

political tension was one of the chief characteristics of Scottish life, with the constant threat of civil war hanging over everything.

Yet despite their difficulties the Protestants were increasing in number and influence. Knox's account in his history of the growth of the movement is well borne out by the records of the day, which tell of the vigorous efforts of the church authorities to stem the rising tide by various means. While Mary of Guise, who had become regent in 1554, had for a time appeared complaisant, largely because she did not have the force to do otherwise, once the Treaty of Cateau Cambresis had been signed between France and Spain in 1558, she prepared to take the necessary action with the support of French troops, to wipe out the obnoxious religious movement.[7]

Her hopes and plans were too late, however, not only because of the growth of the Protestants, but because of the condition of the church itself. True, to all outward appearances it was in a very strong position. Owning probably more than half of the country's real estate, headed by Archbishop James Hamilton, half-brother of James Hamilton, Earl of Arran and Duc de Châtelherault, former regent, its position seemed virtually impregnable.[8] Furthermore, because it represented the element which was devoted to the French cause, it had the hearty backing of Mary of Guise, James V's widow, and a typical representative of the fanatically Roman Catholic family of the Dukes of Lorraine who later organized the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve (1572). From all this, one could hardly have contemplated an easy overthrow of the Roman Church's power in Scotland, though it might happen in England or Germany.

Even these very appearances of strength, however, were in the long run causes of its downfall. For one thing, as in the case of all monopolies, it had become corrupt. Morally it was in a sad state, as anyone may see who reads the acts of the "reforming" councils of the 1550's. Furthermore it was in a low

state intellectually as is shown by a perusal of the introduction to Archbishop Hamilton's catechism. Little or no preaching was done, since the majority of the clergy seem to have been virtually illiterate. There were some scholars such as John Major, Hector Boece and others but they were either teaching a few students in the universities or were serving the crown as government officials. At the level of the average man the church was having relatively little influence beyond the carrying out of certain ceremonies, most of which were in Latin, incomprehensible to the rank and file of the faithful.[9]

This reflected the condition of society as a whole. While the Scots were probably no worse than the English, the French or the Germans, they seem to have been a more openly immoral and violent people. One only has to read through the remissions for murder and other crimes recorded in the Register of the Secret Seal, to obtain some understanding of the social mores of the time. Along with this there was the discontent that was particularly noticeable among both the lairds and the burgesses of the towns. Not only did they have no great interest in the church, but they seem to have felt that they were the exploited element in society. The burgesses were being repeatedly taxed by the crown for its own purposes, often to finance attacks on England, while the lairds were supposed to take part in these attacks as members of the feudal levy. Added to this, inflation was just beginning to take its toll, with the result that the lairds in particular were beginning to feel the pinch. While the great nobles could weather the storm by obtaining royal favors or ecclesiastical benefices for their relatives, neither the gentry nor the townspeople had the same advantages. The result was that this "middle group" were prepared for reform, not merely of the church, but of society as a whole.[10]

Yet if reform were to take place, it would need more than a merely negative

attitude toward the government or the church. Some positive program or ideas were needed. Furthermore, leadership also had to be provided, for without someone who would give some moral force to the demand for reform, nothing much would happen, except perhaps an outbreak of terrorism such as that which manifested itself in the murder of Cardinal Beaton in 1548. Reform needed direction. It was this that John Knox provided, and to understand what he did we must glance first at the background out of which he came and then at what he believed he should do.

With regard to his background, we must keep in mind that he came from Lothian, the burgh of Haddington to be exact, an area constantly overrun by the English and often oppressed by the Earl of Bothwell, from nearby Hailes Castle, or by the Earl of Douglas, from Tantallon. The constant threat to life and property suffered by the lairds of this area bred a race tough in fibre and quick in revenge. They did not mince matters. Linked with this group were the burgesses of Haddington and Edinburgh, men who had suffered because of the constant fighting with the English who had actually occupied Haddington and burned Edinburgh to the ground during the "rough wooing" of the late '40's. Knox spoke both for and to these people, the rural and urban "middle class" of the area. Because of this fact they became and remained his most vigorous and faithful backers. To them were joined, also, the burgesses of Perth, Dundee, Montrose, St. Andrews and other urban centers as well as the lairds of Fife, Angus, Mearns and the southwest. His appeal was to the people of the "middling sort" who wanted reform in many aspects of Scottish life.

The nobles, on the other hand, did not seem to have had the same desire to follow his lead. For one thing he was of a low social status, since his father was probably only a farmer. He was not an aristocrat, nor even an aspiring

laird such as Maitland of Lethington. Furthermore, he had few of the "graces" of the aristocracy. He was far too much inclined to speak his mind in terms that might win the support of the burgesses and bonnet lairds, but which would only offend the more polite, if less honest, nobles. Consequently only a few of the nobles ever gave him their full support. Among those who did were the Earl of Glencairn, the Earl of Rothes, Lord Ruthven and a few others. Even the fifth Earl of Argyll and the Earl of Moray, who became regent on Mary's abdication in 1567, turned away from him at least for a time. One might put Queen Mary in the same category, for when she summoned him to her presence to rebuke him for some of the things he had said, he refused to back down although he always remained polite but plain spoken. The result was that both the Queen and the "politiques" around her became his determined enemies. His directness and at times bluntness did not appeal to Mary's close advisers such as William Maitland of Lethington and others of that ilk.[11]

But it was not just Knox's social background that shaped his attitudes and expression. He had a deep sense of his calling to be a preacher of the Gospel. He had been summoned by the congregation in St. Andrews to enter the ministery in 1548, which left with him a conviction that this was his life's occupation. As he put it in the introduction to one of the few sermons that he published:

> For considering my selfe rather cald of my God to instruct the ignorant comfort the sorowfull, confirme the weak, and rebuke the proud, by tong and livelye voyce in these most corrupt dayes, than to compose bokes for the age to come, seeing that so much is written ..., and yet so little well observed; I decreed to containe my selfe within the bondes of that vocation, wherunto I found my selfe especially called.[12]

It was this conviction that enabled him to carry on, despite all opposition and when his cause seemed almost lost, to encourage and stimulate his supporters to continue their struggle to bring about a radical reform in both church and state.

He had his own experiences of doubt and misgivings which led to retreats at times, it is true, but always he returned to his task with vigor fortified by the consciousness that this was the work to which God had called him. We may not agree with his assurance or his actions, but we can hardly doubt his belief in his own calling.

Added to both his background and his sens of calling were the experiences through which he went during the twelve years before his return to Scotland from Geneva in 1559. On one hand, some of his experiences had been negative in character. In England he had been brought face to face with the manoeuvrings of the great nobles of the realm who often supported the Reformation for their own particular economic ends. He had sympathized with the Protector Somerset, but felt that he proved lukewarm in the Gospel. He had, however, apparently come to distrust the Duke of Northumberland completely as only a feigned Protestant. Furthermore, he had known from personal experience what it meant to come under persecution for the faith. He had served nineteen months in a French galley as a slave tugging at an oar. He had seen something of the persecution of the Protestants in England under Mary Tudor, and had heard with anguish the story of the burning of such men as John Hooper, Hugh Latimer, Nicholas Ridley and Thomas Cranmer. He had also read Chandieu's account of the persecution of the Huguenots in Paris, and may even have seen French Protestants burnt at the stake. Consequently when he returned to Scotland he came with certain doubts about the nobility coupled with a deep hatred of the Roman Catholic Church.

On the other hand, he had also reaped some positive benefits from his experiences in England and on the Continent. For one thing he had spent considerable time on both sides of the channel as pastor of congregations. In England he had ministed to the churches in Berwick-on-Tweed and Newcastle-on-Tyne. On the Continent

he had had the unfortunate experience of being the leader of the English refugee congregation in Frankfort during its most difficult days. When forced out of that city he had been called to the English congregation in Geneva; and just before returning to Scotland he had for some months acted as the co-pastor of the French congregation in Dieppe. In all of these churches he had learned something new. He had come to see the best method of organizing such groups. He had helped to prepare confessions, to translate the Bible into plain English and to deal with the various problems which face every shepherd of souls. He had learned much in twelve years.[13]

On his return to Scotland in 1559, therefore, he did not do so as an inexperienced scholar who had only theories in his head. He landed in Leith on May 3rd, a man who had learned how to lead, a man who had been hardened in the fires of persecution and conflict, a man who knew what he wanted in the way of reform and who was prepared to fight for it. At the same time, he was also convinced that he had been called of God to do this work: a man of faith and prayer. Here was the individual who could pull the Protestant forces together to give them encouragement and strength to oppose the dominant forces of France and Roman Catholicism.

Knox's Achievements

At times we may feel that Knox was overly rigid and even harsh in his judgments and actions. But when we consider the forces against which he was fighting both in Scotland and on the Continent, we may be forced to admit that had he not taken the strong stand that he did, he would have accomplished little or nothing. As it was, despite the oppostion of the old church, of most of the upper nobility and of the corwn, he succeeded in leading the Protestant

forces to victory. True, he had his problems after victory seemed assured in 1560, but he did achieve much more than might have been expected, although not nearly as much as he had hoped.

Probably his most notable accomplishment immediately on his return to Scotland was his restoring of morale to the Protestant forces. Things had not been going well with them. Many had become discouraged and with the set-backs which they suffered in the period just about the time of his landing, they seemed about ready to give up. Repeatedly, however, it was his voice with its clarion call which stimulated them to go on in the name of the Lord. Randolph the English ambassador, spoke of his voice as putting more courage into the Protestants' hearts than the sound of five hundred trumpets continually "blustering in our ears." In this way, Knox laid down the foundation for the ultimate success of the Protestants, by giving them the confidence that ultimately the victory was theirs.[14]

His influence, however, was more than purely psychological. He brought to the Scots something that he had imbibed when in Geneva: the concept that the whole of life was to be lived to the glory of God. His view of his own calling to the ministry he repeatedly expressed to both friend and foe alike, but in so doing he also spoke in terms of the calling of others to their work. He did not hesitate to point out to the two queens, Mary and Elizabeth, that they were called to serve God in their sphere. Likewise he repeatedly stressed the same idea to the nobles and to the people in general. His words reported by his servant Robert Bannatyne: "So long as I live, lat me live, O Lord, to thy glorie" represent well what he felt all men should do.[15] This point of view he succeeded in impressing on a few, at least, who were to carry on his tradition. He gave the Scots a new pattern of life, a new sense of personal responsibility.

At the more mundane level, he gave them a new church organization with this term being taken in its broadest sense. Largely responsible for the Scots' Confession and the Book of Discipline, he helped to lay down the basic principles upon which the Reformed church in Scotland was to be constructed. True he did not work out all the organizational details, but he sought to make the church as thoroughly Reformed as he possibly could. In this endeavour he was constantly blocked the Roman Catholic opposition, but even by some of those who professed to agree with his views, but who would suffer economically if his plans for the church's financial support were implemented. Nevertheless in 1566 he could assert

> For as touching the doctrine taught by our ministers, and as touching the administration of the Sacraments used in our Churches, we are bold to affirm that there is no realm this day upon the face of the earth that hath them in greater purity; yea .... there is none .... that hath them in like purity.

His hopes, he felt, had at least been partially realized.[16]

His plans and purposes did not stop with the church, for he believed that only a well educated populace would be spiritually sound and mature. Consequently he was very much interested in establishing a school system which would give all Scots adequate training for the service of God and the commonwealth. The Book of Discipline laid down plans for a system of education which would eventually enable those with the necessary mental equipment to attend university. It took a considerable time for this design to be implemented, but eventually it did, so that G. M. Trevelyan could comment that in the Union of 1707 England joined with the best educated nation in Europe.[17]

One other influence which Knox had was in the matter of care for the poor. This had always been one of his concerns, so we need hardly be surprised that in the Book of Discipline it also appears. He had seen what a problem

poverty had been to the authorities in Edinburgh, a problem intensified by the depression which was affecting Europe as a whole in the 1560's. But it was not just becuase of a temporary situation that he insisted on some form of poor relief. He constantly maintained that it was the Christian's duty to care for his brother's economic needs in this world. He had already advised congregations that they should take up collections for the poor at their services of worship, and when he had the opportunity he repeatedly pressed home on the government the importance of its doing something to alleviate the misery of poverty which was so prevalent in Scotland. On numerous occasions he raised the question in the General Assembly of the church to persuade that body to take action to persuade parliament or the Privy Council to attend to the matter. He was by no means always successful, but he undoubtedly had considerable influence in this regard.[18]

John Knox, much as he may be disliked in some quarters, undoubtedly exercised a major influence on Scotland - even among those who disagreed with him. By his preaching and his leadership in other ways he undoubtedly affected Scottish character. Even such an anti-Calvinist as Robert Louis Stevenson has to admit this, whether he will or not. Furthermore, he laid down the basis for the later development of Presbyterianism under Andrew Melville which led on to the Covenanters of the 17th century, the seceeders of the 18th and the Disruption of 1843. Whether one likes him or not, one cannot but admit that he has had a powerful impact on Scotland.

When we go on to think of the Scottish influence outside of Scotland, we must also admit that Knox has also made his mark abroad, especially in the United States and Canada. The Scots who migrated did not come primarily as mercenary soldiers as they had gone to Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries. They came rather as pioneer settlers whether to North

Carolina, Nova Scotia or the backlands of Ontario. Wherever one turns one finds relics of their advent to this continent, indicating their influence in every sphere of activity and endeavour. The same could be said of Australia and New Zealand and even Africa and the Orient. And with them they took the characteristics which had been moulded and formed from their inheritance of Knoxian Calvinism.

Whether we think of him as a difficult and abrasive individual or even as a figure of fun, we have to acknowledge that Knox achieved much in his own day and generation. Moreover, he did so against great odds and strong opposition. We may learn, moreover, from his experience that despite all opposition a man of Christian faith who has the power to communicate his ideas to people, can do much to change and stimulate even a whole nation to follow new paths and to serve God in its day of opportunity.

#

Department of History,
University of Guelph.

FOOTNOTES

1. J. Knox, WORKS, D. Laing, ed., (Edinburgh, 1864), VI, 139.
2. IBID., VI, 94ff: II, 26f; IV, 354.
3. C. L. Warr, THE PRESBYTERIAN TRADITION, (London, 1933), pp. 250 ff, cf. D. MacKinno DR. CHARLES L. WARR ON JOHN KNOX, A CRITICISM, (Edinburgh, 1954); J. Ridley JOHN KNOX, (New York, 1968), pp. 465ff; H. Trevor-Roper, JOHN KNOX, THE LISTENER, 80 (1968), 745 ff; A. Fraser, MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, (New York, 1970), part 2.
4. R. Bannatyne, A JOURNAL OF THE TRANSACTION IN SCOTLAND, (Edinburgh, 1806), pp. 427ff; J. Melville, DIARY, (Edinburgh, 1829), p. 21.
5. T. M'Crie, LIFE OF JOHN KNOX, (Edinburgh, 1806); G. MacGregor, THE THUNDERING SCOT, (Philadelphia, n.d.).
6. Ridley, OP.CIT., chap.I; M.H. Merriman, "The assured Scots: Scottish collaboration with England during the Rough Wooing," SCOTTISH HISTORICAL REVIEW, XLVII (1968) 10ff; J. N. Charteris, The Rise of the English Party in Scotland (1524-43) [Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, McGill, Montreal], passim.
7. JOHN KNOX'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND, W.C. Dickinson, ed., (Edinburgh, 1949), I, 42ff.
8. ACCOUNTS OF THE COLLECTORS OF THE THIRDS OF BENEFICES, 1561-1572, G. Donaldson, ed., (Edinburgh: Scottish Hist. Soc., 1949), p.viif; W. L. Mathieson, POLITICS AND RELIGION, Glasgow, 1902), pp. 27ff; I.F. Grant, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF SCOTLAND BEFORE 1603, (Edinburgh, 1930), pp.223ff.
9. STATUTES OF THE SCOTTISH CHURCH 1225-1559, D. Patrick, ed., (Edinburgh,: S.H.S., 1907), pp. 84ff; THE CATECHISM OF JOHN HAMILTON, , T.G. Law, ed., (Oxford, 1884), Introduction and Preface; D. H. Fleming, THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND, (London, 1910), pp.39ff.
10. Grant, OP.CIT., pp. 384ff; W.S. Reid, SKIPPER FROM LEITH, (Philadelphia, 1962), passim; W.S. Reid, "The coming of the Reformation to Edinburgh," CHURCH HISTORY, 42, (1973), pp. 27ff.

11. Knox, HISTORY, II, 13ff, 43f, 72ff, 93, 108ff; 134f.
12. Knox, WORKS, VI, 229.
13. In order to gain an understanding of the impact which these various experiences had on Knox it is necessary to read through most of the six volumes of his collected works.
14. Knox, HISTORY, I, 265ff; CALENDAR OF SCOTTISH PAPERS, J. Bain, ed., (Edinburgh, 1898), I, no. 1017.
15. Bannatyne, OP.CIT., (Edinburgh, 1836), p. 16.
16. Knox, HISTORY, II, 3, I, 343ff.
17. IBID., II, 295ff.; G.M. Trevelyan, A SHORTENED HISTORY OF ENGLAND, (London, 1942), p.342.
18. Knox OP.CIT., II, 290f, 302f.

Robert Choquette,
University of Ottawa,
1972.

"Linguistic and Ethnic Factors in the French-Irish Catholic Relations in Ontario."

I-Introduction

Since the British conquest under Wolfe in 1759, Canada has been made up of two major linguistic and cultural groups, the French and English. Although insignificantly small in numbers atthe outset, the ranks of the Anglophone group were soon swelled by the immigration of some thirty-five thousand Loyalists from the United States after the American Revolution; the Canadiens in 1760 numbered some seventy thousand Francophones. In 1791, in order to satisfy the demands of the increasing Anglophone community who felt ill at ease under the civil laws and customs of French Canada, the British Government divided its Canadian colony into two semi-autonomous entities, namely Lower Canada for the French, and Upper Canada for the English, the latter being largely a frontier territory. In 1840, the two Canadas were reunited under a common government with each section electing fifty percent of the Legislature of the United Canadas. Since the British North-America Act of 1867 establishing Canadian Confederation, the country has been divided into provinces, Ontario being the wealthiest and most powerful.

Until the 1850's, Francophones constituted a majority of the Canadian population; since Confederation the reverse has been true, and increasingly so. The growth of the French Canadian population has been due almost exclusively to a phenomenally high birth-rate to which immigration has added hardly at all. In fact almost every immigrant to the country adopts the English language, even in the predominantly Francophone province of Québec. From 1760 until Québec's Quiet Revolution of the nineteen sixties, the Roman Catholic Church held an unchallenged sway over French Canadian society, serving as its only native and powerful social structure.

The scarcity of arable land in Québec's Saint Lawrence river valley coupled with the density of the area's population and periodic economic crises, prompted Francophones, in the last three quarters of the nineteenth century, to migrate in ever increasing numbers to the adjacent province of Ontario. Needless to say, their Church accompanied them. During this same period, Irish immigrants also began coming to Canada, as a result of the critical conditions prevalent in Ireland in the mid-nineteenth century. Although Ontario had previous settlements of Francophones in its southwestern tip, namely the descendants of farmers who had fed the Detroit outpost of the French colonial empire, as well as Scottish Anglo-catholics who had settled with their priest Alexander MacDonell in the southeastern part of the Province in the early nineteenth century, the phenomenon of large-scale Catholic immigration,

both French and English, became a subject of concern and a springboard for nativist feelings among Ontario's Protestant Anglophone population.

At the outset, during the eighties and nineties, the main conflict was religious; the Protestants, led by the Orangemen, and the Protestant Protective Association (1891-1897), feared a Catholic takeover of their country, and the Catholics, in spite of their ethnic differences, stuck together in order to ward off the attacks of the Protestants. Within this context, schools became the foci of debate, the Catholics wanting full equality in tax-sharing for their public (but separate) schools. Indeed, Ontario had a system of public (or common) schools, all subject to the Ontario Department of Education, but wherein local school boards could declare their schools denominational, and thereby become 'Separate' schools. The Protestants as a rule wanted one faith, one flag and one language.

The issue which was allegedly a religious conflict at its inception, slowly transformed itself in the three decades between 1883 and 1913 into an explicitly ethnic, linguistic and cultural conflict, and the Roman Catholics who had resisted the Orangemen's sallies in unison during the eighties and nineties, became progressively more divided along linguistic and cultural lines. By 1910 the latter issue took precedence over the Protestant-Catholic quarrel. Bishops, clergy and faithful began to line up according to their ethnic affiliation and to see

their principal opponents as either Irish or French-Canadian Catholics, and by the same token the Protestant 'enemy' receded into the background. In a rather intriguing 'about-face,' in the second decade of the twentieth century, the Irish Catholics of Ontario were defending the same cause as their traditional enemies the Orange Lodges, against the French Catholics, their erstwhile allies.

Although, on a province-wide scale the English-French conflict appeared primary only by 1910, in two exclusively Roman Catholic institutions, namely the Church hierarchy and the University of Ottawa, the Irish-French battle came to a head somewhat sooner. The engagement within the hierarchy developed during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and continued through the first quarter of the twentieth; knowledge of the skirmishing was usually hid from public view. The University of Ottawa's difficulties occurred particularly between 1898 and 1908; this ethnic, racial and linguistic war made the headlines of several newspapers.

Since my topic is not Ontario nativism but English-French conflict within Ontario Catholicism during the first quarter of the twentieth century I begin by studying in a first part the question of the University of Ottawa, and the factors leading up to the 1910 ACFEO congress, presenting these as preliminary skirmishing prior to the main French-English engagement studied in a second part. The latter will consist in studies centering first on Bishop Michael Francis

Fallon of London, and second on the Ontario Department of Education's Circular of Instructions No. 17 , the two foci of the ethnic and linguistic quarrels between 1910 and 1927.

II-Thesis

Ethnic, cultural and linguistic awareness, passion and prejudice were a primary motivation for Ontario Roman Catholics during the first quarter of the twentieth century. Indeed, whenever these factors appeared at odds with other norms of decision (such as the pronouncements of the hierarchy, the civil governments, or the courts) the former overshadowed the latter among both Francophone and Anglophone Canadians.

This study is important for several reasons, the most manifest being that it constitutes a key part of the historical inquiry into French-English relations in Canada, an issue involving the very survival of the country. It may serve to defuse an explosive situation fostered in part by ignorance of the history of these relations, and may thereby contribute to the building of a really bilingual and bicultural Canadian nation.

While English-French conflict during my chosen period is crucial to the understanding of the contemporary Canadian scene, the role of the Roman Catholic Church in this problem is largely ignored; yet that Church's part in this controversy was central. Churchmen played a leading though not exclusive part therein. Furthermore .the..study shows that the French Canadian hierarchy and clergy, rather than

'selling-out' to the English 'establishment' in return for varied favors (a charge frequently repeated in French Canada), were the main leaders and defenders of the Franco-Ontarian in his struggle for equal rights. It will also be shown that the Irish Canadian hierarchy and clergy, led by Bishop Fallon, were the foremost opponents of the French Canadians and the most militant apostles of the unilingual-English political ideology in Ontario. While the few publications on or around this subject present the entire issue in a political and educational setting, I will show how Roman Catholic Churchmen initiated, led and largely controlled the entire struggle from beginning to end among both French and English Catholics.

Just as the Anglo-Protestants of Ontario were responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in the late nineteenth century, they were to be, ironically enough, the main agents of the restoration of peace and harmony in the twenties. This serves to underline the fact that ethnic, linguistic and cultural bitterness and prejudice were more consistently manifested by Catholics of Ontario than they were by the Protestants. It will also be suggested that within the ranks of Catholicism, the most insecure faithful, that is to say those feeling 'conquered,' namely the Irish Canadians and the French Canadians, will constitute the most virulent and uncompromising antagonists.

The analysis of this English-French clash in the early twentieth century will bring to light the different ideologies

and presuppositions of each party. The Anglophone Catholics merely reflected the mood of the times in their 'progressive' faith in Imperialism and Anglo-Saxon superiority; they only outdid their Protestant fellow-citizens in the intensity of this faith, nourished by the insecure and therefore agressive militancy of the large Irish Canadian contingent within Ontario Catholicism. The French Catholics on the other hand, educated in a minority psychology, both politically and religiously, were endeavoring to preserve and develop a French Canadian Catholic culture in a majority English Protestant province. They thus fought for bilingualism and biculturalism in Ontario, and it is interesting to see that the editorials in Le Devoir by Henri Bourassa, the man whom Fallon saw as his arch-enemy in his 'Nationalist' capacity, could be taken verbatim as the present-day policies of the governments led by L.B. Pearson in the 1960's and P.E. Trudeau in the late sixties and early seventies.

Both camps made use of every weapon available, including their church and diplomatic pressures by foreign governments. The French and English Canadian Roman Catholic hierarchy each appointed an agent in Rome to defend their respective causes. The study shows the vast amount of misunderstanding of each party by the other, and the unquestionable sincerity of most of the actors. It also shows how, an ethnic minority group in Ontario, supported by the Francophone Catholics of Québec, succeeded in breaking an Ontario law unfavorable to themselves, and how they succeeded in reversing the policies

of Rome with regard to the language and cultural affiliation of episcopal nominees to Ontario sees.

Finally, given that the Canadian Roman Catholic Church is the only large Canadian institution with deep roots in all parts of the country and with a relatively unified government, knowledge of its involvement in Canada's foremost national problem may foster its greater participation in the construction of a bilingual and bicultural but united country.

Therefore, while recognizing the importance of Catholicism in the building of Canada, I will be arguing that whenever ethnic, cultural and linguistic factors appeared at odds with Church directives between 1897 and 1927, the former took priority among both French and English Catholics.

III-The Story

My study is set in a framework of developing ethnic, linguistic and cultural awareness, beginning to grow on several fronts during the last three decades of the nineteenth century, reaching a peak of virulence during the first fifteen years of the twentieth century, and slowly ddclining thereafter until its public termination in 1927. I have chosen the year 1897 as a point of departure for that is when Archbishop Duhamel of Ottawa sent a lengthy report to Rome arguing against the division of his Archdiocese as solicited by Ontario's Anglophone Catholic hierarchy. Also, the Reverend M.F. Fallon, O.M.I., had been appointed Vice-Rector of the University of Ottawa in 1896, and was just getting in stride by 1897 as leader of Ottawa's

Irish-Catholic community. The year 1927 was the time when the Ontario Legislature abrogated the Ontario Department of Education's Circular of Instructions No. 17 , the ruling which had fed the fires of nativism and racism since 1912.

English-French conflict within Ontario Catholicism during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was manifest in two areas, the ecclesiastical and the educational, the latter area leading simultaneously to political conflict. I will deal with each of these in turn.

The fourth Provincial Council of Québec in 1868 divided Canada into three ecclesiastical provinces, namely Québec, Toronto, and Saint-Boniface, the norm of division being that Québec was for the French, Toronto for the English, and Saint-Boniface for the 'mëtis' or half-breeds (mixture of Indian and French Canadian Voyageurs), the latter being centered in the prairies of Western Canada. The diocese of Ottawa, Ontario, straddled the boundary between the two civil provinces of Québec and Ontario, but since the majority of its Roman Catholic faithful was Francophone, the Bishop was Francophone and was a suffragan of the Québec Archbishop and belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Québec. The Archbishop of Toronto disliked this state of affairs and informed Ottawa's Bishop Guigues as early as 1868 that he would ask Rome to make Ottawa part of the T^{o}ronto ecclesiastical province. Guigues resisted until his death in 1874, whereupon the English bishops of Ontario submitted a petition to Rome arguing the same case.

J.T. Duhamel, Guigues' successor in Ottawa in 1874, also objected to the Toronto move, claiming it was merely an attempt by the English of Ontario to remove the French-speaking Bishop of Ottawa and replace him by an English-speaking one. Rome temporized, and the Toronto group reiterated its plea in 1879 and again in 1881. The latter attempt was prompted by a petition by the Archbishop of Québec in 1881 requesting that Rome promote Ottawa to the level of Archdiocese, and make it the head of a new ecclesiastical province, continuing to straddle the Ontario-Québec boundary. This was done in 1886. However, Toronto continued to pressure Rome, demanding that the Ottawa Archdiocese be split to conform with the civil boundaries and that Ottawa become a part of the ecclesiastical province of Toronto. Increased pressures in this regard forced Archbishop Duhamel to write a rebuttal in 1897.

In 1899, Rome established a permanent Apostolic Delegation in Ottawa, and thereafter a new series of actors or middlemen would participate in all of Canadian Catholicism's problems.

Ecclesiastical French-English quarrels were to come to a head in 1910, for on April 25 of that year, the Reverend M.F. Fallon O.M.I. was consecrated Bishop of London, Ontario, a bi-ethnic diocese, and in August, Archbishop C.H. Gauthier of Kingston was transferred to the see of Ottawa, vacant since Duhamel's death in 1909. Fallon's appointment was unfortunate, for the man was already seriously compromised by his involvement in

the University of Ottawa affair; he would detonate the ethnic explosive which had become very unstable by 1910. By the same token, Gauthier's sympathies were all with the English camp : he had called and chaired an August 15, 1910 meeting of Ontario's Anglophone Bishops which pressured the Ontario Premier to disregard the requests of the January, 1910, Congress of Franco-Ontarians. Yet Rome appointed Gauthier to direct the destinies of an Archdiocese and ecclesiastical province whose faithful were 4/5 French.

Thereafter there was no end to controversy over ecclesiastical affairs. Zealots of both parties compiled statistics to show the numbers of English or French faithful in parishes, dioceses, schools, and mission posts. In mixed parishes the comparative length of French and English sermons, catechism classes, and singing was tabulated. Any and all episcopal vacancies were the occasion for lengthy and varied petitions by an increasing number of interested parties including Bishops, clergy, and politicians, requesting a successor of their persuasion or at least the transfer of their 'bigot' elsewhere in order to make room for their man. Appeals by Rome or by other men of good will were of no avail; the disease had to run its course.

The clash between French and English Catholics over education was somewhat more extensive and complex. It first came to a head during the first decade of the twentieth century at the University of Ottawa. This skirmish would train the war-

riors for the broader provincial stage during the next decade.

Incorporated in 1848 as Saint Joseph's College in Bytown (later Ottawa), and chartered in 1866 at the last session of the Parliament of the United Canadas, the University of Ottawa was from the outset a bilingual school established by its founder Bruno Guigues, O.M.I., a Frenchman, to serve the needs of the Ottawa area. Guigues was also the first Bishop of Ottawa as well as Provincial Superior of the Oblates in Canada. Upon his death in 1874, the school became unilingual English and remained so until 1901 when it reverted back to its bilingual policy.

The Reverend M.E. Fallon,O.M.I., newly-ordained (1894) was appointed in 1894 to the University as a Professor of english. In 1896 he was also appointed Vice-Rector and during these years he became the foremost leader of Ottawa's Anglophone Catholic population. For reasons unknown, but perhaps because of his manifest Anglophilia and Francophobia (he claimed to love the French language and the French people, but he could never get along with them) he was removed as Vice-Rector in 1898, and was appointed Pastor of the campus' St. Joseph Church. Fallon led the resistance to the University's reversion to bilingualism in 1900-1901, and in the summer of 1901 he was made Religious Superior of the Oblate 'Holy Angels' parish in Buffalo N.Y. He later claimed his removal from Ottawa resulted from a plot.

However, although stationed outside the country, Fallon

remained the central figure in the University of Ottawa ethnic war which raged from 1901 to 1908. His Ottawa partisans made him just as effectively present as if he had been there in person. Through a series of short visits back to Ottawa, Fallon managed to remain very much in the center of things. The English camp protested and fought every move by the University authorities which could possibly be construed as partial to the French and prejudicial to the English. One headline followed another in the local newpapers as Ottawa's Catholic University became a racist battlefield. At one stage or another the partisans managed to enlist Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Apostolic Delegates, Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, and, necessarily, the international administration of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. No churchman or church decree carried enough weight to quell the controversy.

In spite of the above episode's virulence however, the educational conflict between French and English Canadians that was to determine much of Canada's future history only erupted during the second decade of the century.

Since 1883, as a result of extensive French Canadian migration into Ontario and the simultaneous English Canadian migration from Ontario to the Western provinces and to the United States, nativism began to characterize Ontario politics. The Orange lodges became very active in shaping public opinion and in pressuring the Ontario government, primarily through the parliamentary Opposition Conservative party. The result

was a series of government-sponsored inquiries into the status and quality of Ontario's bilingual schools (the schools of the Francophone minority), and some provincial regulations requiring that the teaching in these schools be done in the English language (1885, 1891). But legal loopholes in these rulings allowed the bilingual schools to continue operations as before, and Ontario's Liberal government tolerated the situation.

During the nineties Ottawa was the scene of initial educational skirmishing between French and English Catholics. The Ottawa Separate School Board, elected by Separate School ratepayers, operated both the English and bilingual schools of its jurisdiction. Because of growing discontent and ethnic-linguistic consciousness among parents and their representatives on the Board, it was decided at a public meeting of 1886, chaired by Archbishop Duhamel, that the Board would thereafter divide itself into a French and an English Committee, each being responsible for the handling of funds and the enactment of educational regulations applicable to bilingual and English Separate Schools respectively. It is significant that Fallon, then a student at the University of Ottawa, attended this meeting. The arrangement was based on an agreement whereby each city ward would be entitled to have one English and one French trustee, and whereby English voters would not interfere in the election of the French trustee and vice-versa. This arrangement appears to have worked to the mutual satisfaction of both parties until 1903, when because of the controversy

which was raging around the University of Ottawa, Francophone rate payers intervened in one city ward's Separate School Board election helping to defeat the English candidate who was unsympathetic to bilingualism and thereby electing an Anglophone candidate who was sympathetic to the claims of the Francophones. The French thereby gained an effective majority on the Separate School Board and in 1906, the system of dual Committees was abolished and all schools, both bilingual and English, reverted to the direct control of the full Board of Trustees. By this time, Francophones constituted a sizeable majority (2/3) of the Catholics subject to the Ottawa Separate School Board but were nevertheless electing only nine of the Board's eighteen Trustees.

In this context, the Anglophone Catholic faction claimed that it was contributing more tax dollars than the Francophone Catholic and that the School Board was spending more on the bilingual Schools than on the English Separate Schools. This claim appears to have been unfounded.

The turn of the century, also witnessed another French-English issue in Ottawa. 'Les Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes,' a Roman Catholic Congregation of teaching Brothers, had established themselves in Ottawa in the early 1860's and had grown by the nineties into the largest teaching Order in the city, staffing most of the boys' schools. In 1893-1894, they were accused of a series of misdemeanors in their administration of several Ottawa Separate Schools (e.g. outdated pedagogical

theory, mediocre manuals, overpricing of textbooks, arbitrary discipline), and a movement to oust them from Ottawa was initiated by some prominent Ottawa Francophones. It happened that these same French ratepayers were members of an Ottawa liberal intellectual group and members of the Ontario Liberal party. Archbishop Duhamel, supported by his clergy, saw their move against the Brothers as a manifestation of anticlericalism and excessive anglophilia. In fact these liberals even wrote newspaper articles on Roman Catholic ecclesiology, which were anything, but, ultramontane. They succeeded in having the 'Frères' removed from the city's schools in 1897, much to the Archbishop's regret; by then, however, even this controversy had begun to take on linguistic and ethnic overtones. The Brothers were to return in 1902.

In 1907, after a prolonged judicial dispute, the King's Privy Council in Great Britain upheld an Ontario Court ruling that 'Religious' (Nuns and Brothers) teachers in Ontario, had to obtain provincial certification just as any other teacher. Ontario's Catholic hierarchy had fought this regulation, particularly because of its effect on the bilingual Catholic schools. In fact these schools were largely staffed by 'Religious' coming from the province of Québec where no provincial certification laws existed apart from those enacted by particular congregations of 'Religious'. If these teachers were required to qualify by Ontario standards, many would return to Québec and Ontario's bilingual schools would lose many of

its cheap laborers.

This prompted the Ottawa Franco-Ontarians to meet in late 1908, the outcome being a resolution to call a Congress representative of all the French of Ontario. The meeting was held in January 1910, attended by some 1,200 delegates. The Congress, via its Executive, sent a list of requests to the Ontario Government in February, 1910.

Meanwhile, Ontario's Bishops were on the verge of obtaining more advantageous tax-sharing for Ontario's Separate schools. The Government, in late 1909, agreed to submit to the Legislature a revised bill to that effect, the text of which had been hammered out to the mutual satisfaction of the Bishops and the Government. But after receiving the requests of the Association Canadienne-Francaise d'Education d'Ontario (ACFEO), the Premier informed the English Bishops that this so complicated matters that their tax-sharing bill would not be submitted to the Legislature in the foreseeable future. The Bishops were furious, and began calling meetings of Ontario's English-speaking Bishops only, whereas both the English and French hierarchies of Ontario were invited to former meetings. It is at this time (April 1910), that Fallon was consecrated Bishop of London, and at a meeting of August 15, 1910, the English-speaking Bishops of Ontario, delegated him as their spokesman to pressure the provincial government against any compromise with the Franco-Ontarians.

Fallon had seen ethnic action before this, however. Less

than a month after his consecration of April 25, 1910, he had convened a high official of the Ontario Department of Education in order to express to him, in most categorical terms, his determination to suppress all bilingual schooling in his diocese and to handle any and all clerical agitators defending that cause; he wanted the government to do its share on the political and administrative side. Mr. Hanna reported this conversation to his superior, Doctor Pyne, Minister of Education, in a lengthy letter, which was released to the press four months later, by a Francophone sympathizer working for an Ontario Cabinet Minister, and published in Le Devoir in October 1910. On June 5, 1910, the Detroit Free Press in an article entitled "French and Irish War in Ontario," made the issue a public one and stated that the Irish Catholics of Ontario were now defending the same cause as the Orangemen, their traditional enemies, against the French Catholics. In July, Bishop Fallon reiterated his stand in a diocesan retreat for priests, and in August, Premier James Pliny Whitney wrote the A.C.F.E.O. telling them that the law as it then stood allowed the Franco-Ontarians all desirable freedom.

In September of 1910, at a Montreal Eucharistic Congress, Archbishop Bourne of London, England, made a speech arguing that the Catholic Church in Canada had better adopt the English language as its sole mode of expression, for English was the language of the future. This prompted Henri Bourassa, former federal Member of Parliament, and editor in chief of Le Devoir

in Montréal, to respond by defending the French Canadians' right to speak French in their country, and to advise churchmen to 'be all things to all men' and thus to speak French with Francophone people. His newspaper thereupon published the Hanna-Pyne letter of May 1910, relating the Fallon-Hanna conversation in Sarnia, Ontario. Fallon then reentered the play by a public speech in Goderich, Ontario, arguing anew his belief that bilingualism was pedagogically unsound, its only result being to make the French Canadians 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.'

Meanwhile the Ontario Gobernment had established another Commission of Inquiry led by Dr. Merchant, and bearing again on Ontario's bilingual schools. The Commissions's Report led to the enactment of Circular of Instructions No. 17 by the Ontario Department of Education in June of 1912, this being made a permanent law in August of 1913. The Circular, commonly referred to as 'Regulation XVII,' forbade the use of French as a language of instruction or communication in any school of Ontario, except in cases where in the judgment of the Chief Inspector of Schools, the children could not understand English. In the latter case, French could be used in the first two years of schooling but not thereafter.

Since the regulation only affected French-speaking pupils, and since the latter were almost all Catholic, and therefore the great majority being in Separate schools under the strong control of the provincial Bishops, the 'Regulation

XVII' controversy was particularly acute within Catholicism. Bishop Fallon led the Anglophone Catholic camp, the ACFEO prompted by Franco-Catholic Bishops and clergy led the Franco-Ontarian camp, and the Ottawa Separate School Board, advised by the ACFEO led the open defiance of the Ontario Government's 'Regulation XVII.'

Samuel Genest, Chairman of the Ottawa Board and future President of the ACFEO (1919-1921), informed the Ontario Department of Education in September 1912, that Ottawa would not comply with 'seventeen'. Toronto thereupon threatened and cajoled the Ottawa Trustees but to no avail. Meanwhile, Ottawa Anglophone Catholics became progressively more vociferous and menacing, particularly after the Toronto Government withheld all grants from the Ottawa Separate School Board until they complied with the infamous Regulation. Genest was not to give in. Teachers went unpaid, all building programs were discontinued, collections were taken up throughout the Province of Québec, and the Québec Legislature passed special legislation enabling Québec school boards to contribute to the Ottawa cause. Whenever English school Inspectors appeared in bilingual schools, children left their classrooms by windows and fire escapes.

In an attempt to break its bilingualist opposition, the Ontario Legislature passed special legislation in 1915 dissolving the Ottawa Separate School Board and appointing in its place a three man Commission. The Ottawa Board thereupon

appealed to the Courts claiming the Ontario Legislature's move was ultra vires. The King's Privy Council ultimately upheld the Genest appeal, the Commission was dissolved, the elected School Board reinstated, and the three member Commission was sued for illegitimately spending the Ottawa Separate School Board's funds.

Ottawa's Francophone resistance had its dramatic moments. When the three man Commission of 1915 took over a local school, ousting its regular teachers and mounting a police guard to prevent the rebels from returning, Ottawa's Franco-Catholic parents converged on the school and while the men kept the police busy, the regular teachers reentered through the windows. The women then mounted a day and night guard around the school to prevent a recurrence of the incident; they used hat pins as weapons. Lady Laurier, wife of Canada's former Prime Minister, chaired a drive to collect money to purchase coal for the schools, and Ottawa's teaching Brothers led the local schoolchildren in demonstrations and protest parades.

The Canadian Catholic hierarchy divided along linguistic and cultural lines, for or against 'seventeen'. The Anglophone Catholic hierarchy to a man, favored the new ruling; the Franco-Catholic hierarchy just as unanimously rejected it. Rome endeavored to obtain a compromise solution, but to no avail; indeed the Cardinal-Archbishop of Québec and Primate of the Catholic Church in Canada warned Rome that if the French Canadian observed many more instances of a pro-Anglicization

policy by the Church, particularly in the nomination of Bishops, there were strong possibilities that schism would ensue, for the French Catholics were resolved to defend their rights at all costs.

While several appeals in the Courts were being decided (1914-1916) in favor of the Government's stand, Pope Benedict XV, in 1916, sent a letter to the Canadian Bishops urging peace and understanding, defending the right of Francophones to learn and speak their language, and urging the Government's right to require that they learn English. This was the position the French Canadians had defended all along; the English Bishops agreed but insisted that the first two years of elementary schooling were sufficient for the French language: thereafter all should speak English. A meeting of all Ontario Bishops was held in January 1917 in Ottawa, whereupon Fallon published a lengthy (60 pp.) memorandum to his episcopal colleagues, defending his stand on Regulation XVII, decrying the abuse he was subjected to by French newspapers, and calling upon the assembled Bishops to do nothing about 'seventeen'. The assembled Lords did manage, however, to publish a joint pastoral letter to their faithful which rather blandly repeated the Pope's statement, but hardly added anything to it. This letter did however show a willingness to stay together, for it was signed by all Ontario Bishops, both French and English. It marks the end of the period of open warfare among the Catholics of Ontario. Bilingual and bicultural

peace gradually returned during the next ten years (1918-1927), and Regulation XVII was abrogated in September 1927.

The end of World War I and its French-English troubles about military conscription disposed the Canadian people to earnestly seek a settlement to their foremost domestic problem. The men responsible for the return to normalcy in French-English relations between 1918 and 1927 were Liberal Senator Napoleon Belcourt and the members of the Unity League of Ontario. Belcourt had been President of the ACFEO from 1910 to 1912 when he resigned, due to in-fighting within the Association. In 1920 he was asked by Cardinal Bégin of Québec in the name of the Francophone hierarchy to reassume command of the ACFEO, which he agreed to do; he was reelected to the Presidency in 1921. He immediately proceeded, in unison with some leading Toronto intellectuals, to found the Unity League of Ontario, whose avowed purpose was to recreate bilingual and bicultural unity in Ontario. This League was the primary instrument in changing Ontario public opinion during the twenties. It is significant that of the one hundred and fifty members of this Association, only one was Roman Catholic, namely Belcourt himself; every other member was Protestant. Although for political purposes, it was essential that the League be made up of Anglophones, the fact that none of these were Roman Catholic illustrates a key part of my thesis, namely that racism and Francophobia were much more prevalent among Ontario's

Irish-Catholics than they were among the Anglo-Protestant majority of the population. The significance of this point lies in the fact that Fallon and his followers would never admit that for them language and religious faith went hand in hand; indeed, they denied this categorically. The French Catholics, on the other hand, openly admitted and stated that their language and faith were inextricably bound; they wrote editorials and lengthy essays to defend this view.

Both the educational and ecclesiastical aspects of English-French conflict in Ontario will appear as a single problem in the part of my dissertation studying Bishop Fallon's troubles within his own diocese. Fallon's Francophobia was integral and applied to all areas subject to his power of decision. His activities aimed at eliminating French from the schools of his diocese are inseparable from his efforts at replacing Francophone religious orders by Anglophone ones; his efforts to anglicize his churches are also one aspect of his basic policy.

Fallon was to spend a lengthy part of his episcopal career (1910-1931) in ecclesiastical courts defending himself against several charges, most of them resulting from his alleged persecution of his French subjects, clerical and lay. Rome twice suggested he resign his see because of the constant trouble he was in, but the warrior-Bishop would refuse and then inform his priests that he had turned down an important promotion because of his love of them. Summarily Fallon was a fighter, and

he needed a fight at all times to make life worth living. Whenever things were too quiet on the home front, he went out of his way to pick a fight; at different times he attacked the Protestant churches, criticized the visit of a government envoy to Mexico, and defended the cause of Irish independence.

The London diocese proved particularly sensitive to English-French differences, but need not have become a major problem area, had a more tactful and pastorally sensitive Pastor been appointed. Though some local differences of opinion had occurred in the Windsor area around 1900, the diocese had a relatively unblemished record of English-French cordiality until the promotion of Bishop McEvay to the archbishopric of Toronto in 1908, indeed, until April 25, 1910, the day of Fallon's consecration.

The London troubles began before the date of the consecration, when the Francophone Apostolic Administrator of the see, asked Fallon if he would allow him to say a few words in French, after the English speech, on the day of the consecration ceremonies. Fallon refused. When Archbishop Bruchési of Montréal discreetly pressured Fallon to comply with his Vicar-General's request, he was told in no uncertain terms to mind his own business. Fallon then accepted to hear the French words of welcome. Once established in his see, and having begun to make himself known as a bigoted Francophobe (i.e. conversation with Hanna in May, 1910, statement to his priests in July, 1910, delegation to Premier Whitney in August, 1910, Goderich statement in October, 1910). Fallon closed a bilingual

teacher-training school in Windsor by removing the French Religious Order of Women who operated it, and replacing the Order by an English one. To the Windsor Separate School Board's protests he replied that as Bishop he alone would decide which Order belonged in the Diocese.

When one of his parish priests died, the Bishop, through his Vicar-General, appointed a replacement who was clearly not welcome to the Francophone parishioners. When the parishioners congregated before the priest's house in order to prevent the newcomer's installation, the police were called in to install the new pastor by force (they broke a few heads in the process) and a squad of soldiers was assigned to guard the house to prevent the faithful from throwing the man out.

Faced with numerous complaints of unilingual-English catechism instruction, Fallon would reply that since most children understood English, they should be content with English unilingualism. It was only after several complaints, petitions (by adults and children) and pressures brought to bear by the Apostolic Delegate that Fallon consented to have some catechism classes in French and some French preaching in mixed French-English parishes. The Bishop refused one of his senior Pastors permission to attend an annual meeting of a French Language Association in Québec city, for no valid reason, and when this same priest protested the Bishop's decision, Fallon removed him from his parish in spite of the parishioners' protests, and informed him that his services would no longer be

required in the London Diocese. The priest in question had been serving there for twenty-five years, and was no longer a young man. Finally, in 1913, Fallon was sued in ecclesiastical court by five of his Francophone priests for his alleged persecution of the French minority.

Throughout the second decade of the century, while Fallon was defending himself against two ecclesiastical lawsuits and one civil lawsuit, Rome's Consistorial Congregation at first intimated to Fallon (1913) that a large American diocese was his for the asking, and then, in 1918, explicitly suggested to him, in rather severe words, that he move elsewhere. As stated above, however, the Bishop of London refused to move.

IV-Conclusion

It is a well-known fact in Canadian history that the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a time of increasing linguistic and cultural tension between French and English, as well as a time of growing nativism in Ontario. The French-English troubles of 1910-1927 are usually seen as an effort by Anglo-Protestant Ontario to curb French-Catholic expansion in the province.

While recognizing the truth of this for the late nineteenth century, my study shows that after the year 1910, Roman Catholics of English speech were just as responsible as the Anglo-Protestants for limiting the linguistic rights of the Francophones. Moreover it will appear that Anglo-Protestants were much more active in reestablishing the rights

of the French Catholics during the 1920's than were the Anglophone Catholics. I will argue that this was the case partly because of the minority consciousness of the English Catholics as opposed to the Protestants, and partly because of the more tightly-structured religion of the Catholics, assuming that once religion supports a cause, good or bad, that cause can be made to outlast its usefulness. Indeed by the end of World War I, the cause of Ontario's Orange Lodges reflected in the slogan "One Faith, One Flag, One Language" was no longer viable, for the fact was that ten percent of Ontario's population was Francophone, French and English had fought and died side by side in the war, and the Canadian people were tired of continued fighting and strife.

Two novels pleading for mutual understanding and goodwill were published (The Clash, Bridging the Chasm), Ontario businessmen began good-will visits to Québec, and the Unity League of Ontario was founded. It was easier for the Protestants to modify their attitudes in regard to the French Canadians, for religion was not as determining a factor in their ideological make-up as it was for the Roman Catholics. The Francophone Catholics did not need to change their attitude substantially for they still stood for the same rights as they had in 1910. The English Catholics were however compelled, by the new mood and climate of opinion to change their policies to a significant degree; this proved more difficult for them than for the Protestants, for Anglo-Catholic leaders had in fact

identified the cause of their faith with that of their language, and the rigid determinism of Catholic doctrine in the early twentieth century did not allow substantial alterations to its teachings.

I therefore argue that within the boundaries of Ontario Catholicism, between 1897 and 1927, linguistic, ethnic and cultural factors always took priority over Church directives whenever the former appeared at odds with the latter.

My assumptions as they bear upon the study are that Roman Catholicism must maintain a policy of universalism as opposed to narrow parochialism in every sphere of its activity, that Canada is worth maintaining as a nation and that bilingualism and biculturalism are the only viable means to achieve this goal. I also believe that the Canadian Roman Catholic Church had both the right and the duty to become involved in the controversies of the period, even though some of its activities did more harm than good, and that the separation of Church and State, though most desirable in the legal and fiscal realms, must never be understood to mean that whatever the State lays claim to is necessarily out of bounds to the Church (e.g. education).

Interpretative histories:

Wade, Mason, The French Canadians, 1860-1967, Rev. ed., Toronto, Macmillan of Canada; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1968, 2 vol., 1128 p.

Sissons, C.B., Bilingual Schools in Canada, London, England, 1917.

Walker, F.A., Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Toronto, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1968.

Appendix

Sources

I-Publications

Barber, Marilyn, "The Ontario Bilingual Schools Issue: Sources of Conflict," in Canadian Historical Review, Vol.XLVII, No. 3, September 1966, p. 227-248.

Prang, Margaret, "Clerics, Politicians and the Bilingual Schools Issue in Ontario, 1910-1917," in Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XLI, No. 4, December 1960, p. 281-307.

Sissons, C.B., Bilingual Schools in Canada, London, England, 1917.

Wade, Mason, The French Canadians, 1860-1967, Rev. ed., Toronto, Macmillan of Canada; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1968, 2 vol., 1128 p.

Walker, F.A., Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Toronto, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1968.

II-Unpublished sources are not found in any one major collection but are scattered at random throughout Ontario. The main sources of documentation are entries 1 and 2 of the following list.

1. Archives of the Diocese of London, Ont.
2. Archives of the ACFEO
   a) papers held at the U. of Ottawa Library
   b) papers held at ACFEO headquarters, Ottawa.
3. Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.

4. Archives of the Province of Ontario, Toronto.

5. University of Toronto Library - Special Collections.

6. Archives of the Archdiocese of Ottawa.

7. Archives of the Archdiocese of Kingston, Ont.

8. Archives of the Diocese of Alexandria, Ont.

9. Archives of the Diocese of Hearst, Ont.

10. Archives of the University of Ottawa, held at Saint-Paul University, Ottawa.

All of the above archives, with the exception of the University of Ottawa archives and of the papers held by the University of Toronto Library, are unclassified, the documents being held in varying states of chaos and confusion.

Thomas Fuller (1608-1661) was an Anglican priest and historian whose royalist sympathies caused him difficulties with Cromwell's regime, but whose wit earned him popularity as a writer. Not being a man who set much importance on family trees, he once wrote:

> Lord, I find the genealogy of my Saviour strangely checkered with four remarkable changes in four generations. Reheboam begat Abia: a bad father begat a bad son. Abia begat Asa: a bad father and a good son. Asa begat Jehoshaphat: a good father and a good son. Jehoshaphat begat Joram: a good father and a bad son. I see, Lord, from hence that my father's piety cannot be entailed: that is bad news for me. But I see also that actual impiety is not hereditary: that is good news for my son. (1)

Such an observation should be borne in mind when we are reminded (as we invariably are by his contemporary biographers) that the first bishop of the diocese of Niagara was descended on his father's side from this same "worthy master Fuller", and on his mother's from Archbishop Loftus. Loftus was one of the founders of Trinity College, Dublin, and its first Provost. The college authorities seemingly placed a higher value on heredity, and Bishop Fuller was surprised when he visited Dublin to discover that his sons would be entitled to important privileges if they entered Trinity, on account of the Archbishop. (2)

Thomas Richard Fuller had been a soldier some sixteen years when his regiment set out for Canada in 1799. His Majesty's 41st Regiment of Foot disembarked from the Asia Transport in October. Captain Fuller himself had been left behind with the sick at Cork; but he soon rejoined his men. When a command post became vacant in St. John's, Fuller as an old officer was considered. But his commanding officer chose not to recommend him, since he had "perceived the most evident marks of derangement in that officer since his arrival here..." (3) Later, when he was passed over again, he memorialized the Colonel commanding His Majesty's Forces in the Canadas expressing his "Extreme Surprise and concern" that for the third time a Junior Captain was appointed to the Command of a post, and lamenting that he was "the eldest of his rank in British North America". A number of Generals would bear witness to his ability. (4) When he received no reply, he again expressed his disappointment, claiming his slow promotion

> is my misfortune not my fault. I little thought when I came to Upper Canada I should be thus degraded. Life under such circumstances is not worth preserving. (5)

His memorials met with success; he was placed in command of troops at York, and promoted to Brevet Major.

For a period he acted as Deputy Assistant Quarter Master General for Canada, and seems to have spent some of his time at York, some at Kingston. In this latter town on the 16th of July, 1810, was born his son, Thomas Brock. The following month, on the 12th of August, the baby boy was baptized by the "minister of Kingston", G.O. Stuart. He took his middle name from one of his godfathers: General Issac Brock. The other sponsors were Poole England, Patrick Corbett and Charlotte England. (6) Two other sons were born to the Major and his wife Mary (7): Edmund and William. Little is known about them,

and even some contemporary articles about the bishop say that he had no brothers. (8)

During the war with the United States, in December 1813, Fuller died. His widow decided to remain in Canada, "requesting ... that her pension and compassionate allowance to her children may be drawn in this Country". (9) When Mary Fuller died in 1817, her sister Margaret took on the responsibility of raising the orphaned sons. Some years later, when young Thomas was about 13, she married the rector of Chippewa, the Rev'd William Leeming (1787-1863). William had followed his brother Ralph as an SPG missionary to Canada in 1820, was placed in Chippewas and would remain there until his death. Soon after the marriage, Mrs.Leeming petitioned the government to continue Thomas' pension beyond his fifteenth birthday, when otherwise it would cease. The expense of educating the boys was heavy, and she needed assistance. (10)

For some time Thomas attended the Hamilton Grammar School. From there he went to York, where the missionary (John Strachan) was master of the Home District Grammar School. In this two-storey blue building Fuller was instructed, perhaps in Greek and Latin and mathematics, by the young men who were preparing under Dr. Strachan to take holy orders.

One of his school-mates here was William McMurray (1810-1894). The lad's parents had brought him ought from Ireland in the year after his birth. William was too young to be ordained when he finished his divinity studies, so Lieutenant-Governor Colborne sent him to establish mission posts among the Indians along the north shores of Lakes Huron and Superior. When he was ordained, a year later, Fuller was present to record the event. (11) Returning to the mission, he married a girl of Indian-Irish blood, who had been educated in Montreal. The couple later lived in the rectories at Ancaster and Niagara-on-the-Lake, and he would be made Archdeacon when his old school friend became bishop in 1875.

In 1828 a combined seminary-school, supported by the SPG, had been established in the garrison town of Chambly, Lower Canada. The teacher (Joseph Braithwaite) was not much older than some of his prospective students, being 23 years of age when he set out from Oxford for his new post.

Fuller was one of seventeen men who would receive SPG scholarships to study at Chambly, and at the age of 19 began his four year course. One of the others to receive such a scholarship was his room-mate there, John Gamble Geddes. Many years later Geddes would run against him in the election for bishop of Niagara, and would be named by him as first dean of the cathedral.

He felt that his type of education suited him well for the Canadian church:

> I think that all will acknowledge that young men, educated in the country, habituated to the manners and customs of the people, enured to the fatigues and privations attendant upon a missionary's life in new countries, and accustomed to the climate, from which many strangers suffer severely, are ... better suited for supplying our wants than those educated in Europe. (12)

At the same time he felt the need"for a regularly established and well patronized 'school of the Prophets'". The system of young men studying for the ministry under the guidance of an older clergyman was too demanding on the latter's time. Moreover the clergy would need the background of a more formal type of education in order to meet "the opposition...from the infidels on the one side, who are no longer the ignorant grovellings they were in former ages, and from the various bodies of dissenters on the other, whose ministers

are ... becoming more and more thoroughly educated". He was to show an active concern for education throughout his life--not just for divinity students, but for young people and adults as well.

From Chambly he had acted as a catechist and scripture reader in the surrounding area. When his studies were completed, he was made deacon by Bishop Stewart in the cathedral at Quebec (8 September 1833). After a short stay at the Bay of Quinte, he was made assistant minister of the parish church of Montreal (c. 1833-1835). Soon he was ministering to the needs of a community beset by crisis. Cholera had crossed the ocean with the influx of Irish immigrants and was plaguing the Canadas.

> For many weary weeks the young clergyman was unceasingly employed amid the fearful scenes of the city pest houses, in visiting the sick, consoling the dying, and burying the dead in their hurriedly made graves. (13)

In quieter times he labored in some of the outlying areas, (14) and established a free service in a neglected part of the city, giving rise to the later parish of St. George. (15)

Two important events marked this time. When he was growing up in the Niagara area, Thomas came to know the family of Colonel Samuel Street, who lived in the village of Clark-hill. The colonel's son Thomas would later become a Member of Parliament, and one of the richest men in Ontario. And Samuel's eldest daughter Cynthia became Mrs. Fuller in April 1834. She would bear him six sons and three daughters. It was a fortunate marriage since Miss Street, as Canon Langtry pointed out, "in addition to being, in gentleness, goodness, and wisdom, the very ideal of a parson's wife, brought him a large fortune". (16) The financial security which she brought would prove helpful in later years, when parishes--and even the new diocese of Niagara--were hard pressed to pay Fuller his salary. Shortly after the marriage, on January 11th 1835, Fuller was priested by Bishop Stewart, in St. James' Church, York.

The prospects of the church in the Canadas when Thomas Fuller was priested were not encouraging. Bishop Stewart had been ill, and the stipend from the government for the bishop was to cease on his death. Other grants from the SPG were to be reduced. There were not enough clergy to serve the growing population of the country.

The young priest wrote down his Thoughts on the Present State and Future Prospects of the Church of England in Canada. He was worried that the colonial church did not share the advantages of establishment that were enjoyed by the mother church, and that the privileges which she did have (such as the clergy reserves) were not very secure.

> We must no longer depend upon the favor of government, or trust to the property we now hold or probably we will find them both but as broken reeds in the day of need.

The situation confronting the church here was becoming more and more like the situation the church in the United States had had to deal with, and we could profit by adopting the American form of government by synods. The support which had come from the government must now come from the people.

> The laity alone have in their hands what can supply our wants. Before we can avail ourselves of it, we must allow them to have some voice in its disbursement.

The example of the prosperity of the American church would show the value of involving lay people in diocesan synods. For those who might be wary of the idea, he pointed out the practical control the laity already had, through parliament, over the church in England; and he showed it to be in harmony with the practice of the early church.

> And surely it is less objectionable to admit a layman to the councils of the church, where many matters of a purely secular nature must be discussed, than to the spiritual offices of preaching and exhorting.

Fuller read his manuscript to Charles Reid, who had been a fellow pupil at Braithwaite's school, and was now rector of Rawdon, L.C. In "much earnest and frequent discussion", Reid agreed "that a crisis in the history of the Church could not be distant", and urged his friend to print the essay. It was about this time that Fuller moved to become the missionary at Chatham. There was then no press in Upper Canada west of Toronto, so the appeal to the example of the American church was printed at Detroit. The pamphlet was published anonymously, and in July of 1836 a copy was sent to the bishop and every clergyman in the doicese.

Four months later Bishop Mountain (who had been consecrated Bishop of Montreal and was assuming some of the ailing Stewart's episcopal duties) held a visitation of the clergy of Upper Canada. They were summoned to St. James' Church in Toronto, and after divine service Dr. Strachan "ascended the pulpit and delivered a discourse, in which he portrayed in his vigorous style the condition of the Church in this country...and the only measures that he could suggest for their remedy". Saltern Givens (who was a year older than Fuller, and was also educated at Strachan's school--perhaps at the same time) was sitting next to Fuller in the pew. At the end of the sermon he remarked, "The Archdeacon has taken his ideas from your pamphlet". Many years later when the pamphlet was reprinted, Givens wrote that Fuller was entitled to the honor of having first suggested synodical action in the colonial church. (17)

Lands continued to be reserved for the church for some years, but they were not without their problems. While Fuller was at Chatham (1836-1840), he petitioned the Lieutenant Governor, Sir George Arthur, saying that he was on "the reduced allowance of £100 per annum". The rectory had been established,

> but that, in consequence of errors made in the return of Lots sent in by the late Missionary, it has not yet been endowed...there is attached to the parish only two small lots, neither of which yields the slightest income: but...there is a "glebe" lot in the neighbourhood, which has always been looked upon as belonging to the parish, for which many applications have been made to him, and which your Excellency's memorialist humbly prays may be confirmed to him and his successors, by grant, lease for a term of years, or otherwise...

It was a matter of some urgency, for the land had "during the last two years been greatly injured by persons cutting the best wood over the whole lot, and sending the greater part of it to the Detroit Market". (18)

From Chatham, where he was the only clergyman for 40 miles, he returned in 1840 to the Niagara area where he had been brought up by his guardian. The Anglicans (and German Lutherans) of Thorold had received the ministrations of clergy in the surrounding area since the 1790's, including Fuller's 'adoptive father' William Leeming during the period 1821-1829.

Most recently James Clarke, an Irishman who was St. Catharines' first rector, had been taking occasional services there. Now Bishop Strachan (--the diocese of Toronto had just been formed, in 1839--) appointed Fuller to reside in the village and take charge of the mission.

A stone church, St. Peter's, had been built in 1832. Now with the arrival of a clergyman, the Governor--still Sir George Arthur--saw fit "to erect and constitute a parsonage or rectory at Thorold in the Township of Thorold", and "to present the Rev. Thomas Brock Fuller...to be the incumbent of such parsonage or rectory". (19)

He began his duties on June 19th, just about a month before the death of his neighbour from St. Catharines. Mr. Clarke, aged 68 years, was being driven to take services at Port Dalhousie when the horse ran off and he was thrown from the wagon, dying from the fall. Strachan had intended Fuller to serve the Thorold church entirely, to help Mr. Leeming look after the people at Stamford, and to spend some time in the "destitute parts of the surrounding country". (20) Now he and Leeming had to provide St. Catharines with weekly services until A.F. Atkinson (another Irishman) arrived there later that year. No sooner had this happened than first John Anderson at Fort Erie, and then Thomas Green at Niagara, took ill, and their parishes had to be supplied.

Even with all this activity, he found time to establish a second congregation seven miles away, at Port Robinson on the Welland Canal. At first services were held in a school house, then in 1843-1844 a church was built, paid for in part by grants from the governor, the bishop and the SPG. Mr. John Beatty stood out as a benefactor of the church, and a director of the Sunday School; and on his death in 1861 Fuller published a brief 'memoir' of him. (21)

He was interested in the extension of the church beyond his parish as well, and soon after he arrived at Thorold, the Niagara District Branch of the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto was formed, with Fuller as its first secretary. The establishment of a parochial branch soon followed, and its meetings, he reported, "showed that we have our people with us in this 'our work and labour of love'". Raising money was, however, not always easy. One year the parochial association reported that it took "the greatest of exertions" to raise its contribution " inconsequence of the great local depression along the line of the canal, with the stoppage of the great flouring mills for the last nine months". (22)

The Wesleyan Methodists had a chapel in Thorold, which had been built in 1833. They were a small, friendly group; or at least they were until the year after Fuller's arrival. Then they decided to hold a Protracted Meeting, which proved so successful that a second one was held early in 1842. One of their number described what was happening in a letter to the Christian Guardian:

> after three weeks labor, 33 souls united with the church, and a number of them have been brought to feel the joys of pardoned sin. The Meeting is still going on; the penitent benches are crowded with those who are inquiring the ways of salvation ... Great are the changes that have taken place in our highly favoured village within the last twelve months; from a little handful we now number very near one hundred that meet in class... But in the midst of all these privileges and blessings there are sinners who are unconverted to God, who are hardening their hearts and stiffening their necks.

Some of those who crowded the penitent benches had been Anglicans, despite the efforts of their rector to harden their hearts against such goings on. Indeed, as the Meeting was about to begin, Mr. Fuller warned his congregation from the pulpit (in the words of John's first epistle): "Beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they be of God". And he told them that the extravagances of revivals, the penitence stool and united vocal prayer were certainly not of God. Some of his parishoners were impressed by his strong words, and wrote a letter asking for their sermon to be published. The drafter of the letter told how one person (one of the former Anglicans) said "he had seen Jesus Christ, held him by the hand, and jumped with him as high as the stool, from which the Spirit lifted him". The letter and the sermon were soon printed by the diocesan printers, Messrs. Rowsell in Toronto.

The local Methodists found it hard to believe that anyone would describe his experiences at a revival in such a way, and appointed two of their number to try to track down the story. According to them, it turned out to be an unfounded rumour. According to two of the Anglican letter writers, they verified their statement.

While this was going on, the diocesan paper The Church added fuel to the fire. In announcing the pamphlet, it echoed Fuller's mistrust of Methodists and their revivals:

> It is melancholy, indeed, to contemplate the havoc made by these raving usurpers of the priesthood, and to know that every Lunatic Asylum contains the victims of their "unauthorized ministries"... Our own Province is infested with these "ravening wolves", and Mr. Fuller deserves well of every lover of Christianity for stripping them of their "sheep's clothing".

The gauntlet had been thrown down, and it was picked up by the Christian Guardian in a series of long editorials. Methodists were used to attacks by The Church, but "such an outburst of mortification, anger, and rabid enmity, we have not seen exceeded in any of this Editor's productions". Quoting at length the local church's investigation of the allegation that a Methodist jumped with Jesus, the paper complained:

> We have here ignorance, hearsay, supposition, haste, misrepresentation, exaggeration and prevarication. And these on which Mr. Fuller founds his charge of "arrogance", "presumption", and "impiety" against the Wesleyan-Methodist Church!

The editorials sought to justify the practices complained of. The editor even went to the Toronto Asylum, where he found no evidence of people being committed because of revivals; and he pointed out that though there were four Methodists there, there were also at least five members of the Church of England. And he suggested that the real reason for Fuller's attack could be found in a tell-tale sentence from the sermon: "The people have almost forsaken mine to crowd the Methodist Church".

On his part, the rector felt that his pamphlet had done something to reverse the flow of people, that it had helped to point some "pious dissenting families, sick of the evils of schism" toward the Catholic church. The bitterness of the debate is symptomatic of the mistrust that generally existed in those years between Methodists and the Church of England. (23)

If the Church of England was to be protected against the encroachments of Methodists, so too was it to be defended against the claims of the

Roman Church. Having accused the Methodists of--amongst other things--being sectarians and schismatics, he felt a need to show that his own church did not lay open to similar charges. So now from the Thorold pulpit came a sermon on "The Roman Catholic Church not the mother church of England". The argument was one common to Anglicans at the time, that the church in England had always been an independent branch of the Christian Church, over which the pope came to usurp authority, which was thrown off at the reformation. Had the pope accepted the results of the reformation, things would have been fine. But when Pius V excommunicated Queen Elizabeth; he encouraged the "popish party" to separate themselves from the Church of England. So Fuller can assert, "The date of the Roman Catholics in England, as a distinct sect...may therefore be fixed in the year 1570". To his own mind at least he proved his text (from Cyprian), "Non enim nos abillis, sed illi a nobis recesserunt". When John Strachan came to visit the parish, he read the sermon; and the bishop recommended it to the Church Society of the diocese for publication as a tract. (24)

When Fuller arrived at Thorold, vessels were being locked through the Welland canal on Sundays. So he joined with some others (John Ker, William James and William Beatty) in 1845 to bring a lawsuit against the government, which some three years earlier had assumed entire control of the canal. The result was that the Sabbath Observance law was strictly enforced until 1876. (25)

Fuller had a lively interest in the American church. In 1853 he was one of four people who represented the diocese of Toronto at the General Convention of that church in New York city. The delegation was well received, (26) and one of the major proposals considered there--for a confederacy of churches, based in part on the use of the prayer book--must have struck a chord with the rector of Thorold. That, indeed, was to become the gist of a series of articles he would write in the Canadian Methodist Magazine on "Christian Unity". (27) But what the proposer of this plan came to regard as a corollary of his idea--that greater liturgical freedom ought to be allowed within the episcopal church--would be less palatable to him.

The example of American precedent had figured largely in Fuller's first pamphlet advocating lay participation in the governing of the Canadian church. His concern for Sabbath observance which led to the Welland canal lawsuit may have sprung in part from his closeness to the American scene, where Canadian sabbatarianism found some of its roots at the time. Certainly the quotations from American authors in his addresses and writings reflect the attention he gave to the church in the United States.

His interest was reciprocated in 1856, when he was granted an honorary STD from Hobart College, which had been established by Bishop Hobart at Geneva, New York early in the 1820's. Bishop Strachan congratulated him, (28) and despite Hobart's high-churchmanship Fuller commemorated the event by baptizing his new son Henry Hobart. (29)

The following year Trinity College, Toronto repeated the honour by granting him a DCL. (30) When nominated, he seemingly suggested to the bishop that the college consider granting degrees to non-Canadians. Strachan thought he was in too great haste in his desire to cultivate "friendly relations with our Brethren on the other side" and deemed it better to "cultivate our own field" first. He didn't want Trinity to become like the American universities, which granted their honorary degrees all too readily. (31) The bishop's remarks must have hurt Fuller, who had carefully begun to record his new American DD whenever he signed his name.

Fuller was not, however, afraid to voice his disagreements about more important aspects of university policy with Strachan, who had become defensive about his college. The bishop's dream of the Anglican King's College being the centre for higher education in the province had been denied when the new Baldwin government secularized it in 1849. Now the fifties and sixties saw a controversy over the relationship between the new, government-endowed University, and the denominational universities (like Trinity, which Strachan had established shortly after the loss of King's). By giving up their charters and affiliating with the University, the denominational institutions stood a chance of sharing its endowment. Principal Leitch of Queen's tried to persuade the bishop to join with the Church of Scotland and the Wesleyan Methodists in advocating this plan. And Fuller, who headed the synod's university committee, sought to convince the diocese to do the same. Had they succeeded, the province would have had one inclusive University with affiliated denominational colleges, rather than a number of competing universities. The majority of Synod, however, shared Strachan's mistrust of giving up Trinity's charter, and the university committee's report had to be withdrawn. (32)

Many of the clergy of Upper Canada, either through necessity or interest, took to farming their land. The rector of Thorold was one of these, and Archdeacon Dixon later said of him,

> The farmers in the vicinity had fallen into very slovenly habits of farming, and to remedy them, he, by great exertions, induced them to form an "Agricultural Association," of which he became Vice-President. He secured the presentation of a silver medal for the best managed farm, which was won by one of his neighbours. He also compiled a work on agriculture of a very useful character, which was published in 1854. Through his efforts a vast improvement was made both in the style of farming and in the character of the stock in that part of the Niagara district. (33)

At the end of April 1856, Bishop Strachan held his annual visitation of his clergy, at the cathedral. It was held on a Wednesday, probably to allow time for the clergy to get to and from their parishes between Sundays. Two months before, the bishop had asked Rural Dean Fuller to be the preacher at the meeting. When the bishop informed Archdeacon Bethune of the invitation, he confided: "He is a grumbler but says he has never since 1835 preached at Toronto. He therefore has some reason to grumble and he may be useful hereafter". Fuller's sermon about "The Sufficiency of the Christian Ministry" described the importance of the minister's role as compared to other professions, since he dealt with things that mattered for eternity. Yet while he would magnify the office, he would also humble the instrument. He warned as well that preaching the word and administering the sacraments do not by themselves bring fruit, that when we look down from our pulpits we see men who have every reason to believe, but do not. The minister should not attribute his successes or failures just to himself, since "the hearts of men are in God's hands, not in ours". Explaining his title, he continued "that in the great work entrusted to our care, 'our sufficiency is of God'". Archdeacon Bethune, seconded by Dr. O'Meara, moved the traditional request that the synod publish the sermon. (34)

If circumstances of need sometimes prompted in clergy an interest in farming, other circumstances led them to become involved in education, for they were better schooled than the majority of their fellow citizens. Before the village of Thorold gained a school, classes were held by the Rev'd William Dickson. When in 1857 the County Council of Welland passed an act establishing a grammar school there, Dickson along with Fuller and four others became the first trustees. The first two masters were clergymen and graduates of Trinity College: Alexander Dawson and Donald I.F. McLeod. The latter afterwards

married one of Fuller's daughters. Latin was the chief subject taught in the higher grades, and "the pupils were chiefly boys, since the study of the classics was considered beyond the capability of the feminine intellect". (35)

The next year the Thorold Mechanics' Insitute was organized, with 110 subscribers and Dr. Fuller as its first president. The Institute was a combination of a library and a club to sponsor literary talks. Fuller delivered the first lecture on the appropriate topic of "Reading". (36)

Shortly after Benjamin Cronyn's election as the first Bishop of Huron (July 1857), Fuller unsuccessfully sought the former's place as rector of London. The editor of the Independent-Reform St. Catharines Journal seemingly bore no love for the aspirant, for the paper reported he

> has addressed the following egotistical and bribing circular to the members of the "Diocesan Church Society". The Rev. gentlemen is bringing the same tactics into use in the clerical field that he has been accustomed to use in political elections in Welland. The "Rural Dean" is one of the richest men in Welland, and when personal or family aggrandizement or emolument is likely to be the reward of his labors, he will not hesitate to make a greater promise than that contained in the postscript.

There follows the letter in which he outlined the grounds for seeking the rectory, including the support he had received during the late episcopal election, and the offending postscript:

> Where desired, the expenses of those voting for me could be borne. --T.B.F. (37)

A few years after his disappointment about not going to London, Fuller was appointed to the Church of St. George the Martyr in Toronto. When he left Thorold, the congregation owed him £2305/5/2--money which had been spent on the building of the new St. John's church there. He forgave the congregation the debt, and the people in gratitude presented him with a silver plated model of the church for whose erection he was responsible. Now he arrived at a new congregation, who were having their own financial difficulties.

While he was in Toronto, some of Fuller's pamphlets were reprinted, and two new ones published. One was the first of a projected series of tracts to be put out by the Home District Clerical Association (though I haven't found any others in this series). Entitled "Forms of Prayer", it was part of his constant defence of the Book of Common Prayer. It takes the form of a rather artificial dialogue between two laymen: Mr. Jones, who is "a zealous and intelligent Churchman", and Mr. Smith, who is "sincere", "but much prejudiced against the Church". Though we aren't told so, Mr. Smith must be a little simpleminded, for his prejudices vanish rapidly before the zeal of Mr. Jones. In the course of the discussion, Fuller gets in a remark about churches where the singing is "too fine", so that the congregation is left to "sing God's praises by proxy". The prayer book, he suggests, prevents people from being prayed at as well as sung at. It is also a safeguard against the "grievous errors" into which "some few of our clergy have at times, alas! fallen"; for "the teaching of the reading desk was an antidote to the teaching of the pulpit".

The other Toronto pamphlet was a sermon preached in St. George's Church on the occasion of Prince Arthur's recovery from illness: "A Nation's Mercy Vouchsafed to a Nation's Prayers". It was a chance to proclaim the Victorian loyalty to the royal family, protesting against the "treasonable and republican principles" some people were espousing. It was a chance, too, to bask in the sun which never set on the British Empire. "Is there not,"

the preacher asked, "a marked resemblance between the position of England among the nations of the earth and that of ancient Israel"?

> Was there ever a nation , which, so small in itself exerted such a sway in the world? Was there ever a nation, so great in worldly prosperity as that nation, whose bankers furnish the sinews of war to all other nations? Was there ever a nation who had God so nigh unto them, so favoured, so blessed with spiritual privileges and rich opportunities of extending His kingdom throughout the world?

Feeling the weight of age, Bishop Strachan felt the time had come for the election of a coadjutor, who would be styled Bishop of Niagara. For three days and nights in September 1866 ballot after ballot took place. A sports writer described the election in terms of a horse race. The runners in this "Race for the Mitre" were "the Bishop of Romford's white mare Cobourg Lass (aged)" (A.N. Bethune), "Mr. Trincoll's black horse Pontifex Maximus" (Provost Whitaker of Trinity College) and "Mr. T. Broeck's grey horse, The Badger" (Fuller--brock is an old word for badger). (38) A stalemate between Whitaker, who led with the clergy and Fuller, who led with the laity and evangelicals was broken when the former withdrew and Bethune gained the majority The defeated episcopal candidate was collated archdeacon of Niagara, with a jurisdiction extending beyond the present bounds of the diocese to include Northumberland, Durham, Peterboro, Victoria, Ontario and parts of York counties. About a year later Strachan died, and Fuller and McMurray were among his six former pupils who acted as pall-bearers. (39)

For some years the Archdeacon of Niagara had hoped that this area, in which he had grown up and served, might become a diocese. Already parts of the diocese of Toronto had been severed off to produce the sees of Huron and Ontario. The growing population of the remainder, the 1872 Synod resolved, was again "too extensive for the supervision of one Bishop". But as far as the Church of England was concerned, the area of the future diocese of Niagara was not a prosperous one. On its formation it would have 27 missionaries and only 20 self-supporting parishes. Under these circumstances an episcopal endowment would be particularly important. Again the Street money helped Fuller's hopes for the church to be realized, when his wife and her sister (Mrs. O.T. Macklem) offered $15,000 towards the endowment for the diocese, which they hoped would be named "Niagara".

At the 1873 synod, a committee had been formed to help bring the new diocese into existence; and the following year the synod memorialized the Ontario House of Bishops to permit its formation. The bishops concurred in February 1875, and the Metropolitan invited the clergy and lay representatives of the area to "the school house of Christ Church, Hamilton, on Wednesday, March 17, at 2 p.m. for the purpose of selecting one godly and well-learned man to be Bishop of the said new Western diocese".

The choice of day must have seemed propitious to Fuller, with his Irish parentage. His most prominent rival was the rector of Christ's Church in Hamilton, his former room-mate at Chambly, John Gamble Geddes. The dislike of some low churchmen for this gentlemen, however, was evident in the banners which they hanged in James Street, indicating that a vote for Geddes was a vote for popery. It would be an election about which men felt with passion. In a sermon at the eucharist before the voting took place, Provost Whitaker reminded the people to be sober about what they were doing:

> Let me commend you to the guidance of the Grace of God--it is for Him and His Church that you are about to act. Dare to invest your conduct with the sacred dignity of godly simplicity and sincerity.

And Bishop Bethune caused a stir of excitement when he warned the assembly that he expressly desired no demonstration of any kind to be made on the announcement of the result.

With one ballot, Archdeacon Fuller won the majority vote of each order, and Bishop Bethune declared him duly elected. When the bishop was asked to name the diocese, one clergyman suggested the name "Western", which had been associated with the area when the question of subdividing Toronto diocese was raised. But the rector of Niagara, William McMurray, proposed "Niagara" as an alternative. "It shall be called the Diocese of Niagara", announced the bishop, and concluded the session with his blessing. (40)

The Metropolitan, Bishop Oxenden, came from Montreal for the consecration, and was assisted not only by the bishops of Toronto and Huron, but also by two American bishops, from Michigan and Western New York. (Americans had taken part in the five consecrations which previously had taken place in Canada). The service took place on the feast day of SS Philip and James, on Saturday, May 1st. The consecration was in St. Thomas' Church, Hamilton, because Christ's Church was being rebuilt at the time, in expectation of being made the cathedral. The mother church of the see city was in fact appointed as cathedral, and Fuller's "old friend" and erstwhile rival in the election, Geddes, was named as its Dean. Was it an oversight that the bishop's stall was placed on the north side in the new church, while the traditional place for the bishop (the sought side) was occupied by the dean? (41)

As bishop he was involved in the normal episcopal round of confirmations, ordinations and consecrations. He felt that one of the high points of his career was the consecration of the church at Queenston, because of its assoication with his godfather. When the second Lambeth Conference took place in 1878, the bishop and his wife left Hamilton on the steamer Spartan for Liverpool to attend. Conscious of the contribution of the honorable society to the Canadian church, the bishop gave some 65 addresses in England and Ireland for the SPG.

Fuller was bishop in a period when new methods of biblical criticism were leading to questions about many assumptions about the scriptures, and when ecclesiastical authorities were trying to suppress those questions. Overseas a professor of old testament was removed from his chair, and a bishop was threatened with removal from his see, for their suggestions about the authorship and historical accuracy of parts of the old testament. In Canada two Presbyterians were tried by church courts, one for doubting that "eternal" punishment would last forever, the other for speaking of a progressive revelation in scripture. Methodists who used the new critical methods were in trouble with the authorities of their church. (42)

In a charge to synod, the bishop reflected this desire to deny any validity to the critical methods or the doubts which they caused. Clergy were to instruct their people "as to the genuineness, authenticity, uncorrupted preservation and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures". The people needed support

to face the sceptical climate of the age. Indeed many persons in the congregations, especially the males, shared that scepticism.

> Satan has filled their minds with such doubts that they are not prepared to take their stand on the Lord's side. The clergyman who has to deal with such persons has never himself (been) harassed in this way, and cannot, therefore, understand their real condition.

The truth of scripture might be shown by "the fulfilment of prophecy to the very letter", by miracles, by the "excellence of the doctrines" and "the purity of the moral precepts of the Bible", by the harmony between its different parts, and by the benefits it has produced. Questions about the bible were seen only as the result of scepticism, and they could be avoided if the clergy would "Lay the foundations deep, strong and firm...," if they would give the positive instruction that was never more needed than now. (43)

Preaching was important, and he thought he saw a change in style during forty years from "the elaborate, very able, very learned, but at the same time very dry, essays" of earlier days "to plain, earnest, practical Gospel sermons, delivered with warmth and earnestness". (44) His own preaching was done in a "gentle, quiet, patient voice", (45) and he probably followed his own advice not to depend on a manuscript. "To speak to the heart", he said, "you must speak from the heart".

This advice applied only to preaching, however, and not to the rest of the service. Some Anglicans in early Upper Canada had felt "it would perhaps be prudent to make some concessions as to points of Form" by shortening the services, "when they do not involve any vital principles of our religion". (46) Others even adopted the practice of dissenters, of praying "from the heart" as well as from the prayer book. The bishop reminded his clergy that extempore prayer was "contrary to the principles of our church", and exhorted them to observe the rubrics of the prayer book. (47)

He was always striving for an enforcement of what he felt to be proper practice, from 1858 when he moved at the Toronto Synod that the Lord Bishop appoint a "Committee on the discrepancies in the celebration of Divine Service" (and was placed by Strachan on the said committee) till the end of his life. He didn't object to choral service, so long as the singing was good, and there was not too much of it. One hymn, he noticed to his dismay, had 40 lines in it. (48) Music was a contentious matter in many denominations, and when St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in Toronto introduced an organ, the move was opposed in the General Assembly. Presbyterians feared the music might compete with the proclamation of the word, Anglicans that it might disrupt the order of the service. Fuller reprimanded his clergy for hurrying through the service, and for making unauthorized abbreviations of it. He objected to a new practice whereby congregations joined with the minister in saying the General Thanksgiving. In the next to last diocesan synod over which he presided he encouraged a memorial to the provincial synod asking for the "promotion of greater uniformity in public worship". (49)

Ritualism could show itself in strange guises, and the bishop and others were ready to combat it. When Archdeacon Palmer left St. George's Church, Guelph, he urged his congregation to travel the traditionally Anglican via media, being wary of the evils of Rome, and inclining from the extremes of the Protestant bodies. Alexander Dixon, who became the new rector about the time that Fuller became bishop, did find his people wary of the "evils of Rome". When a new curate donned a cassock, an Irish parishonner threatened to retaliate by wearing his wife's petticoat. A lady who brought a lily to

decorate the otherwise bare church one Easter found it removed by a warden. And when the Young People's Association planted a flower bed in the shape of a maltese cross, they were ordered to tear it up and reseed the plot with grass. (50)

Such were some of the feelings held when Fuller became bishop. A sympathetic biographer described him as being "sound and consistent in his allegiance to the prayer book, and free from all trace of biogotry and party spirit ". (51) Yet that allegiance sometimes showed itself in ways very much like party spirit. He assumed perhaps too readily that his feelings for the prayer book were--or should be--shared by all others. He warned those under his jurisdiction that

> it becomes us to bow with submission to the law of our Prayer Book as interpreted, for our guidance, by the highest tribunal of the British Empire. (52)

In a letter to his clergy, he told how the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had decided recent court cases against, for example, the use of "lights", of the crucifix and of incense in churches. He reminded them that the Provincial Synod of Canada in 1868 forbade "the elevation of the elements in the celebration of the Holy Communion, the use of incense during divine service and the mixing of water with the sacramental wine", and disapproved "the use of lights on the Lord's table and vestments except the surplice, stole or scarf, and hood". In case his clergy should not heed, he sent a copy of the letter to their wardens as well. When some of his clergy pleaded their conscience as requiring them to wear alb and chausable, he replied that his conscience bound him to promises made at his consecration to prevent any breach of the laws of the church. Yet when the Judicial Committee interpreted the prayer book as meaning that a bishop should wear a cope in his cathedral for the consecration at the Lord's Supper, he felt himself excused by the provincial synod's opposition to such vestments.

On Wednesday, December 17th, the Hamilton Spectator reported that the bishop had died early in the morning, at home. "The gentle, quiet, patient voice," it said, "is hushed forever; the active brain lies in eternal repose; the hand that blessed the needy lies cold and still". The funeral took place on Saturday from the cathedral. (53) On Sunday, the cathedral was filled (with 700 people in the evening) for memorial services. Archdeacon Dixon of Guelph preached stern reminders of man's mortality to his hearers, based on sobering texts from Ecclesiastes and the Psalms:

> A good name is better than precious ointment; and the day of death than the day of one's birth. (Ecclesiastes 7:1, text at the morning service).
> The days of our years are threescore years and ten...yet is their strength labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away. (Psalm 90:10, text at the evening service).

The sort of sources on which a biographer draws inevitably shapes the picture that results. A lack of correspondence leaves us with a hazy impression of Fuller's friendships, though there seems to have been a bond with Archdeacons McMurray and Dixon, fellow Irishmen. He certainly benefited the church materially, and his wealth has left behind some financial records. A fourth century church historian named Socrates said that church history often ends up being an account of disputes, and he looked forward to the time when it would have no more subject matter. That time hasn't come yet, and some of

his tracts and sermon show the part that Fuller played in the causes of his day. The positive value that he affirmed, lying behind some of the negative bickering, was the value of the book of common prayer. He was a man of his age, and bishops today (I hope) would not be members of the "church militant" in quite the same way. But as an Anglican and a bishop, his role was often, appropriately, as "defender of the faith".

Notes:

1. Quoted in the Living Message (May, 1971), page 5.
2. Archdeacon Dixon, Useful Lives (Toronto, 1884), page 4. Hamilton Public Library.
3. Lt.-Col. Thomas to Major Green, 9 November 1801. Public Archives of Canada.
4. To Colonel Bowes, York, 6 May 1806. PAC.
5. To Colonel Bowes, Kingston, 10 July 1806. PAC, G-909, page 82.
6. Record of baptisms in the archives of the Synod of the Diocese of Ontario.
7. The Diocese of Ontario archives has a record of Captain Fuller's marriage to Mary O'Brian England by John Stuart on July 26th, 1806. Miss England was the daughter of a Captain of the 47th Regiment of Foot.
8. Edmund was baptized September 1st, 1811 (Diocese of Ontario archives). The Public Archives of Ontario has a record of an unsuccessful petition by Thomas and his brother William for a land grant (10th April 1834).
9. Prevost to Drummond, Quebec, 5 January 1815. PAC, C-1226, Part 2, page 3.
10. Memorial of Mrs. Wm. Leeming. PAC
11. The Church, March 30, 1839.
12. T.B. Fuller, Thoughts on the Present State and Future Prospects of the Church of England in Canada, with Hints for some Improvements in her Ecclesiastical Arrangements. First published anonymously in 1836. Reprinted with a preface and notes (Hamilton, 1877), page 10. General Synod Archives.
13. Dixon, Useful Lives, page 5.
14. Ormstown, Harrington, Beauharnois, Terrebonne and the township of Godmanchester. Cf. F.D. Adams, A History of Christ Church Cathedral (Montreal, 1941), page 16.
15. Perhaps. Though a contemporary biography by J.C. Dent in the Canadian Portrait Gallery (Toronto, 1881), vol. IV, pages 125-6 ascribes the beginnings of St. George's to Fuller, the parish itself cannot trace the link that far back.
16. History of the Church in Eastern Canada and Newfoundland. (London, 1892), page 249.
17. Thoughts on the Present State and Future Prospects of the Church of England in Canada, with Hints for some Improvements in her Ecclesiastical Arrangements. First published anonymously in 1836. Reprinted with a preface and notes (Hamilton, 1877). N.F. Davin described the printing of the original pamphlet in The Irishman in Canada (London and Toronto, 1877). There was some dispute over Fuller's claim to originality in this pamphlet. John Strachan had proposed the formation of synods, in a sermon preached at the episcopal visitation at York in 1832, but he rejected the idea of lay participation in such synods.
18. PAO. T.B. Fuller to Sir George Arthur, May 1838. The Land Council decided (2 August 1838) that since there was already a rectory, no action was necessary.
19. 28 October 1840. Cf. The History of the Parish of Thorold (1953), p. 12 Some four years before, the township (as opposed to the town) of Thorold

had been made a parish.

20. Fuller to the SPG, 18 January 1841.

21. Memoir of Mr. John Beatty, who Died at Port Robinson, C.W., 15th February, 1861. (Toronto: Rowsell, 1861) 24 pp. Copy in General Synod Archives.

22. 1848. Quoted in The History of the Parish of Thorold, p. 12

23. Copies of the second (1856) edition of the pamphlet, Religious Excitements tried by Scripture, and their fruits tested by experience, are in PAO and TPL, having been presented by the author to the Chief Justice and to William McMurray respectively. See also the Christian Guardian, 2 March, 27 April, 18 and 25 May 1842; The Church, 23 April and 18 June 1842; and Fuller's report to the SPG, 2 January 1843.

24. The Roman Church not the Mother Church of England. (Cobourg, 1844) and (Welland, 1866). Copy in Toronto Public Library.

25. History of Thorold, p. 116

26. Strachan to Fuller, 15 November 1853. Strachan Letter-Books, p. 321. PAO

27. Canadian Methodist Magazine.

28. Strachan Letter-Books, 22 July 1856.

29. Register of St. John's church, Thorold. He was born 27 July 1856 and baptized 5 October.

30. Strachan Letter-Books, 2 June 1857.

31. Strachan Letter-Books, 25 June 1857.

32. Cf. John S. Moir, Church and State in Canada West, chapter 5.

33. Dixon, Useful Lives, p. 10. Mr. John Burtniak of Brock University Library has shown me a copy of The Canadian Agricultural Reader compiled "by a Vice-President of the Niagara District Agricultural Society, and Township Superintendent of Common Schools", published at Niagara in 1845. One wonders whether this was the work mentioned by Dixon. Was Dixon's 1854 a misprint or misunderstanding for 1845? And were the posts of the compiler of the Reader held by Fuller, who was later to be Vice-President of the Thorold Agricultural Society and trustee of the first grammar school there?

34. The Sufficiency of the Christian Ministry (Toronto: Rowsell, 1856). Copy in General Synod Archives.

35. History of Thorold, pp. 163-5.

36. Ibid., p. 166.

37. St. Catharines Journal, September 10, 1857. Microfilm in St. Catharines Public Library.

38. T.C. Patterson, Sporting Intelligence (Toronto, 1866).

39. Excerpts from a memorial sermon preached by Archdeacon Fuller are contained in Bethune's Memoir of Bishop Strachan (Toronto: Rowsell, 1870), pp. 316-321.

40. History of the Diocese of Niagara to 1950, chapter 6; Fuller's 1876 Synod address; C.H. Mockridge, The Bishops of the Church of England in Canada and Newfoundland (Toronto, 1896), chapter 27; Katharine Greenfield, "The Reverend John Gamble Geddes and Early Days at Christ's Church, Hamilton" in Wentworth Bygones, no. 4 (1963).

41. Christ's Church Cathedral Hamilton 1835-1935, p. 39

42. The old testament critics were W.R. Smith and Bishop Colenso of Natal.

The Presbyterians were D.J. Macdonnell in the late 1870's, and John Campbell in the early 1890's. The Methodists were George Jackson and George Workman in the first decade of this century.

43. Selections from the Address of the Lord Bishop of Niagara...(Hamilton, 1881), pp. 16-17.

44. Synod address, 26 May 1879, printed in the synod Journal, p. 21.

45. The Spectator, Hamilton, 17 December 1884.

46. Radcliffe, Authentic Letters from Upper Canada (Toronto: MacMillan, 1953), p. 118.

47. 1877 synod address, in the synod Journal, p. 18.

48. 1882 synod address.

49. 1880 and 1882 synod addresses.

50. History of St. George's Parish, Guelph, Ontario 1832-1932, p. 33.

51. J.C. Dent, The Canadian Portrait Gallery (Toronto, 1881), vol. IV, p. 126.

52. Printed letter of December 1881.

53. O.R. Rowley says he was buried "in Burlington Cemetery at Hamilton" (The Anglican Episcopate of Canada and Newfoundland (1928), p. 65), but in my wanderings through the possible areas, I have been unable to find his tombstone.

THE PENTECOSTAL ASSEMBLIES OF CANADA AND SOCIETY

A Paper read to the

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

on

June 1, 1973

at

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario

by

Ronald A.N. Kydd

Lecturer in Church History

Central Pentecostal College

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

On May 17, 1919 seven men were incorporated for essentially religious purposes under letters patent, which were issued under the Seal of the Secretary of State of Canada.[1] The name of the new corporation was The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada.[2]

This group of men was united by a common religious experience, glossolalia, which had come to them through two distinct channels. In the case of some, the news of this experience had been carried to them from the United States, while in the case of others, it was heard in Toronto.

The first large-scale occurance of glossolalia on the North American continent took place at Topeka, Kansas in 1901. Experiences under gone and teachings developed there gave shape to all twentieth century Pentecostal groups.[3] From Topeka news of this peculiar phenomenon spread to Los Angeles, where a centre of Pentecostal worship was established at 312 Azuza Street.[4] It was to there that one of the founding fathers of the PAOC, R.E. McAlister, went, and it was there that he encountered glossolalia, receiving it as part of his own religious experience in 1906.[5] He returned to Canada, enraptured with his new experience.

In 1907 W.H. Durham of Chicago made his way to 312 Azuza Street. He, too, received glossolalia and subsequently returned to Chicago, where he preached the message of this new dimension of spiritual life.[6] It was in Durham's mission that A.H. Argue, a real estate agent from Winnipeg, Manitoba, first heard and observed glossolalia.[7] He returned to Winnipeg, opened his home to prayer meetings, and saw glossolalia appear among the supplicants on May 2, 1907.[8]

The other channel through which glossolalia passed to the founding fathers of the PAOC was the home of Mr. and Mrs. A. Hebden in Toronto. Glossolalia appeared in the mission which they were conducting in their cottage on November 17, 1906.[9] The Hebdens and those worshipping there had had no previous contact with the people at Azuza.[10] What has occurred among them was spontaneous.

The PAOC has grown steadily from these beginnings. In 1946 the fellowship was made up of 574 local assemblies and recognized 1,190 credential holders (ordained ministers, missionaries, etc.). It was estimated that its membership stood at 30,000.[11] By March 15, 1972, there were 749 local assemblies, 1,945 credential holders,[12] and an estimated membership of 160,000.[13] It is only in the last fifteen years that this group has begun to draw the serious attention of historians,[14] and it remains virtually virgin territory for the historian: the scope for research is vast.

Of course the growth which is observable in the PAOC did not take place in a vacuum: it happened in the context of a wider society. The purpose of this paper is to examine the PAOC's relationship to its social matrix.[15] As the study proceeds, it will become evident that the relationship between the PAOC and society through the years has been dynamic rather than static: there have been significant changes. We shall proceed by discussing several attitudes which have been held by the PAOC. Specifically, we shall give attention to its attitudes regarding personal behaviour, social responsibility, and education.[16]

ATTITUDE REGARDING PERSONAL BEHAVIOUR

First, we turn to the PAOC attitude regarding personal behaviour.

> As in tones of thunder the Lord insists upon separation from the world. Roman soldiers, after a night of riotous revelry, at day dawn, become sober and put on the soldier's armor. So, from the moment of conversion soldiers of Christ are to "cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light," never again to take it off: the course of this world being accounted forever a thing of the past![17]

This passage clearly illustrates the basic thinking underlying PAOC standards of personal behaviour. These standards rest upon an insistence upon separation from "the world".[18] The grounds, which are given expression, for this position are several: Scriptural injunctions;[19] the entirely corrupt state of the world,[20] and the loss of respect and influence if compromise with the world takes place.[21] It is here that tension arises for the Pentecostal, because his fundamental motivation in life is to "convert" as many men as possible to faith in Christ. However, this means that he must go into society and by doing so, run the risk of comoromising his standards of holiness in attempts to make himself more acceptable. Several Pentecostals have sensed this tension and addressed themselves to it, stressing that while it is necessary to convert men, one must also maintain his moral standards.[22] This emphasis upon the ideals of holiness and separation have characterized the PAOC throughout its history.[23]

We shall now give attention to what the PAOC has said regarding personal behaviour in a number of particular areas, starting with dress and appearance.

The tone of PAOC discussions of behaviour in this area was set by an article published in 1926, entitled "A Father's Advice".[24] In this article the principle which is laid down is "modesty". Clothing must not be immodest. This same principle appears in a resolution passed by the Saskatchewan District Conference of the PAOC in 1940. It reads:

> Whereas the Bible schools of our land play a great part in moulding the lives of our young people in the home assemblies be it
>
> Resolved that we the Saskatchewan conference go on record as recommending that a ruling be enforced forbidding the students to use cosmetics, the dressing of the hair after the fashion of the world, painting of fingers or wearing of apparel tending to conspicuousness by its lack of modesty or conformity to the world during the Bible school term.[25]

This resolution reveals the depth to which the feeling regarding modesty has run among Pentecostals. The same depth of feeling is evident in an article written in 1941 by D.N. Buntain.[26] Here he argues that when Satan began to bring immodest dress into the church, he was playing his "master card", because "he has been able, through this clever, destroying thing to get many, even among our preachers, on his side." By this Buntain means that although Pentecostal preachers could not be seduced by Satan by means of, for example, drinking or gambling, some have fallen because they have allowed immodest dress, which they mistakenly thought to be not worth protesting against, into churches. From this we may deduce that in spite of the fact that some members of the PAOC seemed to be wavering, the ideal of modest dress still prevailed in PAOC circles in 1941.

Interestingly enough, there appears to have been only one article published in the PT, the official organ of the PAOC, since

1941 which discusses immodest dress with some degree of detail.[27] This would suggest that the wavering which Buntain saw and warned against has assumed significant proportions over the last thirty years.

We turn now to the PAOC stance regarding sexual behaviour. First, it can be said that throughout its history the PAOC has decried both pre-marital and extra-marital sex, although it has never made clear what all it thinks the word 'sex' entails in this context.[28] G.N. Fulford speaks of the reduction of sexual love from the spiritual to the erotic realm, protesting strongly against it. While explaining how this could have happened, he says,

> Add to these the scores of shrewdly contrived advertising campaigns which make sex the not too slyly concealed bait to attract buyers for almost every imaginable product; the degraded columnists who have consecrated their lives to the task of the publicizing of soft, slinky nobodies with the faces of angels and the morals of alley cats; conscienceless novelists who win a doubtful fame and grow rich at the inglorious chore of dredging up literary putridities from the sewers of their souls to provide entertainment for the masses. These tell us something about how Eros has achieved his triumph over the civilized world.[29]

There can be little doubt about what the Pentecostal thinks about illicit sex. However, unfortunately for the PAOC, it has not been able to escape the influence of Eros entirely. Leona Wright makes reference to the fact that "Hasty marriages of necessity are infiltrating the rank and file of our youth."[30]

Regarding the questions of divorce and remarriage, the PAOC position has been modified slightly through the years. In 1941 it was thought that divorce was not a viable option for Christians and that to remarry while a former partner was still living would be to commit adultry--and adulterers cannot enter the kingdom of

heaven.[31] At present, divorce is strongly discouraged, but permitted on the grounds of adultery. After divorce, remarriage while the former partner is alive is discouraged. If a person does remarry, he becomes ineligible to hold credentials with the PAOC or to hold elective offices in the local church.[32]

While it is true that over the years the PAOC has spoken clearly regarding sexual behaviour and that the position adopted at present is anything but libertarian, it is also true that there have been modifications in both its pronouncements and its practices in this area.

When attention is directed toward what the PAOC has had to say regarding motion pictures, one sees that blanket condemnations have been issued. A resolution passed by the General Executive in March, 1971 sums up very well what the PAOC's position has been since the time of its inception. The resolution says,

> Resolved that we reaffirm our stand against theatre attendance by Pentecostal Christians, especially in view of the attempts being made to entice Christians to attend the movie version of 'The Cross and the Switchblade' which is being released in the theatres only, and other movies advertised as 'good' and 'responsible' entertainment.[33]

In fact, this resolution goes further than previous condemnations of motion pictures in that it explicitly forbids Pentecostals to attend a picture which is based on a book about the opening of a Christian mission among street gangs in New York.

In spite of the rigidity of the present stance, there is evidence that attendance at motion pictures is becoming more popular among younger Pentecostals, although there is no adequate research to support this statement.

Finally, in the last fifteen years it has become necessary for

the PAOC to take a stand regarding money. It is perhaps inaccurate to call the sentiments which have been expressed on this question a "stand": there has been only one article in the PT which has dealt with the issue at length, and that one was written by a British Pentecostal. The position taken is that money in itself is not wrong provided that having it does not lead to extravagance, ostentation, or one's using it to secure a place in the church for which one's spiritual qualifications do not qualify him.[34] It would appear that the PAOC has been less concerned about the sin of materialism than about other sins.

It may now be observed that throughout its history, on questions of personal behaviour, the PAOC has consistently rejected much of the moral behaviour of the larger society in favour of a more rigoristic standard. It may also be observed that it is becoming increasingly difficult for the PAOC to maintain that standard.

ATTITUDE REGARDING SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The second attitude of the PAOC which we shall examine is the attitude regarding social responsibility. As we shall see, there has been ambivalence here: there are signs that the Pentecostal has wanted both to ignore society and to play an active role in it. He has always been loyal, but he has not always been able to see his place clearly.[35]

Ambivalence is very much in evidence over the holding of public office. Negative feeling was expressed early. In 1927

G.E. Smith responded to the question "Should a Christian take part in the politics of the country?" by saying, "We believe not".[36] He did not think that the Christian should not be involved only to the extent that he would not run for office, but he also implied that the Christian should not even vote in elections.[37]

On the other hand, the problem has been grappled with by a number of authors who express a positive position regarding the Christian and politics. E.N.O. Kulbeck says that, in their desire to be separate from the world, many Christians isolate themselves from society, with the result that society is robbed of the influence of Christianity.[38] Donald Gee says we must respect Christians who go into politics, because "...it is governments that affect the living and witnessing conditions of millions."[39] In another article, E.N.O. Kulbeck urges his readers to vote and even offers some practical advice:

> In our Parliamentary system, if we want our vote to count in Ottawa, our final choice on how to vote, will therefore be strongly influenced by the moral qualifications of the leader of the party, and his ability to form a government. For this reason a vote cast for a third party candidate, even though the local candidate is a good man, will be ineffective in Ottawa, except in an opposition role.[40]

In addition to these comments, there have been several other articles published which call for political involvement and for prayer for politicians.[41]

Since 1950 members of the PAOC have begun to emerge as office holders. In the political field, four have been elected to provincial houses of legislature: P.A. Gagliardi,[42] Everett I. Wood,[43] Raymond Edwards,[44] and Mrs. Ethel Wilson.[45] All of these except Edwards have served as cabinet ministers. They represent three

political parties: Gaglardi and Wilson are Social Credit, Wood is NDP, and Edwards is Liberal. The kind of actions which Pentecostals hope their politicians will take was illustrated by Gaglardi when he rose in the B.C. Legislative Assembly to reply to comments a university professor had been making regarding the belief in God. He argued that it is folly to try to influence students against believing in God because it is a belief in God upon which democracy rests.[46] In addition to these who were elected to office, David Smith, a graduate of Carleton University, was appointed as executive assistant to the Honourable Walter Gordon, when he was a Minister-without-Portfolio in the federal cabinet.[47]

Alongside the politicians, the Pentecostals have had numbered amongst them a trade union leader. In 1955 Sam Jenkins swept into office as president of the Marine Workers and Boilermakers' Union (CCL) in Vancouver.[48] At the same time he was a lay preacher with the PAOC and was conducting a mission in Vancouver regularly. In justifying his position as a Christian at the head of a trade union Jenkins explained that he was there in order to help the needy,[49] and in order to reach union men for Christ.[50]

The PAOC has assumed social responsibility in the area of philanthropy with less hesitancy than in the area of public office. After acknowledging that spiritual concerns must occupy first place in the Chrisitian's thinking, E.N.O. Kulbeck goes on to argue strongly in favour of Christians being involved in activities which alleviate social problems.[51] However, even before Kulbeck wrote, the PAOC was actively engaged in several types of social ministry. During the past twenty-five years, agencies and districts

of the PAOC have operated Bethel Home for Girls in Toronto,[52] the Bethel Haven Rest Home in Nipawin, Saskatchewan,[53] the H.H. Williams Memorial Hospital in Hay River, NWT,[54] Shepherd Lodge, a senior citizens' home, in Toronto,[55] and Bethel Home for the Aged in Waterboro, New Brunswick.[56] Since the early 1950's the PAOC has been active in providing social services.[57]

About the same time as they were beginning to hold public office and to provide social care, Pentecostals were demonstrating increased awareness of their social responsibility by becoming vocal over issues which concerned society. Members of the PAOC have spoken out on abortion. The positions which they have presented are reducible to the statement that abortion is permissable, but only on very compelling grounds such as danger to the health of the mother or severe deformity of the fetus. The high view of the sacredness of human life leads the writers to regard abortion as a "last resort" measure.[58] One of the writers, V.L. Gingrich discusses the complexities of the issue lucidly, pointing out the responsibilities the evangelical Christian must be prepared to shoulder if he insists on opposing a freer approach to abortion.[59]

A Pentecostal voice has also been heard on the subject of sex education and family life. George Smith argues that the subject of sex should not be avoided and presents a four-point program involving the home, the church, the school, and the community as a responsible method of providing education in this area.[60]

Laws have also come under scrutiny. Various conferences have assumed positions (in all cases, conservative positions) on liquor,[61] the legalizing of the sale of contraceptive devices and drugs,[62]

the relaxing of laws regarding lotteries, homosexuality, and abortion (the action suggested on these issues included plans for a "write-in" campaign),[63] and the relaxing of federal drug laws.[64]

Sam Jenkins, now an evangelist with the PAOC, looks upon laws in another way. He says,

> I am my brother's keeper--against thieves, murderers, extortioners, and laws that discriminate against him. Therefore, I will join with him to fight a bad law. When I do so, I am helping to bear his burden, thus fulfilling the law of Christ.[65]

Jenkins also says that if a law is bad, "...every nonviolent action I can take to break it, I will."[66] These are extraordinary words to be coming from a PAOC evangelist.

All of these factors--the holding of public office, the philanthropic activity, the expression of opinions on social issues --combine to demonstrate that since 1950 the PAOC has had a growing sense of social responsibility.

ATTITUDE REGARDING EDUCATION

The PAOC's attitude toward education is the last of the three attitudes that we shall consider in this paper. There can be no doubt that over the years the matter of education has caused feelings to run high among Pentecostals. Both secular and theological education have evoked a variety of responses.

When one focuses attention upon education, the first two decades of the history of the PAOC--roughly 1920-1940--present a rather confusing picutre, which is attributable to the fact that there were then two widely differing attitudes on the subject.

On one hand, some Pentecostals seem to have viewed learning with varying degrees of antipathy. This feeling is enshrined in a resolution passed at the first General Conference of the PAOC in 1919.

> ...whereas much contention and confusion has been caused over the issue of one God and Trinitarian views, also the Baptismal Formula, be it resolved, that we as a body go on record as disapproving not only the above issues, but of all other issues, that divide and confuse God's people to no profit, and that aggressive evangelism be our motto.
>
> Whereas we recognize the three-fold relationship of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost being clearly taught in the New Testament, Be it resolved, that we express ourselves in harmony with this truth as expressed in the Word of God.
>
> As to baptism we feel like leaving the matter of formula with the individual.[67]

It would appear that the men at this conference were so disenchanted with theology that they were prepared to dismiss as of no consequence the fruit of centuries of prayer, thought, and discussion. In fact this resolution is an attempt to obviate further discussion. It would appear that theology was thought to be expendable because it was both divisive and time-consuming. These were men with a mandate. What was important was to let "aggressive evangelism be our motto" and to get on with the job. Sitting around thinking could not compare with that.

The aversion felt toward education was not limited to theological education. If anything, it was more strongly felt when secular education was in view. Stories were circulated depicting the sorrow which was caused by universities and colleges.[68]

This picture is made more complex by the fact that there were a significant number among the early Pentecostals who seem to

have a much greater appreciation for education than those whose views have been presented above. A number of the leaders of the fledgling movement were comparatively well-educated men. J. Eustace Purdie, who was principal of the theological college eventually founded by the PAOC from 1925 to 1950, had graduated with the B.D. degree from Wycliffe College, Toronto in 1907. He was awarded the D.D. degree honoris causa in 1936 by The Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.[70] Thomas T. Latto, District Superintendent of the Manitoba District of the PAOC from 1936 to 1938,[71] held the B.A. degree from the University of Manitoba, graduating in 1915, and two years later, in 1917, he graduated from Manitoba Theological College with honours.[72] D.N. Buntain, who went on to become the Superintendent of the Manitoba District of the PAOC[73] and later, the General Superintendent of the PAOC for the whole of Canada (1936-1944),[74] had graduated from Wesley College in 1922 with the Diploma in Theology for the General Conference Course,[75] after having been enrolled in a five-year theological program.[76] Buntain did well enough in his studies at Wesley College to be considered for an award at the time of his graduation.[77] H.C. Sweet, who served as Principal of Western Bible College in Winnipeg from January, 1931 until the summer of 1932,[78] and subsequently remained on the faculty of the college, had previously graduated with the B.A. degree from the University of Manitoba,[79] and served as Principal of the interdenominational Winnipeg Bible Institute.[80]

The presence of these men among early Pentecostals establishes the fact that there were at least some Pentecostals who had been

exposed to both secular and theological education, and there is no record that any of them sought to denigrate his education subsequent to joining the Pentecostal movement. To be coupled with these facts are the observations that in 1927 both the eastern and the western conferences of the PAOC voted unanimously in favour of establishing a permanent Bible College (property was purchased in Winnipeg for that purpose),[31] and that in the same year support for the Bible College was warmly solicited.[32]

All of this serves to indicate that among the early members of the PAOC there were both those who depreciated and those who valued education.[33]

From this situation which existed prior to 1940, there emerged a variety of positions. Some continued to be suspicious of education,[34] while others have recognized the importance of education, especially theological education, and spoken in favour of it.[35] Gradually a moderate position which attempts to balance education and spiritual life has appeared. It is to be found in the objectives for Bible Colleges which were articulated at a meeting of Bible College leaders in the fall of 1964:

(1) The colleges must recognize the claims of young people, who, because of the kind of society in which they live, are obliged to demand further, better and higher education.
(2) The colleges must recognize and emphasize the importance of teaching biblical languages, and teaching them in a sympathetic atmosphere.
(3) The colleges must recognize the need to maintain stability in the face of pressures to offer work for which they are not qualified. Standards must be raised, but they must be raised slowly so that continuity with the past is not broken, lest the impression be left that old values no longer prevail.
(4) The colleges must recognize that they can advance the cause of Christ's Kingdom only if they do not lose sight

of their original objective, namely, the preparation of men for the proclamation of the gospel in the power and demonstration of the Holy Spirit.

(5) The colleges must not repeat the error of other denominations who have placed too high a value upon academic qualifications and have thereby excluded worthy and mature candidates from entering the ministry. The colleges must continue to have courses available for the training of applicants who have not had the opportunity of completing their high school.[36]

We see here a blending of an appreciation for education and a desire to retain a prominent spiritual dimension in institutions which train men for the ministry of the PAOC.

This in part reflects a reality of the present situation: in spite of cautions which are given regarding universities,[37] attendence at universities has now been widely accepted and academic honours are received with some degree of pride among Pentecostals.[38]

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that there have been changes in the relationship between society and the PAOC during the approximately 55-year history of the movement. Attitudes have experienced modification to varying degrees: with regard to personal behaviour, standards of holiness and separation have been maintained, but with increasing difficulty and shifting emphases; with regard to social responsibility, hesitancy to become involved dissipated markedly during the decade between 1950 and 1960; with regard to education, out of an ambiguous situation in the 1920's and 1930's a moderate position has arisen, which trys to hold education and and spiritual interest in balance. However, at the same time university education has become more acceptable among Pentecostals. There can be no question but that the PAOC is experiencing much more interaction with society now than it did in 1919.

Notes

[1]Canada Gazette, 52 (1918-199) 3647

[2]The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada will hereafter be referred to as the PAOC.

[3]Vinson Synan, The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), pp. 99-103

[4]Synan, pp. 103-116; W.J. Hollenweger, The Pentecostals, Trans. R.A. Wilson (London: SCM, 1972), pp. 22ff.; Frank Bartleman, Another Wave Rolls In! Ed. J.G. Myers (Northridge, Calif.: Voice Publications, 1970), pp. 46-92.

[5]Gloria G. Kulbeck, What God Hath Wrought: A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (Toronto: PAOC, 1958), p. 29ff.: Synan, p. 114.

[6]J.T. Nichol, Pentecostalism (New York: Harper and Row, 1966) p. 37.

[7]A.R. Argue, "Azuza Street Revival Reaches Winnipeg," The Pentecostal Testimony (Hereafter referred to as PT.), (May, 1956),9.

[8]Ibid.

[9]G.A. Chambers, "Early Days of Pentecost," PT, (Nov. 15, 1951), 6; S.H. Frodsham, With Signs Following: The Story of the Pentecostal Revival in the Twentieth Century (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1941), p. 53.

[10]Frodsham, p. 53; G.F. Atter. "The Third Force" (Peterborough, Ont.: The College Press, 1962), p. 36.

[11]"Secretarial Report," PT, 27, 21, (Nov. 15, 1946), 6.

[12]"Report of the General Secretary-Treasurer", Departmental Reports: 23th General Conference, Halifax, Nova Scotia, August 24-29, 1972, p.11.

[13]Letter from E.N.O. Kulbeck, Director of Public Relations, PAOC, to R.A.M. Kydd, May 3, 1973.

[14]So far only one book (Gloria Kulbeck, What God Hath Wrought), one monograph (Erne A. Peters, The Contribution to Education by the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (Homewood, Man., 1971), and one thesis (E.R. Ross, The Emergence of Theological Education within the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (Unpublished M. Th. Thesis: University of Toronto, 1971), which focus upon the PAOC, have been produced. The PAOC has also been discussed in Atter, "The Third Force" (pp. 35-42, 67-69, 95-106), Nichol, Pentecostalism (pp. 156-164), and the older work, Frodsham, With Signs Following (pp. 53-56). At

present there are significant problems inherent in research into the PAOC with regard to sources. An interest in archives is only just now clearly emerging within the fellowship, which means that more, and perhaps better, sources than are now available will be placed at the disposal of scholars in the future. In the light of this, the conclusions arrived at in the present study must be regarded as tentative to some extent. However, I think that the basic observations will remain valid. It is my opinion that new material will allow us to speak more precisely on the issues raised here, but that it will not necessitate a far-reaching revision of the positions taken.

[15]This should be a useful study in view of the emphasis which sociologists of religion have placed upon the relationship between religious groups and society. See Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, Trans.; O. Wyon (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931), I, 331 and 336; H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929). p. 20; Liston Pope, Millhands and Preachers (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), p. 119; S.D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948), p. xii; W.E. Mann, Sect, Cult, and Church in Alberta (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955), p. 5; R.A. Dynes, "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status," American Sociological Review, 20 (1955), 555 and 559; B.R. Wilson, "An Analysis of Sect Development, "Patterns of Sectarianism,Ed. B.R. Wilson (London: Heinemann, 1967), pp. 23, 25, and 41; Benton Johnson, "Do Holiness Sects Socialize in Dominant Values ?" Social Forces, 39 (May, 1961), 309, 310, and 316; D.A. Martin, "Denomination," British Journal of Sociology, 13 (1962), 11; Benton Johnson, "On Church and Sect," American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), 542; N.J. Demerath, III, Social Class in American Protestantism (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1965), pp. xix and 33; B.R. Wilson, Religion in Secular Society (Penguin Books, 1966), pp. 213 and 215ff.; Werner Stark, Sectarian Religion (The Sociology of Religion, 2) (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), pp. 6 and 267f.; B.R. Wilson, Religious Sects (London: World University Library, 1970),p. 16; Clifford Hill, "Immigrant Religious Sect Development in Britain," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 10, 2 (1971), 122, and Benton Johnson, "Church and Sect Revisited," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 10, 2 (1971), 127f. A number of scholars have rejected either much of the work which has been based on the "Church -Sect" typology or the typology itself (See P. Gustafson, "UO-US-PS-PO": A Restatement of Troeltsch's Church-Sect Typology," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 6(1967), 65; A.W. Eister, "Toward a Radical Critique of Church-Sect Typologizing," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,6 (1967), 85; J.A. Coleman, "Church-Sect Typology and Organizational Precariousness," Sociological Analysis,29 (1968), 63, and J.K. Benson and J.H. Dorsett, "Toward a Theory of Religious Organizations," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,10, 2 (1971), 138f.), but I agree with Benton Johnson ("Church and Sect Revisited," p. 127) that the "Church-Sect" typology has stimulated research (and I think it will

continue to do so) and that it is, therefore, premature to ring the curtain down upon it. Of course, this does not mean that there is no need to continue attempting to refine the typology in order to make it a more useful tool in research.

In spite of the fact that the reasearch behind this paper was guided and informed by the sociological studies referred to above, and by others which have not been mentioned, the material in the paper is not presented as an empirical test of a particular hypothesis.

[16]These attitudes have been selected because they are regarded as being important in the discussion of the types of religious groups by sociologists who have studied sectarian religion, and because of considerations regarding space. Other attitudes which could have been studied with benefit would be those concerning organization, ecumenicity, evangelism, and worship.

[17]"Separation," PT, 3, 11 (Nov., 1927), 15.

[18]This may be regarded as evidence of the importance the Holiness Movement had upon emerging pentecostal groups in North America. In a paper entitled The Holiness Movement: Preparing Ground for Pentecostalism, presented in connection with a course in the Toronto School of Theology, January, 1972, B.R. Ross argues strongly for a connection between the Holiness movement in Canada, led by R.C. Horner, and the PAOC. See also Synan's The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States.

[19] "Alone," PT, 6, 8 (Aug., 1927), 9.

[20]Ibid.

[21] D.N. Buntain, "Compromise: The Easy Way to Ruin," PT, 22, 15 (Aug. 1, 1941), 3.

[22]Buntain, "Compromise," p. 3; H.H. Barber, "God's People Are a Separate People," PT, (July, 1954), 31, and Mrs. Hope Smith, "Worldliness: What Is It?" PT, (July, 1965), 28f. B.R. Wilson discusses this tension in "An Analysis of Sect Development," pp. 36f.

[23]See W.E. McAlister, "Holiness," PT, (Feb., 1956) 4 and 25: Central Pentecostal College (Hereafter referred to as CPC.), Minutes of the 1962 General Conference of The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, p. 3, September 15, Resolution No. 12: "The Biblical Standards of Morality" (An official statement prepared by the Youth and Family Commission of the PAOC and approved by the General Executive of the PAOC), PT, (May, 1966), 7, and CPC, Minutes of the 27th General Conference, The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, Victoria, B.C. August 20-25, 1970, p. 25, Aug. 25, Resolution No. 20.

[24]PT, 5, 6 (June, 1926), 14.

[25]CPC, Minutes of the Saskatchewan District Conference of the PAOC 1940, p. 5.

[26]"' The Old Fogie Again,'" PT, 22 24 (Dec. 15, 1941), 3.

[27]Mrs. Hope Smith, "Worldliness: What Is It," PT, (July, 1965), 29.

[28]See C.M. Ward, "The Fulfillment of Hosea 4:1-3: Moral Defilement and Its Remedy," PT, (Sept., 1938), 18; "The Biblical Standards of Morality," p. 7, and H.H. Barber, "The New Morality and the Eternal Verities," PT, (Nov., 1968), 5 and 29.

[29]G.N. Fulford, "The Erotic versus the Spiritual," PT, (Aug., 1963) 2.

[30]"Can Our Youth Survive?" PT, (April, 1969), 6.

[31]"Concerning Divorce," PT, 22, 16, (Sept. 1, 1941), 19.

[32]CPC, Minutes of the 27th General Conference, The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, Victoria, B.C., August 20-25, 1970, p. 21f., Aug. 24, Resolution N. 14.

[33]PT, (June, 1971), 9.

[34]Donald Gee, "The False Gospel of Materialism," PT, 39, 2 (Feb., 1958), 7.

[35]Pentecostals have been able to produce very patriotic, almost jingoistic literature (See D.N. Buntain, "Our Flag," PT, 22, 2 (Jan. 15, 1941), 3, but they have also vascillated over conscientious objection (See "A Statement of Fundamental Truths Approved by the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada," PT, 9, 10 (Oct., 1928), p. 5, section 23; D.N. Buntain, "Conscientious Objectors, " PT, 22, 4 (Feb. 15, 1941), 2; E.A. Harrison, "What of Our Little Ones?" PT, 22, 12 (July 1, 1941), 15, and D.N. Buntain, "If I Were Caught in the Draft," PT, 22, 16 (Sept., 1, 1941), 4f).

[36]G.E. Smith, "Citizenship," PT, 6, 1 (Jan., 1927), 16.

[37]Ibid.

[38]"Separation or Isolation," PT, 38, 9 (Sept., 1957), 2.

[39]Donald Gee, "Pentecost and Politics," PT, 41, 2 (Feb., 1960), 8.

[40]"Why a Christian Should Vote",PT, (Nov., 1965), 32.

[41]See E.E. Cairns, "The State, Church, and Christian Citizen," PT, 43, 3 (Mar., 1962), 6-9; Walter Judd, "The Christian and Politics," PT, 43,3 (Mar., 1962), 7; Blanch E.H. Dekoning, "How Do We Rate as Christian Citizens?" PT, (April, 1963), 9, and E.N.O. Kulbeck, "Editorial,"PT, 43,7 (July, 1962), 2.

[42]"Rev. P.A. Gaglardi Appointed Works Minister in Bennett's Cabinet," PT (Sept. 15 1952), 11. Gaglardi is still an MLA in B.C. and he is still the pastor of the Kamloops church which he was pastoring when he was first elected to office.

[43]"People and Places," PT, 43, 1 (Jan., 1962), 15.

[44]"People and Activities," PT, 40, 8 (Aug., 1959), 12

[45]"Canadian," PT, 40, 9 (September, 1959), 17.

[46]The Hon. P.A. Gaglardi, "Belief in God and 'Academic Freedom'", (A speech delivered in the B.C. Legislature.) PT, (May, 1963), 28f.

[47]"People and Places," PT, (April, 1967), 14.

[48]"Surprise Vote: Pastor Sam Boilermakers Head," PT, (April, 1955), 26.

[49]S.B. Jenkings, "Pentecostal Union Leader Speaks His Mind," PT, 41, 5 (May, 1960), 8.

[50]S.B. Jenkins, "A Trade Union President's Testimony for Christ," PT, 39, 2(Feb., 1958), 6.

[51]E.N.O. Kulbeck, "Faith without Works," PT, 41, 3 (Mar., 1960), 2 and "My Brother's Keeper," PT, 41, 8 (Aug., 1960), 2.

[52]This institution, which was founded by Mrs. Joseph Hutchinson in 1928 (Pauline Grant, "A Ministry of Christian Compassion," PT, 43, 9 (Sept., 1962), 34.), came into being to help unmarried girls who were pregnant. After the death of its founder, the Eastern and Western Ontario Districts of the PAOC maintained the home until it was taken over by the Pentecostal Benevolent Association of Ontario between the General Conferences of 1960 and 1962 (See C.M. Wortman, "General Secretary Treasurer's Report," PT, 43, 11 Nov, 1962), 4.

[53]This senior citizens' home was built by the Rev. and Mrs. Charles Bates (See Grant, p. 4.), taken over by the Saskatchewan District of the PAOC (See Office of the Saskatchewan District of the PAOC, C.H. Stiller, District Superintendent's Report, 1953, p. 4.), and sold in 1966 (See OPC, Minutes of the Saskatchewan Conference of the PAOC, 1966, p. 2.).

[54]The 6-bed hospital was opened in 1957 (See "H.H. Williams Memorial Hospital Dedicated," PT, 39, 1 (Jan., 1958), 12.), enlarged to accommodate 12 beds in 1962 (See Eunice Myrah, "Hay River Hospital Resume," PT, Feb., 1965), 10.), and finally sold with the hospital being relocated in a new 22-bed building, which was opened on June 28, 1965. (See "New Hay River Hospital Opened," PT, (Oct., 1965), 14.).

[55]This 107-bed institution was built under the auspices of the Pentecostal Benevolent Association of Ontario (See Gloria G. Kulbeck, "When Winter Comes," PT, 41, 1 (Jan., 1960), 8.), and was opened in April, 1961 (Grant, p. 5). The provision of additional space has been discussed (See "New", PT, 52, 7 (July, 1971, 13).

[56]This home was opened in 1942 with room for 35 guests (See "People and Places," PT, 41, 7 (July, 1960), 17f. By 1962 it had been taken over by the Maritimes Pentecostal Benevolent Association (Grant, p. 5). On October 19, 1963 additions to the home were opened which enable it to accommodate 70 guests. (See Ralph Thompson, "New Premises of Bethel Home Opened," (Reprint from Fredericton, N.B. Gleaner.) PT, (Feb., 1964), 9.

[57]The opening of a senior citizens' home in Newfoundland was announced ("Senior Citizens' Home for Newfoundland," PT, (Oct., 1966), 14), but no more information is available to the present writer.

It is interesting to note that, in the cases of three of the five institutions which the PAOC has operated, individuals have taken the initiative in establishing them rather than the organization. This would suggest that philanthropy has been more of an individual concern among Pentecostals than a corporate feeling.

[58]C.R. Stiller, "Therapeutic Abortion from the Medical Viewpoint," PT, (Aug., 1971), 4,5, and 26 and V.L. Gingrich, "Therapeutic Abortion from a Theological Viewpoint," PT, (Aug., 1971), 6-9. For a more traditional approach to the question see Louis Tamminga, "A Christian Testimony Regarding Abortion." (Reprint from the Banner.), PT, (Aug., 1969), 6.

[59]Gingrich, p. 9.

[60]George Smith, "Family Life and Sex Education in Edmonton Schools," PT, (April, 1970), 9.

61 CPC, Minutes of the Manitoba District Conference of the PAOC, 1942, July 3.

[62]CPC, Minutes of the 1966 General Conference of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, p. 24, Aug., 30, Resolution No. 34

[63]CPC, Minutes of the 26th General Conference, The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, Windsor, Ontario, August 22-27, 1968., p. 15f., August 26, Resolution No. 19.

[64]CPC, Minutes of the 27th General Conference, The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, Victoria, B.C., August 20-25, 1970, p. 11, Aug., 21, Resolution No. 6.

[65]S.B. Jenkins, "Breaking the Law," PT, (Sept., 1969), 28.

[66]Jenkings, p. 4.

[67]National Office of the PAOC, Toronto, Ontario, General Conference Minutes of the PAOC, 1919, p. 19 as quoted by B.R. Ross, The Emergence of Theological Education within the PAOC, p. 53.

[68]See Ross, The Emergence of Theological Education within the PAOC, p. 57.

[69]J.E. Purdie, "My Own Pentecost, PT, (June, 1970), 4.

[70]J.E. Purdie in an interview conducted by R.A.N. Kydd, March 24, 1973.

[71]See CPC, Minutes of the Manitoba District Conference of the PAOC, 1936, p. 1 and 1938, p. 1.

[72]T.T. Latto "From Presbyterian Church to Pentecost," PT, 39, 5 (May, 1958), 7 and 28.

[73]CPC, Manitoba District Conference Minutes, 1928, p. 10 and 1935, p. 1.

[74]W.E. McAlister, "Funeral Service of Rev. D.N. Buntain," PT, 36, 11 (Nov., 1955), 23

[75]University of Winnipeg, Minutes of the Senate of Wesley College, April 26, 1922, p. 28.

[76]University of Winnipeg, Student Records, Wesley College, 1920-21 and 1921-22.

[77]University of Winnipeg, Minutes of the Senate of Wesley College, April 26, 1922, p. 29. The award was not given to him.

[78]Kulbeck, What God Hath Wrought, p. 52.

[79]"People and Places," PT, 40, 6 (June, 1960), 16.

[80]CPC. Letter from Rollin T. Chafer to H.C. Sweet, November 5, 1930. It is fairly widely-known that Sweet also held a legitimate Ph.D., but I was unable to ascertain from where he got it or when.

[81]"Permanent Bible School," PT, 7, 9 (Sept., 1927), 19.

[82]"Canadian Pentecostal Bible College," PT, 8, 11 (Nov., 1927), 10.

[83]From this it would appear that Ross is too sweeping when he says, "Quite simply, the earliest Pentecostal followers had no respect for theology because they equated all theology with what was popularly referred to as "modern theology". (The Emergence of Theological Education within the PAOC, p. 29).

[84]See D.N. Suntain, "Evolution--Some Things to Think About," PT, 22, 8 (April 15, 1941), 3; L.T. Holdcroft, "Modern Fables," PT, 31, 2 (Jan. 15, 1950), 5; P.S. Jones, "Modern Education--Whither Bound?" PT, 28, 18 (Nov. 1, 1947), 5, 22; "Education--Bane or Blessing", PT, 40, 6 (June, 1959), 7, and W.E. McAlister, "Appalling Infidelity in Modern Institutions of Learning," PT, (July 1, 1952), 6f.

[85]"National Bible School Committee Meeting Report," PT, 22, 11 (June 1, 1941), 6; A.C. Schindel, "The Importance of Our Bible Colleges." PT, 39, 7 (July, 1958), 5, 28; C.W. Lynn, "A Trained Ministry," PT, (July, 1964), 4, 35, and T. Johnstone, "Theology; the Greatest of the Sciences," PT, (June, 1966), 11.

[86]C.H. Stiller, "Bible Colleges Emphasize Pentecostal Standards," PT, (Sept., 1966), 11.

[87]For example, see C.A. Ratz, "'Lost Faith' at University," PT, (Mar., 1966), 5, 33.

[88]See Bernice Gerard, "Pentecostal Chaplain Appointed at University, " PT, (Jan, 1964), 10, 34; B. Fradsham, "Chi Alpha," PT, (Mar., 1966), 28 (The article reports the founding of an association of Pentecostal students on the campus of Memorial University, St. John's Newfoundland.), and "Christ Ambossador Wins $2,800 University Scholarship," PT, (Mar., 1966), 29 (This is representative of several such reports.).

SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE AND CHURCH HISTORY: A CASE STUDY

To introduce the spectre of sociology at this meeting of Canadian church historians may be deemed heretical, or at least retrogressive, by some. But, if legitimation is required, it should be remembered that when the late H. H. Walsh decried the undue devotion among religious analysts to certain sociological constructs, the issue was one of reductionism. It was his belief, for example, that the church-sect typology so dominant in Canadian church historiography limited the understanding of religious "enthusiasm".[1]

The concern of this paper is not to simplify by the introduction of sociological explanation but rather to underline just one factor in historiographical analysis. The larger framework for this discussion is historical relativism which assumes with Carl Berger that history invariably "reflects and incorporates the ideological climate of the period in which it was conceived and composed".[2] The narrower focus is ethnic historiography recently raised to consciousness in Canada by French-Canadian nationalism and in the United States by both Black Power advocates and a generally malfunctioning melting pot.[3] The sociology of knowledge especially as articulated by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann[4] provides the analytical perspective with the case in point coming from the Mennonite study of Anabaptism as critiqued most notably by James M. Stayer of Queen's University.[5] Given the imprecision inherent in this form of theoretical procedure, this paper may best be seen as an excercise in methodological probing.

I

The "social construction of reality" is, according to our sociologists, a dialectical process of externalization, objectification, and internalization. For present purposes it is sufficient to interpret this "sociologeze" to mean that man, because of his peculiar biological nature, creates an environment of society and culture in which his humanity is completed and defined, this social environment most notably in its language gains the status of objective reality, and this reality in turn is owned by the individual as internal facticity through socialization to the extent that "the structures of this world come to determine the subjective structures of consciousness itself".[6] Despite the "real" status of this objective world, its fragile nature in the face of chaos requires legitimization through a "Weltanschauung". Because religion plays a decisive role in the construction and maintenance of these "realities", the sociology of religion becomes an integral partner of the sociology of knowledge.[7]

Even if this system deserves criticism especially where the empirical sociology as Van Harvey argues tends to drift off into philosophical speculation,[8] it proves most suggestive to church historians. For one, under the broadened definition of religion offered, the vast variety of new and pseudo- religions within our pluralistic society which alongside traditional religions serve the legitimating function, deserve inclusion under the aegis of religious history, if not of church history more narrowly defined.[9] Then too, this perspective places a large question mark after the concept of secularization insofar as that term refers to dereligification.[10]

The interest here in this "relationship between social structure and consciousness", however, focusses rather on the necessity for historical

study to perceive the interaction between society and thought in both the era under research and the historians own ideation. Parenthetically, before pursuing these dual aspects, two caveats are required lest we once again drift into a simplistic reductionism. To begin, the assumption here is of a mutual interaction between the thought world and social situation rather than a one way determinism.[11] And further, to speak of historical relativism in this sense does not exclude the possibility of at least comparative historical objectivity (and truth?) but rather should serve as a step towards that "noble dream". Speaking from within the historicist tradition which strongly influenced the sociology of knowledge, F. H. Bradley suggested that "it is when history becomes aware of its presuppositions that it first becomes truly critical and protects itself (as far as is possible) from the caprice of fiction".[12]

There is of course a limit to the historical applicability of the sociology of knowledge. As Peter Berger noted in appropriate humility "There can be no satisfying sociological explanation of why Hegel thought what he did" although, he added, "sociology is relevant in seeking to explain the impact of a thinker of Hegel's stature".[13] James Preus, an historian of Christian thought, argues that the area preserved as sacrosanct from the wiles of sociology is, however, much too large. An epistemological dualism fostered by Hegelian idealism, according to Preus, is exhibited by most historians of Christian thought, who accordingly operate as though ideas float entirely free of a societal base.[14] Historians more interested in the institutions and common piety of the church possibly avoid the epistemological trap Preus identifies by operating more closely to those less lettered in feigning ahistorical "truth". .

But even if church historians do perceive the relation between society and ideas in their historical subjects, the social rootedness of their own work deserves much more serious consideration than has been evidenced, at least overtly, heretofore. A notable exception is a most provocative essay on The Myth of Christian Origins in which the author, Robert L. Wilken, adopted the Berger-Luckmann perspective to speak of the "historical constructions of the past". It is his thesis that "what memory is in the lives of individuals, history is for groups - organizations, institutions, religions or nations",[15] and that "historical memory contributes to the social construction of reality".[16] Accordingly, "to speak of historical constructions of the past is to speak of the way the memory of the past is formed by the experiences of a community, and kept alive as the community reproduces these memories in its ongoing life". "Someone living outside of the community", he adds, "may have quite a different perception of the same historical event."[17]

This community rootedness and functionality of history is echoed in the report of the History Panel delegated by the Survey of the Behavioral and Social Sciences conducted under the auspices of the National Academy of Science. According to this significant study of the current status of historical studies in America, history is defined as:

> first of all, the custodian of the collective memory and as such performs the important function of nourishing the collective ego. Second, it is in all societies a primary vehicle of the socialization of the young, teaching them the past so that they may know who they are and behave appropriately in the present. Third, it is the branch of inquiry that seeks to arrive at an accurate account and valid understanding of the past.[18]

Interestingly, that part of this definition which seeks to emphasize historical "objectivity" uses normative terminology such as "valid understanding" which is in itself community determined.

A ready example of interest to church historians in which the history created by a community is supremely socially functional is suggested by Kenneth Murdock's study of Puritanism. Witnessing their seemingly insatiable appetite for historical writing, Murdock concluded that:

> "the Puritan wrote and read biography and history partly because they helped him in his effort to establish his relation to the traditions, symbols, myths, common experience, common sensibility and common culture of the world outside his little province. If he could establish this relation, he could ease his feeling of isolation and his worries about his 'status' and 'belongingness' in the whole human community. If he read lives and histories diligently enough he might better understand himself and his intimates in the village, and be more confident of his dignity and 'identity' and theirs." [19]

These lengthy quotations conclude the attempt to suggest that among the various insights the sociology of knowledge offers to history, it is of special importance at least for this essay, that history writing is rooted in community and is functional towards the identity definition of that community. "Identity" as here understood obviously moves beyond biography to embrace, in continuity with the work of Erik Erikson, the concept of a "group ego", or if you will a "community ego", i.e. the very stuff of History.[20]

II

North American society can be defined in terms of the criss-crossing of two sets of social stratification - the one based on class and the other on ethnicity.[21] Sociologists of knowledge in the tradition of both Marx and Mannheim have been impressed by the functionality of horizontal social differentiations in the formation of varying "realities". [22] Without denying the role of class in the social construction of reality, it is here suggested that in North America especially, "ethnicity" is an important variable in historical consciousness.[23]

Studies of New York City focussed upon the Age of Jackson[24] and the present alike[25] underline the ethnicity variable in American self-identity and self-interest. Thus ethnic block voting continues to provide major leakage to, if not actually shattering, the proverbial melting pot. Similarly John Porter's monumental study of Canadian society insists that class interest cannot vitiate, even if frequently assimilating, the facts of ethnicity.[26]

In keeping with the definitional direction established by E. K. Francis,[27] Milton M. Gordon attributed the concept "ethnic group" to "any group which is defined or set off by race, religion, or national origin, or some combination of these categories".[28] Ethnicity thus moves beyond kinship relationships to embrace the associational dimensions of peoplehood and Gemeinschaft.[29] Recently Andrew Greeley, in a most provocative interpretation of American religion, argued that in the face of the "impersonality of the industrial metropolis", American denominations emerged as "quasi-ethnic" entities to fulfill the need for belonging.[30] The vertical groupings in American society based on ethnic differentiations are accordingly not only the vestiges of divergent heritages imported into America but also the ongoing associations in which the individual is embraced in a group ego.[31]

Accepting these definitions, historians will find interesting Gordon's conclusion that the ethnic group is "likely to be the group of historical identification".[32] That is, the group established by race, religion or national origin in which or to which the individual has been socialized supplies his historical memory and historical identity. Thus Michael Novak

offers this fascinating suggestion. "What is an ethnic group?", he asks.

> "It is a group with historical memory, real or imaginary. One belongs to an ethnic group in part involuntarily, in part by choice. Given a grandparent or two, one chooses to shape one's consciousness by one history rather than another. Ethnic memory is not a set of events remembered, but rather a set of instincts, feelings, intricacies, expectations, patterns of emotion and behavior; a sense of reality; a set of stories for the individuals - and for people as a whole to live out."[33]

Novak is reaching for an understanding of ethnicity very similar to Clifford Geertz's definition of religion. According to Geertz a religion is:

> "(1) a system of symbols which acts to
> (2) establish powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations in men by
> (3) formulating conceptions of a general order of existance and
> (4) clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that
> (5) the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic." [33b]

For Novak, ethnic identity serves a religious function; it establishes "a sense of reality; a set of stories for the individuals - and for the people as a whole to live out;" it establishes "moods and motivations". Thus, Novak not only agrees that the ethnic group is of utmost importance in the social construction of reality, but also emphasizes that the unique historical "reality" of an ethnic entity is less a matter of historical chronology than of "mood".

It is within this context that ethnic and denominational historiography must be seen. Such history is written from the vantage of the "reality" to which the historian has been socialized. Thus, "ingroup" and "outgroup" interpretations will likely vary if not in fact at least in mood. The "ingroup" historian writes for his own and his community's identity, whereas the "outgroup" historian writes, in part, to incorporate the ethnic entity under study into his own and his community's self-understanding. Accordingly, Vincent Harding insists that white American history must be entirely reconceived to include the Black experience in every facet. Only then can it begin to be the Black man's history - and for that matter, an honest white man's history.[34] But even then, as is symbolized in the debate over William Styron's The Confessions of Nat Turner, Black and white historiography will vary according to their particular worlds of "reality".[35] A similar example could be cited regarding the divergence between French and English interpretations of Canadian history.[36] These cases of differing historical readings are thus not simply a matter of bigotry, apologetics or propoganda nor necessarily of disagreements on historical "facts" - although these frequently emerge - but rather of honest differences based upon divergent "realities". Refereeing between varying historical interpretations, or in other words, relative historical objectivity is possible only when the social construction of diverse realities is realized, and to the extent possible, superceeded. According to Mannheim, this ought to be the task of the intellectual.[37]

Contrary to Mannheim's fondest hopes, the intellectual remains a human animal and thus cannot, at least in any absolute sense, escape the social conditioning of his ideation.[38] However, the intellectual frequently occupies a social situation which allows him to offer a unique perspective and which, in turn qualifies any monolithic emphasis upon ethnicity in the social construction of reality. As Milton Gordon theorizes, intellectuals found largely in the university and arts professions tend to be "marginal men" in

the sense that they have weakened traditional ethnic identities and, therefore, tend to look to each other for their primary group relations, forming thereby a subsociety of their own.[39] Accordingly as subsociety membership shifts so does the "reality" modify in the new situation.

The implications of the intellectual community as a unique subsociety - or "ethnos" if you will - are most relevant to the subject at hand but for now can only be hinted at from a distance. It might be suggested, for example, that the professor of religion or history writing primarily for fellow referents of the intellectual subsociety is working from a different "reality" than the church historian writing from within the "reality" of his ethnic group. In the U.S. this distinction is institutionalized, although only in shades of gray, in the history division of the American Academy of Religion and the American Society of Church History. The church historian straddling several such subsocieties, as many do, must in some way sort out his "realities" for the health of his historical product.

A further modification, lest we reduce North American society to a static series of parallel ethnic groups, hinges on the dynamic nature of ethnic "reality" resultant upon a vast complex of subsocietal interaction. Common religious, educational, economic, political, entertainment and mass media influences minimize divergent realities and push towards varying degrees and modes of acculturation. In similar fashion the history of the dominant groups - the "charter" or "core" ethnics - is passed on to the minority groups as normative in identity definition.[40] The extent to which this "standard" history is adopted by the minorities as their history and results in amnesia with regard to their own unique stories, assimilation has taken place.[41]

Yet the maintenance of ethnic identities for a variety of reasons and by diverse mechanisms denies total assimilation. Geographical, cultural, social and ideological differentiations acting separately or in varying combinations to continue to define distinct ethnic identities, although these identities are frequently redefined to accommodate the acculturation forces undermining traditional self-understanding.[42] Not least, ethnic ideologues most frequently through ethnic history, offer the group ideological alternatives to absolute assimilation.[43] Thus, the variations in historical perspective resulting from the ethnic construction of reality, remain an important variable in historical analysis.

III

Mennonite historiography, especially in its recent quest of the Anabaptist vision, exemplifies rather forcefully the ideological function of both ethnic and denominational history.[44] This historiography may not be typical for as James Nichols noted: "The Mennonites have exhibited in this generation a vigor in historical studies unequaled, in proportion to their size, by any other Christian tradition in America.... (This movement) seems to have arisen in part from the international crisis of identity of the Mennonites and their need to identify a viable tradition."[45] But even if the Mennonite case is unique, it may at least prove suggestive in the study of other American religious bodies. Any adequate understanding of Mennonite historiography and the social context to which it responded requires detailing which is in process elsewhere.[46] Suggestions as to the direction of such an analysis offered here obviously carry the risks of inaccuracy inherent in all such abbreviations.

The crisis of identity, correctly isolated by Nichols, climaxed after the first World War and resulted from a confluence of a series of factors. Anxiety arose with: the end of significant geographical and cultural differentiation, the inability to join the American nation in the Great War, the lack of an adequate written ideology, the growing body of University-trained scholars, the unsatisfactory flirtations with both the Fundamentalist and Modernist parties, and the disgrace of their forefathers at the hands of church historians from other traditions. The solution pressed by the Mennonite ideologues was to share in the renewed emphasis on theology among church historians[47] by translating the Anabaptist research begun in late nineteenth century Europe into a viable theological identity for twentieth century American Mennonites.[48] The concrete manifestations, all of which related to Harold S. Bender - the major architect - in some way, culminated in the Mennonite Quarterly Review, the Mennonite Encyclopedia, numerous source publications, dissertations, monographs and a Bender Festschrift. The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision, which included his American Society of Church History presidential address "The Anabaptist Vision" - a virtual paradigm of the movement.

These Anabaptist studies which emerged to serve as a new formulation of Mennonite ideology have recently come under repeated criticism.[49] James Stayer, for example, although admitting his own indebtedness to Mennonite scholarship and noting recent exceptions to the rule, found unwarranted "the premise fostered above all by American Mennonites, that something called 'Evangelical Anabaptism' had a historical existance that began in Zurich in 1525 and that gave rise to the Swiss Brethren, Mennonites and Hutterites".[50] Stayer objected primarily to the isolation of a systematic theology from an essentially diverse and dynamic movement.[51] The offense of this operation to sound history, according to Stayer, was the imposition of a normative definition from another era upon a historical movement in which theological flux rather than stasis prevailed.[52]

In his focus "upon interacting groups and sects rather than on a unified movement",[53] Stayer's treatise represents a most impressive and legitimate revisionism in Radical Reformation research. Given the confessional needs of Mennonites in the era not coincidentally paralleling that of neo-orthodoxy in American theology, Mennonite ideologues did define sixteenth century Anabaptism to fit their particular situation. Clearing away what appear to be errors in historical judgement from a post mid-century perspective obviously is necessary for "ingroup" and "outgroup" historians alike to facilitate the formulation of a new history for a new day. However, in his commitment to intellectual history to the almost complete exclusion of a sociology of historiography, Stayer begs to be questioned on both his critique of Mennonite historians and his own conclusions.

Stayer, for one, assumes that their ideological usage of Anabaptism blinded Mennonite historians to sixteenth century reality.[54] The truth in this needs to be balanced with the real possibility of a unique mitgefuehl of those who stand in the very ethnic tradition established by certain Anabaptists, who find their own identity in an interpreted version of that sixteenth century aberration, and who episodically at least experience shades of the same ostracism resultant upon rejection of society's majority position. If Mennonites like Blacks and other ethnics bring a unique mood to their history because of their peculiar socialized "realities", then historians need to pause before judging that reading wrong although different from the perspective of their ethnos.

Still within his analysis of Mennonite historiography, Stayer complements those of us Mennonites who accept his revisionist stance in Anabaptist studies by exulting that this development "is heartening evidence that the perspectivist nature of the historian's enterprise does not preclude rationality and progress of knowledge".[55] Such an explanation despite its flattery is only partly adequate. Rationality hopefully plays its role but it is also significant that contemporary Mennonites no longer find necessary the defense of Anabaptism as a viable Christian tradition. Furthermore, by the 1960's the ideological needs of Mennonites were no longer served by a statically formulated systematic theology of "evangelical Anabaptism". Consequently, not only was it possible and necessary to reintroduce the revolutionary Anabaptists into the fold but also the reality of a diversified and acculturated Mennonite denominationalism rendered ready translation of a monolithic Anabaptism into the twentieth century increasingly frustrating and suspect.[56] A new interpretation of Anabaptism followed.[57] Interestingly, in America "ingroup" and "outgroup" redefinitions are proceeding apace suggesting that the dynamics requiring new insights are broadly shared.[58]

Even though an "outgroup" historian of the Anabaptists, Stayer cannot escape his own ideology which is undoubtedly related to his peculiar ethnos. He is, his readers are appropriately informed, "a profane historian with a liberal perspective"[59] who "can better identify with the realpolitical ethic of Zwingli and Hubmaier than with that of any of (his) other protaginists".[60] This biographical revelation offers some indication as to the source and definitions of the categories "crusading", "realpolitical", "apolitical moderates", and "radical apoliticism"[61] which do not appear in the sixteenth century literature, and according to some interpreters, are foreign intrusions into the world of that century.[62] To make Zwingli into the image of John C. Bennett seems as inappropriate from one perspective, as creating Pilgram Marpeck in the image of modern day Mennonites from another. But then each of us works from the "mood" of our unique ethnic identity.

This exploitation of James Stayer's excellent study for present purposes obviously does not exhaust the issue of a sociology of Mennonite historiography. A possible direction in the application of the insights of the sociology of knowledge to church history, however, is hopefully established.

NOTES

[1]H. H. Walsh, "Canada and the Church: A Job for the Historians", Queen's Quarterly, LXI (Spring, 1954), 78; and "The Challenge of Canadian Church History to its Historians", Canadian Journal of Theology, V (1959), 163.

[2]Carl Berger, "Introduction", in Approaches to Canadian History (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), vii.

[3]A good introductory summary of this new awareness, which in itself provides evidence of the sociology of knowledge in operation, is provided by Martin E. Marty, "Ethnicity: The Skeleton of Religion in America", Church History, XLI (March, 1972), 5-21.

[4]Most notably in their: The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., Anchor edition, 1967).

[5]James M. Stayer, Anabaptists and the Sword (Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1972).

[6]Peter L. Berger, The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., Anchor edition, 1969), 15.

[7]See especially: Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, "Sociology of Religion and Sociology of Knowledge", Sociology and Social Research, XLVII (July, 1963); Peter Berger, The Sacred Canopy; and Thomas Luckmann, The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society (New York: The Macmillan Co., Paperback ed., 1970).

[8]Van A. Harvey, "Some Problematical Aspects of Peter Berger's Theory of Religion", Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLI (March, 1973), 75-93.

[9]This suggestion was earlier made with reference to Canadian religious studies by N. K. Clifford, "Religion and the Development of Canadian Society: An Historical Analysis", Church History, XXXVIII (Dec., 1969), 506-523.

[10]See esp. Luckmann, op. cit.

[11]Following a rereading of F. Engels, some recent Marxist historiography has also modified a rigoristic ueberbau-unterbau determinism. e.g. "Die Vorstellungen der Menschen der Menschen sind nicht mechanistisch aus der jeweiligen Klassenkampfsituation abzuleiten", Gerhard Zschaebitz, Zur Mitteldeutschen Wiedertauferbewegung nach dem Grossen Bauernkrieg (Berlin: Ruetten und Loening, 1958), 17.

[12]F. H. Bradley, Collected Essays (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935) I, 20, as quoted by Van A. Harvey, The Historian and the Believer (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), 70.

[13]Peter Berger, "'Sincerity' and 'Authenticity' in Modern Society", The Public Interest, XXXI (Spring, 1973), 84.

[14]James S. Preus, "Toward a Redefinition of the History of Christian Thought", an unpublished paper presented at Andover Newton Theological School, 1969. See also his attempts to move beyond this epistemological trap via the sociology of knowledge: "The Political Functions of Luther's Doctrina", Concordia Theological Monthly, XLIII (October, 1972), 591-599; and "Theological Legitimation for Innovation in the Middle Ages", Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies, III (1972), 1-26.

[15]Robert L. Wilken, The Myth of Christian Beginnings: History's Impact on Belief (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., Anchor edition, 1971), 5.

[16]Ibid., 13.

[17]Ibid., 14.

[18]David S. Landes and Charles Tilly, ed., History as Social Science (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), 5.

[19]Kenneth B. Murdock, "Clio in the Wilderness: History and Biography in Puritan New England", Church History, XXIV (Sept., 1955), 136.

[20]"One can only conclude that the functioning ego, while guarding individuality, is far from isolated, for a kind of communality links egos in a mutual activation. Something in the ego process, then, and something in the social process is - well, identical." Erik H. Erikson, Identity: Youth and Crisis (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968), 224. This is but one reference to a concept Erikson develops here and elsewhere. Church historians weill be especially acquainted with his: Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1958).

[21]This notion is most ably set forth by: Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

[22]For a quick review of sociology of knowledge theories see the relevant article in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, VIII (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1968), 428-435.

[23]This position is implicit in Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958 ed.).

[24]Lee Benson, The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1970 ed.), 331.

[25]Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City (Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I. T. Press, 1963).

[26]John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), esp. ch. III.

[27]E. K. Francis, "The Nature of the Ethnic Group", The American Journal of Sociology, LII (March, 1947), 393-400; and "The Russian Mennonites: From Religious to Ethnic Group", The American Journal of Sociology, LIV (Sept, 1948), 101-107.

[28]Assimilation in American Life, 27.

[29]Ibid., 38.

[30]Andrew M. Greeley, The Denominational Society: A Sociological Approach to Religion in America (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1972), 114.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Assimilation in American Life, 53.

[33] (a) Michael Novak, The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies (New York: The Macmillan Company,), 47 and 48.

(b) Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System", in Michael Banton, ed. Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion (New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1966). 4.

[34]Vincent Harding, "The Afro-American Past", motive (April, 1968) reprinted in Martin E. Marty and Dean G. Peerman, eds., New Theology No. 6 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969), 167-177.

[35]See: John B. Duff and Peter M. Mitchell, eds., The Nat Turner Rebellion: The Historical Event and the Modern Controversy (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971).

[36]See: Marcel Trudel and Genevieve Join, Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study (Ottawa, Ontario: Queen's Printers, 1970); and Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book II Education (Ottawa, Onta io: Queen's Printers, 1968), chapter XVII.

[37]Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1936), 161-164.

[38]See for example: S. N. Eisenstadt, "Intellectuals and Tradition", Daedalus (Spring, 1972), 1-20.

[39]Assimilation in American Life, 56-59, 224-232; and "Social Class and American Intellectuals", American Association of University Professor's Bulletin, XL (Winter, 1954-55), 517-528.

[40]Joshua A. Fishman, "Childhood Indoctrination for Minority-Group Membership", Daedalus (Spring, 1961), 329-349.

[41]Assimilation in American Life, 62.

[42]These unique ethnic identities frequently undergo major redefinition in order to accommodate both acculturation and ethnicity. See: Vladimir C. Nahirny and Joshua A. Fishman, "American Immigrant Groups: Ethnic Identification and the Problem of Generations", The Sociological Review, XIII (November, 1965), 311-326; John J. Appel, "Hansen's Third Generation 'Law' and the Origins of the American Jewish Historical Society", Jewish Social Studies, XXIII (January, 1961); and Nathan Glazer, "Ethnic Groups in America: From National Culture to Ideology" in Morroe Berger, et. al., Freedom and Control in Modern Society (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1954), 158-176. For a sustained study of such an accommodation see: Marshall Sklare, Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955). On general ethnic maintenance see: Joshua A. Fishman, et. al., Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1966).

[43]Without necessarily accepting all the implications of Parsons' analysis, an appropriate definition of "ideology" as here used is "a system of beliefs, held in common by the members of a collectivity, i.e., a society, or a subcollectivity of one - including a movement deviant from the main culture of the society - a system of ideas which is oriented to the evaluative integration of the collectivity, by the interpretation of the empirical nature of the collectivity and of the situation in which it is placed, the processes by which its members are collectively oriented, and their relation to the future course of events" in Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951), 349. The Theoretical framework for my understanding of ideology is informed by: Clifford Geertz, "Ideology as a Cultural System", in David E. Apter, ed., Ideology and Discontent (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), 47-75.

On the ideological function of ethnic, including denominational, history see: John J. Appel, "Immigrant Historical Societies in the United States, 1880-1950" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1959); William G. Andrews, "A Recent Service of Church History to the Church", Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1899, Vol. I (1900), 389-428; and Jacob R. Marcus, Studies in American Jewish History (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1969).

[44]The Mennonites share both ethnic and denominational characteristics. See: Francis, "The Russian Mennonites: From Religious to Ethnic Group", op. cit.

[45]James H. Nichols, "The History of Christianity" in Philip Ashby, ed., Religion (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), 188. Compare: "Of the smaller denominations none has been more active in recent years in cultivating their history than has the Mennonite." William W. Sweet, "Church Archives in the United States", Church History, VIII (1939), 49; and Franklin H. Littell, From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), 141-144.

[46]The writer's doctoral dissertation in progress at Princeton University. "History as Ideology: The Identity Struggle of an American Minority - the Mennonites" (tentative title).

[47]George H. Williams, "Church History" in Arnold S. Nash, ed., Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), 147-180.

[48]See "Historiography: Anabaptist", Mennonite Encyclopedia, II (Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1956), 751-765.

[49]See for example: Gordon Rupp, Patterns of Reformation (London: Epworth Press, 1969), 157, 335; Zschaebitz op. cit., 9-21; and Claus-Peter Clasen, Anabaptism: A Social History, 1525-1618 (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1972).

[50]Anabaptists and the Sword, 8-9

[51]Ibid., 13-14.

[52]Ibid., 21.

[53]Ibid., 20.

[54]Ibid., 10.

[55]Ibid., 20.

[56]See: John H. Yoder, "Anabaptist Vision and Mennonite Reality" in A. J. Klassen, ed., Consultation on Anabaptist-Mennonite Theology (Fresno, California: Council of Mennonite Seminaries, 1970), 1-46; and Paul Peachey, "Identity Crisis Among American Mennonites", Mennonite Quarterly Review,

[57]Especially in the work of Walter Klaassen. See his: "The Nature of the Anabaptist Protest", Mennonite Quarterly Review, XLV (October, 1971), 291-311.

[58]The work of Bainton, Williams and Littell generally shared the earlier Mennonite interpretation, whereas Stayer's reading is very similar to that of Walter Klaassen, op. cit.

[59]Anabaptists and the Sword, 6.

[60]Ibid., 22.

[61]Ibid., 3.

[62]e.g.: Walter Klaassen, op. cit.